In the preceding chapter a descriptive account of results obtained from different treatments presented in tabular, graphical and statistical form were put forward. Thus, the results of the present study were presented in the preceding chapter. In this chapter, a discussion of the findings and their interpretation has been attempted. While clarifying the objectives and problems of the present study, it has been already said that the present study was undertaken with a view to understanding the impact of personality traits and social maturity on emotional intelligence of undergraduate respondents.
In this chapter an attempt has been made at interpreting and discussing these results as a whole in the light of various theoretical frameworks evolved by different findings of present author and relevant findings of the others. This chapter is stratified in four sections. The first section deals with the assumptions and underlying causes as to why the t-test has been used to analyze and interpret the data. In the second section, the correlates of EI has been described to prove the first hypothesis. In the third section, the functional relationship between personality traits and emotional intelligence will be discussed in the light of obtained results and the results of other investigators. In the fourth section, functional relationship between social maturity and emotional intelligence will be discussed. The finding of these statistical analyses have been discussed taking variables one by one. The strategy adopted for discussing the results in each case has been compared with the results of other related researches, if any, and then an interpretation of consonance or dissonance between findings has been attempted. If in case of any variable, no previous empirical study is available, the findings have been discussed in the light of underlying theoretical prepositions about the variable.

**Statistical Analysis Used**

With a view to bringing out the differential relationship among these variables e.g. personality traits, social maturity and emotional Intelligence, it was
necessary to interpret and analyze the data statistically. For this purpose, parametric technique, i.e. 't' test was used.

't' test

In order to test the significance of the difference between the two means, t-values have also been computed because the t-test of significance is adequate when we want to determine whether or not two means differ significantly from each other. It is employed in case of experiments involving two groups. Keeping this fact in mind t-test was also applied. However, the t-distribution is a theoretical sampling distribution, which is employed when number of cases in a group is a thirty or less, then the distribution of means of the sample is different from normal distribution curve. Miller & Charles (2006) advocated that a well selected sample of 30 individuals is adequate.

The t-test for means of independent samples assume:

(a) Normality of distributions of the variables in the populations from which the sample are drawn i.e. the observations should be taken from the normally distributed population.

(b) The observation should essentially be homogenous.

(c) The variation of population should essentially be homogenous.
The variables measured must be based on interval scale, so that statistical treatment is possible.

The normality of the dependent variable eg. Emotional Intelligence, in the present study was measured by the measures of Mean, Median, Mode, Standard Deviation, Skewness and Kurtosis for the group. It was found normal. Therefore, t-test was applied to the obtained data.

**Hypothesis-1**

*The phenomenon of emotional intelligence is a function of multiple factors.*

The study of EI is currently a topic of considerable interest and activity within individual differences research. The reason for this interest are two fold. Firstly, the idea that people differ in measurable ways in their emotional skills is an interesting idea in its own right, suggesting the open up of an area of individual differences assessment not currently covered by existing measures of intelligence and personality, Secondly, emotional intelligence is expected to be linked to a range of theoretically interesting outcomes. Emotional intelligence requires that we learn to acknowledge and understand feelings in ourselves and others and we appropriately respond to them creatively applying the energy of the emotions to our daily life, work and relationships. The enhanced interpersonal skills of high EI individuals would be expected to be associated with outcomes such
as better social and personal relationships, whilst interpersonal aspect of EI such as mood regulation would be expected to link to higher levels, for example, higher levels of life satisfaction and fewer level of depression. Several studies have been conducted in India on EI that have focused on the relevance and prevalence of Emotional Intelligence in the Indian business context (e.g., Bhalla and Nautiyal, 2004; Srivastava and Bharamanikar, 2004; Bindu and Thomas, 2006) or on the development of Emotional Intelligence in the Indian socio-cultural context (Sibia, Misra, and Srivastava, 2004).

Number of studies reported that female have scored higher than male on Emotional Intelligence Scale. (Brackett and Mayer, 2003; Mayer et al., 2002; Schutte, Malouff, Hall, Haggerty, Cooper, Golden, and Domheim, 1998; Thingujam and Rank, 2000). Argyle (1990) found that female being more perceptive, empathic, and adaptable than male. Studies showed that females to be more socially skilled than males (Argyle, 1990; Hargie, Saunders, and Dickson, 1995). Schutte et al. (1998) concluded that female score higher on emotional intelligence scale than male. Petrides and Furnham (2000) found lower correlation between measured and self-estimated emotional intelligence for females than for males.

Emotional intelligence (EI) is one among them that can potentially moderate the effect of stress. For example, researchers have demonstrated that EI is related with lower level of stress and reduced chance of its
adverse consequences (Duran & Ray, 2004; Hunt & Evans, 2004; Naidoo & Pau, 2008; Pau and Croucher, 2003). Pau and Croucher (2003) observed in their study that lower levels of EI (particular ability to regulate mood) was associated with higher levels of perceived stress. Similarly, Slaski and Cartwright (2008) observed that managers who scored higher on measures of EI suffered less subjective stress, experienced better health and well-being, and demonstrated better management performance. Such observations have been supported in recent studies also (e.g., Duran & Ray, 2004; Naidoo & Pau, 2008).

Emotional intelligence has been found to be positively correlated with measures of depression, stress and loneliness have been found to be negative (Austin, Saklofske, & Egan, 2005; Dawda & Hart, 2000; Day, Therrien, & Carroll, 2005; Palmer, Donaldson, & Stough, 2002; Saklofske, Austin, & Minski, 2003; Schutte et al., 1998; Slaski & Cartwright, 2002; Tsaousis & Nikolaou, 2005). Positive associations of EI with higher levels of self-rated physical health have also been reported by researchers (e.g., Tsaousis & Nikolaou, 2005).

An abundance of research examining EI in individuals has been published in the past decades (Abraham 1999; Bachman, Stein, Campbell & Sitarenios 2000; Bar-On, Brown, Kirkcaldy & Thome 2000; Barling, Slater & Kelloway 2000; Cadman & Brewer 2001; Ciarroachi, Deane & Anderson 2002; Ciarrochi, Chan & Caputi 2000; Davis, Stankov & Roberts 1998; Dulewiez 2000; Dulewicz & Higgs 2000; Fox & Spector 2000; Gardner & Stough 2002; George
Emotional intelligence was originally conceptualized by Salovey & Mayer (1990) as accurate perception, appraisal, expression and understanding of emotion.

These investigators ascertain the influence of a number of personal variables on emotional intelligence. Present investigation was also done to study the effect of factors like personality traits and social maturity in relation to emotional intelligence and the results revealed that these variables are significantly correlated to emotional intelligence. Thus, it may be convincingly argued that emotional intelligence is a function of multiple factors, confirming the hypothesis-I.

**Hypothesis-2**

*It was hypothesized that variations in personality traits would cause significant difference in emotional intelligence.*

In this section an attempt has been made to interpret and discuss the obtained results, regarding personality traits and EI.
EI was investigated in relation to personality traits of undergraduate respondents. As stated earlier, Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire was employed to probe the relationship of the respondents. In the first place an effort has been made to present a factor wise interpretation.

**Personality Factor-A : Reserved vs. Outgoing and Emotional Intelligence**

EI was studied as a function of personality Factor A i.e. "Reserved vs. Outgoing". The results depicted in Table 5.3 and its graphic representation in Fig. 5.4, convey a close relationship between EI and this personality factor. From the computed t-ratio (t = 4.90 > .01), which is statistically significant at .01 level of significance, it is safe to visualize that Outgoing respondents are relatively more emotionally intelligent (78.50 ± 3.13) than the Reserved ones (74.20 ± 3.65). It is evident from results and statistical analysis thereof that respondents scoring high i.e. sten scores 8 to 10 on personality factor A were found more emotionally intelligent than those obtaining sten scores i.e. 1 to 3. The low scores on the factor in question i.e. reserved respondents tend to be generally stiff, cool, skeptical and aloof. Hence, they are liable to prefer things rather than people, working alone rather than working together and are likely to be precise and rigid in their mode of doing things and less interested in personal standards. Thus, it was not beyond expectation that they were found relatively less emotionally intelligent. On the other hand high scorers on this personality factor are outgoing, warmhearted, easygoing, participating, emotionally expressible, ready to
cooperate, soft hearted, adaptable, kindly and good natured. They are supposed to prefer socially expressible and impressive situations. Not only that but outgoing people are alive to social situations and more other oriented. Thus, it was very obvious that people having characteristics as described above i.e. those who were kind-hearted, cooperative, alive to situation and other oriented i.e. outgoing, were found to be for more emotionally intelligent. Further, it is in consonance with our common sense and common experience of day to day life. They may be more emotionally intelligent on account of their good nature, better understanding of the causes of feelings, a sense of kindness, better frustration tolerance and anger management, their concern for others and above all because of their tolerance, empathy and compassion for others. Their emotional intelligence may satisfy their needs for socially impressive situations, which, ultimately may help them achieve social recognition, and approval which they value. It is safe to visualize here, that emotional intelligence is a function of Personality Factor-A and the hypothesis is confirmed. This finding is not against general expectation in this regard. The finding may be explained in terms of personal norms of outgoing people. Such people may be motivated to develop emotional literacy, make better relationships, experience more achievement, love and joy in their life. It may be argued that outgoing people who are alive to social situations and concerned with others are more liable to be emotionally intelligent. Thus, our finding about emotional intelligence in relation to Personality Factor-A, "Reserved vs. Outgoing"
may be explained in terms of self-control, zeal and persistence, ability to motivate one self and knowing and controlling one’s emotions.

**Personality Factor B : Low vs. High Intelligence and Emotional Intelligence**

The results depicted in Table 5.4 of the previous chapter, described the mean performance of "low" and "high" intelligence respondents on MEII. As stated earlier the mean difference was found statistically significant, obviously, the general mental ability which is an important dimension in individual differences had important functionality for emotional intelligence so far as the results of the present investigation and statistical analysis thereof is concerned. People scoring low on personality factor-B, i.e. "low" intelligence persons are apt to be less well organized, poorer in judgement, and lower in morale, hence, they are not supposed to exhibit any significant concern for emotional self-awareness, management of emotions, self motivation, reading and handling emotions. Their dullness and lower morale may restrain them from reducing stress, recognizing and managing personal emotions and understanding non-verbal communication of others. On the other side, the "high" intelligence people are persistent, bright, higher in scholastic capacity and given to abstract thinking. Their tendency to abstract thinking and interest in intellectual pursuits may help them in reducing stress, managing own emotions, understanding others non-verbal communications and resolving conflicts. Having more foresight and insight in the situation may make such people (high intelligence) more emotionally intelligent. They will display
considerations for other's feelings in the process of making intelligent decisions (Sosick & Megerian 1999; Fox 2002). Besides, that, it may be argued that high intelligence may imply more emotional maturity and stability, that is why, high intelligent respondent were found more emotionally intelligent. Thus, "low" and "high" intelligence is related with emotional intelligence of respondents.

The measurement of intelligence in Cattell's 16 PF test is unspeeded and is a power measure, and therefore, may correlate quite so highly with the usual speeded intelligence test as with a power test. Cattell himself admits it in his "Handbook for the 16 PF test" (1970). Thus, an attempt to probe relationship between intelligence and emotional intelligence be very reliable and, hence needs to be confirmed by using speeded measures of intelligence.

Personality Factor-C : Emotional Instability vs. Emotional Stability and Emotional Intelligence

EI was also measured in relation to emotional characteristics. The results in Table 5.5 and its graphic representation in Fig. 5.6 of the previous chapter on results presented the mean performance on MEII of high and low sten scorers on Personality Factor C. The respondents scoring low on this factor (C-) are regarded as emotionally instable or low on ego strength and those scoring high (C+) are supposed to be emotionally stable and may have a higher ego-strength. The significantness of t value (t = 7.98 > .01) at .01 level of statistical significance, conveys beyond doubt that persons with higher ego strength (C+) are emotionally
mature, stable, dynamic, realistic about life, unruffled and hence more capable in labelling their feelings show respect for other peoples feeling and validate other people's feelings. On the other side the respondents who score low sten score (C-) tend to be low in frustration tolerance for unsatisfactory conditions, evading necessary reality demands, easily angry and annoyed, having neurotic symptoms such as phobias, sleep disturbance, psychosomatic complaints, so on and so forth. Hence, they are liable to be less emotionally intelligent. Therefore, the results are not against common sense.

The results may be explained with reference to empathy theory (Wispe, 1986; Hornstein, 1982, and Fultz et.al., 1986) which stresses that there are people who experience other's distress as their own. It may be stated that emotional stability leads people to experience others emotions and distress as their own, and hence their greater concern for others emotions. In other words, emotionally stable persons may feel responsible for not helping (Regan, Williams & Sparling, 1972), therefore a feeling of guilt may crop up, consequently they extend help to avoid this feeling of guilt. The empathic concern involves feeling sympathetic, tender, softhearted and compassionate (Coke, Batson & McDavis, 1978; Krebs, 1975; Hoffman, 1981). They had demonstrated a correlation between helping behaviour and empathy (Coke et.al., 1978), empathic concern motivates helping even when the cost of escaping is low (Batson, et.al. 1981) and this motivation may be truly emotionally intelligence. Hence, it may be observed that
emotionally stable persons are more emotionally intelligent than those who suffer from emotional instability.

**Factor E : Humble vs. Assertive and Emotional Intelligence**

Table 5.6 and the graphic representation in Fig. 5.7 showed the mean performance of respondents scoring low and high on personality factor-E, on MEII. It is obvious, that mean performance of respondents scoring high (assertive) is more \( (75.80 \pm 3.56) \) than those scoring low (humble) \( (70.60 \pm 3.83) \) on MEII. The same is observed in the graphic representation (Fig. 5.7). The obtained t value \( (t = 5.47 > .01) \) is statistically significant at .01 level of significance, which showed beyond doubt, that in comparison to humble, assertive or dominant respondents were found to be more emotionally intelligent. The conclusion, seems very safe from the statistical analysis of results, which proves superiority of assertive or dominant people over their humble or submissive counterparts. According to Cattell (1970), the respondents who obtain low sten scores \( (E-) \) on this source trait, tend to be submissive, dependent, considerate, docile, conformist, passive, and give way to others, while those who score high \( (E+) \) are apt to be ascendant, assertive, self assured, independent minded, authoritarian and competitive. It is assumed that tendency for dominance and assertion may lead people to greater sense of doing good to others. Perhaps such people tend to feel the importance of developing awareness and monitoring behaviour. They possess some skills of paramount importance such as compassion, empathy, and trust and interpersonal
skills such as self-knowledge, observation and contemplation have been reflected. Since assertive respondents possess the quality of understanding the feelings and emotions of others, interact in mature manner, avoid manipulating behaviour, being able to protect the personal rights as well as the rights of other individuals, rational thinking, and a healthy style in which to conduct interpersonal relationships, that is why, they were found here emotionally intelligent. Their urge for self assertion finds expression in their emotionally intelligent deaes.

From the ascendnec-submission studies with Allport's test, Cattell (1970) observed that dominance tends to be positively correlated to some extent, with social status. In the light of this study it may be argued that greater tendency of emotional intelligence among assertive respondents may be an expression of their striving for higher social status. Here, we will not indulge in conceptual controversy which may question such behaviour as real emotional intelligence.

Murray (1930) in his book "Explorations in Personality" discussed a number of Psychogenic Needs including the one for dominance. The findings of Murray may also account for greater degree of energized behaviour, less aggressive, more responsible, more pro-social, more sharing and more demoratic in assertive or dominant individuals that is why assertive respondents were found more emotionally intelligent than humble respondents. Thus, our results in relation to personality factor E - visa vis assertive people are more emotionally intelligent.
Personality Factor F: Sober vs. Happy-go-lucky and Emotional Intelligence

The results on MEII with reference to factor F—Sober vs. Happy-go-lucky (enthusiastic) presented in Table 5.7 depicted mean performance and t value of sober and enthusiastic respondents on MEII. It is visualized that respondents obtaining higher sten scores (Enthusiastic) were relatively more emotionally intelligent (78.20 ± 3.36) than those who were tagged as "Sober" (74.80 ± 3.45) because of their low sten scores. The same impression is gathered from the bargraph depicted in Fig. 5.8. The mean difference was found significant at .01 level of significance \( t = 3.86 > .01 \). Thus, it is reasonable to observe that this personality trait is positively associated with emotional intelligence. The result supports our hypothesis about the personality trait Sober vs. Enthusiastic which may be related with EI. Therefore, we may safely conclude that enthusiastic or happy-go-lucky people are more emotionally intelligent than the sober ones.

Greater emotional intelligence in enthusiastic or happy-go-lucky respondents may be on account of their typical characteristics such as enthusiasm, surgency, and heedlessness. Their carefree nature and enthusiasm implies adventure which may often motivate to emotionally intelligent behaviour. Possibly, enthusiastic respondents are spontaneous, heedless, expressive, cheeaful, active, talkative, frank, effervescent and carefree, that is why they were found more emotionally intelligent (Mayer, Caruso, Salovery, Formica & Woolery 1999;
Abraham 1999; George 2000). Not only that they are impulsive and mercurial which may also predispose them to know, feel, use and communicate or even monitor one's own or others' emotions. It is a common experience that careful and unimpulsive people do think twice before acting in situations which involve some risk, hence their lesser concern for others. The persons who score low on this personality Factor (F-) tend to be restrained, reticent, prudent, desurgent, serious and introspective. Desurgency, according to Cattell (1970) is the central characteristic of such people, which may make them anxious, restless and depressive etc. and is associated in mild degree with practically all mental illnesses with neuroses, schizophrenia and alcoholism. Hence, it would not be proper to expect such people to understand ourselves and other people, sense, understand and effectively apply the power of emotions. The results presented in Table 5.7 of the previous chapter too paints the same. On the other side, the F+ people who are happy-go-lucky, (enthusiastic) respondents label their feelings appropriately, distinguish between thoughts and feelings, feel engized and show respect for other people's feelings. These characteristics may be taken as enough to motivate them and finally lead to perform emotionally intelligent behaviour.

**Personality Factor-G : Expedient vs. Conscientious and Emotional Intelligence**

The results in Table 5.8 of the previous chapter, manifest mean performance and t value of expedient and conscientious respondents on MEII. The obtained t value \( t = 5.55 > .01 \) is statistically significant at .01 level of
significance. Graphic representation of mean performance of the two groups in Fig. 5.9 too provides the same impression. It confirms the hypothesis regarding impact of this Personality Factor G on emotional intelligence. The significance of results assures us about the genuineness of the difference in mean performance on MEII as a function of this personality trait-- Expedient vs. Conscientious. Obviously, persons scoring high on personality trait i.e. conscientious respondents were found more emotionally intelligent (78.30 ± 3.55) in the present piece of research, than those scoring low on this factor - Expedient (73.30 ± 3.43).

"This factor, particularly in observer ratings, has some resemblance to the ego strength. It brings a strong involvement in moral concerns of right and wrong. Whatever coheres in the psychoanalytic concept of superego strength seems to be embodied in this demonstrated source trait. Certainly, it best depicts the deeply rooted concern for moral standards ....." Cattell (1970).

The results in Table 5.8 conveys very clearly that people who score low on this personality factor (i.e. expedient) tends to be unsteady in purpose, casual and lacking in effort for group undertaking. The freedom from group influence and weaker superego may lead them to immoral and antisocial acts. They have very scanty respect or regard altogether for obligation to other people as such their low scores on MEII resulting in less emotionally intelligent individual. The obtained result is not surprising. On the other hand our results of investigation of EI in relation to personality trait G reveals a positive association. The greater
amount of EI was found in conscientious respondents because of their stronger superego strength and better moral development, more conforming, more exacting in character, dominated by sense of duty, persevering, responsible and rule bounded. These characteristics of individuals make them more emotionally intelligent (Sibia, Mishra & Srivastava 2004; Nidhi 2006). This finding is at least partly supported by the observations of Morrison, Siegel & Francis (1984) who argue that better moral development is an index of prosocial attitude. It also corroborates the observations of Cattell (1970) emphasizing a resemblance between this factor and ego strength. The positive association between this trait and prosocial behaviour implies that such people are apt to be more duty bound, preserving and responsible. The inner "categorical imperative" of this essential superego (in psychoanalytic sense) may lead to ego involvement in any task, and therefore be responsible for higher scores on MEII by conscientious respondents.

Superego is the concept established by Freud, which distinguishes between right and wrong, good and bad, and moral - immoral. According to Freud (1930) superego embodies moral, cultural, ideals and restrictions, made up of conscience and ego-ideal. Superego is capable of taking decision but lacks in motivational force. The decision taken by its cannot be rejected, because its rejection may lead to mental conflict and tension. It dominates over ego and id, hence a conscientious person is likely to keep himself away from immoral deed. Due to strong superego such people cannot be dictated, because they work according
to the dictates of their own conscience, hence they may be found to be more conforming, dominated by sense of duty and rule bound. Hence, we may invoke Freud's superego which is supposed to be a source trait of conscientious personality, to explain the finding about the impact of this personality factor on MEII.

**Factor H : Shy vs. Venturesome and Emotional Intelligence**

Table 5.9 in the previous chapter presented results on MEII in relation to Personality Factor H (Shy vs. Venturesome). It presents the mean performance on MEII of high and low sten scores. The t ratio is given in the same Table (t = 5.57 > .01), which is statistically significant at .01 level of significance. Thus, the results support the hypothesis about functionality of personality trait (H) in relation to EI. It is very safe to observe that high scorers on Personality Factor H (Venturesome) are for more emotionally intelligent (79.20 ± 3.46) than those scoring low (Shy) (74.30 ± 3.35) (See Fig. 5.10). The people possessing source trait H- reports to be intensely shy, tormented by an unreasonable sense of inferiority, diffident, restrained, timid, and quick to perceive threat which put contraints on their concern for others. The results express that venturesome people i.e. Ss scoring high on Personality Factor H (H+) were found comparatively more emotionally intelligent because they possess some typical characteristics in them e.g. bold, venturesome, uninhibited, sociable, ready to try to new things, spontaneous and abundant in emotional response. It may be argued that H+ (venturesome) are more other oriented, self aware, and assertive and possess more
stress tolerance. Inspite of these characteristics, they have specific mental attitudes for recognizing and marshalling emotions and hence are more emotionally intelligent.

**Factor I: Tough minded vs. Tender minded and Emotional Intelligence**

Table 5.10 in previous chapter on Results, depicts mean performance on MEII in relation to personality trait-I (Tough minded vs. Tenderminded). The means do not show any marked difference in the performance of two groups. The graphic representation in Fig. 11 also gives the same impression. The respondents obtaining high sten scores on source trait I are apt to be tenderminded, and low sten scorers are liable to be toughminded. It is evident from 5.10 that toughminded and tenderminded respondents have scored 66.20 ± 3.83 and 65.30 ± 3.59 mean scores respectively indicating no marked difference in emotional intelligence of toughminded and tenderminded undergraduate. The obtained t ratio (t = .93 < .05) was found statistically insignificant. It may be concluded without any hesitation that source trait I has insignificant impact on emotional intelligence of respondents. No doubt, tough-minded people are self reliant, realistic and independent but skeptical of subjective cultural elaborations. At times, they are unmoved, hard, cynical, and smug. So they are less likely to be emotionally intelligent, because of their typical characteristics. Similarly, high scorers on this source trait are apt to be tenderminded, soft hearted, day dreaming, artistic, faminine and fastidious. Sometimes they are demanding of help,
impatient, impractical and dependent. A person needs attention of others, is demanding and dependent, can not be expected to employ emotional knowledge and recognize the relationship among emotions and transitions from one emotion to another. Common sense says that he will be more self-centered, hence any behaviour relating to emotional perception, emotional facilitation of thought, emotional understanding and emotional management from him would be inconsistent with his very nature and type. It means toughness and tenderness is dependent on enviroment and culture. Thus, we may argue that in our culture this source trait of Cattell’s 16 P.F. test i.e. tough minded and tender minded is not relevant in relation to emotional intelligence.

**Personality Factor L : Trusting vs. Suspicious and Emotional Intelligence**

The mean performance of Trusting and Suspicious respondents on MEII was presented in Table-5.11. The mean of Trusting respondents (M = 78.60 ± 3.34) is very slightly different from the mean of suspicious (M = 73.50 ± 3.86) respondents. The same is evident from the perusal of bargraph in Fig. 5.12. The obtained t value (t = 5.48 > .01) has also been given in the above referred table, which is statistically significant. It may safely be concluded, that this source trait L is also related with emotional intelligence.

The persons who score high on this factor (suspicious) tend to be mistrusting, doubtful about everything and everybody distrustful, self-opinionated,
unconnected with other people does not influence their emotional management competencies because "Projection and inner tension" is the essence of this pattern. Therefore, they are apt to depend heavily on defence mechanism -- projection and protension which may have an important role in paranoia (Cattell, Tarbo & Komlos, 1964, 1965). That is why they were found less emotionally intelligent. On the other hand, respondents belonging to low pole of the factor - Trusting tends to be free of jealous tendencies, adeptable, cheerful, uncompetetive, concerned about other people and a good team worker. That is why respondents belonging to Trusting group were found more emotionally intelligent.

**Personality Factor M: Practical vs. Imaginative and Emotional Intelligence**

Results in Table 5.12 of the previous chapter shows mean performance of Practical and Imaginative respondents which is $76.60 \pm 3.45$ and $75.50 \pm .10$ respectively. There is a slight difference between them. The computed $t$ value $= 1.26$, which is statistically nonsignificant. The graphic representation in Fig. 5.13 also provides the same impression. On the basis of results and its graphic representation it is not difficult to observe that this source trait had no significant impact on EI of the two groups. In other words, the EI scores remained unaffected whether the group of respondents. A brief description of the characteristics of low and high sten scorers on personality Factor M will shed some
light over the obtained results which are nonsignificant in relation to their performance on MEII.

Persons obtaining low scores on this trait tend to be anxious to do the right things, and are concerned over details but mostly unimaginative and careful. Such characteristics may inhibit their concern for others. On the other side, persons who score high tend to be unconventional, absent minded, wrapped up in inner urgencies, and unconcerned about every day matters and incidents. They are bohemians, self motivated, creative and oblivious of particular persons and physical realities. Such characteristics may also inhibit the development of emotional management capacities. Thus, no significant relationship between EI score and this source trait is not against common sense. The hypothesis is rejected atleast in relation to this particular factor. Thus, it is concluded that neither practical nor imaginative personality trait is a significant determiner of EI of the respondents employed in the present investigation.

**Personality Factor N : Forthright vs. Shrewd and Emotional Intelligence**

The results in Table 5.13 of the chapter on results depict mean performance on MEII as a function of personality trait N i.e. forthright vs. shrewd. The obtained t value ($t = 1.93 < .05$) is not statistically significant at any respectable level of significance. The results reveal that EI is not significantly related with source
trait N. Although, the shrewed respondents have obtained greater mean score in comparison to forthright respondents but the results can not be relied upon.

The persons scoring low sten score (N-) on this personality trait are apt to be simple, sentimental, natural and spontaneous. On the other hand, high sten scorers on this factor (N+) are likely to be polished, shrewd, calculating, cunning and possibly insecure. These characteristics of forthright and shrewed respondents make no significant difference in emotional intelligence. The bargraph in Fig. 5.14 too depicts the superiority of shrewed respondents over the forthright ones in relation to their EI (upadhyaya 2008). Meaning thereby that the characteristics of forth right and shrewed respondents may not make any significant difference in their ability to identify, use, understand and manage emotions.

**Personality Factor O : Placid vs. Apprehensive and Emotional Intelligence**

Table 5.14 in the section of results presented the results on MEII of low and high sten scorers on source trait O. The mean performance of low scorers-Placid (M = 77.20 ± 3.86) is greater than that of high scorers Apprehensive (M = 73.40 ± 3.47) on personality factor O. The difference in means is significant at .01 level (t = 4.00 > .01). Thus, it is evident beyond any doubt, that source trait O is an important predictor of EI, hence placid persons may be tagged as emotionally intelligent. The same is evident from the graphic representation of the data in Fig.
5.15. Why the placid Ss are more emotionally intelligent than the apprehensive ones.

The placid people (O-) are likely to be more self confident, self assured, mature, unanxious, more confident and capable to deal with things and people in their environment. Hence, it may be argued that the placids are more emotionally intelligent on account of their self confidence, self assurance and capacity to deal with things. On the other side, the high scorers (apprehensive) respondents are apt to be self blaming, anxious worrying, apprehensive, insecure, and troubled, coupled with guilt proneness. That is why they have less social awareness, less self-regulation of emotions and less control over their emotions resulting in decrease in emotional intelligence. Clinically, source trait O is very important, firstly, as one of the largest factor in anxiety, and secondly, as a tendency. The hypothesis in regard to EI in relation to this personality trait is confirmed and therefore, it is observed that placid people are more emotionally intelligent than their apprehensive counter parts.

**Personality Factor Q₁ : Conservatism vs. Radicalism and Emotional Intelligence**

The results in Table 5.15 of the previous chapter on results depicted mean performance of Conservative and Radical respondents on MEII. The respondents obtaining low sten scores on source trait Q₁ are labelled as Conservative, whereas, those obtaining high sten scores are tagged as Radicals.
or experimenting. The mean performance of radicals ($M = 77.20 \pm 3.84$) is greater than those of conservatives ($M = 73.40 \pm 3.89$), which clearly shows a difference in the mean performance of two groups under question at the moment. This mean difference is indicative of the fact that high scorers (Experimenting) on trait $Q_1$ ($Q_1^+$) are far more EI than low scorers ($Q_1^-$) (Conservative). A glance at bargraph in Fig. 5.16 also indicate the same effect.

Thus, our hypothesis about this personality Factor $Q_1$ stands on confirmed, and it is safely concluded that source trait $Q_1$ is a predictor of EI. In other words, Conservative people do have skills of emotional intelligence.

Now the question is that why the experimenting respondents were not found emotionally intelligent? The question may be answered if we consider the characteristics of radical people. The radicals are more experimenting, more well informed, inclined to explore the problems in their surrounding required for emergency intervention such as saving someone skeptical and enquiring regarding ideas, hence less emotionally intelligent. Whereas conservative respondents are more cautious and compromising in regard to new ideas, inclined to go with inclinations and more conservative in religion and politics, that is why, they were found more emotionally competent in recognizing and managing their own feelings, recognise and respond appropriately to the feelings of others, tolerate frustration and concentrate better (Mayer, Caruso, Salovey, Formica & Woolery
1999). The conservative being more well informed are supposed to be more aware of social responsibilities and hence more emotionally intelligent.

**Personality Factor Q<sub>2</sub>: Group dependency vs. Self sufficiency and Emotional Intelligence**

The EI scores obtained as a function of source trait Q<sub>2</sub> had been presented in Table 5.16 in the chapter on results. It presents mean performance of two groups (Group Dependent vs Self sufficient) and the t value. The graphic representation of data in Fig. 5.17 shows that group dependent respondents are more emotionally intelligent than those who are self-sufficient. The same is evident from the means. Therefore, it is obvious that this factor Q<sub>2</sub> is a predictor of EI and group dependent respondents may be considered to have more control over the regulations of emotions and management of emotions. The obtained t value \( t = 6.00 > .01 \) is statistically significant at .01 level. It is, therefore, observed that the result is statistically significant and may be trusted upon. The question is why group dependent respondents are more emotionally intelligent?

To explain the above raised question it is proper to peep into the characteristics of two types of people. The group dependant respondents tend to go along with the group, prefers to work and make decisions with other people, likes and depends on social approval and admiration which may enhance their concern for others, and monitor one’s own and other feelings and emotions. Whereas the
person's scoring high on trait $Q_2$, (self sufficient), are temperamentally independent, accustomed to going his own way, making decisions and taking action on his own. In view of their independence and other related characteristics they had been found less emotionally intelligent.

**Personality Factor $Q_3$: Uncontrolled vs. Controlled and Emotional Intelligence**

Results in Table 5.17 of the previous chapter depicted EI scores of low and high scorers on Personality Factor $Q_3$. The results reveal a difference in mean performance of Undisciplined (73.60 ± 3.36) and Controlled (78.50 ± 3.56) respondents. The bargraph depicted in Fig. 5.18 also provides the same impression. The obtained t value ($t = 5.505 > .01$) is statistically significant at .01 level, and shows that the obtained difference in the mean performance can be relied upon. Thus, it may be observed that respondents scoring high on this source trait i.e. controlled ones are relatively more emotionally intelligent than their counterparts tagged as uncontrolled.

It may be explained by reviewing the essential characteristics of the two types of bipolar traits. The controlled respondents have strong control of emotions and general behaviour, are inclined to be socially aware and careful, are apt to possess high strength of self sentiment, strong control of emotions and general behaviour. Further, their strong will power, social awareness, self respect and self esteem, self regard, and desire for social reputation. Possibly, such social
and emotional traits may motivate them to conform to norms. Therefore, controlled respondents were found more satisfied with their social networks and appear to receive more social support.

**Personality Factor Q₄: Relaxed vs. Tense and Emotional Intelligence**

Results in Table 5.18 of the previous chapter showed mean performance on MEII as determined by personality factor Q₄. The mean performance on MEII Scale of Relaxed and Tense groups differed. A glance at graphic representation based on the mean performance of relaxed and respondent also showed the same difference. Person's scoring low on this source trait (Q₄⁻) are labelled as Relaxed while the high scorers (Q₄⁺) are called as Tense. The results in Table 5.18 and the bargraph make it evident that the two groups differ in their mean performance on MEII. The obtained t value (t = .017 < .5) was found statistically insignificant at any respectable level of significance. Meaning thereby that Relaxed respondents were found to have more control over their emotions. They were more satisfied with their social networks and avoid interpersonal arguments and fights.

The main characteristics of relaxed persons, considered important include, low egoistic tension, calm, tropid, over satisfied with environment, and unfrustrated. The over satisfaction with environment may lead them to emotional intelligence in the sense that such characteristics may enhance the level of emotional
intelligence. On the other side, tense respondents are likely to have high ergic tension which shows itself by the individuals being irrationally worried, tense, anxious, and turmoil. But obtained mean score of Relaxed and Tense respondents on MEII was not found statistically significant.

The overall picture that emerges from the above factorwise discussion of personality source traits, it is evident that out of sixteen factors twelve had been found to be significantly related with EI scores, while four had been found to be unrelated. All others had functionality for EI except factors. I (Tough vs. Tenderminded), M (Practical vs. Imaginative), N (Forthright vs. Shrewed) and Q₄ (Relaxed vs. Tense). Thus, from the total impression about EI as related to personality traits, it is observed that personality may be considered as a significant determinant of EI of late adolescent respondents. Keeping in view that twelve out of sixteen personality factors predicted emotionally intelligent orientation, we may add that our hypothesis about relationship between EI and personality traits stands verified to a large extent.

Social Maturity and Emotional Intelligence

Hypothesis-2

It was hypothesized that different levels of social maturity would cause differences in emotional intelligence of respondents.
The second major problem that was subjected to empirical investigation in the thesis was to find out the functional relationship between level of social maturity and emotional intelligence variables. It was hypothesized that there would be significant difference in the EI scores of respondents belonging to different levels of social maturity groups. The results obtained from the present investigation are of great value that permits us to answer the question which are basic to the nature of emotional intelligence variable. Table 5.19 in the Chapter of results present data of mean performance of two groups namely - Above Average and Below Average Social Maturity groups, the obtained total mean values on MEII were found 78.60 ± 3.56 and 73.50 ± 3.89 respectively. It was found that respondents of above Average group have scored comparatively higher total mean scores (M = 78.60 ± 3.56) than the respondents of Below Average group (M = 73.50 ± 3.89) on Social Maturity Scale. Meaning thereby that the respondents of Above Average Social Maturity group were found comparatively more emotionally intelligent than the respondents of Below Average Social Maturity group (See. Fig. 20). The obtained t-ratio was also found statistically significant. Thus, obtained data is confirming the hypothesis.

Our purpose was to examine the influence of level of social maturity on emotional intelligence of undergraduate respondents. A close inspection of Table 5.19 clearly evinces that the independent variables e.g. level of social maturity is factor of paramount importance because obtained t-ratio (t = 5.08 > .01)
was also found statistically significant. In this way, it can be safely concluded that level of social maturity variable is playing significant role causing differential effects on emotional intelligence of undergraduate respondents. This investigation support the hypothesis that level of social maturity variable was found an important factor causing different amount of emotional intelligence among respondents. Social maturity means knowing what to do and striving for it by following role models to reach the desired level of acceptable social behaviour. Social maturity is a long process to be socially mature. Students should be exposed to those people who are socially mature so they can pattern his behaviour accordingly. The students can try to reach the expectation of social system, parents, teachers, siblings and peers who matter to them.

Now the question arises why the respondents belonging to Above Average Social Maturity Group have scored higher scores on MEII in compassion to Below Average Social Maturity Group. The respondents belonging to Above Average Social Maturity Group were found capable in modifying their behaviour in terms of asserting his independence and seeking aid or relief in the socio-cultural context, acquire self control at coming up the expectations of the society, mobilizes the resources to overcome stresses, aware about their roles during the process of their social growth, and live up expectations of the society in which they live, No doubt, the behaviour of the individual depends upon maturation. Maturation is also helpful in the process of social adjustment. The socialization plays an important
role in social maturation, social learning and social adjustment. Much of the behaviour of individual determined by the process of socialization. Psychologists (Redmond 1998; McNichol, Williame, Alam & McAndrew 1973; Peterson, Slaughter & Paynter 2007) concluded that social maturity deals with learning to properly relate to acquaintances, friends and intimate relationships. It also involves how to honour and respect those in authority; civil, parental, employer of spiritual. Inspite of these characteristics of socially mature persons, they respect their peers and their emotions, against forming cliques and dislike bullying (Pettit, Lsaird, Dodge, Bates & Criss 2001). That is why respondents belonging to Above Average Social Maturity Group were found more satisfied with their lives because they know and manage their emotions, they recognize emotions among others, they understand the causes of feelings, they recognize the differences between feelings and actions, they possess better ability to express anger appropriated without fighting, they possess more positive feelings about self, school and family, feel better at handling stress, feel less lonliness and less social anxiety, better able to focus on the task at hand, and pay attention, less impulsive and possess more emotional control, able to analyze and understand relationships, more assertive and skilled at communicating, were more popular, outgoing, considerate, prosocial, sharing, cooperative, helpful, and democratic, that is why, they were more emotionally intelligent. In this case, it would not be out of place to mention that happiness shifts its meaning as the level of social maturity increases. In sum,
results from this study indicate that social maturity makes an important contribution to emotional intelligence.
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