Social Intelligence is the ability to get along well with others and the skill in handling social relationship in the social environment. Sometimes referred to simplistically as “people skill” which includes an awareness of situations and the social dynamics that govern them and a knowledge of interaction styles and strategies that can help a person to achieve his or her objectives in dealing with others. As teachers are considered as nation builders, they are expected not only as intelligent but also be expected as Socially Intelligent too. It also involves a certain amount of self-insight and a consciousness of one’s own perceptions and reaction patterns to others, co-workers and community to make cordial relationships. In this context, the investigator studied the social intelligence among prospective teachers in Cuddalore District of Tamilnadu, India. A sample of 100 prospective teachers from different Educational Institutions was selected as the sample of the study. Normative survey method was adopted by using simple random sampling technique. To study the Social intelligence of prospective teachers Social Intelligence Scale by N.K Chandha and Usha Ganesan was used. The findings of the study revealed that prospective teachers are having high level of social intelligence. There exists significant difference in social intelligence between male and female prospective teachers whereas there is no significant difference in social intelligence with respect to family type. Also it is found that male is relatively high in social intelligence than their counterparts.

1. INTRODUCTION
Social intelligence is a combination of a basic understanding of people, a kind of strategic social awareness, and a set skills for interacting successfully with them. A simple description of social intelligence is the ability to get along well with others and to get them to cooperate. A careful review of social science research findings, ranging from Gardner and Goleman to Dale Carnegie, suggests five key dimensions as a descriptive framework for social intelligence as:

1. **Situational Radar:** The ability to “read” situations, understands the social context that influences behavior, and choose behavioral strategies that are most likely to be successful.

2. **Presence:** Also known as “bearing,” presence is the external sense of one’s self that others perceive: confidence, self-respect and self-worth.

3. **Authenticity:** The opposite of being “phony authenticity is a way of behaving which engenders a perception that one is honest with one’s self as well as others.

4. **Clarity:** The ability to express one’s self clearly, uses language effectively, explain concepts clearly and persuade with ideas.

5. **Empathy:** More than just an internal sense of relatedness or appreciation for the experience of others, empathy in this context represents the ability to create a sense of connectedness with others.

This SPACE formula immediately suggests the possibility of describing, assessing and developing social intelligence in terms of observable behaviors. Each of the five dimensions can be reconstructed into a set of representative behaviors that may range from highly ineffective to highly effective in social intelligence.

2. Need and importance of the study
Individuals who are socially intelligent appear to experience a rich, meaningful life, as opposed to truncated in affective experiences and navigate in social environments. Furthermore, aspects of social intelligence have been found to be associated with enhanced social problem-solving abilities, experienced leadership, and positive interpersonal experience. Social intelligence can serve as a foundation for, and help facilitate in the leadership effectiveness and success. Social intelligence involves patience, cooperativeness, Confidence, Sensitivity, Tactfulness and Sense of humour that helps the prospective teachers to go along well with students, co-workers and community. In this context, the investigator felt the need to study the social intelligence among prospective teachers in Cuddalore District of Tamilnadu, India. The findings of the study may help the teacher educators and policy makers to help the prospective teachers to be socially intelligent.

3. Statement of the problem
Based on the above discussion the investigator has chosen the problem and is entitled as “A study on Social intelligence among prospective teachers”.

4. Operational Definition of Social intelligence
Social intelligence is the ability to get along well with student, parent, co-workers and community and also to get them to cooperate in terms of Patience, Confidence, Cooperativeness &Sensitivity, Sense of humour and Recognition of Social environment.

5. Objectives of the study:
The objectives for the present study are:
1. To study the level of social intelligence of the prospective teachers.
2. To find out the level of prospective teachers social intelligence with regard to:
   a. Gender and
   b. Type of family
3. To find out whether there is any significant difference between the male and female prospective teachers in their social intelligence.
4. To find out whether there is any significant difference in social intelligence between prospective teachers belongs to joint and nuclear family.

6. Hypotheses of the study:
1. There is no significant difference between male and female prospective teachers in their social intelligence.
2. There is no significant difference in social intelligence between prospective teachers belongs to joint and nuclear family.

7. Method of study
In this present study the normative survey research method is used. A sample of 100 prospective teachers was selected from different educational institutions from Cuddalore District of Tamilnadu, India. Simple random technique was adopted to select the subjects for the present study. The collected data were analyzed by using the statistical techniques as descriptive and differential analysis.

8. Tool used
The Social Intelligence Scale (SIS) constructed by N.K. Chandha and Usha Ganesan has been used to measure the Social Intelligence of Prospective teachers.
9. Description of the Tool
This Social Intelligence Scale has eight dimensions. In case of ‘6’ dimensions (Patience, Confidence, Cooperativeness, Sensitivity, Sense of humour and Recognition of Social environment) the students were given a choice of three alternatives for each item and were asked to choose the appropriate one. In case of first four dimensions (Patience, Confidence, Cooperativeness and Sensitivity), scores of 1, 2, 3, were given to three responsive alternatives. In other two dimensions (Sense of humour and Recognition of Social environment) one of the three alternatives given in the appropriate response, the responses when given was allotted a score of ‘1’. In case of “Tactfulness” dimension the responses were in the form of “Yes” or “No”, the appropriate response was awarded a score of “1”. The total score for social intelligence is 132 (First thirty nine statements are of three point scale and the remaining fifteen statements lie in yes or No type.)

9. Scoring
Scoring is done as per the manual of Social Intelligence Scale (SIS)

10. Analysis for social intelligence scores
10.1: Descriptive Analysis
Table –1: showing mean and standard deviation scores for Social intelligence of prospective teachers for entire and subsamples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>73.12</td>
<td>08.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Family Type</td>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>74.45</td>
<td>9.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>70.47</td>
<td>9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Entire Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>72.46</td>
<td>9.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the objectives of the present study is to find out the level of social intelligence among prospective teachers. On analysis of table -1, the mean and standard deviation for the entire sample is 72.46 and 9.32 respectively. One can score the maximum of 132 for Social Intelligence scores. The higher the mean score is the indication of higher level of Social Intelligence. The mean score for the present study is found to be higher than the mid value of 66. Hence it may be concluded that the prospective teachers are having high level of Social intelligence. Similarly, for the subsamples of male, female, joint family and nuclear family all the mean scores are also found to be higher than the mid value. Hence it is concluded that male, female, nuclear and joint family prospective teachers are having higher level of social intelligence. It is also observed from the table, while comparing the mean scores of male and female prospective teachers, male are having relatively higher level of social intelligence than female. Based on the findings of the study, it is suggested that teacher educators should also provide guidance to prospective teacher to be more socially intelligent for a successful teaching profession.

10.2: Differential Analysis
Hypothesis-1: There is no significant difference between male and female prospective teachers in their social intelligence.

Table – 2: showing Mean Difference in social intelligence scores of prospective teachers based on Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D</th>
<th>t’ value</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Intelligence</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>74.45</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>70.47</td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table-2, the ‘t’ value for male and female social intelligence score is found to be 2.46 which is significant. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and it is concluded that there exist significant difference between male and female prospective teachers in their level of Social Intelligence.

Hypothesis-2: There is no significant difference between prospective teachers belongs to joint and nuclear family in their social intelligence.

Table – 3: showing Mean Difference in social intelligence scores between prospective teachers based on Family Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D</th>
<th>t’ value</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Intelligence</td>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>81.59</td>
<td>12.49</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>82.23</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table-3, the ‘t’ value for joint and nuclear family prospective teachers social intelligence score is found to be 0.47 which is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted and it is concluded that there is no significant difference between prospective teachers belongs to joint and nuclear family in their level of Social Intelligence.

11. Major findings of the study
1. The prospective teachers are having high level of Social intelligence.
2. Male prospective teachers are having high level of Social intelligence.
3. Female prospective teachers are having high level of Social intelligence.
4. Prospective teachers belongs to joint family are having high level of Social intelligence.
5. Prospective teachers belongs to nuclear family are having high level of Social intelligence.
6. Male are having relatively higher level of social intelligence than their counterparts.
7. There exists significant difference between male and female prospective teachers in their level of Social intelligence.
8. There is no significant difference between prospective teachers belongs to joint and nuclear family in their level of Social Intelligence.

12. CONCLUSION
The present study was conducted to study the social intelligence among prospective teachers and explores some interesting results such as male prospective teachers are having relatively high level of social intelligence than female. This finding revealed that male are easy moving with others than female. Based on the findings of the study, it is suggested that teacher educators should also provide guidance to prospective teacher to be more socially intelligent for a successful teaching profession.
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