An Comparative Study on the Effects of Personality on Emotional Intelligence between Professional and Non-Professional Students of Pune City

Mr. Amitabh Patnaik, **Assistant Professor,**

Dr. D.Y. Patil Institute of Management Studies, Sector- 29, Nigdi-Pradhikaran , Pune- 411044

Abstract:

Emotional Intelligence reflects the ability to read and understand others in social contexts, to detect the nuances of emotional reactions, and to utilize such knowledge to influence others through emotional regulation and control. As such, it represents a critically important competency for effective leadership and team performance in today's organizations. Emotional Intelligence scale developed by Dr. Meera Shanker and Dr. Omer Bin Sayeed (2006) was used to examine the Emotional Intelligence of students. Myer Briggs Type Indicator Form G developed by Isabel Myers and Katherine Briggs (1977) was used to measure the personality preference on 4 dichotomies that include Extraversion vs. Introversion, Sensing vs. Intuition, Thinking vs. Feeling, and Judging vs. Perceiving. It was found that there were significant differences on Emotional Intelligence and personality between professional and non- professional students. The complete sample comprises 250 students pursuing professional and nonprofessional courses from different colleges, with a mean age of 22.43, of Pune city, out of which 57% constitute male students, 43% constitute female students; 170% constitute professional students and 80% constitute non-professional students. Results indicate that non-professionals were emotionally intelligent than professional students. The results were found to be very much consistent with the results reported elsewhere in the literature. The implications of the study were discussed in detail.

In transforming students into business professionals, academicians need to play a pivotal role by enriching students' knowledge and enhancing students' level of Emotional Intelligence using some theories and simulations as viable tools and interventions. The present study examines the influence of Emotional Intelligence on personality between professional and non-professional students.

Keywords: Emotional Intelligence, professional and non-professional students, perceiving, sensing, thinking.

Introduction:

Emotional Intelligence represents the ability to perceive appraise and express emotion accurately and adaptively; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; the ability to access and/ or

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories

International Journal in Management and Social Science

http://www.ijmr.net.in email id- irjmss@gmail.com   Page 163

generate feelings when they facilitate cognitive activities and the ability to regulate emotions in oneself and other.   – *Mayer & Salovery*, *1997*

Emotional knowledge, skills, and competencies are essential to the student development values of individual and community. The affective or emotional learning domain is central to student development. Experiential and self-directed learning activities need to be systematic and accountable. Colleges and universities need to be able to demonstrate and show faculty, students, and the entire academic community how courses, programs, services, and resources make a difference in professional and personal development. Student development programs are positioned to meet this type of institutional accountability.

It is appropriate and important that academic development is the first and foremost goal of colleges and universities. However, a college education may prove to be leadership and career limiting if healthy emotional development is not viewed as an important and necessary role of the total college experience. To achieve the educational aspirations of the 21 century, there is an increasing need to develop healthy, responsible, and productive students, teachers, faculty, staff, and administrators in Professional and Non-Professional academic disciplines. Accountability needs to be embraced and in effect in academic, behavior, and emotional development. Fundamental beliefs and core values of student development in higher education have included the following:

- Recognition of the preeminence of the academic mission of the university;
- Respect for the integrity and wellbeing of each student;
- Commitment to actively building a healthy and safe learning environment;
- Equality and fairness in serving all students;
- A celebration of diversity.

These beliefs and values are consistent with the academic goals of higher education. They need to be embraced with institutional commitment and accountability. Colleges and universities are expected to document how academic and student development programs lead to and result in student achievement, retention, career enhancement, and leadership development. A balanced system of accountability and commitment is needed. Student development programs, utilizing an education- and research-based model of emotional intelligence competencies and skills, are needed to demonstrate this institutional commitment to accountability.

The Emotional Learning System:

Emotional and experienced-based learning is different from traditional academic content learning. The *Emotional Learning System* is based on this difference. Its five steps are systematic and sequential, yet fluid and interactive–the system is designed to ensure a learner centered development process built on honest, positive self assessment.

- Step 1 (*Self Assessment: Explore).* Requires the student to develop an intentional self assessment habit: inquiring, discovering, questioning;

- Step 2 (*Self Awareness: Identify*).   Involves the process of identifying an experience as either a thought or feeling and leading to reflection not reactivity;

- Step 3 (*Self Knowledge: Understand*). Involves 'insight' and an understanding that allows a student to make choices about how to behave;

- Step 4 (*Self Development: Learn*). Involves learning various ways to improve behavior; and

- Step 5 (*Self Improvement: Apply and Model*). Requires the application and modeling of emotionally intelligent behavior to achieve academic and career goals.

The development of emotional intelligence is an intentional, active, and engaging learning process rich with personal meaning. Development is learner-centered and based on the internal frame of reference of the learner with the use of a positive assessment process. It is our belief that emotional intelligence is best understood and learned when framed around specific emotional competencies and skills. The foundation of the emotional learning process is a positive assessment of thirteen emotional skills organized around four key competencies (Nelson and Low 1999, 2003).

Literature Review:

Empirical studies indicate that there is a significant relationship between high feeling and thinking scores and EI. MBTI feeling is significantly negatively correlated with emotional resilience (Malcolm Higgs). Research studies also indicate a positive correlation between intuition and thinking and emotional intelligence. Kilduff et al. conducted a study on 170 MBA students and results indicate that extraverts were high in self-monitoring and quick in decision-making. Unlike sensors, intuitors and extraverts are less likely to perceive stress. (Paul, Malcolm

Higgs, 1999). Intuitors are found to be high on problem-solving ability than sensors (Felder).

There is a positive relation between extraversion and pleasant affect (Frank Fujita*,* 2000)*.* A survey on U.S. adult population indicated that extraverts were happier than introverts, and tender minded were happier than tough minded (Kenneth O. Doyle and Seounmi Youn, 2000). Argyle (1990), Diener (1984), Diener et al (1992); Emmons and Diener (1986), Myers and Diener, (1995) came with the consistent

result that extraversion tends to predispose people toward positive affect regardless of the level of social contact. Research indicates that extraversion and positive affectivity were related to retrieval of positive memories and the tendency to make positive judgments (Rusting, Cheryl L, 1999). Research studies indicate that intuition and extraversion is significantly and positively related to higher levels of EI such as decision making. MBTI extraverts are not specifically described as being sensitive to others needs and are more self-centered. There is a positive relationship between MBTI extraversion and motivation. (Malcolm Higgs, 2001).

Donald H. Saklofske, (2003) conducted a study on a sample of 354 students to examine the relationship between personality traits and Emotional Intelligence. EI was found to be negatively and significantly correlated with Neuroticism, and positively and significantly correlated with Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. However, there are mixed results with respect to extroversion and empathy.

Extraversion and self control were significantly associated with academic achievement. (Shaun Newsome, 1999). Mental stressors will not increase impulsive behaviors in extraverts. (Karin F. Helmers, 1996). Eysenck, Pearson, Easting, and Allsopp (1985) conducted a study on 51 female occupational therapy students and found that impulsiveness is positively correlated with extraversion, .57(p<.01). Corulla (1989) showed impulsiveness to be more aligned with extraversion than with psychoticism (P<.01) (Paul R. Pearson, 1990). Leonard Street and Deinard conducted a study on 58 managers and executives of MNC with the purpose of studying the relationship between their emotional intelligence (EI) and their personality traits with their performance. Results indicated that higher performing managers are extraverts and are emotionally intelligent more than introverts. Joseph P. (1990) conducted a study on 137 students who completed the Eysenck Personality questionnaire and found that, impulsive subjects were neurotic extraverts and anxious subjects were neurotic-introverts. A negative relationship was found between the MBTI dimension of introversion and the EI elements of both motivation and influence (Dulewicz and Higgs, 1999).

The personality types of 5,723 gifted adolescents were examined and the most common personality types among gifted adolescents were "intuitive" and "perceiving." They were higher on the introversion, intuition, thinking, and perceiving dimensions of the personality scales of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) when compared to general high school students. The gifted males were higher than the gifted females in the perceiving dimension. There was a non-significant difference between the gifted females and gifted males in the judging-perceiving scale (Ugur Sak, 2004). Emotional and social intelligent skills increase as one gets older. (Baron, 1997; Goleman, 1998; Ajaypal Singh, 2000).

There is also no significant difference in Emotional Intelligence between undergraduates who study technical and non-technical courses, as well as between undergraduates of Nanyang Technological University (NTU) and National University of Singapore (NUS) although male undergraduates achieved higher EI scores than female undergraduates (James Poon Teng Fatt, 2004). Gifted females were significantly higher in extraversion, intuition and feeling dimension when compared to the gifted males (p < .01, Ugur Suk, 2004). Donald H. Saklofske found that higher score in extraversion was significantly associated with better emotional well-being in males, but surprisingly, with worse emotional well-being in females among college students. Empirical studies indicate that there is high representation of male professionals on the introversion preference category. The two most common personality types for both business students and non- business students were SFJ and NFJ (Garland and Garland, 1987). Several studies have found that ISTJ, ESTJ, and INTJ are the most prevalent personality types among professional accountants. Sensing and thinking types perform better with lectures, whereas intuitive and feeling types perform better with computer-assisted instruction (Moores, 1990).

Objective of the Study:

The study aims to examine the influence of personality type on emotional intelligence among professional and non-professional students. There are no studies conducted in the area of emotional intelligence and personality with respect to professional and non-professional students. So the present study attempts to bridge the gap by exploring that area.

Research Methodology:

Sample Size:

Sample was selected from student population. The total sample comprises 250 students with a mean age of 22.73 of Pimpri- Chichwad area of Pune city. 170 % constitute professional students and 80% constitute non-professional students. A sample of 250 students enrolled in 6 different colleges situated in PCMC area participated in the study. The sample was divided into professional students and non-professional students by considering the course that is being pursued by the students. Students pursuing MBA, MCA, B.E. and B.Pharm. constitute professional course holders and students pursuing M.A, M.Sc. and M.Com. are ramified under non-professional course holders taking the Indian education system under consideration. Disproportionate stratified random sampling, a probability sampling method was used to collect the data from student population.

Demographic Sheet

Information on biographical variables like age, gender, educational qualification and so on were collected.

Questionnaires

Emotional Intelligence scale developed by Dr. Meera Shanker and Dr. Omer Bin Sayeed (2006) was used to examine the emotional intelligence of students. This is 6 point scale with "1" indicating strongly disagree,'2' indicating disagree, '3' indicating mildly disagree, '4' indicating disagree '4' indicating mildly agree '5' indicating agree, '6' indicating strongly agree. The scale consists of 61 items measuring 10 factors such as

1. Emotionality and impulsiveness

There are 15 items in this subscale that measure emotionality and impulsiveness.

2. Self- Acceptance

There are 15 items in this subscale that measure self- acceptance

3. Problem Solving Orientation

There are 6 items in this subscale that measures problem solving orientation.

4. Self-Awareness

There are 6 items in this subscale that measure self-awareness.

5. Self-Confidence

There are 6 items in this subscale that measure self-confidence

6. Decisiveness and Independence

There are 6 items in this subscale that measure decisiveness and independence

7. Personal Fulfillment

There are 4 items in this subscale that measure personal fulfillment

8. Empathy

There are 4 items in this subscale that measures empathy.

9. Anxiety and Stress

There are 4 items in this subscale that measure anxiety and stress.

10. Assertiveness

There are 4 items in this subscale that measure assertiveness.

The psychometric properties of the items(corrected item to total correlation) and cronbach alpha reliabilities calculated for the subscales were quiet satisfactory**.** The median corrected item total correlations for ten accepted scales ranged from a minimum of 0.45 to 0.74.

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories

International Journal in Management and Social Science

http://www.ijmr.net.in email id- irjmss@gmail.com   Page 168

Myer Briggs Type Indicator Form G

Myer Briggs Type Indicator Form G is developed by Isabel Myers and Katherine Briggs (1977) is used to measure the personality preference on 4 dichotomies that includes extraversion vs. introversion (E-I), sensing vs. intuition (S-N), thinking vs. feeling (T-F), judging vs. perceiving (J-P). This questionnaire consists of 126 items 80 of which are research items not scored for type. The self-scorable version of form G contains only 94 items needed to produce the type.

Psychometric properties of MBTI Inventory

Internal consistency reliability using split half method is highly satisfactory. Form G internal consistency reliability coefficient ranging from .82 to.86.The internal consistency reliability coefficient for E-I dichotomy scale is .82, for S-N is .84, for T-F is .83 and for J-P is .86.Test retest reliability for form G with a 9 month interval ranges from .59 to.70 for E-I dichotomy the test retest reliability is .70 for S-N it is .170 for T-F it is .59, for J-P it is .63. The correlation between the MBTI and the Jungian type survey are of special interest to the construct validity of the MBTI. Rich compared the MBTI and the 15th edition of the JTS on a sample of 98 evening division students in a course on Jung offered at the University of Minnesota. Correlations were reported for the sums of MBTI points and JTS scores. The correlations between the two instruments were E .170(p<.01), I .66(p<.01), S .54(p<.01), N .47(p<.01), T .33(p<.01), F .23(p<.05).The two instruments appear to be tapping the same constructs.

Analysis of Data

Data analysis was carried out by using SPSS 21.0 version. T-test was used to examine the influence of personality on emotional intelligence in professional and non-professional students.

Results and Discussion:

Table 1 indicating mean differences between professionals and non-professionals on Emotional Intelligence.

Table 1: Emotional Intelligence Factors: Differences between Professionals and Non - Professionals

S. No.	Emotional Intelligence Factors		Mean	S .D	t-value
01	Emotionality and Impulsiveness	Professionals (170)	3.85	.170	-1.39
		Non-Professionals (80)	3.99	.73	
02	Self- Acceptance	Professionals (170)	4.170	.84	-1.11
		Non-Professionals (80)	4.80	.76	
03	Problem-Solving Orientation	Professionals (170)	5.50	.91	-.90
		Non-Professionals (80)	5.61	.85	
04	Self-Awareness	Professionals (170)	4.49	.70	-2.06*

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories

International Journal in Management and Social Science

http://www.ijmr.net.in email id- irjmss@gmail.com   Page 169

		Non-Professionals (80)	4.69	.71	
05	Self-Confidence	Professionals (170)	4.69	1.77	-.15
		Non-Professionals (80)	4.72	.73	
06	Decisiveness and Independence	Professionals (170)	3.53	.76	.28
		Non-Professionals (80)	3.50	.86	
07	Personal Fulfillment	Professionals (170)	4.52	.97	-1.80
		Non-Professionals (80)	4.76	.93	
08	Empathy	Professionals (170)	4.70	.84	-1.77
		Non-Professionals (80)	4.92	.89	
09	Anxiety and Stress	Professionals (170)	2.69	.48	-1.77
		Non-Professionals (80)	2.81	.50	
10	Assertiveness	Professionals (170)	4.10	.85	.82
		Non-Professionals (80)	4.19	.85	

*p ≤ 0.05, **p ≤ 0.01

The above table indicates mean differences between professional and non-professional group on emotional intelligence factors. The results indicate that there is a significant difference between professionals and non-professionals on self-awareness factor (t=-2.063, p<.01).This indicates that non-professionals are high on self-monitoring and introspection than professionals. Nonprofessionals constantly monitor and check their actions and are high in problem-solving. There are no significant differences between professional and non-professional group on other EI factors but the mean scores were high for non-professionals on emotionality and impulsiveness, self-acceptance, problem-solving orientation, self-confidence, empathy, anxiety and stress and assertiveness than professionals.

Table 2 indicating mean differences between professionals and non-professionals on Personality

Table 2: Personality: Differences between Professionals and Non-Professionals

S. No.	Personality Dimensions	Groups	Mean	S .D	t-value
01	Extraversion	Professionals (170)	13.75	4.99	-1.16**
		Non-Professionals (80)	14.51	4.66	
02	Introversion	Professionals (170)	11.25	5.18	1.84**
		Non-Professionals (80)	9.98	4.89	
03	Sensing	Professionals (170)	17.13	4.63	-2.11*
		Non-Professionals (80)	18.52	4.86	
04	Intuition	Professionals (170)	8.37	3.19	1.14
		Non-Professionals (80)	7.87	3.20	
05	Thinking	Professionals (170)	13.09	4.74	0.13
		Non-Professionals (80)	13.01	4.38	
06	Feeling	Professionals (170)	8.86	3.72	-1.00
		Non-Professionals (80)	9.35	3.55	
07	Judging	Professionals (170)	15.19	5.61	-2.79*
		Non-Professionals (80)	17.37	5.69	
08	Perceiving	Professionals (170)	11.13	5.54	3.05*
		Non-Professionals (80)	8.96	4.99	

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories

International Journal in Management and Social Science

http://www.ijmr.net.in email id- irjmss@gmail.com   Page 170

*p ≤ 0.05, **p ≤ 0.01

The above table shows that there are significant differences between professionals and nonprofessionals on extraversion (t=1.16, p<.01), introversion (t=1.84, p<.01), sensing (t=.211, p<.05) and perceiving (t=3.05, p<.05). This shows that non- professionals showed a strong preference for extraversion, sensing and judging where as professionals showed a high preference for introversion and perceiving. This indicates that non-professionals are action-oriented and rely on external environment for stimulation and guidance. Non-professionals trust known facts, tend to be specific, organized, decisive, goal oriented, focus on the present and follow a step-by-step procedure. Contrary to non-professionals, professionals prefer detachment and are open, spontaneous, adaptable, and curious in nature.There are no significant mean differences between professionals and non –professionals on intuition, thinking, feeling, and judging, but mean scores are high on intuition, thinking, among professionals and feeling, judging among nonprofessionals.

Table 3: Emotional Intelligence Factors: Mean Differences between Extraversion and Introversion in Professional and Non-professional students

Emotional Intelligence Factors	Personality Preference	Professional group (n = 170)			Non Professional group (n = 80)		
		Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
Emotionality and Impulsiveness	Extraversion	59.625	9.337	3.113*	60.037	11.006	0.226
	Introversion	54.807	11.1707		59.3170	11.275	
Self-Acceptance	Extraversion	24.135	3.793	3.401*	24.833	3.196	3.288*
	Introversion	21.800	4.672		21.1704	4.559	
Problem Solving Orientation	Extraversion	28.163	4.550	2.094*	28.704	3.888	1.762
	Introversion	26.564	4.642		26.1704	5.803	
Self-Awareness	Extraversion	27.846	3.1704	3.522*	28.796	3.739	1.693
	Introversion	25.473	4.650		26.895	5.363	
Self-Confidence	Extraversion	19.135	6.305	0.666	19.204	2.587	1.709
	Introversion	18.807	8.813		17.842	3.934	
Decisiveness and Independence	Extraversion	25.250	5.031	1.654	24.778	5.379	0.766
	Introversion	23.782	5.843		23.526	7.933	
Personal Fulfillment	Extraversion	18.885	3.784	3.424*	19.352	3.876	2.011*
	Introversion	16.745	3.678		17.526	3.221	
Empathy	Extraversion	18.769	3.190	-0.570	19.407	3.277	-0.831
	Introversion	19.091	3.733		20.211	4.492	
Anxiety and Stress	Extraversion	26.462	5.667	2.799*	27.241	5.291	0.634
	Introversion	23.745	6.102		26.211	7.990	
Assertiveness	Extraversion	12.510	2.336	1.798	12.944	2.382	1.819
	Introversion	11.745	2.914		11.1704	3.146	

*p ≤ 0.05, **p ≤ 0.01

The above table indicates that there are significant mean differences between extroversion and introversion groups on emotional intelligence factors like emotionality and impulsiveness (t=3.113, p<0.05), self-acceptance (t=3.401, p<0.05), problem-solving orientation (t=2.094, p<0.05), self-awareness (t=3.522, p<0.05), personal-fulfillment (t=3.424, p<0.05) and anxiety and stress (t=2.799, p<0.05) for professional students. This indicates that professional students showing a high personality preference for extroversion are emotionally impulsive and experience high levels of anxiety and stress.

There is significant mean difference between extroversion and introversion group on self-acceptance and personal fulfillment for non-professional students. Non-professionals showing a preference for extroversion are self-contented and are more likely to accept themselves despite some limitations. Although there are no significant differences, mean scores were high on extroversion group on all emotional intelligence factors for non-professional students.

Table 4: Emotional Intelligence Factors: Mean Differences between Judging and Perceiving in Professional and Non-professional students

Emotional Intelligence Factors	Personality Preference	Professional group (n = 170)			Non Professional group (n = 80)		
		Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
Emotionality and Impulsiveness	Judging	58.60	9.43	1.156	65.31	12.54	2.480*
	Perceiving	56.00	11.94		58.14	10.24	
Self-Acceptance	Judging	23.789	4.172	1.365	24.947	4.612	1.118
	Perceiving	22.833	4.277		23.800	3.571	
Problem Solving Orientation	Judging	27.789	4.536	0.584	28.579	3.805	0.345
	Perceiving	27.352	4.430		28.182	4.493	
Self-Awareness	Judging	27.413	4.219	1.808	28.316	4.820	0.085
	Perceiving	26.167	3.980		28.218	4.117	
Self-Confidence	Judging	19.156	8.466	0.797	19.842	2.9170	1.599
	Perceiving	18.204	3.224		18.600	2.903	
Decisiveness and Independence	Judging	25.284	4.875	1.509	23.737	7.615	-0.785
	Perceiving	23.963	5.972		25.018	5.553	
Personal Fulfillment	Judging	17.844	3.830	-1.122	19.3170	4.031	0.560
	Perceiving	18.574	4.0170		18.800	3.744	
Empathy	Judging	19.083	3.252	1.143	20.263	3.429	0.862
	Perceiving	18.444	3.559		19.436	3.660	
Anxiety and Stress	Judging	25.789	5.1700	0.1708	27.316	6.019	0.215
	Perceiving	25.111	6.386		26.982	5.772	
Assertiveness	Judging	12.587	2.397	1.515	12.263	2.156	-0.740
	Perceiving	11.963	2.628		12.782	2.773	

*p ≤ 0.05, **p ≤ 0.01

The above table indicates that there is a significant mean difference between judging and perceiving groups on emotionality and impulsiveness ((t=2.480, p<0.05) for non-professional students. This shows

that non-professional students showing a personality preference for judging are emotionally impulsive and explode in anger apparently without having much control over it. Although there are no significant differences, the mean scores were high for judging group on emotional intelligence between professional and non-professional students.

Table 5: Emotional Intelligence Factors: Mean Differences between Sensing and Intuition in Professional and Non-professional students

Emotional Intelligence Factors	Personality Preference	Professional group (n = 170)			Non Professional group (n = 80)		
		Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
Emotionality and Impulsiveness	Sensing	57.806	10.339	-0.835	59.743	11.330	-0.472
	Intuition	60.214	9.986		62.500	12.124	
Self-Acceptance	Sensing	23.438	4.283	-0.828	24.086	3.851	0.787
	Intuition	24.429	4.201		22.500	5.260	
Problem Solving Orientation	Sensing	27.674	4.560	-0.200	28.157	4.356	0.625
	Intuition	27.929	4.376		26.750	4.856	
Self-Awareness	Sensing	27.090	4.049	0.202	28.157	4.279	-0.716
	Intuition	26.857	4.897		29.750	5.315	
Self-Confidence	Sensing	18.986	7.455	0.694	18.929	2.975	0.275
	Intuition	17.571	5.019		18.500	4.123	
Decisiveness and Independence	Sensing	24.771	5.126	-0.444	24.871	5.811	1.500
	Intuition	25.429	6.802		20.250	9.215	
Personal Fulfillment	Sensing	18.146	3.883	0.806	18.900	3.857	-0.304
	Intuition	17.786	4.627		19.500	3.416	
Empathy	Sensing	18.875	3.294	1.159	19.600	3.657	-1.298
	Intuition	17.786	3.984		22.000	1.633	
Anxiety and Stress	Sensing	25.361	5.730	-1.746	26.786	6.069	-0.069
	Intuition	28.214	6.919		27.000	5.888	
Assertiveness	Sensing	12.236	2.586	-1.243	12.600	2.590	1.031
	Intuition	13.143	2.825		11.250	1.258	

*p ≤ 0.05, **p ≤ 0.01

The above table indicates that there are no significant differences between sensing and intuition groups on emotional intelligence for professional and non-professional students. In professional students, mean scores were found to be high on intuition group on some of the emotional intelligence factors like emotionality and impulsiveness, self-awareness, problem solving orientation, decisiveness and independence. In non- professional students, mean differences were found to be high on intuition group on some of the emotional intelligence factors like emotionality and impulsiveness, personal fulfillment, empathy and anxiety and stress.

Table 6: Emotional Intelligence Factors: Mean Differences between Thinking and Feeling in Professional and Non-professional students

Emotional Intelligence Factors	Personality Preference	Professional group (n = 170)			Non Professional group (n = 80)		
		Mean	SD	t-value	Mean	SD	t-value
Emotionality and Impulsiveness	Thinking	57.563	9.244	0.000	65.316	12.543	2.480*
	Feeling	57.563	10.877		58.145	10.246	
Self-Acceptance	Thinking	23.292	3.655	-0.250	24.947	4.612	1.118
	Feeling	23.473	4.417		23.800	3.571	
Problem Solving Orientation	Thinking	27.792	4.371	0.349	28.579	3.805	0.345
	Feeling	27.518	4.613		28.182	4.493	
Self-Awareness	Thinking	27.042	3.781	0.108	28.316	4.820	0.085
	Feeling	26.964	4.802		28.218	4.117	
Self-Confidence	Thinking	18.438	2.873	-0.449	19.842	2.9170	1.599
	Feeling	19.000	8.450		18.600	2.903	
Decisiveness and Independence	Thinking	23.375	5.278	-2.219*	23.737	7.615	-0.785
	Feeling	25.402	5.302		25.018	5.553	
Personal Fulfillment	Thinking	18.333	3.844	0.721	19.3170	4.031	0.560
	Feeling	17.848	3.921		18.800	3.744	
Empathy	Thinking	19.792	3.059	2.444*	20.263	3.429	0.862
	Feeling	18.402	3.392		19.436	3.660	
Anxiety and Stress	Thinking	25.083	5.626	-0.437	27.316	6.019	0.215
	Feeling	25.527	5.995		26.982	5.772	
Assertiveness	Thinking	12.167	2.452	-0.427	12.263	2.156	-0.740
	Feeling	12.357	2.637		12.782	2.773	

*p ≤ 0.05, **p ≤ 0.01

The above table indicates that there are significant mean differences between feeling and thinking groups on empathy (t=2.444, p<0.05), decisiveness and independence (t=-2.219, p<0.05) in professional students. This indicates that professional students showing a personality preference for thinking are very decisive and independent in nature. Professional students showing a high preference for feeling are more empathetic and more sensitive to others feelings and emotions. There is a significant mean difference between feeling and thinking groups on emotionality and impulsiveness (t=2.480, p<0.05) in non-professional students. Non-professional students showing a high preference for feeling type are impulsive, emotional and explode in anger lacking control over them.

Conclusion:

Unlike professional students, nonprofessional students were fully aware of their shortcomings and showed a high personality preference for extraversion**,** sensing and judging. Professional students enjoyed solitude and preferred privacy. Professional students were open, spontaneous, adaptable, and curious in nature. Professional students showing a high personality preference for extroversion are emotionally impulsive, anxious and are fully aware of the limitations. Non professionals showing a

preference for extroversion are high on personal fulfillment and self awareness Professional students showing a personality preference for thinking are very decisive and independent in nature. Professional students showing a high preference for feeling are more empathetic and emotionally impulsive in nature. Non-professional students showing a personality preference for judging are emotional and impulsive. Non-professional students showing a high preference for feeling type are emotionally impulsive. The results are very much consistent with the international evidence provided by the researchers.

References:

1. Amirtha, M. and Kadheravan, S. (2006). Influence of personality on the emotional intelligence of teachers. *Edu Tracks,* 5(12), 25-29.

2. Annaraja, P. and Jose, S. (2005). Emotional Intelligence of B.Ed. trainees. *Research and Reflections in Education,* 2, 8-16.

3. Calhoun, J. C. (1996). The Student Learning Imperative: Implications for Student Affairs.

Journal of College Student Development, 37(2), 188-122.

4. Cooper, R. K. and Sawaf, A. (1997). Executive EQ: Emotional Intelligence in Leadership and Organizations. New York, NY: Grosset/Putnam.

5. Devi, U. L. and Uma, M. (2005). Relationship between the dimensions of Emotional Intelligence of adolescents and certain personal social variables. *Indian Psychological Review,* 64(01), 11-20.

6. Dhull, I. and Mangal, S. (2005). Emotional Intelligence its significance for teachers. *Edu Tracks,* 4(11), 14-16.

7. Epstein, S. (1998). Constructive Thinking: The Key to Emotional Intelligence, Prager Press.

8. Goleman, Daniel (1995). Emotional Intelligence New York, NY: Bantam Books.

9. Nelson, Darwin and Nelson, Kaye (1999). Emotional Intelligence Skills: Significant Factors in Freshmen Achievement and Retention: Columbia, SC: A paper presented at the Annual

Conference on The First Year Experience, University of South Carolina.

10. Nelson, D.B. (2002). Emotional Intelligence Skills and Academic Achievement: A Cross

Cultural Perspective. Research manuscript. Texas A&M University-Kingsville, TX.

11. Palmer, P. J. (1998).   The Courage to Teach: Exploring the Inner Landscape of a Teacher's

Life. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

12. Tapia, M. and Marsh, G. (2001) Emotional Intelligence: The Effect of Gender, GPA and Ethnicity. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Mexico. (ED 464086)

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories

International Journal in Management and Social Science

http://www.ijmr.net.in email id- irjmss@gmail.com   Page 175