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Abstract
Background: The purpose of the study was to assess Social Quotient and its comparison among professional students from different streams.
Methods: The study was confined to Banaras Hindu University. Subjects were selected on the basis of random sampling method. A total of 200 male professional students from different streams i.e. Engineering, Medical, Physical Education and Social Science (50 from each stream) were selected for the study. Observations were made on the contents related to Social Intelligence. Assessment of Social Quotient (S.Q.) was done by using Social Intelligence Scale developed by N. K. Chadha and Usha Ganesan. To characterize professional students on Social intelligence the data was analyzed by applying Descriptive Statistics i.e. Mean, Standard Deviation, Range, Skewness, Kurtosis. Finally, One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used in order to compare social quotient among professional students from different streams.
Results: Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation for Social Quotient between Engineering and Social Science Student; Medical and Social Science Student showed existence of significant relationship for Social Quotient. Significant difference was found among Engineering, Medical, Physical Education and Social Science Students in relation to Social Quotient.
Key words: Social Quotient and Professional Students.

INTRODUCTION
Social intelligence according to the original definition of Edward Thorndike is "the ability to understand and manage men and women, boys and girls, to act wisely in human relations" It is equivalent to interpersonal intelligence, one of the types of intelligences identified in Howard Gardner's Theory of multiple intelligences, and closely related to theory of mind. Some authors have restricted the definition to deal only with knowledge of social situations, perhaps more properly called social cognition or social marketing intelligence, as it pertains to trending socio-psychological advertising and marketing strategies and tactics.
E.L. Thorndike has divided intelligent activity into three types:
(1) Social Intelligence, or the ability to understand and deal with persons
(2) Concrete intelligence, or ability to understand and deal with things as in skilled trades and scientific appliances;
(3) Abstract intelligence, or ability to understand and deal with verbal and mathematical symbols.
The merit of this classification of types of intelligent activity, for psychological testing, is that it indicates several realms in which persons might be functioning and implies that separate and sufficiently specialized tests might be devised to measure how effectively persons are functioning in each.

**Statement of the Problem**

The statement of the problem was stated as to assess Social Quotient, and its comparison among professional students from different streams i.e. Engineering, Medical, Physical Education and Social Science.

**Aims & Objectives of the Study**

- To assess the Social Quotient among professional students from different streams.
- To compare the Social Quotient among professional students from different streams.

**Research Questions or Hypothesis**

It was hypothesized that there would be significant difference among professional students from different streams i.e. Engineering, Medical, Physical Education and Social Science in relation to social quotient.

**PROCEDURE AND METHODOLOGY**

**Coverage:**

**Universe of the Study:** The study was confined to Banaras Hindu University.

**Sampling Frame:** Subjects were selected as a sampling frame from different professional streams i.e. Engineering, Medical, Physical Education and Social Science.

**Sampling Method:** Subjects were selected on the basis of random sampling method.

**Sampling Size:** A total of 200 male professional students from different streams i.e. Engineering, Medical, Physical Education and Social Science (50 from each stream) were selected for the study.

**Units of Observation:** Observations were also made on the following contents related to Social Intelligence:

- a) Patience
- b) Cooperativeness
- c) Confidence level
- d) Sensitivity
- e) Recognition of social environment
- f) Tactfulness
- g) Sense of humor
- h) Memory

**Criterion Measures**

The criterion measure adopted for the study was as follows:

- Assessment of Social Quotient (S.Q.) was done by using Social Intelligence Scale developed by N. K. Chadha and Usha Ganesan.

**Statistical Techniques**

- To characterize professional students on social intelligence the data was analyzed by applying Descriptive Statistics i.e. Mean, Standard Deviation, Range, Skewness, Kurtosis.
- Finally, One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used in order to compare social quotient among professional students from different streams i.e. Engineering, Medical, Physical Education and Social Science.
RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS OF THE FINDINGS

TABLE-I: Descriptive Statistics of Engineering, Medical, Physical Education and Social Science Students in relation to Social Quotient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Engineering Students</th>
<th>Medical Students</th>
<th>Physical Education Students</th>
<th>Social Science Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>95.240</td>
<td>67.84</td>
<td>101.64</td>
<td>103.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Mean</td>
<td>2.00989</td>
<td>4.07054</td>
<td>2.00321</td>
<td>1.80521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-.1.47 .337</td>
<td>-.338</td>
<td>-.847</td>
<td>-.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Skewness</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>2.802</td>
<td>-.781</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Kurtosis</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>108.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>79.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>115.00</td>
<td>114.00</td>
<td>123.00</td>
<td>129.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-1 clearly depicts the descriptive statistics values for the Engineering, Medical, Physical Education and Social Science students in relation to Social Quotient, which shows that the mean for Engineering, Medical, Physical Education and Social Science students were found to be 95.24 ± 2.00, 67.84 ± 4.07, 101.64 ± 2.00 and 103.80 ± 1.80 respectively. Standard deviations were 14.21, 28.78, 14.16 and 12.76 for the same. Range for Engineering, Medical, Physical Education and Social Science students were 63, 108, 60 and 50 respectively.

TABLE- II: Analysis of Variance among Engineering, Medical, Physical Education and Social Science Students in relation to Social Intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>41315.26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13771.75</td>
<td>39.51644*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>68307.36</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>348.5069</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 level of significance, F 0.05 (3, 196) = 3.14

Table-2 revealed that there was significant difference among Engineering, Medical, Physical Education and Social Science Students in relation to Social Quotient, as obtained F-ratio was 39.51, which was greater than the tabulated value 3.14, required for F-ratio to be significant at 0.05 level with (3,196) degree of freedom.

Since the one way analysis of variance was found significant in relation to Social Quotient, the least significant difference (LSD) test was applied to find out the differences of the paired means among Engineering, Medical, Physical Education and Social Science Students.
TABLE-III: Least Significant Difference (LSD) post hoc test for the paired means among Engineering, Medical, Physical Education and Social Science Students in relation to Social Intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Medical Students</th>
<th>Physical Education Students</th>
<th>Social Science Students</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Critical Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Students</td>
<td>4762</td>
<td>3392</td>
<td>5082</td>
<td>4762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Students</td>
<td>3392</td>
<td>5082</td>
<td>5190</td>
<td>428*</td>
<td>6.091822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education Students</td>
<td>5082</td>
<td>5190</td>
<td>5190</td>
<td>1690*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science Students</td>
<td>3392</td>
<td>5190</td>
<td>5190</td>
<td>1798*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5082</td>
<td>5190</td>
<td>5190</td>
<td>108*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 level of significance

It is evident from table 3 that paired mean differences among Engineering, Medical, Physical Education and Social Science Students in relation to Social Intelligence was found significant between Engineering and Medical; Engineering and Physical Education; Engineering and Social Science; Medical and Physical Education; Medical and Social Science; Physical Education and Social Science. Hence, it is inferred that mean difference between Medical and Social Science > Medical and Physical Education > Engineering and Medical > Engineering and Social Science > Engineering and Physical Education > Physical Education and Social Science.

The graphical representation of means among Engineering, Medical, Physical Education and Social Science Students in relation to Social Intelligence has been presented in figure No.1.

Figure 1: Comparison of Means among Engineering, Medical, Physical Education & Social Science Students in relation to Social Quotient

![Mean Comparison Graph](image-url)
DISCUSSION

The scholar assess the Social Quotient and also compared the Social Intelligence among professional students from different streams i.e. Engineering, Medical, Physical Education and Social Science.

The findings of the study revealed that there was significant difference among Engineering, Medical, Physical Education and Social Science Students in relation to Social Quotient. The possible reason for this may be that students from different streams have difference in social intelligence due to difference in their social exposes to social environment.

"By social intelligence is meant the ability to understand and manage men and women, boys and girls -- to act wisely in human relations". Similarly, Moss and Hunt (1927) defined social intelligence as the "ability to get along with others" (p. 108). Vernon (1933), provided the most wide-ranging definition of social intelligence as the person's "ability to get along with people in general, 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 underlying personality traits of strangers".

Paired mean differences among Engineering, Medical, Physical Education and Social Science Students in relation to Social Intelligence was found significant between Engineering and Medical; Engineering and Physical Education; Engineering and Social Science; Medical and Physical Education; Medical and Social Science; Physical Education and Social Science. Hence, it is inferred that mean difference between Medical and Social Science > Medical and Physical Education > Engineering and Medical > Engineering and Social Science > Engineering and Physical Education > Physical Education and Social Science. Results clearly shows that Social Science students scored high in SQ in comparison to Medical students because Social Science student have background and better knowledge about the prevailing contents of society in comparison to Medical students.

The similar trends had been cited by Noortje, Meijs et. al. (2010).

Discussion of Hypotheses

It was hypothesized that there would be significant difference among professional students from different streams i.e. Engineering, Medical, Physical Education and Social Science in relation to social quotient which is accepted.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Significant difference was found among Engineering, Medical, Physical Education and Social Science Students in relation to Social Quotient.
2. Paired mean differences among Engineering, Medical, Physical Education and Social Science Students in relation to Social Intelligence was found significant between Engineering and Medical; Engineering and Physical Education; Engineering and Social Science; Medical and Physical Education; Medical and Social Science; Physical Education and Social Science. Hence, it is inferred that mean difference between Medical and Social Science > Medical and Physical Education > Engineering and Medical > Engineering and Social Science > Engineering and Physical Education > Physical Education and Social Science.
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