Chapter-7

Summary and Conclusion
SUMMARY & CONCLUSION

This chapter deals with the summary of the present study as well as the conclusion. It may be mentioned here that the present study tapped psycho-ecological deprivation as the independent variable and the group of dependent variables included personality - (big five) and emotional intelligence.

Thus, attempts were made to see the differential effects of psycho-ecological deprivation, if any, on personality (Big Five) and emotional intelligence.

Objectives of the study

The objectives of the presented are stated as under:

(i) To ascertain the effects of psycho-ecological deprivation on personality factors.

(ii) To assess the effects of psycho-ecological deprivation on emotional intelligence.

(iii) To assess the effects of social context (domicile) and gender on personality.

(iv) To evaluate the effects of social context (domicile) gender on emotional intelligence.
Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were examined in the present study:

(1) Variation in psycho-ecological deprivation would influence extraversion differently.

(2) Psycho-ecological deprivation would influence neuroticism differently.

(3) Psycho-ecological deprivation would influence openeness to experience differentially.

(4) Psycho-ecological deprivation would influence agreeableness differentially.

(5) Psycho-ecological deprivation would influence conscientiousness differentially.

(6) Psycho-ecological deprivation would influence emotional intelligence differentially.

(7) The rural and urban Ss would differ significantly in personality traits (big five).

(8) The rural and urban Ss would differ significantly in emotional intelligence.

(9) The male and female Ss would differ significantly in big five personality traits.

(10) The male and female Ss would differ significantly in emotional intelligence.
Sample

The sample of the present study was constituted from 500 higher secondary students belonging to rural and urban areas. It consisted of both, male and female respondents.

Tools

The following tools were used in the present study:

(1) PD Scale

This scale was used to ascertain the level of psycho-ecological deprivation in the respondents. It is developed by Mishra and Tripathi (1971). It consists of 96 items. Norms for the present purpose were developed by the researcher to classify the sample into High, Moderate and Low psycho-ecological deprivation groups.

(2) Big Five Scale

The personality of the subjects was assessed with Hindi version of Big Five personality scale McCrae and Costa (1990). Its Hindi version prepared by Singh (2004) was used. It consists of 50 items.

(3) Emotional Intelligence Scale

The El scale developed by Ankur et.al. (2001). It consists of 34 items.
The reliability and validity of the above scales have been reported to be high.

Conclusion

The findings in general demonstrate the differential effects of psycho-ecological deprivation on the selected aspects of behaviour, viz. big five personality factors and emotional intelligence. Results in brief are summarized as under:

Section-1

Psycho-ecological deprivation and Personality

The three psycho-ecological deprivation (PED) groups were compared on the scales of extraversion, conscientiousness, agreeableness and openness to experience. Results are presented briefly as under:

(i) Although F-Ratio was found to be significant for the dimension of extraversion, and the t-ratios between HPED Vs. MPED, HPED Vs. LPED were found to be significant, but MPED Vs. LPED were not found to be significant.

(ii) F-Ratio was not found to be significant for the dimension of neuroticism.

(iii) F-Ratio was not found to be significant for the dimension in Agreeableness.
(iv) F-Ratio was not found to be significant for the dimension of conscientiousness, but the t-Ratios between HPED Vs. MPED were not found to be significant, HPED Vs. LPED were found to be significant, MPED Vs. LPED were not found to be significant.

(v) F-Ratio was found to be significant for the dimension of openness to experience, and the t-Ratios between High Psycho-ecological deprivation Vs. Middle Psycho-ecological deprivation were found to be significant. High Psycho-ecological Deprivation Vs. Low Psycho-ecological Deprivation, Moderate Psycho-ecological Deprivation Vs. Low Psycho-ecological Deprivation were not found to be significant.

Hence, the proposed hypothesis is accepted with some reservation. Briefly stated, greater the degree of deprivation, higher its interfering effects on personality.

Section-II
Psycho-ecological Deprivation and Emotional Intelligence

As regards the differential effects of psycho-ecological deprivation (PED) on Emotional Intelligence, findings in general approve the assumption that prolonged...
psycho-ecological deprivation is an important correlate of Emotional Intelligence. The Three Psycho-ecological Deprivation groups have been found to differ significantly on the scales of A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J.

(i) F-Ratio was found to be significant on the scale A and the t-Ratio between High Psycho-ecological deprivation Vs. Middle Psycho-ecological deprivation, high psycho-ecological deprivation Vs. low psycho-ecological deprivation, moderate psycho-ecological deprivation Vs. low psycho-ecological deprivation were found to be significant.

(ii) F-Ratio was found to be significant on the scale B at .05 level. This suggests that the difference between the scores of three psycho-ecological deprivation groups is real, not the function of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is therefore, accepted.

(iii) F-Ratio was found to be significant for the dimensions of scale C, but the t-Ratio between High Psycho-ecological Deprivation Vs. Middle Psycho-ecological deprivation was not found to be significant, High Psycho-ecological deprivation Vs. Low Psycho-ecological deprivation were found to be significant, Middle Psycho-ecological deprivation is an important correlate of Emotional Intelligence. The Three Psycho-ecological Deprivation groups have been found to differ significantly on the scales of A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J.
deprivation Vs. Low Psycho-ecological deprivation were found to be significant.

(iv) The three psycho-ecological deprivation group have been found to differ significantly on the scale D. F-Ratio was found to be significant.

(v) The three psycho-ecological deprivation group have been found to differ significantly on the scale E. F-Ratio has been found to be significant.

(vi) The three psycho-ecological deprived group have not been found to differ on the scale F. F-Ratio was not found to be significant.

(vii) The three psycho-ecological deprived group have been found to differ significantly on the scale G. F-Ratio has been found to be significant, and t-ratios between HPED Vs. MPED and MPED Vs. LPED are significant while t-ratio between HPED Vs. LPED is not significant.

(viii) The three psycho-ecological deprived group have been found to differ on the scale H. F-Ratio has been found to be significant at .01 level and t-ratio between HPED Vs. MPED, HPED Vs. LPED were found to be significant but MPED Vs. LPED was not found to be significant.
(ix) The three psycho-ecological deprivation groups were not found to differ on the scale I. F-Ratio found is significant.

(x) The three psycho-ecological deprivation group have been found to differ on the scale J. F-Ratio is significant at .05 level. The t-ratio between HPED Vs. LPED, MPED Vs. LPED were found to be significant but HPED Vs. MPED was not found to be significant. This suggests that the difference between the scores of three psycho-ecological deprivation groups is real to a great extent, not the function of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is, therefore, accepted but with some exceptions.

Section-III

Social Context and Personality (Big Five)

(i) A comparison of rural and urban subject shows that there is higher tendency of extraversion among Rural subject as compared to their urban counterpart. The CR is significant .01 level, which suggests that difference between the two groups is real, not the function of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is therefore accepted.
(ii) There is higher tendency of neuroticism among Rural subject as compared to their urban counterpart. But, the CR is not significant which suggest that difference between the two groups is not real. The proposed hypothesis is therefore rejected.

(iii) A comparison of rural and urban subject shows that there is higher tendency of Agreeableness among Rural subject as compared to Urban counterpart. That CR is significant .01 level, which suggest that difference between the two groups real, not the function of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is therefore accepted.

(iv) There is higher tendency of conscientiousness among Rural subject as compared to their urban counterpart. The CR is significant .01 level, which suggest that difference between the two groups real, not the function of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is therefore accepted.

(v) A comparison of rural and urban subject shows that there is higher tendency of openness to experience among Rural subject as compared to Urban counterpart. The CR is significant .01 level, which suggest that difference between the two groups real,
not the function of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is therefore accepted.

Section-IV

Social Context and Emotional Intelligence

(i) On factor A of emotional intelligence both groups have scored more or less mean groups is the lower than the urban groups. The CR value is not significant. It means that the difference between the two groups is not real, i.e., the function of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is, therefore, rejected.

(ii) A comparison of rural and urban groups on factor B of emotional intelligence shows that both groups have scored rural mean value is higher than the urban groups. The CR value is significant .01 level, which suggest that difference between the two groups real, not the function of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is therefore accepted.

(iii) On factor C of emotional intelligence shows that both groups have scored lower than the urban groups. But, the CR value is not significant. It means that the difference between the two groups is not real, i.e., the function of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is, therefore, rejected.
(iv) A comparison of rural and urban groups on factor D of emotional intelligence shows that the CR value is significant .01 level, the two groups real, not the function of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is, therefore, accepted.

(v) A comparison of rural and urban groups on factor E of emotional intelligence shows that rural mean groups is lower than the urban groups. The CR value is significant .01 level, the two groups real, not the function of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is, therefore, accepted.

(vi) A comparison of rural and urban groups on factor F of emotional intelligence shows that rural mean groups is lower than the urban groups. The CR value is significant .01 level, the two groups real, not the function of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is, therefore, accepted.

(vii) As regards, on factor G of emotional intelligence shows that both groups have scored similar mean values. The CR value is not significant. It means that the difference between the two groups is not real, i.e., the function of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is, therefore, rejected.
(viii) On factor H of emotional intelligence shows that the CR value is not significant. It means that the difference between the two groups is not real, i.e., the function of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is, therefore, rejected.

(ix) A comparison of rural and urban groups on factor I of emotional intelligence shows that the CR value is significant .01 level difference between the two groups real, not the function of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is, therefore, accepted.

(x) A comparison of rural and urban groups on factor J of emotional intelligence shows that the CR value is significant .01 level, the difference between the two groups is real, not the function of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is therefore accepted.

Section-V

Gender and Personality (Big Five)

i) A comparison of male and female subjects shows that there is higher tendency of extraversion among male subjects as compared to their female counterpart. The CR is significant at .01 level, which suggest that difference between the two groups is real, not the
function of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is therefore accepted.

ii) There is higher tendency of neuroticism among male subjects as compared to their female counterparts the CR is significant at .01 level, which suggests that difference between the two groups is real, not the function of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is therefore accepted.

iii) A comparison of male and female subjects shows that there is higher tendency of agreeableness among male subject as compared to their female counterpart. The CR is significant, which suggests that difference between the two groups is real. The proposed hypothesis is accepted.

iv) It has been found that there is higher tendency of conscientiousness among the male subjects as compared to their female counterpart. The CR is significant at .01 level, which suggests that difference between the two groups is real, not attributable to chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is, therefore, accepted.

v) The results also reveal that there is higher tendency of openers to experience among male subjects as
compared to female counterpart. The CR is not significant, which suggests that difference between the two groups is not real. The proposed hypothesis is therefore rejected.

Section-VI

Gender and Emotional Intelligence

i) Their comparison on factor A of emotional intelligence shows that both groups have scored similar mean values. The CR value is not significant. It means that the difference between the two groups is not real, i.e., the function of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is, therefore, rejected.

ii) As regards on factor B of emotional intelligence male groups is higher than the female groups. The CR value is significant .01 level, which suggest that difference between the two groups real, not the functions of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is, therefore, accepted.

iii) When compared on factor C of emotional intelligence male's mean values was found to be high than the female's mean values. But CR value is not significant. It means that the difference between the two groups
is not real, i.e., the function of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is, therefore, rejected.

iv) Male and female groups differ on factor D of emotional intelligence. Mean of female group is the lower than the male group. The CR value is significant .01 level, which suggest that difference between the two groups real, not the function of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis, is therefore, accepted.

v) A comparison of male and female groups on factor E of emotional intelligence shows that male's mean values is higher than the female's values. The CR value is significant .01 level, which suggest that difference between the two groups real, not the function of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is, therefore, accepted.

vi) Their comparison on factor F of emotional intelligence shows that mean of male group is the lower than the female group. The CR value is significant .01 level, which suggest that difference between the two groups real, not the function of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is, therefore, accepted.
vii) On factor G of emotional intelligence both groups have scored similar mean values have been found. The CR value is not significant. It means that the difference between the two groups is not real, i.e., the function of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is, therefore, rejected.

viii) As regards their position on factor H of emotional intelligence male group scored higher mean values than the female group. But CR value is not significant. It means that the difference between the two groups is not real, i.e., the function of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is, therefore, rejected.

ix) A comparison of male and female groups on factor I of emotional intelligence shows that both groups have scored similar mean values. The CR value is not significant. It means that the difference between the two groups is not real, i.e., the function of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is, therefore, rejected.

x) A comparison of male and female groups on factor J of emotional intelligence shows that male mean values is lower than the female values. The CR value is
significant .01 level, which suggest that difference between the two groups real, not the function of chance variable. The proposed hypothesis is therefore accepted.

Findings in Brief

Findings of the present study are summaries as under:

i) The differential effects of psycho-ecological deprivation have been obtained for extraversion, conscientiousness and openness to experience but not for the dimensions of neuroticism and agreeableness.

ii) As regards the differential effects of psycho-ecological deprivation on emotional intelligence, such effects were obtained for factors A, B, C, D, E, H, I, J but not for the factors F and G.

iii) The rural and urban respondents were found to differ significantly on all but one dimension - neuroticism.

iv) As regards as the effects of social context on emotional intelligence a mixed bag of results has been obtained.

v) The male and female respondents were found to differ significantly on the dimensions of extraversion,
neuroticism, conscientiousness but not on the dimensions of agreeableness and openness to experience.

vi) The differential effects of gender was obtained for the factors B, D, E, F, H and J of emotional intelligence while such effects were not obtained for remaining four factors.