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Abstract
Social Intelligence is of more importance in the present life style due to growing tensions, stresses and various complexities. It can be learned, developed and used as an effective life skill for managing personal life, interpersonal relationships and achieving success in all the walks of life. The present study was conducted to know the social intelligence of male and female undergraduate students of science and Arts subject streams studying in various degree colleges of Dhampur, Bijnor.

For this purpose descriptive survey method was used. 30 Arts and 35 Science undergraduate students were selected, for the sample by adopting stratified disproportionate random sampling technique. The data was collected by using Social Intelligence Scale (SIS) constructed and standardized by Dr. N.K. Chadda and Usha Ganesan. The data was analyzed by using ‘t’ test. The findings of gender analysis indicates that female student’s posses more social intelligence than male students and analysis of stream indicates that arts students are having greater social intelligence than students of other streams.
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Introduction:

Thorndike (1920) studies Intelligence in its three facets, pertaining to understand & manage ideas (abstract intelligence), concrete objects (mechanical intelligence) and people (social intelligence). Social intelligence is the persons ability to understand and manage other people and to engage in adaptive social interactions (Thorndike, 1920). Social intelligence has two key constituents which are distinctly personal and social in nature, one is intrapersonal intelligence and other is interpersonal intelligence. Intrapersonal intelligence is the persons ability to gain access to his or her own internal, emotional life while interpersonal intelligence is the individuals ability to notice and make distinctions among other individuals. Generally, Intelligence is considered to be the power to think, understand, learn and decide. However intelligence is much more than it. According to ancient Indian Philosopher, the inner self of man has three parts: Mind, Intelligence and Ego. Due to coordination of the Mind, the external senses become active and due to it, the Intelligence becomes active. Social means to relating to human society and its members; "social institutions"; "societal evolution"; "societal forces"; "social legislation". It is living together or enjoying life in communities or organized groups; "a human being is a social animal"; "mature social behavior". It is relating to or belonging to or characteristic of high society; "made fun of her being so social and high-toned"; "a social gossip column"; "the society page". It is composed of sociable people or formed for the purpose of sociability; "a purely social club"

And now we discuss about the Social Intelligence. Social intelligence describes the exclusively human capacity to use very large brains to effectively navigate and negotiate complex social relationships and environments. Psychologist and professor at the London School of Economics Nicholas Humphrey believes it is social intelligence or the richness of our qualitative life, rather than our quantitative intelligence, that truly makes humans what they are – for example what it’s like to be a human being living at the center of the conscious present, surrounded by smells and tastes and feels and the sense of being an extraordinary metaphysical entity with properties which hardly seem to belong to the physical world. Modern brain research supports the thesis that humans are social beings, hard-wired to live and work together, and that those who possess, develop and employ the skills needed to bond with others are those who will prosper in health, wealth,
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happiness, and effectiveness. Goleman says that brain research suggests that people “catch” emotions from one another—emotions are transmitted brain to brain through subtleties of expression, speech and mood and that we affect one another more than we know, even alternating the very structure of the brain and our physiological responses and health in long-term relationships. Thus the study of social intelligence is enormously important. In the case of social intelligence, there are things we can learn from social neuroscience to apply to our relationships, improving them and improving ourselves at the same time. The brain, for instance, triggers a smile in someone in return for a smile. Even a picture or movie of a smiling person will trigger at least a minute change in facial muscles, the beginning of an answering smile. Social intelligence—the passing of minute messages and responses to others—will transmit what we are inside to others, having, we hope, a good effect.

Social intelligence is significant to teachers who are trying to motivate students, employers who want to retain employees and increase production, marriage partners, parents, and everyone else who interacts with other human beings in significant ways—that is, all of us.

Then the miracle of social intelligence occurred. As Goleman stooped to show concern, a small group of people gathered around the unconscious man. It was as if Goleman’s compassion had given them permission to give in to their own. Within a few minutes, the man was sitting upright, eating food and water others had rushed to buy for him and waiting for an ambulance one of these Good Samaritans had arranged to have called for him.

Such is the human brain. It is so wired for good relationships with others that even witnessing an altruistic act on the part of another gives us a strong mental lift and urges us to move forward in our own altruism. This is an international phenomenon, from Jersey to Japan, where people report a deep feeling of reinforcement and joy from watching a tough and anti-social looking gang member rise to offer his seat to an elderly gentleman. Everyone witnessing such an event is moved, and moved to perform more acts of altruism themselves.

**Objectives of the Study:**

To access and compare the attitude between Arts and Science college students in relation to their Social Intelligence with Eight Dimensions (Patience, Co-operativeness, Confidence, Sensitivity, Recognition of Social Environment, Tactfulness, Sense of Humour, Memory).

**Hypothesis of the Study:**

- **Ho1:** There is no significance difference between Arts and Science subject stream in relation to their Social Intelligence.
- **Ho2:** There is no significance difference between Arts and Science college students in relation to their Patience.
- **Ho3:** There is no significance difference between Arts and Science college students in relation to their Cooperativeness.
- **Ho4:** There is no significance difference between Arts and Science college students in relation to their recognition of Social Environment.
- **Ho5:** There is no significance difference between Arts and Science college students in relation to their Confidence Level.
- **Ho6:** There is no significance difference between Arts and Science college students in relation to their Sensitivity.
- **Ho7:** There is no significance difference between Arts and Science college students in relation to their Tactfulness.
- **Ho8:** There is no significance difference between Arts and Science college students in relation to their Sense of Humour.
- **Ho9:** There is no significance difference between Arts and Science college students in relation to their Memory.

**Methodology of the Study:**

"A system of broad principles or rules from which specific methods or procedure may be derived to interpret or solve different problems within the scope of a particular discipline, unlike an algorithm, a methodology is not a formula but a set of practices”.

**Research Method:**

Descriptive Survey Method will have use for the study.
Population:

65 colleges student’s community were scope of study. Means others words they have called as Population.

Sample and Sampling:

I will select 65 samples and will use stratified technique for data collection.

Tool:

For the data collection researcher will use standard test Social Intelligence Scale development by N.K. Chadha and Usha Ganesan.

Statistical Techniques:

In my study I will use Mean, Median, Sd, t-test and appropriate statistics technique for study.

Analysis of Data, Discussion and Result:

H01. There is no significance difference between Arts and Science subject stream in relation to their Social Intelligence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. Stream</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D.F</th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>108.23</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>105.64</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Interpretation:

After analyzing the data given in the Table No. 1.1 indicate that the effect of students factor in relation to the subject stream between under graduate students of two contrast groups the Arts students ( N = 30) score ( M =108.23 ) Mean score point with ( 8.37) standard deviation while their counterpart less scored science students ( N = 35 ) score ( M =105.64 ) mean score with ( 7.89) standard deviation. The ‘t’ - value clearly depicts ( t = 1.33) that both the groups did not have significant difference in relation to their social intelligence. Thus on the basis of ‘t’ - value ( 1.33) 1st hypothesis of the study that “There is no significance difference between Arts and Science subject stream in relation to their social intelligence” had been accepted even at the 0.05 level of significance ( 1.96).

H0.2 There is no significance difference between Arts and Science college students in relation to their Patience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. Stream</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D.F</th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.53</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.58*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.55</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Interpretation:

Table no. 1.2 shows the Mean score of the 2 groups of patience level and t-test was applied to see whether the difference between the two groups were significance or not. The mean score (20.53) for patience of arts students is somewhat more than the mean score (19.55) of science students for patience. This means that patience of arts students have high than science students. The obtained t-test (1.58) is smaller than the table value which is not significant at both level.
Ho3- There is no significance difference between Arts and Science college students in relation to their Cooperativeness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. Stream</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D.F</th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.70*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26.61</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Interpretation:**

Result given in the Table No. 1.3 clearly reveals that the effect of students factor in relation to the male college students for sensitivity between female college students for sensitivity of two contrast groups the arts students (N = 30) score (M = 26.2) Mean score point with (2.10) standard deviation while their counterpart higher scored science students (N = 35) score (M = 21.61) mean score with (2.68) standard deviation. The ‘t’ - value clearly depicts (t = 0.70) that both the groups did not have significant difference in relation to their cooperativeness. 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 Cooperativeness” had been accepted even at the 0.05 level of significance (1.96).

Ho.4 There is no significance difference between Arts and Science college students in relation to their Confidence Level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. Stream</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D.F</th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.03</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>41.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21.11</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance difference at both level (.01 and .05).

**Interpretation:**

An analysis of table no 1.4 reveals that there is a strong significant difference between mean score of arts college students for confidence (m=21.03) is higher than that of science college students for confidence (m=21.11). Here calculated value of ‘t’ is 41.13 which is smaller than the ‘t’ value given in the table. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected at 0.05 and 0.01 level of significant.

Ho5- There is no significance difference between Arts and Science college students in relation to their Sensitivity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. Stream</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D.F</th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>47.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21.26</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance difference at both level (.01 and .05).
Interpretation:

An analysis of table no 1.5 reveals that there is a strong significant difference between mean score of arts college students for sensitivity \(m=22\) is higher than that of science college students for confidence \(m=21.26\). Here calculated value of, ‘t’ is 47.24 which is smaller than the ‘t’ value given in the table. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected at 0.05 and 0.01 level of significant.

\[Ho_6\text{- There is no significance difference between Arts and Science college students in relation to their recognition of Social Environment.}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. Stream</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D.F</th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Interpretation:

This indicates Ho\text{6} “There is no significance difference between arts and science college students in relation to their recognition of Social Environment” has been accepted at both level of significance (0.05 and 0.01).

I can say that there has no difference between art and science college students in relation to their recognition of Social Environment.

\[Ho_7\text{- There is no significance difference between Arts and Science college students in relation to their Tactfulness.}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. Stream</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D.F</th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Interpretation:

After analyzing the data given in the Table No. 1.7 indicate that the effect of students factor in relation to the subject stream between under graduate students of two contrast groups the Arts students (N = 30) score (M =108.23) Mean score point with (8.37) standard deviation while their counterpart less scored science students (N = 35) score (M = 105.64) mean score with (7.89) standard deviation. The ‘t’ - value clearly depicts (t = 1.33) that both the groups did not have significant difference in relation to their Tactfulness.

Thus on the basis of ‘t’ - value (1.33) 1\text{st} hypothesis of the study that “There is no significance difference between Arts and Science subject stream in relation to their Tactfulness” had been accepted even at the 0.05 level of significance (1.96).
Ho.8 There is no significance difference between Arts and Science college students in relation to their senses of Humour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. Stream</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D.F</th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.75*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Interpretation:**

Table No. 1.8 gives that Mean (3.43) and SD (1.30) of senses of Humour of arts students and Mean (3.43) and SD (1.30) of senses of Humour of science students calculated value of ‘t’ is 1.75 which is lesser than the table value of ‘t’.

This indicates Ho8 “There is no significance difference between arts and science college students in relation to their senses of Humour.” has been accepted at both level of significance (0.05 and 0.01).

I can say that there has no difference between art and science college students in relation to their Senses of Humour.

Ho.9 There is no significance difference between Arts and Science college students in relation to their Memory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. Stream</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D.F</th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Interpretation:**

Table No. 1.9 shows that the obtained ‘t’ value is 0.49 which is lesser than tabled t value of 2.58 and the hypothesis is accepted hence it can be concluded that there is a no significant difference between art and science college students in relation to their Memory.

It can be seen that mean score of science for sense of humour (6.54) is greater than art for sense of humour (6.51) in relation to their Memory.

**Findings:**

1- Not significance difference between Arts and Science Subject Stream in relation to their social intelligence.

2- Not significance difference between Arts and Science college students in relation to their Patience.

3- Not significance difference between Arts and Science college students in relation to their Cooperativeness.

4- Significance difference between Arts and Science college students in relation to their Confidence Level.

5- Significance difference between Arts and Science college students in relation to their Sensitivity.

6- Not significance difference between Arts and Science college students in relation to their recognition of Social Environment.

7- Not significance difference between Arts and Science college students in relation to their Tactfulness.

8- Not significance difference between Arts and Science college students in relation to their senses of Humour.

9- Not significance difference between Arts and Science college students in relation to their Memory.

**Conclusion:**

Social Intelligence is important variable which play a key role in the development of personality of an individual. The purpose of the present study is to comparative study of social intelligence based on various factors (such as- gender, place of living, and their subject stream) of college students. In general we can say that there is no significant difference in social intelligence compared on
various factors such as (patience, cooperativeness, recognition of Social Environment, Tactfulness, Memory, senses of Humour) expects arts stream students who are having greater social person than science students.
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