



SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE AND SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT OF HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS IN RELATION TO GENDER AND RURAL/URBAN DICHOTOMY

Sabahat Aslam

Research Scholar

Abstract

The present research was taken up with broad objective to study the Social Intelligence and scholastic achievement of higher secondary school students in relation to their gender and Rural/Urban Dichotomy. The sample comprised of 800 higher secondary school students (400 Rural and 400 Urban students, out of which 200 were male and 200 were female). The sample for the study was selected randomly from the different schools of Srinagar (as urban district) and Ganderbal (as rural district). The sample was selected in such a way to ensure that every unit of the population could get equal chance to be selected in the sample. Social Intelligence Scale developed by N.K. Chadda and Ganesan was administered for the present sample and scholastic Achievement was obtained from the previous two years performance records of the sample subjects. Result findings suggest no significant difference between rural and urban higher secondary school student`s on Social Intelligence. Result findings suggest significant difference between male and female higher secondary school student`s on Social Intelligence. The results also suggest significant mean difference between rural and urban students on their Academic Achievement and urban student`s have higher Academic Achievement as compared to rural higher secondary school students. And the results also suggest that there is significant difference between male and female higher secondary students on Social Intelligence and females were found to have higher academic achievement than male students.



Scholarly Research Journal's is licensed Based on a work at www.srjis.com

INTRODUCTION

Education in one sense or the other appears to be as old as human race, though in the course of time its meaning and objectives have inevitably undergone certain changes. Education is believed not only to be an instrument of social change, but also an investment in national development. According to John Dewey, "Education is reconstruction or reorganization of experiences, which adds to the meaning of experience and which increases the ability to direct the course of subsequent experiences". Life involves a constant and continuous modification of experiences and ideas, bringing about changes in skills, attitudes and values. This helps the child to adjust and accommodate to the fast changing world.

Social intelligence is the capacity to know one's own self or to know others. Intrapersonal intelligence is the person's ability to assess his or her internal, emotional life whereas interpersonal intelligence is the individual's ability to assess other individuals. Several

definitions of social intelligence have been offered by theorists, but all share two common components (a) the awareness of others (b) their response and adaptation to other and the social situations (Kobe, *et al.*, 2001). Social intelligence is a mental ability distinct from abstract and mechanical intelligence. Social Intelligence is important to lead a successful life in a society. Social intelligence helps an individual to develop a healthy relationship with other people. Socially intelligent people behave tactfully and build strong relationships with other people in the society. Social intelligence is also useful in solving the problems of social life and help in dealing well with various social issues. These concepts of social intelligence are incorporating internal & external perceptions, social skills and other psychosocial variables. Marlowe's (1986) model of social intelligence comprised five domains- personal attitude, social confidence. Social attitude is indicated by having an empathetic ability, emotional expressiveness for others, social interaction with others.

Scholastic Achievement is the outcome of performance as grades on report cards. Academic Achievement concerns with the result of evaluative situations. The issue of student's achievement has become the issue of many Psychological and educational studies and numerous research works have linked it to adolescence.

The importance of scholastic achievement has given boost to many queries for researchers like the factors enhancing achievement in students, etc. The motivation of success is derived from the evaluative and feedback related concept of an individual.

OBJECTIVES

The following objectives were formulated for the present Investigation:

- To study the Social Intelligence of Rural and Urban higher Secondary School Students.
- To study the Social Intelligence of male and female higher secondary school students.
- To study the Scholastic Achievement of Rural and Urban higher Secondary School Students.
- To study the scholastic Achievement of male and female higher secondary school students.
- To compare Rural and Urban higher Secondary School Students on Social Intelligence.
- To compare Male and Female higher secondary school students on Social Intelligence.
- To compare Rural and Urban higher Secondary School Students on Scholastic Achievement.
- To compare male and female higher secondary school students on Scholastic Achievement.

HYPOTHESES

The following hypotheses were formulated for the present study:

- Rural and Urban higher Secondary School Students differ significantly on Social Intelligence.
- Male and Female higher secondary school students differ significantly on Social Intelligence.
- Rural and Urban higher secondary school students differ significantly on Scholastic Achievement.
- Male and Female higher secondary school students differ significantly on Scholastic Achievement.

OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF VARIABLES

The following operational definitions were been formulated for the present study:

- 1. Social Intelligence:** In the present study, social intelligence was been operationally defined as the scores obtained by administered N.K. Chadha and Usha Ganesan Social Intelligence Scale.
- 2. Scholastic Achievement:** For the present study, scholastic achievement was been operationally defined as the scores obtained by the sample subjects in their previous two examinations.

SAMPLE

The sample for the study consisted of 800 Higher secondary school students in which 400 were rural higher secondary school students 400 were urban higher secondary school students and out of which 200 were male rural and female rural higher secondary school students and 200 were male urban and female urban higher secondary school students. The sample for the present study was selected from district Srinagar (Urban) and district Ganderbal (Rural), which were selected randomly from ten districts of Kashmir. The sample for the study was selected randomly to ensure that every unit of the population gets equal chance of being selected. The researcher ensured that discretions of the researcher should not get involved in the selection of the sample from the population.

The breakup of the sample shall be as under:

Group	Rural Students		Urban Students		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Higher Secondary Students	200	200	200	200	800

SELECTION AND DESCRIPTION OF TOOLS

The tools for the present study were selected in a manner to achieve an optimum level of confidence by the investigator for the objectives of the study. Since the study principally contained two variables namely Social Intelligence and Scholastic Achievement. Therefore, such tools were decided to be chosen as could validly and reliably measure these variables. The investigator after screening a number of available tests finally selected the following tools to collect the data.

1. Social Intelligence Scale (SIS) developed by N.K.Chadda and Ganesan.
2. Scholastic Achievement of the sample subjects were assessed by checking the previous two year academic performance record of the sample subjects.

ANALYSIS

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

A) Social Intelligence: Social Intelligence Scale was employed to measure Social Intelligence of sample subjects in the area of Patience, Cooperativeness, Confidence level, Sensitivity, Recognition to Social Environment, Tactfulness, Sense of Humour and Memory.

Table 4.15: Showing the mean comparison between male and female higher secondary school students on Patience dimension of Social Intelligence (N=800)

Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
Male	400	19.99	2.320	0.898	Insignificant
Female	400	19.83	2.705		

The above table depicts the mean comparison between male and female higher secondary school students on Patience dimension of Social Intelligence. The statistical data reveals that there is no significant difference between the two groups on Patience dimension which reveals that both Male and Female students have almost similar Patience. Though the mean difference favours male students but the difference failed to arrive at any level of confidence.

Table 4.16 : Showing the mean comparison between Male and Female higher secondary school students on 'Co-operativeness' dimension of Social Intelligence (N=800).

Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of Significance
Male	400	25.14	3.210	1.612	Insignificant
Female	400	25.51	3.280		

A quick look at the above table shows the mean difference between male and female higher secondary students on Cooperativeness dimension of social Intelligence. The data depicts that there is no significant difference between the two groups as the calculated t-value as it does not exceeds the tabulated value which confirms that both male and female higher secondary school students are almost equally Co-operative .Though the mean difference favours the female higher secondary school students but the observed difference failed to arrive at any level of significance.

Table 4.17: Showing the mean comparison between male and female Higher secondary school students on ‘Confidence’ dimension of Social Intelligence (N=800)

Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
Male	400	20.59	1.911	2.355	Significant at 0.05 level
Female	400	20.26	2.050		

The perusal of the above table shows the mean difference between male and female higher secondary school students on ‘Confidence’ dimension of Social Intelligence. The statistical data reveals that there is significant difference between the two groups and the difference was found to be significant at 0.05 level. As the mean score favours the male students which confirms that male higher secondary school students are having better confidence level than their counterparts.

Table 4.18: Showing the mean comparison between Male and Female higher secondary school students on ‘Sensitivity’ dimension of social intelligence(N=800).

Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
Male	400	20.50	2.45	1.75	Insignificant
Female	400	20.80	2.36		

The perusal of the above table shows the mean difference between male and female higher secondary school students on sensitivity dimension of Social Intelligence . The statistical data reveals that there is no significant difference between the two groups because the calculated t-value does not exceed the tabulated value at any level of confidence which confirms that both male and female higher secondary school students are almost equally sensitive. Though the mean difference favours the female students but the difference failed to arrive at any level of confidence.

Table 4.19: Showing the mean comparison between male and female higher secondary school students on ‘Recognition of Social Environment’ dimension of Social Intelligence (N=800)

Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
Male	400	1.77	0.747	3.967	Significant at 0.01 level
Female	400	1.99	0.819		

The above table shows the mean difference between male and female higher secondary school students on ‘Recognition of Social Environment’ dimension of social intelligence. The data reveals that there is significant difference between the male and female higher secondary school students at 0.01 level. As the calculated t-value exceeds the tabulated t-value and the mean value favours the female students which reveals that female higher secondary students have better Recognition to Social Environment than their counterparts.

Table 4.20: Showing the mean comparison between Male and Female higher secondary school students on ‘Tactfulness’ dimension of Social Intelligence (N=800).

Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
Male	400	4.80	1.564	1.447	Insignificant
Female	400	4.96	1.563		

A quick look at the table shows the mean difference between male and female higher secondary school students on ‘tactfulness’ dimension of social intelligence . The statistical data shows that there is no significant mean difference between the two groups as the calculated t-value does not exceed the tabulated t-value at any level which confirms that both male and female higher secondary school students are almost equally tactful. Though the mean difference favours the female students but the difference failed to arrive at any level of confidence.

Table 4.21: showing the mean comparison between the male and female higher secondary school students on ‘Sense of humour’ dimension of social intelligence (N=800).

Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
Male	400	4.75	1.554	1.917	Insignificant
Female	400	4.96	1.544		

A quick look at the above table shows the mean difference between male and female higher secondary school students on ‘sense of humour’ dimension of social intelligence. The statistical data reveals that there is no significant mean difference between the two groups as the calculated t-value does not exceed the tabulated t-value at any level which confirms that the male and female higher secondary students are having almost similar sense of humour.

Table 4.22: showing the mean comparison between the male and female higher secondary school students on ‘Memory’ dimension of social intelligence (N=800).

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of Significance
Male	400	8.24	2.217	4.72	Significant at 0.01 level
Female	400	8.91	1.765		

The above table shows the mean difference between male and female higher secondary school students on ‘memory’ dimension of social intelligence. The data reveals that there is a significant difference between the male and female students on ‘Memory’ dimension and the difference was found to be significant at 0.01 level. As the mean value favours the female students which reveals that female higher secondary students have better memory power than their counterparts.

Table 4.23: Showing the mean comparison between Male and Female higher secondary school students on Composite Score of Social Intelligence (N=800).

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of significance
Male	400	105.78	7.67	2.30	Significant at 0.05 level
Female	400	107.22	9.83		

The perusal of the above table shows the mean difference between male and female higher secondary school students on composite scores of social intelligence. The above table shows that there is significant difference between the two groups as the calculated t-value exceeds the tabulated value at 0.05 level and the mean difference favours the female students which reveals that female higher secondary students have better Social Intelligence than the male higher secondary school students.

In the light of the above empirical evidences, the hypothesis which reads as, ***“Male and female higher secondary students differ significantly on Social Intelligence.”*** stands accepted.

In the light of the above results, the Objective which reads as, **“To compare Male and Female higher secondary school students on Social Intelligence”** stands accomplished.

Table 4.24: Showing the mean comparison between Rural and Urban higher secondary school students on ‘Patience’ dimension of Social Intelligence (N=800)

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Level of significance
Rural	400	20.25	3.324	1.94	Insignificant
Urban	400	19.77	3.661		

The above table shows the mean difference between rural and urban higher secondary school students on Patience dimension of Social Intelligence. The statistical data reveals that there is no significant mean difference between the two groups as the calculated t-value does not exceed the tabulated t-value at any level of significance which confirms that the rural and urban higher secondary students are having almost similar patience.

Table 4.25: Showing the mean comparison between Rural and Urban Higher secondary school students on ‘Cooperativeness’ dimension of Social Intelligence (N=800).

Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
Rural	400	25.14	3.457	1.612	Insignificant
Urban	400	25.51	3.019		

A quick look at the above table shows the mean difference between rural and urban students on ‘Cooperativeness’ dimension of social intelligence. The statistical data reveals that there is no significant mean difference between the two groups as the calculated t-value does not exceed the tabulated t-value at any level of confidence which confirms that the rural and urban higher secondary students are almost equally cooperative.

Table 4.26 : Showing the mean comparison between Rural and Urban higher secondary school students on ‘Confidence’ dimension of Social Intelligence (N=800).

Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
Rural	400	20.17	1.921	3.657	Significant at 0.01 level
Urban	400	20.68	2.022		

The above table shows the mean difference between rural and urban students on ‘Confidence’ dimension of Social Intelligence. The statistical data reveals that there is mean difference between rural and urban higher secondary school students on Confidence dimension and the difference was found to be significant at 0.01 level. As the mean difference favours the urban

Copyright © 2017, Scholarly Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies

students which confirms that urban students are having better Confidence than the rural higher secondary school students.

Table 4.27: Showing the mean comparison between Rural and Urban higher secondary school students on ‘Sensitivity’ dimension of Social Intelligence (N=800).

Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
Rural	400	20.77	3.241	0.249	Insignificant
Urban	400	20.83	3.572		

The above table shows the mean comparison between rural and urban students on ‘Sensitivity’ dimension of social intelligence. The data shows that there is no significant difference between rural and urban higher secondary students as the calculated t-value and tabulated t-value do not differ at any level of confidence which indicates that both rural and urban students are equally sensitive.

Table 4.28: Showing the mean comparison between rural and urban higher secondary school students on ‘Recognition of Social Environment’ dimension of Social Intelligence (N=800).

Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
Rural	400	1.85	0.650	2.476	Significant at 0.05 level
Urban	400	1.97	0.719		

The perusal of the above table depicts the mean significant difference between rural and urban students on ‘Recognition of Social Environment’ dimension of social intelligence. The statistical data reveals that there is significant difference between rural and urban higher secondary school students on ‘Recognition of Social Environment’ dimension and the difference was found to be significant at 0.05 level. As the mean difference favours the urban students which confirms that urban higher secondary school students are having better recognition to social environment than the rural higher secondary school students.

Table 4.29: Showing the mean comparison between rural and urban higher secondary school students on ‘Tactfulness’ dimension of Social Intelligence (N=400each).

Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
Rural	400	4.65	1.648	8.76	Significant at 0.01 level
Urban	400	5.61	1.443		

The above table shows the mean difference between rural and urban higher secondary school students on ‘Tactfulness’ dimension of Social Intelligence. The statistical data reveals that there is significant mean difference between Rural and Urban higher secondary school students on ‘Tactfulness’ dimension and the difference was found to be significant at 0.01 level. As the mean difference favours the urban students which confirms that the urban students are more Tactful than the rural higher secondary school students.

Table 4.30: Showing the mean comparison between rural and urban higher secondary school students on ‘Sense of Humour’ dimension of Social Intelligence (N=800).

Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
Rural	400	5.53	1.586	7.79	Significant at 0.01 level
Urban	400	4.68	1.498		

The above table depicts the mean comparison between rural and urban higher secondary school students on ‘Sense of Humour’ dimension of Social Intelligence. The statistical data reveals that there is significant mean difference between rural and urban students on ‘Sense of humour’ dimension and the difference was found to be significant at 0.01 level. As the mean difference favours the rural students which confirms that rural higher secondary school students are having more sense of humour than the urban higher secondary school students.

Table 4.31: Showing the mean comparison between rural and urban higher secondary school students on ‘Memory’ dimension of Social Intelligence.

Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
Rural	400	8.72	3.21	0.434	Insignificant
Urban	400	8.61	3.92		

The above table shows the mean difference between rural and urban higher secondary school students on ‘Memory’ dimension of social intelligence. The data reveals that there is no significant mean difference between rural and urban higher secondary school students as the calculated t-value and tabulated t-value do not differ at any level of confidence which indicates that both rural and urban students have equal memory.

Table 4.32: Showing the mean comparison between rural and urban higher secondary school students on Composite Score of Social Intelligence (N=800).

Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
Rural	400	107.08	7.483	0.145	Insignificant
Urban	400	107.16	8.093		

The above table depicts the mean comparison between Rural and Urban students on Composite Score of Social Intelligence. The statistical data reveals that there is no significant difference between the two groups as both the groups have almost similar social Intelligence. Though the mean difference favours the Urban higher secondary school students but the difference failed to arrive at any level of confidence.

In the light of the above empirical evidences, the hypothesis which reads as , ***“Rural and Urban higher secondary students differ significantly on Social Intelligence.”*** stands rejected.

The above mentioned results show that, the objective which reads as , ***“To compare rural and urban higher secondary school students on Social Intelligence”*** stand accomplished.

B) SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT

The scholastic achievement of the sample subjects were assessed by consulting the previous two years academic performance of the sample subjects. The aggregate marks of the two years were taken as indicators of academic performance of the sample subjects.

Table 4.47: Showing the significant mean difference between male and female higher secondary school students on Scholastic Achievement.

Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
Male	400	65.82	5.842	7.755	Significant at 0.01 level
Female	400	69.98	8.999		

The above table reveals that there is significant mean difference between male and female higher secondary school students on scholastic achievement. The data depicts that there is a significant mean difference between the two groups and the difference was found to be significant at 0.01 level. As the mean difference favours the female students which reveals that female students are higher on academic achievement than male students.

In the light of the above evidences, the hypothesis which reads as , ***“Male and female higher secondary students differ significantly on Scholastic Achievement.”*** stands accepted.

On the basis of the above mentioned results, the Objective which reads as, ***“To compare Male and Female higher secondary school students on Scholastic Achievement”*** stands accomplished.

Table 4.48: Showing the mean comparison between rural and urban higher secondary school students on Scholastic Achievement.

Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value	Level of significance
Rural	400	69.22	2.907	11.34	Significant at 0.01 level
Urban	400	73.58	7.117		

The above table shows the mean comparison between rural and urban students on Scholastic Achievement. The data depicts that there is significant mean difference between the two groups and the difference was found to be significant at 0.01 level as the calculated t-value exceeds the tabulated t- value at 0.01 level. The observed difference favours the urban higher secondary school students which confirms that urban higher secondary school students are high on academic achievement than the rural higher secondary school students.

In the light of the above evidences, the hypothesis which reads as, ***“Rural and Urban higher secondary students differ significantly on Scholastic Achievement.”*** stands accepted.

On the basis of the above results, the Objective which reads as, ***“To compare Rural and Urban higher secondary school students on Scholastic Achievement”*** stands accomplished.

CONCLUSION

The following conclusion have been drawn from the present study:

Social Intelligence

1. It was also seen that there is no significant mean difference between the male and female students on patience, cooperativeness, sensitivity, tactfulness and sense of humour dimensions of social intelligence.
2. It was also revealed that there is significant mean difference between the male and female students on confidence dimension of Social Intelligence. Male higher secondary school students are having better confidence level as compared to female students.
3. It was found that there is significant difference between the male and female students on recognition of social environment dimension of social intelligence. Female higher secondary students were found to have better recognition to social environment than the male students.

4. It was found that there is significant mean difference between the male and female students on memory dimension of social intelligence. Female higher secondary students were found to have better memory than the male students.
5. It has been found that there is significant mean difference between male and female higher secondary school students on overall dimensions of social intelligence. Female higher secondary students were found to have high level of social intelligence than the male higher secondary school students.
6. It was found that that there is no significant mean difference between rural and urban students on patience dimension of social intelligence. It was also found that there is a significant difference between rural and urban higher secondary school students on confidence dimension. Urban higher secondary school students were high level of confidence than the rural students.
7. It was found that there is significant mean difference between rural and urban higher secondary school students on tactfulness dimension of social intelligence. Urban students are more tactful than the rural students.
8. Significant mean difference between rural and urban higher secondary school students was found on sense of humour dimension of social intelligence. Rural higher secondary school students were found to have better high sense of humour than the urban higher secondary school students.
9. It was found that that there is no significant mean difference between rural and urban students on patience, cooperativeness, sensitivity, memory dimensions and overall scores of social intelligence.

Scholastic Achievement

1. It was found that there is significant mean difference between the male and female students on scholastic achievement. Female students were found to have better scholastic achievement than male students.
2. It has been found that there is significant mean difference between the rural and urban students on their scholastic achievement. Urban students were found to have better scholastic achievement than the rural higher secondary school students.

EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

1. Maximum (74%) of the higher secondary school students were found to have average level of social intelligence. Therefore, the policy makers and educational planners should focus on the non scholastic aspect of the child's personality. So that our

educational system will also ensure socialization, acculturation among the students. Female higher secondary school students were found to have better social intelligence than the male higher secondary school students. Therefore, it is recommended that male students should be exposed to different social interactions and social gatherings so that their social intelligence shall get enhanced.

2. Females were found to have better academic achievement than the males. Therefore, proper motivation, remedial classes, career counseling should be organized for the male higher secondary school students to enhance their academic achievement. A good attractive school climate should be ensured in the educational institutions so that male students will excel in their academic career. Urban higher secondary school students were found to have better academic performance than the rural higher secondary schools students. Therefore, it is recommended that the infrastructural facilities in the rural higher secondary schools should be upgraded so that the children of the rural school will get maximum benefit out of the education in order to motivate best minds in the rural schools. Incentives should also be given to the teachers who are voluntarily willing to serve in the rural areas.

REFERENCES

- Bo Scott Bennett (2015) Social Intelligence of Undergraduates Enrolled in Traditional vs. Distance Higher Education Learning Programs. Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy Psychology, Walden University*
- Habib (2013) et al. A study of relationship between social intelligence and organizational performance (case study: Ardabil regional water company's managers) international journal of organization leadership. vol.2, no 1-10.*
- Hassan (2013) Aminpoor: A study on relationship between social intelligence and happiness in Payame Noor University students. Scholars Research Library. Annals of Biological Research, 2013, 4(5):165-168.*
- Karanam Mahaboobvali and DR. s. vijaya vardhini. A study on Social intelligence of secondary school teachers with respect of their Gender and Age. The international journal of Indian psychology. ISSN 2348-5396(e) ISSN:2349-3249(p), volume 3, Issue 2, NO. 2, Dip:18.01.036/20160302.*
- Lisette Froeling (2016) Social Intelligence as a Predictor of Unpopularity: The Moderating Effect of Ethnicity. Journal of General Social Sciences: Youth Studies*
- Mande Pramod Prakash(2016). A study of social intelligence of B.Ed students teachers in Barshi. International journal of engineering technology science and research. Vol. 3, issue3.*
- Manjari Srivastava (2016). A study on impact of Social intelligence on Peer Relationships among Adolescents: A Gender Analysis. International journal of recent scientific research. Vol.7,issue 8, pp.12791-12794.*
- Mehdi Asadi (2016). A study on the impact of social intelligence of the management on the mental health in the Supreme Audit Court. International Academic journal of Accounting and financial management. Vol.3, No.4, pp.34-40.*

- Miranti Rahmatika and Neti Hernawati (2016). *The influence of school Environment, Social intelligence and self –Esteem towards academic achievement of students in rural area.* *Journal of child development studies*, vol. 01, 28-39.
- Murphy, C. G. & Hicks, T. (2006). *Academic characteristics among first-generation and non-first-generation college students.* *College Quarterly*, 9(2), 1-20.
- Noortje Meijs. Antonius H. N. Cillesson. et.al (2010) *Social Intelligence and Academic Achievement as Predictors of Adolescent Popularity.* *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, 39:62–72.
- Nuthana, P. G. and Ganga V. Yenagi (2009): *Gender Analysis of Academic Achievement among high school students*, *Karnataka Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 22(5), 1135-1138.
- Olga Iatsevich et al (2017) *conducted a research on the study of social intelligence of students majoring in “industrial and civil construction”.*
- Pada, M., (2002) *Analysis of relationship between academic achievement and school interventions of class IX students.* *Psychological Journal of Researchers*, vol. 4(3): 11-25.
- Parto Eshghi and et al., (2013). *Relationship between social intelligence with effective influence among physical education expertise in Isfahan education organizations.* *European journal of Experimental Biology*, 3(3):168-172.
- Qingwen Dong Randall J. Koper Christine M. Collaco (2008). *Social Intelligence, Self-esteem, and Intercultural Communication Sensitivity.* *Journal of Intercultural Communication Studies XVII: (2).*
- Rakshanda Lateef(2015) *Social Awareness, Social Intelligence and Academic Achievement of first generation learners and non first generation learners of university of Kashmir. M.phil dissertation submitted to the department of education, University of Kashmir.*