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ABSTRACT

The study was intended to find out the social intelligence of college students in Cuddalore, Villupuram, Nagapattinam, Thanjore, vellore and Thiruvannamalai Districts of Tamil Nadu, India. Random Sampling Technique was used to compose a sample of 1050 college students. Mean, Standard Deviation and t value were calculated for the analysis of data. The result revealed that the locality, type of family and type of colleges had no significant difference but, gender and type of institution exhibited significant difference in respect of their social intelligence of college students.

INTRODUCTION

The human capacity to understand what does happening in the world and responding to that understands in a personally and socially effective manner. The successful diplomat, salesman, and minister must be socially intelligent, and in many other occupations one’s success will depend as much on social sense as on formal training. The socially intelligent person has the knack of getting along well with people. He makes friends easily and is tactful and understanding in human relationship. This study is mainly focused on the social intelligence among the college students.

Review of related literature

Gulford (1968) suggested that social intelligence could be accounted for as a fourth category of information. It carries the implication that there are 30 abilities involved in social intelligence as specified by structure of intellect (Social Intelligence) theory, six abilities for dealing with different products of information within each of the five operation categories. Chadha and M.S.Usha Ganesan (1986) have conducted “A study on social intelligence as related to mental health. This study reveals that there is a significant correlation between measure of mental health and social intelligence.

Statement of the problem

The problem selected for the present study may be stated as follows,

“The problem selected for the present study is stated as: “A study on social intelligence of college students”

Objective of the study

The researchers have framed the objectives for the study to find out the difference in social intelligence if any, among:

1. Male and female college students
2. Urban and rural area college students
3. Government, private college students
4. Nuclear and joint family
5. Arts and Science College and College of Education students

Hypotheses of the study

For the present study, the researchers framed the following hypotheses,

1. There is no significant difference between male and female college students in respect of their social intelligence.
2. There is no significant difference between urban and rural area college students in respect of their social intelligence.
3. There is no significant difference between government and private college students in respect of their social intelligence.
4. There is no significant difference between nuclear and joint family students in respect of their social intelligence.
5. There is no significant difference between arts and science and B.Ed. college students in respect of their social intelligence.
METHOD OF THE STUDY

Normative survey method (Kothari, 1985) was employed. The tool is administered to the samples of 1050 students. The data was collected and subjected to statistical analysis to arrive at a conclusion.

Tools used

The following tools were used in the present investigation. Social Intelligence scale by Chadha N.K and Usha Ganesan (1986)

Sample of the study

In this present study, 1050 students studying the B.A/B.SC and B.Ed.,courses were taken as sample. The random sampling technique (kothari, 1985) has been used in the selection of the sample. The samples were collected from the colleges situated in Cuddalore, Villupuram, Nagapattinam, Thanjore, vellore and Thiruvannamalai Districts of Tamil Nadu.

Statistical techniques used

The following statistical techniques have been used in the present study for the analysis of collected data.

1. Descriptive Analysis
2. Differential Analysis
3. Correlation analysis

Major findings of the study

The verification of the hypothesis based on the analysis of data indicates that there is a significant difference in the mean social intelligence of male and female college students (t=2.836) and it is inferred that the female students have more level of social intelligence than the male students (ii)The testing of the hypothesis based on the analysis of data indicates that there is no significant difference in the social intelligence of urban and rural college students (t=0.531) and it is inferred that the rural students have more level of social intelligence than the urban students (iii)The testing of the hypothesis based on the analysis of data indicates that there is a significant difference in the social intelligence of private and Government college students (t=6.50) and it is inferred that the government students have more level of social intelligence than the private students. (iv) The testing of the hypothesis based on the analysis of data indicates that there is no significant difference in the social intelligence of the college students belonging to nuclear and joint family (t=1.126) and it is inferred that the joint nuclear students have more level of social intelligence than the nuclear students.(v)The testing of the hypothesis based on the analysis of data indicates that there is no significant difference in the social intelligence even though they study in Arts&science and B.Ed college students (t=0.482) and it is inferred that the B.Ed students have more level of social intelligence than the Arts&science students.

Conclusion

To sum up, the following conclusions have been reached in the light of the present investigation. The locality, type of family and type of colleges had no significant difference but, gender and type of institution exhibited significant difference in respect of their social intelligence of college students.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL. NO</th>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>t’</th>
<th>Significant value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>82.50</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>2.836</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>84.44</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Locality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>83.08</td>
<td>12.14</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>83.44</td>
<td>09.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Types of family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nuclear</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>82.90</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>1.126</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>joint</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>83.65</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Types of college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts &amp; science</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>83.12</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.Ed</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>83.45</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Type of institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>81.49</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>85.85</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S=Significant
NS=Not Significant