

Connecting Social Intelligence with Social Media Usage: A Study at a University

Mohd Raziq¹ and Dr Shiva Shukla²

¹ Research Scholar, School of Education, Central University of Gujrat, Gandhinagar

² Ex-Assistant Professor, Central University of Punjab, Bathinda, OrcID identifier: 0000-0002-4036-4736

Abstract:- Educational activities need teamwork from stakeholders to achieve intended targets. Teamwork is a collaborative process involving interactions and communication. Social interactions result in successful collaborations when social intelligence is applied. Social media platforms are used extensively by university students for their social interactions. Social media usage is a behaviour with a pattern that can be determined psychometrically. With this idea, the present research was conducted to study the association of social media usage with the context of social intelligence, referring to gender and subject stream. The study involved a sample of 208 students stratified based on subject stream, i.e., arts and science students and gender. The data was collected via a proportional stratified sampling technique for fourth-semester postgraduate students of the university. The study's findings suggest the group performed average for social intelligence and high for social media usage. The students of the arts stream showed higher social intelligence than science students. The male students performed better in social intelligence, and the female students showed higher social media usage.

Keywords:- *Interpersonal Intelligence, Practical Intelligence, Social Platforms, Social Networking, User-Friendly Media, Higher Education Institutions*

I. INTRODUCTION

The world today changes rapidly owing to research and innovation in every field. These changes develop frequently and make life complex. Technology plays a crucial role in making life convenient along with these challenges. The technical interface creates intricacies in life functions that further needs to be addressed by research and innovations. Thus, technology makes lives multifaceted and forever changes how we connect with the world. Higher education also witnesses technological advancement. These advancements expedite industry 4.0 strategies: digitalization, knowledge intensification, trust building, dialogue, and networking (Cunningham, 2018). These strategies have led organizations to create them as values for their stakeholders who work, communicate and behave to promote these practices (du Plessis, 2021).

University education requires the involvement of many stakeholders, including present and ex-students, faculty members, staff, administrators, trustees, employers, policymakers, government planners, and the public. Industry 4.0 strategies make the education sector attain quality-oriented social and collaborative approaches. Thus, an

academic environment thrives on social connections. The social life at the university campus is known for the varied associations that are the basis of the student's future social network. The use of technology to complete tasks and communicate affects interpersonal relationships. The complex situation is made workable when the social behaviour gets facilitated through judicious interpersonal dealings. A behaviour apt to interpersonal intelligence ensures good networking, dialogue, and a congenial work environment. Social intelligence is the ability to transact interpersonally (Chadha, 1986).

➤ *Social intelligence and university students*

University witnesses diversity among students. The diversities are always welcome and celebrated as part of the academic culture. Socialization is often promoted to achieve integration among university students. With practical intelligence, social interactions can achieve productivity and success in associated areas. One aspect of student engagement on the university campus is social. Interactions with friends and peers in the academic and social spheres of the institution and interaction with teaching staff are the core area of campus social engagement (Zhoc, 2020). Sociability and social adaptability are interchangeable terms with social intelligence and are crucial for successful social engagements. Social intelligence manifests in an individual's social behaviour (Strang, 1930). Sociability is social skills, traits, and abilities that help achieve desired social success (Gilliland and Burke, 1926). These skills of social interactions aid in adapting to social situations (Gerardi, 2015). Social intelligence is a visible social skill, observed mainly through the responses experienced practically by oneself and others (Boyatzis et al., 2015). For students, social skills predict strategies for valuing acceptance by peers and involvement in campus activities (Chan, 2003). Social intelligence enables a behavioural repertoire of social problem-solving skills, positive social actions, and prosocial traits that promotes success in friendships (Newcomb et al., 1993). Thus, Interpersonal intelligence benefits social functioning in higher education institutions.

The employability skills of university graduates are decisive for job prospects. The social aspect of these skills involves effective communication, interpersonal intelligence, and interpersonal skills (Malhotra, 2020). The university campus provides many opportunities to develop social intelligence and social skills required for future employment. An individual's integration into a group commences during the learning stage. Here, the individual benefits from others' experiences and fosters behaviours guided by external references (Bouvard and Suzanne, 2016). Social skills also

bring success in campus leadership roles. The university setting is a ground for future leaders. Successful leaders exhibit empathy and attune to other people's moods (Goleman and Boyatzis, 2008). Socialization opportunities for future leadership roles meet success with social intelligence, where empathic interpersonal dealings play a crucial role.

➤ *Social media usage and university students*

Social media is a group of internet-based applications built on the foundations of Web 2.0 technology, allowing the creation and exchange of user-generated content (Kaplan and Haenlein, 2010). Different social media platforms are most frequently used to make social connections available in busy campus life. Social communication and interactions are more accessible through social media than any other mode of communication. The convenience of usage gets enhanced as they are accessible through mobile devices. The interface is asynchronous and user-friendly, with a constant flow of messages. The activities involved are clicks and keystrokes, which cut out the tiresome nuances of social formalities for sharing thoughts. The interface also makes socialization convenient for socially shy and introverts (Thompson, 2018). The social life of students has entirely changed in the last few decades owing to the usage of online platforms. How social media is used now impacts the connectivity to kith, kin and peers within personal and professional lives. (Jacob, 2015).

These social media include blogs, microblogs, and other communication networks like Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Blogs, WhatsApp, WeChat, Myspace, Snapchat, and many more. These internet-based social networks allow users to interact and communicate with each other in a systematic stream. University students are inseparable from their virtual social media identities in present times. Social networking sites are often used to discuss movies, music, national issues like politics and economy, religious matters, and academics (Eke et al., 2014). Online networking activities range from instant messaging, following other social IDs, catching up on the news, taking videos or photos, sharing them, dating, and making themselves aware of the trends (Bal and Bicen, 2017). Social media is prevalent for personal communications and upsurges within the professional scope as university graduates are expected to possess networking skills essential for employment. Academic institutions are encouraging social media usage for educational purposes, specifically concerning the distribution of course materials, communication channels on campus, and the enhancement of collaborative learning and knowledge building (Collins and Halverson 2010). It is now used as a platform through which higher education curriculum is delivered as students, faculty members, and administrators depend on social media to disseminate their instruction, learning, research, and extension activities (Jacob, 2015). With the prevalence of mobile devices for social media use, learning is ubiquitous, as students can interact with the content and study without specific learning locations (Gikas and Grant, 2013).

➤ *Social media usage and intelligent social interactions*

Social media provide space for user-generated content and online social interaction. Its usage can be catchphrase as everybody and anybody can share anything, anywhere,

anytime (Joosten, 2012). Socialization is an integral part of academic campus life. Youngsters live and thrive in their groups. This socialization proves to be a stepping stone to significant aspects of their future life. Owing to the busy lifestyle and plethora of challenges a student faces, they have become the largest group using social media and platforms for maintaining their social networking. Social media usage is an intelligent answer to the busy lifestyle challenge and a convenient method to be part of a group. A communication interface with technology is always impersonal, and when interpersonal intelligence is applied, it helps achieve success in socialization, collaborations, and teamwork, making industry 4.0 strategies successful.

❖ *Operational definitions*

➤ *Social Intelligence*

Social intelligence is the ability to deal with people, react to social situations in daily life and build relationships. Social intelligence develops in eight dimensions: patience, cooperativeness, confidence, sensitivity, recognition of the environment, tactfulness, sense of humour, and memory.

➤ *Social Media Usage*

Social media usage is the web 2.0-supported internet-based activities related to creating, publishing and exchanging user-generated content.

❖ *Objectives of the study*

- To analyze the difference in levels of social intelligence
- To study the relationship of social intelligence with social media usage
- To investigate the association of social intelligence concerning social media usage for science students
- To test the connection of social intelligence regarding social media usage for art students
- To associate the relationship between social intelligence for social media usage of male students
- To examine the relationship between social intelligence for social media usage of female students

II. METHODOLOGY

The study sought to find the distribution of social intelligence and its association with the usage of different types of social media. The appropriate method for this purpose was concluded to be a descriptive survey. The social intelligence scores were collected by utilizing a standardized scale. Further, a researcher-constructed scale was used to gather scores for the psychometric measures of social media usage.

➤ *The population of the study*

The study population was fourth-semester postgraduate students of the Central University of Punjab. There were 452 students enrolled as per the official record, of which 331 were from science and 121 were from the art faculty.

➤ *Sample of the study*

The sample frame with a 5% margin for error and 95% confidence level for the population of 452 was estimated to be 208 students.

➤ *Sampling techniques*

The data was collected using a proportionate stratified sampling technique. The sample of 208 students was further divided into science and art faculty strata. The science students were 152, with 85 male and 67 female students. There were 56 art students, with 25 male and 31 female students. Here each stratum was proportionate to its population size.

➤ *Data collection*

Using a proportionate stratified random sampling technique, the investigator made a sample of 208 students enrolled at the Central University of Punjab for postgraduate programs for session 2017-19 for the 4th semester. The head of every department and concerned authorities sought permission to collect the data. Interaction and rapport building with the students was ensured before the data collection. The data was collected after giving adequate instructions.

➤ *Tools for data collection*

• *Social Intelligence*

The Social Intelligence Scale (Chadda and Ganeshan, 1986) was utilized with 66 multiple-choice test items. The scale was divided into eight dimensions: patience, cooperativeness, confidence, sensitivity, recognition of social environment, tactfulness, sense of humour, and memory.

• *Social Media Usage*

The investigators constructed the Social Media Usage Questionnaire based on the standardized Usage of Social Networking Sites Questionnaire (Gupta and Bashir, 2018). The questionnaire had four dimensions: academics, socialization, entertainment, and informativeness, based on the core areas of students' activities.

➤ *The technique of analysis and interpretation*

The hypotheses were tested using mean, standard deviation, and Pearson's coefficient of statistical correlation techniques. Hypotheses were tested using Pearson's Coefficient of Correlation statistical technique.

III. RESULTS, INTERPRETATION, AND DISCUSSION

➤ *Hypothesis 1: There is no significant relationship between social intelligence and social media usage*

Table 1: Relationship between social intelligence and social media usage

Variable	N	Mean	SD	R	Remark
Social Intelligence	208	88.55	8.58	-0.0693	Not Significant
Social Media Usage		82.64	7.98		

The mean value of science students for social intelligence is 88.55, and social media usage is 82.64. Pearson's coefficient of correlation is calculated to be -0.0693. As the calculated value of *r* was less than the table value, we may say no significant relationship exists between Social Intelligence and Social Media usage. Hence, the null hypothesis was accepted.

➤ *Hypothesis 2: No significant relationship exists between social intelligence and social media usage among science students*

Table 2: Relationship between social intelligence and social media usage for science students

Variable	N	Mean	SD	R	Remark
Social Intelligence	153	87.69	8.39	-0.093	Not Significant
Social Media Usage		82.76	7.63		

The mean performance of science students for social intelligence was 87.69, and social media usage was 82.76. Pearson's Coefficient of Correlation was calculated as -0.093. Since the calculated value of *r* was less than the table value, we may say that no significant relationship is found between the two variables. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

➤ *Hypothesis 3: No significant relationship is present between social intelligence and social media usage among art students*

Table 3: Relationship between social intelligence and social media usage of art students

Variable	N	Mean	SD	R	Remarks
Social Intelligence	55	90.96	6.05	-0.0025	Not Significant
Social Media Usage		82.30	8.96		

Art students' mean social intelligence performance is 90.96, and social media usage is 82.3. Pearson's coefficient of correlation is calculated to be -0.0025. Since the calculated value of *r* was less than the table value, we may say no relationship was found between the two variables. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted.

➤ *Hypothesis 4: Social intelligence and social media usage do not relate significantly for male students*

Table 4: Relationship between social intelligence and social media usage for male students

Variable	N	Mean	SD	R	Remarks
Social Intelligence	111	89.01	8.89	0.078	Not Significant
Social Media Usage		82.02	8.04		

The mean value of male students for social intelligence is 89.01, and social media usage is 82.02. Pearson's coefficient of correlation was calculated as 0.078. Since the calculated value of r was less than the table value, we may say that no significant relationship was found between social intelligence and social media usage for male students. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

➤ *Hypothesis 5: There is no significant relationship between social intelligence and social media usage for female students*

Table 5: Relationship between social intelligence and usage of social media for female students

Variable	N	Mean	SD	R	Remark
Social Intelligence	97	88.02	8.23	-0.246	Significant at 0.05 level
Social Media Usage		83.35	7.89		

The mean performance of female students for social intelligence is 88.02, and social media usage is 83.35. Pearson's coefficient of correlation is calculated to be -0.246. as the table value of r is less than the calculated value, we may say that a significant relationship exists between the two variables. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

- Overall, students performed average in social intelligence
- Social media usage among all students is found to be average
- Social intelligence is found to be higher in science students than in art students
- Science students are high social media users than art students
- Male university students are found to be more socially Intelligent than female students
- Female students are found to be higher social media users than male students
- No significant relationship is found between social intelligence and social media usage for art and science students
- No significant relationship is found between social intelligence and social media usage for male students
- A significant negative relationship is found between social intelligence and social media usage for female students

RECOMMENDATIONS

- The mean score for all the university students reflects average social intelligence. It is recommended that the university should include expert guidance and counselling to promote collaboration and meaningful socialization among university students.
- As social media usage is average among the students, the university can adopt methods to include higher education social media, also known as HESM, practices for academic purposes as they would prove to be beneficial to higher education stakeholders at all levels

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

- As social media is popular among the young generation, similar studies can be conducted on school students
- Similar studies can be conducted to find the rural and urban differences
- Similar studies can be accomplished through qualitative techniques of analysis

LIMITATIONS

- The study was limited to the Central University of Punjab, Bathinda.
- The study was limited to science and arts streams, and students of humanities were not part of the research design
- The tool for Social Media Usage was not standardized

REFERENCES

- [1]. Bal, E., & Bicen, H. (2017). The purpose of students' social media use and determining their perspectives on education. *Procedia Computer Science*, 120, 177–181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2017.11.226>
- [2]. Boyatzis, R.E., Gaskin, J., Wei, H. (2015). Emotional and Social Intelligence and Behavior. In: Goldstein, S., Princiotta, D., Naglieri, J. (eds) *Handbook of Intelligence*. Springer, New York, NY. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-1562-0_17
- [3]. Bouvard, P., & Suzanne, H. (2016). *Collective Intelligence Development in Business*. John Wiley & Sons. DOI:10.1002/9781119377641
- [4]. Chadha, N.K., & Ganesan, U. (1986). *Publication manual for social intelligence scale*. National Psychological Corporation, 4/230, Kacheri Ghat, Agra, India. 1986.
- [5]. Chan, D.W. (2003). Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence and Their Relationships with Social Coping Among Gifted Adolescents in Hong Kong. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 32, 409–418. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025982217398>

- [6]. Collins, A., & Halverson, R. (2010). The second educational revolution: Rethinking education in the age of technology. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 26(1), 18–27.
- [7]. Du Plessis, M. (2021). Enhancing Psychological Wellbeing in Industry 4.0: The Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence, Social Connectedness, Work-Life Balance and Positive Coping Behaviour. In: Ferreira, N., Potgieter, I.L., Coetzee, M. (eds) *Agile Coping in the Digital Workplace*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-70228-1_6
- [8]. Eke, H. N., Omekwu, C. O., & Odoh, J. N. (2014). The use of social networking sites among undergraduate students of the university of Nigeria, Nsukka. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 2014(1).
- [9]. Gerardi, D. (2015). PERSPECTIVES ON LEADERSHIP: Conflict Engagement: Emotional and Social Intelligence. *The American Journal of Nursing*, 115(8), 60–65. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26619727>
- [10]. Gikas, J., & Grant, M. M. (2013). Mobile computing devices in higher education: Student perspectives on learning with cell phones, smartphones & social media. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 19, 18–26.
- [11]. Gilliland, A.R., & Burke, R. (1926). Measures of Sociability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 10, 315-26.
- [12]. Goleman, D., & Boyatzis, R. (2008). Social intelligence and the biology of leadership. *Harvard business review*, 86(9), 74-81.
- [13]. Gupta, S. & Bashir, L. (2018). Social Networking Usage Questionnaire: Development and Validation in an Indian Higher Education Context. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 19 (4), 214-227. DOI: 10.17718/tojde.471918
- [14]. Jacob, W.J. (2015). Social Media, Social Intelligence, and Emerging Trends in Higher Education Communication. In: Neubauer, D.E., Ghazali, K. (eds) *Technology and Workplace Skills for the Twenty-First Century*. International and Development Education. Palgrave Macmillan, New York. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137491923_3
- [15]. Joosten, T. (2012). *Social media for educators: Strategies and best practices*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [16]. Kaplan, A. M., & Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of Social Media. *Business Horizons*, 53(1), 59–68.
- [17]. Newcomb, A. F., Bukowski, W. M., & Pattee, L. (1993). Children's peer relations: A meta-analytic review of popular, rejected, neglected, controversial, and average sociometric status. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113, 99–128. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.113.1.99.
- [18]. Strang, R. (1930). Measures of Social Intelligence. *American Journal of Sociology*, 36(2), 263–269. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2766381>
- [19]. Zhoc, K.C.H., King, R.B., Chung, T.S.H. *et al.* (2020). Emotionally intelligent students are more engaged and successful: examining the role of emotional intelligence in higher education. *European Journal of Psychological Education* 35, 839–863. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-019-00458-0>
- **WEBLIOGRAPHY**
- [20]. Cunningham, S. (2018, September 7). The difference between the terms Fourth Industrial Revolution and Industrie 4.0 matters, Cunningham. <https://www.cunningham.org.za/2018/09/07/the-difference-between-the-terms-fourth-industrial-revolution-and-industrie-4-0-matters/>
- [21]. Malhotra, S. (2020, June 23). Decoding Employability: Building your "Personal Brand", Socially Desi. <https://sociallydesi.com/why-employability-skills-are-important/>
- [22]. Thompson, E. (2018, February 8). Is Social Media Helping Or Hurting Introverts?, Huffington Post. https://www.huffpost.com/archive/ca/entry/is-social-media-helping-or-hurting-introverts_a_23348251