

Personality and emotional competence among high and low socially intelligent subjects

Renuka Joshi and Valentina Yumlembam
Department of Psychology, DAV College, Dehradun

The present study was aimed to find out the personality and emotional competence of high and low socially intelligent subjects. High and low socially intelligent subjects were selected by using social intelligence scale of Chadha and Ganesan (2004), 102 low socially intelligent and 96 high socially intelligent subjects were administered emotional competence scale of Bhardwaj (2007) and Singh's differential personality inventory developed by Singh and Singh (2002). Means, SDs and t values were computed to draw inferences. The obtained findings denoted that high and low socially intelligent subjects were found significantly different from each other on personality pattern and emotional competence dimensions. Socially high intelligent subjects were found significantly higher on the level of decisiveness (DEC), masculinity (MAS), ego strength (EGO), dominance (DOM) and self esteem (SEL). On emotional competence high social intelligent subjects were found to have higher tendency of adequate depth of feeling (ADF), adequate expression and control of emotions (AECE) and ability to functions with emotions (AFE).

Keywords: social intelligence, personality and emotional competence

Social Intelligence is the ability to deal with people and being comfortable with them. People always seek to be friendly with socially intelligent people because they are easy to talk to, easy to get along with, adapt well with others and situations. However, socially intelligent people can read signs when others are in need of privacy or solitude, company and a good laugh, assistance and consultation, etc. Cantor and Kihlstron (1987) defined social intelligence as specifically geared to solving the problems of social life and in particular managing the life tasks. Social intelligence is closely related to cognition and emotional intelligence, and can also be seen as a first level in developing systems intelligence. Research psychologists studying social cognition and social neuroscience have discovered many principles which human social intelligence operates.

Goleman (2006) proposed that social intelligence is made up of social awareness (including empathy, attunement, empathic accuracy, and social cognition) and social facility (including synchrony, self-presentation, influence, and concern).

Riggio, Messamer and Throckmorton (1991) studied that correlational and factor analytic analyses indicated that although social and academic intelligence may be conceptually distinct, there is considerable measurement of social intelligence. Emotional and social intelligence is the universally distinguishing characteristic that differentiates outstanding performers in leadership and professional roles from those who are average or poor. It determines the level of individual ability to manage negative emotions, deal with stress and demanding life roles, motivate one's self and realize personal goals, as well as the ability to manage the emotions of others and to influence and motivate their behavior. The most successful and fulfilled people demonstrate higher competency strengths in emotional and social intelligence. One of the great things about ESI is that it is measurable and can be strengthened in individuals and organizations. Joshi and Gupta (2010) showed no significant difference between boys and girls on EI and its dimensions. Asore (2012) revealed that women administrators with high level of emotional competence employ efficient stress management techniques for their work-life balance. Those techniques are useful

for every working person in general and for every working woman in particular.

Emotional intelligence enables the adolescent to develop very good interpersonal relationships and to have better social support. It is a highly desirable and personally valuable attribute to possess. Through life skills training and scientific guidance, we can improve the emotional intelligence of adolescents and thus we can lead them towards a very successful future life. Sharma (2003) found that adequate depth of feeling is greater among girls than boys. In addition, encouragement of positive emotions has been found to be greater in boys than girls. No gender differences were found on the level of ability to cope with problem emotions.

Personality is the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine the characteristics behavior and thought. Adolescents are extremely personality conscious and highly motivated to improve them. Often discipline is considered as essential for the growth and development of the child. Parental discipline is very essential for building healthy personality of the child. The patterns of socialization used by parents influence the child's personality. Adamovova and Strizenee (2004) found that high, low and average cognitive orientation is positively associated with warmth from Extraversion, with openness towards experience, and the majority of facets of Agreeableness. Lynn and Martin (1997) reported that women have higher means than men on neuroticism and men obtained higher means than women on psychoticism and on extraversion.

Research suggests that emotional health is fundamental to effective learning. The most critical element for a student's success in school is an understanding of how to learn. Some key ingredients for this understanding are confidence, self control, capacity to communicate and ability to co-operate. These traits are all aspects of emotional intelligence. An intelligent adolescent who is self aware and intrinsically motivated will definitely have very high academic performance. Adolescents with high emotional intelligence will also have good relationship with teachers and parents which also help them to perform well in their examinations. Students with good EQ will not have conflicts with peer group and are not likely to use drugs or alcohol.

Method

Participants

For the present study the subjects were selected randomly from Dehradun districts. 102 low socially intelligent and 96 high socially intelligent subjects were selected from Survey of India, Zoological survey of India, Wadia institute of Himalayan geology, DRDA, State bank of India. City finance, ICICI, HDFC and Reliance. All the subjects were matched on socio economic status, age and educational level. The age range of all the subjects was 24-30 years. Educational level was graduate plus.

Instruments

The following fairly established and standardized tools were used in this study for the purpose of data collection-

Social intelligence Scale: Constructed and standardized by Chadha and Ganesan (2004) was used which measure social intelligence on eight dimensions namely, Parience (A), Co-operativeness (B), Confidence (C), Sensitivity (D), Recognition of Social environment (E), Tactfulness (F), Sense of Humour (G) and Memory (H).

Personality Scale: Singh's differential personality inventory developed by singh and Singh (2002) to measure personality on ten dimensions, namely, decisiveness (DEC), responsibility (RES), emotional stability (EMO), masculinity (MAS), friendliness (FRI), heterosexuality (HET), ego strength (EGO), curiosity (CUR), dominance ((DOM) and self esteem (SEL).

Emotional Competence Scale: Constructed and standardized by Bhardwaj (2007) was used which measures emotional competence on five dimensions, namely, adequate depth of feeling (ADF), adequate expression and control of emotions (ACCE), ability to function with emotions (AFE), ability to cope with problem emotions and enhancement of positive emotions (ACPE) and enhancement of positive emotions (EDE).

Hypotheses of the study

Keeping in view the main objective following hypothesis are framed;

- The subjects with high and low social intelligence will differ significantly from each other on personality and its dimension.
- The subjects with high and low social intelligence will differ significantly from each other on emotional competence and its dimension.

Procedure

The data was collected individually from the subjects after establishing a good rapport first of all social intelligence scale was administered. Before testing on emotional and personality scale five minute rest was given. Raw scores were obtained with the help of respective manuals and processed further using Means, SDs and t values were computed to test the proposed hypothesis. Keeping in view the main objective of this study the socially intelligent subjects were classified on two levels high and low using scores of social intelligent scale with the help of manual of the test. Further both the groups were compared on personality dimensions and emotional competence dimensions and inferences were drawn.

Result and discussion

The calculated means, SDs and t values of Personality and emotional competence of high and low socially intelligent subjects are shown in

table 1-2. The observation of table 1 shows comparison of high and low socially intelligent subjects on personality and its dimensions. On overall personality pattern socially high intelligent subjects obtained lower mean values than socially low intelligent subjects. The calculated t value for overall personality pattern was found to be significant. It means that subjects of high and low social intelligent differ significantly from each other on total personality pattern Observation of mean value indicates that high social intelligent subjects are significantly higher on personality pattern as compared to low social intelligent subjects. On various dimension of personality pattern high and low socially intelligent subjects were also found to be significantly different from each other except on curiosity (CUR) dimension of personality.

Table1: Means and SDs of subjects with high and low socially intelligent on personality and its dimensions

Variables	High		Low		t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
DEC	8.20	1.41	7.40	1.32	5.33**
RES	7.00	0.80	9.88	1.00	27.69**
EMO	10.00	1.00	13.00	0.82	28.57**
MAS	8.06	1.73	7.42	2.00	3.04**
FRI	11.00	2.00	13.08	2.00	9.04**
HET	3.08	2.00	4.88	1.84	4.90**
EGO	10.88	1.06	8.00	1.00	26.18**
CUR	7.80	3.00	8.00	2.50	0.64
DOM	13.88	1.50	11.18	1.40	16.87**
SEL	8.80	1.50	7.40	1.50	8.23**
Total Personality	85.48	4.87	86.06	4.51	36.49**

*Significant at .05 level, **Significant at .01 level

Observation of table 1 shows significant t values on decisiveness (DEC), masculinity (MAS), ego strength (EGO), dominance (DOM) and self esteem (SEL) dimension of personality. Observation of mean value (table1) clearly denotes that subjects with high level of social intelligent scored significantly higher mean values then subjects with low socially intelligent on decisiveness (DEC), masculinity (MAS), ego strength (EGO), dominance (DOM) and self esteem (SEL) dimension of personality. It means that the tendency of taking quick decision, high level of ego-strength (EGO), higher tendency of dominance (DOM) and self esteem (SEL) was found to be more among socially high intelligent subjects as compared to low socially intelligent subjects.

Furthermore, low social intelligent subjects obtained significant higher mean values than high social intelligent subjects on responsibility (RES), emotional stability (EMO), friendliness (FRI) and heterosexuality (HET). The mean difference on these dimensions were found to be significant indicating actual difference between both the groups on these dimensions of personality. Subjects with low socially intelligent were found to have significantly higher tendency of taking responsibility such as finishing task in time, meeting people on appointed time and attending meeting in time as compared to subjects with high social intelligent.

Emotional stability (EMO) was also found to be significantly higher among low socially intelligent subjects as they are good in controlling over their emotions, considered alimnt in their proper perspective and take criticism realistically high socially intelligent subjects.

Friendliness (FRI) was found to be significant higher among low socially intelligent subjects as they possess deeper acquaintance

with people, often help others in time of trouble and show proper love and affection to even juniors and unknown.

Heterosexuality (HET) was found to be significantly higher among low socially intelligent subjects as they don't feel shy among members of opposite sex and take active participation in working with members of opposite sex.

On the basis of obtained findings the proposed hypotheses is accepted and it can be concluded that high and low social intelligent subjects differ significantly from each other on overall personality pattern and its dimensions except curiosity Jeloudar, Aida Suraya Md Yunus, Roslan and Sharifah (2012) revealed that significant differences existed between teachers with high and moderate level of social intelligence on classroom discipline. Teachers with high level of social intelligence scored higher in the classroom discipline strategies of discussion, recognition, involvement, and hinting, whereas teachers with moderate level of social intelligence scored higher in the use of aggression.

Table 2: Means, SDs and t values of subjects with high and low socially intelligent on emotional competence and its dimensions

Variables	High		Low		t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
ADF	16.00	2.32	19.00	2.33	11.53**
AECE	23.14	2.00	22.18	2.00	4.17**
AFE	23.18	1.82	19.30	2.00	17.63**
ACPE	18.00	1.82	20.80	2.00	12.72**
EPE	19.30	2.00	22.40	2.10	13.47**
Total EC	104.66	3.87	101.58	4.01	52.7**

*Significant at .05 level, **Significant at .01 level

To test the second hypotheses Means, SDs and t values were computed which are shown in table 2. Table 2 shows that high and low socially intelligent subjects differ significantly from each other on total emotional competence. Mean values indicated that subjects with high social intelligence scored higher mean values than low socially intelligent subjects. It can be said the emotional competence is significantly higher among high socially intelligent subjects as compared to low socially intelligent subjects.

High and low socially intelligent subjects were compared on various dimension of emotional competence and values were shown in table 2. The calculated t values were found to be significant for all the dimensions of emotional competence denoting that high and low socially intelligent subjects differ from each other on these dimensions of emotional competence. Observation of mean value shows that subjects with high social intelligent scores significant higher on adequate expression and control of emotions (AECE) and ability to functions with emotions (AFE) dimension of emotional competence, then subjects with low socially intelligent subjects.

Furthermore, low social intelligent subjects obtained significantly higher mean values than high social intelligent subjects on adequate depth of feeling (ADF) have a tendency of being confident or capable with all reality assumptions, ability to cope with problem emotions (ACPE) play a destructive role and pose a potential damage to the life orientations of the individual's course of life, and enhancement of positive emotions (EPE) have a tendency of positive emotions in the

personality make-up to ensure a meaningful and fairly integrated life dimensions of emotional competence. The mean difference on these dimension were found to be significant indicating actual difference between both the groups on these dimensions of emotional competence. Subjects with low social intelligence were found to have significantly higher tendency of feeling confident or capable with all reality assumptions, as compared to subjects with high social intelligent. Ability to cope with problem emotions (ACPE) was also found to be higher among low socially intelligent subjects as they play a destructive role and pose a potential damage to the life orientations of the individual's course of life. Enhancement of positive emotions (EPE) was also found to be higher among low socially intelligent subjects as they have the competency of the person to develop a predominance of positive emotions in the personality make-up to ensure a meaningful and fairly integrated life.

On the basis of obtained findings the purpose hypotheses is accepted and it can be concluded that high and low social intelligent subjects differ significantly from each other on emotional competence and its dimensions.

Finally it can be concluded that high and low socially intelligent subjects possess significantly different personality pattern from each other. Socially high intelligent subjects were found to have significantly higher on the level of decisiveness (DEC), masculinity (MAS), ego strength (EGO), dominance (DOM) and self esteem (SEL). On emotional competence high social intelligent subjects were found to have higher tendency of adequate depth of feeling (ADF), adequate expression and control of emotions (AECE) and ability to functions with emotions (AFE).

References

- Asore M.D. (2012). A Study of Emotional Competence And Stress Management Techniques Applied By Women Administrators For Work-life Balance. *Indian Streams Research Journal*, 2(7).
- Bharadwaj, R.L., & Sharma, H.C. (2007). *The Scale of Emotional Competencies*. Bal Niwas Taj Basai, Agra.
- Cantor, N., & Khilstom, J.F. (1987). *Personality and Social Intelligence*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Chadha, N.K., & Ganesan, U. (2004). Social Intelligence Scale. *National Psychological Corporation*, Kacheri Ghat, Agra.
- Goleman, D. (2006). *Social Intelligence: The New Science of Human Relationships*. Bantam Books.
- Joshi, R., & Gupta, M. (2010). Gender differences among boarders of emotional intelligence and behavioural problem". *Praachi Journal of Psycho-Cultural Dimensions*, 26(1), 23-30.
- Lucia, A., & Strizenc, M. (2004). Personality-structural correlates of cognitive orientation to spirituality. *Studia Psychologica*, 46(4), 317-325.
- Lynn, R., & Martin, T. (1997). Gender differences in extraversion, neuroticism, and psychoticism in 37 nations. *Social Psychology*, 137(3), 369-373.
- Ronald, E. R., Jack, M., & Throckmorton, B. (1991). Social and academic intelligence: Conceptually distinct but overlapping constructs. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 12(7), 695-702.
- Soleiman, Y. J., Md Yunus, A.S., Samsilah R., & Sharifah, Md. N. (2012). The Influence of Social Intelligence of Secondary School Teachers on Classroom Discipline Strategies. *J Psychology*, 3(1), 39-45.
- Sharma, P. (2003). *Perceived Parenting Models and sex as correlates of the Emotional Competencies among Normal and Cerebral Paished Early Adolescents*. Doctoral Dissertation, Agra: University of Agra.
- Singh, A.K., & Singh, A.K. (2002). *Singh's Differential Personality Inventory*. National Psychological Corporation, Agra.