JETIR.ORG ISSN: 2349-5162 | ESTD Year : 2014 | Monthly Issue
JOURNAL OF EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES AND INNOVATIVE RESEARCH (JETIR)
An International Scholarly Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

A comparative Study of Social Intelligence

Randeep Kaur
Research Scholar Department of Education S.S.J. Campus Almora, Kumaun University
Dr. Bheema Manral
Professor Department of Education S.S.J. Campus University Almora

ABSTRACT

Aristotle has rightly called man a social animal. A human cannot fulfill even the basic needs on his/her own. Being social is a natural human instinct. In this study social intelligence refers to being patient, cooperative, sensitive, confident, tactful, being able to recognize social situations accurately, humorous, and being able to memorize the personalities of national importance. The aim of the study is to compare the social intelligence of B.Ed students of Kumaun University on the basis of subject stream. Descriptive survey method was employed in the study. The sample of the study was B.Ed students of colleges affiliated to Kumaun University Nainital. Tool for collecting the data was Social Intelligence Scale (SIS) by N.K. Chadha & Usha Ganesan. Mean, SD, t-test statistical tools etc. were applied for analyzing the data. It was obtained from the results that in some dimensions there is a significant difference between arts and science stream pupil teachers. In overall social intelligence arts stream pupil teachers have scored significantly higher than science stream pupil teachers.

Key Terms: *Social Intelligence, B.Ed students, Kumaun University, stream*

Introduction: As society is very basic structure of any civilization, human prefer to stay in a social structure rather than to live alone in isolation. Being social and to develop social relationships are basic tendencies of human. Any human gets big achievements in a society itself. By connecting with other people in society a human learns, adjusts, readjusts, responds and reflects. In start man was not aware of social ethics but slowly s/he learnt the importance of to remain in groups and to celebrate, cooperate and associate with others.

Social intelligence is a kind of intelligence which helps any person to develop harmonious relationships and to maintain them effectively. Furthermore social intelligence is also very important for understanding one's own self and of others. If a person is socially intelligent s/he will manage social situations skillfully and will act according to particular situation. Social intelligence is the ability to get along with others and to make them cooperate with us. Self-consciousness and self insight of perceptions and someone's own reaction pattern are important factors in it.

As a construct social intelligence was first mentioned by Thorndike (1920), he defined it as "the ability to understand and manage men and women, boys and girls, to act wisely in human relations" (p. 281). Thus Thorndike has defined social intelligence as the ability to comprehend people and to act intelligently. In words of Moss & Hunt (1927) Social intelligence is "ability to get along with others". According to them social intelligence is to interact with other people effectively and to maintain that relationship. Gardner (1983) gave concept of multiple intelligences and gave seven types of intelligences and later on added some more. These intelligences are- linguistic, logical- mathematical, spatial, musical, kinesthetic, interpersonal and intrapersonal. Although he did not mentioned social intelligence by its name but his concept of intrapersonal and interpersonal

are exclusively social and personal. Interpersonal intelligence is defined as to reach out and understand others feelings and emotions while intrapersonal intelligence is the ability to understand one's own depths, feelings and emotions. Albrecht (2004) gave a model of social intelligence which was originated on the theory of multiple intelligences by Gardner. He defined social intelligence in the words "the ability to get along well with others and to get them to cooperate". Goleman (2006) also gave a model of social intelligence based on Neuroscience research field. He defined social intelligence in two categories; social awareness and social facility. Social awareness is the awareness of other people and social facility is the ability that a person does with that awareness.

From the above definitions it is clear that social intelligence is the ability to understand social situations effectively and to develop and maintain the relationships harmoniously with others.

Though social intelligence is most important for all to handle a social situation effectively yet it is particularly very urgent for teachers to interact and to understand their students. As we all know school is a mini society and in it teachers prepare their students to become members of a society and to making appropriate behaviour in social situations. That's why the training of school teachers must be done in such a way that social intelligence is enhanced. The teacher educators must indulge them in active work of seminars or presentations and group discussions using some innovative form. This kind of work will enhance the social intelligence of people teachers and it will facilitate their learning, the way of maintaining discipline in the classroom, managing student behaviour, developing good attitude towards supervisors and positive relationships with colleagues. Social intelligence in the present study measures about an individual having patience, being co-operative with others, sensitivity towards others feelings and needs, being tactful about the challenging situations, and having positive sense of humour as according to the SIS (Social Intelligence Scale) developed by **Dr. N.K. Chadda & Usha Ganesan.**

1.1Statement of the problem:

"A comparative Study of Social Intelligence"

1.2 Objectives: - The present study aims to compare the social intelligence of the B.Ed students on the basis of subject stream.

1.3 Hypothesis: - There is no significant difference in social intelligence of B.Ed students on the basis of stream.

2.0 Review of related literature: S (2020) investigated into the topic impact of emotional intelligence, multiple intelligences and social intelligence on entrepreneurial intention. It was revealed from the investigation that male students are more motivated to become entrepreneurs than female students. In regard to social intelligence there was found no significant difference between male and female students. It was also revealed from the study that with regard to all the factors of Entrepreneurial Intention, namely Pro Activeness, Creativity and Self Efficacy, there was found no significant difference and both genders are proactive to identify opportunities in the field they do work.

Trivedi (2020) conducted a study on emotional intelligence and social intelligence among student- teachers. There was no significant difference was found on the scores of social intelligence between female and male student teachers but there was a significant difference between rural and urban area. The urban student techers posses more social intelligence than student teachers of rural area. As far as emotional intelligence was concerned it was found a significant difference on the basis of gender and area. Emotional intelligence of male student teachers was higher than female student teachers and urban student teachers were found more emotionally intelligent than the rural student teachers. It was also revealed from the study a positive correlation between emotional and social intellience of student teachers.

Mehta (2019) conducted a research on Development of personal values among students of secondary school in relation to their personality traits. Survey method was applied in this study and tools used to collect data were Personal Value Questionnaire developed by P.B. Sherry & R.P. Verma and Multi Dimensional Personality Inventory by Manu Rani Agrawal. From this study it was discovered that personality traits of secondary school students correlated with their value patterns despite the previous studies showed contradictory results. Furthermore it was also discovered from the study that rural and urban secondary school students marked no significant difference in their value patterns.

3.0 Methodology: - The methodology section outlines the plan and method of a research work. In it, Universe of the study, sample, data & sources of data, variables, tool and statistical procedure are included. The details of such are as follow: -

3.1 Population and Sample: -

The population of the study is students doing B.Ed in colleges affiliated to Kumaun University Nainital. The students were selected for the sample by stratified random sampling. Total 412 students were selected for the sample and it was further subdivided into various categories.

3.2 Data and Sources of Data: -

The present study has been done in colleges for B.Ed course that are affiliated to Kumaun University Nainital. For the concerned study primary data has been collected from the colleges.

3.3 Tool for the study: The tool for collecting data in the present study is Social Intelligence Scale (SIS) developed and standardized by N.K. Chadha & Usha Ganesan. There are total eight dimensions of the tool namely; patience, cooperativeness, confidence, sensitivity, recognition of social environment, tactfulness, humour and memory.

3.4 Statistical Tools: - The nature of data is quantitative in the present study therefore in the present study only quantitative statistical tools are applied for analyzing the data. Mean S.D and t-test are employed for data analyzing in the present study.

4.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 4.1 frequency distributions of the social intelligence of pupil teachers of on the basis of Stream.

Dimension of SI	Category	N	Mean	SD	SEM	t-value	Remark
Patience	Arts	220	21.21	2.54	0.17	2.74**	Significant
	Science	192	21.86	2.23	0.16		
Cooperativeness	Arts	220	27.65	3.84	0.25	1.38	Not significant
	Science	192	28.18	3.93	0.28		
Confidence	Arts	220	21.96	2.06	0.13	0.70	Not significant
	Science	192	22.10	1.96	0.14		
Sensitivity	Arts	220	22.06	2.40	0.16	1.97*	Significant

	Science	**192**	**21.60**	**2.30**	**0.16**		
Recognition of Social Environment	**Arts**	**220**	**1.08**	**0.70**	**0.04**	**2.01***	**Significant**
	Science	**192**	**0.94**	**0.71**	**0.05**		
Tactfulness	**Arts**	**220**	**4.65**	**1.29**	**0.08**	**0.67**	**Not significant**
	Science	**192**	**4.73**	**1.22**	**0.09**		
Sense of Humor	**Arts**	**220**	**4.00**	**1.60**	**0.10**	**2.05***	**Significant**
	Science	**191**	**4.33**	**1.65**	**0.11**		
Memory	**Arts**	**220**	**10.56**	**2.74**	**0.18**	**2.13***	**Significant**
	Science	**192**	**10.09**	**1.79**	**0.13**		
Total	**Arts**	**220**	**114.44**	**8.55**	**0.62**	**2.05***	**Significant**
	Science	**192**	**112.65**	**9.10**	**0.61**		

***Significant at 0.05 level of confidence, ** significant at 0.01 level of confidence.**

Table number 4.4 shows that the mean scores of pupil teachers on the basis of stream differ statistically in some dimensions of Social Intelligence. A detailed account of them is given below dimension wise:

Patience

In Patience dimension the mean and SD scores of arts and science pupil teachers are 21.21 & 21.86 and 2.54 & 2.23 respectively. SEM scores for the rural and urban groups are 0.17 & 0.16 respectively. The calculated t-value for the same groups is 2.74; which is statistically significant at the 0.05 level of confidence and it means that the null hypothesis for that there is no significant difference between arts and science stream pupil teachers is rejected and research hypothesis that there is a significant difference between both the groups is accepted. The same results were also obtained by Sharma (2017), Bhatt (2023) and Ganaie & Mudasir (2015). Sharma (2017) in her study; she compared science and arts stream pre serveice teachers; in which he got the facts that science stream pre service teachers were more patient than arts stream pre service teachers. Ganaie & Mudasir (2015) also took a study on sceince and social sceince college students. This study was neamed as A Study of Social Intellience and academic acheivement of college students of district Srinagar J&K, India. It was revealed from the study that science college students were more patient than social science students. Bhatt (2023) in her study named A study of ecological intelligence, emotional intelligence and social intelligence of the students of Kumaun University. She also otained the same results in which science stream students were found more patient than other academic stream students.

The researcher reasons that study of science is very diffucult and it demands a huge amount of patience to complete it. Furthermore science students have to perform many kinds of experiments which require a lot of patience. Laboratory and practical work of science stream requires huge patience and calmness. Due to these facts a general theory has been established that science students are more patient than arts students.

Cooperativeness

In the dimension named cooperativeness the mean scores of pupil teachers are 27.65 & 28.18 for arts and science stream pupil teachers. SD and SEM scores of the same group for arts and science pupil teachers are 3.84 & 3.93 and 0.25 & 0.28. The obtained t-value for both the groups is 1.38; which is very less to be statistically significant

at 0.05 level of confidence. It proves that the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between arts and science pupil teachers on the basis of stream is accepted in this dimension of social intelligence.

On the contrary Sharma (2017) & Bhatt (2023) found contrary results where science stream students were more cooperative than arts stream students. The researcher reasoned that both arts and science stream pupil teachers are opting for B.Ed course in which there are lots of activities and presentation are performed. During the teaching training process cooperativeness is must for performing duties effectively. Therefore the obtained result is justified.

Confidence

In the dimension of social intelligence named confidence the mean scores of arts and science pupil teachers are 21.96 & 21.10 and SD and SEM 2.06 & 1.96 and 0.13 & 0.14 respectively. The obtained t-value for the groups is 0.70 and it is not found significantly different, that's why the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between arts and science stream pupils on the basis of stream in this dimension of social intelligence is accepted. The researcher reasons that arts and science students get equal situations and tasks to complete in B.Ed course. Both groups of students are exposed to different kinds of activities like stage performance, seminars, games group discussions, debates etc. So both science and arts group students are found equally confident.

Sensitivity

In Sensitivity dimension of social intelligence the mean scores of pupil teachers of arts and science stream are found 22.06 & 21.60 respectively. Furthermore SD and SEM scores of the students in same manners are 2.40 & 2.30 and 0.16 & 0.16. The obtained t-value for the groups is 1.97; which is statistically significant at 0.05 level of confidence. This signifies that the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between arts and science stream pupil teachers in sensitivity dimension of social intelligence is rejected and the research hypothesis is accepted for the same. Therefore a general theory is established that arts students are more sensitive than science stream students. The reason behind this may be that subject of arts is philosophical and aesthetic and makes students more sensitive than science stream students. The same results were also indicated by the Saxena et.al (2013) in which it was found that arts stream undergraduate students are more sensitive than science stream undergraduate students. In an another study done by Sharma (2017); it was obtained that there was no significant difference between science and arts stream students.

Recognition of socail environment

In next dimension named recognition of social environment the mean scores of arts and science stream are 1.08 & 0.94 resoectively. The SD and SEM scores for arts and science stream pupil teachers are 0.70 & 0.71and 0.04 & 0.05 respectively. The calculated t-value for the same groups is 2.01 and it is significant at 0.05 level of confidence. It implies that the null hpohtsis that there is no significant difference between arts and science pupil teacher in recognition of social enviornment dimension of social intelligence; is rejected. Arts stream pupil teachers are more able to recognise a social situtation than science stream pupil teachers. It was reasoned by the researcher that it is because that arts stream students generally more open to social situation because the nature of arts stream. In this stream many subjects are oreinted towards society and people; which gives oppurtunity to understand people and their situations and environment whereas in science stream no such oppretunity is given. It is well known fact that science is based on natural lows and study of human nature is not involved in it. Study done by Saxena et.al (2013) also showed the same results.

tactfulness

In dimension named tactfulness the mean scores of arts and science students are 4.65 and 4.73 respectively. The SD and SEM scores of the groups are 1.22 &1.29 and 0.08 & 0.09 respectively. The t-value for the groups is 0.67, which is not significant statistically. It means that the null hypothsis that there is a significant difference between arts and science stream pupil teachers is accepted in tactfulness dimension. The reason behind it may be that both

arts and science stream students have to face social sitations and they have to handle them properly so that they can coordinate effieceintly with society. A study done by Sharma (2017) also gave the same results in which there was found no significant difference between arts and science streams in tactfulness dimension. On the contrary Saxena et.al (2013) found that there was a significant difference between science and arts stream students. In the result of the study it was found that arts stream students were more able to tackle the situation than to science stream stuudents significantly.

Sense of Humour

In dimension named sense of humour the found means for arts and science stream students 4.00 & 4.33 respectively. The calculated SD and SEM scores for arts and science stream are 1.60 & 1.65 and 0.10 & 0.11 respectively. The obtained t-value 2.05 which is significant at 0.05 level of confidence. Which means the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between arts and science stream pupil teachers is rejected and research hypothses for the same is accepted and a general theory has established that science stream students are more humourous than arts stream students. The reason behind this may be that the science stream students have to work together in projects and other works. They work together and develop a healthy sense of humour while in arts stream no such activities are performed. Study done by Saxena et.al (2013) showed that there was no significant difference between arts and science stream students.

Memory

In next dimension named memory the obtained mean scores of arts and science stream pupil teachers are 10.09 and 10.56 respectively. Furthermore the SD and SEM for the groups are 2.74 & 1.79 and 0.18 0.13. The t-value for the groups is 2.13 which is significant statistically on 0.05 level of confidence. It indicates that the null hypothsis that there is no significant difference between arts and science stream pupil teachers on the memory dimension of social intelligence is rejected. It means that memory of both srteam students is not equal and arts stream pupil teachers are more able to recognize the famous faces of the country. The researcher reasoned that in arts stream facts are very important and students have to memorize them and to achieve understanding and reflective level of learning one must be able to memorize facts. Only then one can go to next level of learning. Furthermore in arts stream more facts are to be memorized and the nature of the stream is theoretical. Study done by Sharma (2017) indicated same results which indicated that arts students have more ability to remember faces of popular personalities of our country. On the contrary Saxena et al. (2013) found that science stream students have more memorizing capacity than that of arts stream students.

Total Social Intelligence

In total social intelligence the mean scores of the science and arts stream students are found 112.65 and 114.44 respectively. The SD and SEM scores for the science and arts stream pupil teachers are 9.10 & 8.55 and 0.61 & 0.62. The obtained t-value for the groups is 2.05 and it is significant at 0.05 level of confidence. Therefore the null hypothsis that there is a significant difference between arts and science stream pupil teachers is rejected and research hypothses that there is a significant difference between them is accepeted. It is clearly visible that arts stream students are more socially intelligent than science stream students. The researcher reasoned that this can be due to the fact that arts stream is social in nature and it is oriented towards people and society so arts students are more able to deal social situations than science stream students. The similar result was also found in study done by Saxena et.al (2013). In the study done by him it was found that arts students were better in social intelligence than the science students. A study done by Makawana (2023) named 'Social intelligence, spiritual intelligence and study of values among college students showed a different result where there was found no significant difference between different streams college students in total social intelligence.

Conclusion: From the above analysis of the data it is obtained that on some dimensions of social intelligence pupil teachers differ significantly while on others there exists no significant difference. In patience, sensitivity,

recognition of social environment, sense of humour, memory and total social intelligence; there is a significant difference in social intelligence. In patience, sense of humour and memory science stream pupil teachers have scored significantly higher and in the dimensions named sensitivity, recognition of social environment and total social intelligence arts stream pupil teachers have scored significantly higher than science stream pupil teachers.

Bibliography

Agrawal, J. C. (2010). *Education for values, environment and human rights* [Book]. Shipra Publications New Delhi.

Best, J. W. & Kahn, J. V., (2008). *Research in Education*[Book]. Prentice Hall of India Private Limited New Delhi.

Birknerová, Z., & Frankovský, M. (2013). Social Intelligence in the Context of Personality Traits of Teachers. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research* , 11-17.

Chadda, N.K., & Ganesan, Usha (2017). Manual of social intelligence scale. Agra: National Psychological Corporation.

Crow, L. D. & Crow A. (1979). Educational psychology. New Delhi: Eurasia Publishing House (Pvt). Ltd.

Dhingra, K., & Tiakala. (2016). Social Intelligence of Higher Secondary School Students in Nagaland. *Researchpaedia* , 46-54.

Goleman, D. (2006). Social intelligence: The new science of human relationships. New York: Bantam Books.

Kerlinger, F. N. (2016). *Foundations of Behaviural Research.* Delhi: Surjeet Publications.

Koul, L. (2014). *Methodology of educational research.* Noida: Vikas Publishing House.

Saxena, S., & Jain, D. K. (2013). Social Intelligence of UndergraduateStudents In Relation To Their Gender and Subject Stream. *Research Gate* , 1-4.

Singh, A. K. (2014). *Educational Psychology.* Patna: Bharti Bhawan Printers.

Thorndike, E. L. (1920). *Intelligence and Its Uses.* Retrieved june 28, 2020, from Gwern: https://www.gwern.net/docs/iq/1920-thorndike.pdf

Trivedi, K. A. (2021). *A study of emotional intelligence and social intelligence among student teachers* [Thesis]. http://hdl.handle.net/10603/318191