

## **SOCIAL-CAPABILITY OF ADOLESCENCE IN RELATION TO THEIR SEX AND LOCALITY**

*\*Maansi sharma (Sr.Asstt.Prof.)*

*Govt.College Of Education*

### **ABSTRACT:**

Social capability is an important ingredient of modern civilizations and is the essential attribute of the members of a society. It is an elusive concept because the skills and behavior required for healthy social development vary with the age of child and with the demands of particular situations. The level of success of an individual in the society depends upon the extent to which he has acquired richness and potency of social capability desirable for his self-actualization, growth and development. Locality shows a significant role in determining the level of social competence of the individual. Present study was conducted on sample of 400 (200 rural and 200 urban). Test of significance revealed significant difference in the terms of locality and gender. No other significant difference was found. Keeping these figures in mind, we need to focus on those factors which help to recover and awareness to the extent of this problem among college students.

**Keywords:** *College, Sex, Locality, Social capability*

### **INTRODUCTION:**

Adolescence is a period of rapid physical growth and mental development. This transitional stage involves biological (i.e. pubertal), social and psychological changes, though the biological or physiological ones are easy to measure objectively. Adolescence is clearly a time during which many changes occur and thus, it is regarded as a significant intervention point for behavioral change (O' Dunohue & Tolle, 2009). Mostly the collegiate during the period of adolescence face number of challenges like:

- Accepting one's physical condition or body as it is;
- Achieving new and more mature relationships with age mates;
- Playing social roles i.e. becoming responsible member of society;
- Acquiring values;
- Preparing for economic career;
- Preparing for marriage and family life.

Man as a social being in general and adolescent in particular has to face many challenges in his life for making his proper adjustment in various situations of life. For this purpose he has to develop sufficient level of competence and confidence in him. Competence means the ability to do something in a satisfactory or effective way to achieve the goal.

In early childhood, social capability has been defined as "the ability of young children to successfully and appropriately select and carry out their interpersonal goals" Guralnick( 1990) p. 4), and socially competent young children have been described as

“those who engage in satisfying interactions and activities with adults and peers” (Katz & McClellan (1997) Thus, social capability is indexed by effectiveness and appropriateness in human interaction and relationships.

### **Social Capability and Adolescence**

Previous studies have reported that the Social capability/competence was interlinked with adolescence. Rubin (2001) and other scientists understand social competence as effectiveness and adequateness of an individual's reflection of various problem situations in life, and the ability to overcome them. Social competence is an important ingredient of modern civilizations and is the essential attribute of the members of a society. It is an elusive concept because the skills and behavior required for healthy social development vary with the age of child and with the demands of particular situations. The level of success of an individual in the society depends upon the extent to which he has acquired richness and potency of social competence desirable for his self-actualization, growth and development. social competence is attributed as the ability to communicate, cooperate, to handle conflicts, to achieve goals, to adapt easily, to display the initiative, to take responsibility etc. (Valeeva & Karimova, 2014). Rubin & Rose-Krasnor define social competence as "the ability to achieve personal goals in social interaction while simultaneously maintaining positive relationships with others over time and across situations".

In the light of the above discussion the investigator felt it necessary to undertake the present research work

### **OBJECTIVES OF THE PRESENT STUDY:**

Following will be the main objectives of the present study:

- To study the significant differences in social competence of college students in terms of locality..
- To study the significant differences in social competence of rural college students in terms of gender.
- To study the significant differences in social competence of urban college students. in terms of gender.
- Comparison of social competence scores among urban college students as per category
- Comparison of social competence scores among rural college students as per category

### **HYPOTHESES**

- There will be no significant differences in social competence of college students in terms of locality.
- There will be no significant differences in social competence of college students in terms of gender.
- There will be no significant differences in social competence of urban college students in terms of gender.
- There will be no significant differences in social competence of urban college students in terms of category

- There will be no significant differences in social competence of urban college students in terms of category
- There will be no significant differences in social competence of urban college students in terms of category
- There will be no significant differences in social competence of rural college students in terms of category

**METHODOLOGY:**

**Sample:** A sample of 400 (200 rural and 200 urban) was randomly selected by Tippet’s method from the different college students of Jammu city. All the students were in the B.A./B.Sc/B.Com Part-I of degree colleges of Jammu city.

**TOOLS TO BE USED:**

**Social competence :** Social competence in the present study consists of the factors like social sensitivity, social maturity, social skills, social relations, social skills, social relations, social commitment, social appreciation ability, social emotional integrity, social involvement, social respectability, social leadership, social cooperates and compliance, social acceptability social tolerance, social competition, social authority, adult-resource exploitability, social participation, pro-Social attitude & composite social scale. For the present study, social competence will be measured on the basis of scores obtained by the respondents on the social competence scale developed by Dr. V.P Sharma, Dr. KiranShukla and Dr.PrabhaShukla

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS:**

Table 1: Comparison of social competence scores among college students as per locality.

VARIABLE	Locality	N	MEAN	SD	t	df	SIG.(2-tailed)
Social competence	Rural	200	200.14	21.989	1.867	398	.063
	urban	200	196.07	21.604			

Table 2: Comparison of social competence scores among rural college students as per gender

VARIABLE	GENDER	N	MEAN	SD	Cr -ratio	df	SIG.(2-tailed)
Social competence	Rural boys	100	196.79	21.295	2.175	198	.031*
	Rural girls	100	203.49	22.266			

**Table 3 : Comparison of social competence scores among urban college students as per gender**

VARIABLE	GENDER	N	MEAN	SD	Cr -ratio	df	SIG.(2-tailed)
Social competence	Urban boys	100	189.53	23.419	4.482	198	.000**
	Urban GIRLS	100	202.61	17.418			

**Table 4: Comparison of social competence scores among urban college students as per category**

VARIABLE	GENDER	N	MEAN	SD	Cr -ratio	df	SIG.(2-tailed)
Social competence	Urban reserved category GIRLS	50	202.12	18.512	.280	98	.780
	Urban general GIRLS	50	203.10	16.425			

**Table 5: Comparison of social competence scores among rural college students as per category**

VARIABLE	GENDER	N	MEAN	SD	Cr -ratio	df	SIG.(2-tailed)
Social competence	Rural reserved Boys	50	201.86	19.082	2.440	98	.016*
	Rural gen boys	50	191.72	22.352			

**Table 6: Comparison of social competence scores among urban college students as per category**

VARIABLE	GENDER	N	MEAN	SD	Cr -ratio	df	SIG.(2-tailed)
Social competence	Urban reserved Boys	50	188.50	27.516	.438	98	.662
	urban general boys	50	190.56	18.675			

Table 7: Comparison of social competence scores among rural college students as per category

VARIABLE	GENDER	N	MEAN	SD	Cr -ratio	df	SIG.(2-tailed)
Social competence	Rural reserved category GIRLS	50	211.00	21.740	3.567	98	.001**
	Rural general GIRLS	50	195.98	20.345			

**DISCUSSION :**

**Social Competence and Locality:**Table 1 shows that mean score of rural students are higher than urban students. A study of MamataNayak (2014) revealed that 31.67% urban school adolescents exhibited high level of social competence, while only 14.17% of rural school adolescents exhibited high level social competence, which was accounted for the difference in cultural values, cultural beliefs and other related facilities. Sternberg (2004) bluntly stated,” Behaviour that in one cultural context is smart may be, in another cultural context, stupid”.

**Social Competence, Locality and Sex Differences:** Table 2 shows that the significant difference between rural boys and rural girls on Social competence. RURAL girls scored higher social competence (M=203.49) than rural boys (M=196.79). Table 3 shows that the significant difference between urban boys and Urban GIRLS on Social competence. Urban girls scored higher social competence (M=202.61) than rural boys (M=189.53). A study of Putallaz, Hellstern, Shep- pard, Grimes, &Glodis, (1995) revealed that girls seem to be more competent overall in determining the intentions of others and in generating effective solutions to social problems. Walker (2005) depicted that significantly predicted more aggressive or disruptive behavior for boys and higher prosocialbehavior for girls in peer-related social competence. Miller, Danaher, & Forbes, 1986; Musun-Miller, 1993; Walker, Irving, &Berthelsen, 2002 indicated that there may be important gender differences in the ways in which children think about social problems and solve interpersonal conflicts .

**Social Competence, Locality, Category:**

Table 4 shows that the urban reserved category girls scored higher social competence (M= 18.512) than urban general girls (M=16.42).where as Table 5 shows that the significant difference between rural reserved category boys and rural general category boys. Rural reserved boys scored higher social competence (M= 201.86) than rural general boys (M=191.72). Table 6 shows that the urban general boys scored higher social competence (M= 190.56) than Urban reserved Boys (M=188.50) More over Table 7 shows that the significant difference between rural reserved girls and rural general girls. rural reserved category girls scored higher social competence (M=211.00) than rural general girls(M=195.98).Shiner (2000) in another study on childhood personality, an

importance construct of social competence, reported that such skill changes with time/age and continues to late adolescence.

## REFERENCES :

Guralnick M. J., (1990). Social competence and early intervention *Journal of Early Intervention* 14(1): 3-14 [CrossRefGoogle Scholar](#)

Katz L. G., McClellan D. E., (1997). *Fostering children's social competence: The teacher's role*. Washington, DC: NAEYC [Google Scholar](#)

Miller, P. M., Danaher, D. L., & Forbes, D. (1986). Sex-related strategies for coping with interpersonal conflict in children aged five and seven. *Developmental Psychology*, 22, 543-548.

Musun-Miller, L. (1993). Social acceptance and social problem solving in preschool children. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 14, 59-70.

Nayak.M (2014) Influence of culture linked gender and age on social competence of higher secondary school adolescents retrieved from [http://www.ijhssi.org/papers/v3\(10\)/Version-1/H03101031039.pdf](http://www.ijhssi.org/papers/v3(10)/Version-1/H03101031039.pdf)

O'Donohue, W., & Tolle, L. W. (2009). *Behavioral approaches to chronic disease in adolescence: A guide to integrative care*. New York: Springer

Putallaz, M., Hellstern, L., Sheppard, B. L., Grimes, C. L., & Glodis, K. A. (1995). Conflict, social competence, and gender: Maternal and peer contexts. *Early Education and Development*, 6, 433-447.

Rubin, K.H. & Rose-Krasnor, L. (1992). Interpersonal problem solving. In V.B. Van Hasselt & M. Hersen (Eds.), *Handbook of social development* (pp. 283-323). New York: Plenum

Rubin, K. H. (2001). *Interpersonal problem solution and social competency in children's behavior*. St.

Petersburg: Piter

Shiner, R. (2000). Linking childhood personality with adaptation: Evidence for continuity and change across time into late adolescence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(2), 310-325.

Sternberg, R.J. (2004). Culture and Intelligence. *American Psychologist*, 59 (5), 325-338.

Valeeva, R. A., & Karimova, L. A. (2014). Research of Future Pedagogue-Psychologists' Social Competency and Pedagogical Conditions of its Formation. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 131, 40-44.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.076>

Walker, S. (2005). Gender differences in the relationship between young children's peer-related social competence and individual differences in theory of mind. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 166 (3), 297-312

Walker, S., Irving, K., & Berthelsen, D. (2002). Gender influences on preschool children's social problem-solving strategies. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 163, 197-209.