

Research Innovator

International Multidisciplinary Research Journal



Vol II Issue II : April 2015

Editor-In-Chief

Prof. K.N. Shelke

www.research-innovator.com

Research Innovator

A Peer-Reviewed Refereed and Indexed International Multidisciplinary Research Journal

Volume II Issue II: April – 2015

CONTENTS

Sr. No.	Author	Title of the Paper	Page No.
1	Chiya Parvizpur & Fazel Asadi Amjad	The Unconscious Criticality of Wright's Native Son to Capitalism	1
2	B.A. Tina Zahel & Prof. Dr. Franz Josef Gellert	Ageing Workers in SMEs and the Influence on Corporate's Internationalization	12
3	Mimita Sachdeva	Life Skills and the Autistic Child	26
4	Talluri Mathew Bhaskar	The Fire and the Rain: A Myth Retold	29
5	Dr. Ankita Khanna	Assessments beyond Writing: An Attempt to Provide a Fair Chance to the Learners	44
6	Dr. Meetakshi Pant	Total Factor Productivity and Financial Structure of Steel Industry	49
7	Ashish Kumar	Carelessness of Man's Mind: a Study of Albert Camus's the Stranger	62
8	Dr. Manju Lalwani Pathak	Debunking the image of Sindhis as Refugees	68
9	Rita Malache	Approaches of tribal development: A critical Perspective	72
10	Prof. Dr. Patil Vijaykumar Ambadasrao	Wendy Wasserstein's An American Daughter: An Analysis	82

11	Dr. Khandekar Surendra Sakhar	Portrayal of Relations and Globalization in Kiran Desai's Novel 'The Inheritance of Loss'	89
12	Dr. Rakseh Rai	A Study of Social Intelligence among College Students of Tura (West Garo Hills) in Meghalaya	95
13	Prof. Vijay D. Songire	Male Sufferers in Toni Morrison's The Bluest Eye, Sula and Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things	109
14	Prof. R.Y. Shinde & Dr. Archana Durgesh	Vijay Tendulkar's His Fifth Woman: A Brief Introduction	116
15	Prof. (Dr) Mala Tandon	Alternate Schooling and Teacher Education: Issues, Challenges and Priorities	122
16	Dr. J. Thirumaran	A study on three leading stochastic Optimization methods in simulation	130
17	Dr Tanu Tandon Mr. Durgesh Pathak	Media and Education: Pathways to End Women Violence	135
18	K. Ravi Sankar & Dr. V. B. Chithra	The Inner Awareness of the Human Soul: A Study of the Apprentice	139
19	Dr. Vitthal V. Parab	A Socio-Literary Perspective in the Novels of Jhumpa Lahiri & Bharati Mukherjee	147

A Study of Social Intelligence among College Students of Tura (West Garo Hills) in Meghalaya

Dr. Rakseh Rai

Associate Professor, Dept. of Education, Nagaland University, Kohima Campus, Meriema, (Nagaland) India

Abstract

Intelligence is considered to be the power to think, understand, learn and decide of human behavior and Intelligence is the dynamic and central part of human being and without social value man cannot build up society that's why social intelligence should be engage among students behaviour because all children are the future of Nation. This study attempt has been made for Social Intelligence of College students. This paper studied the Social Intelligence of college students of Tura (Meghalaya) with relation to their gender. This research was carried out only Tura Districts in Meghalaya. The data were gathered through 'Scale for Social Intelligence of College students' from 150 college students of Tura (Meghalaya). out of 150 (70 Male and 80 Female college students) was sample of my study. Results showed that the social intelligence of college students were significantly different in respect of Gender and its various Dimensions. The result of the investigation revolved that Female has more social intelligence than male college students. In this study another dimensions of social intelligence like (Patience, Co-cooperativeness, Sensitivity, Recognition of Social Environment, Tactfulness, and Sense of Humour, both groups have more less same values but in the terms of Confidence and Memory female college students have great value than male college students. So try to provide special social training for the college students.

Key Words - Social Intelligence, College students

1. Introduction

Society is also the social structure and interactions of that group of people. Social structure is the relatively enduring patterns of behavior and relationships within a society. Thus, a society is not only the group of people and their culture, but the relationships between the people and the institutions within that group. A society, or a human society, is a group of people related to each other through persistent relations, or a large social grouping sharing the same geographical or virtual territory, subject to the same political authority and dominant cultural expectations. Human societies are characterized by patterns of relationships

(social relations) between individuals who share a distinctive culture and institutions; a given society may be described as the sum total of such relationships among its constituent members. A society can also consist of like-minded people governed by their own norms and values within a dominant, larger society. This is sometimes referred to as a subculture, a term used extensively within criminology. More broadly, a society may be illustrated as an economic, social or political infrastructure, made up of a varied collection of individuals. Members of a society may be from different ethnic groups. A society can be a particular ethnic group, such as the Saxons; a nation state,

such as Bhutan; or a broader cultural group, such as a Western society. The word society may also refer to an organized voluntary association of people for religious, benevolent, cultural, scientific, political, patriotic, or other purposes. A "society" may even, though more by means of metaphor, refer to a social organism such as Anant Colony or any cooperative aggregate such as, for example, in some formulations of artificial intelligence. The term social refers to a characteristic of living organisms as applied to populations of humans and other animals. It always refers to the interaction of organisms with other organisms and to their collective co-existence, irrespective of whether they are aware of it or not, and irrespective of whether the interaction is voluntary or involuntary.

Intelligence, as defined in standard dictionaries, has two rather different meanings. In its most familiar meaning, intelligence has to do with the individual's ability to learn and reason. It is this meaning which underlies common psychometric notions such as intelligence testing, the intelligence quotient, and the like. In its less common meaning, intelligence has to do a body of information and knowledge. This second meaning is implicated in the titles of certain government organizations, such as the Central Intelligence Agency in the United States, and its British counterparts MI-5 and MI-6. Similarly, both meanings are invoked by the concept of social intelligence. As originally coined by E.L. Thorndike (1920), the term referred the person's ability to understand and manage other people, and to engage in adaptive social interactions. More recently,

however, Cantor and Kihlstrom (1987) redefined social intelligence to refer to the individual's fund of knowledge about the social world.

And now we discuss about the Social Intelligence. Social Intelligence is of course closely related to emotional intelligence. Its main distinction from Emotional Intelligence is as Goleman states is that in 1995, when Emotional Intelligence was published brain research had not reached the acmes of understanding it has now reached. What was more, whereas emotional intelligence dealt mainly with the personal, social intelligence deals with the interpersonal—that fascinating array of interactions with others that affects how we feel mentally, emotionally, and even physically. It also affects how teachers are able to motivate students, employers, workers, how marriages can be sources of nurturance and mutual support and how to raise children in a family. The first example Goleman gives of social intelligence is that of a group of American soldiers in Iraq paying a bisect to a cleric to enlist his aid in distributing relief supplies. The local populace feared the well-armed soldiers. They were afraid they were going to arrest their cleric or profane their mosque. A mob quickly surrounded the soldiers. One can imagine what would have happened should a soldier, threatened by a gesture, shot off a gun. Social Intelligence is quite different from Emotional Intelligence. It is the capacity to accurately identify others' emotions, empathize with them, to see things from another person's perspective. It is the ability to leverage that awareness in an effective way to cooperate in the pursuit of goals and the creation of positive relationships. An important aspect

of Social Intelligence is accurately identifying the emotions of others rather than making up what you think they feel. There is a risk of projecting one's own emotions on to someone else rather than inquiring and listening openly to their perspective. A CEO with good Social Intelligence is able to understand the feelings and perspectives of others, see past their surface behaviors to underlying motivations and skillful bring out the best in others. Both Emotional Intelligence and Social Intelligence are often combined in what is now called ESI or Emotional Social Intelligence. Teams are strongly affected by the team leader's ESI. Teams in organizations led by leaders who have low ESI are undermined, misdirected and deprived of the resources and authority they need to do the task at hand. (Hughes and Terrell 2007). 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 acknowledge 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 standard point 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. Thorndike's (1920) original definition of social intelligence included the idea of the ability to: (a) understand others and (b) act or behave wisely in relating to others. Therefore, Thorndike is interpreted as providing for: (a) a cognitive appreciation of others without necessary action on the part of the perceiver and (b) action-oriented coping with others. After Thorndike defined social intelligence, most investigators did not alter his construction but simply accepted a test, most often the George Washington University Social Intelligence Test of Moss and his associates (Moss, Hunt, Omwake, & Ronning, Moss, Hunt, & Omwake, 1949; Moss, Hunt, Omwake, & Woodward, 1955), as an operational definition of social intelligence (cf. Thorndike & Stein, 1937). It is important to note that Moss and Hunt themselves (1927) cited social intelligence as the "ability to get along with others " and Hunt (1928) indicated that the test was designed to measure an " ability to deal with people". These definitions obviously emphasize Thorndike's second meaning but were criticized as unclear by some researchers (Mc- Clatchy,1929 Pintner & Upshall,1928). Strang (1930) accepted the "ability to deal with people" definition but emphasized the separate knowledge and functional aspects of social intelligence by reviewing techniques judged by her as appropriate to measure each. social technique or ease in society, knowledge of social

matters, susceptibility to stimuli from other members of a group, as well as insight into the temporary moods or the underlying personality traits of friends and of strangers. At the time of Vernon's writing, there was no one technique or no set of measures available to tap all of the aspects of social intelligence enumerated by him. There still isn't. More recently, there has been further succinct approbation of the action aspect of Thorndike's formulation with Wechsler (1958) indicating that social intelligence is a "facility in dealing with human beings" And, O'Sullivan, et al. Supported the cognitive half of his pioneering declaration by stating that behavioral cognition, one form of social intelligence, is the "ability to understand the thoughts, feelings, and intentions of other people as manifested in discernible, expressional cues". There definitely have been variations of what Thorndike (1920) called social intelligence, some of which are practically identical to his concept and others extremely tangential. A few examples suffice. In a paper which is shown to be quite important to social intelligence later in this review, Wedeck (1947), working in England, investigated "psychological ability" which he defined as "an ability to judge correctly the feelings, moods, motivations of individuals". Since he used a definition so compatible with social intelligence, it is interesting that Wedeck, schooled in the tradition of Spearman, did not cite Thorndike or other Americans in the field of social intelligence although his paper was well documented. Chapin, who was aware of American work on social intelligence, dealt directly with the George Washington Scale (1939) and

later developed his own scale of "social insight" (1942). In his earlier work, Chapin accepted the George Washington Scale as a criterion measure of social intelligence and validated a Social Participation Scale against it. His conclusion was that "social participation in the organized groups and institutions of the community, is itself a rough measure of social intelligence". The Social Participation Scale patently was a potential measure of the "action" or "functional" facet of social intelligence. Chapin (1942) followed by developing a test, the Social Insight Scale, which was a gauge of the "understanding" part of social intelligence. In this latter paper, however, he explicitly distinguished social insight from social intelligence by indicating that social insight is "the ability to define a given social situation in terms of the behavior imputed to others present, rather than in terms of the individual's own feelings about the others". This alleged distinction between social insight and social intelligence is a difficult one to comprehend and has not been supported with data. Other concepts that have appeared related to social intelligence and have been studied through the use of tests or scales include empathy and insight. The question is, what sorts of things the individual has to know, or know how to do, in order to achieve a role-taking-mediated end". On the basis of their research, they proposed five major "things" the person has to know. Specifically, these were: (a) recognition of the existence of perspective, that is, recognition that one's own perceptions, thoughts, or feelings in a situation need not coincide with those of the other person, (b) recognition of the need for

an analysis of the perspective of the other and recognition that such an analysis would be useful in obtaining one's goal, (c) the ability to actually carry out this analysis or predict with accuracy the relevant role attributes of the other, (d) the maintenance of cognitions yielded by this analysis in the face of conflicting cognitions representing one's own point of view, and (e) the application of these cognitions to the end at hand, such as effective communication. The consideration of these five points by Flavell, et al. includes the "understanding" and "factual" components of Thorndike's definition. It may be further noted that their investigations of role-taking and communication typically relied on actual interpersonal situations with emphasis on skills in terms of the particular needs of the other with respect to his perspective (or point of view) and/or what the other might be expected to know, or need to know, if the communication were to be effective. The social intelligence quotient or SQ is a statistical abstraction similar to the 'standard score' approach used in IQ tests with a mean of 100. Unlike the standard IQ test however it is not a fixed model. It leans more to Piaget's theory that intelligence is not a fixed attribute but a complex hierarchy of information-processing skills underlying an adaptive equilibrium between the individual and the environment.

2. Justification of the Study

Social Intelligence is being able to tune in to other people, to read them, to know how they are thinking about things, what they are feeling right now, and using that (knowledge) to communicate effectively

with them," he says. He says emotionally intelligent people can achieve great results by themselves, but socially intelligent people will also drive others to be more successful at the same time. Human is a social being he cannot develop his personality until he become aware to his society and this awareness help him to establish in the society. 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 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. The study is focused on the Social Intelligence

Between colleges students due to some are following reasons:

1. This research will also help to understand the behaviour of students in particular condition that's why it might be helpful to correct the behaviour of the students and will help to grow the capability of students to behave in positive direction to their problems.
2. It might be helpful for the students and for the society to be calm and positive in the stressful situations.
3. This research will be helpful to identify and corrective the very common problems of the society like 'Suicide' that is increasing in the students because of the stressed situations due to study and other stuff.
4. As we know that socially intelligent people will also drive others to be more successful. So these practices

will also help to develop good management skills in the people. By applying the common laws of SI a manager can effectively manage their subordinates.

5. Social Intelligence will also help the people to improve their overall thinking and that leads to improve the performance of their respective areas.

So if we summarize the conclusion of this topic then we can say Social Intelligence will be very helpful for our society and due to the variation of application of this topic it will be quite a challenging for research. As till yet there is no that much significance work done over this topic and due to my interest I would like to work on this one..

3. Statement of the Problem

A study of Social Intelligence among college students of Tura West Garo Hills in Meghalaya

4. Operational Definition: The term used in the statement of the problem, are defined operationally below:

4.1-Social Intelligence: Social Intelligence was the driving force in developing the size of human brains and today provides our ability to use those large brains in complex social circumstances. Social intelligence describes the exclusively human capacity to effectively navigate and negotiate complex social relationships and environments.

4.2. Gender: Gender is a range of characteristics of femininity and masculinity. It can be described by following terms that the physical state of being male or female.

5. Objectives of Study: To examine and compare the attitude between Male and Female students in relation to their Social Intelligence with Eight Dimensions. (Patience, Co-operativeness, Confidence, Sensitivity, Recognition of Social Environment, Tactfulness, Sense of Humour, Memory).

6. Hypothesis of Study

Ho1-There is no significance difference between Male and Female college students in relation to their Social Intelligence.

Ho2- There is no significance difference between Male and Female college students in relation to their Patience.

Ho3- There is no significance difference between Male and Female college students in relation to their Cooperativeness.

Ho4- There is no significance difference between Male and Female college students in relation to their recognition of Social Environment.

Ho5- There is no significance difference between Male and Female college students in relation to their Confidence Level.

Ho6- There is no significance difference between Male and Female college students in relation to their Sensitivity.

Ho7- There is no significance difference between Male and Female college students in relation to their Tactfulness.

Ho8- There is no significance difference between Male and Female college students in relation to their senses of Humour.

Ho9- There is no significance difference between Male and Female college students in relation to their Memory

7. Delimitation of the Study: The present investigation has its delimitations with regards to the variables studies i.e.

1.7.1- The present study was conducted only on college students.

1.7.2 – The present study only 150 college students have taken.

1.7.3-The area of present study was limited only Tura (west Garo Hill)

3. Research Methodology

Keeping in view the nature and purpose of the study, the Descriptive Survey Method of educational research is preferred. Survey method has its own importance. Survey studies are conducted to collect data of the existing phenomena with a view to employ data to justify current conditions and practices.

The purpose of present study is to investigate of college going students towards their social intelligence. For this purpose 'survey' method was used. Questionnaire for collecting information about social intelligence of students were distributed among the 70 sample of male students of undergraduate level & 80 sample of female students of college students.

3.1 Population and Sample :

Research is invariably conducted by means of a sample drawn from the target population on the basis of which generalizations are drawn and made applicable to the population as a whole. The target population in the present study covered college students of my population were selected and the present study 70 male and 80 female college students of sample size of my research in West Garo District (Meghalaya)

3.2. Tool Used: The data were collected from the college students by administering “**Social Intelligence Scale**” developed and standardized by N. K. Chadha and Usha Ganesan.

3.3 -Statistical technique used

For the analysis of Data Investigator had used appropriate statistical technique like, Mean,SD and t-test

4-Analysis and Interpretation of Results

The data was analyzed statistically by using Mean, Standard deviation and t-score for social intelligence of the students.

1- Ho1: There is no Significance Difference between Male and Female College Students in Relation to their Social Intelligence.

Table 4.1

Gender	No.	Mean	SD	D.F	t-test
Male	70	72.3	46.04	148	6.15**
Female	80	108.5	14.8		

**significant at 0.05 and 0.01 level of significance

An analysis of table no 4.1 reveals that there is a strong significant difference between mean score of female {m=108.5} is lower than that of male{m= 72.3}. Here calculated value of, ‘t’ is 6.15 which is higher than the ‘t’ value given in the table. Hence the null hypothesis is

rejected at 0.05 and 0.01 level of significance. We can say Female has more social intelligence than male college students

2-Ho2: There is no Significance Difference between Male and Female College Students in Relation to their Patience.

Table 4.2

Gender	No.	mean	SD	D.F	t-test
Male	70	18.71	2.61	148	0.92*
Female	80	19.32	2.30		

*Not significant difference at .05 and .01

It reveals from table no. 4.2 that t- value come out to be 0.92 which is not significant at both level (0.1 and 0.05) .This table indicates that male and female college students not differ significantly as measured by patience. Thus the hypothesis “There is no significance difference between Male and Female college students in relation to their Patience” has been accepted.

3-Ho3: There is no Significance Difference between Male and Female College Students in Relation to their Cooperativeness.

Table 4.3

Gender	No.	mean	SD	D.F	t-test
Male	70	24.32	3.03	148	2.85**
Female	80	27.50	2.12		

** Significant at 0.05 and 0.01 level of significance

Table no. 4.3 gives that Mean (24.32) and SD (3.03) of Male college students of cooperativeness and Mean (27.50) and Sd (2.12) of Female cooperativeness were significantly different at both level (.05 and .01) . The value of ‘t’ is 2.85 which is greater than the table value . This indicates Ho3 “There is no significance difference between Male and Female college students in relation to their Cooperativeness” has been rejected. It means Female were more cooperativeness than male.

4-Ho4- There is no Significance Difference Between Male and Female College Students in Relation to their Recognition of Social Environment.

Table 4.4

Gender	No.	mean	SD	D.F	t-test
Male	70	0.9	0.58	148	.121*

Female	80	0.94	0.73		
--------	----	------	------	--	--

*Not significance difference at .05 level.

It is clear from the Table No – 4.4 that mean scores for recognition of social environment of male (M = 0.9) is greater than recognition of social environment of female (M = 94) . Here calculated value of ‘ t ‘ is .121 which is lesser than the ‘ t ‘ value given in the table Hence the null hypothesis that “There is no significance difference between Male and Female college students in relation to their recognition of Social Environment has been accepted .

5-Ho5- There is no Significance Difference between Male and Female College Students in Relation to their Confidence.

Table 4.5

Gender	No.	Mean	SD	D.F	t-test
Male	70	21.44	2.50	148	0.82*
Female	80	21.71	2.13		

*Not significant difference at (.01 and .05) level.

Table no. 4.5 shows the Mean score of the 2 groups of confidence level and t-test was applied to see whether the difference between the two groups were significance or not. The mean (21.71) of confidence female is somewhat more than the mean score (21.44) of confidence male. This means that confidence of female have high than male. The obtained t-test (0.82) is smaller than the table value which is not significant at both levels.

6-Ho6- There is no Significance Difference between Male and Female College Students in Relation to their Sensitivity.

Table 4.6

Gender	No.	Mean	SD	D.F	t-test
Male	70	20.12	3.35	148	1.08*
Female	80	20.63	2.90		

*Not significant difference at both level (.05 and .01).

Result given in the Table No. 4.6 clearly reveals that sensitivity of two contrast groups the male students (N = 70) score (M =20.12) Mean score point with (3.35) standard deviation while their counterpart higher scored female students (N = 90) score (M = 20.63) mean score with (2.90) standard deviation. The ‘ t ’ - value clearly depicts (t = 1.08) that both the groups did not have significant difference in relation to their sensitivity. Thus on the basis of ‘ t ’ - value (1.02) 6th hypothesis of the study that “

There is no significance difference between Male and Female college students in relation to their Sensitivity” had been **accepted** even at the 0.05 level of significance (1.96).

7-Ho7- There is no Significance Difference between Male and Female College Students in Relation to their Tactfulness.

Table 4.7

Gender	No.	Mean	SD	D.F	t-test
Male	70	3.83	1.24	148	0.36*
Female	80	3.94	1.42		

*Not significant difference at both level (0.01 and 0.05 level)

Table No. 4.7 gives that Mean (3.83) and SD (1.21) of Male college students for tactfulness and Mean (3.94) and SD (1.24) of female college students for tactfulness and calculated value of ‘t’ is 0.36 which is lesser than the table value of ‘t’.

This indicates Ho7 “There is no significance difference between Male and Female college students in relation to their Tactfulness” has been accepted at both level of significance (0.01 and 0.01).So I can say that there has no significance between male and female college students in relation to their tactfulness.

8-Ho8- There is no Significance Difference between Male and Female College Students in Relation to their Sense of Humour.

Table 4.8

Gender	No.	Mean	SD	D.F	t-test
Male	70	3.05	1.23	148	1.8*
Female	80	3.47	1.5		

**Not significant difference at 0.01 and 0.05 level.

Table No. 4.8 the obtained t-value is 1.8 which is lesser than the table value at both level of significance. This shows that no there is no significant difference in the mean of male and female college students for sense of humour. Therefore the null hypothesis is accepted and it can be said that there is no significant difference between male and female college students will regard to their sense of humour.

9-Ho9- There is no Significance Difference between Male and Female College Students in Relation to their Memory.

Table 4.9

Gender	No.	Mean	SD	D.F	t-test
--------	-----	------	----	-----	--------

Male	70	9.1	2.31	148	6.8**
Female	80	11.14	1.27		

**Significant difference at both level (0.1 and 0.05).

The data in the above shows that obtained t value is 6.8 which is significant at both level. Therefore the null hypothesis is rejected and in its place an alternative hypothesis is accepted that there is significance difference in the mean score of male college students in relation to their memory. It also concludes that mean scores of Male college students (9.1) is less when compared with female mean score (11.14) of memory.

Thus the hypothesis “There is no significance difference between Male and Female college students in relation to their Memory” is rejected. Means female has more Memory than male .

5-Findings and Educational implications

The Research paper is confined to the main conclusions, suggestion and educational implication, finding for further study of value of students under graduate level. The main findings on the basis of interpretation and analysis of obtained data.

The finding are presented here in accordance with the objectives of the study

➤ The first hypothesis was- “There is no significance difference between Male and Female college students in relation to their Social Intelligence”. Calculated ‘t’ value is greater than ‘t’ table value at (0.01) and (0.05), level of significance (df=148).Hence the null hypothesis – “There is no no significance difference between Male and Female college students in relation

to their Social Intelligence” which has been rejected and Female students has more social intelligence than male college students .

➤ The second hypothesis was – “There is no significance difference between Male and Female college students in relation to their Patience”. Calculated ‘t’ value is smaller than ‘t’ table value at (0.01) and (0.05) level of significance (df=148).means both group has more less same Patience value in their behavior.

➤ The third hypothesis was – “There is no significance difference between Male and Female college students in relation to their cooperativeness”. Calculated ‘t’ value is greater than ‘t’ table value at (0.01) and (0.05) level of significance (df= 148).Hence the null hypothesis – “There is no significant difference between Male and Female college students in relation to their cooperativeness” has been rejected and it can be said that male and female college students are differ significantly in relation to their co-cooperativeness.

➤ The fourth hypothesis was – “There is no significance difference between Male and Female college students in relation to their recognition of Social Environment”. Calculated ‘t’ value is lesser than ‘t’ table value at (0.01) and (0.05) level of significance (df=158).

➤ The fifth hypothesis was – “There is no significance difference between Male and Female college students in relation

to their Confidence Level. Calculated 't' value is smaller than 't' table value at (0.01) and (0.05) level of significance (df=148). Hence the null hypothesis – “There is no significance difference between Male and Female college students in relation to their Confidence Level”, has been accepted and it can be said that male and female college students are not differ significant to their confidence level.

- The hypothesis that “There is no significance difference between Male and Female college students in relation to their Sensitivity” the mean score of female college students is higher than that male college students, which has been accepted.
- The seventh hypothesis was – “There is no significance difference between Male and Female college students in relation to their Tactfulness .Calculated 't' value is smaller than 't' table value at (0.01) and (0.05) level of significance (df=148).Hence the null hypothesis “There is no significance difference between Male and Female college students in relation to their Tactfulness.” has been accepted and it can be said that male and female college students are not differ significance in relation to their Tactfulness.
- The hypothesis that “There is no significance difference between Male and Female college students in relation to their senses of Humour” the mean score of male college students is lower than that female college students, which has been accepted.
- The ninth hypothesis was – “There is no significance difference between

Male and Female college students in relation to their Memory”. Calculated 't' value is greater than 't' table value at (0.01) and (0.05) level of significance (df=148) Hence the null hypothesis –“ There is no significance difference between Male and Female college students in relation to their Memory” .has been rejected and it can be said that male and female college students are differ significance in relation to their Memory.

6. Educational Implications

Social Intelligence is important variable which play a key role in the development of personality of an individual. The purpose of the present study was to compare the Social Intelligence of college students in context to Gender, and their Subject Stream. Social intelligence is the ability to acquire and apply knowledge from our socially and the socially of other.

6.1. For Teachers

This study is of great importance of teachers as it provides feedback to them, and it would also help in stress management, so that they can be at their level best and utilize their potential.

6.2. For Administration

Administrator also plays the main role in imparting the social based education. He makes the socially based environment in school as well as conducts programmers which are socially based as: Speech competition, painting competition, celebrating festivals of all religions which develop social, moral and cultural intelligence among all. The administrator should do his duty perfectly listening others attentively he

can be given correct advice and doing all this socially are developed. Giving socially based education family, society, teacher, administrator play equal role.

6.3 For Society

Undoubtedly there is degradation of social man. There are so many reason to be counted modernity, development, western civilization etc., are the causes other reasons of degradation in socially can be counted thus-

- Lack Unsafely, Disbelief, terror among artists and literary figures and growing tendency of estimation in social.
- Lack of high human ideals in the diplomats of nation.
- Degradation of socially due to science and arts development.
- Changing teacher's role degradation in socially.

Bibliography:

1. Gulliksen, H. (1950). Theory of Mental Tests, Network: John Wiley and Sons, INC.
2. Hathaway, S. (1964). Principles of Psychological Measurement by A.C. Helmstadter. London: Methuen.
3. Helmstadter, G.C. (1966). Principle of Psychological Measurement, London: Methuen and Co. Ltd.
4. Nunnally, J.C. (1978). Psychometric Theory, New York: McGraw Hill.
5. Ackerson, L. (1933). In disagreement with R.A. Lincoln's article, "The Unreliability of Reliability Coefficientelants". Journal of Educational Psychology, 24 233-255.
6. Anastasi, A (1961). Psychology Testing (2nd Edition). New York: The MacMillan Company.
7. Anastasi, A (1968). Psychology Testing (3rd Editing) New York: The MacMillan Company.
8. Anstey, E(1966). Psychology Tests, London: Thomas, Neon Sons Ltd.
9. Binet, A. (1916). The Development of intelligence in Children (translated by E.S Kite). Vineland. N.J: Training School.
10. Cattell, J. Mck.(1890). Mental Tests and Measurement, Mind, 15,373-380.
11. Cronbach, L.J. (1984).Essential of Psychology Testing, New York: Harper and Row.
12. Cronbach, L.J. and Gleser, G.C. (1954). Review of 'The Study of Behaviour', Psychometrika, 19, 329-333.
13. Downie, N.M. and Heath, R.W. (1970). Basic Statistical Methods, New York: Harper and Row.

Thus, we can say that socially have degraded. They have degraded but not completely destroyed. In the present time also man respect women. He considers lie, theft robbery etc wrong. So by the socially based education the main hand in degradation of socially industrialization and westernization play the main role.

6.4 For School: It is the main role of family, teachers, means of communication, educational institutions and administrator to impart socially based education. The suggestion of Kothari commission also is that – The youth should be given based education.

6.5 For Policy Makers

This study is helpful to give directions in the field of education accountability, code of conduct related with Social Intelligence to the policy makers.

14. Dockrell, W.B. (1974). On Intelligence, London: Methuen.
15. Edwards, A.L.(1975). Manual of Person Preference Schedule, New York: The Dryden Press, INC.
16. Edward, A.L. (1967). Statistical Methods for the Behavioural Sciences, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
17. Ferguson, G.A. (1942). Item selection by the constant process. Psychometrika 7,19-29.
18. Flemming, Edwin G, and Flemming, C.W. (1946). A Qualitative Approach to the problem of improving selection of salesmen by psychological tests. Journal of Psychology, 2, 127-150.
19. Freeman, F.S. (1965). Theory and Practice of Psychological Testing, Holt, Rinehart and Winstion, INC.
20. Galton, F. (1908). Memories of my life, London : Methuen.
21. Guilford, J.P. (1967). The Nature of Human Intelligence. New York : McGraw Hill.
22. Guilford, J.P. and Hopener, R. (1971). The Analysis of Intelligence, New York : McGraw Hill.
23. , T. (1928). The Measurement of Social Intelligence, Journal of Applied Psychology, 12, 317-334.
24. Buch, M.B. (ed.), 1991. Fourth Survey of Research in Education (1983-1988), Vol. 1&2, New Delhi: N.C.E.R.T.
25. Buch, M.B. (ed.), 1997. Fifth Survey of Research in Education (1988-1992), Vol.1, New Delhi: N.C.E.R.T.
26. Buch, M.B. (ed.), 2000. Fifth Survey of Educational Research (1988-1992) Vol.2, New Delhi: N.C.E.R.T.
27. Aggarwal, J.C., 2007. Essentials of Educational Psychology, Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
28. Best, John W. & Khan, James V., 2007. Research in Education, 9th Edition, Prentice Hall, New Delhi.
29. McCall, W.A. (1922). How to Measure in Education, New York :The McMillan Company.

Dhanashree Publications

Flat No. 01, Nirman Sagar CHS,
Thana Naka, Panvel, Raigad - 410206



Research Innovator

International Multidisciplinary Research Journal

www.research-innovator.com