

**"Understanding impact of personality traits on social intelligence of Students: A Study in Context of College Going Students of Jammu District."**

Submitted for the award of  
the partial fulfilment of  
the degree of  
M.Phil.

To

**The Central University of Haryana**

**Submitted to: Dr. Sarika Sharma, Associate Prof.  
Submitted by: Altaf Rasool, Reaserch Scholar**

Central University of Haryana

August 2016

# CERTIFICATE

Department of Education  
School of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences  
Central University of Haryana  
Mahendergarh, Haryana

Dated:

This to certify that I **Altaf Rasool** have carried out the research embodied in the present dissertation, “**Understanding impact of personality traits on social intelligence of Students: A Study in Context of College Going Students of Jammu District.**” for the full period prescribed under M.Phil Education. Ordinances of the

university. I declare to the best of my knowledge that no part of this dissertation was earlier submitted for the award of research degree of any University.

The present work as above has been carried out under my Supervision and the declaration as above by the scholar is correct to the best of my Knowledge.

(Signature of the Supervisor)  
**Dr. Sarika Sharma**  
Supervisor & Head, Department of Education  
Central University of Haryana  
Mahendergarh, Haryana

(Signature of the Scholar)  
**Altaf Rasool**  
Roll No. 6041

**Forwarded by:-**  
**Head of the Department**

## **Acknowledgement**

First and foremost I offer my sincerest gratitude to my supervisor, **Dr. Sarika Sharma, Head of Department, Department of Education** who provided me the opportunity to research on current and contextual topic in my M.phil program which can be a small contributing service to this area. I am so deeply grateful for her help, professionalism, and valuable guidance and for her patience, motivation, enthusiasm, and immense knowledge. Throughout this project and through my entire program of study I express my deep and sincere appreciation.

My deepest thanks also goes to Dr. Renu Yadav for her continuous support, guidance or help to complete my work. I would like to thank the other teachers of my

department; Dr. Dinesh and Mrs. Aarti Yadav who were involved with me and suggested me for the latest updating in research and its changing scenario. I also regards them for their encouragement, insightful comments, and motivation. In particular, I am grateful to my teachers for enlightening me the first glance of research.

I would also like to acknowledge my fellow friends and senior research scholars Showkat Hussain Itoo Suraj Kumar of Central University of Haryana, who helped me out in various problems which come in front of me in research, and continues support in terms of knowledge, during the course and this research program as well. My sincere thanks is for all my class mates and research scholars. Thank also goes to the support staff especially e-lab and Library of the university, where they helped me out in my basic needs regarding this study.

I also thanks to the various Heads and Teachers of the colleges, where I visited and their support which I got from their side, and helped me out in collection of data, through this I would be able to complete my research work.

*I take pride in myself for being the son of ideal parents – “Gh Rasool Shaksaz” and “Saleema Banoo” whose everlasting desire, blessings and help throughout my academic exploration brought me here.*

**Altaf Rasool**

## \

## INDEX

| <i><b>Chapter</b></i>   | <i><b>Description</b></i>         | <i><b>Page No.</b></i> |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|
| <i><b>Chapter 1</b></i> |                                   | <i><b>8 -22</b></i>    |
| 1.1                     | Conceptual Frame Work             |                        |
| 1.2                     | Personality                       |                        |
| 1.3                     | Characteristics of Personality    |                        |
| 1.4                     | Meaning and Definitions of traits |                        |
| 1.5                     | Definition of personality traits  |                        |
| 1.6                     | Social intelligence               |                        |
| 1.7                     | Need and Importance               |                        |
| 1.8                     | Statement Of The Problem          |                        |

|                     |   |                |
|---------------------|---|----------------|
| 1.9                 | Operational definition of variables                               |                |
| 1.10                | Objectives:-  |                |
| 1.11                | Hypotheses:-  |                |
| 1.12                | Delimitations of the study  |                |
| <b>Chapter 2</b>    | <b>REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE</b>                               | <b>23-46</b>   |
| 1.1                 | Review Of Related Literature                                      |                |
| 1.2                 | Introduction  |                |
| 1.3                 | Studies Conducted In Abroad                                       |                |
| 1.4                 | Studies In India  |                |
| 1.5                 | Studies On Social Intelligence                                    |                |
| 1.6                 | Research Gap  |                |
| <b>Chapter 3</b>    | <b>METHODS AND PROCEDURES</b>                                     | <b>47-57</b>   |
| 3.1                 | Population  |                |
| 3.2                 | Sample Of The Study   |                |
| 3.3                 | Selection Of The Tools  |                |
| 3.4                 | Tool Used   |                |
| 3.4.1               | Social Intelligence Scale   |                |
| 3.4.2               | Esyencs Personality Questionnaire                                 |                |
| 3.5                 | Validity  |                |
| <b>Chapter 4</b>    | <b>ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA</b>                        | <b>58-80</b>   |
| 4.1                 | Regression  |                |
| <b>Chapter 5</b>    | <b>FINDINGS, EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS AND FURTHER SUGGESTIONS</b> | <b>81-86</b>   |
| <b>SUMMARY</b>      |   | <b>87-100</b>  |
| <b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b> |   | <b>101-105</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX</b>     | 1. Social Intelligence Scale                                      |                |
|                     | 2. Esyencs Personality Questionnaire                              |                |

## List of Tables

|             |  |
|-------------|--|
| Table No. 1 | List of the Colleges taken for Data collection                               |
| Table No. 2 | Dimensions of Social Intelligence as per manual                              |
| Table No. 3 | Scoring for the Dimensions a) Patience as per manual                         |
| Table No. 4 | Scoring for the Dimensions b) Cooperativeness as per manual                  |
| Table No. 5 | Scoring key for the dimension C) Confidence as per manual                    |
| Table No. 6 | Scoring Key for the dimension D) Sensitivity as per manual                   |
| Table No. 7 | Scoring Key for dimension E) Recognition of Social Environment as per manual |

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| Table No. 8    | Scoring key for the dimension of (F) Tactfulness as per manual  |
| Table No. 9    | Scoring Key for dimension of (G) Sense of Humor as per manual   |
| Table No. 10   | Scoring Key for dimension of (H) Memory as per manual.  |
| Table No. 11   | Split half Reliability Coefficients as per manual   |
| Table No. 12   | Test - retest Reliability Coefficients as per manual.   |
| Table No. 13   | Model Summary of personality traits on social intelligence among college going students.  |
| Table No. 13.1 | ANOVA of personality traits on social intelligence among college going students.  |
| Table No. 13.2 | Coefficient Summary of personality traits on social intelligence among college going students.  |
| Table No. 14   | Model Summary of personality traits on social intelligence among college going students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.  |
| Table No. 14.1 | Annova Summary of personality traits on social intelligence among college going students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.   |
| Table No. 14.2 | coefficient Summary of personality traits on social intelligence among college going students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.  |
| Table No. 15   | Model Summary of personality traits on social intelligence among college going students.  |
| Table No. 15.1 | ANOVA summary of personality traits on social intelligence among college going male students.   |
| Table No. 15.2 | Coefficients <sup>a</sup> summary of personality traits on social intelligence among college going male students.   |
| Table No. 16   | Model Summary of hypotheses There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going male students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.                     |
| Table No. 16.1 | ANOVA <sup>b</sup> Summary of hypotheses There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going male students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.        |
| Table No. 16.2 | Coefficients <sup>a</sup> Summary of hypotheses There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going male students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score. |
| Table No. 17   | Modal summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going female students.   |
| Table No. 17.1 | ANOVA <sup>b</sup> summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going female students.  |
| Table No. 17.2 | Coefficients summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going female  |

students.

|                |  |
|----------------|--|
| Table No. 18   | Model Summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going female students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.                    |
| Table No. 18.1 | Model Summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going female students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.                    |
| Table No. 18.2 | Anova Summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going female students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.                    |
| Table No. 19   | coefficient Summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going female students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.              |
| Table No. 19.1 | Modal summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going rural students.   |
| Table No. 19.2 | ANOVA <sup>b</sup> summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going rural students.  |
| Table No. 20   | Coefficients summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going rural students.  |
| Table No. 20.1 | Model summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going rural students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.                     |
| Table No. 20.2 | ANOVA <sup>b</sup> summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going rural students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.        |
| Table No. 22   | Coefficients <sup>a</sup> summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going rural students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score. |
| Table No. 22.1 | Modal summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going urban students.   |
| Table No. 22.2 | ANOVA <sup>b</sup> summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going urban students.  |
| Table No. 23   | Coefficients <sup>a</sup> summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going urban students.   |
| Table No. 23.1 | Model Summary of hypotheses There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going urban   |

|                |  |
|----------------|--|
|                | students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.  |
| Table No. 23.2 | ANOVA <sup>b</sup> Summary of hypotheses There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going urban students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.          |
| Table No. 24   | Coefficients <sup>a</sup> Summary of hypotheses There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going urban students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.   |
| Table No. 24.1 | Model Summary of hypotheses There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among science going college students.   |
| Table No. 24.2 | ANOVA <sup>b</sup> summary of hypotheses There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among science going college students.  |
| Table No. 25   | Coefficients <sup>a</sup> Summary of There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among science going college students.  |
| Table No. 25.1 | Modal summary of hypotheses There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among science going college students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.                     |
| Table No. 25.2 | ANOVA <sup>b</sup> Summary of hypotheses There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among science going college students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.        |
| Table No. 26   | Coefficients <sup>a</sup> summary of hypotheses There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among science going college students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score. |
| Table No. 26.1 | Model Summary of hypotheses There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going arts students.  |
| Table No. 26.2 | ANOVA <sup>b</sup> Summary of hypotheses There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going arts students.   |
| Table No. 27   | Coefficients <sup>a</sup> summary of hypotheses There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going arts students.  |
| Table No. 27.1 | Modal summary of hypotheses There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going arts students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.                        |
| Table No. 27.2 | ANOVA <sup>b</sup> summary of hypotheses There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going arts students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.           |
| Table No. 28   | ANOVA <sup>b</sup> summary of hypotheses There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going arts students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.           |



|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| Table No. 28.1 | <p>Coefficients<sup>a</sup>      Summary of hypotheses</p> <p>There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going arts students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.</p> |
|----------------|---|

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1 Conceptual Framework**

It is well known fact that personality plays a significant role in shaping not only the behavior of an individual but also his total success and prosperity in life. Interest in personality is as old as civilization: Ancient philosophers and poets frequently ventured about why individuals were exceptional and why they differed

from each other in so many ways. Interaction between the individuals has played an important role in the growth of an individual's personality. There is not family background which plays significant role in the development of child but social factors which also play an important role in determining the behavior of the individuals. In every culture and society children and adolescents are subjected to various kinds of pressures, both personal and social. These pressures exert great influence on the personality development of the children, which ultimately influences not only the all-round development of that particular society but also affects the future development of the country. In other words, we can say that personality of the individual determines the nature of the society and the society in turn influences and nurtures the personality of an individual; thus, mutually strengthening each other. According to Cattell (1950) "the personality of an individual is that which enables us to predict what he will do in a given situation." Mischel and Shoda (1995) identified personal styles or strategies of individuals in dealing with the situations and found that these styles or strategies remain consistent over the years and they in turn, become a kind of behavioral signature of their personalities. These personality patterns or styles are determined largely by personality traits. The surroundings and the various interacting patterns that the child faces from the beginning of life determine the dynamics of personality.

Therefore according to Allport who counted 18000 traits like terms in English language that designed distinctive and personal forms of behavior The terms adjective, defines how people reflect, Observe and feel these terms do not reflect personality of an individual but there are several thousand of them do. Allport (1961) acknowledge that rich collection of traits provide a way of capturing the uniqueness of each individual. So this uniqueness of each person could be described in terms of individual dispositions. Cardinal traits are having the dominant place because all the individual actions can be traced back to them. Some people are without cardinal traits at that time central traits described an individual's behavior to some extent but nothing such a complete way as cardinal traits.

Allport the least generalized characteristics of the person he labeled secondary traits. These traits are like chocolates or prefer foreign cars but these traits have narrow range situation. Allport recommended that cardinal, central and secondary

traits come from materials produced by the individuals themselves- material such as letter, diaries or personal journal

Personality is observed in terms of several traits in the trait approach. so in our day to day conversation we attribute traits to our friends and our dear ones as being honest, shy, aggressive, lazy, dependent, dull etc. It may be defined as comparatively permanent and moderately consistent general behavior pattern that an individual shows in most situations. These configurations are said to be the basic unit of ones behavior in a variety of conditions. E.g. if an individual behaves performs honestly in several situations, his behavior may be generalized and he may considered as honest and honestly in several situations and honesty is said to behavioral trait of his personality. Two personality theories namely Allport theory and Cattells theory are said to be the best example of the trait approach. Every individual has a contour of features and capabilities that result from tendencies, learning and development. These obvious as individual variance in intelligence, creativity and many more.

Social intelligence refers to the ability to read other people and understand their intentions and motivations. People with this intelligence are usually clued into the differences between what others say and what they really mean. As a result, socially intelligent types may sometimes be accused of being mind readers. People who successfully use this type of intelligence can be masterful conversationalists. This can be due to a combination of excellent listening skills and the ability to meaningfully engage others. People who are socially intelligent can usually make others feel comfortable. They also tend to enjoy interacting with a variety of people.

## **1.2 PERSONALITY**

The modern aim of education is the wholesome, balanced or harmonious development of personality. Educationists and psychologists are busy in building wholesome or harmonious personality of the individual. Thus personality is the apex and crux of psychology and education. All knowledge of psychology and education is ultimately related to understanding or development of personality. What we are and what we hope or seek to become is our personality. It permeates every aspect of human life, it influences our behavior.

**Etymological Definition:** The word “Personality” is derived from the Latin word “Persona” which means the mask or dress which the actors used to wear in Greek drama. But it is narrow concept of personality because ‘persona’ is something external in nature and it does not include inner traits. The meaning of the personality has changed little since classical times and comments like what does he see in her?

**Psychological meaning:** But the personality is the sum total of physical, mental, emotional, social, instinctual, moral, spiritual and temperamental make-up of the individual. It is the essence of one’s instincts, feelings, emotions, sentiments, thoughts, ideas, attitudes, aptitudes, intelligence, experience, habits, perception, memory, imagination and various ways of behavior. His clothes, digestion or lameness, style of life, enthusiasm and the like color his personality. One important psychological mechanism which guides behavior is personality. As personality forms an inclination towards certain characteristic reactions in any given situation, personality traits are likely to influence attitudes and behavior in human being. The question of how best to interpret or define personality has long exercised the mind of psychologists. Personality is observed by actual observation which is the sum of activities and those activities which gives reliable information over a period of time.

Allport (1937) has defined personality as “a dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determines his unique adjustment to his environment.”

Cattell (1970) “Personality is that which permits a prediction of what a person will do in a given situation”.

Eysenck, (1971), “Personality is the more or less stable and enduring organization of a person’s character, temperament, intellect and physique, which determines his unique adjustment to the environment”. After years of research in the field now researchers have recognized the potential predictive power of personality and derived the reasons for individual differences (**Miller and Jablin 1991; Wanberg and Kammeyer-Mueller 2000**). Personality construct can be measured on the basis of some entities which can be perceived. Similarly the dimensions of personality like five factors namely Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness,

Agreeableness, Conscientiousness are also the constructs which are being measured by means of some visible entities in the form of behaviors. It is clear that in order to analyze a person's personality one needs to study his/her behaviour or rather in other words the behavioural responses of an individual are the perfect indicators to know a person's personality. "Personality" can be defined as a dynamic and organized set of characteristics possessed by a person that uniquely influences his or her cognitions, emotions, motivations, and behaviors in various situations. **(Ryckman, R. 2004)**

The word "personality" originates from the Latin word *persona*, which means mask. Significantly, in the theatre of the ancient Latin speaking world, the mask was not used as a plot device to disguise the identity of a character, but rather was a convention employed to represent or typify that character. Personality may also refer to the patterns of thoughts, feelings and behaviors consistently exhibited by an individual over time that strongly influence the expectations, self-perceptions, values and attitudes, and predicts the reactions to people, problems and stress. Similarly, the word personality indicates the set of predictable behavioral responses that make us recognizable to others. The pioneering American psychologist **Gordon, Allport (1937)** described two major ways to study personality: the nomothetic and the idiographic. Nomothetic psychology seeks general laws that can be applied to many different people, such as the principle of self-actualization, or the trait of extraversion. Idiographic psychology is an attempt to understand the unique aspects of a particular individual.

**Santrock, J.W. (2008)** explains that personality psychology is a branch of psychology that studies personality and individual differences. Its areas of focus include:

- Constructing a coherent picture of the individual and his or her major psychological processes,
- Investigating individual differences - how people are unique, and
- Investigating human nature - how people are alike.

### **1.3. Characteristics of Personality**

So what exactly makes an up a personality? As described in the definitions, we would expect that traits and patterns of thought and emotion make up an important part. Some of the other fundamental characteristics of personality include:

- Personality is dynamic in nature. It is not static. It is ever growing, developing and ever changing
- Personality is organized and integrated.
- Personality is the dynamic organization within the individual of various psychological systems. (Habits, attitudes, aptitudes, emotions, sentiments, motives, beliefs, feelings, thoughts, intelligence etc.)
- All the systems that comprising personality are to be regarded as determining tendencies.
- Personality is something unique. No two individuals have same personality at all.
- Consistency: It is generally a recognizable order and regularity to behaviors. Essentially, people act in the same ways or similar ways in a variety of situations.
- Psychological and Physiological: Personality is a psychological construct, but study suggests that it is also influenced by biological processes and needs.
- It impacts behaviors and actions: Personality does not just influence how we move and respond in our environment; it also causes us to act in certain ways.
- Multiple expressions: Personality is displayed in more than just behavior. It can also be seen in our thoughts, feelings, close relationships and other social interactions.

#### **1.4 Meaning and Definitions of traits**

In psychology, trait describes a characteristic that is unchanging and predictable. For example, shyness is a trait that is usually stable in an individual's personality. Another example is talkativeness. A child who is talkative is likely to continue this characteristic throughout the various stages of development. There are some temperamental traits that researchers believe to be innate-that is, the infant possesses a basis for developing the trait at birth. Other traits are acquired through

learning, such as the tendencies toward tidiness or untidiness. Determining whether a trait is inborn or acquired is difficult, and many psychologists and others study various human traits to gather evidence to help provide insight into this question. According to Trait theorists they recognize that different traits are relevant to different settings. No one imagines that people will performance in a way that is indifferent to social contexts. Costa and McCrae observes: personality traits are postulated to be endogenous disposition whose origin and development are independent of environment influence. Some researchers are interested in the acquired traits that enable an individual to function effectively in society. These traits, known as socially adaptive traits, enable the individual to participate in society as a member of a couple, family, club, school class, or sports team. Examples of these traits are cooperation, motivation, and willingness to share. The counterpart to socially adaptive traits, socially maladaptive traits, prevents the individual from effectively participating in groups. Examples of socially maladaptive traits are deception, antisocial behaviour, and extreme selfishness. **Pervin, L. & John, O. (1999)** defines that traits are the consistent patterns of thoughts, feelings, or actions that distinguish people from one another. Traits are basis tendencies that remain stable across the life span, but characteristic behaviour can change considerably through adaptive processes. A trait is an internal characteristic that corresponds to an extreme position on a behavioural dimension.

**Nausheen, Adenwalla. (2007)** illustrates that traits are distinguishing qualities or characteristics of a person. Traits are a readiness to think or act in a similar fashion in response to a variety of different stimuli or situations. Philosopher Hippocrates described four humors phlegm, blood, black bile and yellow bile. According to Hippocrates these were the reproductions of four cosmic elements earth, water, air and fire. Each of which had a particular quality cold for air, heat for fire, moist for water, and dry for earth. Similarly these humors combine together and determine the individual's health and character. Eysenck argued that, beneath their clear illogicality, these ideas symbolize the three main notions which characterize modern work in personality (H.J Eysenck and Eysenck, 1985). First behavior is best described in terms of traits that characterize people in varying degrees. Second these traits combine to define essential type. Third individual differences on these types are based

on constitutional (I,e genetic ,neurological, bio chemical factors). To a large extent, these three notions serve as Eysenks credo).

### **1.5 Definition of personality traits**

Personality trait defined as a complex of qualities and characteristics or the pattern of thought, emotion, and behavior of one people that is stable across time and many situations and seen as being distinctive to a group, nation, place etc. Personality traits influence the choice of words which one use to communicate with others. Personality traits are responsible for one's brain functioning and its normal neurobiological and biochemical reactions. They establish electrochemical dialogue that takes place between the brain, the endocrine system, and the physical body. Personality traits reveal themselves through a predominant color found in the human energy system. (Ryckman, R.:2004) According to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of the American Psychiatric Association (2011), personality traits are "enduring patterns of perceiving, relating to, and thinking about the environment and oneself that are exhibited in a wide range of social and personal contexts." Theorists generally assume (a) traits are relatively stable over time, (b) traits differ among individuals (for instance, some people are outgoing while others are reserved), and (c) traits influence behavior.

Funder, D. C. (2001) illustrates that traits are distinguishing qualities or characteristics of a person. Traits are a readiness to think or act in a similar fashion in response to a variety of different stimuli or situations. In general, trait theory assumes that people differ on variables or dimensions that are continuous. People are seen to differ in the amounts or quantities of a characteristic rather than differ in the quality of their characteristics. Allport, G.W. (1937) delineated different kinds of traits, which he also called dispositions. Central traits are basic to an individual's personality, while secondary traits are more peripheral. Common traits are those recognized within a culture and thus may vary from culture to culture. Cardinal traits are those by which an individual may be strongly recognized. It can be concluded that Personality trait is a complex of qualities and characteristics or the pattern of thought, emotion, and behavior of one people that is stable across time and many situations and seen as being distinctive to a group, nation, place etc. It is an enduring patterns of perceiving, relating to, and thinking about the environment and oneself that are exhibited in a wide range of social and personal contexts which generally assume : (a) traits are



relatively stable over time, (b) traits differ among individuals (for instance, some people are outgoing while others are reserved), and (c) traits influence behaviour. In the present study, personality traits refer to personality traits of physical education students at University level.

### **1.6 Social intelligence**

Education which is considered an important instrument which brings change in over all aspects of individual life and prepares human beings to be successful in a society. From this point of view education is serving for the development of individuals. Education starts from the womb of mother and continues till the last breath of life. It is constant and ongoing process. Schooling generally begins somewhere between the ages four and six when children are gathered together for the purposes of specific guidance related to skills and competencies that society deems important. In the past, once the formal primary and secondary schooling was completed the process was finished. However, in today's information age, adults are quite often learning in informal setting throughout their working lives and even into retirement. Education is indispensable to normal living, without education the individual would be unqualified for group life (Safaya, et al. 1963). It can be guessed that with man's development of language and then a variety of written forms of communication, the existence of individual differences among men is a characteristic which later would be called "Intelligence" became discernible even thousands of years ago. While intelligence is one of the most talked about subjects within psychology, some researchers have suggested that intelligence is a single, general ability; while others believe that intelligence encompasses a range of aptitudes, skills and talent. Intelligence is a term describing one or more capacities of the mind. In a different context this can be defined in different ways including the capacities for abstract thought, understanding, communication, reasoning, learning, planning, emotional intelligence and problem solving. Andrew Hamilton MacPhail (1924): A study of Intelligence as a factor in the selection, retention, and guidance of college students; based on investigations made at many different institutions and at Brow University in particular. An analysis of these coefficients justified the conclusion expressed by Terman that "compared with other available means of predicting the success of college students the intelligence test makes a favorable showing in general." Anju Sharma (1989) found that intelligence, academic achievement, and

adult dependence was significantly associated with the social maturity of children, although adult-dependence had a negative association. Mainstream Science on Intelligence” (1994): An editorial statement by 52 researches defines Intelligence as; A very general mental capability that, among other things, involves the ability to reason, plan, solve problems, think abstractly, comprehend complex ideas, learn quickly and learn from experience.

Thorndike (1920) gave the concept of social intelligence and put forth the idea that intelligence could be separated into three facets. These include mechanical, social, and abstract intelligence. These facets included social, mechanical and abstract intelligences. The defining factor separating these facets is the type of subjects or stimuli, individuals must interact with. Mechanical intelligence is the ability of persons which helps them to interact with machines and other things amicably. So far as the abstract intelligence is concerned it deals with individual performance by using ideas and non-tangible objects. Social Intelligence relates to individual’s interaction with people in an intelligent manner. Thorndike’s theory states that a socially intelligent person will be able to understand others and that he or she will be able to use this information to act wisely in human relations.

Every one possesses profile of faces and skills that result from tendencies, learning and development. This manifest as individual differences in creativity, intelligence and many more. Social intelligence which refers to that it is the ability to read other people and understand their intents and inspirations. People with this intelligence are usually clued into the differences between what others say and what they really mean. As a result, socially intelligent types may sometimes be accused of being mind readers. People who successfully use this type of intelligence can be masterful communicators. This can be due to a combination of outstanding listening skills and the capability to meaningfully engage others. People who are socially intelligent can usually make others around them feel comfortable and included. They also tend to enjoy interacting with a variety of people.

Social intelligence which truly makes us humans is the qualitative aspect of our life, somewhat than our quantitative intelligence. According to Social Scientist Ross Honey Will, “Social Intelligence is an aggregated measure of self and social awareness, evolved social beliefs and attitudes and a capacity and appetite to manage

complex social change.” It can be described as a combination of abilities: the first is a basic understanding of people (i. e. a kind of strategic social awareness) and the second is the skills needed for interacting successfully with them, in other words, the ability to get along with others and to encourage them to cooperate with you. Social Intelligence can be thought of as encompassing five dimensions: Presence, Clarity, Awareness, Authenticity and Empathy. People with high Social Intelligence are often said to have “Nourishing Behaviors” which make others around them feel valued, loved, respected and appreciated. These people are considered as magnetic personality individuals because they appealing to others. Conversely people low in Social Intelligence are often described as “Toxic”, on the other hand people with this character behaves in such an way which will hurt the sentiments of others it is due to because lack of insight. In other words they are often so preoccupied with personal stresses that they fail to see the impact of the behavior on other. They will often undergo radical behavioral or even personality changes when made to see themselves as others see them.

### **1.7 Need and Importance**

Students play an important role in contemporary society it has been rightly said that future of the country is depend on the students and are the builders of the nation. New theories of intelligence have been introduced and are gradually replacing the traditional theory. So traits which are considered building blocks of personality and plays significant role in shaping the behavior of students. Through these personality traits it helps the students to adjust in the environment which is full of chaos and confusion and the students are not in a position to decide what to do. Through the close connection between the traits and social intelligence which enables the persons to perform effectively in society. So in the contemporary world things are changing day by day and the needs demands of individuals are changing accordingly. So it is essential especially for the students to act wisely and to deal effectively in the changing situation. The student has become the center of concern, not only the reasoning capacities, but also his creativity, emotions, and interpersonal skills. Psychologist Howard Gardener (1983) introduced multiple intelligence theory which says that IQ alone is not only measure for success, there are also certain factors which plays key role in determining the success of an individual these are emotional intelligence and social intelligence which impacts the success of an individual. In this

modern world especially in the field of education and due to rapid growth of industries where human interactions and relations play a vital role these personality traits and social intelligence acts as bridge to handle the situation and adjust in the situation and to achieve the success in life. Although a number of studies on the relationship of personality traits and social intelligence, but little research has been done on personality traits and social intelligence. Hence it is noteworthy to apply the two frame works Eysencks personality questionnaire and social intelligence inventory to which extent the impact of personality traits on social intelligence. Stability distinguishes traits on social intelligence from transient properties of the person. Social intelligence as a personality trait as performance characteristics may be regarded as an important social competence and significant predictor of successfulness of a student. The researcher wants to analyze the interconnection amongst personality traits and social intelligence.

The present study is a humble attempt to assess the impact of personality traits and social intelligence of college students. The psychologists developed interest in understanding, promoting and utilizing the individual differences for the development and prosperity of the society. The investigator has reviewed the literature and found it feasible to work on the topic. The study will be the guideline for the teachers, educationists and practitioners, researchers as well as curriculum planners, in order to imbibe coherence and integrity in personality and develop social intelligence among the college students so that the students will be able to acquire basic understanding regarding themselves.

In the light of the above research gap the investigator justifies the need to conduct a study stated as under.

## **1.8 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

**“Impact of Personality Traits on Social Intelligence of Students: A Study in Context of College Going Students of Jammu District.”**

## **1.9 Operational definition of variables**

### **1.9.1 Personality Traits**

It refers to enduring personal characteristics that are revealed in a particular pattern of behavior in a variety of situation. Personality traits for the present study have been measured through Eysenck's personality questionnaire-R (1975). It measures personality in four dimensions. These dimensions are as under:

1. Psychoticism
2. Extraversion
3. Neuroticism
4. Lie scales

### **1.9.2 Social Intelligence**

It as an ability to understand other people and social interactions, and apply this knowledge in leading and influencing other people for their mutual satisfaction. Social intelligence for the present study has been measured through N. K. Chadha and Usha Ganesan Social Intelligence Scale (1986). It measures social intelligence in eight dimensions. These dimensions are as under:

1. Patience
2. Cooperativeness
3. Confidence level
4. Sensitivity
5. Recognition of social environment
6. Tactfulness
7. Sense of humor
8. Memory

### **1.9.3 College students**

College students are those who are on rolls in various degree colleges of district Jammu. The sample has been taken from the third year college students during year (2016-17).

### **1.10 Objectives:-**

The following objectives have been formulated for the present study:

1. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going students.
2. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism and life score.
3. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among male going college students.
4. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among male college going students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism and life score.
5. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among female college going students.
6. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among female college going students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism and life score.
7. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among urban college going students.
8. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among urban college going students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism and life score.
9. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among rural college going students.
10. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among rural college going students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism and life score.
11. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among Science College going students.
12. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among Science College going students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism and life score.
13. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among Arts College going students.
14. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among Arts College going students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism and life score.

### **1.11 Hypotheses:-**

Following hypotheses have been formulated for the present study.

1. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going students.
2. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.
3. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going male students.
4. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going male students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.
5. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going female students.
6. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going female students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.
7. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going rural students.
8. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going rural students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.
9. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going urban students.
10. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going urban students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.
11. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among science going college students.
12. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among science going college students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.
13. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among arts going college students.

14. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among arts going college students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.

### **1.12 Delimitations of the study**

1. The study is delimited to Jammu.
2. The study is delimited to the students of class 3<sup>rd</sup> year.
3. The study took only male-female rural –urban science-arts factors into consideration.
4. The present study has been conducted on 200 students only.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

#### **2.1 INTRODUCTION**



“The competent physician must keep himself consistently abreast of latest discoveries in the field of medicine. The successful lawyer must be able to readily locate information pertinent to the case at hand. Obviously the careful student of education, the research worker and investigator should become familiar with the location and use of source of education information.”

**(Good Barr and Scates)**

“If we could first know where we are and where we are standing we could better judge what to do and how to do”.

**(Abraham Lincoln)**

This chapter deals with the review of the literature. It is an attempt to discover relevant material published earlier in the problem of study. This covers the empirical research studies done previously in the problem area. The studies conducted during the last few decades in the field of personality and social intelligence that are more relevant and pertinent to the present investigation are discussed in this chapter. Before taking up any specific research project in the development of discipline, the investigator must be thoroughly familiar with previous theories and practices. It helps to save time and resources. The review of literature is a crucial aspect of the planning of study and the time spent in such a survey invariably is a wise investment. A survey of related studies was undertaken by the investigator to get an insight into the work that has already been in the field of this investigation and also to get suggestions regarding the ways and means for the collection of relevant data and interpretation of results.

Researcher has read many studies conducted abroad and conducted in India. It has been observed that the personality traits which plays an important role in the development of personality and the study reveals that there is close connection between the personality traits with other dimensions in the academic achievement which shows positive correlation. The details of the studies are divided into two groups; 1. Studies in Abroad, 2. Studies in India.

## **2.2 STUDIES CONDUCTED IN ABROAD**

**Rezier, Agnes, G. (1975)**, has associated the personality characteristics of determined low and high achieving pharmacy students showed high achievement associated with a planned, orderly life style and introversion.

**Wayson, Peter, Direew. (1982)**, in the University of California conducted a research study on “the birth order and personality traits styles and structures, differences reflective by projective test”, a discriminate analysis indicate that last born selected had more elaborated and well-articulated object representation on the Rorschach and less likely to exhibit pathological ideation.

**Mecclum, L.A. and Merrel, K.W. (1998)**, studied the relationship between personalities with academic achievement levels. Majority of the students are on the low level of neurotic dimension while only minorities of them are on the high level. The study also shows that, on the whole, majority of the students have excellent academic achievement. This may be because they received good attention and care, and high appreciation from their peers, parents and the students around them, enabling them to improve their self-concept which had positive impact on their learning process.

**Saksanit, Watchira. (2015)**. in his study found that

- The mean score of personality traits rated by 2,236 physical education students was at moderate level.
- The mean scores of the personality traits in total score and in different dimensions (i.e. extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience) rated by physical education students at university level were at moderate level.
- The mean score of the personality traits rated by male physical education students was at high level whereas the mean score of the personality traits rated by female physical education students was at moderate level. 260
- There was the significance between mean scores of personality traits in total score and in different dimensions rated by male and female physical education students. The personality traits in total score and in different dimensions rated by male physical education students has greater value than that of the personality traits in total score and in different dimensions rated by female physical education students.

- The total mean score of the personality traits rated by physical education students belonging to primary and secondary groups of parents( education was at moderate level whereas the mean score of the personality traits rated by physical education students belonging to bachelor and master degree groups of parents( education was at high level.
- There was the significant difference between mean scores of personality traits in total score and in different dimensions rated by physical education students belonging to different groups of socio-economic status of family (parent (education). The mean score of the personality traits in total score and in different dimensions rated by physical education students belonging to lower socio-economic status of family (parents (education) has smaller value than that of the mean score of the personality traits in total score and in different dimensions rated by physical education students belonging to higher socio-economic status of family (parents (education).
- The total mean score of the personality traits rated by physical education students belonging to agriculture and labour groups of parents( occupation was at moderate level whereas the mean score of the personality traits rated by physical education students belonging to business and government service groups of parents( education was at high level.
- There was the significant difference between mean scores of personality traits in total score and in different dimensions rated by physical education students belonging to different groups of socio-economic status of family (parents (occupation). The physical education students belonging to business group of socio-economic status of family (parents (occupation) obtained the greatest value of mean score on the personality traits in total score and in different dimensions. The physical education students belonging to agriculture group of socio-economic status of family (parents (occupation) obtained the lowest value of mean score on the personality traits in total score and in different dimensions.
- The total mean score of the personality traits rated by physical education students belonging to 10,000-15,000 Baht and 15,001-20,000 Baht groups of parents( monthly income was at moderate level whereas the mean score of the personality traits rated by physical education students belonging to 20,001-

25,000 Baht and 25,001 Baht onwards groups of parents( monthly income was at high level.

There was the significance between mean scores of personality traits in total score and in different dimensions rated by physical education students belonging to different groups of socio-economic status of family (parents( monthly income). The mean score of the personality traits in total score and in different dimensions rated by physical education students belonging to lower socio-economic status of family (parents (monthly income) has smaller value than that of the mean score of the personality traits in total score and in different dimensions rated by physical education students belonging to higher socio-economic status of family (parents (monthly income).

### **2.3 STUDIES IN INDIA**

**Mishra, H.K. (1962,** conducted a relative study of non-academic background and personality structure of high and low achievers in engineering education. The high and low groups from different engineering courses were formed. Besides studying personality traits aspirations, rural and urban, data on income were obtained for both the groups. The study revealed that personality configurations of the two groups differed in traits like anxiety, Judgment and Neuroticism. There were, however no alterations in their intelligence, attitude towards teacher, social adjustment and total emotionality. The groups did not seem to differ in their dimension either.

**Joshi, (1974),** investigated on the problem, “a study of creativity and some personality traits of intellectually gifted high school students”. He established from his study that (i) most effective contribution to all types of creative scores was giftedness (ii) age was important correlate of creativity at fifteen years age level (iii) in case of boy’s giftedness was contributed to emotional maturity in case of boys (iv) He founded there was low positive correlation between intelligence and types of creativity scores.

**Srivastava, S.S (1979),** established a study on Indian students who rated on personality characteristics themselves as academically successful and unsuccessful. Both the groups of the students did not differ on two other second order factors,

emotional versus alert noise and subdued versus independence. In his study academically successful students were significantly lower on anxiety factor than unsuccessful students. Academically unsuccessful students were fewer extroverts than academically successful students.

**Menon, S.K. (1980)**, having analyzed with the various works of research the researcher has come up with the main findings of the study were over-achieving groups of superior and general ability and of boys and girls were less extrovert and less maladjusted than under achievers and showed greater academic interest and endurance. Over achieving girls of general ability showed—strong interest in aesthetic, social and mechanical activities. Demographic factors and socioeconomic status markedly influenced over and under-achievement. Higher occupational and educational levels of fathers, educational levels of mothers, family income and parental attention were related to high achievement, but the extent of relationship was not similar in boys and girls. Job aspiration, educational aspiration and general ambition were strongly associated with high achievement, particularly for girls. Urban residence was related to high achievement.

**Gupta (1983)** acknowledged that certain personality variables are associated to achievement of a particular sex, factor B and J in the case of male adolescents and factor C, D and O in the case of females.

**Girija, P.R and Bhadra, B.P(1984)**, He investigated the personality characteristics of high and low achievers on motivation to succeed, efficient work plan and competitiveness. They indicate that the two groups differ significantly. High score achievers were good in all aspects. High achievers are highly motivated and the personality scale description suggests that whatever they want to achieve in life.

**Sharma (1985)**, establish that high and low achievers do not differ significantly on the locus of control on the component of personality.

**Sood, R. (1988)**, He revealed that personality factors that could forecast academic achievement in some specialized courses and using cattell's 16 PF test found a few factors, each 'contributing' positively, and a few others, negatively, to

achievement in engineering, medicine, business management and law, exploring the relationship of creativity to personality, locus of control and alienation.

**Jantli, R.T. (1988)**, discovered the interrelationship between teacher behavior pupil personality and the pupil growth outcome and found academic achievement negatively related to extraversion and neuroticism.

**Khatoon, J. (1988)**, the chief outcomes were high success obtained a higher mean value on personality factor H and lower mean value on factor-I than the low achievers. Rural students achieved higher mean values on factors E and Q2 than their urban counterparts. On factors D, I and O girls achieved higher mean values, while on factor H they were lower than boys. Achievement locality interaction did not affect the personality traits significantly. Interaction between achievement and sex significantly affected personality factors C, Q2 and Q4. On Factors E, F, G and Q3 the interaction effect of locality and sex were significant. Interaction of achievement, sex and locality did not have significant effect on any personality factor. High academic achievers were adventurous, active, impulsive, socially bold, tough-minded, expressive, obedient, conventional and humble, whereas low academic achievers were more shy, timid, threat sensitive, tender-minded, unconventional, aggressive and assertive. Rural students tended to be more assistive and self-sufficient, whereas urban students were obedient and group-dependent. Male students were more phlegmatic, adventurous, tough-minded and placid in comparison to female students who were more excitable, shy, tender-minded and apprehensive by nature.

**Haq, Najmul, (1988)**, observed that in subject English students especially male over achievers were found more submissive, self-assured, obedient, secure and accommodating than under achievers who were more assertive, competitive, stubborn, apprehensive, insecure, worrying and troubled and aggressive. On the other hand, over achievers female in subject English were found to be more assertive, enthusiastic, tough-minded, self-sufficient, reject illusions, obedient and affected by feelings but less prone to circumspect individualism than female under achievers. Under achievers Male in English were extra emotionally stable, excitable, assertive, sober, tough-minded, apprehensive, dependent but less tense than underachieving females. over achievers male in mathematics were more intelligent, emotionally

stable, enthusiastic, relaxed and adventurous than female over achievers. On the other hand, female over achievers were more apprehensive, self-sufficient, tense and assertive than their male counterparts. Under achievers male in mathematics were higher on reservedness, intelligence, emotional stability, adventurousness, tough-mindedness, security and self-control than female under achievers. On the other hand, female under achievers were more assertive and tense than male counterparts who were more obedient and relaxed.

**Ramaswamy, R. (1988)**, establish that, among high and low achieving boys and girls the academic achievement was found positively related to personality, achievement motivation, self-concept, study habits, and SES. Significant difference was found between high and low achievers in personality, achievement-motivation, self-concept, study habits and SES.

**Dixit, Santosh Kumar, (1989)** Concluded that in the educational achievement Personality factors significantly influenced. Intelligence was related to educational achievement. Self-concept was not related to educational achievement.

**Joshi, R. (1989)**, Analyzed the differences among the four groups, the engineering group was the highest on fluency, flexibility, originality, elaboration, The engineering group was the highest on fluency, flexibility, originality, elaboration, extroversion and neuroticism, powerlessness, psychoticism and social alienation followed by medicine management and law groups. In fluency, originality, extroversion and neuroticism women were higher than men.

**Sharma, K. (1989)**, conduct a study to identify the over-achievers and the under achievers and compared them with some personality factors. The study reveals that there were significant differences among the over-achievers, average achievers, and under achievers with regard to their adjustment in the school, home, social and religious and miscellaneous areas. The findings of the study reveal that over-achievers had better adjustment than the under-achievers in all these areas of adjustment. Those who had more effective adjustment in the school, home, social and religious and miscellaneous areas were over-achievers and those having less effective adjustment in these areas were under achievers. Those who had more effective adjustment in the

school, home, social and religious and miscellaneous areas were over-achievers and those having less effective adjustment in these areas were under achievers. Intelligence was related to adjustment in all these areas, which implied that adjustment was at least partly dependent upon intelligence.

**Ayishabi, T.C. (1990)** the study examined that Muslims , Hindu and Christian Students differed in social adjustment, introversion and self –concept and differed in only two personality variables, viz., introversion and manifest anxiety. Students belonging to small, medium and large families varied in masculinity. Differences have been observed in personal adjustment, social adjustment, introversion and masculinity between the urban and rural students. High, average and low groups based on parental education varied in masculinity. High, average and low parental occupations of students varied in parental adjustment, social adjustment, general anxiety and manifest anxiety. High, average and low groups in achievements differed in introversion. Different intelligence level of students differed in personal adjustment, introversion, masculinity, general anxiety, manifest anxiety and examination anxiety.

**Devi, Ujwala A. (1990)**, conducted an investigation which shows that girls are significantly higher in academic achievement than boys. In the intelligence levels of boys and girls which show that there was no significant difference. Girls were shown less in neurotic than boys. There was no difference between boys and girls in the locus of control. Significant and positive correlation of academic achievement showed with intelligence. Academic achievement was negatively correlated with neuroticism. Intelligence showed a negative relationship with neuroticism and a positive relationship with locus of control.

**Vijay Kumar Seth (1990)**, the study was examined on the personality patterns of high achieving and low achieving students in professional courses (Engineering, Medicine and Teaching Education). The major findings were high and low achieving students taken together differed significantly from each other on personality factors of lower-higher scholastic mental capacity (Factor-B); emotional instability (Factor-C); experience Conscientiousness (Factor-G); Shyness–Venture sameness (Factor-H); Placidity apprehensiveness (Factor-O) and Low High



ergictension (Factor - Q1). High achieving students were found to differ significantly from each other, on personality factors of lower-higher scholastic mental capacity (Factor B); De surgency–Surgency (Factor-F), and tough mindedness. Low achieving students were found to differ significantly from each-other, on factors of reservedness-outgoingness (Factor–A); Low-Higher Scholastic Mental Capacity (Factor–B); Tough mindedness-Tender mindedness (Factor-I); Trust placement-Suspiciousness (Factor-L) and Lower-Higher ergictension (Factor-Q4).

**Verma, B.P. (1992)**, investigated a study in which he found that correlations between traits of sociability, ascendance, secretiveness, reflective, impulsivity, placid, accepting, vigorous, co-operative, persistence, warmth, aggressiveness, tolerance and tough-minded and academic achievement on the other hand, were not found to be significant. Positive and significant relationship was found between ‘responsible’ trait of temperament and academic achievement. High and Low achieving groups did not show any significant difference in the mean scores of sociability, ascendant, secretiveness, reflectiveness, impulsivity, placid, accepting, vigorous, cooperative, persistence, warmth, and aggressiveness. It has been found that high achieving group of students had significantly higher value of mean scores of ‘responsible’ trait than low achieving group of students.

**Saxena, Anju and Rashmi (1994)**, the study was carried out on the personality structure of advantaged school-going children. The findings of the study were advantaged children were highly superior in comparison to disadvantaged children on traits like emotional construction, abundance of creative impulses, high degree of empathy and given to introspection. Girls were less superior in comparison to boys in relation to 15 personality traits.

**Abraham, T. (1996)**, the purpose of the investigation was to determine the influence of basic personality factors on academic achievement. The major findings were on academic achievement maximum influence was of scholastic aptitude. The influence of the temperamental dimension of neuroticism and introversion–extroversion on academic achievement showed sex differences. It was found that the factor analysis of the personality variables and academic achievement evolved a factor pattern in which three factors could be identified, viz., scholastic aptitude,

neuroticism and extroversion– introversion. The personality factors evolved from the analysis of scores obtained from a) a sample of boys and girls; b) a sample of boys; c) a sample of girls was similar. The personality factors evolved in the analysis had significant loading on the personality variables and so the influence of personality on academic achievement could be described in terms of the personality factors. Boys were found to be superior to girls in their achievement and the same trend was noted in the loading of the dominant personality factors.

**Mavi, N.S. and Iswarpatel (1997)**, the objectives of the study were to examine the relationship between academic achievement and selected personality variables of IX Grade Students. The personality variables are personality adjustment, intelligence, self-concept and level of aspiration. The study reveals that there was a weak relationship between the personality variable and academic achievement, in the case of tribal and non-tribal students. The study shows that in overall non –tribal student scored higher than the tribal students.

**Mishra, S.P. (1997)**, it has been examined that the high achievers in arts, commerce, science were higher on the level of creativity than the low achievers in arts, commerce and science streams than their low achieving counterparts.

**Narayana Koteswara, M. and Ramachandra Reddy, B. (1998)**, the study examines that the students of high school in language Telugu 14 factors of HSPQ had significant influence on reading achievement. The students whose personality characteristics for more intelligent, emotionally stable, excitable, assertative, happy, controlled and tense, performed significantly better on reading achievement in Telegu language, in comparison to those students whose personality characteristics were observed as less intelligent, phelegmatic, obedient, sober and undisciplined.

**Sood, S. (1999)**, the study was investigated to study the effect of different personality factors as facilitators in mathematical achievement it was found from the 16 factors only seven factors of personality correlated significantly. They were schizothymes-cyclothymiacs: lower –higher mental capacity.

**Mishra, G. (1999)**, the study was intended to find out the comparison between the two groups of tribal tenth student. A questionnaire was administered on High school personality Questionnaire (HSPQ) tribal tenth grade students were more intelligent, sober, conscientious, zestful, self-sufficient, controlled and tense than their SC counterparts. It was found that the SC students were reserved, less intelligent, emotionally less stable, inactive, submissive, happy-go-lucky, having weaker ego strength, tough minded, insecure, group dependent and tense. In contrast, general category students were outgoing, more intelligent, emotionally stable, overactive, tender minded, reflective, self-assured, and relaxed had low level of integration.

**Neeta, Kaushik. (1999)**, the purpose of this study was to explain the magnitude of influence of extroversion of female adolescents on their socio-metric status is found to be significant. It has been found that the female adolescents of high and low extroverted and average and low extroverted groups differ significantly in respect of their socio metric status. High and average extroverted female adolescent group don't differ significantly with regard to their socio metric status. High and average, high and low and average low self-concept also show that differences in self-concept contribute to differences in their social acceptance. Self-concept as a whole exerts a moderate influence on sociometric status. Inferiority and emotional stability which is considered other two components has also been found to be significant.

**Nateson, N. and Susila, C. (2000)**, indicated that the chosen personality factors (Cattell's Children personality questionnaire) are not significantly influencing the achievement of V Standard boys (N=300) and girls (N=300) in the age group of 9 to 10 years in schools.

**Basanti, Jagan Mohan and Mukhopadhaya (2000)**, studied the effect of Psychological factors and academic achievement among tribal students. It was found that boys and girls did not differ in terms of psychological constraints. The degree of psychological constraints differed between high achievers and low achievers. High achievers had low levels of psychological constraints. It was revealed that psychological constraints and academic achievement are negatively correlated with each other

**Govinda, Reddy. (2002).** investigated that, factors B, E, F, M, Q2 and Q4 of 16PF have significant influence on the total scholastic achievement of DIET Students.

**Rao, S.B. (2003),** the purpose of this study was to explain the role of certain aspects of personality and patterns of adjustment in scholastic performance. It was observed that the high and low achievers did not show significant difference in general mental ability. It was also found that level of academic achievement was positively related to academic adjustment. Differences in achievement were found to be significantly related to aspects of personality like neurotic difficulties, moral and sense of responsibility. Academic adjustment was found to be significantly related to the considered aspects of personality. Differences in academic adjustment were not found to be significantly related to differences in mental ability. Differences in the aspects of personality were not significantly related to difference in mental ability.

**Annie, K. Jacob (2004),** the aim of the study was to determine the relationship of psychological factors such as self-concept, values, anxiety, introversion and extroversion. Over achievers, normal achievers and underachievers differ in respect of their verbal creativity scores and it has been found that there is significant positive relationship between creativity and self-concept for overachievers and underachievers.

**Gyanani, T.C. and Kapoor, A. (2004),** the study investigates that the child rearing practices influence the various personality factors of boys and girls differently. It has been observed that children, whose parents followed good child – rearing practices, they are found to be highly participating, warm hearted, active, obedient, mildly assertive, happy, less realistic, vigorous, zestful, placid, self-assured, self-disciplined and controlled while. In comparison to those parents whose rearing practices are poor the children are found to be reserved, active, taciturn, realistic, and vigorous. Boys were found to be emotionally less stable, active, mildly assertive, dominating, sober, restrained, forthright, natural, self-assured, placid and relaxed. On the other hand, girls are found to be emotionally stable, less active, relaxed, energetic, worrying and shy. Personality factors are found to be statistically significant among the students. This shows that boys whose parents adopt poor child-rearing practices

are serious, careless and tense in comparison to the boys whose parents adopt good child rearing practices. Girls, who are getting poor child-rearing practices are found to be submissive, serious, unwilling to act, individualistic, slightly restrained and calculating in comparison to girls whose parents adopt good child-rearing practices.

**Chauhan, R.S. (2004)**, the purpose of the study was to examine that the positive linkage is held between the extroversion and introversion personality type of poor adjusted pupils with their degree of learning style preferences. However, the extroversion and introversion personality type may have a positive and significant linkage with individualistic (Vs.) Non-individualistic preferences of urban male, Short attention span (Vs.) Long Attention span, Environment-oriented (Vs.) Environmental-Free preferences of Urban female, visual Vs. aural, Motivationcentered Vs. Motivation Non-centered preferences of rural female and Individualistic Vs. Non-individualistic learning style preference of pupils in general.

**Rajani, M. (2004)**, found that the personality factors viz., (1) Factor-B (less intelligent Vs more intelligent), (2) Factor-C (Emotionally less stable Vs Emotionally stable), (3) Factor-E (Obedient Vs Assertive) (4). Factor-G (Moral standards Vs Superego's strength) (5). Factor-H (Shy Vs Venturesome), 6) Factor-Q1 (placid Vs Apprehensive), 7) Factor-Q3 (Undisciplined Vs Controlled) and 8) Factor-Q4 (Relaxed Vs Tense) of HSPQ have significant influence on study habits of intermediate students. The remaining factors of HSPQ don't have significant influence on study habits.

**Marilyn Macdonald (2004)**, conducted study on the Cognitive, Academic and personality characteristics of early school leavers and per sisters. Both leavers and per sister are found to be concrete thinkers are the chief findings of the study. The per sisters had significantly higher academic self-concept than the leavers, and the other group had significantly higher academic self-concepts than the per sisters. On the dimension of self –concept and personality of students there was no significant difference.

**Panchalingappa. (2004)**, the study investigates that there are significant differences between normal and under achievers in respect of their self-confidence, general anxiety, test anxiety and study habits. The study reveals that due to lack of

self-confidence, general anxiety, test anxiety and poor study habits are all possible casual factors associated with under achievement.

**According to Azizi et.al (2005)**, the objectives of the study is that the students who has develop positive self- concept who have positive self-conceptgenerally received good attention and care from their parents, families, teachers, friends or students around them. Besides this they will continuously have the chance to gain more success than failure. Because they feel respected and they get good support from others. The findings from the study also showed that majority of students have extrovert personality.

**Jean-Paul E. Priete. (2005)**, the study suggests that the students with green personality characteristics have a serious and mature attitude and are more likely to their towards their occupational plans as opposed to their blue counter parts

**Khan, Z.N. (2005)**, conducted a study on 400 students of A.M.V., Aligarh-India selected from the senior secondary school ( 200 Boys & 200 Girls) the aim of the study was to establish the predictive value of different measures of cognition, personality and demographic variables for success at higher secondary level in science stream. The study reveals that the combined sample of boys and girls yielded seven factors. It was established that the students possessing high intelligence and are fairly high on academic achievement the sample are conscientious, venturesome, kind, stable, reserved, trusting, persevering, lively, and co-operative. Low achiever scores of boys and girls yielded six factors. The factors obtained by the low achievers reveal that such students are lively, reserved, impulsive, conscientious, trusting, experimenting and harsh. They also have achievement motivation, verbal and non-verbal intelligence, divergent thinking and high socio-economic status. Those boys who achieve revealed that such boys are reserved, submissive, expedient, suspicious, fickle-minded, lively, nervous, co-operative, shy, impulsive, conservative and harsh. They also have non-verbal intelligence and high socio-economic status. High achieving girls revealed that for high achievement, girls require the following characteristics: Venturesome, persevering, submissive, reserved, serious, cooperative, experimenting, expedient, harsh, nervous, impulsive and trusting. They also have non-verbal intelligence and socio-economic status, but lack divergent thinking. High

achievers are stable, conservative and dominant but the low achievers are shy, impulsive and harsh. Stability and dominance are important characteristics of a person who is likely to be methodically engaged in his studies, which may result in high achievement. On the contrary, low achievers are impulsive i.e. they are uneasy, affected by feelings, impatient-excitabile and act on in their studies and, hence, are shy as well as harsh. Low achievers are fickle-minded, expedient and submissive, but the high achievers are persevering, conscientious and venturesome. This shows that perseverance, conscientiousness and venturesome behaviour tend to help in high achievement. It is also quite logical that a person who is able to take risk and is hard working and conscientious will secure higher marks at any examination than the one who is fickle-minded, expedient and submissive. High achievers are reserved, serious and trusting in nature, which traits seem to help in high achievement. The reservedness and seriousness lead to high achievement, because a person with these traits is able to devote sufficient time to his studies, without interference of his peers. But it is essential for high achievement that the person should not possess nervous temperament. Low achievers are sociable, suspicious and lively. All these characteristics lead to low achievement, which is perhaps due to the carefree nature of the students in this group. High achieving student is co-operative, kind and possesses sufficiently high level of verbal intelligence, but the low achieving students are deficient in verbal intelligence. Thus, verbal intelligence is very important. The high achieving boys have been found to be impulsive, suspicious shy, fickle-minded, conservative, dominant, and belong to low socio-economic status. The high achieving girls have been found to be stable, trusting, venturesome, persevering, experimenting, and submissive and belong to high socio-economic status.

**Rangaswami, G., (2006),** the findings of the study are that there was no significant relationship between the personality factors A, B, C, D, F, H, I, J, Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4 with moral judgment score. Significant relationship were found between the personality factor E (Obedient Vs assertive) and G (Moral standards Vs super ego strength) with moral judgment scores of the students.111

**Prasad, C.N. (2007),**the study investigates that the factors of HSPQ had shown significant influence on boys other than Q3. The low score in the factor ‘Q3’ shows qualities like disciplined and self-conflict can be observed in the boys. The

factors A, B, F, J, Q2 and Q4 of HSPQ have no significant influence on the urban and rural students. But for remaining factors C, D, E, G, H, I, O and Q3 of HSPQ, the mean values of the rural students were less than the urban students. Those boys residing in the non-residential schools have not significantly influenced by the factors A, C and H of HSPQ. But for the remaining factors, B, D, E, F, G, I, J1, Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q4 of HSPQ, the study shows that mean values of boys in the non-residential schools are more than the girls in the non-residential schools, other than the factors G, H, J, Q3 and Q4 of HSPQ which showed significant influence on the X class students. All the personality factors of HSPQ except the factor 'O' of HSPQ significantly influenced the academic achievement of the students.

**Manju M. Prachi, M. and V.Vineeth Kumar (2008).** Conducted a study University of Rajasthan, Jaipur in their study personality patterns of Higher Secondary boys across different Demographic Groups found that differences in personality patterns are present among SC, ST and non-backward boys but they are more prominent in rural areas than in urban areas. The findings of the study show that rural SC and rural non-backward boys differed on factors 'A', 'C' 'F', and 'H' (Table 1 and 2) indicating that rural SC boys were more reserved, affected by feelings, sober and shy than rural non backward boys who were more warmhearted, emotionally stable, enthusiastic, venturesome and socially bold. However urban SC and urban non-backward boys did not have much difference. They differed only on Factor 'J' that urban SC boys were more vigorous and zestful in their behavior than urban non-backward boys, who were more obstructive and individualistic. When an overall comparison pertaining to SC boys is made, it is found that SC boys differed significantly from the non-backward boys on factors 'A', 'C' 'F' and 'J'. the findings of the study reveals that SC boys are generally more reserved, detached, affected by feelings, emotionally less stable, sober, serious, and zestful in contrast to non-backward boys, who are more outgoing, warmhearted, calm, emotionally stable, happy-go-lucky, enthusiastic and individualistic.

**Bana, V. (2008).** Conducted a comparative study regarding learning problems of disabled students and normal students in relation to their personality and self-concept and found that there is a difference in learning problems of disabled students, in the learning problems of normal and disabled students, personality traits of normal



and disabled students, self-concept of normal and disabled students, disabled students have more adjustment problems than normal students and also found that personality traits have effect on self-concept on individual students but have no effect on the self-concept of disabled and normal students.

**Krishna Reddy, K. (2009)**, the study investigates that, the students with high personality characteristics are more intelligent, emotionally stable, Obedient, super-ego strength, venturesome, tense minded, Placid and accommodating, humble and controlled have significantly better scholastic achievement, than the students with the personality characteristics less intelligent, emotionally less stable, assertive, moral standards, shy, tough-minded, apprehensive, undisciplined, aggressive, headstrong and self-assured.

**Yahaya, A. (2009)**, the objectives of the study was to examine the relationship between the self-concept and personality of students and with their academic achievement. The research outcomes indicated that there was no significant difference between dimension of self-concept and personality of students according to gender and there was no significant relation between dimension of self-concept and personality with students' academic achievement.

**Lucy's, (2011)**. Worked on proficiency and achievement which states that personality played a major role in developing achievement in English language.

**Seta, O. P. (2012)**. A study was carried out in Punjab and Rajasthan states on personality in relation to self-concept, family environment and emotional maturity of adolescents living in healthy family, and high self-concept are more extrovert than less healthy family and low self-concept, there is no significant difference between top and bottom group of emotional maturity, adolescents of both Punjab and Rajasthan on their self-concept, emotional maturity, family environment, rural and urban regarding their personality, Punjab rural and Rajasthan rural adolescents, Punjab urban and Rajasthan urban adolescents, male and female adolescents of Punjab state, male and female adolescents of Rajasthan state Punjab male and Rajasthan male adolescents. And there found a significant difference between rural and urban students of Rajasthan states, Punjab rural adolescents and Rajasthan rural

adolescents on their self-concept, personality, Punjab urban adolescents and Rajasthan urban adolescents on their family environment, male and female adolescents of Punjab state on their emotional maturity, Punjab female and Rajasthan female adolescents personality, Punjab males and Rajasthan males on emotional maturity.

**Sood, S. Bakshi, A. and Gupta Richa, (2012)**, conducted study in the university regarding the relationship between personality traits, spiritual intelligence and well-being in university students. The main aim of the study was to find out relationship between Big Five personality traits, spiritual intelligence and well-being and to explain the role of personality traits and spiritual intelligence in university students. Conscientiousness was regarded as the main predictor of well-being in the university level students. From the two types of universities differences have emerged in certain aspects out of this study. A comparison of the students studying through open system with those studying in the university following regular mode for imparting education reflects that the students from University of Jammu are lower on agreeableness and conscientiousness as well as on all the subcomponents of spiritual intelligence except TA. As TA is negatively predicting well-being of students, further research should be carried out to explore into the causes of this negative trend. The findings of the study are restricted to students doing post-graduation in psychology so it needs to be confirmed through carrying out more studies while considering the students from various departments of both universities. Future studies may focus on finding out the causes of lower scores on spiritual intelligence in students studying through regular mode.

**Baro, M. and Buragohain, M. (2014)**. Comparative study was conducted in Assam on the teachers of physical education and general education teachers and the study was conducted on the personality trait which shows that there were no significant difference in the personality traits of physical education teachers and general education teachers. There were significant difference in the extroversion between Physical Education and General Education Teacher. On the basis of statistical findings it was concluded that there were insignificant difference in personality traits between Physical Education teacher and General Education teacher.

**Gulgule, R., Jag tap, P. and Dr. Wavhal, S. (2014)**, studied the relationship between aggression and big five personality and finds that males highest correlation was obtained for the factor openness followed by extroversion, neuroticism, conscientiousness and agreeableness. Same is the case with the females too; the highest correlation was obtained for factor openness then followed by neuroticism, conscientiousness, agreeableness and extraversion. In the total sample, the factor openness had the highest correlation followed by neuroticism, extraversion, conscientiousness and agreeableness.

**Lone, K. A. (2014)**, a study was conducted in Bandipora District of Jammu and Kashmir state which found that that there is a significant positive association between the job stress and personality traits of the secondary school teachers. Therefore, due significance is given to several factors affecting job stress and personality traits of the teachers, so that there is decrease in job stress, increase in job involvement for prevalence of congenial learning environment within an educational institution.

**Agarwal, v. (2015)**. Investigated a study on the impulsive buying behavior of the consumers and the impact of personality traits, this study reveals hat how the personality traits effect the purchasing decision of the consumers. Extroversion and neuroticism traits had positive effect on the impulse purchase. There is much other personality theory which is not considered here. The study is conducted only in Bangalore which has to be expanded to other regions. The emotional aspect of the respondents while they shop is also not considered.

#### **2.4: STUDIES ON SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE**

**Sumanlata, saxena and Rajat kumar jain(2013)**.The study was to examine the social intelligence on students in relation to their gender and subject stream. The study was conducted on male and female undergraduate students of science and arts subject streams studying in various degree college of Bhilia city, Chhattisgarh.the findings of the study indicates that female students possesses more social intelligence than male students and so far as the streams are concerned arts students are having greater social intelligence than other students of other streams.

**Malikeh Beheshtifar, Fateme Roasaei(2012).**The aim of the study was to determine the role of social intelligence in organizational leadership that social intelligence can help as a foundation for, and help to facilitate in the leadership effectiveness and successes. It is recommended to measure a manager's social intelligence and help him or her develop a plan for improving it.

**Kumari, Bindu(2014).** Conducted a review which signifies the prominent role of personality traits now the question arises persons having the same intelligence but still some persons inclined and other are not .it displays that the optimistic view of early researchers was correct that personality has its relation with academic performance; it is not a mere assistant of intelligence in determining the academic performance. The w (will factor) means the willingness of an individual to perform is equally important in determining academic and it is as important as g (general factor) of intelligence. The most related personality trait conscientiousness is the key factor in predicting the performance of an individual. The research conducted so far statistically support the correlation and yet there are many key factors to be explored for establishing for direct relationship.

**Ghazi, Shahzada and Saif ullaaha (2013).** The study examined the relationship between student's personality traits and their academic achievement in Khyber pakhtun, Pakistan. For this type of survey Descriptive design was used.In this study all the secondary school students of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan constituted population of the study. Out of 25 districts, 2 districts were randomly selected ( Bannu & Lakki Marwat). 12009 students who were studying in the secondary schools of these districts, out of these 12009 students, 800 students of 10th class were selected through multistage random sampling method using proportional allocation technique as a sample of the study. Self-made questionnaire was used for this study. The findings of the study revealed that "conscientiousness" and "agreeableness" personality traits were found high while "extroversion". "Neuroticism" and "openness to experience" personality traits were found low in secondary school students. Overall there was no significant relationship found between the student's personality traits and their academic achievement.

**Kook, Moochoe, Baity, Hyeong and Cho (2007).** Investigated the psychiatric symptomatology and personality characteristics of Korean senior high school students considered to use the internet to excess. Questionnaire on internet use pattern during

the previous month, the internet addiction test(IAT), the symptom checklist-90 R (SCL-90-R), and the sixteen personality factor questionnaire(16PF) were administered for collecting the data. A total of 328 students, aged 15 to 19 years, participated in the study. Students were divided into 4 internet user groups according to their IAT total scores: nonusers (n = 59,18.0%), minimal user (n=155, 47.3%), moderate users(n=98,29.9%), and excessive user (n= 16,4.9%). The SCL-90-R showed that the excessive users group, when compared with the other group in this study, reported the highest level of symptomatology. The 16PF also revealed that excessive users were easily affected by feeling, emotionally less stable, imaginative, absorbed in thought, self- sufficient, experimenting, and preferred their own decision.

**Crown, (2013).** An empirical study of three Kerri Anne intelligences. The purpose of the study was to investigate the social intelligence,emotional intelligence and cultural intelligence. Sample 467 students were taken from business courses at al large university in the northeastern part of the United States (n=467). Analysis was conducted usingprincipal component analysis and structural equation modeling. Using AMOS, multiple models of the relationship among these intelligences were developed to determine, as hypothesized if social intelligence was superordinate to emotional and cultural intelligences, which are presented as distinct but overlapping constructs. The findings of the study did not support social intelligence being superordinate to emotional and cultural intelligence.Findings did support emotional intelligence and cultural intelligence being distinct but related.

**Sembiyan, R, et al., (2011).**the study wasconductedon the attitude towards regionalism of collegestudentsin relation to social intelligence. The study was proposed to find out the attitude towards regionalism of college students in relation to social intelligence of college students inVellore, Villupuram, Thanjore, Cuddalore districts of Tamil Nadu, India. For the sample of 1050college students random sampling technique was used. Mean, S.D, t. value and R. value was calculated for the analysis of data. The findings of the study revealed that there is no significant relationship between attitude towards regionalism and social intelligence of the college students.

**Zamirullah Khan, et al., (2011)** A Study was conducted on the students of physical education on the aspect of social intelligence. The objective of the study was to investigate impact of social intelligence by the participation of physical education activities and the subject physical education. A scale developed by Chadda and Ganesan was used to find out the social intelligence. The sample consisted of 45 physical education students and the age ranged from 19 to 35. As per the results, the students of B. P. Ed scored better than students of B.P.E in the tactfulness dimension of social intelligence.

**Deepti Hood, et al., (2009).** Study was conducted on Social Intelligence as a predictor of positive psychological health. A sample of 300 working adults were taken and the study was examined the relationship between psychological health and social intelligence. Positive health was assessed by (a) 29–Oxford Happiness Scale, (b) Satisfaction with life scale and (c) Life Orientation test-revised.

Significant positive correlation was found between the components of positive psychological health Social Intelligence Scale by N. K. Chadda and Usha Ganesan was used for to assess the social intelligence i.e. satisfaction with life and happiness, and six factors of Social Intelligence (Cooperativeness, Confidence, Sensitivity, Tactfulness, Sense of humor and Memory). Optimism was found to be significantly and positively correlated with patience, cooperativeness, and tactfulness and negatively correlated with memory. Further step-wise regression analysis revealed that out of eight, seven factors of social intelligence significantly predict one or the other positive health dimensions.

**Qingwen Dong, et al., (2008).** Social Intelligence, Self-Esteem and Intercultural Communication Sensitivity. This study focused on two factors: Social Intelligence and Self-Esteem. To examine the relationship between Social Intelligence and Self-Esteem and Intercultural Communication Sensitivity a sample of 419 undergraduate have been taken from the two universities in the western united states.in addition to it the relationship between self-esteem and intercultural communication sensitivity was examined. Results support hypothesized relationships and indicate a statistically significant relationship between social intelligence and intercultural communication sensitivity with social intelligence accounting for more than 10% of the variance in (ICS). Both dimensions of self-esteem, self-worth and

self-efficacy were significantly related to (ICS), accounting for an additional 4% of the variance in (ICS).

**Meijs, N. Antonius, et al., (2008).** The study was examined on Social Intelligence and Academic Achievement as predictors of adolescent popularity. This study compared the effects of social intelligence and cognitive intelligence, as measured by academic achievement, on adolescent popularity in two school contexts. A distinction was made between sociometric, a measure of social dominance. Participants were 512, 14-15 year old adolescents. (56% girls and 44% boys) in vocational and college preparatory schools in Northwestern Europe. Perceived popularity was significantly related to social intelligence, but not to academic achievement, in both contexts. For the interaction between academic achievement and social intelligence socio metric popularity was predicted, further qualified by school context. Whereas college bound students gained sociometric popularity by excelling both socially and academically, vocational students benefited from doing well either socially or academically, but not in combination.

**Jones, Karen Day, (1997).** Discrimination of two aspects of Cognitive-Social Intelligence from Academic Intelligence. This study collected measures of social-cognitive flexibility, crystallized social knowledge and academic problem solving from 169 high school seniors. Results support a division of social cognitive intelligence into declarative and procedural social knowledge crystallized and flexible knowledge application as distinct from academic problem solving.

**Wong, Chau-Ming T, et al., (1995).** Conducted a study on multi trait-multi method study of academic and social intelligence in college students. The focus of the study was on the two multi trait-multimethod studies of academic and social intelligence reveals social intelligence and other cognitive and behavioral aspects (i.e. social perception, social knowledge and social insight can be discriminated. Verbal, non-verbal, self and other-report measures were administered to 134 female college students and to 227 male and female college students. Both for the dimensions of cognitive and behavioral dimensions of social intelligence convergent and discriminate validities were established. (social knowledge and social perception). In

both studies, the cognitive social intelligence factors had poor convergent validities, and research participants were college students attending a highly selective university.

### **2.5: Research gap**

The topic chosen should be such as it has not been investigated earlier. From a review of research and after concluding, whatever researches, the investigator could come across through his sincere efforts did not find any study, which has been either in the country or abroad, on the present subject. The topic being new and have not been investigated earlier, has received the attention of the investigator. Hence the newness of the topic is also one of the reasons for the choice of the present study.

The above review reveals that many scholars have studied the different factors which affect academic achievement of the students. However, a comprehensive yet concise research work focusing on those closely related to variables namely personality traits, social intelligence.

## **CHAPTER 3**



## **METHODS AND PROCEDURE**

A research design encompasses the methodology and procedures employed to conduct any sort of research. The preparation of a research proposal or design is an important step in the research process. This provides a basis for the elevation of the project and gives the adviser a basis for assistance during the period of his or her direction. It also provides a systematic plan of procedure for the research fellow. Research design is a road map for researchers. It is a step by step approach. Any piece of research is incomplete without a proper plan of action. A research is designed to enable the researcher to arrive at a valid, objective and accurate solution of the given problem as possible. Research design is thus, a detailed plan of how the goals of research are achieved. The research design constitutes the blue-print for collection, measurement and analysis of data. It aids the researcher in allocation of his limited resources by posing crucial choices: Is the blueprint to include experiments, interviews, observations, and the analysis of records, simulation, or some combination of these? Are the method of data collection and research situation to be highly structured? Is an intensive study of a small sample more effective than a less intensive study of a large sample? Should the analysis be primarily qualitative or quantitative? John W. Best (2007) Research is considered to be the more formal, systematic, intensive process of carrying on the scientific methods of analysis. It involves of more systematic structure of investigation, usually resulting in some sort of formal record of procedures and a report of result or conclusions. According to Kothari “Research Design stands for advance Planning of the method to be adopted for collecting the relevant data and the techniques to be used in their analysis, keeping in view the objectives of the research to availability of staff, time and money.”

The present study is designed to study the impact of personality traits on social intelligence on college students. As such, the descriptive method of research was employed to carry out this piece of research work. The details regarding sample, tools and statistical treatment are reported as follows:

### **3.1: POPULATION**

A population is a summation of all the organisms of the same group or species, which live in the same geographical area, and have the capability of interbreeding. A research population is also known as a well-defined collection of individuals or objects known to have similar characteristics. All individuals or objects within a certain population usually have a common, binding characteristic or trait. Usually, the description of the population and the common binding characteristic of its members are the same. "Government officials" is a well-defined group of individuals which can be considered as a population and all the members of this population are indeed officials of the government. In the present study the students of different Government degree colleges of Jammu district constitute the population of the study and a representative sample from this population has been selected by the investigator.

### 3.2: SAMPLE OF THE STUDY

The sample for the present study consisted the total population of all colleges of district Jammu. The study was conducted on a sample of 200 college students which was further divided into different groups of male-female and rural-urban arts-science dichotomy. The college students were in the age group of 19 - 21 years. The sample has been selected on the basis of random sampling technique. The breakup of the sample is given as follows:

**Table No. 1: List of the Colleges taken for Data collection**

| S.NO | NAME OF THE COLLEGE              | MALE    |      | FEMALE  |      | TOTAL |
|------|----------------------------------|---------|------|---------|------|-------|
|      |                                  | SCIENCE | ARTS | SCIENCE | ARTS |       |
| 1.   | GOVT WOMENS COLLEGE GANDHI NAGAR | NIL     | NIL  | 18      | 12   | 30    |
| 2.   | GOVT WOMENS COLLEGE PARADE       | NIL     | NIL  | 20      | 10   | 30    |
| 3.   | GOVT DEGREE COLLEGE PALOURA      | NIL     | 18   | NIL     | 18   | 36    |
| 4.   | GOVT DEGREE                      | NIL     | 22   | NIL     | 10   | 32    |

|    |                       |    |     |    |     |    |
|----|-----------------------|----|-----|----|-----|----|
|    | COLLEGE BISHNA        |    |     |    |     |    |
| 5. | GOVT M.A.M PG COLLEGE | 28 | 10  | 05 | NIL | 43 |
| 6. | G.G.M SCIENCE COLLEGE | 21 | NIL | 08 | NIL | 29 |

### 3.3: SELECTION OF THE TOOL

Selection of the tool is very important in any research study. If appropriate tools are not used, the investigator may be misled and the efforts of the investigator would go waste as he would not be able to achieve the objectives of the study. An investigator has to look for such procedural techniques and tools which will answer his pursuits or hypothesis objectively. A competent investigator, therefore, looks into the possible measures which can help him in arriving at the desired results. Accordingly, the present investigator adopted the following tool for the collection of data.

### 3.4: TOOL USED

The data for the present study was collected with the help of

#### 3.4.1 SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE SCALE

Social intelligence scale developed by Prof. N. K Chadda and Usha Ganesan and published by National Psychological Corporation, Agra.

#### 3.4.2 ESYENCS PERSONALITY QUESTIONNAIRE

##### 1. Social Intelligence Scale

- **Item construction and selection**

A set of 15 to 20 items were constructed for each dimension. An initial pool of 140 items was constructed for the whole scale. The six dimensions (Patience, Recognition of Social Environment, Confidence, Sensitivity, Sense of Humour and Co-operativeness) were constructed using the multiple choice technique. In the tactfulness dimension, responses were elicited in terms “yes” or “No” (Jackson, Neil & Beran, 1973). In the last dimension, that of Memory a set of 30 pictures was presented for recognition. The entire set of 140 items was given to 5 experts and the

necessary changes introduced, 91 items which met 100 percent approval amongst the judges were retained. These items were then tested for social desirability with the help of five experts. The items were on a 9 point rating scale ranging from extremely desirable, through neutral to extremely undesirable. (Edward, 1957). The items were all retained and subjected to item analysis.

- **Item analysis**

The scale was administered to an unselected sample of 300 (150 males and 150 females) for the purpose of item analysis. This sample was drawn from population of university students pursuing a variety of courses. In the case of 6 dimensions (Patience, Confidence, Cooperativeness, Sense of Humor and recognition of Social Environment) the student was given a choice of three alternatives for each item and was asked to choose one. In the case of the first four dimensions (Patience, Cooperativeness, Confidence and sensitivity) scores of 1, 2 and 3 were given three response alternatives e.g.in the confidence dimension a score of 3 would indicate a high degree of confidence, a score of 1 a lack of confidence and a score of 2 would reveal moderate confidence. In other words dimensions (Sense of Humour and Recognition of Social Environment) one of the three alternatives given is the appropriate response. This response when given was allotted scores of 1. In the case of Tactfulness dimension the responses were in the form of “Yes” or “No”. The appropriate response was awarded a score of 1. The last dimension that of Memory was scored 1 or 0 on whether or not the subject’s response was right or wrong. In the case of four dimensions (Tactfulness, Sense of Humour, Recognition of Social Environment and Memory) the Phi Coefficient was calculated on the basis of the high and low group on one hand and the scores of 1 or 0 on the other. These values were then converted into Chi-Square. For the remaining dimensions (Patience, Confidence, Cooperativeness and sensitivity) the square values were calculated based on the expected and observed outcome for each item, using the entire sample of 300. The items having Non-significant Chi- Square values were dropped from the scale at this point. Two levels of significance that is 5% and 1% were taken as the criterion for dropping the items. A total of 66 items were retained in the Final scale.

The final distributions of items per dimensions are as follows:-

Number of Items retained under each dimension in the scale.

**Table No. 2: Dimensions of Social Intelligence as per manual**

| <b>Dimension</b>                     | <b>Number of items Retained.</b> |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| a) Patience                          | 8                                |
| b) Co-cooperativeness                | 11                               |
| c) Confidence                        | 8                                |
| d) Sensitivity                       | 9                                |
| e) Recognition of Social Environment | 3                                |
| f) Tactfulness                       | 7                                |
| g) Sense of Humour                   | 8                                |
| h) Memory                            | 12                               |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>66</b>                        |

**Table No. 3: Scoring for the Dimensions (A) Patience as per manual.**

| <b>Item Nos.</b> | <b>Response Alternatives</b> |          |          |
|------------------|------------------------------|----------|----------|
|                  | <b>A</b>                     | <b>B</b> | <b>C</b> |
| 4                | 1                            | 3        | 2        |
| 8                | 2                            | 3        | 1        |
| 15               | 1                            | 2        | 3        |
| 16               | 1                            | 3        | 2        |
| 20               | 1                            | 2        | 3        |
| 27               | 3                            | 1        | 2        |
| 33               | 3                            | 2        | 1        |
| 36               | 2                            | 3        | 1        |
|                  | Score Awarded                |          |          |

**Table No. 4: Scoring for the Dimensions b) Cooperativeness as per manual.**

| Item Nos. | Response Alternative |   |   |
|-----------|----------------------|---|---|
|           | A                    | B | C |
| 1         | 3                    | 2 | 1 |
| 5         | 3                    | 1 | 2 |
| 9         | 5                    | 1 | 2 |
| 14        | 2                    | 1 | 3 |
| 17        | 1                    | 3 | 2 |
| 21        | 3                    | 1 | 2 |
| 25        | 3                    | 2 | 1 |
| 26        | 2                    | 3 | 1 |
| 28        | 1                    | 3 | 2 |
| 31        | 1                    | 3 | 2 |
| 32        | 2                    | 1 | 3 |
|           | <b>Score Awarded</b> |   |   |

**Table No 5: Scoring key for the dimension C) Confidence as per manual**

| Item Nos. | Response Alternative |   |   |
|-----------|----------------------|---|---|
|           | A                    | B | C |
| 3         | 1                    | 3 | 2 |
| 7         | 3                    | 2 | 1 |
| 11        | 2                    | 3 | 1 |
| 12        | 2                    | 3 | 1 |
| 19        | 1                    | 3 | 2 |
| 23        | 2                    | 1 | 3 |
| 30        | 1                    | 2 | 3 |
| 35        | 1                    | 2 | 3 |
|           | <b>Score Awarded</b> |   |   |

**Table No 6: Scoring Key for the dimension D)Sensitivity as per manual.**

| Item Nos.            | Response Alternative |   |   |
|----------------------|----------------------|---|---|
|                      | A                    | B | C |
| 2                    | 2                    | 1 | 3 |
| 6                    | 1                    | 3 | 2 |
| 10                   | 1                    | 2 | 3 |
| 13                   | 2                    | 1 | 3 |
| 18                   | 2                    | 3 | 1 |
| 22                   | 2                    | 3 | 1 |
| 24                   | 1                    | 2 | 3 |
| 29                   | 3                    | 1 | 2 |
| 34                   | 2                    | 1 | 3 |
| <b>Score Awarded</b> |                      |   |   |

**Table No 7: Scoring Key for dimension E) Recognition of Social Environment as per manual.**

| Item Nos.            | Response Alternative |   |   |
|----------------------|----------------------|---|---|
|                      | A                    | B | C |
| 37                   | 1                    | 0 | 0 |
| 38                   | 1                    | 0 | 0 |
| 39                   | 0                    | 1 | 0 |
| <b>Score Awarded</b> |                      |   |   |

**Table No 8: Scoring key for the dimension of (F) Tactfulness as per manual**

| Item Nos.            | Response Alternative |    |
|----------------------|----------------------|----|
|                      | Yes                  | No |
| 40                   | 0                    | 1  |
| 41                   | 0                    | 1  |
| 42                   | 0                    | 1  |
| 43                   | 1                    | 0  |
| 44                   | 0                    | 1  |
| 45                   | 1                    | 0  |
| 46                   | 1                    | 0  |
| <b>Score Awarded</b> |                      |    |

**Table No 9: Scoring Key for dimension of (G) Sense of Humor as per manual.**

| Item Nos. | Response Alternative |   |   |
|-----------|----------------------|---|---|
|           | A                    | B | C |
| 47        | 0                    | 1 | 0 |
| 48        | 1                    | 0 | 0 |
| 49        | 0                    | 1 | 0 |
| 50        | 0                    | 1 | 0 |
| 51        | 0                    | 0 | 1 |
| 52        | 0                    | 0 | 1 |
| 53        | 1                    | 0 | 0 |
| 54        | 1                    | 0 | 0 |
|           | <b>Score Awarded</b> |   |   |

**Table No 10: Scoring Key for dimension of (H) Memory as per manual**

| Score of one (1) for following correct responses |                           |
|--|---------------------------|
| 55. Indira Gandhi                                | 61. Sarojini Naidu        |
| 56. Sachin Tendulkar                             | 62. Rabindarnath Tagore   |
| 57. Ram dev                                      | 63. A.P.J Abdul Kalam     |
| 58. C V Raman                                    | 64. Atal Bihari Vajapayee |
| 59. Lata Mangeshkar                              | 65. Aishwariya Rai        |
| 60. Prem Chand                                   | 66. Dr. Rajendra Prasad   |

### **Reliability**

In the present scale test, retest and split half techniques were employed to find the reliability co-efficients. For finding the split half reliability a sample of 150 (75 males and 75 females) was taken. The following coefficients were obtained.

**Table No 11: Split half Reliability Coefficients as per manual**



| <b>Areas</b>                         | <b>Rel. coeff</b> |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|
| A. Patience                          | .93               |
| B. Cooperativeness                   | .91               |
| C. Confidence                        | .89               |
| D. Sensitivity                       | .90               |
| E. Recognition of Social Environment | .95               |
| F. Tactfulness                       | .91               |
| G. Sense of Humour                   | .90               |
| H. Memory                            | .96               |

In order to determine the retest reliability, the previous sample used for split half was administered the scale after a period of fifteen days. The following coefficients were obtained.

**Table No 12: Test - retest Reliability Coefficients as per manual.**

| <b>Areas</b>                         | <b>Reliability Coefficients</b> |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| A. Patience                          | .94                             |
| B. Cooperativeness                   | .91                             |
| C. Confidence                        | .90                             |
| D. Sensitivity                       | .93                             |
| E. Recognition of Social Environment | .95                             |
| F. Tactfulness                       | .84                             |
| G. Sense of Humour                   | .92                             |
| H. Memory                            | .97                             |

### **3.5 Validity**

The techniques of validity used to validate this scale were (1) Empirical Validity and (2) Cross validation.

To test the empirical validity a sample of 50 individuals was taken external criterion used was the „Social Intelligence Test“ by F. A. Moss, T. Hunt, K. M. Omwaka and L. G. Woodward (1949), George Washington University Series. The present Scale and the Social Intelligence Test by Moss and Hunt were administered and scored accordingly. The data obtained was subjected to Pearson Product Moment Correlation

for testing the validity. The dimensions of recognition of social environment, memory and sense of humour were common to the present scale and the Social Intelligence Test by Moss and Hunt. The sense of Humour dimensions was similar in both cases. The other two dimensions mentioned were slightly different in format and manner of administration. In spite of this correlation obtained for all these three dimensions were positive and significant. Further the remaining dimensions that of patience, confidence, sensitivity, cooperativeness and tactfulness indicate significant correlation with the total score of the Social Intelligence Test by Moss and Hunt. The total score of the present scale is highly and significantly correlated with the Social Intelligence Test by Moss and Hunt. ( $r=70 < 01$ ). Henceforth the present scale has a validity coefficient of 70.

For the purpose of cross validation, a sample of 15 individuals was taken. The data obtained on the first sample and the second sample was correlated to test the validity of the scale. The Pearson's Product Moment Correlation was obtained. The coefficients obtained are as follows:

**Table No 13: Cross validation-correlation between two groups as per manual.**

| <b>Areas</b>                         | <b>Correlation between two Groups</b> |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| A. Patience                          | .82                                   |
| B. Cooperativeness                   | .91                                   |
| C. Confidence                        | .86                                   |
| D. Sensitivity                       | .75                                   |
| E. Recognition of Social Environment | .91                                   |
| F. Tactfulness                       | .75                                   |
| G. Sense of Humour                   | .95                                   |
| H. Memory                            | .94                                   |

**Overall cross validation  $r = 80$**

## 2. Eysenck personality questionnaire-R (EPQ-R)

The Eysenck personality questionnaire is the result of many years of developmental works. It was designed to give a rough and ready measure of three important personality dimensions: Psychoticism, Extraversion and Neuroticism. Each of these three traits is measured by means of 100 questions, carefully selected after lengthy item analysis. The earlier history of the development of inventories for the purpose of measuring these traits has been reviewed in the structure of human personality.

Psychoticism which describes the personality as solitary, troublesome, cruel, lacking in feeling and empathy, hostile to others, sensation seeking, and liking odd and unusual things. Neuroticism refers to the general emotional liability of a person, his emotional over-responsiveness and his liability to neurotic breakdown under stress. Extraversion as opposed to introversion refers to the out-going, uninhibited, sociable proclivities of person. These three dimensions are conceived of as being quite independent. It also seems clear that under certain circumstances many people will dissimulate, and even under ordinary experimental test conditions it seems likely that some people will dissimulate. Given that it is possible and indeed easy to dissimulate, it clearly becomes important to attempt the construction of scales for the measurement of dissimulation, in order to establish who has dissimulated when, and if possible to correct the measurement scales for this dissimulation. Several different methods have been tried in this connection, but the most important has undoubtedly been the construction so-called lie score.

### **Scoring procedure**

To see that each question has only one answer then place the key on the booklet so that ( \*) marks on the booklet are visible through the circles on the key. There are 4 scores (Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism and Lie score) to be obtained. Each answer scores 1 point. For example, to obtain the score for Psychoticism add 1 score for each answer visible through the squares and record the sum in the table on page 1. Do the same for page 2, 3 and 4. Transfer these scores on the table at back page. Repeat this procedure to obtain Extraversion, Neuroticism and Lie score.

## **CHAPTER 4**

## **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA**

The scored data has no meaning unless it is analyzed and interpreted by suitable scientific methods. Analysis of data means studying the material in order to determine inherent fact. It involves the breaking up of the complex factors into simple parts and putting them in new arrangements for the purpose of interpretations.

For every researcher, it is crucially important to know that not only precision in the collection of data or selection of tools can guarantee the accomplishment of objectives, but adequate knowledge in the application of statistical analysis is equally important. Data analysis is the act of transforming data with the aim of extracting useful information and facilitating conclusion. Data analysis is the process of systematically applying statistical and or logical techniques to describe and illustrate, condense, recap and evaluate data.

In the present endeavor, the investigator has made an attempt to analyze and interpret the data of the present study by using different statistical techniques.

### **4.1: Regression**

When two related variables have cause and effect relationship and when a change in one variable induces a change in the other variable then there exists correlation between them. Thus, the strength of relationship between them can be known and measured by the correlation. If the average value of one variable is to be estimated corresponding to the given value of the other variable then regression is used. Here, of course the cause and effect relationship between two variables is tacitly implied. A variable in which change occurs is called a cause variable or independent variable. We shall call it an independent variable and we shall denote it by X. the other variable whose value is to be estimated corresponding to a given change in X is called an effect variable or dependent variable and we shall denote it by Y. In statistical terms, we say that there is some definite mathematical relationship with an error term.

$$Y = \alpha + \beta X + \mu(\text{error term})$$

Where,

Y = Dependent variable

X= Explanatory variable/Independent variable  
 $\alpha$  = Constant term  
 $\beta$  = Coefficient term/ slope of the equation

**Hypothesis H 1: There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going students.**

**Table No. 13: Model Summary of personality traits on social intelligence among college going students.**

**Model Summary**

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .760 <sup>a</sup> | .577     | .575              | 6.873                      |

**Predictors: (Constant), PTSA**

From Table 13: shows that there is very high cause and effect relationship between the personality traits and social intelligence of college students. Table 4.1 shows that the value of  $R^2$  is .577 it means that 57.7 percent variation in Social Intelligence is explained by personality traits.

**Table No. 13.1: ANOVA of personality traits on social intelligence among college going students.**

**Anova<sup>b</sup>**

| Model         | Sum of Squares | Df  | Mean Square | F       | Sig  |
|---------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---------|------|
| 1. Regression | 12758.573      | 1   | 12758.578   | 270.094 | .000 |
| Residual      | 9353.022       | 198 | 47          |         |      |
| Total         | 22111.595      | 199 |             |         |      |

**Predictors: (Constant), PTSA**

**Dependent Variable: SISA**

From the Table 13.1: calculated value of F ratio is 270.094 which is greater than the table value and also the p value i.e. .000 is less than .05 level at 0.01 level of significance which means that the personality traits has significant impact on social intelligence of arts going college students. Hence the hypothesis stating that there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence of college going

students with reference to psychoticism, neuroticism, extroversion and life score on social intelligence is not accepted.

**Table No.13.2: Coefficients Summary of personality traits on social intelligence among college going students.**

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

| Model |            | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t      | Sig. |
|-------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
|       |            | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |        |      |
| 1     | (Constant) | 50.207                      | 2.786      |                           | 18.020 | .000 |
|       | PTSA       | .859                        | .052       | .760                      | 16.435 | .000 |

**Dependent Variable: SISA**

From the Table 13.2: it is evident that personality trait has impact on social intelligence among college students, because the dimensions PTSA all have positive coefficients and are significant at 5% level.

**Hypothesis H 2: There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.**

**Table No. 14: Model Summary of personality traits on social intelligence among college going students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.**

**Modal summary**

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .766 <sup>a</sup> | .587     | .578              | 6.846                      |

Predictors: (Constant), LSA, ESA, PSA, NSA

The Table 14: shows that there is a very high cause and effect relationship between the personality traits and social intelligence of college students. Table 14 shows that the value R2 is -587 percent variations in social intelligence is explained by personality traits. This relatively low explained variation in SISA by personality traits is because there are other variables influencing the SISA which are not included in the model.

**Table no 14.1: ANOVAb Summary of personality traits on social intelligence among college going students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.**

**ANOVA**

| Model |            | Sum of Squares | Df  | Mean Square | F      | Sig.              |
|-------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| 1     | Regression | 12973.110      | 4   | 3243.277    | 69.206 | .000 <sup>a</sup> |
|       | Residual   | 9138.485       | 195 | 46.864      |        |                   |
|       | Total      | 22111.595      | 199 |             |        |                   |

**Predictors: (Constant), LSA, ESA, PSA, NSA**  
**Dependent Variable: SISA**

From the Table 14.1: calculated value of F ratio is 69.206 which is greater than the table value and also the p value i.e. .000 is less than .05 level at 0.01 level of significance which means that the personality traits has significant impact on social intelligence of arts going college students. Hence the hypothesis stating that there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence of college going students with reference to psychoticism, neuroticism, extroversion and life score on social intelligence is not accepted.

**Table No.14.1.2: coefficient Summary of personality traits on social intelligence among college going students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.**

**Coefficient**

| Model |            | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | T      | Sig. |
|-------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
|       |            | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |        |      |
| 1     | (Constant) | 49.880                      | 3.132      |                           | 15.925 | .000 |
|       | PSA        | .988                        | .188       | .283                      | 5.257  | .000 |
|       | ESA        | .784                        | .178       | .212                      | 4.402  | .000 |
|       | NSA        | .591                        | .149       | .219                      | 3.959  | .000 |
|       | LSA        | 1.121                       | .166       | .359                      | 6.755  | .000 |

Dependent Variable: SISA

From the Table 14.1.2: it is evident that personality trait has impact on social intelligence on college students, because The dimensions of SISA .i.e PSA, ESA, NSA, LSA all have positive coefficients and are significant at 5% level. Since the coefficient of LSA is greatest (1.12) and that of NSA (.591) is least it can be interpreted that LSA has more influence on SISA and the NSA has the least impact on SISA.

### Hypothesis 3

**There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going male students.**

**Table No. 15: Model Summary of personality traits on social intelligence among college going male students.**

### Model summary

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .781 <sup>a</sup> | .610     | .606              | 6.940                      |

**Predictors: (Constant), PTM**

The Table No.15: shows that there is very high cause and effect relationship between the personality traits and social, intelligence among college going male students. Table 15 shows that the value of R<sup>2</sup> is .610, it means that 61.0 percent variation in social intelligence is explained by personality traits.

**Table no 15.1:ANOVA summary of personality traits on social intelligence among college going male students.**

### ANOVA<sup>b</sup>

| Model |            | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F       | Sig.              |
|-------|------------|----------------|----|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| 1     | Regression | 7370.975       | 1  | 7370.975    | 153.033 | .000 <sup>a</sup> |
|       | Residual   | 4720.265       | 98 | 48.166      |         |                   |
|       | Total      | 12091.240      | 99 |             |         |                   |

Predictors: (Constant), PTM

Dependent Variable: SIM



From the Table 15.1: calculated value of F is 153.033 which is greater than the value and also the p value is .000 is less than .05 level at 0.01 level of significance which means that the personality traits has significant impact on social intelligence on male going college students. Hence the hypothesis stating that there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going male students is not accepted.

**Table no 15.2 Coefficientssummary of personality traits on social intelligence among college going male students.**

| Model        | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | T      | Sig. |
|--------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
|              | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |        |      |
| 1 (Constant) | 50.229                      | 3.785      |                           | 13.270 | .000 |
| PTM          | .869                        | .070       | .781                      | 12.371 | .000 |

Dependent Variable: SIM

From the table 15.2 it is evident that the personality traits on college gong male students because the dimension SIM have positive coefficient and are significant at 5% level.

**Hypothesis 4: There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going male students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.**

**Tabel no 16 Model Summary of hypotheses There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going male students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.**

**Modal summary**

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .797 <sup>a</sup> | .635     | .620              | 6.814                      |

**Predictors: (Constant), LM, EM, NM, PM**

From Table 16: shows that there is very high cause and effect relationship between personality traits and social intelligenceof college going male students. Table 16 shows that the value of R2 is -.635 it means that 63.5 percent variation in social intelligence is explained by personality traits.

**Table no 16.1 ANOVA summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going male students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.**

**ANOVA**

| Model |            | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F      | Sig.              |
|-------|------------|----------------|----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| 1     | Regression | 7680.021       | 4  | 1920.005    | 41.349 | .000 <sup>a</sup> |
|       | Residual   | 4411.219       | 95 | 46.434      |        |                   |
|       | Total      | 12091.240      | 99 |             |        |                   |

Predictors: (Constant), LM, EM, NM, PM

Dependent Variable: SIM

From the Table 16.1: calculated value of F ratio is 41.349 which is greater than the table value and also the p value i.e. .000 is less than .05 level at 0.01 level of significance which means that the personality traits has significant impact on social intelligence of male going college students. Hence the hypothesis stating that there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence of college going male students with reference to psychoticism, neuroticism, extroversion and life score on social intelligence is not accepted.

**Table no 16.2 Coefficients Summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going male students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.**

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

| Model |            | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | T      | Sig. |
|-------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
|       |            | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |        |      |
| 1     | (Constant) | 52.171                      | 4.282      |                           | 12.185 | .000 |
|       | PM         | .871                        | .290       | .244                      | 3.005  | .003 |
|       | EM         | .586                        | .241       | .157                      | 2.432  | .017 |
|       | NM         | .595                        | .212       | .225                      | 2.801  | .006 |
|       | LM         | 1.345                       | .211       | .453                      | 6.362  | .000 |

Dependent Variable: SIM

From the Table 16.2: it is evident that personality trait has impact on social intelligence on male going college students, because the dimensions of SIM i.e PM, EM, NM and LM all have positive coefficients and are significant at 5% level. Since the coefficient of LM is greater (1.345) and that of EM is least (.586) it can be interpreted that LM has more influence on SIM and the EM has the least impact on SIM.

**Hypothesis 5: There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going female students.**

**Table No. 17: Modal summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going female students.**

**Modal summary**

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .731 <sup>a</sup> | .535     | .530              | 6.831                      |

Predictors: (Constant), PTF

From the Table 17: shows that there is very high cause and effect relationship between personality traits and social intelligence among college going female students. Table 17 shows that the value of R<sup>2</sup> is .535, it means that 53.5 percent variation in social intelligence is explained by personality traits. This relatively low variation in PTF by personality traits is because there are other variables influencing the PTF which are not included in the model.

**Table no 17.1 ANOVA<sup>b</sup> summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going female students.**

**ANOVA<sup>b</sup>**

| Model |            | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F       | Sig.              |
|-------|------------|----------------|----|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| 1     | Regression | 5260.849       | 1  | 5260.849    | 112.734 | .000 <sup>a</sup> |
|       | Residual   | 4573.261       | 98 | 46.666      |         |                   |
|       | Total      | 9834.110       | 99 |             |         |                   |

Predictors: (Constant), PTF

Dependent Variable: SIF

From the Table 17.1: calculated value of F ratio is 112.734. Which is greater than the table value and also the p value i.e. .000 is less than .05 level at 0.01 level of

significance which means that the personality traits has significant impact on social intelligence of female going college students. Hence the hypothesis stating that there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence of college going female students with reference to psychoticism, neuroticism, extroversion and life score on social intelligence is not accepted.

**Table no 17.2 Coefficientssummary of hypothesesthere will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going female students.**

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

| Model |            | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t      | Sig. |
|-------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
|       |            | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |        |      |
| 1     | (Constant) | 50.470                      | 4.187      |                           | 12.054 | .000 |
|       | PTF        | .844                        | .080       | .731                      | 10.618 | .000 |

Dependent Variable: SIF

From the Table 17.2: it is evident that the personality traits have impact on social intelligence on female going college students, because the dimension SIF have the positive and are significant at 5% level.

**Hypothesis 6: There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going female students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.**

**Tabel No. 18: Model Summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going female students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.**

**Modal summary**

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .743 <sup>a</sup> | .552     | .533              | 6.810                      |

Predictors: (Constant), LF, PF, EF, NF

From the Table No.18: shows that there is moderate cause and effect relationship between the personality traits and social intelligence. Table 18 shows that the value of R2 is .552. It means that 55.2 percent variation in social intelligence is explained by personality traits. This relatively low explained variation

in SIF by personality traits is because there are other variables influencing the SIF which are not included in the model.

**Table No 18.1: Model Summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going female students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.**

ANOVA<sup>b</sup>

| Model |            | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F      | Sig.              |
|-------|------------|----------------|----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| 1     | Regression | 5428.592       | 4  | 1357.148    | 29.265 | .000 <sup>a</sup> |
|       | Residual   | 4405.518       | 95 | 46.374      |        |                   |
|       | Total      | 9834.110       | 99 |             |        |                   |

Predictors: (Constant), LF, PF, EF, NF. Dependent Variable: SIF

From the Table 18.1: calculated value of F ratio is 29.265 which is greater than the table value also the p value is .000 is less than .05 level at 0.01 of significance which means that the personality traits has significant impact on social intelligence among female going college students. Hence the hypothesis stating that there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among female going college students with reference to Psychoticism, Neuroticism, Extraversion, Life score.

**Table no 18.2 Coefficientssummary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among female going college students with reference to Psychoticism, Neuroticism, Extraversion, Life score.**

Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

| Model |            | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | T      | Sig. |
|-------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
|       |            | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |        |      |
| 1     | (Constant) | 46.817                      | 4.599      |                           | 10.180 | .000 |
|       | PF         | 1.100                       | .251       | .324                      | 4.382  | .000 |
|       | EF         | 1.217                       | .279       | .335                      | 4.365  | .000 |
|       | NF         | .616                        | .219       | .222                      | 2.817  | .006 |
|       | LF         | .618                        | .277       | .184                      | 2.231  | .028 |

Dependent Variable: SIF

From the Table 18.2: it is evident that the personality traits have impact on social intelligence on female going college students. The dimension of SIF i.e PF,EF, NF, LF has a positive co relation and are significant at 5% level. Since the coefficient of EF is greater (1.217) and that of NF (.616) is least it can be interpreted that EF has more influence on SIF and NF has the least impact on SIF.

**Hypothesis 7: There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going rural students.**

**Table No 19: Modal summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going rural students.**

**Modal summary**

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .786 <sup>a</sup> | .619     | .615              | 6.542                      |

Constant predictors

From the Table 19: shows that there is very high cause and effect relationship between the personality traits and social intelligence among college going rural students. Table 19 shows that the value of R<sup>2</sup> -619, it means that 61.9 percent variation in social intelligence is explained by personality traits.

**Table No 19.1 ANOVA<sup>b</sup> summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going rural students.**

**ANOVA<sup>b</sup>**

| Model |            | Sum of Squares | Df  | Mean Square | F       | Sig.              |
|-------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| 1     | Regression | 8187.737       | 1   | 8187.737    | 191.310 | .000 <sup>a</sup> |
|       | Residual   | 5050.188       | 118 | 42.798      |         |                   |
|       | Total      | 13237.925      | 119 |             |         |                   |

Predictors: (Constant), PTRDependent Variable: SIR

From the above Table 19.1: calculated value of F ratio is 191.310 which is greater than the table value and also the p value is .000 is less than .05 level of significance which means that the personality traits has significant impact on social intelligence on

rural going college students. Hence the hypothesis stating that there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among rural going college students is not accepted.

**Table no 19.2 Coefficients<sup>a</sup>summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going rural students.**

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

| Model        | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | T      | Sig. |
|--------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
|              | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |        |      |
| 1 (Constant) | 51.127                      | 3.261      |                           | 15.676 | .000 |
| PTR          | .837                        | .061       | .786                      | 13.831 | .000 |

Dependent Variable: SIR

From the above table 19.2 it is evident that personality traits has impact on social intelligence among college going rural students because SIR have positive coefficient and are significant at 5% level

**Hypothesis 8**

**There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going rural students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.**

**Table No 20: Model summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going rural students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.**

**Modal summary**

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .797 <sup>a</sup> | .635     | .623              | 6.478                      |

Predictors: (Constant), LR, ER, PR, NR

From the Table No: 20 show that there is very high cause and effect relationship between the personality traits and social intelligence. Table 20 shows that the value of R<sup>2</sup> is .635. It means that 63.5 percent variation in social intelligence is explained by personality traits in SIR.

**Table No. 21.1: ANOVA summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going rural students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.**

ANOVA

| Model |            | Sum of Squares | Df  | Mean Square | F      | Sig.              |
|-------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| 1     | Regression | 8411.324       | 4   | 2102.831    | 50.103 | .000 <sup>a</sup> |
|       | Residual   | 4826.601       | 115 | 41.970      |        |                   |
|       | Total      | 13237.925      | 119 |             |        |                   |

Predictors: (Constant), LR, ER, PR, NR  
Dependent Variable: SIR

From the Table 21.1: calculated value of F Ratio is 50.103 which is greater than the Table value and also the p value I.e .000 is less than .05 level at .01 is less than .05 level of significance which means the personality has significant impact on social intelligence among rural going students. Hence the hypothesis stating that there will be no significant impact of personality traits on college going rural students is not accepted.

**Table no 21.2: Coefficients<sup>a</sup> summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going rural students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.**

Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

| Model |            | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | T      | Sig. |
|-------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
|       |            | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |        |      |
| 1     | (Constant) | 49.023                      | 3.888      |                           | 12.607 | .000 |
|       | PR         | .958                        | .235       | .284                      | 4.085  | .000 |
|       | ER         | .951                        | .238       | .242                      | 3.997  | .000 |
|       | NR         | .438                        | .197       | .165                      | 2.223  | .028 |
|       | LR         | 1.153                       | .205       | .385                      | 5.635  | .000 |

Dependent Variable: SIR

From the Table 21.2: it is evident that the personality traits ha impact on social intelligence on college going rural students, because the dimensions of SIR I.e



PR, ER,NR,LR all have positive coefficient and are significant at 5% level. Since the coefficient of LR (1.153) and that of NR (.438) is least. It can be interpreted that LR has more influence on SIR and the NR has least impact on SIR.

**Hypothesis 9: There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going urban students.**

**Table No. 22: Modal summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going urban students.**

**Modal summary**

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .562 <sup>a</sup> | .316     | .307              | 8.053                      |

Predictors: (Constant), PTU

From Table No 22: shows that there is moderate cause and effect relationship between the personality traits and social intelligence of college going urban students. Table 22 shows that the value of R2 is .316, it means that 31.6 percent variation in social intelligence is explained by personality traits. This relatively low explained variation in PTU is because there are other variables influencing the PTU which are not included in the model.

**Table no 22.1ANOVA<sup>b</sup> summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going urban students.**

**Annova**

| Model        | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Squares | F      | Sig  |
|--------------|----------------|----|--------------|--------|------|
| 1.Regression | 2248.939       | 1  | 2248.939     | 34.679 | .000 |
| Residual     | 4863.739       | 75 | 64.8590      |        |      |
| Total        | 7112.675       | 76 |              |        |      |

(A) Predictors: (Constant), PTU (B) Dependent Variable: SIU

From the Table No 22.1: calculated value of F ratio is 34.679 which is greater than the table value and also the p value I,e .000 is less than .05 level at .01 level of significance which means that personality traits has significant impact of social intelligence among college going urban students. Hence the hypothesis stating that

there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence on urban going college students is not accepted.

**Table no22.2 Coefficients<sup>a</sup> summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going urban students.**

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

| Model |            | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t     | Sig. |
|-------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
|       |            | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |       |      |
| 1     | (Constant) | 60.019                      | 6.045      |                           | 9.928 | .000 |
|       | PTU        | .683                        | .116       | .562                      | 5.889 | .000 |

Dependent Variable: SIU

From the Table 22.2: it is evident that personality traits has impact on social intelligence among college going urban students because dimension SIU have positive coefficient and are significant at 5% level.

**HYPOTHESES No 10: There will be no significant impact of personality traitson social intelligence among college going urban students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.**

**Table No. 23: Model Summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going urban students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.**

**Modal summary**

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .610 <sup>a</sup> | .372     | .337              | 7.876                      |

Predictors: (Constant), LU, EU, NU, PU

From the Table No. 23: shows that there is low cause and effect relationship between the personality traits and social intelligence of among college going urban students. Table 23 shows that the value of R2 is -.372.it means that 37.2 percent variation in social intelligence is explained by personality traits. This relatively low explained variation in SIU by personality traits is because there are other variables influencing in SIU which are not included in the model.

**Table No 23.1 ANOVA<sup>b</sup> Summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going urban students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.**

**Modal summary**

| Model |            | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F      | Sig.              |
|-------|------------|----------------|----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| 1     | Regression | 2646.949       | 4  | 661.737     | 10.669 | .000 <sup>a</sup> |
|       | Residual   | 4465.726       | 72 | 62.024      |        |                   |
|       | Total      | 7112.675       | 76 |             |        |                   |

Predictors: (Constant), LU, EU, NU, PU

Dependent Variable: SIU

From the Table No.23.1: calculated value of F Ratio is 10.669 which is greater than the Table value and also the p value I.e .000 is less than .05 level at .01 level of significance which means that the personality traits has significant impact of social intelligence of college going urban students . Hence the hypothesis stating there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going urban students is not accepted.

**Table No. 23.2: Coefficients Summary of hypotheses There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going urban students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.**

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

| Model |            | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | T     | Sig. |
|-------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
|       |            | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |       |      |
| 1     | (Constant) | 62.375                      | 6.405      |                           | 9.739 | .000 |
|       | PU         | 1.189                       | .363       | .331                      | 3.278 | .000 |
|       | EU         | -.017                       | .316       | -.005                     | -.054 | .000 |
|       | NU         | .703                        | .255       | .275                      | 2.752 | .000 |
|       | LU         | .704                        | .310       | .230                      | 2.272 | .000 |

Dependent Variable: SIU

From the Table 23.2: it is evident that the personality traits has impact on social intelligence among urban going college students, because the dimensions on SIU i.e PU,EU,NU,LU all have positive coefficient and are significant at 5% level. Since the coefficient of PU is greater (1.189) and that of EU (-.017) is very least. It can be interpreted that PU has more influence on SIU and EU has the least impact on SIU.

**Hypothesis 11: There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among science going college students.**

**Table No. 24: Model Summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among science going college students.**

**Modal summary**

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .772 <sup>a</sup> | .596     | .592              | 6.976                      |

Predictors: (Constant), personality trait

From the Table 24: shows that that there is very high cause and effect relationship between personality traits and social intelligence among science going college students. Table 24 shows that the value of R2 is .596, it means that 59.6 percent variation in social intelligence is explained by personality traits.

**Table no 24.1: ANOVA<sup>b</sup> summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among science going college students.**

**Annova**

| Model |            | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F       | Sig.              |
|-------|------------|----------------|----|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| 1     | Regression | 7045.336       | 1  | 7045.336    | 144.757 | .000 <sup>a</sup> |
|       | Residual   | 4769.664       | 98 | 48.670      |         |                   |
|       | Total      | 11815.000      | 99 |             |         |                   |

Predictors: (Constant), personality trait

Dependent Variable: social intelligence

From the Table 24.1: personality trait as an independent variable the calculated value of F ratio came out to be is 144.757 which is significant at .05 level also the p value that is .000 which is less than .05 level. Hence it can be inferred that personality traits has significant impact on social intelligence. Therefore the hypothesis stating there is

no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among science going college students is not accepted.

**Table No 24.2: Coefficients<sup>a</sup> Summary of Hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among science going college students.**

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

| Model             | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | T      | Sig. |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
|                   | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |        |      |
| 1 (Constant)      | 42.329                      | 4.359      |                           | 9.710  | .000 |
| personality trait | .996                        | .083       | .772                      | 12.032 | .000 |

Dependent Variable: social intelligence

From the table 24.2 it is evident that personality traits has impact on social intelligence among science going college students because there is positive coefficient and are significant at 5% level.

**Hypothesis 12 : There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among science going college students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.**

**Table No.25: Modal summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among science going college students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.**

**Modal summary**

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .774 <sup>a</sup> | .599     | .582              | 7.062                      |

Predictors: (Constant), LS, ES, PS, NS

The Table no 25: shows that there is very high cause and effect relationship between the personality traits and social intelligence among science going college student. The table 25 shows that the value of R2 is .599 it means that 59.9 percent variation in social intelligence is explained by personality traits.

**Table No. 25.1: ANOVA<sup>b</sup> Summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among science going college students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.**

**ANOVA**

| Model |            | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F      | Sig.              |
|-------|------------|----------------|----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| 1     | Regression | 7077.685       | 4  | 1769.421    | 35.483 | .000 <sup>a</sup> |
|       | Residual   | 4737.315       | 95 | 49.866      |        |                   |
|       | Total      | 11815.000      | 99 |             |        |                   |

Predictors: (Constant), LS, ES, PS, NS

Dependent Variable: social intelligence.

From the Table 25.1: calculated value of F ratio is 35.483 which is greater than the table value and also the p value is .000 is less than .05 level of significance which means that the personality traits has significant impact on social intelligence among science going college students. Hence the hypothesis stating that there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among science going college students with reference to Psychoticism, Neuroticism, Extraversion, Life score is not accepted.

**Table No. 25.2: Coefficients summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among science going college students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.**

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

| Model |            | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | T     | Sig. |
|-------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
|       |            | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |       |      |
| 1     | (Constant) | 41.775                      | 5.053      |                           | 8.267 | .000 |
|       | PS         | .933                        | .291       | .246                      | 3.205 | .002 |
|       | ES         | 1.046                       | .263       | .265                      | 3.985 | .000 |
|       | NS         | .875                        | .220       | .308                      | 3.987 | .000 |
|       | LS         | 1.188                       | .300       | .316                      | 3.963 | .000 |

Dependent Variable: social intelligence

From the Table 25.2: it is evident that the personality traits has impact on social intelligence on science going college students, because the dimensions of science I,e PS, ES ,NS, LS have positive co efficient and are significant at .5% level. Since the co efficient of LS is greater (1.188) and that of NS has (.875) is least. It can be interpreted that LS has more influence on science stream and NS has least impact on science stream.

**Hypothesis 13: There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going arts students.**

**Table No.26: Model Summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going arts students.**

**Modal summary**

| Model | R    | R.Square | Adjusted R square | Standard error of the estimate |
|-------|------|----------|-------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1     | .760 | .578     | .574              | 6.563                          |

Predictors: (Constant), pt arts

From Table No 26: shows that there is cause and effect relationship between the personality traits and social intelligence among college going arts students. Table 26 shows that the value of R2 is .578,it means that 57.8 percent variation in social intelligence is explained by personality traits.

**Table No. 26.1: ANOVA<sup>b</sup> Summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going arts students.**

**ANOVA**

| Model        | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F       | Sig.              |
|--------------|----------------|----|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| 1 Regression | 5789.267       | 1  | 5789.267    | 134.388 | .000 <sup>a</sup> |
| Residual     | 4221.723       | 98 | 43.079      |         |                   |
| Total        | 10010.990      | 99 |             |         |                   |

Predictors: (Constant), pt arts

Dependent Variable: si arts

From the Table 26.1:personality traits as an independent variable the calculated value of F ratio came out to be is 134.388 which is significant at .05 level also the p value

that is .000 which is less than .05 level. Hence it can be inferred that personality traits has significant impact on social intelligence. Therefore the hypothesis stating that there is no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among arts going college students is not accepted.

**Table No 26.2: Coefficients<sup>a</sup> summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going arts students.**

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

| Model        | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | T      | Sig. |
|--------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
|              | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |        |      |
| 1 (Constant) | 56.453                      | 3.515      |                           | 16.059 | .000 |
| pt arts      | .756                        | .065       | .760                      | 11.593 | .000 |

Dependent Variable: si arts

From the Table 26.2:it is evident that personality traits has impact on social intelligence among college going arts students, because the dimension have the positive coefficient and are significant at 5% level.

**Hypothesis 14: There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going arts students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.**

**Table No.27: Modal summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going arts students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.**

**Modal summary**

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .777 <sup>a</sup> | .604     | .587              | 6.464                      |

Predictors: (Constant), LA, EA, NA, PA

From the Table No 27: shows that there is very high cause and effect relationship between the personality traits and social intelligence among college going arts students .Table 27 shows that the value of R2 is -.604. It means that 60.4 percent variation in social intelligence is explained by personality traits.



**Table No 27.1: ANOVA<sup>b</sup>summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going arts students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.**

ANOVA

| Model |            | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F      | Sig.              |
|-------|------------|----------------|----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| 1     | Regression | 6041.838       | 4  | 1510.460    | 36.152 | .000 <sup>a</sup> |
|       | Residual   | 3969.152       | 95 | 41.781      |        |                   |
|       | Total      | 10010.990      | 99 |             |        |                   |

Predictors: (Constant), LA, EA, NA, PA

Dependent Variable: si arts

From the Table No 27.1: calculated value of F ratio is 36.152 which is greater than the table value and also the p value is .000 is less than .05 level of significance which means that the personality traits has significant impact on social intelligence among college going arts students. Hence the hypothesis stating that there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among arts going college students with reference to Psychoticism, Neuroticism, Extraversion, Life score on social intelligence is not accepted.

**Table No. 27.2: Coefficients Summary of hypotheses there will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going arts students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.**

Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

| Model |            | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | T      | Sig. |
|-------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
|       |            | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |        |      |
| 1     | (Constant) | 56.950                      | 4.142      |                           | 13.748 | .000 |
|       | PA         | .997                        | .293       | .293                      | 3.398  | .001 |
|       | EA         | .486                        | .254       | .138                      | 1.911  | .059 |
|       | NA         | .400                        | .222       | .155                      | 1.803  | .075 |
|       | LA         | 1.141                       | .195       | .430                      | 5.861  | .000 |

Dependent Variable: si arts

From the Table 27.2: it is evident that the personality trait has impact on social intelligence among arts going college students. The dimensions of arts i.e PA, EA ,NA ,LA have a positive correlation and are significant at .5% level. Since the coefficient of LA is greater (1.141) and that of NA (.400) is least it can be interpreted that LA has more influence on arts and NA has the least impact on arts.

# CHAPTER 5

## FINDINGS, EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS AND FURTHER SUGGESTIONS

### GENERAL CONCLUSION

In the light of analysis and interpretation of the data as given in the previous chapter, the investigator arrived at the following conclusions:

1. From the results it is found that there is significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going students.
2. It is found that there is high cause and effect relationship between personality traits and social intelligence of college going students.
3. There found significant impact of personality on social intelligence among male going college students.
4. High cause and effect relationship was found on the college going male students the dimensions of personality traits life score and Psychoticism has a more influence than the Extraversion and neuroticism.
5. There found significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among female going college students.
6. There found Positive and significant correlation between the personality traits and social intelligence among female going college students the dimensions of personality traits like Extraversion and life score has great impact than the Psychoticism and Life score on female going college students.
7. There found significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going rural students.
8. There found positive and significant correlation between the personality traits and social intelligence on college going rural students because all the dimensions of personality traits Life score and Psychoticism has more impact than the Extraversion and Neuroticism.
9. There found significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among urban going college students.
10. There found high cause and positive relationship between the personality traits and social intelligence on urban going college students dimensions like Psychoticism and Life score has more influence than the Extraversion and Neuroticism.

11. There found significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among science going college students.
12. There found high cause and positive relationship between personality traits and social intelligence among college going science students dimensions of personality traits like Life score and Extraversion has more influence than the Psychoticism and Neuroticism.
13. There found significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among Arts going college students.
14. There found high cause and positive relationship between the personality traits and social intelligence among college going arts students dimensions of personality traits like Life score and Psychoticism has more influence than the Extraversion and Neuroticism.

## **V.II EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS**

### **Implications for Parents:**

Parents can endeavor to develop their personality by implementing effective intervention program.

- By helping them to frame the time table and instructing them to adhere to it.
- By encouraging the students to use library for books, magazines and newspapers daily.
- By providing guidance to their students.
- By making the home environment more conducting and motivating.
- Parents of such children can better utilize their time for upbringing of their children.
- It also indicates that if uneducated parents have penetrating look and positive attitudes towards the education they can set a mile stone by preparing their children for good citizens.
- The individuality should be respected. Parents, teachers and family members should help them in building positive attitudes, towards themselves and others.
- At home parents should also be careful towards their education and pay attention towards their behavior and education, achievement, potentialities, interest, problem solving abilities for developing their personality.

- As failure and success affect their personality, so they should be guided properly by their parents, teachers, and other family members to keep proper track of progress.

### **Implications for Teacher**

The teacher should find out the causes and factors and should approach accordingly. The teacher should pay attention according to the needs of these students. The method of teacher should also be according to their levels. It becomes the duty of educational administrators to remodeled aims of education, methods of teaching, promotions and rewards according to their needs and requirements. The teacher should also pay special attention on development of these children accordingly.

- The present study is also a pointer to those teachers who think that their job is only to impart the knowledge of three R's. Rather, it is more important that those children who exhibit varying personality characteristics should be segregated in the school ladder.
- The activities and programs for the development of positive traits among Jammu students should be incorporated in the teaching-learning process.
- The individuality should be respected. Parents, teachers and family members should help them in building positive attitudes, towards themselves and others.
- These students should be properly encouraged to get proper education with other students so that they can make proper adjustment and develop their personality to greatest extent.
- Because of diversities in our society, our society is complex so problems of these students are increasing. It is necessary for teachers to handle to the problems of these students carefully and make them able to solve their problems confidently.
- As failure and success affect their personality, so they should be guided properly by their parents, teachers, and other family members to keep proper track of progress.

## **Implications for Policy Makers**

As the needs of these students are quite different from other students, the educational policy maker should reframe with provision inclusive environment, inclusive class rooms, school enriched and diversified curriculum.

- Self-acceptance and acceptance by others is an important aspect at this age of development so, it is important to respect their opinions and ideas, it will help them to develop decision making capacities.
- These students should be treated with appropriate behaviour which helps in gaining confidence and develop their personality positive which would ultimately be helpful in their adjustment and in solving their problems, related to their personal and social problems and achieving success.
- There should be provision of counseling at colleges at appropriate intervals so that they should overcome their problems and difficulties and become confident, well-adjusted students

## **SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH**

For the proper development of individual as well as nation in a democratic pattern, it is essential that the personality characteristics of the people should be properly measured. In case we do not do so, we will find maladjustment in every walk of life. For example a person, who should be clerk in the bank, is appointed as a teacher just by chance and a person, who should be an officer in army, works as a painter. So it can be said that we never take into consideration the personality characteristics of the individual when we frame any policy or programs. After considering the findings, the investigator stated that there is still a scope of further studies in other walks of life. The following will be the main areas of research.

1. A similar study can also be made at other levels of education i.e. at primary, secondary, or technical education.
2. In the present study the investigator has studied only Eynnks personality questionnaire , and social intelligence scale on the same pattern other personality factors can also studied.

3. The same study can be done for the university students because only college student's students are selected for the study.
4. The investigator has studied personality traits and social intelligence of college students of Jammu and Kashmir only. The same study can be done for teachers also.
5. A comparative study of personality traits of government and private colleges can also be made because the present study has conducted on government colleges.
6. The same study can be made for professional colleges such as Bed, medical and engineering etc.
7. The similar study can be conducted on large sample also i.e. at state level or at national level.
8. The present study is confined only district i.e (Jammu) of Jammu and Kashmir. similar study can be extended to other regions of the state.
9. The present study is only conducted on the college students and the colleges are affiliated with the University of Jammu. similar study may be conducted while incorporating students from CBSE board and other boards.
10. Other statistical techniques may be used for analyzing data or raw scores obtained by different tools.
11. Standardized tools for measuring personality traits of college students and social intelligence may be developed by the investigator himself.
12. Qualitative study may be undertaken to investigate the effects of various cognitive and non-cognitive variables among students in different socio-cultural and environment conditions in the state.
13. Experimental study can also be undertaken on the selected group.

#### **V.IV LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

The presents study has answered few questions but also led some other questions. Due to lack of time, resources, knowledge and expertise research work has limitations. The limitations of the present study are as:

1. Present study has carried out on a sample of 200college students both male and female so the results derived on the basis of this study have limited generalizations.

2. In this investigation personality inventory and social intelligence scale of college students have been studied. there are many other variables; all of them have not been studied due to lack of time at the disposal of investigator.
3. Through the sample incorporate both male and female students belonging to joint and nuclear family, no comparative study of students belonging to Students (male and female) from nuclear and joint families' high achiever and low achiever have been studied but economic and socio-cultural effects have not been studied in this investigation.

## **V.V CONCLUSION**

On the basis of finding, discussed in the foregoing pages, it can be concluded that all the personality traits and social intelligence which plays an important role in the development of personality and social intelligence which helps a persons to adjust in the present contemporary world, because of the relationship between traits and social intelligence which helps the students to lead a good life and tackle the difficult situations of life amicably. In the study it is found that the significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence was found on male, female rural ,urban science and arts going college students.



# Summary

## Conceptual Framework

It is well known fact that personality plays a significant role in shaping not only the behavior of an individual but also his total success and prosperity in life. Interest in personality is as old as civilization: Ancient philosophers and poets frequently ventured about why individuals were exceptional and why they differed from each other in so many ways. Interaction between the individuals has played an important role in the growth of an individual's personality. There is not family back ground which plays significant role in the development of child but social factors which also play an important role in determining the behavior of the individuals. In every culture and society children and adolescents are subjected to various kinds of pressures, both personal and social. These pressures exert great influence on the personality development of the children, which ultimately influences not only the all-round development of that particular society but also affects the future development of the country. In other words, we can say that personality of the individual determines the nature of the society and the society in turn influences and nurtures the personality of an individual; thus, mutually strengthening each other. According to Cattell (1950) "the personality of an individual is that which enables us to predict what he will do in a given situation." Mischel and Shoda (1995) identified personal styles or strategies of individuals in dealing with the situations and found that these styles or strategies remain consistent over the years and they in turn, become a kind of behavioral signature of their personalities. These personality patterns or styles are determined largely by personality traits. The surroundings and the various interacting patterns that the child faces from the beginning of life determine the dynamics of personality.

Therefore according to Allport who counted 18000 traits like terms in English language that designed distinctive and personal forms of behavior. The terms adjective, defines how people reflect, Observe and feel these terms do not reflect personality of an individual but there are several thousand of them do. Allport (1961) acknowledge that rich collection of traits provide a way of capturing the uniqueness of each individual. So this uniqueness of each person could be described in terms of individual dispositions. Cardinal traits are having the dominant place because all the

individual actions can be traced back to them. Some people are without cardinal traits at that time central traits described an individual's behavior to some extent but nothing such a complete way as cardinal traits.

Allport the least generalized characteristics of the person he labeled secondary traits. These traits are like chocolates or prefer foreign cars but these traits have narrow range situation. Allport recommended that cardinal, central and secondary traits come from materials produced by the individuals themselves- material such as letter, diaries or personal journal

### **Need and Importance**

Students play an important role in contemporary society it has been rightly said that future of the country is depend on the students and are the builders of the nation. New theories of intelligence have been introduced and are gradually replacing the traditional theory. So traits which are considered building blocks of personality and plays significant role in shaping the behavior of students. Through these personality traits it helps the students to adjust in the environment which is full of chaos and confusion and the students are not in a position to decide what to do. Through the close connection between the traits and social intelligence which enables the persons to perform effectively in society. So in the contemporary world things are changing day by day and the needs demands of individuals are changing accordingly. So it is essential especially for the students to act wisely and to deal effectively in the changing situation. The student has become the center of concern, not only the reasoning capacities, but also his creativity, emotions, and interpersonal skills. Psychologist Howard Gardener (1983) introduced multiple intelligence theory which says that IQ alone is not only measure for success, there are also certain factors which plays key role in determining the success of an individual these are emotional intelligence and social intelligence which impacts the success of an individual. In this modern world especially in the field of education and due to rapid growth of industries where human interactions and relations play a vital role these personality traits and social intelligence acts as bridge to handle the situation and adjust in the situation and to achieve the success in life. Although a number of studies on the relationship of personality traits and social intelligence, but little research has been done on personality traits and social intelligence. Hence it is noteworthy to apply the

two frame works Eysencks personality questionnaire and social intelligence inventory to which extent the impact of personality traits on social intelligence. Stability distinguishes traits on social intelligence from transient properties of the person. Social intelligence as a personality trait as performance characteristics may be regarded as an important social competence and significant predictor of successfulness of a student. The researcher wants to analyze the interconnection amongst personality traits and social intelligence.

The present study is a humble attempt to assess the impact of personality traits and social intelligence of college students. The psychologists developed interest in understanding, promoting and utilizing the individual differences for the development and prosperity of the society. The investigator has reviewed the literature and found it feasible to work on the topic. The study will be the guideline for the teachers, educationists and practitioners, researchers as well as curriculum planners, in order to imbibe coherence and integrity in personality and develop social intelligence among the college students so that the students will be able to acquire basic understanding regarding themselves.

In the light of the above research gap the investigator justifies the need to conduct a study stated as under.

#### **STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

**“Impact of Personality Traits on Social Intelligence of Students: A Study in Context of College Going Students of Jammu District.”**

#### **Operational definition of variables**

##### **Personality Traits**

It refers to enduring personal characteristics that are revealed in a particular pattern of behavior in a variety of situation. Personality traits for the present study have been measured through Eysenck’s personality questionnaire-R (1975). It measures personality in four dimensions. These dimensions are as under:

1. Psychoticism
2. Extraversion
3. Neuroticism

#### 4. Lie scales

### **Social Intelligence**

It is an ability to understand other people and social interactions, and apply this knowledge in leading and influencing other people for their mutual satisfaction. Social intelligence for the present study has been measured through N. K. Chadha and Usha Ganesan Social Intelligence Scale (1986). It measures social intelligence in eight dimensions. These dimensions are as under:

1. Patience
2. Cooperativeness
3. Confidence level
4. Sensitivity
5. Recognition of social environment
6. Tactfulness
7. Sense of humor
8. Memory

### **College students**

College students are those who are on rolls in various degree colleges of district Jammu. The sample has been taken from the third year college students during year (2016-17).

### **Objectives:-**

The following objectives have been formulated for the present study:

15. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going students.
16. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism and life score.
17. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among male going college students.
18. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among male college going students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism and life score.

19. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among female college going students.
20. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among female college going students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism and life score.
21. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among urban college going students.
22. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among urban college going students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism and life score.
23. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among rural college going students.
24. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among rural college going students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism and life score.
25. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among Science College going students.
26. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among Science College going students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism and life score.
27. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among Arts College going students.
28. To find the impact of personality traits on social intelligence among Arts College going students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism and life score.

### **Hypotheses:-**

Following hypotheses have been formulated for the present study.

15. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going students.
16. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.
17. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going male students.

18. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going male students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.
19. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going female students.
20. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going female students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.
21. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going rural students.
22. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going rural students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.
23. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going urban students.
24. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going urban students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.
25. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among science going college students.
26. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among science going college students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.
27. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among arts going college students.
28. There will be no significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among arts going college students with reference to Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Life score.

#### **Delimitations of the study**

5. The study is delimited to Jammu.
6. The study is delimited to the students of class 3<sup>rd</sup> year.
7. The study took only male-female rural –urban science-arts factors into consideration.
8. The present study has been conducted on 200 students only.

## **Review of Related Literature**

### **Research gap**

The topic chosen should be such as it has not been investigated earlier. From a review of research and after concluding, whatever researches, the investigator could come across through his sincere efforts did not find any study, which has been either in the country or abroad, on the present subject. The topic being new and have not been investigated earlier, has received the attention of the investigator. Hence the newness of the topic is also one of the reasons for the choice of the present study.

The above review reveals that many scholars have studied the different factors which affect academic achievement of the students. However, a comprehensive yet concise research work focusing on those closely related to variables namely personality traits, social intelligence.

## **Methods and Procedure**

The present study is designed to study the impact of personality traits on social intelligence on college students. As such, the descriptive method of research was employed to carry out this piece of research work. The details regarding sample, tools and statistical treatment are reported as follows:

### **POPULATION**

A population is a summation of all the organisms of the same group or species, which live in the same geographical area, and have the capability of interbreeding. A research population is also known as a well-defined collection of individuals or objects known to have similar characteristics. All individuals or objects within a certain population usually have a common, binding characteristic or trait. Usually, the description of the population and the common binding characteristic of its members are the same. "Government officials" is a well-defined group of individuals which can be considered as a population and all the members of this population are indeed officials of the government. In the present study the students of different Government degree colleges of Jammu district constitute the population of the study and a representative sample from this population has been selected by the investigator.

## **SAMPLE OF THE STUDY**

The sample for the present study consisted the total population of all colleges of district Jammu. The study was conducted on a sample of 200 college students which was further divided into different groups of male-female and rural-urban arts-science dichotomy. The college students were in the age group of 19 - 21 years. The sample has been selected on the basis of random sampling technique. The breakup of the sample is given as follows:

**Table No. 1: List of the Colleges taken for Data collection**

| S.NO | NAME OF THE COLLEGE              | MALE    |      | FEMALE  |      | TOTAL |
|------|----------------------------------|---------|------|---------|------|-------|
|      |                                  | SCIENCE | ARTS | SCIENCE | ARTS |       |
| 1.   | GOVT WOMENS COLLEGE GANDHI NAGAR | NIL     | NIL  | 18      | 12   | 30    |
| 2.   | GOVT WOMENS COLLEGE PARADE       | NIL     | NIL  | 20      | 10   | 30    |
| 3.   | GOVT DEGREE COLLEGE PALOURA      | NIL     | 18   | NIL     | 18   | 36    |
| 4.   | GOVT DEGREE COLLEGE BISHNA       | NIL     | 22   | NIL     | 10   | 32    |
| 5.   | GOVT M.A.M PG COLLEGE            | 28      | 10   | 05      | NIL  | 43    |
| 6.   | G.G.M SCIENCE COLLEGE            | 21      | NIL  | 08      | NIL  | 29    |

## **SELECTION OF THE TOOL**

Selection of the tool is very important in any research study. If appropriate tools are not used, the investigator may be misled and the efforts of the investigator would go waste as he would not be able to achieve the objectives of the study. An investigator has to look for such procedural techniques and tools which will answer his pursuits or hypothesis objectively. A competent investigator, therefore, looks into



the possible measures which can help him in arriving at the desired results. Accordingly, the present investigator adopted the following tool for the collection of data.

### **TOOL USED**

The data for the present study was collected with the help of

- **SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE SCLAE**

Social intelligence scale developed by Prof. N. K Chadda and Usha Ganesan and published by National Psychological Corporation, Agra.

- **ESYENCs PERSONALITY QUESTIONNAIRE**

### **Analysis and Interpretation of Data**

#### **Regression**

When two related variables have cause and effect relationship and when a change in one variable induces a change in the other variable then there exists correlation between them. Thus, the strength of relationship between them can be known and measured by the correlation. If the average value of one variable is to be estimated corresponding to the given value of the other variable then regression is used. Here, of course the cause and effect relationship between two variables is tacitly implied. A variable in which change occurs is called a cause variable or independent variable. We shall call it an independent variable and we shall denote it by X. the other variable whose value is to be estimated corresponding to a given change in X is called an effect variable or dependent variable and we shall denote it by Y. In statistical terms, we say that there is some definite mathematical relationship with an error term.

### **FINDINGS, EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS AND FURTHER SUGGESTIONS**

1. From the results it is found that there is significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going students.
2. It is found that there is high cause and effect relationship between personality traits and social intelligence of college going students.
3. There found significant impact of personality on social intelligence among male going college students.

4. High cause and effect relationship was found on the college going male students the dimensions of personality traits life score and Psychoticism has a more influence than the Extraversion and neuroticism.
5. There found significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among female going college students.
6. There found Positive and significant correlation between the personality traits and social intelligence among female going college students the dimensions of personality traits like Extraversion and life score has great impact than the Psychoticism and Life score on female going college students.
7. There found significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among college going rural students.
8. There found positive and significant correlation between the personality traits and social intelligence on college going rural students because all the dimensions of personality traits Life score and Psychoticism has more impact than the Extraversion and Neuroticism.
9. There found significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among urban going college students.
10. There found high cause and positive relationship between the personality traits and social intelligence on urban going college students dimensions like Psychoticism and Life score has more influence than the Extraversion and Neuroticism.
11. There found significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among science going college students.
12. There found high cause and positive relationship between personality traits and social intelligence among college going science students dimensions of personality traits like Life score and Extraversion has more influence than the Psychoticism and Neuroticism.
13. There found significant impact of personality traits on social intelligence among Arts going college students.
14. There found high cause and positive relationship between the personality traits and social intelligence among college going arts students dimensions of personality traits like Life score and Psychoticism has more influence than the Extraversion and Neuroticism.

## **EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS**

### **Implications for Parents:**

Parents can endeavor to develop their personality by implementing effective intervention program.

- By helping them to frame the time table and instructing them to adhere to it.
- By encouraging the students to use library for books, magazines and newspapers daily.
- By providing guidance to their students.
- By making the home environment more conducting and motivating.
- Parents of such children can better utilize their time for upbringing of their children.
- It also indicates that if uneducated parents have penetrating look and positive attitudes towards the education they can set a mile stone by preparing their children for good citizens.
- The individuality should be respected. Parents, teachers and family members should help them in building positive attitudes, towards themselves and others.
- At home parents should also be careful towards their education and pay attention towards their behavior and education, achievement, potentialities, interest, problem solving abilities for developing their personality.
- As failure and success affect their personality, so they should be guided properly by their parents, teachers, and other family members to keep proper track of progress.

### **Implications for Teacher**

The teacher should find out the causes and factors and should approach accordingly. The teacher should pay attention according to the needs of these students. The method of teacher should also be according to their levels. It becomes the duty of educational administrators to remodeled aims of education, methods of teaching, promotions and rewards according to their needs and requirements. The teacher should also pay special attention on development of these children accordingly.

- The present study is also a pointer to those teachers who think that their job is only to impart the knowledge of three R's. Rather, it is more important that those children who exhibit varying personality characteristics should be segregated in the school ladder.
- The activities and programs for the development of positive traits among Jammu students should be incorporated in the teaching-learning process.
- The individuality should be respected. Parents, teachers and family members should help them in building positive attitudes, towards themselves and others.
- These students should be properly encouraged to get proper education with other students so that they can make proper adjustment and develop their personality to greatest extent.
- Because of diversities in our society, our society is complex so problems of these students are increasing. It is necessary for teachers to handle to the problems of these students carefully and make them able to solve their problems confidently.
- As failure and success affect their personality, so they should be guided properly by their parents, teachers, and other family members to keep proper track of progress.

### **Implications for Policy Makers**

As the needs of these students are quite different from other students, the educational policy maker should reframe with provision inclusive environment, inclusive class rooms, school enriched and diversified curriculum.

- Self-acceptance and acceptance by others is an important aspect at this age of development so, it is important to respect their opinions and ideas, it will help them to develop decision making capacities.
- These students should be treated with appropriate behaviour which helps in gaining confidence and develop their personality positive which would ultimately be helpful in their adjustment and in solving their problems, related to their personal and social problems and achieving success.

- There should be provision of counseling at colleges at appropriate intervals so that they should overcome their problems and difficulties and become confident, well-adjusted students.

The educational administrators, teachers, counselors should be well aware of the personality traits of their students. Teachers should help students to develop their study habits, capabilities, potentialities and capacities. Teacher should also help them in developing attitudes towards home, school and society. It becomes the duty of all the responsible and experience person to mold the students in such a way that they can provide maximum benefits to the society. College as an agency of education has the highest responsibility to do such type of duty. College should be providing congenial and progressive atmosphere that can help the society to draw the best that lies inside the personalities of these students.

## **SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH**

For the proper development of individual as well as nation in a democratic pattern, it is essential that the personality characteristics of the people should be properly measured. In case we do not do so, we will find maladjustment in every walk of life. For example a person, who should be clerk in the bank, is appointed as a teacher just by chance and a person, who should be an officer in army, works as a painter. So it can be said that we never take into consideration the personality characteristics of the individual when we frame any policy or programs. After considering the findings, the investigator stated that there is still a scope of further studies in other walks of life. The following will be the main areas of research.

1. A similar study can also be made at other levels of education i.e. at primary, secondary, or technical education.
2. In the present study the investigator has studied only Eysenck's personality questionnaire, and social intelligence scale on the same pattern other personality factors can also studied.
3. The same study can be done for the university students because only college student's students are selected for the study.

4. The investigator has studied personality traits and social intelligence of college students of Jammu and Kashmir only. The same study can be done for teachers also.
5. A comparative study of personality traits of government and private colleges can also be made because the present study has conducted on government colleges.
6. The same study can be made for professional colleges such as Bed, medical and engineering etc.
7. The similar study can be conducted on large sample also i.e. at state level or at national level.
8. The present study is confined only district i.e. (Jammu) of Jammu and Kashmir. Similar study can be extended to other regions of the state.
9. The present study is only conducted on the college students and the colleges are affiliated with the University of Jammu. Similar study may be conducted while incorporating students from CBSE board and other boards.
10. Other statistical techniques may be used for analyzing data or raw scores obtained by different tools.
11. Standardized tools for measuring personality traits of college students and social intelligence may be developed by the investigator himself.
12. Qualitative study may be undertaken to investigate the effects of various cognitive and non-cognitive variables among students in different socio-cultural and environment conditions in the state.
13. Experimental study can also be undertaken on the selected group.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Mohan, Anand, (1988). Scholastic Achievement as Related to Self - Esteem Feelings of Security, Depression and Test Anxiety. *Fifth Survey of Research in Education (1988 - 92)*, Vol. II, J.P. Sharma, pp. 1888
- Hom Chaudhuri, S. (1996). "An analytical study of correlates of academic performance of school students". *Journal of Educational Research Extension*, Vol.2, p.183.
- Haq, Najmul (1988). "A Study of certain personality correlates of over-under achievement in different school subjects". Ph.D., (Edn.), Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh (U.P), India.
- Menon, S. K. (1980). *Effect of Parents Socio-economic status, student's self-concept and gender on science related attitude and achievement*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Punjab, Lahore
- Srivastava, M. L. (1979). *A study of Adjustment, Self-concept and Personality of secondary school students in Chandigarh*. Unpublished M.Ed. Dissertation Punjab University, Chandigarh.
- Joshi, R.J. (1974). *A study of Creativity and some personality traits of the intellectually gifted High School Students*. (Doctoral Dissertation MSU University. 1974).
- Mishra, H.K. (1962). *Personality Factors in High and Low Achievers in Engineering Education*, Doctoral Thesis, Education IIT, Kharagpur.
- R.J. Joshi, (1974). *A Study of Creativity and Some Personality Traits of Intellectually Gifted High School Students*. Ph.D. (Edu.) M.S.U., p.256 (Second Survey of Research in Education1).
- Srivastva. R. K., and Saxena. V. (1979). *Personality Correlates of self-rated Academic success and failure- a comparative study*, project financed by P.P.N. College, Kanpur.
- Kolwadkar, V. (1980). *Study of gifted children in relation to their personality variables, level of adjustment and scholastic achievement*. *Fifth Survey of Research in Education*. New Delhi: N.C.E.R.T. 1997.
- Crown, Anne. K (2013).an empirical analysis of three intelligences. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, Vol 45(2), pp. 105-114.
- Khan, Z, Khan, N.A, Haider, Z. (2011). *A Study on Social Intelligence of the students of physical education*. *International Journal of Sports Sciences and Physical education. (IJSSPE)* Vol-II, Issue-I.

- Hooda, D, Sharma, N.R and Yadav. A (2009). Social Intelligence as a predictor of positive psychological health. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*. Vol-35, No.1 pp. 143-150
- Khan, Z, Khan, N.A, Haider, Z. (2011). A Study on Social Intelligence of the students of physical education. *International Journal of Sports Sciences and Physical education*. (IJSSPE) Vol-II, Issue-I.
- Jones, K. and Day J.D. (1997). Discrimination of two aspects of cognitive-Social Intelligence from Academic Intelligence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89 (3), pp. 486-497.
- Sharma. A (1989) .A Comparative study of values, intelligence, and academic achievement, Abstracts of Research studies conducted by teacher education institutions in India, Volume 3. , D.R. Goel, R. C. Madhavi.
- Wong, Chau-Ming T-day, Jeanne D, Maxwell, Scott, Meara, Naomi M. (1995). A multrait-multimethod study of academic and social intelligence in college students; *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol 81 (1), pp. 117-133.
- Sembayan, R, Visvanathan, G and Dr P. C. Naga Subramani. (2011). A Study on the attitude towards regionalism of college students in relation to Social Intelligence. *Indian Streams Research Journal (ISRJ)* Vol-I, Issue-IX.
- Meijs, N, Antonius. H. N. Cillessen, Ron. H. J. Scholte, Segers. E, Spijkerman. R (2008). Social Intelligence and Academic Achievement as predictors of adolescent popularity; *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, Department of Psychology*, University of Connecticut, Storrs/USA.
- Dong, Q, Koper, R.J, Collaco, C.M (2008). Social Intelligence, Self-esteem and Intercultural Communication Sensitivity. *Intercultural Communication Studies*. Vol-II, Issue- XVII.
- Sexena, s. and Jain, R.K. (2013). Social Intelligence of Undergraduate Students In Relation To Their Gender and Subject Stream. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)*, Vol., 1/1, PP.01-04
- Sembayan, R. and Visvanathan, G. (2012). A Study on Social Intelligence of College Students. *International Journal of Current Research*, Vol., 4, pp.231-232.
- Birknerora, z. (2013).*Social Intelligence in the Context of Personality Traits of Teachers.American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, vol., 3, no., 7.pp.11-17.
- Mcclum, L.A. and Merrell, K.W. (1988). “A study of the relationship between personalities with academic achievement levels”. (Google search/www.eric.ed.gov.in)



- Mishra, H.K. (1962). "Personality factors in High and low achievers in Engineering Education". Ph.D. Education, IIT Kharagpur, India.
- Gadzella, B.M. (1976). "Differences between high and low-achievers on selfperceptions". *Journal of Experimental Education*. (www. jstor.org)
- Girija, P.R. and Bhadra, B.P. (1984). "A study of ability, study habits and skills, values and personality characteristics of high and low achieving scheduled caste and tribe students". *Psychological studies*, Vol.29(1), pp.13-17.
- Govinda Reddy, V. (2002). "Influence of certain psycho-sociological factors on scholastic achievement of DIET student". Ph.D. *Thesis, Dept. of Education, S.V. University, Tiruapti, (A.P).*
- Gupta, P.L. (1983). "A study of personality characteristics of ninth grade over and under achieving boys and girls at different levels of achievement motivation". Ph.D. Thesis. Punjab: Punjab University.
- Joshi, R. (1989). "A Study of creativity in relation to personality, locus of control and alienation". Ph.D., (Psy.), Panjab University, Panjab.
- Mohanty, A.K. (2002). "A study of the relation between components of family environment and academic achievement of gifted and underachievers". *New Frontiers in Education*, Vol.40 (3), pp.25-27.
- Khan, Z.N. (2005). "A study of scholastic achievement of higher secondary students in science stream". Dept. of Edn, S.S.D.S. College, Iglas, 202124, Aligarh, India.
- Mishra, N.L. (1997). "Psychological study of internal approach and student career". *Psycholingua*, pp.73-80.
- Mohanty, P. (1999). "Social correlates of Academic Achievement: A comparative study of High and Low achievers rural scheduled caste primary school girls". Ph.D. (Edu.). *New Frontiers in Education, International Journal of Education, New Delhi*, Vol.42 (1), pp.18-21.
- Mishra, G. (1999). "Towards indigenous psychology of cognition: knowing the Indian Tradition". *Journal of Indian Psychology*, 17, 1-22
- Ramaswamy, R. (1988). "An inquiry into the correlates of achievement". Ph.D., (Edn.), South Gujarat University, India
- Sharma, K. (1989). "A study of different academic divisioners related to some psycho-sociological factors". *Ram-Eesh Journal of Education*, Vol.3 (1), pp.42-46.

- Sharma and Sunitha, (1985). “A comparative study of anxiety pattern of high and low achievers of scientific stream”. *Perspectives in psychological Researchers*. Vol.8 (1), pp.40-42.
- Sinha, S., Trivedi J.K., Gupta, S.C., and Sinha, P.K. (1989). “A study of high and low achievers with special references to their intelligence, and family variables”. *Indian Journal of clinical psychology*, 15, 103-107.
- Sinha, Neeta (1991). “A social and psychological study of academically talented and average students”. Ph.D., (Edn.), University of Allahabad, India.
- Sood, S. (1999). “A Study of Creativity, Problem solving ability and personality characteristics as correlates of mathematical achievement of students of residential and Non-residential schools”. Ph.D., (Edn.), Panjab University, India.
- Verma, B.P. and Shikh, G.Q. (1996). “Cognitive Style, personality and Psychological Needs”. *Journal of Psychological Researches*, 40, 62-68.
- Verma, B.P. (1992). “Relationship between temperament and academic achievement”. *Indian Educational Review*, Vol.27(3).
- Yadav, P.L. (1989). “Anxiety, Frustration and Neuroticism as functions of socio-economic status and cultural setting in different divisioners and failures of high school students”. Ph.D., (Edu.), Kanpur University. *Fifth Survey of Educational Research* (1988-92), Vol.I, NCERT, New Delhi.
- Ayishabi, T.C. (1990). “A Study of group differences in certain achievement related personality variables of students”. Ph.D., (Edn.), University of Calicut.
- Basanti, Jagan Mohan and Mukhopadhaya, (2000). “A study of the effect of psychological factors on academic achievement among tribal students”. *Indian Educational Review*, Vol.23(1), pp.16-18.
- Ayodya, (2007). “A study of emotional problems of school children and relation to life events and school achievement”. *New Frontiers in Education*, Vol.40(4), pp.19-21.
- Annie, K.J. (2004). “A study creativity among overachievers and under achievers of students of IX standard in Relation to certain psychological factors”. *Edutracks*, Vol.7(2), October, 2007.
- Abraham, T. (1996). “A Study of the influence of basic personality factors on academic achievement”. Unpublished doctorial thesis in Education, S.V. University, Tirupati (India).
- Chauhan, R.S. (2004). “A Study of Learning – Styles of high school students

in the context of their Adjustment and Extroversion–Introversion”. Ph.D., (Edu.), H.N.B. Grahwal University, Sri Nagar.

- Goel Swami Pyari, (2002).“Feeling of security, Family attachment and values of Adolescent Girls in Relation to their Educational Achievement”. *Indian Journal of Psychometry and Education*, Vol.33 (1), pp.25-28.
- Jantli,R.T.(1988).“Relationship between teacher behaviour, pupil personality and pupil growth outcome”. Ph.D., (Edn.), Karnataka University, India.
- Jean-Paul E. Prieto, (2005).“Discovering the relationship between personality type and predicted Academic Success”. *Master of Arts in Psychology*, East Caroline University. ([www.eric.edu.gov.in](http://www.eric.edu.gov.in))
- Rangaswami, G. (1988). “A Study of Moral Judgment of High School Pupils in relation to certain factors”. Ph.D., (Edu.), S.V. University, Tirupati (A.P), India
- Saxena, Anju and Rashmi. (1994).“Personality Structure of advantaged school-going children”. *Indian Journal of Psychometry and Education*, 25, 85-90.
- Sen, Barat Kalpana, (1992).“An investigation into the personality make-up, intelligence and study habits of high and low achievers”. Ph.D., (Edn.), University of Calcutta, India.
- Sophia Gir, Prbhajain and Radhika Lodha, (2006). “Social maturity and Locus of control of high achievers and low achievers– A comparative analysis”. *Recent researchers in Education and psychology*, Vol. I & II.