

The Interconnection of Social Intelligence and the Attitude of People to Dangers

Maralov Vladimir Georgievich¹, Kudaka Marina Aleksandrovna¹,
Markovich Vadim Aleksandrovich^{2,3}, Kulanina Svetlana Vadimovna⁴

¹Department of Psychology, Cherepovets State University, Russia, ²International Psychology and Education Center LLC, ³Department of Humanitarian and Social Disciplines, Faculty of Management, Institute of Law and Business, ⁴Department of Biology and Chemistry, Mathematics and Natural Sciences Faculty, Elabuga Institute of Kazan Federal University, Russia

Abstract

Introduction: The relevance of the problem is caused by the importance of identification of factors that determine the existence of different types of people's attitudes to dangers, which makes it possible to explain and predict their behavior from the positions of security. It was suggested that social intelligence is one of the most important factors. The goal of the study is the identification of psychological features of the relationship between the social intelligence and people's attitudes to dangers. **Materials and Methods:** During the research, we used the theoretical (analysis, specification, and generalization) and empirical methods of data collection. As diagnostic tools, we used special techniques to identify the types of people's attitudes to dangers and social intelligence. Taking part in the study were 292 participants of different gender, education, and employment aged from 19 to 50 (their average age: 30.3). **Results of the Study:** It was found that social intelligence is closely related to the type of attitude of people to dangers. To a greater extent, this relationship manifests itself in the choice of adequate or inadequate ways of responding to dangerous situations than in the manifestations of sensitivity to threats. We also discovered some differences in men and women with different levels of social intelligence, which were manifested in the ability to adequately or inadequately respond to dangers. In particular, men with low social intelligence more often ignore dangers while and women tend to exaggerate their significance. **Discussion and Conclusions:** It is shown that inadequate response manifested in the forms of exaggeration or understatement of the significance of threats in people with a low level of social intelligence performs a protective function acting as a compensation for the inability of an individual to understand situations and to correctly assess them from a security standpoint. The obtained data can be used in psychological counseling of men and women as well as in the work of psychological services in the process of formation of people's adequate attitudes to dangers.

Key words: Attitude to danger, men, sensitivity to threats, social intelligence, ways to respond to dangerous situations, women

INTRODUCTION

A successful solution to the numerous problems related to the provision of human security in various types of activities inevitably leads to the question of how a person treats dangers. There are many examples in which all conditions are created for a safe life and activity of a person. Nevertheless, due to his carelessness, non-observance of elementary norms and rules he faces unpleasant and dangerous situations, which are detrimental to his life, health, and psychological well-being. Moreover, on the contrary, there are many people whose life and work are associated with constant dangers and threats, but they are careful, circumspect, and capable of building a

tactic for their interaction with the environment and society that can prevent threats and make them feel relatively safe.

From the psychological point of view, the phenomenon of ignoring of dangers by people is of special interest. Life shows that there are people who do not follow security rules, run unjustified risks, demonstrate carelessness, and negligence or

Address for correspondence:

Maralov Vladimir Georgievich, 35, Pervomaiskaia street,
Cherepovets, 162612, Russian Federation, Russia.
E-mail: vgmaralov@yandex.ru

Received: 17-03-2018

Revised: 25-03-2018

Accepted: 30-03-2018

prone to conflict and aggressiveness, create dangerous situations not only for themselves but also for other people.

The relevance of the research of psychological characteristics of people's attitudes toward dangers is determined by two important reasons. First, from a scientific point of view, it is important to identify the factors, mechanisms, and conditions for the existence of different types of people's attitudes to dangers, which make it possible to explain and predict their behavior from a security perspective. Second, the applied aspect is also important; the knowledge of the structure and determinants of the attitude to dangers make it possible to purposefully influence them, to make adjustments, and to create preconditions for an adequate attitude to dangers.

The attitude toward dangers consists of two components: Sensitivity to threats and the choice of adequate or inadequate ways of responding to dangerous situations. Sensitivity is manifested in a person's ability to detect the signals of threats, to exercise constant control over the situation, and to predict the possible consequences of events' development. An adequate response will be the one that allows individuals to cope with difficulties and dangers in an optimal way using socially developed norms and rules of behavior. Accordingly, an inadequate response will be the one that does not lead to a resolution of the problem but worsens the condition of a person leading to physical and psychological trauma. For example, in a conflict situation, an adequate form of response would be the choice of a strategy of cooperation or compromise, while the inadequate form is the choice of rivalry or avoidance, which can lead to the escalation of conflicts, destructiveness, and serious damage to oneself and the opposite side.

Therefore, under the attitude to danger, we will understand the ability of an individual to detect dangerous signals in a timely manner (sensitivity to threats) and to choose adequate or inadequate ways of responding to threats.^[1] Depending on the combination of the level of sensitivity to threats and the choice of adequate or inadequate ways of responding to dangerous situations, one can speak of the type of attitude of a person to dangers. Science has accumulated a significant empirical material, which brings us closer to an understanding of the differentiation of people's attitudes to dangers. At the same time, for the sake of justice, it should be noted that one studies mostly motivational and personal factors of attitudes toward dangers^[2-4] as well as behavioral security models^[5] rather than their intellectual components. In our opinion, a special role here belongs to social intelligence. It is known that social intelligence gives a person rich opportunities to optimize his interaction with society. It manifests itself in the ability to foresee the consequences of one's behavior in a certain situation, to understand the logic of development of interaction situations (including the dangerous ones), and to predict what will happen in the future.

The ability to make logical generalizations, which is the basis of social intelligence, determines the ability to identify

significant signs in various non-verbal reactions of a person, to sensitively react to the changes in the meaning of similar verbal manifestations. Proceeding from the above-said, it can be assumed that people with a high social intelligence will be more flexible in responding to situations related to threats, demonstrating an increased sensitivity to dangers, and choosing adequate methods of response in comparison to the people with a relatively low level of social intelligence. Based on this assumption, the goal of our research was formulated - to reveal the psychological features of the relationship between social intelligence and people's attitudes to dangers.

Based on this assumption, the goal of our research was formulated - to reveal the psychological features of the relationship between social intelligence and people's attitudes to dangers.

Literature review

The problem of people's attitude to dangers constantly attracted and keeps attracting the attention of psychologists. For the first time, it was formulated in a broad philosophical and psychological context within the framework of humanistic psychoanalysis. Within this framework, the driving force of man's interaction with society is the contradiction between the need in security and his desires and aspirations. According to Horney,^[6] this contradiction is resolved through an individual's choice of one of the following strategies: The movement toward people, the movement from people, and the movement against people. Horney^[7] draws attention to the same problem. He singled out and described the phenomenon of "flight from freedom." In his opinion, a person tries to protect himself using such behavior strategies as authoritarianism, destructiveness, and automatic conformism. Within this framework, specific mechanisms of detection of threats by individuals are described. They were identified by Horney.^[8] According to her, such mechanisms include human emotions, in particular, anxiety and fear, which fulfill the signal function. In subsequent studies, it was found that the emotional response to a threat is determined by its significance for an individual and the assessment of the likelihood of its occurrence.^[9]

An invaluable contribution to the development of the theory of security needs was made by Maslow,^[10] who proposed a model of the hierarchical structure of needs, where the need for security refers to the fundamental basic needs of individuals. His research gave rise to a discussion in psychology about the structure, purpose, and functions of needs of an individual as sources of his activity.

A special group of studies includes the works devoted to the problems of people's behavior in extreme situations. It is shown that the state of a person in an extreme situation passes through a number of stages: Shock, psychophysiological demobilization, the stage of resolution, and the stage of

recovery. The most typical ways of responding to a threat in an extreme situation are struggle, flight, and inaction.^[11] It was also established that the willingness to meet with dangers is determined by many personal factors, where the vital role is played by the viability of a person. The strategies for ensuring personal security in emergency situations were determined and described. They include avoidance strategy, conservative strategy, absorbing strategy, communicative resonance strategy, and development strategy.^[12]

In addition to extreme situations, there is a large class of life situations that can carry a real or potential threat: A substandard product bought in a store - got poisoned; dressed not for the weather - fell ill, postponed an important affair - did not cope with the assignment, quarreled with someone - spoiled the relationship, etc. Therefore, the ability to adequately reflect a particular situation from the standpoint of assessing its danger or safety is an inalienable attribute of a person's life. For the first time, the differentiation of the attitude of people to dangers was carried out in clinical psychology on the example of the attitude of people toward diseases. The starting point was the work of Luria,^[13] where he advanced and developed the idea of the "internal picture of the disease." The monograph of Nikolaeva^[14] gives an overview of the works devoted to various approaches to the classification of the attitude of people to diseases. It was found that a person can have an adequate attitude to his disease, can exaggerate or minimize its significance, to have hypochondriacal or indifferent reactions. Based on these studies, we came to the conclusion that an adequate attitude, exaggeration, or understatement of danger can characterize not only the person's attitude to the disease but also to any danger. On the basis of a combination of sensitivity to danger and the choice of adequate or inadequate ways of responding to threatening situations, one can distinguish different types of people's attitudes to dangers.

Regarding the social intelligence and its relationship to the attitude toward danger the following should be noted. Beginning with the work of Thorndike, who introduced the concept of "social intelligence,"^[15] the work of Guildford, who proposed a model of social intelligence,^[16] and Sullivan, who developed a test for the measurement of social intelligence,^[17] by now there is an extensive bibliography devoted to this problem. First of all, it should be noted that there is a large number of definitions of social intelligence. If we try to generalize them, then social intelligence can be defined as a person's ability to perceive, understand, and evaluate the situations of interaction with other people, to predict future developments, and to make decisions on this basis.

In modern surveys of the social intelligence research,^[18] six areas of its study are distinguished. They include: (1) Research aimed at identifying and studying various components of social intelligence, (2) development of models of social intelligence, (3) identification of people's ideas about social intelligence, (4) research of the general cognitive structures

and processes that influence the process of interaction of people, (5) study of the relationship between social and emotional intelligence, (6) development of applied models of social intelligence.

With regard to our problem - the study of the relationship between social intelligence and people's attitudes to dangers - there are not so many works that describe the specifics of this relationship. Nevertheless, the relationship between social intelligence and psychological defenses has been established.^[19] There is also a definite relation between an individual's choice of strategies for coping behavior and specific features of his social intelligence. In particular, Kryukova showed that a person's ability to recognize the structure of interpersonal relationships in dynamics, to analyze complex situations of people's interaction, to understand their meaning, and to foresee consequences have a special impact on the choice of coping behavior strategies. At the same time, it is noted that such relationship is not sustainable. In a number of studies, the role of social intelligence in shaping a person's readiness to work in extreme situations is revealed.^[20] For example, it was revealed that people with high social intelligence are more prepared to work in an extreme situation than people with low social intelligence.^[21]

In the previous studies of one of the authors of this article,^[22] it was established that social intelligence has a greatest influence on the choice of adequate ways of responding to dangerous situations. At the same time, this study highlighted a number of new problems related to the need to identify the specifics of the relationship between social intelligence and the type of attitude to dangers depending on gender and related to the implementation of a satisfactory interpretation of the facts of exaggeration or ignoring of dangers by people with different levels of social intelligence. These problems served as an additional incentive for the organization of a special study, the results of which are presented in this article.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In the process of research, theoretical and empirical methods were used. Analysis, concretization, and generalization were used as theoretical methods. Empirical methods include the authors' questionnaires to identify the types of people's attitudes toward dangers^[1] and the test of Guildford^[16] and Sullivan in the adaptation of Mikhailova.^[17]

The questionnaire of sensitivity to threats: It is designed to identify a person's ability to detect possible threats and to control the situation. It consists of 12 questions - tasks that simulate real typical situations. Each task of the questionnaire includes the formulation of a statement and four answers. The test subject should choose only one of them, which is the most consistent with his opinion. Some of these questions are aimed at diagnosing the level of sensitivity to threats to life and health, others - to threats to psychological well-being.

The received scores are summed for all questions. As a result, we get the final score, which characterizes the level of individual sensitivity to dangers. A scale for the transfer of “raw” scores into sten scores has been developed. A high level includes scores from 7 to 10.

The questionnaire for identifying the types of responding in dangerous situations: It consists of 17 questions -statements modeling human behavior in real standard situations, which can be dangerous. For each question four variants of answers are suggested corresponding to four types of personality behavior: Adequate, exaggerating the dangers, ignoring the dangers, uncertain. For each type of response a total score was given, after which the “raw” scores, as in the previous case, were transferred to sten scores. A high level includes scores from 7 to 10.

Based on the results of diagnostics of sensitivity to dangers and the type of response in threatening situations, it becomes possible to define 8 types of people’s attitudes to dangers: Adequate sensitive, adequate with reduced sensitivity, anxious (exaggeration of threats) sensitive, anxious with reduced sensitivity, ignoring sensitive, ignoring with reduced sensitivity, indefinite sensitive, and indefinite with reduced sensitivity.

The test of Guilford and Sullivan in the modification for the Russian-speaking audience of Mikhailova^[17] consists of four subtests. The first subtest “story with completion” diagnoses the ability to anticipate the consequences of behavior, the ability to anticipate further actions of people on the basis of analysis of real communication situations; to orientate oneself in the non-verbal reactions of the interaction’s participants and the knowledge of role models, rules that regulate people’s behavior. The second subtest of the “expression group” is aimed at revealing the ability to correctly assess the conditions, feelings, and intentions of other people by their non-verbal manifestations: Facial expressions, postures, and gestures. The third subtest “verbal expression” diagnoses the sensitivity to the nature and shades of human relationships, the speed, and correctness of understanding what people say to each other (speech expression) in the context of a certain situation, certain relationships. Finally, the fourth subtest “story with addition” makes it possible to reveal the level of ability to recognize the structure of interpersonal situations in dynamics. Based on the results of these subtests, a general composite score is derived, which characterizes the level of development of social intelligence in general.

Participating in the study were 292 subjects of different genders, education, and employment aged from 19 to 50 (mean age 30.3). Of them, there were 131 men (average age 27 years), women - 161 (average age 33). The sample was randomly formed. The survey was conducted either in group form (where opportunities allowed) or in individual form. Each subject was given the texts of questionnaires and individual forms for filling. To improve the reliability of the results, the study was conducted anonymously, the

respondents indicated only their gender and age. Data processing was carried out using the criterion ϕ^* - Fisher’s angular transformation.

The study was conducted in three stages. On the first stage, a theoretical analysis of the problem of the relationship between the types of attitudes toward dangers and social intelligence was carried out. On the second stage, an empirical study was conducted. The third stage was devoted to the processing of empirical data, analysis of the obtained results, their interpretation, and conclusions.

RESULTS

Let us refer to the main results of the research. First of all, we will characterize the sampling of respondents from the position of representation of the type of attitude to dangers and level of expressiveness of social intelligence regarding the gender. The results of distribution of respondents by types of attitude to dangers are reflected in Table 1.

As we see from the Table 1, our research has found all types of people’s attitude to dangers. The first position is taken by the types, connected to adequate reacting (43%), the second - by exaggeration of dangers (26%). At the third place, there is the indefinite type (in the amount of 21%). The types connected to dangers ignoring are met more seldom (10%). There were found the essential differences in types of attitude to dangers depending on gender. For most men, adequate reacting types dominate, which in total make 59%. A small amount of men (10%) tend to exaggerating of danger, 15% ignore the danger, and for 16% the indefinite type dominates. There is another picture for women. Adequate type is met more seldom than for men. It makes in general 29%. Such reduction happens because of the growth of aspiration to dangers exaggeration (40%). Dangers ignoring is characteristic only for small amount of women, only 7%. Indefinite type, in general, makes 24%.

In the same manner, we will give the general characteristics of results of social intelligence level research. The results are reflected in Table 2.

Hence, as it is shown in Table 2, in our sampling of the respondents, there dominated the medium level of social intelligence (49%), which totally corresponds with a numerous studies of this phenomenon that proves that people in their mass have the medium intelligence. 29% show the relatively high level of social intelligence and 22% - the relatively low level. High intelligence among men is 34%, and among women, it is 26%. Low social intelligence was found in 25% of men and in 18% of women. There were not found any statistically essential differences in the levels of social intelligence for men and women; this allows to conclude that gender has no essential influence on levels of social intelligence expressiveness.

Now let us refer to the solution of the core task of our research - the determination of interrelation of social intelligence and peculiarities of people's attitude to dangers. Taking into consideration, the fact that there were found essential differences in attitude of men and women to dangers, we will present the results in sampling for men and women separately. Interrelation of the social intelligence and the types of attitude to danger for men are shown in the Table 3.

Men with a high level of development of social intelligence, for the most part (79%), have an adequate response to the dangers (35% - adequate sensitive type and 44% - adequate with reduced sensitivity). In our sample, subjects with anxious

and ignoring types of response were not found. Only 21% show an indeterminate type, moreover uncertain one with a reduced insensitivity predominates (19%). The percentage of adequate types of men with an average level of social intelligence is reduced to 67% (adequate sensitive - 37% and adequate with reduced sensitivity - 30%). A small percentage of anxious subjects with a reduced sensitivity type (4%) appears. The percentage of men (11%) who ignore danger is increasing. Uncertain type is 18% (7% - undetermined sensory and 11% - undetermined with reduced sensitivity). A different picture is observed with men who have a low level of social intelligence. Here, up to 21% the percentage of subjects with adequate types of response decreases (adequate

Table 1: Types of people's attitude to dangers (%)

Types of attitude to dangers	In general		Male		Female		Statistical meaningfulness of differences between men and women (φ - * - Fisher's angular transformation)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	φ *	P
Adequate-sensitive	20	43	29	59	12	29	$\varphi^*=3.66$ $P<0.001$	$\varphi^*=5.23$ $P<0.001$
Adequate with the reduced sensitivity	23		30		17		$\varphi^*=2.62$ $P=0.004$	
Anxious-sensitive	10	26	2	10	18	40	$\varphi^*=5.00$ $P<0.001$	$\varphi^*=6.16$ $P<0.001$
Anxious with the reduced sensitivity	16		8		22		$\varphi^*=3.42$ $P<0.001$	
Ignoring -sensitive	3	10	4	15	4	7	$\varphi^*=0.00$	$\varphi^*=2.20$ $P=0.014$
Ignoring with the reduced sensitivity	7		11		3		$\varphi^*=2.79$ $P=0.002$	
Indefinite - sensitive	6	21	3	16	8	24	$\varphi^*=1.50$ $P=0.067$	$\varphi^*=0.71$ $P=0.044$
Indefinite with the reduced sensitivity	15		13		16		$\varphi^*=0.72$	
Total	<i>n</i> =292 100%		<i>n</i> =131 100%		<i>n</i> =161 100%			

Table 2: Levels of social intelligence expressiveness (%)

Levels of social intelligence (%)	In general		Male		Female		Statistical meaningfulness of differences between men and women (φ *Fisher's angular transformation)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	φ *	P
Composite estimation (general estimation of social intelligence)								
High	29		34		26		$\varphi^*=0.18$, $P=0.06$	
Medium	49		41		56		$\varphi^*=0.3$, $P=0.005$	
Low	22		25		18		$\varphi^*=0.17$, $P=0.08$	
Total	<i>n</i> =292 100%		<i>n</i> =131 100%		<i>n</i> =161 100%			

sensory - 9% and adequate with reduced sensitivity - 12%). At the same time, the number of anxious-type subjects increases up to 30% (anxious sensitive - 6% and anxious with a reduced sensitivity - 24%) and up to 38% - the number of subjects ignoring dangers (ignoring-sensitive - 9% and ignoring with reduced sensitivity - 29%). Differences between marginal groups are statistically significant. 11% is undefined with a reduced sensitivity type.

And at one more point, I would like to plump for. Table 3 clearly shows the types of attitudes toward dangers and identifies ways to respond in threat situations. Sensitivity to threats is not singled out. We will fill this gap. In the group of men with high social intelligence, 37% of subjects show increased sensitivity to dangers and men with low social intelligence - 24%. The differences are statistically insignificant ($\varphi^* = 1.25$, $P = 0.10$).

Thus, it is observed that men have a significant interaction between the level of social intelligence and the types of attitude toward dangers. Subjects with high social intelligence are more likely to show an adequate sensitive and adequate type of attitude toward dangers with a lower sensitivity. Men with low social intelligence are less likely to react to threats adequately, more often they are inclined either to ignore dangers or to exaggerate them.

Analogously, we will analyze the results of the study in the female sample of the subjects [Table 4].

Table 4 illustrates the fact that women experience a more complex and diverse picture of the interrelation of the social intelligence with the types of attitudes toward risks than men. Among women with high social intelligence, the 44% under test demonstrate adequate types of attitude to the dangers (23% - adequate sensitive and 21% - adequate lower sensitive type). At the same time, what attracts attention is that a significant number of women with high intelligence (32%) tend to exaggerate the dangers (16% - an alarming sensitive type and 16% - an alarming lower sensitive type). A very small percentage of women (10%) ignores risk and 14% shows an indefinite reaction. Among the women with average intelligence, the adequate attitude to dangers is reduced to 28% (adequate sensitive - 10%, adequate lower sensitive type - 18%). There is an increase up to 40% under test with a alarming type of attitude to danger (19% - alarming sensitive type and 21% - alarming lower sensitive type). Only a small part of this group of women ignores danger (3%), and a significant percentage of them (29%), who demonstrate an indefinite attitude to dangers (indefinite sensitive - 7% and indefinite lower sensitive - 22%). Among the women with low level of social intelligence, the percentage of adequately responding to the risk continues to decrease to 12% (4% - adequate sensitive

Table 3: Interrelation of social intelligence and types of attitude to danger for men (%)

Types of attitude to dangers	High level of social intelligence		Medium level of social intelligence		Low level of social intelligence		Statistical meaningfulness of differences between the respondents with high and low intelligence level (φ^* - Fisher's angular transformation)	
Adequate-sensitive	35	79	37	67	9	21	$\varphi^*=2.89$, $P=0.001$	$\varphi^*=5.46$, $P<0.001$
Adequate with the reduced sensitivity	44		30		12		$\varphi^*=3.27$, $P<0.001$	
Anxious-sensitive	0	0	0	4	6	30	$\varphi^*=2.18$, $P=0.0015$	$\varphi^*=5.01$, $P<0.001$
Anxious with the reduced sensitivity	0		4		24		$\varphi^*=4.49$ $P<0.001$	
Ignoring -sensitive	0	0	2	11	9	38	$\varphi^*=2.67$, $P=0.004$	$\varphi^*=5.85$, $P<0.001$
Ignoring with the reduced sensitivity	0		9		29		$\varphi^*=5.00$, $P<0.001$	
Indefinite - sensitive	2	21	7	18	0	11	$\varphi^*=1.23$, $P=0.10$	$\varphi^*=1.18$, $P=0.10$
Indefinite with the reduced sensitivity	19		11		11		$\varphi^*=0.99$, $P=0.10$	
Total	$n=43$ 100%		$n=54$ 100%		$n=34$ 100%			

Table 4: Interrelation of social intelligence and types of attitudes toward dangers among women (%)

Types of attitude toward dangers	High level of social intelligence		Middle level of social intelligence		Low level of social intelligence		The statistical significance of the differences between subjects with high and low levels of intelligence (φ^* -Fisher's angular transformation)	
Adequate - sensitive	23	44	10	28	4	12	$\varphi^*=2.45$, $P=0.007$	$\varphi=3.05$, $P<0.001$
Adequate with reduced sensitivity	21		18		8		$\varphi^*=1.55$ $P=0.061$	
Anxious - Sensitive	16	32	19	40	14	50	$\varphi^*=0.23$ $P=0.10$	$\varphi^*=1.51$, $P=0.066$
Anxious with reduced sensitivity	16		21		36		$\varphi^*=1.90$, $P=0.028$	
Ignoring - Sensitive	5	10	1	3	11	13	$\varphi^*=0.92$, $P=0.10$	$\varphi^*=0.38$, $P=0.10$
Ignoring with reduced sensitivity	5		2		2		$\varphi^*=0.68$, $P=0.10$	
Uncertain - sensitive	9	14	7	29	11	25	$\varphi^*=0.27$, $P=0.10$	$\varphi^*=1.48$, $P=0.07$
Uncertain with reduced sensitivity	5		22		14		$\varphi^*=1.30$, $P=0.10$	
Total	$n=43$ 100%		$n=90$ 100%		$n=28$ 100%			

type and 8% - adequate lower sensitive type). Increases to 50% the number of subjects tend to exaggerate the dangers (14% - alarming sensitive and 36% - alarming lower sensitive type). 13% tend to ignore the dangers. A quarter of all women (25%) were of indefinite type (11% - indefinite sensitive type and 14% - indefinite lower sensitive type). As well as in the male sample, we found no significant differences in the displays of sensitivity to dangers. The women with high intelligence show increased sensitivity - 53%, with low - 40% (differences are not statistically significant).

Hence, the general trend identified in the male subjects sample exists also in the women one. The women with high social intelligence are statistically significantly more often responds to danger adequately than women with a low level of social intelligence. It has discovered an increase of the percentage of women examinees with a low level of social intelligence who tend to exaggerate the dangers (50%) and types of the attitude to the risk associated with indefinite response. At the same time, it discovered the significant differences from the male sample. The main one is that, despite having the high social intelligence, 32% of women in this group as well as women with low social intelligence, exaggerate the danger.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

We will try to interpret the results obtained preliminarily; we note that in the present work we are talking not about the

influence of the social intelligence on the attitude of people to the dangers and not about the influence of the type of attitude to the dangers on the social intelligence but about their interrelation. We believe that both the social intelligence and the attitude to dangers are formed in the cooperation. Therefore, here it is difficult to talk about the priorities or about what affects what. Social intelligence is due to the experience of the interaction with other people, the solving of the specific tasks related to the problems of building relationships, cooperation, and preventing conflict situations. The attitude toward dangers is due to a wider range of tasks that have to be solved in the interaction not only with people but also with the world at large. It is an indisputable fact that the people with low social intelligence but brought up in the traditions of serious and responsible attitude to their lives and the lives of others, will react adequately in situations of danger. Conversely, the people with high social intelligence can intentionally ignore the danger to assert themselves.

As it has been shown, men experience quite a clear picture. Men with high social intelligence react to danger or adequately (79%) or show indefinite response (21%). Men with low social intelligence have the lower level of adequacy (to 21%) and increased tendency either to exaggerate the dangers (30%) or to ignore them (38%). A small part of them demonstrates an indefinite response (11%). How can we explain these facts?

The explanation must be sought in the field of personal and cultural characteristics of the people. In all likelihood, the

low level of social intellect complicates a person's ability to assess objectively the situation and make adequate decisions. Therefore, there appear difficulties in forecasting the further development of the step due to the inability to identify and correctly interpret the different signs of non-verbal and similar verbal reactions of a person. Hence, the protective mechanisms start to trigger. Typical among them is either ignoring the problem (ignoring the dangers as insignificant to oneself) or a desire to exaggerate them intentionally. Ignoring dangers is also ambiguous and has a different nature at the different people. Some intentionally ignore danger and take risks. Others do it deliberately, to emphasize their independence (ignoring sensitive type). Still, others show an elementary carelessness (ignoring lower sensitivity type). People with low social intelligence often show carelessness as an expression of the ability not to enter deeply into any problems. The exaggeration of dangers also performs a protective function. People with low social intelligence have difficulty in assessing the situation, so they either are at loss making decisions (do not know what to do and how to act - hence the indefinite type of attitude to dangers), or for security exaggerate the importance of any event, giving it the status of a danger. The presence of relatively high percentage of men with high social intelligence but showing an indefinite response (21%) can be explained by the fundamentally different nature of existence here of unspecified type, compared with subjects with low level of social intelligence. If people with low social intelligence is simply difficult in the implementation of the choices and not know what to do, then people with high social intelligence react to the situation selectively, skillfully summarizing, and understanding the logic of evolving situation of interaction. This is the flexibility of their thinking. Depending on the circumstances and situation, such person can react adequately, in other situations may simply ignore the danger or, if necessary, can focus on it, thereby exaggerating its significance. Women present less clear picture than men do. A general trend of the decrease of an adequate response to dangers depending on the level of social intellect is preserved, but with the specificity. At women with high level of social intelligence, an adequate attitude to the dangers (44%) and the desire to exaggerate the danger (32%) dominate. At women with low social intelligence, the desire to exaggerate dangers (50%) takes the first place; the second one is occupied by indefinite types of responses (25%). The desire to ignore the dangers at women is a lesser expressed than in men and varies in the range of 10–13%, regardless of the social intelligence level. Explanation of those facts is about the same as for the male sample. The decrease in the level of social intelligence, the inability to properly interpret and understand the events lead either to confusion and uncertainty of reactions or to use of a protection reliable for many women - to respond the events emotionally, just in case, exaggerating its importance. It should also be pointed out, however, that at 36% of women in this category the exaggeration of the dangers is not accompanied by increased sensitivity to them. All this is understandable and fits into the logic of understanding

the psychological characteristics of women, if not for one thing. Why women with high social intelligence also tend in some cases to demonstrate not adequate types of attitude to the dangers like men, but to exaggerate them (32%)? We find only one explanation of this fact. If women with a low level of social intelligence do it spontaneously, than women with high level of social intelligence do it deliberately and are fully aware of the capabilities of different probabilistic outcomes of events that they had identified as dangerous. In their opinion, it is better to assume the worst (to be safe) and take action, than to regret their inaction or insufficient taken measures.

CONCLUSION

Hence, on the basis of a series of the conducted research, it can be concluded that social intelligence is closely linked to the type of attitude of people to dangers. Increasingly, this interrelation is shown in the choice of adequate or inadequate ways of responding to dangers than in the sensitivity (sensitivity) to risks. People with high social intelligence tends to choose the adequate ways of reaction in situations of danger than people with low social intelligence. The differences of such an interrelation in men and women are defined. For men with high social intelligence is typical either adequate response to danger or indefinite, but a flexible response depending on the assessment of the significance of the situation and specific circumstances. Men with low social intelligence are more likely either to ignore the danger, either to exaggerate them. Women with high social intelligence react to danger adequately, or in some cases, exaggerating their importance. Women with low social intelligence are characterized by the exaggeration of dangers or indefinite response.

The data obtained can be used in the course of counseling men and women, as well as in the work of psychological services in the process of formation of adequate attitude to the dangers.

REFERENCES

1. Maralov VG, Yu ME, Maralova TP, Perchenko EL, Smirnova OV, Tabunov IA. Developing Person in the Mirror of Threats. Cherepovets: Cherepovets State University of Higher Professional Education; 2013. p. 144.
2. Lyz' NA. Individual Safety from System Stability. *Izvestiya SFedU. Eng Sci* 2008;6:66-9.
3. Maralov VG. Interrelation of needs for safety with types of the relation of people to threats (on the example of student's youth). *Int Res J* 2017;1-3:128-34.
4. Petrovsky VA. Personality in Psychology. Rostov-on-Don: Phoenix; 1996. p. 512.
5. Krasnyanskaya TM. Personal security of a person in the problem field of the psychology of security. *Sci Technol*

- Innov 2005;40:145-53.
6. Horney K. Our Internal Conflicts. Constructive Theory of Neuroses. Moscow: Academic Project; 2007. p. 224.
 7. Horney K. The Neuritic Personality of Our Time. Introspection. Moscow: Progress; 1993. p. 220.
 8. Kotik MA. A new method for the experimental evaluation of the attitude of people to the events that worry them. Questions Psychol 1994;1:97-104.
 9. Fromm E. Escape from Freedom. Moscow: Progress; 1990. p. 272.
 10. Maslow A. Motivation and Personality. St. Petersburg: Peter; 2012. p. 352.
 11. Dontsov AI, Yu PZ, Yu ZO, Perelygina EB. Psychology of Security: Tutorial. Moscow: Yurayt; 2016. p. 276.
 12. Krasnyanskaya TM. Strategies for organizing psychological self-sufficiency of the subject's safety in an extreme situation. Izvestia SFU. Eng Sci 2005;5:207-13.
 13. Luria AR. Internal Picture of the Disease and Iatrogenic Diseases. Moscow: Medicine; 1977. p. 111.
 14. Nikolaeva VV. Influence of Chronic Illness on the Psyche. Moscow: MSU; 1987. p. 168.
 15. Thorndike EL. Intelligence and its use. Harper's Mag 1920;140:227-35.
 16. Guildford J. Three sides of intelligence, psychology of thinking. In: Psychology of Thinking. Moscow: Progress; 1965. p. 14.
 17. Mikhailova ES. Methods of researching social intelligence: Adapting the test of J. Guilford and M. Sullivan: A Guide to Use. St. Petersburg: SE "IMATON"; 1996. p. 56.
 18. Luneva OV. History of social intelligence research (the ending). Knowledge understanding. Skill 2009;1:223-9.
 19. Mikhailova ES. Social Intelligence: Concepts, Models, Diagnostics. St. Petersburg: Publishing House St.-Petersburg. University; 2007. p. 266.
 20. Kryukova TL. Psychology of Coping in Different Periods of Life. Kostroma: KSU named after NA Nekrasov, Kostromaizdat; 2010. p. 380.
 21. Fetisova MM. Development of social intelligence as a component of psychological readiness for activity in extreme situations. Psychopedagogy Law Enforc Agencies 2007;4:25-7.
 22. Kudaka MA, Illenzeer OM. Investigation of the level of development of social intelligence with types of attitude towards dangers in people of mature age. Sci Notes Cherepovets State Univ 2016;1:6-8.

Source of Support: Nil. **Conflict of Interest:** None declared.