Social Intelligence and Aggression among Senior Secondary

School Students: A Comparative Sketch.

Sameer Babu M

Research Fellow

Jamia Millia Islamia

A Central University

New Delhi.

Abstract of the Paper

Background of the problem: Recently most of our senior secondary classes are notorious for theft, bullying, ragging, rapes, and even for murder. This is because of ill treatment of our students in their classroom, mal administration of educational institutions, and etc. Diminishing social norms is also an important matter here. India is also witnessing the incidents of juvenile delinquency. Reports show that the problem of student aggression is increasing day by day. The study concerning the social pattern, social acceptance, social intelligence, aggressive nature among students, etc. are highly relevant in India, especially in Kerala.

Aims: The aims of the study are 1) To measure the extent of social intelligence among senior secondary school students. 2) To measure the extent of aggression among senior secondary school students. 3) To find out the relationship between social intelligence and aggression. 4) To compare the students in their social intelligence.   5) To compare the students in their aggression.

Sample: Population is the senior secondary school students of Malappuram district of Kerala state of India. Sample of the study is 84 senior secondary school students of Malappuram district.

Methods: To collect information from the sample an integrated approach is good. Here normative survey method was used.

Results: Social Intelligence among senior secondary school students is of average. They have a greater amount of aggression. Relationship between social intelligence and aggression scores of senior secondary school students is found negative and negligible for the whole sample. But it is not proven significant. Gender based comparison of social intelligence is proved significant. Social intelligence based comparison of aggression is proven significant.

Conclusion: Specified strategies should be developed to deal with aggressive bahaviour. A good approach and a well arranged social intelligence oriented package must be developed and implemented in our schools.

Introduction

Who am I? What am I? Where am I? These are the general questions asked by our senior secondary school students, i.e. adolescents. Adolescence is really a period of stress and confusions. They have confusion on all the aspects of life. It is a transition stage and thus is the period of psychological imbalances among students. He is neither a child nor an adult. Is he a Chult? (Child +Adult).

Educational researchers have a great enthusiasm to study this Chult age, the period of gigantic transition. Why? It is because of the peculiarities of the period. During adolescence students try to understand more about society, Social relations, social approval, dealings, respect, and social identity and so on. They begin the social contact in a wider sense, approach various social institutions in a novel way, develop morale, and understand taboos, standards, and mores of society. Their behavioural aspects have been undergone many changes in a rapid manner. Some of them accept society with increased social awareness and some of them may become agitators, aggressors, bullies, or even criminals.

Social intelligence is one of the thrust areas in the educational researches. Aggressive behaviour among students is closely related with social intelligence of them. Many studies have proven the relationship between these two variables. Social intelligence is the ability to understand the society, and its heartbeats for fruitful and effective involvement in the circulatory process of society like oxygen in human body. The other side of social intelligence is not empty. It is comprised of confusions, chaos, problems, aggressions, and agitations. Aggression is one of the opposites of social intelligence and is any form of behaviour directed towards the goal of harming or injuring another living one who is motivated to avoid such treatments.

Intelligence is generally defined as an aggregate global capacity of an individual to act purposefully, think rationally and deal effectively to a given situation. When it is connected socially it becomes Social Intelligence.

Other than the conventional forms of measurement of intelligence there are other forms or types of intelligence those we can use in the assessment and evaluation of people. The innate capabilities of human beings have various facets and should not only be limited to one or two measurements. In fact, there are multiple types of intelligence that may appear in various intensities and combinations for people. Some may be lacking with one and some may have a good mixture of most intelligence. That variety of combinations stems from the development of the person and is largely determined by the type of environment and the biological factors relating to the development of such intelligence.

Thorndike (1920) defined Social Intelligence as "the ability to understand others and act wisely in human relations". It is a key element in what makes people succeed in life. Social intelligence is the capacity of the individual to interact effectively, with his environment. The interpersonal relations in various work, environment, is itself reflection of social intelligence.

It is the capacity o know oneself and to know others is an inalienable a part of the human conditions as is the capacity to know objects or sounds, and it deserves to be investigated no less than these other "less charged" forms, Gardner (1983).

Social Intelligence or social competence is the ability to understand the feelings, thoughts and behaviours of persons in social or interpersonal situations and to act appropriately, based on that understanding.

Social competence has long been regarded as a fundamental aspect of human capabilities, Thorndike (1927) in an early formulation suggested three types of intelligence, one of which was social competence, is a broad construct that includes demographic adaptive

behavioral and social skill variables. Persons high in social competence are considered to be able to meet the demands of every day functioning and to be equipped to handle participation and responsibility for their own welfare of others.

According to Cantor and Kihlstrom (1987), Social Intelligence is specifically geared to solving the problems of social life, and in particular managing the life tasks, current concerns or personal projects which the person selects for him or her self, or which other people impose on him or her from outside.

Andreon (2006) in his study Social Preference, Perceived Popularity and Social Intelligence-Relations to Overt and Relational Aggression, revealed that the Social Intelligence is a predictor of Aggression. Social Intelligence evaluated only with respect to the domains and contexts in which it is exhibited and the life tasks it is designed to serve. And even in his case 'adequacy' cannot be judged from the viewpoint of the external observer but rather from the point of view of the subject whose life tasks are in play.

Greenspan (1979) proposed a hierarchical model of Social Intelligence, in which Social Intelligence consists of 3 components: Social Sensitivity, Social Insight and Social Communication. Liff, S. B. (2007) revealed in his article 'Social and emotional intelligence: applications for developmental education' the very real, if not causal, relationship between social and emotional intelligence and success in college. Student needs and faculty capacities to address those needs are the focus. Six components of the social and emotional intellectual paradigm, gleaned from the literature and merged with the voices of college educators, are reviewed and pragmatically applied to campus life and learning. Traditionally not a pedagogic focus of higher education beyond a variety of developmental enhancements, it will be shown how sensitivities and learning within the affective domain are strongly linked to the efficacy of a successful collegiate experience for all students.

Reader and Kevin (2002) in a study entitled 'Social intelligence, innovation, and enhanced brain size in primates' revealed an empirical link between behavioral innovation, social learning capacities, and brain size in mammals. The ability to learn from others, invent new behaviors, and use tools may have played pivotal roles in primate brain evolution

Hackworth, Carla A. (2001) in his Ph. D thesis 'Understanding and Managing Others: The Impact of Social Intelligence upon Social Influence' reveals the relevance of social intelligence to social influence. Consistent with but extending past research, recognizing situational influences i.e., discriminative facility was associated with effective social interactions. In particular, individuals high in discriminative facility demonstrated greater flexibility when considering influence tactics than individuals low in discriminative facility.

E. L. Thorndike has divided intelligent activity into three types:

1. Social Intelligence or 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.

Over years a growing interest has been manifested in the concept of social intelligence. It has been highlighted that in various fields today the capacity of the individual to interact emphasis placed on interpersonal relationships in various work environment is itself a reflection of the importance of social intelligence.

The problem of understanding the behaviour of people in face-to-face contacts, of empathy, and of social sensitivity, and problems of managing the behaviour of others have been recognized for a long time, but little systematic work has been done on basic understanding of these phenomena. Thorndike, E. L. (1920) had pointed out that there is an aspect of personality that can be called social intelligence, distinct from abstract and concrete intelligences. Guilford

(1958) suggested that social intelligence could be accounted for as a forth category of information. It carries the implication that there are 30 abilities involved in social intelligence as specified by structure of intellect (SI) theory, six abilities for dealing with different products of information within each of the five operation categories.

Together with cognitive intelligence, emotional and social intelligence form important components of general intelligence. One of the major differences between the two is that the former is thought to relate primarily to higher order mental processes like reasoning, while the latter focuses more on perceiving, immediate processing and applying emotional and social content, information and knowledge. It has also been suggested that another fundamental difference between the two may be that cognitive intelligence is more cortically strategic in nature, while emotional and social intelligence is more limbically tactical for immediate behaviour suited more for survival and adaptation (Goleman, 1995; Bar-On, 1997; Stein and Book, 2000).

Emotional intelligence is the ability to accurately identify and understand one's own emotional reactions and those of others. It also includes the ability to regulate one's emotions and to use them to make good decisions and act effectively. EI provides the bedrock for many competencies those are critical for effective performance in the work place. One's effectiveness in influencing others depends on one's ability to connect with them on an emotional level and to understand why they are feeling and why. In order to influence others effectively we also need to be able to manage our own emotions.

To be effective, change efforts need to begin with the realization that emotional learning differs from cognitive and technical learning in some important ways. Emotional capacities like self-confidence and empathy differs from cognitive abilities because they draw on different brain areas.

Aggression is a broader concept, involving efforts to harm or control another person; it is manifested quite early in childhood; it then typically undergoes changes in its forms and functions. Aggression is a bio-psycho-social phenomenon having biological, cognitive, psychodynamic, and social causes. Gilula and Daniels(1969) defines aggression as the entire spectrum of assertive, intrusive, and attacking behaviours and included both overt and covert attacks, such defamatory acts as sarcasm, self directed attacks and dominant behaviour as well as such assertive behaviours as forceful and determined attempts to master a task or accomplish an act.

Encyclopaedia Britannica suggests a working definition of aggression. Aggression is an action that inflicts pain, anxiety, or distress on another and is in the service of hostile motive or of the emotion of anger.

During adolescence the aggression takes on different manifestations and functions. Adolescents' self- absorption and prickly sensitivity to the views of others means that acceptance by a peer group takes on increased acceptance, as does their own position within the status hierarchy of that group. In addition adolescence is a period when transitions to larger, more complex social environments take place. These settings may involve greater diversity and competition than the adolescent previously encountered.

Bandura (1973) believed that people are thinking organisms that possess capabilities that provide them with some power of self-direction. He wrote that by managing the stimulus determinants of given activities and producing consequences for their own actions, people can somewhat control their own behavior. Bandura explained that human aggression is a learned behavior that like other forms of social behavior is under stimulus, reinforcement, and cognitive control. According to Bandura's (1973) social learning theory, aggression is treated as a complex event that includes behaviors that produce injurious and negative effects to its victims as well as labeling the acts as aggressive. A full explanation of aggression must consider both

injurious behavior and social judgments that decide which injurious acts are labeled as aggressive.

The social learning theory of aggression distinguishes between the acquisition of behaviors that have destructive and injurious potential and the factors that determine whether a person will perform what he has learned. It recognizes the interrelationship between the individual, the environment, and behavior (Grusec, 1992). The theory is promoted through examples set by individuals one comes across in everyday life. People learn through modeling and direct experience and modeling influences can be especially important in the use of aggression (Bandura, 1973). Perceived popular children and adolescents usually are the most influential and connected members of their grade.

Aggression is just one of the several known categories of conduct problems. The behavioural cases related to aggression can be divided into two broad groups- physical, and verbal.

Verbal aggression includes acts such as insulting with bad language, displaying anger, threatening, swearing, and being sarcastic, all in order to cause emotional and psychological pain. Physical aggression aims to cause bodily damage including bullying, destructing, vandalism, fighting, and gangsterism.

According to Shaffer (2002) Aggression is any form of behaviour designed to harm or injure a living being. Some of the numerous types of aggression are the following.

Relational/Social aggression: This occurs when a person behaves maliciously with the intention of damaging an adversary's self-esteem, friendship, or social status. Snubbing, ignoring another person to make him feel bad, not talking with a person following an argument, and spreading malicious gossip. This form of aggression is most common among females.

Non-Physical aggression/Verbal abuse: This form includes name calling, teasing, quarrelling, extortion, intimidating, vicious gossiping, and cruel rumour campaigns. The intention is to harm one's feelings indirectly.

Physical aggression: It is hostile form of aggression and includes kicking, molesting, harassing, biting, hitting, pushing, and torturing. School bullies, street gangsters are included in the physical aggressors.

Retaliatory/Reactive aggression: this form of aggression is done as a part of self-defense or revenge. It is making an attack in return for a similar attack occurs where a person behaves aggressively when there is a real or imagined provocation from other people.

Instrumental/ Proactive aggression: It occurs when a person behaves aggressively to get a reward to satisfy specific personal goals such as gaining access to a certain object, space, or privilege and the aggressor is quite confident that aggression will pay off.

Schools not only supplement the normative pattern of the familial training but also reinforce the content and mode of training. First experience of the child with aggression is clearly from his home. Similar experiences are there in schools. If a child receives punishment from parents and teachers to instill discipline he learns that aggression is a desired characteristic to achieve goals.

Atmosphere is connected with aggression among school going ones. Leober and Dishion (1984) found that boys who fight at home as well as at schools have scored substantially higher on a variety of measures of anti social behaviour than those boys who fight only at home or only at schools when compared in terms of their behaviour and family background. Bhan (1984) found that high intelligence level, better economic condition of the family, better emotional adjustment and adjustment at home and at schools, higher educational and cultural level of the family, and better teacher pupil relations are all associated with relatively lower levels of aggression.

Given the range of behaviours that are covered by the term aggression, it is hardly surprising that there have been many psychological theories taking different perspectives. Some theories propose biological explanations and others emphasize socialization practices. Some psychologists regard aggression as a learned class of behaviours that is evoked by particular conditions where as other psychologists regard it as a trait that predicts how individuals behave across a range of different situations.

There are many possible causes of aggression in human beings. They can be classified broadly into biological and environmental causes. The major factors those cause aggression are the following.

The child: A child's temperament and his learned coping skills are critical to the youngster's being able to manage aggression. Temperament is that part of personality that seems to be controlled by genetics.

The family: the level of family stress and the positive and negative interactions of the family influence children's aggression. Child usually mould his behaviour after adults around him, observing, imitating how others handle their anger and how they behave in different situations.

The community: Tolerance and acceptance of aggression and violence in the community increase the likelihood that children brought up in these contexts will become aggressive and violent. This is because aggressive behaviour is largely learned and maintained in a manner similar to the other learned behaviours. Communities that understand and support children's rights are communities that support children and all their developmental stages. Places where there are supportive adults and healthy alternatives for reaction can protect children while they are learning to deal with many situations.

The environment: It is revealed by different studies that housing, schools, and neighborhood can contribute to aggression. Extreme heat or overcrowding has been shown to increase aggression.

The culture: What sorts of models are children exposed to on television and in the community? When people try to solve problems with physical violence, children mistakenly learn that this is the appropriate behaviour.

Peer influence: Making friendship with anti social peers can lead to the development of aggressive tendencies through modeling violent peers.

Exposure to media violence: Young people love watching too much action-packed violent programmes on television, video, and internet. Many young people see aggressive figures in many brutal programmes as their heroes. They model their aggressive behaviour and get reinforced vicariously while watching the programmes.

Singh, N. N. et al. (2007) in their study 'Mindful parenting decreases aggression, noncompliance, and self-injury in children with Autism' explains- Parent-child transactions provide an important social context for the development of adaptive and problem behaviours in young children with autism. Teaching parents to develop alternative transactional pathways often leads to positive behavioural patterns in their children. The authors taught three parents the philosophy and practice of mindfulness in a 12-week course and assessed the outcome of the training on their children's behaviour. In addition, the mothers rated satisfaction with their parenting skills and interactions with their children. Results showed that the mothers' mindful parenting decreased their children's aggression, noncompliance, and self-injury and increased the mothers' satisfaction with their parenting skills and interactions with their children. They speculated on the possible reasons for the efficacy of mindful parenting in decreasing the children's problem behaviours without the application of specific, programmed contingencies for the children's behaviour.

Murray-Close (2007) in his study 'Children's moral reasoning regarding physical and relational aggression' explored Elementary school children's moral reasoning concerning physical and relational aggression. Fourth and fifth graders rated physical aggression as more wrong and harmful than relational aggression but tended to adopt a moral orientation about both forms of aggression. Gender differences in moral judgements of aggression were observed, with girls rating physical and relational aggression as more wrong and relational aggression as more harmful than boys. In addition, girls were more likely to adopt a moral orientation when judging physical and relational aggression and girls more often judged relational aggression than physical aggression from the moral domain. Finally, moral reasoning about aggression was associated with physically and relationally aggressive behaviour. Considered together, the results indicate that children tend to adopt a moral orientation about aggression, but that they nonetheless differentiate between physical and relational aggression in their moral judgements.

Marjut (2007) in his study Digital game playing and Direct and Indirect Aggression in early Adolescence: The roles of Age, Social Intelligence and Parent-Child Communication revealed that digital game violence was directly associated with direct aggression, especially at age 10, but only among boys. The moderating roll of social intelligence was substantiated among older boys.

Mundia (2006) concluded that Aggression is one of the major problems in schools. The study recommends that more detailed investigations, both qualitative and quantitative, be conducted to gain deeper perceptions in to the nature of the problem its possible causes and solutions, but that are likely to be most effective in addressing it. An enhancement of teacher skills in handling aggressive children needs to be given high consideration and priority by relevant authorities in the present circumstances.

Aggression has many psychological effects and social costs on both the perpetrator and victim. Aggression can disrupt the school's educational processes and group and

inter group relationships in the school community. Aggression should be minimized in all social contexts. The best programmes are those, which are preventative and family focused. We can reduce the aggressive behaviour by removing aggressive toys, videos, and games from them. Cognitive behaviour modification scheme, schedules of reinforcement and behaviour shaping under operant conditioning, the aggression replacement training, and the whole school approach to bullying as suggested by Olweus in 1993.

Peer intervention and mediation can reduce overall levels of bullying and aggression in schools. Some of the strategies for dealing with bullying are the following.

- Θ Education of school staff about bullying and the harassment through in-servicing, with a focus on what is happening between students in the school, making use of surveys, and related discussion.

- Θ The development of specific policy to counter bullying in the school, employing a consultative approach with the involvement of both students and their parents.

- Θ The use of the school curriculum to provide lessons and activities designed to help children to develop knowledge, attitude, and skills that will help them deal more effectively with issues of bullying.

- Θ The empowerment of students to resist and to assist in reducing conflicts.

- Θ Clarification of the roles of staff members in countering the bullying and aggression in school.

- Θ Working closely with parents to reduce bullying, inform and consulting with them on relevant issues in school.

- Θ The clear documentation of steps that have been taken in particular cases together with outcomes in order to facilitate evaluation and justify possible modification in approaches.

Θ A focus on restoring the well being of students who have been psychologically damaged by continued harassment.

Θ Collaboration with appropriate agencies with a related or complementary function.

Study- I *Section-A*

Method

Participants

Two senior secondary schools were selected for this study. From each school 42 students were participated, having an average age of 16.5 years.

Tools

A general data sheet was given to students for collecting data on their age, gender, parental occupation, and stream of study.

The first tool was a *Social Intelligence Scale* constructed and validated by Dr. N.K. Chandha & Ms. Usha Ganeshan (2004). The scale measures five dimensions of intelligence namely patience, co- operative ness, confidence, sensitivity, recognition of social environment, tactfulness, sense of humour, and memory. Reliability of the scale was established in two ways- test- retest and split half. It was proved highly reliable. Cross validity and empirical validity were established in proper channel.

Materials

Students were given response sheets along with the scale.

Procedure

Before administering the tools, the investigator gave a sketch on the tools. It had helped in making a rapport with the students and to make the administration convenient. They were motivated to answer in an honest manner. Adequate time was allotted to them for eliciting responses. The collected data were tabulated and it was found the mean, median, mode, standard deviation, and skew ness.

Results

Table: 1

Social Intelligence Scores of Students (Whole Sample)

N	AM	Med	Mod	SD
84	108	108	105	6.88

Table 1 shows the details of social intelligence scores. Students have a mean of 108 and a median of 108. It is clear that they have an average social intelligence. Mode value is 105 and standard deviation is 6.88.

Table: 2
Social Intelligence Scores of Students (Sub Samples)

Variable	N	AM	Med	Mod	Sk	SD
Boys	34	104.82	107	108	-1.95	7.29
Girls	50	110.16	111	113	-0.36	5.72
Commerce Students	42	108.76	109	105	-1.85	7.67
Humanities Students	42	107.24	108	108	-0.35	5.99
Students of Businessmen	48	107.83	108	107	-1.59	7.50
Students of Non Businessmen	36	108.22	108.5	109	-0.36	6.05
High SI Group	36	113.5	113	109	0.32	3.38
Low SI Group	48	103.88	105.5	105	-2.51	5.88
High Aggr Group	54	107.07	108	108	-1.36	7.35
Low Aggr Group	30	109.67	109	112	-0.55	5.69

Table 2 briefly denotes the social intelligence scores of various sub samples. It is clear that all the distributions except that of high social intelligence group are skewed negatively. Girls have an increased mean value in social intelligence and the value is 110.16

Study I *Section- B*

Method

Participants

This section also has the same group of participants in the section A

Tools

Aggression scale constructed and validated by Dr. G. P. Mathur & Dr. Raj Kumari Bhatnagar (2004). Aggression scale is a five point rating scale, consists of 55 items. Reliability of the scale was 0.88 in males and 0.81 in females. Validity of the scale, when correlated with the scores obtained in the administration of questionnaire prepared by Murray was 0.80 in males and 0.78 in females.

Materials

Participants were given the aggression scale, which occupies the place for recording responses.

Procedure

The investigator gave a brief idea on the tool and also demonstrated the mode of making responses. Product moment correlation, critical ratio, t-test for testing the significance of coefficient of correlations, and t-test for testing the significance of critical ratios were calculated after the tabulation of collected data.

Results

Table: 3
Aggression Scores of Students (Whole Sample)

N	AM	Med	Mod	SD
84	206.02	208.5	219	13.86

Table 3 denotes the aggression scores of senior secondary students. Students have an increased level of aggression. Median value 208.5 shows that 50 percentage of the cases lie above it. Mode and standard deviation are 219 and 13.86 respectively.

Variable	N	AM	Med	Mod	SD	Sk
Boys	34	208.35	206	197	10.83	0.39
Girls	50	204.44	209	219	15.49	-0.88
Commerce Students	42	207.43	208	219	12.84	-0.15
Humanities Students	42	204.62	209	216	14.84	-1.15
Students of Businessmen	48	205.58	204	203	11.42	0.29
Students of Non Businessmen	36	206.61	213	219	16.73	-1.28
High SI Group	36	202.50	204	221	16.47	-0.68
Low SI Group	48	208.67	210	216	10.98	-0.19
High Aggr Group	54	214.56	215	219	6.79	-0.05
Low Aggr Group	30	190.67	194	195	9.29	-1.83

From the table 4 it is clear the aggression scores of senior secondary school students- boys, girls, commerce group, humanities group, students of businessmen, students of non-businessmen, high social intelligence group, low social intelligence group, high aggression group, and low aggression group. Boys and low social intelligence group have an increased amount of aggression. All the groups except boys and students of businessmen are negatively skewed.

Table: 5

Relationship between Social Intelligence and Aggression (Whole Sample)

Variable	N	AM	SD	'r'	t-value	Significance
Social Intelligence	84	108	6.88			*p>0.10
Aggression	84	206.02	13.86	-0.15	1.37	

*Table value = 1.66 at 0.10 (df = 82)

Table 5 reveals the where about of relationship between social intelligence and aggression. The correlation coefficient obtained is -0.15 and is negative negligible. The t-value obtained is 1.37 and is less than table value for the degrees of freedom 82 and hence it is not significant.

Table: 6

Relationship between Social Intelligence and Aggression (Sub Samples)

Group	Arithmetic Mean		'r'	t-value	Remarks
	Social Intelligence	*Aggression*			
Boys	104.82	208.35	-0.18	1.03	p>0.10
Girls	110.16	204.44	-0.06	0.42	p>0.10
Commerce Students	108.76	207.43	0.07	0.44	p>0.10
Humanities Students	107.24	204.62	-0.41	2.84	**P<0.01**
Students of Businessmen	107.83	205.58	-0.07	0.48	p>0.10
Students of Non Businessmen	108.22	206.61	-0.25	1.51	p>0.10
High SI Group	113.5	202.5	0.03	0.17	p>0.10
Low SI Group	103.88	208.67	0.003	0.02	p>0.10
High Aggr Group	107.07	214.56	0.13	0.94	p>0.10
Low Aggr Group	109.67	190.67	-0.19	1.02	p>0.10

Table 6 reveals the relationship between social intelligence and aggression among senior secondary school students. All the correlation coefficients obtained are negligible except in the case of humanities students and students of non-businessmen. In the case of humanities students the relationship is moderate and is proved significant at 99 percentage of confidence limit. Regarding the students of non-businessmen relationship between social intelligence and

aggression is low. Concerning commerce students, high social intelligence group, low social intelligence group, and high aggression group, the relationship is positive; but they do not have significance even at 0.10 level. In all other cases the relationship is negative.

Table: 7

Comparison of social intelligence scores

Variable		AM	SD	CR	*Remarks*
Gender	Boys	104.82	7.29	3.59	Significant
	Girls	110.16	5.72		at 0.01
					level
Stream of	Commerce	108.76	7.67	1.01	Not
study	Humanities	107.24	5.99		significant
Parental	Business	107.83	7.50	0.26	Not
occupation	Non	108.22	6.05		significant
	business				
Aggression	High	107.07	7.35	1.80	Not
	Low	109.67	5.69		significant

Table 7 denotes the comparison among various sub sample groups in their social intelligence. The critical ration obtained between the mean scores of boys and girls is 3.59 and is significant at 0.01 levels. Based on stream of study the critical ratio calculated is 1.01 and is of no significance. Parental occupation is another criterion selected for comparison and the CR obtained is 0.26 and is proven of no significance. Aggression based comparison is also proved not significant.

Table: 8

Comparison of aggression scores

Variable		AM	SD	CR	*remarks*
Gender	Boys	208.35	10.83	1.36	Not
	Girls	204.44	15.49		significant
Stream of	Commerce	207.43	12.84	0.93	Not
study	Humanities	204.62	14.84		significant
Parental	Business	205.58	11.42	0.32	Not
occupation	Non	206.61	16.73		significant
	business				
Social	High	202.5	16.47	1.95	Significant
Intelligence	Low	208.67	10.98		At 0.10
					level

Table 8 gives a picture on aggression based comparison of students. Critical ratios obtained among the mean scores of students 1.36, 0.93, and 0.32 denote that there is no difference among students based on gender, stream of study, and parental occupation respectively. Based on social intelligence the comparison is significant at 0.10 level (CR=1.95).

Results of the study can be summarized in the following heads.

Social Intelligence:

Social Intelligence among senior secondary school students is of average. (Mean Scores- whole sample=108, boys=104.82, girls= 110.16, commerce students=108.76, humanities students=107.24, students of business men=107.83, students of non business men=108.22, high aggressive students=107.07, and low aggressive students=109.67)

Aggression:

Senior secondary school students have a greater amount of aggression. (Mean scores- whole sample=206.02, boys=208.35, girls= 204.44, commerce students=207.43, humanities students=204.62, students of business men=205.58, students of non business men=206.61, students with high social intelligence=202.5, and students with low social intelligence =208.67)

Relationship between social intelligence and aggression:

Relationship between social intelligence and aggression scores of senior secondary school students is found negative and negligible for the whole sample but it is not proven significant (r=-0.15and t-value=1.37).

For boys and girls the relationship is also negative and negligible. (r=-0.18and t=1.03 for boys and r=-0.06and t=0.42 for girls). The relationship is proved not significant.

Concerning commerce students the relationship is positive negligible, but is not significant. (r=0.07and t=0.44). The relationship between the research variables for humanities students is found significant at 0.01 levels. It is negative and moderate relationship. (r=-0.41 and t=2.84).

In the case of students of businessmen the relationship is negative and negligible. (r=-0.07and t=0.48). Concerning the students of non-businessmen r=-0.25 and t=1.51 which is low correlation having no significance at 0.10 levels.

For high social intelligence and low social intelligence groups, the correlation is negligible but positive. (HSI Group-r=0.03and t=0.17, LSI Group-r=0.003 and t=0.02).

High aggression group of students have a positive negligible relationship between variables. (r=0.13and t=0.94). Low aggression group shows negative relationship. (r=-0.19and t=1.02).

Comparison based on social intelligence scores:

Gender based comparison is proved significant at 99 level of confidence. (CR=3.586). Steam of study, parental occupation, and aggression based comparison of social intelligence scores is proven not significant.

Comparison based on aggression scores:

Parental occupation, gender, and stream of study based comparisons are proven not significant. Social intelligence based comparison of students is proven significant at 0.10 levels of significant. (CR=1.95).

Discussion

Major findings of the study:

Social Intelligence among senior secondary school students is of average. (Mean Scores- whole sample=108, boys=104.82, girls= 110.16, commerce students=108.76, humanities students=107.24, students of business men=107.83, students of non business men=108.22, high aggressive students=107.07, and low aggressive students=109.67)

Senior secondary school students have a greater amount of aggression. (Mean scores- whole sample=206.02, boys=208.35, girls= 204.44, commerce students=207.43, humanities students=204.62, students of business men=205.58, students of non business men=206.61, students with high social intelligence=202.5, and students with low social intelligence =208.67)

Relationship between social intelligence and aggression scores of senior secondary school students is found negative and negligible for the whole sample But it is not proven significant (r=-0.15and t-value=1.37). For boys and girls the relationship is also negative and negligible. (r=-0.18and t=1.03 for boys and r=-0.06and t=0.42 for girls). The relationship is proved not significant. Concerning commerce students the relationship is positive negligible, but

is not significant. (r=0.07and t=0.44). The relationship between the research variables for humanities students is found significant at 0.01 levels. It is negative and moderate relationship. (r=-0.41 and t=2.84). In the case of students of businessmen the relationship is negative and negligible. (r=-0.07and t=0.48). Concerning the students of businessmen r=-0.25 and t=1.51 which is low correlation having no significance at 0.10 levels. For high social intelligence and low social intelligence groups, the correlation is negligible but positive. (HSI Group-r=0.03and t=0.17, LSI Group-r=0.003 and t=0.02). High aggression group of students have a positive negligible relationship between variables. (r=0.13and t=0.94). Low aggression group shows negative relationship. (r=-0.19and t=1.02).

Comparison of social intelligence is another aspect of the study. Gender based comparison is proved significant at 99 level of confidence. (CR=3.586). Steam of study, parental occupation, and aggression based comparison of social intelligence scores is proven not significant. Parental occupation, gender, and stream of study based comparisons of aggression score are proven not significant. Social intelligence based comparison of students is proven significant at 0.10 levels of significant. (CR=1.95).

Only humanities students show a significant moderate negative relationship between social intelligence and aggression. The other important finding of the study is that gender plays a good role in social intelligence. Girls are more socially intelligent than boys.

The study supports Marjut (2007), Mundia (2006), and Andreon (2006) at a great extent. Kaikiainen (2002) revealed a significant correlation between social intelligence and victimization, but the present study proves it of changing according to certain variables like gender. Andreon (2006) revealed that social intelligence is a predictor of aggression. But the present study finds out varying relationships between variables based on different sub samples. Anyhow the study would be a good opportunity for those who are associated with schools, students, and education.

The study reports that there is a great amount of aggression among senior secondary students and an average level of social intelligence. There are many possible reasons for the aggression among students. It may be due to the over influence of media in our life, our existing life style, social code, food habit, socialization pattern, family set up, school atmosphere, nature of school discipline and class room code of conduct, diminishing moral values and or any other factor.

In an ample way we can reduce the aggressive behaviour from our younger generation. Students are not being trained socially. In the scene there is less number of activities, policy plans, and special programmes both in our schools and in our surroundings to shape the 'Social Man'. The social man is concept that is denoted as a man with social attitudes, social qualities, social skills, and social values, by which he acts, behaves, interacts, and communicates in a socially approved manner. Social man must have the qualities of tolerance, cooperation, sympathy, social acceptance, helping mind, spirit of we-feeling in the society and so on.

Our system of education must have the objective of social man making. For the same not only teachers but also all the hands associated to the field of education must take special care. Our society, members of community, parents, teachers, family members, social workers, voluntary organizations, political as well as religious leaders; all of them are responsible collectively here in the making of socially approved 'promises of tomorrow'. Such a way we can ensure the reduction of aggressive behaviour and the enhancement of social intelligence among students. Many opportunities are waiting for you, for us, awake, be smart, be optimistic, alive and let alive, let us start now.

Acknowledgements

Bibliography

✓ Ahuja, Anjana. (2006). The ability to influence how others feel- Social Intelligence. *The Times of India.*

✓ Andreou, Eleni. (2006). Social Preference perceived popularity and Social Intelligence.
School Psychology, International 27, 339.

✓ Andura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A Socially Analysis.* Englewood Cliffs, N.T: Prentice
Hall.

✓ Arunima, L., & Gupta, Rajiv (1994). *Aggression School Children factors and Disciplinary Guidelines.* New Delhi: Deep & Deep.

✓ Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. (1963). *Social Learning and Personality Development.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

✓ Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning Theory*. NJ: Prentice Hall.

✓ Bear, G.G (1988). School discipline in the United States: Prevention, correlation and Long term social development. *School Psychology Review*, 27, 14-32.

✓ Burnes, M.L., & Aernberg R.J. (1989). Social Intelligence and Decoding of non verbal Cues. *Intelligence*, 13, P 263-287.

✓ Coleman J.C. (1990). *Foundations of social Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

✓ Crozier, W. Ray. (1997). *Individual Learners, Personality difference in Education*. London: Routledge.

✓ Ford, M.E., & Tisak, M.S. (1983). A further search for Social Intelligence. *Journal of Educational psychology*, 75, P 196-206.

✓ Gay, L.R. (1996). *Educational Research competencies for Analysis and Application*. 5th Ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

✓ Good, Carter V. et. al (1953). *Methodology of educational Research*. New York: Appleton century croffts, Inc.

✓ Gurdner, H. (1993). *Multiple Intelligence: The Theory in Practice*. New York: Basic Books.

✓ James, W. (1890). *The Principles of Psychology*, vol 1, New York: Dover.

✓ Joyce, Bruice., & Weil, Marsha. (1992). *Models of teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd.

✓ Jull, Stephen. (2000). Youth Violence and the management question. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*.

✓ Karir, Rohit. (2006). Gandhi "offers a model for social intelligence". *The Time of India*.

✓ Lewin, K. (1948). *Resolving Social Problems*. New York: Harper.

✓ Marjut, Wallenius. (2007). Digital game playing and Direct and Indirect Aggression in Early Adolescence: The roles of Age, Social Intelligence and Parent-Child Communication. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, vol 36, no. 3, pp. 325-336.

✓ Mouly, George J. (1964). *The Science of Educational Research*. New Delhi: Urasia Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.

✓ Mundia, Lawrence. (2006). Aggressive Behavioural among Swazi Upper Primary Secondary Students. *International Journal of special Education*. 21, 3.

✓ Mundia, Lawrence. (2006). Aggressive Behaviour among Swazi upper Primary and Junior secondary Students: Implications for Ongoing Educational Reforms Concerning Inclusive Education. *International Journal of Special education*. Vol. 21, No. 3.

✓ Olweus, Dan. (1993). *Bullying at school.* UK: Black Well.

✓ Prasad, Janardan., & Kaushik, Vijay Kumari. (1996). *Child Education and Social Development.* New Delhi: Kanishka.

✓ Rigby, K., & Slee, P. (1993). Dimensions of Interpersonal Relating among Australian School Children and their Implications for Psychological Well-being. *Journal of Social Psychology.* 133. Pp 33-42.

✓ Robert, Baron A. & Byrne Donn. (1988). *Social Psychology Understanding Human Interaction.* 7th Ed. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd.

✓ Rojwers, Bill. (19-). *Classroom Behaviour*. UK: Chapman.

✓ Sechrest, L., & Jackson, D.N. (1961). Social Intelligence Accuracy of Interpersonal Predictions. *Cliff Personality*, 29, P 167-182.

✓ Sexton-Radek, Katty. (2005). (Ed). *Violence in Schools*. West Port: Praeger Publishers.

✓ Sternberg, R.J. (1984). Towards a Triarchic Theory of Human Intelligence. *Behavioral & Brain Sciences* 7, P 269-315.

   ✓ Sternberg, R.J. (Ed). (2000). *Handbook of Intelligence*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

   ✓ Worden, R.P. (1996). Primate Social Intelligence. *Cognitive Science*. 20 (4), P 579-616.