A STUDY ON SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE AMONG ADULTS

***Dr. Santosh Kumar**
***Assistant Professor of Psychology Maharani's Arts, Commerce and Management College for women, Sheshadri Road, Bangalore-01.**

ABSTRACT

The present study attempts to measure the influence of social intelligence among Arts and Science . The sample was restricted 80 (N=80) selected randomly from various colleges from rural and urban background the data has been collected P.U. College Gulbarga. The data subjected to statistical analysis like T-test results clearly indicates that responding of females are more social intelligence then the males.

INTRODUCTION:

What is Social Intelligence

Social Intelligence (SI) is the ability to get along well with others, and to get them to cooperate with you. Sometimes referred to simplistically as "people skills," SI includes an awareness of situations and the social dynamics that govern them, and a knowledge of interaction styles and strategies that can help a person achieve his or her objectives in dealing with others. It also involves a certain amount of self-insight and a consciousness of one's own perceptions and reaction patterns.

From the standpoint of interpersonal skills, Karl Albrecht classifies behavior toward others as falling somewhere on a spectrum between "toxic" effect and "nourishing" effect. Toxic behavior makes people feel devalued, angry, frustrated, guilty or otherwise inadequate. Nourishing behavior makes people feel valued, respected, affirmed, encouraged or competent. A continued pattern of toxic behavior indicates a low level of social intelligence - the inability to connect with people and influence them effectively. A continued pattern of nourishing behavior tends to make a person much more effective in dealing with others; nourishing behaviors are the indicators of high social intelligence.

In recent years our knowledge of primate behavior and intelligence have grown rapidly, giving new insights into the origins and nature of our own intelligence. It has been proposed that the richness and complexity of primate social interactions have been a forcing house for the growth of primate intelligence (Jolly 1966 : Humphery 1976) primites social cognition is often approached by informal verbal descriptions (Byrne and whiten 1988. Dennett 1983, Cheney and Syfarch 1990).

There are good reasons to expect that primate social cognition, symbolic representation of social situations scripts are such a representation chosen to be as simple as possible.

A complete and consistent theory of social cognition un see built using scripts and three basic operations of them. The theory gives simples, understandable accounts of many observations, such as primates, understanding of kind status relations in their groups, of alarm calls and attachment behavior.

The theory gives highly adaptable social intelligence with rapid learning of new social regularities in broad agreement with observed primites behavior. A formal motation to describe primate social knowledge and behavior has also proposed by me (1993) using a production role formalism. The script chalens proposed here has feateerres in common with tailored to the social domain.

THE NEED FOR SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE:

Social intelligence in the primate Brain social interactions are more compley than those in other mammals. Some example-Kin recognition : (Judge 1982 : Smis 1985) after a fighat between two monkeys, relatives of one are likely to threater relations of the other female from this protection other examples are described in section is, where they are compared with the theory. These examples shows that primates have detailed knowledge of other in their group of their skin, status and alliance relations of their current state and activities and of the cause effect regularities of their society : that they combine all this knowledge in flexible ways to achieve diverge goals, such as

Each one of these goals involves complexly co-ordinate patterns of behavior and can be studied as a behavioural system (Male 1982) at any one time, an animal is involved in typically one or at most system involves not just stereotyped reflexes but also goal directed behaviour to achieve the goals of any behavioural system compley locomotor, problems may need to be folved. For instance in order to feed a primate might have to negative to a food source negative social obstacles of in the fallen of dominert peers, and than climb a there to pick fruit we absence that there are common modules in the brain to hap go we these problems. As, we shall see, the social domain has enough complexity of its

own, without mixing in those other challenges: may be a letter theory will tackle the interactions how the skin itself may contribute to individuation categorization and so on.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE SOCIAL DOMAIN:

A good strategy it many domains of cognition seems to be to form internal representation of situations in the domain running an internal simulation of external relity is a 1w cost way to check the consequence of possible actions, before doing them for real (for some relevant consideration see (vera & semon 1993) and the response to their article and (worden 1995). To apply the idea of internal representation to the social domain, we first list some important properties of social situations: the theory will use internal representation which match the properties. I shall use examples from a hypathbelical troop of monkeys with roman names: and will contrast the social domain with the sapital / physical domain represented in the LSM.

COGNITIVE MODELS OF SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE:

Conditioning models such as the rescorla wagner (1972) model don't capture the structured systematic and productive character of social situations (51-53) because they represent each casual relation by a single local coupling strength. There is no representation of the structure relation or syrtenetic enumeration of possible relation. They can represent discrete values (54) causal relations over intervers (55) chaining of cause and effect (57) but have no way of discovering of representing the generalistns across individuals (56) which are important in social cognition.

3 mental models (Ex: analoge representations of local space and motion such as the LSM Johnson Larel are probably used by higher animals to predicit the movements of objects around then and to plan to their own.

Symbolic processing (Chalniak & MC Dermoti 1988) has the structured systematic and productive character needed for the social domain (S3-53) it is also well suited to handle the descrete values involves in social situation against representing between feature of the social domain and these styles of computational model is summarized in table.

THEORY OF SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE:

Structure and meaning of scripts:

I shall describe the theory at Marrs (1982) algonithemic level an description of information structures and operations of them note going to the implementation level to consider possible neural relations (that is probably) the level at which neural notes are releuent, as components of the sim we look the simplest internal representation of social situation which captures their important properties which can be used to show that these script are an optional solution to the problem of social cognition giving the best possible fitness under defined conditions there is not space here to present the mathematical theory of scripts.

FACTUAL SCRIPTS AND RULE SCRIPTS:

In the theory each primate continually form script representation of the social elements which male or female obseres. These are called factual scripts and form a sort of historic record of primate or life (or recent part) the purpose of having the representation is to predicit likely social autcomes before they happen and take appropriate actions to flexible and expressive way to represent both general and local social causal lows.

PROBLEM:

A Study on Social Intelligence Among Arts and Science students.

OBJECTIVE:

To find out the differences between Arts & Science college students in the following areas of social intelligence.

a) Patience

b) Co-operativeness

c) Confidence

d) Sensitivity

e) Recognition of Social Environment

f) Tactfulness

g) Sense of Humor

h) Memory

HYPOTHESIS:

There will be significant difference between male & female college students in social intelligence.

VARIABLE:

- Independent variable
- Sex

Dependent variable :-

Social intelligence (Co-cooperativeness')

a) Patience

b) Co-cooperativeness

c) Confidence

d) Sensitivity

e) Recognition of Social Envomment

f) Tactufulness

g) Sense of Humour

h) Memory

Methodology:

80 Male science and arts students 80 female, science and arts students were selected.

Sample design

Arts	Science	Total
80	80	160

Test Used

Social intelligence scale by chada and Usha Ganesan (1986) was used in the study. For scoring the manmade desertions are follows.

Discussion: The results are presented in the following tables.

Table No.1. Shows the results of Arts & Science

	Arts	Science
Mean	105.87	97.06
S.D.	12.06	0.43
T Value	01.767	

Table No.1 shows the results of social intelligence among Arts & Science. The higher means score of Arts students is 105.87 & S.D is 12.06 This clearly shows that the mean score of female is slightly higher than the male. There is a significant difference since the obtained T-Value of 1.767 indicates the same.

Table No.2 Showing the mean scores & S.D of social intelligence of Arts female students.

N=80

	Arts	Science
Mean	91.2	95.06
S.D.	11.01	1.43
T Value	02.216	`

Table No. 2 shows the results of Arts students the mean score of arts is 91.2 and SD 11.1 science mean score is 95.06 and S.D is 1.43. it shows that Science have more social intelligence than the Arts.

CONCLUSIONS:

The following are the conclusions of the study:

1. Table No.1 show the results of social intelligence among arts & science, arts is slightly higher than the male.
2. Table No.2 shows the results of male & females. It shows that females have more social intelligence than the arts.
3. Table No. 3 shows the results of arts and science. arts are more social intelligence than the a.
4. Table No. 4 shows the results of arts. It shows that arts students have more social intelligence than the science students.
5. Table No. 5 showing the results of science, social intelligence it shows that females have more social intelligence than the arts.
6. Table No.6 shows the science students of arts. It shows that the science females have moral social intelligence that the males.
7. Table No. 7 shows the science students of males & females. It shows that science female students have more social intelligence than science male students.
8. Table No.8 shows the results of males of science male & female students. It shows that males have more social intelligence than the males.
9. Table No. 9 shows the results of females of science of male & female. It shows that females science students have more social intelligence than the females science students.
10. Table No.10 shows the results of science & arts male & female students. It shows that female arts & science males have more social intelligence then male arts & science Arts and Science students.

REFERENCES

1. Goleman, D., Social intelligence, New York: Bantam Books, 2006.

2. Suler, J. “The online disinhibition effect” (2004).

http://www-usr.rider.edu/~suler/psycyber/disinhibit.html.

3. Small, G., and Vorgan, G., Surviving the technological alteration of the modern mind, New York: Collins Living, 2008.

4.James,W.,Whatisemotion?,1884.http://psychclassics.yorku.ca/James/emotion.hm

5. Darwin, C., The expression of emotions in man and animals, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965.

6. Barbalet, J., Emotion, social theory and social structure, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1998.

7. Martinez, M. “Beyond classroom solutions: New design perspectives for online learning excellence.” Educational Technology & Society 5(2) (2002).

http://ifets.ieee.org/discussions/discuss_january2002.html.

8. Stacey, E., and Rice, M. “Evaluating an online learning environment.” Australian Journal of Educational Technology 18(3): 323-340 (2002).

9. O’Regan, K. “Emotion and e-learning.” Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks 7(3): 78-92 (2003).

10. Stambor, Z. “How laughing leads to learning.” APA Online 37(6) (2006).

11. Hübler, M.T., and Bell, D.C. “Computer-mediated humor and ethos: Exploring threads of constitutive laughter in online communities.” Computers and Composition 20(3): 277-294 (2003).

12. Anderson, D.G. “Taking the ‘distance’ out of distance education: A humorous approach to online learning.” Journal of Online Learning and Teaching 7(1) (2011). http://jolt.merlot.org/vol7no1/anderson_0311.htm.

13. Bacay, S.C. “Humour in the classroom – A dose of laughter won’t hurt.” CDTLink 10(1) (2006).

14. Taylor, C., Zeng, H., Bell, S., and Eskey. M. “Examining the do’s and don’ts of using humor in the online classroom.” TCC 2010 Proceedings, 2010 (1): 31-46 (2010).

15. Jamison, K.R., Exuberance, New York: Vintage, 2004

16. Johnson, S., Mind Wide Open, New York: Scribner, 2005.

17. Astleitner, H. “Designing emotionally sound instruction: An empirical validation of the FEASPApproach.” Journal of Instructional Psychology 28(4): 209-219 (2001).