

Social Competence in Adolescence



Chauhan M. B.
Research Scholar
Deptt. of Psychology,
Suarashtra University,
Rajkot, Gujarat



Yogesh A. Jogsan
Associate Professor,
Deptt. of Psychology,
Suarashtra University,
Rajkot, Gujarat

Abstract

The main purpose of this research was to find out the social competence in adolescence. The sample consisted of 80 adolescences out of 40 boys and 40 girls were selected purposive sampling methods from the same schools of the Rajkot city (Gujarat). For this purpose of investigation social competence scale developed by V. P. Sharma, K. Shukla and P. Shukla in English language. Gujarati translated by Y. A. jogsan and D. R. Doshi (2017). The obtained data was analyzed t-test to know the mean difference between boys and girls adolescence. The result reveled that are not significant difference in social sensitivity, social skills, social relation, social commitment, social appreciation ability, socio-emotional integrity, social involvement, social respectability, social leadership, social cooperation and compliance, social acceptability, social tolerance, social competition, adult-resource exploitability, social participation and pro-social attitude among boys and girls adolescence. The result also revealed that significant difference in social maturity at 0.05 levels in boys and girls adolescence.

Keywords: Social Competence.

Introduction

Past and current research intends to further the understanding of how and why social competence is important in healthy social development. The study of social competence began in the early 20th century. A noteworthy discovery was that social competence was related to future mental health, thus fueling research on how children interact with their peers and function in social situations. As research developed, different definitions and measurement techniques developed to suit these new findings.

“Social competence is the condition of possessing the social, emotional, and intellectual skills and behaviors needed to succeed as a member of society”.

Parents are the primary source of social and emotional support for children during the first years of life, but in later years peers begin to play a significant role in a child's social-emotional development. Increasingly with age, peers rather than parents become preferred companions, providing important sources of entertainment and support. In the context of peer interactions, young children engage in fantasy play that allows them to assume different roles, learn to take another person's perspective, and develop an understanding of the social rules and conventions of their culture. In addition, relationships with peers typically involve more give-and-take than relationships with adults and thus provide an opportunity for the development of social competencies such as cooperation and negotiation.

During adolescence, peer relations become particularly important for children. A key developmental task of adolescence is the formation of an identity or sense of the kind of person one is and the kind of person one wants to be. Adolescents try on different social roles as they interact with peers, and peers serve as a social stepping stone as adolescents move away from their emotional dependence upon their parents and toward autonomous functioning as an adult. In many ways, then, childhood peer relations serve as training grounds for future interpersonal relation, providing children with opportunities to learn about reciprocity and intimacy. These skills are associated with effective interpersonal relations in adult life, including relations with co-workers and with romantic partners.

Temperament

Temperament is a construct that describes a person's biological response to the environment. Issues such as suitability, rhythm city, sociability and arousal make up this construct. Most often sociability contributes to the development of social competence.

Attachment

Social experiences rest on the foundation of parent-child relationships, and are important in the later development of social skills and behaviors. Attachment of an infant to a care-giver is important for the development of later social skills and behaviors that develop social competence. Attachment helps the infant learn that the world is predictable and trustworthy or in other instances capricious and cruel. Answer describes four types of attachment styles in infancy, including secure, anxious-avoidant, anxious-resistant and disorganized/disoriented. The foundation of the attachment bond allows the child to venture out from his/her mother to try new experiences and new interactions. Children with secure attachment styles tend to show higher levels of social competence relative to children with unsecure attachment, including anxious-avoidant, anxious-resistant, and disorganized/disoriented.

Parenting Style

Parents are the primary source of social and emotional development in infancy, early, and middle/late childhood. The socialization practices of parents influence whether their child will develop social competence. Parenting style captures two important elements of parenting: parental warmth/responsiveness and parental control/demanding. Parental responsiveness (warmth or supportiveness) refers to "the extent to which parents intentionally foster individuality, self-regulation, and self-assertion by being attuned, supportive, and acquiescent to children's special needs and demands." Parental demanding (behavioral control) refers to "the claims parents make on children to become integrated into the family whole, by their maturity demands, supervision, disciplinary efforts and willingness to confront the child who disobeys."

Parenting style contributes to child well-being in the domains of social competence, academic performance, psychosocial development, and problem behavior. Research based on parent interviews, child reports, and parent observations consistently find that:

1. Children and adolescents whose parents are authoritative rate themselves and are rated by objective measures as more socially and instrumentally competent than those whose parents are no authoritative.
2. Children and adolescents whose parents are uninvolved perform most poorly in all domains.

Other factors that contribute to social competence include teacher relationships, peer groups, neighborhood, and community.

Social Competence during Adolescence: Social Sensitivity, Locus of Control, Empathy, and Peer Popularity by Gerald R. Adams. In this research male and female adolescents aged 14, 15, 17, and 18 years of age, the predictive relationship between social competency and peer relations and age differences in social competence were studied. Based upon a social deficit hypothesis, linear age differences were observed in social knowledge, locus of control, and a trend in empathy. Some sex differences were found, but no sex by age interactions were observed.

The predicted relationship between social competency and peer popularity was supported, but was different according to sex of the adolescent.

Social Cognition and Social Competence in Adolescence by Martin Ford(2016). In this research investigated whether social cognition is related to effective social behavior, using 2 samples of 9th and 12th graders as Ss. Social competence was defined as the attainment of relevant social goals in specified social contexts, using appropriate means and resulting in positive development. The social goal chosen was being able to behave effectively in challenging social situations involving salient social objects. Nine measures of social cognition and 4 other measures were used to predict 4 measures of social competence, each dealing with performance in specific challenging social situations. Taken together, these predictors accounted for a large proportion of variance in social competence, especially when a composite criterion was used. Significant age and sex differences were obtained for many of the predictor and criterion variables, and there also appeared to be important developmental differences in the validity of social competence judgments. Factor analysis results suggested that social competence represents a domain of human functioning that is at least partly distinguishable from a cognitive or general competence domain. These results were substantially replicated in a 2nd sample.

Methodology**Problem of Research**

Social Competence in Adolescence

Objective of Research

The main objectives of this study were as under.

1. To examine the Social Competence in Adolescence.

Null-Hypothesis of Research

To related objectives of this study, null hypothesis were as under.

1. There will be no significant difference between means of various components of social competence in adolescence (such as social maturity, social sensitivity, social skills, social relation, social commitment, social appreciation ability, socio-emotional integrity, social involvement, social respectability, social leadership, social cooperation and compliance, social acceptability, social tolerance, social competition, adult/resource exploitability, social participation and pro-social attitude).

Variables of Research

Variables of the Present study as under:

1. Independent variables
 - (i) Gender: Boys and Girls
2. Dependent variables
 - (i) Score receive on social competence scale.
3. Control variables
 - (1)In this study only adolescence were taken.
 - (2)Limited samples were taken for this study.
 - (3)The selection of sample only from same schools of Rajkot city.

(4)In this present study includes 13 to 18 years adolescence.

Participants of Research

According to the purpose of present study total 80 samples has been selected. There were 40 boys and 40 girls adolescence were taken as a sample from different area in Rajkot city (Gujarat).

Instrument of Research

Following Instrument were used for data collection:

Social Competence Scale

Social competence scale made by Dr. V. P. Sharma, Dr. Prabha Shukla and Dr. Kiran Shukla (1992). This scale translated by Y. A. Jogsan (2017). It consisted of 50 items, distributed into eighteen components such as social sensitivity of item No. 1, 44, social maturity of item No. 3 to 5, 10 to 14, 30, 31, 33, 37, 49, social skills of item No. 22, 36, 48, 50, social relations of item No. 28, 39, 40, social commitment of item No. 24, social appreciation ability of item No. 27, socio-emotional integrity of item No. 19,47, social involvement of item No.42, social respectability of item No. 32, 41, social leadership of item No. 2, 19, 21, social co-operational and compliance of item No. 17, social acceptability of item No. 23, social tolerance of item No. 6, 8, 9, 15, 20, 26, social competition of item No. 7, 25, 34, 35, 46, social authority of item No. 16, adult-resource exploitability of item No. 38, social participations of item No. 45 and pro-social attitude of item No. 43. This scale was five pint rating from 'very high, high, average, low and very low'. The test-retest reliability 0.67 and the coefficient of inter ratter reliability are 0.67 and validity is very good.

Procedure of Data Collection

In this study purposive sampling method was used. Initial meeting with the participants was made at different area. Total 80 Participants were taken as a sample. They were informed about the purpose of the study. Upon initial meeting, each participants was also explained the nature of the study. Participants were informed about the confidentiality regarding information collected from them. A time for data collection was set up that was conducive for the participants. Before administering the scale, the purpose of the study was again explained to the participants. A good rapport was built with the participant for getting correct response. Some necessary instruction and guidelines were provided to them properly filling the scale. After this scale was provided to they and they were requested to fill up the scales as per the instructions given in the scales. After completion of the scale participants returned the scale and they were thanked for their participation and co-operation.

Research Design

The aim of present research was to a study of social competence in adolescence. For these total 80 samples were taken with used purposive sampling method. To check significance between groups t-test was used. Result and discussion of study is as under:

Results and Discussions

The main objective of present study was to measure the social competence in adolescence. In it statistical t-test method is used. Result discussion of present study is as under.

Table-1 : Showing Mean, S.D. and t-Value Score of Social Competence in Adolescence

Sr. No.	Components	Variables	N	Mean	S.D.	t	Sig. Level
1	Social sensitivity	Boys	40	7.65	1.60	0.32	NS
		Girls	40	7.48	1.54		
2	Social Maturity	Boys	40	46.32	5.93	2.38	0.05
		Girls	40	47.54	6.51		
3	Social Skills	Boys	40	14.02	3.01	0.54	NS
		Girls	40	13.85	3.28		
4	Social relation	Boys	40	10.95	2.30	1.43	NS
		Girls	40	10.48	2.46		
5	Social commitment	Boys	40	3.89	1.16	1.57	NS
		Girls	40	3.76	1.32		
6	Social appreciation ability	Boys	40	3.22	1.34	0.52	NS
		Girls	40	3.32	1.42		
7	Socio-emotional integrity	Boys	40	7.61	1.75	1.83	NS
		Girls	40	7.39	1.68		
8	Social involvement,	Boys	40	3.52	1.16	0.81	NS
		Girls	40	3.46	1.27		
9	Social respectability	Boys	40	7.13	1.70	1.42	NS
		Girls	40	7.05	1.89		
10	Social leadership	Boys	40	11.18	2.06	0.16	NS
		Girls	40	11.24	1.98		
11	Social cooperation and compliance	Boys	40	4.08	1.10	0.51	NS
		Girls	40	4.02	1.22		
12	Social acceptability	Boys	40	3.46	1.23	1.86	NS
		Girls	40	3.18	1.27		
13	Social tolerance	Boys	40	20.54	4.32	0.49	NS
		Girls	40	20.38	4.02		

14	Social competition	Boys	40	18.18	3.26	1.60	NS
		Girls	40	17.70	3.19		
15	Social Authority	Boys	40	3.38	1.27	0.78	NS
		Girls	40	3.52	1.42		
16	Adult-resource exploitability	Boys	40	3.50	1.28	0.26	NS
		Girls	40	3.43	1.36		
17	Social participation	Boys	40	3.51	1.21	0.63	NS
		Girls	40	3.42	1.29		
18	Pro-social attitude	Boys	40	6.72	1.78	1.76	NS
		Girls	40	7.04	1.88		

Significance Level: 0.05 = 1.99
0.01= 2.64

NS = Not significant

The table-1 indicates that the mean score of social sensitivity in boys are 7.65 and girls are 7.48. The standard deviations for both boys and girls are 1.60 and 1.54 respectively. It means value of boys is higher than girls in social sensitivity. The t-value was 0.32 which were not significant. It means gender difference of the adolescence is not effected factor of social sensitivity. So we can say that first hypothesis was accepted.

The table-1 indicates that the mean score of social maturity in boys are 46.32 and girls are 47.54. The standard deviations for both boys and girls are 5.93 and 6.51 respectively. It means value of girls is higher than boys in social maturity. The t-value was 2.38 which were significant at 0.05 levels. It means gender is effected factor of social maturity. So we can say that first hypothesis was rejected.

The table-1 indicates that the mean score of social skills in boys are 14.02 and girls are 13.85. The standard deviations for both boys and girls are 3.01 and 3.28 respectively. It means value of girls is higher than boys in social skills. The t-value was 0.54 which was not significant. It means gender difference of the adolescence is not effected factor of social skills. So we can say that first hypothesis was accepted.

The table-1 indicates that the mean score of social relations in boys are 10.95 and girls are 10.48. The standard deviations for both boys and girls are 2.30 and 2.46 respectively. It means value of girls is higher than boys in social skills. The t-value was 1.43 which was not significant. It means gender difference of the adolescence is not effected factor of social relations. So we can say that first hypothesis was accepted.

The table-1 indicates that the mean score of social commitment in boys are 3.89 and girls are 3.76. The standard deviations for both boys and girls are 1.16 and 1.32 respectively. It means value of girls is higher than boys in social commitment. The t-value was 1.57 which was not significant. It means gender difference of the adolescence is not effected factor of social commitment. So we can say that first hypothesis was accepted.

The table-1 indicates that the mean score of social appreciation ability in boys are 3.22 and girls are 3.32. The standard deviations for both boys and girls are 1.34 and 1.42 respectively. It means value of girls is higher than boys in social appreciation ability. The t-value was 0.52 which were not significant. It means gender difference of the adolescence is not

effected factor of social appreciation ability. So we can say that first hypothesis was accepted.

The table-1 indicates that the mean score of socio-economical integrity in boys are 7.61 and girls are 7.39. The standard deviations for both boys and girls are 1.75 and 1.68 respectively. It means value of girls is higher than boys in socio-economical integrity. The t-value was 1.83 which was not significant. It means gender difference of the adolescence is not effected factor of socio-economical integrity. So we can say that first hypothesis was accepted.

The table-1 indicates that the mean score of social involvement in boys are 3.52 and girls are 3.46. The standard deviations for both boys and girls are 1.16 and 1.27 respectively. It means value of girls is higher than boys in social involvement. The t-value was 0.81 which were not significant. It means gender difference of the adolescence is not effected factor of social involvement. So we can say that first hypothesis was accepted.

The table-1 indicates that the mean score of social responsibility in boys are 7.13 and girls are 7.05. The standard deviations for both boys and girls are 1.70 and 1.89 respectively. It means value of girls is higher than boys in social involvement. The t-value was 1.42 which was not significant. It means gender difference of the adolescence is not effected factor of social responsibility. So we can say that first hypothesis was accepted.

The table-1 indicates that the mean score of social leadership in boys are 11.18 and girls are 11.24. The standard deviations for both boys and girls are 2.06 and 1.98 respectively. It means value of boys is higher than girls in social leadership. The t-value was 0.16 which were not significant. It means gender difference of the adolescence is not effected factor of social leadership. So we can say that first hypothesis was accepted.

The table-1 indicates that the mean score of social cooperation and compliance in boys are 4.08 and girls are 4.02. The standard deviations for both boys and girls are 1.10 and 1.22 respectively. It means value of girls is higher than boys in social cooperation and compliance. The t-value was 0.51 which were not significant. It means gender difference of the adolescence is not effected factor of social cooperation and compliance. So we can say that first hypothesis was accepted.

The table-1 indicates that the mean score of social acceptability in boys are 3.46 and girls are 3.18. The standard deviations for both boys and girls are

1.23 and 1.27 respectively. It means value of girls is higher than boys in social acceptability. The t-value was 1.86 which was not significant. It means gender difference of the adolescence is not effected factor of social acceptability. So we can say that first hypothesis was accepted.

The table-1 indicates that the mean score of social tolerance in boys are 20.54 and girls are 20.38. The standard deviations for both boys and girls are 4.32 and 4.02 respectively. It means value of boys is higher than girls in social tolerance. The t-value was 0.49 which were not significant. It means gender difference of the adolescence is not effected factor of social tolerance. So we can say that first hypothesis was accepted.

The table-1 indicates that the mean score of social competition in boys are 18.18 and girls are 17.70. The standard deviations for both boys and girls are 3.26 and 3.19 respectively. It means value of boys is higher than girls in social competition. The t-value was 1.60 which was not significant. It means gender difference of the adolescence is not effected factor of social competition. So we can say that first hypothesis was accepted.

The table-1 indicates that the mean score of social authority in boys are 3.38 and girls are 3.52. The standard deviations for both boys and girls are 1.27 and 1.42 respectively. It means value of girls is higher than boys in social authority. The t-value was 0.78 which were not significant. It means gender difference of the adolescence is not effected factor of social authority. So we can say that first hypothesis was accepted.

The table-1 indicates that the mean score of adult-resource exploitability in boys are 3.50 and girls are 3.43. The standard deviations for both boys and girls are 1.28 and 1.36 respectively. It means value of girls is higher than boys in adult-resource exploitability. The t-value was 0.26 which were not significant. It means gender difference of the adolescence is not effected factor of adult-resource exploitability. So we can say that first hypothesis was accepted.

The table-1 indicates that the mean score of social participation in boys are 3.51 and girls are 3.42. The standard deviations for both boys and girls are 1.21 and 1.29 respectively. It means value of girls is higher than boys in social participation. The t-value was 0.63 which were not significant. It means gender difference of the adolescence is not effected factor of social participation. So we can say that first hypothesis was accepted.

The table-1 indicates that the mean score of pro-social attitude in boys are 6.72 and girls are 7.04. The standard deviations for both boys and girls are 1.78 and 1.88 respectively. It means value of girls is higher than boys in pro-social attitude. The t-value was 1.76 which was not significant. It means gender difference of the adolescence is not effected factor of pro-social attitude. So we can say that first hypothesis was accepted.

Conclusion

We can conclude by data analysis as follows:

There were significant differences at 0.05 levels between the mean scores of boys and girls in social maturity. Here girls are higher social mature than boys. It means gender is effected factor of social maturity. There were no significant difference between the mean scores of boys and girls in social sensitivity, social skills, social relation, social commitment, social appreciation ability, socio-emotional integrity, social involvement, social respectability, social leadership, social cooperation and compliance, social acceptability, social tolerance, social competition, adult/resource exploitability, social participation and pro-social attitude.

Limitation and Future Research

This study had several limitations that can be addressed by future research. Firsts, the participants consisted only adolescence of the different areas in Rajkot city. So, it is not representative of all adolescence. Hence, a more representative participant might yield different result; for example, a participant from different areas of Gujarat might show significant interaction effects of areas.

Suggestions

Endeavour can be executed to analyze more them 80 data of sample with efficacy to attain better results. For the accumulation of information, variegated methods except questionnaires can be adopted. Selection of sample can be accomplished with the intake of different district from different state to ascertain in their social competence. To crown the research work, other method of selecting sample can be appropriated.

Reference

1. *Allemant, M., Steiger, A. E., & Fend, H. A. (2014). Empathy development in adolescence predicts social competencies in adulthood. Journal of Personality.*
2. *Bloom M. and et. All. (2009). A blueprint for promoting academic and social competence in after-school programs (pp. 1–19). New York: Springer.*
3. *Calderella, P., & Merell, K. W. (1997). Common dimensions of social skills of children and adolescents: A taxonomy of positive behaviors. School Psychology Review, 26(2), 264–278.*
4. *Gerald R. Adams (2015). Social Competence during Adolescence: Social Sensitivity, Locus of Control, Empathy and Peer Popularity. Journal of youth and adolescence, plenum Publishing Corporation. Vol.15, Issue. 5. Pp.203-211.*
5. *Gouley KK, Brotman LM, Huang KY, Shrout PE. Construct Validation of the Social Competence Scale in Preschool-age Children. Social Development. 2008;17:380–398.*
6. *Martin Ford (2016). Social Cognition and Social Competence in Adolescence. Researchgate.*
7. *Sharma, Shukla P. and Shukla K. (1992). Social competence scale. National Psychological Corporation, agra.*
8. *Susan seebar and eveline wittmann (2016). Competence-based Vocational and Professional Education pp 1029-1050*