6.0 Introduction

Teaching is one of the most challenging jobs in our society. Teachers play the role of producing knowledgeable students with good personality. A quality teacher should have good teaching skills in order to make his teaching effective. Apart from this, quality teachers should also have good Social Intelligence so that their students can communicate well with them. Social Intelligence is about dealing with people. It is a skill which people need to interact and communicate with others.

Aptitude on the other hand maybe described as a special ability or specific capacity distinct from the general intellectual ability which helps an individual to acquire the required degree of proficiency or achievement in a specific field. Aptitude refers to those qualities characterizing a person’s way of behaviour which serve to indicate how well he can learn to meet and solve a certain specified kinds of problem.

Aptitude to be a teacher requires proper Social Intelligence. Teacher is the backbone of Education. Every institution has teachers to guide all along the right path. Without the training system, the institution cannot run successfully. Though student teachers get
trained, some of them do not have the basic knowledge about their subjects and they are not able to get along well with their students and cooperate with them. So the aptitude of a student teacher requires proper Social Intelligence. If a student teacher acquires these factors he or she will be totally involved in the field of teaching. Today’s world is full of stress and tension. Everyone chooses the field which gives money and fame. No one is interested to see the aptitude or Social Intelligence of a teacher. Even though a student teacher’s aptitude and Social Intelligence may change from time to time, if the student teacher is not clear with what he or she wants to do, then he may be a failure in his or her profession.

From the above discussion it is clear that there is a need to study the relationship of Social Intelligence with Teaching Aptitude in India specifically in the state of Meghalaya. Teachers who are socially intelligence will make the teaching and learning process more effective as the students can absorb the knowledge easily and they are able to transfer this knowledge into their long term memory. Thus this study aims to find out the Social Intelligence of Student Teachers in Meghalaya, examine the Teaching Aptitude of Student Teachers and
study the relationship between Social Intelligence and Teaching Aptitude among Student Teachers.

6.1 Statement of the Problem

The study is entitled as follows: “A Study on Social Intelligence in Relation to Teaching Aptitude of Student Teachers in the State of Meghalaya”.

6.2 Operational Definition of the Term Used

The present study involves the following terms which are operationally defined as follows:

1. Social Intelligence: In the present study, Social Intelligence is the ability of an individual to react to social situations of daily life. It is the ability to get along well with others.

2. Teaching Aptitude: Teaching Aptitude is a condition or set of characteristics including knowledge, understanding and attitude regarded as symptomatic or indicative of individual’s ability to acquire with training abilities for teaching work.

3. Student Teachers: Student Teachers in the present study were referred to trainees undergoing training for Secondary Level (B.Ed.) and Elementary Level (D.I.E.T).
6.3 Objectives of the Study

The proposed study intends to achieve the following objectives:

1. To study the Social Intelligence of Student Teachers in Meghalaya.
2. To examine the Teaching Aptitude of Student Teachers.
3. To study the difference in Social Intelligence between the following group of Student Teachers:
   i) B.Ed and Diet.
   ii) Male and Female Student Teachers
   iii) Tribal and Non-Tribal Student Teachers.
   iv) Student Teachers for the Arts, Science and Commerce Streams.
4. To study the difference in Teaching Aptitude between the following group of Student Teachers.
   i) B.Ed and DIET
   ii) Male and Female Student Teachers
   iii) Tribal and Non Tribal Student Teachers
   iv) Student Teachers for the Arts, Science and Commerce Streams.
5. To study the relationship between Social Intelligence and Teaching Aptitude of Student Teachers.
6. To study the difference in the relationship of Social Intelligence with Teaching Aptitude between the following group of Student Teachers.
   i) B.Ed and DIET
   ii) Male and Female Student Teachers
   iii) Tribal and Non Tribal Student Teachers.
   iv) Student Teachers for the Arts, Science and Commerce Streams.

7. To draw out the implication of the study and suggest recommendations.

6.4 Null Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses of the study are formulated as follows:

1. There is no significant difference in the Social Intelligence between
   (i) B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers.
   (ii) Male and Female Student Teachers (B.Ed and DIET)
   (iii) Tribal and Non-tribal Student Teachers (B.Ed and DIET)
   (iv) Arts and Science Student Teachers (B.Ed and DIET)
(v) Arts and Commerce Student Teachers (B.Ed and DIET)

(vi) Science and Commerce Student Teachers (B.Ed and DIET)

2. There is no significance difference in the Teaching Aptitude between

(i) B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers.

(ii) Male and Female Student Teachers. (B.Ed and DIET)

(iii) Tribal and Non-tribal Student Teachers. (B.Ed and DIET)

(iv) Arts and Science Student Teachers. (B.Ed and DIET)

(v) Arts and Commerce Student Teachers (B.Ed and DIET)

(vi) Science and Commerce Student Teachers (B.Ed and DIET)

3. There is no significance relationship between Social Intelligence and Teaching Aptitude of Student Teachers.

4. There is no significant difference in the relationship of Social Intelligence and Teaching Aptitude among

(i) B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers.

(ii) Male and Female Student Teachers. (B.Ed and DIET)

(iii) Tribal and Non-tribal Student Teachers. (B.Ed and DIET)
(iv) Arts and Science Student Teachers. (B.Ed and DIET)

(v) Arts and Commerce Student Teachers (B.Ed and DIET)

(vi) Science and Commerce Student Teachers (B.Ed and DIET)

6.5 Delimitation of the Study

The study was delimited to Student Teachers studying in Colleges of Teacher Education (B.Ed), and District Institute of Education and Training (D.I.E.Ts).

6.6 Population of the Study

The population of the study comprised all Student Teachers studying in the training institutes, Viz. College of Teacher Education, and DIET’s, located in all the Districts of Meghalaya. The details are given in table 1.
Table 1. Training Institutions in the State of Meghalaya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NAME OF INSTITUTION</th>
<th>INTAKE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>College Of Teacher Education (PGT), East Khasi Hills</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>St. Mary's College of Teacher Education, Shillong, East Khasi Hills</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>B.Ed. College, Tura Tura (rongkhon), West Garo Hills</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Don Bosco College Of Teacher Education, Tura, West Garo Hills</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>District Institute Of Education &amp; Training Rongkhon, Tura,</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>District Institute Of Education &amp; Training, Saiden Vill, Nongpoh, Ri Bhoi District</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>District Institute Of Education &amp; Training Nongstoin,West Khasi Hills</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>DIET, Cherrapunjee ,Cherapunjee, Sohra, Saitsohpen, East Khasi Hills</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>DIET, Thadlaskein, Thadlaskein, Jaintia Hills</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>DIET, Rasubelpara, East Garo Hills</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>DIET, Baghmara ,South Garo Hills</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.7 Sample of the Study

Random sampling was used in the study.

Table 2. Sample of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF INSTITUTION</th>
<th>INTAKE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. College Of Teacher Education (PGT), East Khasi Hills</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. St. Mary's College of Teacher Education, Shillong, East Khasi Hills</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. B.Ed. College, Tura, (Rongkhon), West Garo Hills</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Don Bosco College Of Teacher Education, Tura, West Garo Hills</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. District Institute Of Education &amp; Training Rongkhon, Tura,</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. District Institute Of Education &amp; Training , Saiden Vill, Nongpoh, Ri Bhoi District</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. District Institute Of Education &amp; Training Nongstoin, West Khasi Hills</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. DIET, Cherrapunjee ,Cherapunjee, Sohra, Saitsohpen, East Khasi Hills</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. DIET, Thadlaskein, Thadlaskein, Jaintia Hills</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Basic Training Centre, Rasubelpara(Diet) Rasubelpara East Garo Hills</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. DIET, Baghmara ,South Garo Hills</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.8 Tools

The following tools were used for the present study:


6.9 Method of the Study

The method followed in the present study was the descriptive method.

6.10 Collection of Data

The data was collected by the investigator by personally visiting and administering the tools following the guidelines provided in the respective manuals.

6.11 Statistical Techniques

The Measures of Central Tendency, SD, ‘t’ test and Correlation methods were used to statistically analyze the data.
6.12 Major Findings of the Study

The major findings of the study are presented in the following:

6.12.1 Social Intelligence Level of Student Teachers in Meghalaya

1. Social Intelligence Level of Student Teachers in Meghalaya

Out of 577 student teachers in Meghalaya, a number of 416 or 72.10% were placed in the average level of Social Intelligence. Further a number of 92 or 15.94% were placed in the high social intelligence level. Only 69 or 11.96% were placed in the lower level.

2. Social Intelligence Level of B.Ed and DIET Student Teacher

(a) Out of 267 B.Ed student teachers in Meghalaya, a number of 188 or 70.41% were found to be in the average level of Social Intelligence. Further a number of 54 or 20.22% were found to be in the high social intelligence level. Only 25 or 9.36% were found to be in the lower level.

(b) Out of 310 DIET student teachers in Meghalaya, a number of 228 or 73.55% were found to be in the average level of Social Intelligence. Likewise a number of 38 or 12.26% were found to be in the high social intelligence level. Only 44 or 14.19% were placed in the lower level.
3. **Social Intelligence Level of B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers (Male and Female)**

(a) Out of 80 B.Ed student teachers (Male) in Meghalaya, a number of 55 or 68.75% were placed in the average level of Social Intelligence. Similarly a number of 17 or 21.25% were placed in the high social intelligence level. Only 8 or 10% were placed in the lower level.

(b) Out of 187 B.Ed student teachers (Female) in Meghalaya, a number of 133 or 71.12% were found to be in the average level of Social Intelligence. Further a number of 37 or 19.79% were found to be in the high social intelligence level. Only 17 or 9.09% were found to be in the lower level.

(c) Out of 164 DIET student teachers (Male) in Meghalaya, a number of 122 or 73.78% were found to be in the average level of Social Intelligence. Further a number of 25 or 14.02% were found to be in the high social intelligence level. Only 17 or 9.76% were found to be in the lower level.
(d) Out of 146 DIET student teachers (Female) in Meghalaya, a number of 106 or 70.55% were placed in the average level of Social Intelligence.

(e) Further a number of 27 or 18.49% were placed in the low social intelligence level. Only 13 or 8.22% were placed in the higher level.

4. Social Intelligence Level of B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers (Tribal and Non Tribal)

(a) Out of 188 B.Ed student teachers (Tribal) in Meghalaya, a number of 141 or 75.00% were found to be in the average level of Social Intelligence. Likewise a number of 26 or 13.83% were found to be in the high social intelligence level. Only 21 or 11.17% were found to be in the lower level.

(b) Out of 79 B.Ed student teachers (Non Tribal) in Meghalaya, a number of 47 or 59.49% were figured out to be in the average level of Social Intelligence. Further a number of 28 or 35.44% were found to be in the high social intelligence level. Only 4 or 5.06% were placed in the lower level.
(c) Out of 296 DIET student teachers (Tribal) in Meghalaya, a number of 216 or 73.97% were placed in the average level of Social Intelligence. Similarly a number of 42 or 14.38% were placed in the low social intelligence level. Only 34 or 11.64% were placed in the higher level.

(d) Out of 18 DIET student teachers (Non Tribal) in Meghalaya, a number of 12 or 66.67% were found to be in the average level of Social Intelligence. Likewise a number of 4 or 22.22% were found to be in the high social intelligence level. Only 2 or 11.11% were placed in the lower level.

5. Social Intelligence Level of B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers (Arts, Science, Commerce)

(a) Out of 206 B.Ed student teachers (Arts) in Meghalaya, a number of 144 or 69.90% were found to be in the average level of Social Intelligence. Further a number of 42 or 20.39% were placed in the high social intelligence level. Only 20 or 9.71% were found to be in the lower level.

(b) Out of 53 B.Ed student teachers (Science) in Meghalaya, a number of 40 or 75.47% were seen to be in the average
level of Social Intelligence. Similarly a number of 9 or 16.98% were seen to be in the high social intelligence level. Only 4 or 7.55% were placed in the lower level

(c) Out of 8 B.Ed student teachers (Commerce) in Meghalaya, a number of 4 or 50.00% were placed in the average level of Social Intelligence. Further a number of 3 or 37.50% were placed in the high social intelligence level. Only 1 or 12.50% were placed in the lower level

(d) Out of 294 DIET student teachers (Arts) in Meghalaya, a number of 219 or 74.49% were found to be in the average level of Social Intelligence. Similarly a number of 41 or 13.95% were found to be in the low social intelligence level. Only 34 or 11.56% were found to be in the higher level.

(e) Out of 10 DIET student teachers (Science) in Meghalaya, a number of 5 or 50.00% were placed in the average level of Social Intelligence. Further a number of 3 or 30.00% were placed in the high social intelligence level. Only 2 or 20.00% were placed in the lower level.

(f) Out of 6 DIET student teachers (Commerce) in Meghalaya, a number of 4 or 66.67% were placed in the
average level of Social Intelligence. Further a number of 1 or 16.67% were placed in the high as well as low social intelligence level.

(g) Out of 577 student teachers in Meghalaya, a number of 428 or 74.18% were placed in the average level of teaching aptitude. Further a number of 78 or 13.52% were placed in the low teaching aptitude level. Only 71 or 12.31% were placed in the higher level.

6.12.2 Teaching Aptitude Level of Student Teachers

6. Teaching Aptitude Level of Student Teachers

Out of 577 student teachers in Meghalaya, a number of 428 or 74.18% were placed in the average level of teaching aptitude. Further a number of 78 or 13.52% were placed in the low teaching aptitude level. Only 71 or 12.31% were placed in the higher level.

7. Teaching Aptitude Level of B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers

(a) Out of 267 B.Ed student teachers in Meghalaya, a number of 194 or 72.66% were placed in the average level of teaching aptitude. Further a number of 53 or 19.85% were placed in the high
teaching aptitude level. Only 20 or 7.94% were in the lower level.

(b) Out of 310 DIET student teachers in Meghalaya, a number of 234 or 75.48% were placed in the average level of teaching aptitude. Further a number of 58 or 18.71% were placed in the low teaching aptitude level. Only 18 or 5.81% were placed in the higher level.

8. Teaching Aptitude Level of B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers (Male and Female)

(a) Out of 80 B.Ed student teachers (Male) in Meghalaya, a number of 53 or 66.25% were placed in the average level of teaching aptitude. Further a number of 23 or 28.75% were placed in the high teaching aptitude level. Only 4 or 5.00% were placed in the lower level.

(b) Out of 187 B.Ed student teachers (Female) in Meghalaya, a number of 141 or 75.40% were placed in the average level of teaching aptitude. Further a number of 30 or 16.04% were placed in the high teaching aptitude level. Only 16 or 8.56% were placed in the lower level.
(c) Out of 164 DIET student teachers (Male) in Meghalaya, a number of 121 or 73.78% were placed in the average level of teaching aptitude. Further a number of 33 or 20.12% were placed in the low teaching aptitude level. Only 10 or 6.10% were placed in the higher level.

(d) Out of 146 DIET student teachers (Female) in Meghalaya, a number of 113 or 77.40% were placed in the average level of teaching aptitude. Further a number of 25 or 17.12% were placed in the low teaching aptitude level. Only 8 or 5.48% were placed in the higher level.

9. Teaching Aptitude Level of B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers (Tribal and Non Tribal)

(a) Out of 188 B.Ed student teachers (Tribal) in Meghalaya, a number of 143 or 76.06% were placed in the average level of teaching aptitude. Further a number of 26 or 13.83% were placed in the high teaching aptitude level. Only 19 or 10.11% were placed in the lower level.

(b) Out of 79 B.Ed student teachers (Non Tribal) in Meghalaya, a number of 143 or 76.06% were placed in the average level of teaching aptitude. Further a number
of 26 or 13.83% were placed in the high teaching aptitude level. Only 19 or 10.11% were placed in the lower level.

(c) Out of 292 DIET student teachers (Tribal) in Meghalaya, a number of 222 or 76.03% were placed in the average level of teaching aptitude. Further a number of 54 or 18.49% were placed in the low teaching aptitude level. Only 16 or 5.48% were placed in the higher level.

(d) Out of 18 DIET student teachers (Non Tribal) in Meghalaya, a number of 12 or 66.67% were placed in the average level of teaching aptitude. Further a number of 4 or 22.22% were placed in the low teaching aptitude level. Only 2 or 11.11% were placed in the higher level.

10. Teaching Aptitude Level of B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers (Arts, Science, Commerce)

(a) Out of 206 B.Ed student teachers (Arts) in Meghalaya, a number of 155 or 75.24% were placed in the average level of teaching aptitude. Further a number of 36 or 17.48% were placed in the high teaching aptitude level. Only 15 or 7.28% were placed in the lower level.
(b) Out of 53 B.Ed student teachers (Science) in Meghalaya, a number of 33 or 62.26% were placed in the average level of teaching aptitude. Further a number of 16 or 30.19% were placed in the high teaching aptitude level. Only 4 or 7.55% were placed in the lower level.

(c) Out of 8 B.Ed student teachers (Commerce) in Meghalaya, a number of 6 or 75.00% were placed in the average level of teaching aptitude. Further a number of 1 or 12.50% were placed in the high as well as low teaching aptitude level.

(d) Out of 294 DIET student teachers (Arts) in Meghalaya, a number of 221 or 75.17% were placed in the average level of teaching aptitude. Further a number of 57 or 19.39% were placed in the low teaching aptitude level. Only 16 or 5.44% were placed in the higher level.

(e) Out of 10 DIET student teachers (Science) in Meghalaya, a number of 8 or 80.00% were placed in the average level of teaching aptitude. Further a number of 1 or 10.00% were placed in the high as well as low teaching aptitude level.

(f) Out of 6 DIET student teachers (Commerce) in Meghalaya, a number of 5 or 83.33% were placed in the average level of
teaching aptitude. Further a number of 1 or 16.67% were placed in the high teaching aptitude level and 0% in the lower level.

6.12.3 Significant differences

11. Social Intelligence difference between B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers

There is a significant difference of social intelligence between B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers at 0.05 level of significance with df of 530 and t value of 26.81.

12. Social Intelligence difference between B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers (Male and Female)

(a) There is no significant difference of social intelligence between B.Ed Student Teachers (Male and Female) at 0.05 level of significance with df of 149 and t value of 1.42.

(b) There is no significant difference of social intelligence between DIET Student Teachers (Male and Female) at 0.05 level of significance being df of 299 and t value of 0.21.
13. Social Intelligence difference between B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers (Tribal and Non Tribal)

(a) There is a significant difference of social intelligence between B.Ed Student Teachers (Tribal and Non Tribal). Further it also indicate df of 116 and t value of 3.44

(b) There is no significant difference of social intelligence between DIET Student Teachers (Tribal and Non Tribal). Further it also shows df of 21 and t value of 0.81

14. Social Intelligence difference between B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers (Arts, Science and commerce)

(a) There is no significant difference of social intelligence between B.Ed Student Teachers (Arts and Science). It also found out with df of 112 and t value of 0.06

(b) There is no significant difference of social intelligence between DIET Student Teachers (Arts and Science) at 0.05 level of significance with df of 9 and t value of 0.01

(c) There is a significant difference of social intelligence between B.Ed Student Teachers (Arts and Commerce) at 0.05 level of significance with df of 15 and t value of 2.26
(d) There is no significant difference of social intelligence between DIET Student Teachers (Arts and Commerce). It also indicate df of 6 and t value of 2.27.

(e) There is no significant difference of social intelligence between B.Ed Student Teachers (Science and Commerce). It also found out df being 24 and t value of 1.92.

(f) There is no significant difference of social intelligence between DIET Student Teachers (Science and Commerce). Further it also shows df of 12 and t value of 0.92.

15. Teaching Aptitude difference between B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers

There is a significant difference of teaching aptitude between B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers. Mean for B.Ed is 56.62 and SD of 9.206 and Mean for DIET is 73.41 with SD of 5.217. It also indicate df of 407 and t value of 26.37.
16. Teaching Aptitude difference between B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers (Male and Female)

(a) There is no significant difference of teaching aptitude between B.Ed (Male and Female). It also shows Mean for B.Ed (Male) is 55.52 and SD of 8.624 and Mean for B.Ed (Female) is 57.09 with SD of 9.427 being df of 407 and t value of 26.37

(b) There is no significant difference of teaching aptitude between DIET (Male and Female) with Mean of 73.55 and 73.25 and SD of 5.032 and 5.430 being df of 297 and t value of 0.50

17. Teaching Aptitude difference between B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers (Tribal and Non Tribal)

(a) There is a significant difference of teaching aptitude between B.Ed Student Teachers (Tribal and Non Tribal) with Mean of 57.98 and 53.39 and SD of 8.633 and 9.764. Further it also shows df of 132 and t value of 3.62

(b) There is no significant difference of teaching aptitude between DIET Student Teachers (Tribal and Non Tribal). It also mention Mean of 73.37 and 74.04 with SD of 5.291 and 3.874 being df of 21 and t value of 0.70
18. Teaching Aptitude difference between B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers (Arts, Science and Commerce)

(a) There is no significant difference of teaching aptitude between B.Ed Student Teachers (Arts and Science) with a Mean of 56.56 and 56.40 and SD of 9.727 and 7.623. It also shows df of 100 and t value of 0.13

(b) There is no significant difference of teaching aptitude between DIET Student Teachers (Arts and Science). Mean were found out to be of 73.45 and 73.36 with SD of 5.229 and 6.288. Similarly df were found to be of 9 and t value of 0.04

(c) There is a significant difference of teaching aptitude between B.Ed. Student Teachers (Arts and Commerce) with a Mean of 56.56 and 59.53 and SD of 9.727 and 2.842. df were found to be of 15 and t value of 2.44

(d) There is a significant difference of teaching aptitude between DIET Student Teachers (Arts and Commerce). Further a mean were shown to be of 73.45 and 71.37 with SD of 5.229 and 1.857. It also indicate df of 7 and t value of 2.55

(e) There is a significant difference of teaching aptitude between B.Ed. Student Teachers (Science and Commerce) with a mean of
56.40 and 59.53 and SD of 7.623 and 2.842. Similarly df were found to be of 26 and t value of 2.16

(f) There is no significant difference of teaching aptitude between DIET Student Teachers (Science and Commerce). A mean were shown to be of 73.36 and 71.37 with SD of 6.288 and 1.857 being df of 11 and t value of 0.94

6.12.4 Relationship differences

19. Relationship of Social Intelligence with Teaching Aptitude

There is a significant relationship between Social Intelligence and Teaching Aptitude of Student Teachers.

20. Relationship difference of Social Intelligence with Teaching Aptitude between B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers

(a) There is no significant difference in the relationship of Social Intelligence with Teaching Aptitude between B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers with df of 575 and r is equal to 0.086

(b) There is no significant difference in the relationship of Social Intelligence with Teaching Aptitude between Male and Female Student Teachers.
(c) There is a significant difference in the relationship of Social Intelligence with Teaching Aptitude between Tribal and Non Tribal Student Teachers with df of 575 and \( r \) is equal to 0.129.

(d) There is a significant difference in the relationship of Social Intelligence with Teaching Aptitude between Arts and Science Student Teachers.

(e) There is a significant difference in the relationship of Social Intelligence with Teaching Aptitude between Science and Commerce Student Teachers.

(f) There is a significant difference in the relationship of Social Intelligence with Teaching Aptitude between Arts and Commerce Student Teachers.

21. **Relationship difference of Social Intelligence with Teaching Aptitude between B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers (Male and Female)**

(a) There is a significant difference in the relationship of social Intelligence with Teaching Aptitude between B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers (Male) with df of 242 and \( r \) is equal to 0.163.

(b) There is no significant difference in the relationship of Social Intelligence with Teaching Aptitude between B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers (Female) with df of 331 and \( r \) being 0.051.
22. **Relationship difference of Social Intelligence with Teaching Aptitude between B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers (Tribal and Non Tribal)**

(a) There is no significant difference in the relationship of Social Intelligence with Teaching Aptitude between B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers (Tribal)

(b) There is a significant difference in the relationship of Social Intelligence with Teaching Aptitude between B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers (Non Tribal) with df of 95 and r is equal to 0.261

23. **Relationship difference of Social Intelligence with Teaching Aptitude between B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers (Arts, Science and Commerce)**

(a) There is no significant difference in the relationship of Social Intelligence with Teaching Aptitude between B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers (Arts).

(b) There is no significant difference in the relationship of Social Intelligence with Teaching Aptitude between B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers (Science) with df of 61 and r is equal to 0.191

(c) There is no significant difference in the relationship of Social Intelligence with Teaching Aptitude between B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers (Commerce) with df of 12 and r is equal to 0.415
6.13 Implication of the study

The relation of social intelligence and teaching aptitude has a massive impact in the field of teaching. Social Intelligence is about dealing with people and the teacher is the person who deals with the student in the course of the day. The implication of the study is as follows:

1. The findings showed that both the B.Ed and DIET student teachers are having an average level of social intelligence. Therefore the findings imply that a social skill is required in teacher education programme which helps in shaping Social intelligence.

2. The study showed that both the B.Ed and DIET student teachers are having an average level of teaching aptitude. This implies that the teacher education programme should induce more teaching skills, practical and methods of teaching so that the teacher should possess a high teaching aptitude.

3. Since The DIET student teachers are having a high social intelligence than the B.Ed student teachers. Hence, the findings imply that there is a need to initiate an awareness
programme or a course in order to enhance social intelligence skills.

4. The study further revealed that DIET student teachers are having high teaching aptitude than the B.Ed student teachers. This suggests that the DIET student teachers are having more teaching experience which improves the teaching skills and the methodologies adopted. Therefore, teacher training programme should be given proper training of teacher in order to strengthen the causal-relationship between the various qualities of teachers.

5. The findings revealed that Social Intelligence and teaching aptitude are correlated to each other. Therefore this implies that social intelligence should evolve in the teacher education programme.

6. The relationship differences of social intelligence with teaching aptitude of student teachers between different groups are mainly insignificant. Therefore, there is a need to keep on working for the unearthing groups which are significant difference.
6.14 Suggestions

Social Intelligence is the capacity to understand and respond effectively to the emotions, social cues and needs of others in a way that furthers our own values and demonstrates, respect for others at the individual, team, organizational and global levels. In order to have an effective flow of teaching learning instructions, Social intelligence is essential for teachers as they are dealing with students from different backgrounds, ages, cultures and social strata. To facilitate the growth of social intelligence in teaching the following measures can be undertaken:

1. Since the social intelligence level of B.Ed and DIET student teachers scored high at the average level and very less at the higher level, therefore in Teacher Education Programs the concept, theories and processes of Social Intelligence should be taught so as to orient in-service and pre-service candidates about Social Intelligence.

2. Since the B.Ed and DIET student teachers are having an average level of teaching aptitude. Hence, it is expected that teacher training programme should be strongly recommended to revise the existing teachers training
programs with respect to admission criteria, curriculum, teaching practice and measurement and evaluation process.

3. Social intelligence of DIET student teachers are very high compare to B.Ed student teachers. Therefore while administering the entrance test for selection of candidates; social intelligence test may also be included.

4. Teaching aptitude of DIET student teachers are very high than the B.Ed student teachers. Thus efforts should be made to test it more comprehensively in the admission test and its weightage may also be increased.

5. Since social intelligence is related to teaching aptitude of student teachers, therefore it is possible to consider and include the social intelligence test while administering for teaching posts.

6. Training courses or programmes should be initiated for in-service and pre-service teachers in order to enhance their Social Intelligence and teaching aptitude.
6.15 Suggestions for Further Research

Research is an endless process and every research work provides clue for further investigation. Most of the investigator, after completing the research, they may feel inspired to do more research. Therefore, the present study opens up certain avenues for further research which are briefly listed below:

1. A Study on conceptual awareness of Social Intelligence for both the in-service and pre-service student teachers should be undertaken.

2. A Comparative study of the teaching aptitude of fresh categories of student teachers with those of in-service categories.

3. A study may be undertaken to compare the teaching effectiveness of student teachers of arts, science and commerce stream.

4. Construction and Development of Social Intelligence Scale for the Student Teachers.

5. A Comparative study of the teaching effectiveness of male and female student teacher as well as tribal and non-tribal student teachers.
6. A study of Social Intelligence and its effectiveness in the teacher training programme.

7. A Comparative study of the in-service and pre-service student teachers.

8. A study maybe undertaken on relationships of Social Intelligence and various variables.

6.16 Conclusion

According to the findings most of the B.Ed and DIET student teachers are having an average level of social intelligence and teaching aptitude. The DIET student teachers are having a high social intelligence as well as teaching aptitude than the B.Ed student teachers. There is no significant difference of social intelligence between the B.Ed and DIET student teachers (male and female) which is related to the finding of Suresh and Rao (2009) who found that there is no significant difference between Male And Female Student Teachers.

There is no significant difference of social intelligence between the B.Ed and DIET student teachers Arts and Science. The finding of the present study is equivalent to Suresh and Rao (2009) who found that there is no significant difference between the student teachers of arts and science. There is no significant difference of social
intelligence between the B.Ed and DIET student teachers (Science and Commerce) whereas there is a significant difference of social intelligence between B.Ed Student Teachers (Tribal and Non Tribal, Arts and Commerce).

There is no significant difference of teaching aptitude between B.Ed and DIET student teachers male and female which is similar to Bhasin (1988) and Sharma (1984) who found that there is no significant difference of teaching aptitude between male and female student teachers. There is no significant difference of teaching aptitude between B.Ed and DIET student teachers (Arts and Science) whereas there is a significant difference of teaching aptitude between B.Ed Student Teachers (Tribal and Non Tribal, Arts and Commerce, Science and Commerce). There is also a significant difference of teaching aptitude between DIET Student Teachers (Arts and Commerce).

Social intelligence and teaching aptitude of student teachers are correlated to each other and there is a significant difference in the relationship of Social Intelligence with Teaching Aptitude between B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers, but there is no significant difference in the relationship of Social Intelligence with Teaching Aptitude between Male and Female Student Teachers, Arts and Science Student Teachers. There is a significant difference in the relationship of Social
Intelligence with Teaching Aptitude between Science and Commerce Student Teachers, Arts and Commerce Student Teachers, B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers (Male, Non-Tribal) whereas there is no significant difference in the relationship of Social Intelligence with Teaching Aptitude between B.Ed and DIET Student Teachers (Female, Tribal, Arts, Science and Commerce).