Though the concept of social intelligence was put forward as early as 1920 by E. L. Thorndike, he never gave a tool to measure the same. No doubt the importance of social ability has been clearly recognised. Yet we have thus far been able to accomplish surprisingly little in its quantitative measurement. Perhaps this is partly because of our failure to reach a clear understanding on the concept of the term 'social intelligence' and partly because of the difficulty in obtaining a pure criterion to prepare necessary valid tests of social intelligence. Binet's scale of Intelligence has provided a standard measure of intelligence against which tests of abstract intelligence are validated. There is no valid test of such a world-wide reputation measuring social intelligence. Again a considerable amount of work has been done to establish the nature of abstract intelligence and there
are also recognised theories of general intelligence. In case of social intelligence, a confusion still prevails about its nature and structure. As a result, there are very few tests which provide valid and reliable measures of social intelligence.

A study of attempts made hitherto to measure social intelligence reveals three types of tests claiming to measure this kind of intelligence or sociability. The first type of tests consists of questionnaires measuring sociability. The second type includes a number of personality and interest inventories where the trait of sociability or social introversion or social interest is measured. The third type consists of tests of social intelligence, tests of practical judgments, sales aptitude tests etc. It would be appropriate in the context of the present work to review some of these attempts to measure social intelligence.

In 1926, A. R. Gilliland and R. S. Burke\(^1\) published their 'Sociability questionnaire' which, they said, measured sociability or social intelligence of individuals.

---

They used these terms as synonyms and in their definition included both 'ability to deal with his fellow men' and 'fond of mingling with others'. Their questionnaire consisted of three tests of memory for faces and also a questionnaire on range of friends, number of social outings participated in and the degree of liking for several social activities. The validity of this tool was tested against an external criterion viz. sociability ratings of pupils by teachers. The validity coefficient varies from .43 to .60.

In 1926, Dr. Moss and his associates published "The George Washington Test of Social Intelligence". The original form of this test contained the following sub-tests:

1. Judgments in social situations.
2. Recognition of the mental state of the speaker.
3. Observation of human behaviour.
4. Memory for names and faces.
5. Sense of humour.
6. Identification of emotional expression.
7. Social information.

This test has been widely known and widely distributed as an instrument purporting to measure an important aspect of the individual. Because of this, it has been subjected to a considerable study. Its validity has also been studied against a number of external criteria.
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In 1931, Bernreuter constructed his 'Personality Inventory'. This is an instrument consisting of 125 items of the self-rating type. The basic technical novelty of this inventory is its system of scoring and weighting the scores, treating each item-response as indicative of several different traits. In the original inventory, four traits were set up but later on Flanagan added two more traits viz. Sociability and Confidence.

In 1931, the Bureau of Public Personnel Administration reported a preliminary form of a test of social intelligence. The test is composed of 100 true-false and multiple choice statements about types of people and behaviour and descriptions of social situations with choices for a proper course of action. No data about the validity of this test are available.

Ruth Strang prepared her 'Test of Knowledge of Social Usage' in 1931. The test has a limited purpose, viz. the measurement of knowledge of current social usage. Its sampling of areas is sufficiently wide, extending from table manners to respect and consideration for others. The test measures sociability or social intelligence by measuring social information. Attempts to find out the
validity of this test again different external criteria have not yielded consistent results.

In the same year, G. W. Allport,¹ P. E. Vernon and Gardner Lindzey published, "The Study of Values" which aims to measure the relative prominence of six basic interests or motives in personality. The test consists of a number of questions based upon a variety of familiar situations to which two or four alternative answers are provided. This inventory indicates aptitude for dealing with people. The validity of this inventory is indirectly established as we get significant differences between the mean scores of groups whose characteristics are known.

During 1932, Washburn² came out with his 'Social Adjustment Inventory' and Guilford³ prepared the 'Social Introversion' key for the Nebraser Personality Inventory. These two also measure sociability as one of the other traits measured by them.

In 1933, J. J. Stauter and L. M. Hunting⁴ prepared a questionnaire which tried to measure social intelligence
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by knowing the extent of acquaintanceship. The questionnaire asks for the number of one's acquaintances in a wide variety of specialized groups. From this, a total acquaintanceship score is obtained. The test has been validated against sociability ratings by teachers.

In the same year, A. S. Reed and C. C. Weidemann\(^1\) reported a 'Social Situation Judgments Test' in which the subject is required to state the extent of his agreement or disagreement (on a five point scale) with a series of statements concerning social behaviour or judgments of social behaviour. No data are available about the validity studies of this test.

During the thirties, one more test, "A Test of Knowledge of Social Standards" was reported. The test was prepared by Frank E. Tomlin and published by the Stanford University Press. The purpose of this test is to discover knowledge of standards of social conduct. The test is published in two forms. The items relate to social situations. Four choices are given out of which the subject has to select the proper course of behaviour. No validity studies are reported about this test.
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In the early forties, the Bureau of Educational Measurement, Kansas State Teachers College, published a "Test of Social Comprehension" and George Washington University Counselling Centre published a "Test of Etiquette". Both tests are intended to measure the examinee's knowledge of the accepted rules of social conduct. The items are more or less about knowledge of social usage as in Ruth Strang's Test of Social Usage. No validity studies about these tests are reported.

In 1942, S.R.A. published the "Test of Practical Judgments" by Alfred J. Cardall. This is a test more akin to tests of social situations. The items consist of a number of problem situations with a number of alternate courses of action.

During World War II, a number of situational tests were devised to aid the selection of personnel for assignment to tasks involving leadership. The Social Manipulation Inventory is one of these tests. The test describes a variety of situations for each of which the most desirable solution is required of the candidate. No validity data about this test are available.
R. L. Thorndike and S. Stein reviewed these attempts to measure social intelligence up to 1937. They subjected one single test to rigorous treatment. Thorndike carried out the factor-analysis of George Washington University Test of Social Intelligence. They summarised their view of attempts to measure social intelligence as follows:

"Whether there is any unitary trait corresponding to social intelligence remains to be demonstrated. It may be that when the contributions of abstract intelligence (or of various of the factors which make up abstract intelligence) and of interest in people are removed, there will be nothing left. It may be that social intelligence is a complex of an enormous number of specific social habits and attitude."

They concluded that 'ability to deal with people has not been satisfactorily measured!' upto that time.

During the forties, attempts to measure social intelligence have been made through sales aptitudes tests. Though not measuring social intelligence directly, these tests do measure the ability to deal with people in an implied way. Some of these tests are:

- Aptitude Associates Test of Sales Aptitude
- Aptitude Index
- Sales Situation Test
- Test of Sales Judgment
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Most of these tests are situation tests. The items present typical social situations with a number of alternate courses of action from which the proper course of action is to be selected.

Lastly, according to M. E. Hahn,¹

"Studies of the Kuder Preference Record have thrown additional light on the use of interest inventories as tests of these aptitudes and abilities for the purpose of selecting salesmen. Various investigators have found that successful life insurance salesmen were differentiated from men-in-general by their high scores on certain scales of the Bell Adjustment Inventory (Adult Form), The Life Insurance Scale of the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, and the persuasive scale of the Kuder Preference Record. This occupational group, which is generally considered to be possessed of unusual persuasiveness and a particular type of social ability, was markedly different from the groups with which it was compared relative to measured social aggressiveness. Other studies of the selection of salesmen give the same results."

General Criticism about Tests of Social Intelligence:

A lot of criticism is levelled against all the tests of social intelligence constructed till now. Ordinarily, no test whether it be one of abstract intelligence or of social intelligence or of any trait can be a perfect tool. All tests have their strong and weak points. But tests of social intelligence prepared up till now are known for vagueness, faulty technique of construction and doubtful validity.

¹ M. E. Hahn and M. S. MacLean, "Counselling Psychology," Page 183
1. One major criticism against these tests is the lack of clear meaning attributed to the word 'social intelligence'. As already pointed out elsewhere, the concept of social intelligence is confused with social adjustment, acquaintance, etiquette etc.

2. The second general criticism is a narrow meaning attached to the word 'social intelligence' e.g. Ruth Strang measures 'social intelligence' in one aspect only viz. knowledge of social usage.

3. The third and a strong criticism against tests of social intelligence is that their validity is usually of a doubtful nature. Validity studies of a number of tests have been carried out and it is revealed that the results have no consistency. No external criteria are fixed before constructing the tests. Though the detailed procedures of the constructions of many of the tests are not available, one thing stands out from the manuals of available tests that the authors of the tests did not fix in advance the criterion to measure the validity of the tests. The validity of the individual test items is not tested before they are included in the body of the tests.
4. Another criticism, though of a minor nature, against tests of social intelligence is that many of them are situation tests. In situation tests, the responses do not indicate the actual behaviour of the testees but their knowledge of the expected behaviour in conformity with the demands and expectations of society. This criticism is of a general nature and it applies not merely to tests of social intelligence but also to almost all tests of personality, character and attitudes.

5. Yet one more criticism against the tests of social intelligence is that scores on these tests correlate appreciably with tests of general intelligence. This is a criticism which, in fact, does not apply to all the tests. There are tests of sociability or social intelligence like Gilliland's Sociability Questionnaire or the Questionnaire of Stauter Hunting which appear to have a very low - not significant - correlation with Tests of general intelligence. The 'Test of Social Intelligence', prepared by Dr. Moss shows an appreciable correlation with tests of abstract intelligence. The average of inter-correlations between the different sub-tests in "George Washington Test of Social Intelligence" as compared with the average of the intercorrelations
of all the sub-tests of George Washington Mental Alertness Test is of nearly the same degree (.335 and .390). Again the average of inter-correlations of the sub-tests of one test with those of the other is about .344. This suggests that there is about as much in common between the two tests as there is within either.¹

**Impact of Studies of existing Tests of Social Intelligence on the present work:**

The review of the work done in the past on measurement of social intelligence will have no meaning if it is not used to improve this new test that is constructed. The review shows that continuous attempts have been made from 1926, year by year, to devise valid tools to measure social intelligence. That these tests, in spite of their limitations, are useful is seen by the extensive use to which they are put to guidance and personnel selection. All are agreed that there is a pressing need for a reliable and a valid tool to measure social intelligence. The present test is linked up to the series of attempts made from 1926 to devise tools to assess quantitatively social intelligence.

¹ R. L. Thorndike and S. Stein, op. cit., Page 282
The present work avoids the vagueness in defining social intelligence and the narrow meaning often given. We have given social intelligence a broad and comprehensive meaning as described in chapter II.

The criticism of not fixing up a criterion for validation is answered in this work by selecting an external criterion in the form of two contrasted groups of pupils with high and low social intelligence.

The criticism of defective technique of not validating the test items before incorporating them in the test body is met by the most exhaustive and scientific item-analysis and the item selection procedure in the present work.

The present work of construction of test items and the selection of sub-tests has profited by the study of the tests that have been constructed till now to measure the social intelligence. How the plan for the construction and standardization of the present test is based on the study of the past tests and how this plan has profited by the criticism levelled against them is discussed in the next chapter.
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