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Abstract

Social Intelligence is considered by most researchers as the ability to adequately understand and evaluate their own behavior and the behavior of other people. We define social intelligence of future teachers as a cognitive component of communicative competence. Theoretical analysis and the usage of methodologies for social intelligence investigation of J. Guilford and M. Sullivan, and 16-PF methodic of Kettle has allowed us to establish a link with the social intelligence components of communicative competence of the future teachers. The greatest number of significant correlations of social intelligence test is set with the scales of A+, F+, H+, E+, L-, Q2+, G+, N+ by 16-PF Kettle. All subtests and especially composite score revealed a negative correlation with the index of introversion (scale - A-, F-, H-). Thus, the high level of social intelligence in the development of future teachers determine their flexibility, tact, empathy, activity in communicative activity.
intelligence involves the development of teacher knowledge, skills and ability to understand themselves, their behavior, the actions of others and build effective interaction, and achieve goals.

The total number of scientists engaged in research in this area is enormous. As in the case with many other scientific concepts, scientists still can not agree on what exactly social intelligence is. However, the urgency of the problem is in a large extent due to the lack of research of social intelligence in future teachers. On the other hand, so far the development levels of teacher’s social intelligence has not been studied specifically in Kazakhstan. In domestic psychology is still practically no empirical studies of social intelligence. Thus, despite of the presence in foreign sources of a variety of techniques aimed at determining the level of intelligence, there is no translation into Kazakh language and adapting to the Kazakh sample.

In this way, the relevance of the study of social intelligence in future teachers as a condition for the development of their communicative competence is defined as the tendency of the development of scientific knowledge and existing needs of social practice. In psychological science, there are many definitions, approaches and models of social intelligence. And we can not provide all concepts of social intelligence in this article. In this regard, we will describe only the scientific positions that are necessary for an understanding of our work and that serve as justification of goals and objectives of the study, its hypotheses, methods which are used.

Our country is widely known for the concept of social intelligence EL Thorndik, H.J. Eysenck, J. Guilford and others E.L. Thorndik [7] defined social intelligence as part of general intelligence and during his research he paid his great attention to the study of cognitive processes, such as social perception. According to H.J. Eysenck[8] social intelligence is the result of general intelligence under the influence of socio-cultural conditions, the ability of adapting to the needs of the individual to the society. Among the factors affecting the level of social intelligence, H.J. Eysenck identified socioeconomic status, motivation, cultural factors, education, and so on. R.B. Cattell[9] singled out potential and crystalline intelligence. Potential intelligence is the basis of thinking and serves as the basis for the formation of crystalline intelligence. Social intelligence is reviewed by G.W. Allport [10] as special a person's ability to judge people correctly, to predict their behaviour and to ensure adequate adaptation in interpersonal relations. In the works of D. Wechsler [11] social intelligence is understood as an individual's suitability for the human being, that is, the ability to cope well with life's situations. D.G. Myers[12] defines social intelligence as a social thinking as the ability to evaluate themselves and others on the basis of social attitudes. J. Piaget[13] and the social reality. At the moment the complex structural model of social intelligence was represented by J.P. Guilford[14]. According to his concept, social intelligence combines and regulates cognitive processes associated with the reflection of social facilities. M.E. Ford and M.S. Tisak [15] defined social intelligence as a group of mental abilities associated with the processing of social information for successful solving the problem. They proved that social intelligence is not identical to the general intelligence and develops in a social environment.

Holistic theory of intelligence, according to RJ Sternberg [16], includes three aspects: 1) component subtheory that is the explanation of the inner world of the individual, thinking mechanisms related to the processing of information (intelligence component), 2) subtheory experience, determines the efficiency of mastering a new situation, using the previous experience (experiential intelligence) 3 ) subtheory context, which describes and explains the manifestation of intelligence in social situation (situational intelligence). Gradually more and more attention in the study of social intelligence was paid to the research based at the behavioral, non-verbally assess of social intelligence. One of the first who combined these two ways of viewing and diagnosis of social intelligence was S. Kosmitzki and O.P. John [17], proposed the concept of social intelligence, which includes seven items. These components are staffed in two relatively independent groups: the "cognitive" and "behavioral". Theoretical analysis of the literature allowed us to formulate the hypothesis of the study: the level of development of social intelligence in future teachers determines their communicative competence in teaching activities. Consequently, the objective of the research is the study of the features of social intelligence of students in higher educational institution in case of taking into account factors that are relevant in professional communication of teacher.

2. Methods

As the subjects of investigation were students, who are future teachers a number of whom was 164 people from the Kazakh National Pedagogical University named after Abai, Almaty (70 people) and from the East-
Kazakhstan State University named after S. Amanzholov, Ust-Kamenogorsk (100). The average age of the subjects was 18.6 years. Among them there are 32 boys and 138 girls. It should be noted that during the data processing we do not distinguish the gender-specific social intelligence. The study of gender characteristics we will study specifically on a large sample in the future. We used the following tools in the work: a methodology of social intelligence investigation by J. P. Guilford and M. O’Sullivan [18] and the method of Cattell 16-PF (Form C) [19-20]. With a 16-factor personality questionnaire Cattell we investigated: a) mental and b) communication skills of future teachers. The intelligent features of students will be analyzed by the general level of intelligence (factor B), by the level of development of the imagination factor (M), by diplomacy (factor N) and the susceptibility to the new factor (Q1). Communicative competence of students is defined by the following communicatively significant factors: the open-closed (factor A), the degree of dominance (factor E), courage (factor H), suspiciousness (factor L), diplomacy (factor N), independent (factor Q2), carelessness - concern (factor F), sensuality-hardness (factor I), conscientiousness, without conscientiousness (factor G). The testing procedure and rules for processing the data conform to the standard principles of the use of these techniques. As data processing method we used the rank correlation method of C. Spearman.

3. Figures and the results

In the first stage of the study diagnostics of components of social intelligence such as cognition of behavior results, cognition of behavior classes, cognition of change, cognition of behavior systems) by the method of J. Guilford and M. Sullivan has been held. The future teachers prevails average level of social intelligence composite score expressivity (67%). Social intelligence is above average (middle-high and high standard of the ability) is found only in 17% interviewers. 16% of students with level of social intelligence is below normal (low and standard values middle-low abilities) have difficulties in understanding and predicting human behavior. The social intelligence analysis of the future teachers by Guilford and J. M. Sullivan is shown in Table 1. The table shows that the most expressed factor is "cognition of the consequences of behavior" (subtest 1). This means that future teachers (97%) are able to anticipate future behavior of people, based on an understanding of their feelings, thoughts, and intentions. The results of this subtest is closely correlated with higher values of the components in communicative competence of students: by being dynamic (factor N +); by degree of dominance (factor E +), by autonomy (factor Q2 +); by courage (factor H +); by suspiciousness (factor L-) (p < 0.01).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtests</th>
<th>standard values of abilities</th>
<th>subtest 1</th>
<th>subtest 2</th>
<th>subtest 3</th>
<th>subtest 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-high</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further by the degree of expressivity such kind of component of social intelligence, as the knowledge of verbal expression is differentiated (subtest 3). He describes a group of students (88%) as people who possess a highly sensitivity to the nature of human relationships. The values of this sub-test were positively correlated (p <0.01) with the following components of communicative competence: by sensuality (factor I +), conscientiousness (factor G+); intelligence (factor B +), the level of development of the imagination (factor M +), diplomacy (factor N +). Students with low scores (20%) by a factor of perceiving of expressive behavior groups (subtest 2) have no big use of body language, attitudes and gestures, in most cases they use the verbal content of messages. They can often be mistaken in understanding the meaning of words of interlocutor, since they did not take into consideration the accompanying non-verbal reactions. However, experimental data on the two subtests were positively correlated with high levels of self-control (factor Q4 +) and the high value of a closed (factor A) (respectively, rs = 0.57; rs = 0.83, p
<0.01). According to the fourth subtests the lowest scores (30%) have been found among the future teachers. This indicates that the students are not sufficiently developed the ability to predict the success of the construction of communicative activities based on incomplete data and orientate in the nonverbal reactions of the person as well as in the rules and regulations, which are regulating the behavior in the society; ability adequately reflect the objectives, intentions, needs of the communication participants to predict consequences of their behavior. The 4 subtest results were positively correlated with low levels of intellectual factors (p <0.01). In this case, we can talk about the relationship of low development of the imagination (factor M), the susceptibility to the new radicalism (factor Q1), the general intellectual development (factor B) and the development of the ability to understand the structure and dynamics of interpersonal relation situations (subtest 4).

Thus, results have shown that students with high levels of social intelligence on factors their share of competence in communication activity is much higher. As well, the analysis of research suggests that the development of the communicative competence of future teachers in the context of university education significantly correlated with social intelligence. Consequently, the communicative competence of future teachers is associated with the level of social intelligence, and is based on it.

4. Discussion

Thus, most researchers define social intelligence as part of general intelligence, presented in the form of general ability, practical thinking, or a particular form of social adaptation. Review of the scientific literature reveals that the study of social intelligence in future teachers as a condition for the development of their communicative competence are not well understood. In this connection, it is necessary to extend the study of social intelligence allowing for the social and cultural environment. Features of social intelligence in the future teachers of kazakh nationality has not been carried out by anyone. We discuss the social intelligence in the research as special cognitive capacity or mental resource of the individual. Social Intelligence provides an effective solution to the social and psychological problems in culturally sensitive society. The same theoretical analysis shows that the social intelligence depends on the formation of teacher professionalism. According to the characteristics of professional educator, as well as demands for it, social intelligence can be seen as a necessary condition for a successful professional educator. Social Intelligence is the basis for many pedagogical competencies, including for communicative competence, which is necessary for effective action. Therefore, highlighting the problem of social intelligence of future teachers, it makes sense to speak of their communicative competence. This highlights the research of the level of social intelligence and communication competence of future teachers in vocational education.

The conducted experiment shows the peculiarities of social intelligence and communicative competence of future teachers. Average intensity of the composite assessment of social intelligence means that the overall future teachers are effective in interpersonal relations and normally adapted in society. Students with above-average social level can efficiently extract information about the behavior of people, well understand the language of non-verbal communication, and express accurate judgments about people, successfully predict their reactions in the given circumstances. Students with level of social intelligence which is below normal relationships are complicated and the possibility of social adaptation is reduced.

Conclusion

The experiment shows that the majority of future teachers are able to anticipate future behavior of people. However, their predictions may be wrong, if they are to deal with people behaving unusual way. The successful implementation of students’ subtest 1. shows their ability to orientate the non-verbal reactions of participants interaction and knowledge normal - role models and rules regulating the behavior of people. We attribute this result to the students' educational orientation and ethnic characteristics, norms, standards and communication attributes of the Kazakhs. Because, in the culture of the Kazakh communication skills and ability to anticipate the consequences of the behavior and action is of great importance and are based on the ability of communication strategy and tactics which are valuable. Just as likely that the pedagogical orientation and ethical side of Kazakh students help them
quickly and correctly to understand what people say to each other in the context of a particular situation. This allowed for the successful fulfillment of the subtests 3.

Low parameters on the factors "cognition of group expression" (subtest 2), and "cognition of the structure and dynamics of interpersonal situations ineraction" (subtest 4) suggests that some future teachers have some difficulties in interpersonal communication. Consequently, they have not sufficiently developed the ability to analyze complex situations of human interaction and to find the causes of certain behavior, they do not understand the logic of communicative activity. These teachers often speak out of place and wrong in interpreting the words of the interlocutor. And it points to the targeted development of communicative competence of future teachers in vocational education. After all, it is necessary for the teacher to be aware of the holistic context of communication links of the other individual, to analyze the history of his relationship and be able to explain the results of such kind of analysis to another. The relationship of the level of imagination (factor M), susceptibility to the new radicalism factor (Q1), the general intellectual development (factor B) and the ability to learn the structure and dynamics of interpersonal situations relation(subtest 4) proves that social intelligence is a cognitive resource of communicative competence of future teachers.

The greatest number of significant correlations of social intelligence test set with the scales of A +, F +, H +, E +, L-, Q2 +, G+, N + by 16-PF Cattell test. Statistically it is established that all subtests and especially composite score revealed a negative correlation (p <0.01) with the index of introversion (scale - A-, F-, H-).

Thus, experimental research has shown that social intelligence has ethnic characteristics, the analysis of which is one of the important directions for further research.

Therefore, we can say that social intelligence is a necessary term for the development of communicative competence of future teachers.
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