Chapter- 1

Introduction
INTRODUCTION

The outcomes in the life of individuals are said to be the result of an interaction between the person and environment. The Environment may be favourable or unfavourable. It means the environment in which the individuals operate may be poor or rich from the point of view of providing required opportunities and resources for the proper development of the man. Thus, the environmental conditions happen to be the vital factors in determining the behavioural outcomes of the individuals. That is why psychologists have been focussing on the role played by environmental factors in human development and have also been offering valuable suggestions to identify the factors which inhibit it and also the factors which promote to develop desirable personality characteristics and achieve desired goals of life.

So, if an individuals is deprived of proper opportunities of learning and interaction he is bound to lag behind from the individual, enjoying favourable environmental background. This means that variation in degree of deprivation will cause variation in behavioural outcomes also. Several researchers
have demonstrated it in their studies, but there is a general lack of studies tapping behavioural outcomes of the prolonged psycho-ecological deprivation as scheduled to be ascertained in the present study.

In view of this, the present study aimed to ascertain some behavioural outcomes of psycho-ecological deprivation, as personality and emotional intelligence.

The psycho-ecological deprivation is conceived as a global concept embracing all possible aspects and sources of experiences in human life be it social, psychological or facilities. It may be viewed as a total experimental input an individual has received during his life time (Mishra and Tripathi, 1971). Problem of psycho-ecological deprivation arises when the individuals are dispossessed of objects, affection and various types of opportunities for their proper development. Such circumstances exert unfavourable effects on the individuals and are said to be detrimental for the well-being of people (Sinha, 1977).

The term personality is defined as the dynamic organization within the individual of those psycho-physical characteristics that determine his unique adjustment to the situation (Allport, 1948). It is a well research concept, but it still needs much more scientifically planned studies to understand it more thoroughly from the point of view of psycho-ecological deprivation (PED) McCre and Costa
(1987) have proposed a model known as 'Big Five Model' of Personality. It includes neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. These factors have been studied in the present in relation to psycho-ecological deprivation.

The other factor tapped in the present is emotional intelligence. According to Golman (1995) emotional intelligence, is defined as a cluster of traits or abilities relating to the emotional side of life - abilities such as recognizing and managing one's own emotions, being able to motivate oneself and restrain one's impulses, recognizing and managing other's emotions, and handling interpersonal relationships in an effective manner. Lack of such skills exerts adverse impact and results in unhappiness and inability to form positive relationships (Mayor et al. 1999; Peterson & Brown, 2002; Sudarshan & Kumar, 2002). Salvoey & Mayor (1990) has also done good work on it. His view of emotional intelligence includes five characteristics of self-moods, motivation, empathy and social skills like cooperation and leadership.

Freud (1938) was of the view that early experiences of the life work as the foundation stone upon which the later part of life is dependent. Actually, Freud presented a good theorization on derivation. But, however, it was Hebb (1949) who offered experimental evidences showing the role
of deprivation in human life and concluded that deficient environmental situations cause unfavourability which leads to poor behavioural performances (also, Spetz, 1946; Backwin, 1942; Skeels et. al., 1938; Mishra & Tripathi, 1980). These evidences are just the glimpses of works on various types of deprivation and its behavioural consequences.

Not only early scholars have concentrated on it, modern scholars have also conducted studies in order to examine the relationship between various types of deprivation such as psychological, ecological, social, cultural and so on and its effects on behaviour and personality etc. (Kumari, 1993; Mehata, 1995; Archana, 1998).

If a child is deprived of psycho-ecological favourability for learning and development he or she is bound to pay high human cost leading to backwardness in different spheres of life, while they are not really responsible for it. The social system should really be held responsible for their psycho-educational backwardness and deficiencies. The backwardness and deficiencies cause numerous types of behavioural problems which impair personality development and lower emotional competence.

There may be a number of factors which can cause psycho-ecological deprivation leading to various types of deficiencies and behavioural problems. Many studies in Britain, U.S.A. and elsewhere have found that there are
much higher rate of schizophrenia, depression, alcoholism, drug addition and crime among the working classes. Middle class people, on other hand are more prone to anxiety disorders and psychotic affective disorder (Dohrenwend, 1975; Brown & Harries, 1978; Gurin, Veroff and Feld, S. 1960) have also reported class differences in ways of coping with worries and unhappy periods. Though these studies were conducted on the working class respondents and thus are not directly related with the present study, yet they provide indirect support to the assumption that psycho-ecological contexts of life, no doubt, play very important role in the psychological well-being of the individuals.

The Survey of Literature reveals that this area of research has not received the attention it actually deserves. In other words, not very many studies have been done on the dependent variables as tapped in the present study in relation to psycho-ecological deprivation. The number of such studies is very limited and the studies which are available, they suffer from methodological deficiencies of one or the other type. The scarcity of related studies and the limitations inherent in them restrain us from offering sound and valid conclusions regarding the effects of psycho-ecological deprivation on the behavioural outcomes as tapped in the present study, i.e., personality (big five) and emotional intelligence. Because of it, that there are a number of moot questions in this area of
research which need proper clarification. However some assumptions regarding the differential effects of psycho-ecological deprivation can be put forward. For example, it can be assumed that variations in personality and emotional intelligence may be caused by psycho-ecological deprivation.

Keeping in view the present state of knowledge regarding the effects of psycho-ecological deprivation on the tapped dependent variables, the present study in no doubt is highly relevant as it is expected to yield fruitful findings to answer the various moot questions still existing in this area of research. It covers psycho-ecological deprivation as the independent variable, differential effects, if any, of it were assessed on personality (big five) and emotional intelligence.

Concepts of the Study

Present study taps psycho-ecological deprivation as the independent variable and personality and emotional intelligence are covered as the dependent variables. These concepts need to be clarified in this context.

Independent Variable

Psycho-ecological Deprivation

Truely speaking deprivation is an umbrella term. It would be better to describe the term 'deprivation' before talking about the psycho-ecological deprivation. The term 'deprivation' has been used in a variety of ways which at
times denote different processes and procedures. Through widely used, the term has not yet acquired specificity in meaning and operations (Mishra and Tripathi 1980).

From etiological point of view, the term 'deprivation' stems from the verb "to deprive" which means to dispossess (a person or an object), and it implies a "felt loss". It is apparent that deprivation stands for certain deficiencies in the environment, which are not only there but they are also experienced as such by the individual (Sinha, 1977).

In psychological literature, however, deprivation has been frequently used as an explanatory construct as well as an empirical variable to account for a variety of behavioural characteristics observed in controlled laboratory studies as well as studies in natural settings. In such proliferous studies, the term 'deprivation' has come to acquire a variety of meanings.

For example, it has been extensively used by animal psychologists as a source of motivation. After Watson (1914), behaviouristictally oriented psychologists became more interested in objectification of behavioural studies and used animal behaviour as the basis of their theorization (e.g., Hull, 1943; Tolman, 1932). They have frequently used food and water deprivation and also sex deprivation as a procedure to motivate or arouse the animal for subsequent learning.
Deprivation has been also used to refer to a variety of experiential operation in which organisms are subjected to some kind of reduction in sensory input or motor output or both. This procedure has been variously designated as sensory or perceptual deprivation or motor deprivation etc. Still another type of deprivation is found in natural life conditions where we come across a number of experiential dimensions along which members of society are scattered and enjoy different types and amounts of experiences.

**Psycho-ecological Deprivation**

In fact, term deprivation has often been employed interchangeably with other term such as cultural deprivation (Kogan, 1970; Wight et. al. 1970; Rath U. Dash, 1972), educational deprivation (Getzels, 1969), social deprivation (Rankin, 1970; Tulkin, 1972) Parental or Maternal Deprivation (Yarrow, 1961), Economic Deprivation (Symmads, 1968), affective deprivation (Gerwintz, 1961), Psychological deprivation (Langmeier, 1972), Relative deprivation (Crosby, 1976), Cognitive Deprivation (Green et.al., 1967), Medical Deprivation (Suchman, 1967), disadvantage (Havighurst, 1964; Gordan, 1968), Emotional Deprivation (Stott, 1974), Environmental Deprivation (Deutsch, 1965), Inequality (Miller et. al., 1967), Social Pathology (Coleman, 1971), and social disadvantage (Sinha, 1976; Singh, 1976). Any of these...
terms could, with various degrees of precision, be used to denote 'deprivation'. These terms have labeled a large area of behavioural and social interest and represent negative conditions which impose severe restrictions on availability of resources and psycho-social opportunities essential for proper development. Thus, these references clearly indicate that deprivation is multidimensional i.e. psychological, social, cultural, environmental and so on.

In view of the above, the psycho-ecological deprivation can be defined as the failure to get an opportunity to have the experiences required for adequate development of the semi-autonomous, central processes demanded for acquiring skill in cognitive processes" (Hunt, 1964). For Riessman (1962), the family of the culturally deprived child is traditional, patriarchal, superstitious and alienated. Gordon (1965) has stated that terms such as "socio-economic deprivation", "socially disadvantaged", and "culturally alienated" reflect concern with deficiencies in the stimulus conditions of the childhood. Whiteman and Deutsch (1968) have considered psycho-social deprivation as a relative term referring exclusively to specific types of environmental factors. Any environmental factor, according to them, may be considered deprivational if that factor is associated with certain social grouping such as, SES and race, and parental
separation when the environmental variable under consideration with impaired performance.

According to Hess and Shipman (1965), "the behaviour leading to psycho-ecological deprivation is socialized in early childhood, the main quality involved in the effect of this deprivation is a lack of cognitive meaning. In mother-child communication system, and the growth of cognitive processes is fostered in family control system. Imposing restrictions on number and kind of alternatives for action and thought available for the child is certainly detrimental to development and achievements.

Some scholars have discussed the terms 'Privation' and 'Deprivation' in a developmental context and has stated that privation means paucity of all or particular classes of stimuli through lengthy time span, usually early in life at the very time when available stimuli support basic learning. On the other hand, deprivation refers to conditions involving gross shifts in the maintaining environmental situations, both long and short term, brought about by the removal, or decreased availability of stimuli that had become functionally significant for key behaviour system of the child. These conditions include -

(i) reduction in the accustomed level of stimulation,
(ii) changes in the quality or patterning of stimulation,
(iii) removal of the contextual condition that can enhance efficiency of key stimuli, and
(iv) direct interference with responses controlled by such stimuli.

Tannebaum (1969) has concluded that "social deprivation may be characterised as a condition in which particular external and internal factor merge to narrow a person's behavioural alternatives for achieving self fulfillment".

David Bores (cited by Spurlock, 1970) has viewed social deprivation as "experience where in an individual is deprived of the opportunity to develop his capacities to work, to provide for his needs and enjoy the facilities of life". Weight et. al. (1970) have argued that 'cultural deprivation must account for deficiencies, both in experience and in the conditions of learning. Nurcombe (1970) has stated that it refers to a dispossession or loss of privileges, opportunities, material goods and the like. It may occur with reference to three interrelated sets of basic needs physical, psychological and socio-cultural." Longmeier (1972) has viewed it as a general phenomenon and defines "insufficient satisfaction of basic needs for a prolonged period". In his conceptualization he has emphasized four things, i.e., lack of stimulation, lack of cognitive structure, lack of specific attachment, and lack of individualization. These dimensions
combined together are termed as psycho-ecological deprivation.

Many other scholars have also done good work on it. Sinha (1977) has suggested on ecological model of deprivation. The upper and the more visible layer of this ecological model contains home, school, per group etc. each providing three dimensions - physical space and materials, roles and relationships, and activities.

Lewis (1996) has proposed the concept of "culture of poverty". He argues that the culture of poverty is different from the culture of affluence and to adopt to the harsh realities of life, the poor protects himself with a philosophy of life which is characterised by fatalism, impulsiveness, present time orientation, inability to delay gratification, concrete as opposed to subtract thinking, inferiority, aggression, and authoritarianism. However, Feather (1974), Davidson and Gaitz (1974), Cowared et. al. (1974), and Billings (1974) have gathered evidence from different countries and have criticized the view that the individual causes his own poverty and is fully responsible for his socio-economic conditions. It seems more reasonable and plausible to assume that poverty causes the observed behaviour rather than the opposite (Allen, 1970). It is apparent from the close perusal of the foregoing definitions and characterizations
of various deprivations that this term has been used in several ways and with different meanings.

Modern scholars opine that deprivation has to be defined in relation to experiences derived from environment confining or reducing it to membership of class, caste and culture, lead to not only misconceiving of the problem but also to erroneous conclusions. As a matter of fact, they constrain our approach in understanding and analyzing the actual experiences as antecedents of psychological functions. The exact meaning of these terms is not clear and various investigators have used them in different ways. Apart from this, the psychological status of these variables or terms as explanatory constructs is unestablished. The notion that what an individual is, is only due to the incident that he is born in particular caste or class or culture denies the fundamental assumption of organismic functioning that man's phenotypical manifestations are largely results of his experiences derived from his environment. It needs no emphasis to state that at the time of birth man is only an organism having capacity of undifferentiated responses. The transformation of this helpless individual into well adjusted, competent individual is the outcome of his learned responses. The learning process involves responses to environmental stimuli. So the experiences derived from these environmental stimuli work as prime determinants of the psychological status of a mature...
individual. It is an undeniable fact that differences in SES or culture or ethnic groups are frequently reflected in psychological functions. But such differences cannot be adequately explained as functions of these variables. It is needless to say that various types of psycho-ecological deprivations lead to behavioural deficiencies and backwardness in achievement. The effects of such variables, therefore, need to be ascertained from the point of views of personality and emotional intelligence. This area of research is relatively less explored.

**Dependent Variables**

There are two dependent variables in the present study, namely Personality (Big Five) and Emotional Intelligence.

**PERSONALITY**

As we know personality happens to be one of the most fascinating as well as researched concepts in psychology. It has been defined by a number of scholars but these is little agreement among the scholars about its nature. In general, personality may be taken to be an individual's most striking or dominant characteristic. In that sense, a person may be said to be a 'shy personality' or a 'neurotic personality', meaning that his or her dominant attribute appears to be shyness or neurosis.
More formal definitions of personality by psychologists also show little agreement. Influential personality theorists tell us that personality is:

...... the dynamic organization within the individual of those psycho-physical systems that determine his characteristic behaviour and thought (Allport, 1961)

...... a person's unique pattern of traits.

(Guilford, 1959)

...... the most adequate conceptualization of a person's behaviour in all its detail (McClelland, 1951)

As these examples imply, there may be as many different meaning of the term personality as there are theorists who have tried to define it. Nevertheless, a common theme runs throughout most definitions of personality. 'Personality' usually refers to the distinct patterns of behaviour (including thoughts and emotions) that characterize each individual's adaptation to the situations of his or her life. Each theorist uses the particular concepts and language of his history to carve a particular formulation of personality.

If asked to describe oneself, one would probably mention one or more of his or her traits. Traits are personality elements that are inferred from behaviour and account for behavioural consistency. Freud linked certain traits to his stages of psychosexual development. We use traits to
describe others. If you describe a friend as "shy", it may be because you observed some social anxiety or withdrawal in early meeting. In personality trait theory, traits are assumed to endure, to underlie and account for behaviour in various situations. Similarly, you would probably predict consistent social anxiety and withdrawal for your "shy" friend and might be surprised if he or she acted assertively.

Allport labeled traits according to the role they play in directing the behaviour. In rare cases a traits may be so outstanding and pervasive that it seems to steer practically all aspects of a person's behaviour. Such a powerful trait is a cardinal trait (Allport, 1937).

Central traits define the outstanding characteristics of the person. They are the sort that might be mentioned in a letter of recommendation, such as "well-groomed", "honest" and "hard-working", secondary traits are less influential and less noticeable. Rather than generally guiding the behaviour of the individual, they appear to occur in a small range of situations and govern a limited number of responses. Our total pattern of traits is termed our personality structure.

More than 40 years ago Allport and Odbert (1936) catalogued some 18,000 human traits from a search through word list of the sort found in dictionaries. Some were physical traits, like short, white, and brunette. Other were behavioural traits, like shy and emotional. Still other were
moral traits, like honest. This exhaustive list have served as the basis for personality.

Psychologists like Raymond Cattel (1968) have used statistical techniques to reduce this universe of innumerable traits to smaller lists that show commonality in meaning. Cattel also distinguished between surface traits and source traits. Surface traits describe characteristic ways of behaving like cleanliness, stubbornness, thrift and orderliness. We may have observed that these traits tend to form meaningful patterns that are suggestive of underlying traits (cleanliness, stubbornness, and so on were all referred to as Retentive traits by Freud).

Cattell redesigned the Allport catalogue by removing unusual terms and grouping the remaining traits into 16 central source traits - the underlying traits from which surface traits are derived. Cattell argued that psychological measurement of a person's source traits would enable us to predict his or her behaviour in various situations. Cattell believed that the major work of a personality theorist lay in helping refine the list of source traits.

Many other personality theorists have worked to uncover and define central or source traits. For instance, Edwards (1954) isolated 15 source traits and Gough (1954) identified 10, British Psychologist Hans J. Eysenck (Eysenck & Rachman, 1965) has focused much of his
research on the relationships between two source traits: Introversion-Extraversion and Stability. Instability, otherwise called neuroticism.

Trait theory continues to generate useful psychological research, but may be criticized on several grounds. Trait theory is more descriptive than explanatory. It focuses on describing existing traits rather than tracing their origins or investigating how they may be modified. The "explanations" provided by trait theory have been criticized as circular explanations. Allport argued that traits were neuropsychic structure. Somehow embedded in the person's Nervous System. Critics have argued that Allport failed to specify where and how these traits were embedded. In this sense, traits have no more substance than do Freud's Psychic structure. Still, a number of Psychologist's argue that diverse traits like social, shyness, aggressiveness, and neuroticism vary from person to person in ways that suggest that in born factors play an important role.

A basic assumption of trait theory is that human behaviour tends to be largely consistent from one situation to another. But Reseracher suggest that behaviour varies more from situation to situation at least for some people than trait theory would allow. People who are high in private self-consciousness, who carefully monitor their own behaviour, even when others are not observing them, also try to show
consistent behaviour from situation to situation (Fenigstein and others, 1975; Scheir and others, 1978; Underwood & Moore, 1981). But other people show greater variability in behaviour.

**Big Five Model**

'Big Five' is a new approach to explain personality. It has been much more debated all over the globe (Costa & McCrae, 1994; Zuckerogan, 1994). These traits are as under:

- **Openness** - (inventive / curious vs. cautious / conservative). Appreciation for art, emotion, adventure, unusual ideas, curiosity, and variety of experience.

- **Conscientiousness** - (efficient / organized vs. easy-going / careless). A tendency to show self-discipline, act dutifully, and aim for achievement; planned rather than spontaneous behavior.

- **Extraversion** - (outgoing / energetic vs. shy / withdrawn). Energy, positive emotions, surgency, and the tendency to seek stimulation in the company of others.

- **Agreeableness** - (friendly / compassionate vs. competitive / outspoken). A tendency to be compassionate and cooperative rather than suspicious and antagonistic towards others.
• Neuroticism - (sensitive / nervous vs. secure / confident). A tendency to experience unpleasant emotions easily, such as anger, anxiety, depression, or vulnerability.

The most frequently used measures of the Big Five comprise either items that are self-descriptive sentences (De Fruyt et. al. 2004) or, in the case of lexical measures, items that are single adjectives. (Golderg, L.R. 1992). Due to the length of sentence-based and some lexical measures, short forms have been developed and validated for use in applied research settings where questionnaire space and respondent time are limited, such as the 40-item balanced International English Big-Five Mini-Markers (Thomson, 2008) or a very brief (10 item) measure of the Big Five domains (Gosling et. al. 2003).

Openness to Experience

Openness is a general appreciation for art, emotion, adventure, unusual ideas, imagination, curiosity, and variety of experience. The trait distinguishes imaginative people from down-to-earth, conventional people. People who are open to experience are intellectually curious, appreciative of art, and sensitive to beauty. They tend to be, compared to closed people, more creative and more aware of their feelings. They are more likely to hold unconventional beliefs.
People with low scores on openness tend to have more conventional, traditional interests. They prefer the plain, straightforward, and obvious view over the complex, ambiguous, and subtle. They may regard the arts and sciences with suspicion, regarding these endeavors as uninteresting. Some self-statements pertaining to openness include:

**Sample Openness items**

- I have a rich vocabulary.
- I have a vivid imagination.
- I have excellent ideas.

**Conscientiousness**

Conscientiousness is a tendency to show self-discipline, act dutifully, and aim for achievement. The trait shows a preference for planned rather than spontaneous behavior. It influences the way in which we control, regulate, and direct our impulses. Conscientiousness includes the factor known as Need for Achievement (NAch).

**Sample Conscientiousness items**

- I am always prepared.
- I am exacting in my work.
- I follow a schedule.
- I get chores done right away.
**Extraversion**

Extraversion is characterized by positive emotions, surgency, and the tendency to seek out stimulation and the company of others. The trait is marked by pronounced engagement with the external world. Extraverts enjoy being with people, and are often perceived as full of energy. They tend to be enthusiastic, action-oriented individuals who are likely to say "Yes!" or "Let's go!" to opportunities for excitement. In groups they like to talk, assert themselves, and draw attention to themselves.

Introverts lack the social exuberance and activity levels of extraverts. They tend to seem quiet, low-key, deliberate, and less involved in the social world. Their lack of social involvement should not be interpreted as shyness or depression. Introverts simply need less stimulation than extraverts and remain more time alone. They may be very active and energetic, simply not socially.

**Sample Extraversion items**

- I am the life of the party.
- I don't mind being the center of attention.
- I feel comfortable around people.

**Agreeableness**

Agreeableness is a tendency to be compassionate and cooperative rather than suspicious and antagonistic towards
others. The trait reflects individual differences in general concern for social harmony. Agreeable individuals value getting along with others. They are generally considerate, friendly, generous, helpful, and willing to compromise their interests with others. Agreeable people also have an optimistic view of human nature. They believe people are basically honest, decent, and trustworthy.

Disagreeable individuals place self-interest above getting along with others. They are generally unconcerned with others' well-being, and are less likely to extend themselves for other people. Sometimes their skepticism about others' motives causes them to be suspicious, unfriendly, and uncooperative.

**Sample Agreeableness items**

- I am interested in people.
- I feel others' emotions.
- I have a soft heart.
- I make people feel at ease.
- I sympathize with others' feelings.

**Neuroticism**

Neuroticism is the tendency to experience negative emotions, such as anger, anxiety, or depression. It is sometimes called emotional instability. Those who score high in neuroticism are emotionally reactive and vulnerable to...
stress. They are more likely to interpret ordinary situations as threatening, and minor frustrations as hopelessly difficult. Their negative emotional reactions tend to persist for unusually long periods of time, which means they are often in a bad mood. These problems in emotional regulation can diminish the ability of a person scoring high on neuroticism to think clearly, make decisions, and cope effectively with stress.

At the other end of the scale, individuals who score low on neuroticism are less easily upset and are less emotionally reactive. They tend to be calm, emotionally stable, and free from persistent negative feelings. Freedom from negative feelings does not mean that low scorers experience a lot of positive feelings.

**Sample Neuroticism items**

- I am easily disturbed.
- I change my mood a lot.
- I get irritated easily.
- I get stressed out easily.
- I get upset easily.

**Validity of the Big Five**

In a 1981 symposium in Honolulu, four prominent researchers, Lewis Goldberg, Naomi Takemoto-Chock, Andrew Comrey, and John M. Digman, reviewed the available personality tests of the day. They concluded that
the tests which held the most promise measured a subset of five common factors, just as Norman had discovered in 1963. This event was followed by widespread acceptance of the five factor model among personality researchers during the 1980s. In 1984 Peter Saville and his team included the five-factor "Pentagon" model with the original OPQ. Pentagon was closely followed by the NEO five-factor personality inventory, published by Costa and McCrae in 1985.

One of the most significant advances of the five-factor model was the establishment of a common taxonomy that demonstrates order in a previously scattered and disorganized field. What separates the five-factor model of personality from all others is that it is not based on the theory of any one particular psychologist, but rather on language, the natural system that people use to communicate their understanding of one another.

A number of meta-analyses have confirmed the predictive value of the Big Five across a wide range of behaviors. Saulsman and Page examined the relationships between the Big Five personality dimensions and each of the 10 personality disorder categories in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV). Across 15 independent samples, the researchers found that each disorder displayed a unique and predictable five-factor
profile. The most prominent and consistent personality predictors underlying the disorders were positive associations with Neuroticism and negative associations with Agreeableness (Saulsman et. al. 2004).

In the area of job performance, Barrick and Mount reviewed 117 studies utilizing 162 samples with 23,994 participants. They found that conscientiousness showed consistent relations with all performance criteria for all occupational groups. Extraversion was a valid predictor for occupations involving social interaction (e.g. management and sales). Furthermore, extraversion and openness to experience were valid predictors of training proficiency criteria (Barrick, et. al. 1999; Mount, et. al. 1998).

**Selected scientific findings**

Ever since the 1990s when the consensus of psychologists gradually came to support the Big Five, there has been a growing body of research surrounding these personality traits Robert Hogan's edited book "Handbook of Personality Psychology" (Academic Press, 1997).

All five factors show an influence from both heredity and environment. Twin studies suggest that these effects contribute in roughly equal proportion (Jang, et al., 1996). An analysis of the available studies found overall heritabilities for the Big Five traits as follows (Bouchard, et. al., 2003):
• Openness: 57%
• Conscientiousness: 49%
• Extraversion: 54%
• Agreeableness: 42%
• Neuroticism: 48%

Many studies of longitudinal data, which correlate people's test scores over time, and cross-sectional data, which compare personality levels across different age groups, show a high degree of stability in personality traits during adulthood (McCrae, R.R. & Costa, P.T., 1990). More recent research and meta-analyses of previous studies, however, indicate that change occurs in all five traits at various points in the lifespan. The new research shows evidence for a maturation effect. On average, levels of Agreeableness and Conscientiousness typically increase with time, whereas Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Openness tend to decrease (Srivastava et. al., 2003). In addition to these group effects, there are individual differences: different people demonstrate unique patterns of change at all stages of life (Roberts, et. al., 2008).

Cross-cultural research from 26 nations ($N = 23,031$ subjects) and again in 55 nations ($N = 17,637$ subjects) has shown a universal pattern of sex differences on responses to the Big Five Inventory. Women consistently report higher Neuroticism and Agreeableness, and men often report higher
Extraversion and Conscientiousness. Sex differences in personality traits are larger in prosperous, healthy, and egalitarian cultures in which women have more opportunities that are equal to those of men (Costa, P.T. Jr., & McCrae, R.R., 2001; Schmitt, D.P., Realo, A, Voracek, M., & Allik, J., 2008).

The suggestion has often been made that individuals differ by the order of their births. Frank J. Sulloway argues that birth order is correlated with personality traits. He claims that firstborns are more conscientious, more socially dominant, less agreeable, and less open to new ideas compared to laterborns. However, Sulloway's case has been called into question. One criticism is that his data confounds family size with birth order. Subsequent analyses have shown that birth order effects are only found in studies where the subjects' personality traits are rated by family members (such as siblings or parents) or by acquaintances familiar with the subjects' birth order. Large scale studies using random samples and self-report personality tests like the NEO PI-R have found no significant effect of birth order on personality (Harris, J.R., 2006; Jefferson et. al., 1998).

The Big Five have been replicated in a variety of different languages and cultures, such as German (Ostendorf, F. 1990) and Chinese (Trull et. al., 1997). Thompson has used the Big Five structure across several cultures using an
international English language scale (Thompson, et. al., 2008).

Recent work has found relationships between Geert Hofstede’s cultural factors, Individualism, Power Distance, Masculinity, and Uncertainty Avoidance, with the average Big Five scores (McCrae et. al. 2005). For instance, the degree to which a country values individualism correlates with its average Extraversion, while people living in cultures where there are large inequalities in their power structures tend to score somewhat higher on Conscientiousness. The reasons for these differences are as yet unknown; this is an active area of research.

Criticisms

Much research has been conducted on the Big Five. This has resulted in both criticism (A contrarian view of the five factor approach to Personality description) and support (Solid ground in the wetlands of personality : A reply to Block) for the model. Critics argue that there are limitations to the scope of Big Five as an explanatory or predictive theory. It is argued that the Big Five does not explain all of human personality. The methodology used to identify the dimensional structure of personality traits, factor analysis, is often challenged for not having a universally-recognized basis for choosing among solutions with different numbers of factors. Another frequent criticism is that the Big Five is not
theory-driven. It is merely a data-driven investigation of certain descriptors that tend to cluster together under factor analysis.

One common criticism is that the Big Five does not explain all of human personality. Some psychologists have dissented from the model precisely because they feel it neglects other domains of personality, such as Religiosity, Manipulativeness/Machiavellianism, Honesty, Thriftiness, Conservativeness, Masculinity/Femininity, Snobbishness, Sense of humour, Identity, Self-concept, and Motivation. Correlations have been found between some of these variables and the Big Five, such as the inverse relationship between political conservatism and Openness, (McCrae R.R., 1996) although variation in these traits is not well explained by the Five Factors themselves. McAdams has called the Big Five a "psychology of the stranger," because they refer to traits that are relatively easy to observe in a stranger; other aspects of personality that are more privately held or more context-dependent are excluded from the Big Five (McAdam S, D.P., 1995).

In many studies, the five factors are not fully orthogonal to one another; that is, the five factors are not independent. Negative correlations often appear between Neuroticism and Extraversion, for instance, indicating that those who are more prone to experiencing negative emotions tend to be less
talkative and outgoing. Orthogonality is viewed as desirable by some researchers because it minimizes redundancy between the dimensions. This is particularly important when the goal of a study is to provide a comprehensive description of personality with as few variables as possible.

**Emotional Intelligence**

The Greek philosopher Aristotle has a recipe for handline relationships smoothly. You must be able, he said, "to be angry with the right person, to the right degree, at the right time, for the right purpose, and in the right way." Psychologists Peter Salovey and John Mayer call such self control "emotional intelligence". Emotional Intelligence refers to a combination of skills, such as empathy, self-control, and self-awareness (Salovey & Mayer, 1997). Emotional Intelligence is regarded as the fine art of self-control. (Coon - 2003).

Thus, it is obvious that emotional intelligence indicates that one should be realistic. Let's be realistic: There may to be occasions when appraisal-focused coping and problem-focused coping are not successful in warding off emotional turmoil. Some problems are too serious to be whittled down much by reappraisal, and others simply can't be "solved". Moreover, even well-executed coping strategies may take time to work before emotional tensions begin to subside.
Hence, it is helpful to be able to recognize and modulate one's emotions.

According to some theorists, emotional intelligence is the key to being resilient in the face of stress. The concept of emotional intelligence was originally formulated by Peter Salovey and John Mayer (1990). Emotional Intelligence consists of the ability to monitor, access, express and regulate one's own emotions; the capacity to identify interpret, and understand other's emotions; and the ability to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions. components of Emotional Intelligence. It includes four essential components (Mayer & Salovey, 1999).

First, people need to be able to accurately perceive emotions in themselves and others and have the ability to express their own emotions effectively.

Second, people need to be aware of how their emotions shape their thinking, memory, decisions and coping behaviour.

Third, People need to be able to understand and analyze their emotions, which may often be complex and contradictory and may have important social implications.

Fourth, people need to be able to regulate their emotions so that they can dampen negative emotions and make effective use of positive emotions. Investigators are
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striving to develop psychological tests that will measure variations among people in emotional intelligence and facilitate research on the role of emotional intelligence in everyday coping (Salovey et al., 1999).

People who excel in life tend to be emotionally intelligent (Fisher & Ashanasy, 2000; Mehrabian, 2000). Indeed the cost of poor emotional skills can be high. They range from problems in marriage and parenting to poor physical health. A lack of emotional intelligence can ruin careers and sabotage achievement. Perhaps the greatest toll falls on children and teenagers. For them, having poor emotional skills can contribute to depression, eating disorders, unwanted pregnancy, aggression, and violent crime.

Characteristics of Emotionally Intelligent People

What does it mean to be emotionally intelligent? Many elements contribute to emotional intelligence (Mayer et al. 2001). A list of some of the most important skills follows:

**Self-Awareness:** Emotionally intelligent people are tuned into their own feelings. For example, they are able to recognize quickly if they are angry, or envious, or feeling guilty, or depressed. This is valuable because many people have disruptive emotions without being able to pinpoint why they are uncomfortable. Those who are more self-aware are keenly sensitive to their feelings.
Empathy: Empathetic people accurately perceive emotions in others and sense what others are feeling. They are good at "reading" facial expressions, tone of voice, and other signs of emotion.

Managing Emotions: Emotional intelligence involves an ability to manage your own emotions and those of others. For example, you know how to calm down when you are angry and you also know how to calm others.

Understanding emotions: Emotions contain useful information. For instance, anger is a cue that something is wrong; anxiety indicates uncertainty; embarrassment communicates shame; depression means we feel helpless, enthusiasm tells us we are excited.

People who are emotionally intelligent know what causes various emotions, what they mean, and how they affect behaviour.

Substantial disagreement exist regarding the definition of EI, with respect to both terminology and operationalizations. The definitions are so varied, and the field is growing so rapidly, that researchers are constantly amending even their own definitions of the construct.

Models of EI

There are three main models of EI in discussion at present.
• Ability El models
• Mixed models of El
• Trait El model

The ability based model

Salovey and Mayer's conception of El strives to define El within the confines of the standard criteria for a new intelligence. Following their continuing research, their initial definition of El was revised to. "The ability to perceive emotion, integrate emotion to facilitate thought, understand emotions and to regulate emotions to promote personal growth".

The ability based model views emotions as useful sources of information that help one to make sense of and navigate in social environment (Salovey et. al., 2005). The model proposes that individuals vary in their ability to process information of an emotional nature and in their ability to relate emotional processing to a wider cognition. This ability is seen to manifest itself in certain adaptive behaviours. The model claims that El includes 4 types of abilities:

1. Perceiving emotions

The ability to detect and decipher emotions in faces, pictures, voices, and cultural artifacts including the ability to identify one's own emotions. Perceiving emotions represents a
2. Using emotions

The ability to harness emotions to facilitate various cognitive activities, such as thinking and problem solving. The emotionally intelligent person can capitalize fully upon his or her changing moods in order to best fit the task at hand.

3. Understanding emotions

The ability to comprehend emotion language and to appreciate complicated relationships among emotions. For example, understanding emotions encompasses the ability to be sensitive to slight variations between emotions, and the ability to recognize and describe how emotions evolve over time.

4. Managing emotions

The ability to regulate emotions in both ourselves and in others. Therefore, the emotionally intelligent person can harness emotions, even negative ones, and manage them to achieve intended goals.

The ability based model has been criticized in the research for looking and predictive validity in the workplace (Bradberry et. al., 2003).
Mixed Model of EI

The Emotional Competencies (Goleman) Model

This Model was introduced by Daniel Goleman (1998) focuses on EI as a wide array of competencies and skills that drive leadership performance. Goleman's Model outline four main EI constructs:

1. **Self Awareness**: The ability to read one's emotions and recognize their impact while using good feelings to guide decisions.

2. **Self Management**: It involves controlling one's emotions and impulses and adapting to changing circumstances.

3. **Social Awareness**: The ability to sense, understand, and react to others' emotions while comprehending social networks.

4. **Relationship Management**: The ability to influence, and develop others while managing conflict.

Goleman includes a set of emotional competencies within each construct of EI. Emotional competencies are not innate talents, but rather learned capabilities that must be worked on and can be developed to achieve outstanding performance (Bradberry et. al. (2009). Goleman posits that individuals are born with a general emotional intelligence that determines their potential for learning emotional competencies (Boyatzisz, 2002).
The Trait El Model

Petrides and Colleagues (Petrides et.al., 2007; Petrides, 2009) proposed a conceptual distinction between the ability based model and a trait based model of El. According to Petrides et.al. (2000), trait El is "a constellation of emotion related self-perceptions located at the lower levels of personality". In lay terms, trait El refers to an individual's self-perceptions of their emotional abilities. This definition of El encompasses behavioural dispositions and self perceived abilities and is measured by self report as opposed to the ability based model which refers to actual abilities, which have proven highly resistant to scientific measurement. Trait El should be investigated within a personality framework (Petrides et.al. 2001). An alternative label for the same construct is trait emotional self-efficacy.

The trait El model is general and subsumes the Goleman and Bar-on Models discussed above the conceptualization of El as a personality trait leads to a construct that lies outside the taxonomy of human cognitive ability. This is an important distinction in as much as it bears directly on the operationalization of the construct and the theories and hypotheses that are formulated about it. Petrides et. al. (2000).
Criticism of the Theoretical foundation of ET

El is too broadly defined and the definitions are unstable.

One of the arguments against the theoretical soundness of the concept suggests that the constant changing are broadening of its definition which has come to encompass many unrelated elements - has rendered it an unintelligible concept.

Arguing that El is an invalid concept, Locke (2005) asked: "What is the common or integrating elements in a concept that includes introspection about emotions, emotional expression, non-verbal communication with others, empathy, self-regulation, planning, creative thinking and the direction of attention?" He answered by saying: "There is none". Locke et. al. (2005). Commenting on the multiple factors that have been included in the definition, Locke asked rhetorically: "What does El not include?" Locke et. al. (2005).

El cannot be recognized as a form of Intelligence

Goleman's early work has been criticized for assuming from the beginning that El is a type of intelligence. Eysenck (1994), writes that Goleman's description of El contains assumptions about intelligence in general, and that it even
runs contrary to what researchers have come to expect when studying types of intelligence.

Similarly, Locke (2005) claims that the concept of El is in itself a misinterpretation of the intelligence construct and he offers an alternative interpretation; it is not another form of type of intelligence, but intelligence - the ability to grasp abstractions - applied to a particular life domain: emotions. He suggests the concept should be re-labeled and referred to as a skill.

**El has no substantial predictive value**

Landy et. al. (2005) has claimed that the few incremental validity studies conducted on El have demonstrated that it adds little or nothing to the explanation or prediction of some common outcomes (most notably academic and work success). Landy proposes that the reason some studies have found a small increase in predictive validity is in fact a methodological fallacy - incomplete consideration of alternative explanations.

"El is compared and contrasted with a measure of abstract intelligence but not with a personality measure and also not with a measure of academic intelligence". Landy, (2005).

The interpretations of the correlation between El Questionnaires on Personality have been varied, with the trait
El view that re-interprets El as a collection of personality traits being prominent in the scientific literature (Mikolajczak et.al. 2007; Smith et.al. 2008; Austin et.al., 2008).

Promoting El

Researchers on Emotional Intelligence have suggested following strategies to promote El:

1. Taking the time for mindfulness.
2. Recognizing and having emotions.
3. Understanding the causes of feelings.
4. Differentiating between emotion and the need to take action.
5. Preventing depression through "learned optimism".
6. Managing anger through learned behaviour or distraction techniques.
7. Listening for the lessons of feelings.
8. Developing listening skills.

Objectives of the Present Study

The views expressed on preceding pages make it clear that psycho-ecological deprivations experienced by children or people leads to behavioural deficiencies and poor performance, and achievement in various spheres of life. It has been studied from different view points, but the effects of PED on big five personality traits and emotional intelligence are not properly explored. The present study is a step...
forward in this regard. Thus, keeping in view the variables covered in the present study, the major objective of the study can be underlined as below:

1. To ascertain the effects of psycho-ecological deprivation on personality factors.
2. To assess the effects of psycho-ecological deprivation on emotional intelligence.
3. To assess the effects of social context (domicile) and gender on personality.
4. To evaluate the effects of social context (domicile) and gender on emotional intelligence.