

A STUDY OF PERSONALITY FACTORS IN RELATION TO EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE OF STUDENT-TEACHERS

Rakesh Bharti

Lecturer in Education Department of Education
Jammu & Kashmir

Abstract: Emotional intelligence seems to be everywhere. In recent years, it has emerged as a critical factor for sustaining high achievement, retention, and positive behaviour as well as improving life success. Emotional intelligence (EI) and personality traits play a major role in maintaining work effectiveness and efficiency in any organization. The purpose of this study is to see the impact of emotional intelligence on personality traits of student-teachers who aspire to become effective teachers. A total of 600 student-teachers of various colleges of education affiliated to University of Jammu, Jammu were selected as a sample randomly for the purpose of classification in low and high emotional intelligent student-teachers. Finally 80 student-teachers (40 low and 40 high emotionally intelligent) were selected randomly by using P40 and P60 percentiles. To test hypothesis t-test was used. Results of this study indicated significant differences between high and low emotional intelligent student teachers on personality factors.

Keyword: Emotional intelligence, Personality factors, Student-teachers.

INTRODUCTION:

Emotional Intelligence (EI) is about intelligent use of our emotions. This requires being aware of our feelings and the feelings of others in order to manage our behaviour and relationships effectively. Historically speaking, the term emotional intelligence was introduced in 1990 by two American university professors Dr. John Mayer and Dr. Peter Salovey in their attempt to develop a scientific measure for knowing the differences between people's ability in the areas of emotions. However the credit for popularizing the concept of emotional intelligence goes to another American psychologist Daniel Goleman through his book Emotional intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ, published in 1995 was an overnight best seller, and has been translated into 30 languages. The book begins with the insight that people who have high IQ can nevertheless fail – at school, at work, and in relationships. Goleman's idea is that success in life depends just as much on abilities like self-awareness, self-control, and empathy, which are rooted in the “emotional brain”. The major thesis of his book can be summarized by stating that we need a new vision of the study of human intelligence beyond the cognitive and intellectual aspects, a vision that would highlight the importance of the use and management of the social emotional world to understand the course of people's lifetimes.

Researches show that an emotionally strong person is better adjusted to his work environment – and more capable of handling sound and personal relationships. Thus, he is in a better position to lead a more successful, wholesome and fulfilling life. Although everyone has a certain ingrained emotional personality, there is always a scope for improvements. Personality is a complex blend of a

constantly evolving and changing pattern of one's behaviour, emerged as a result of one's interaction with one's environment and directed towards some specific ends.

Singh (2006, p.138) claimed that the teaching profession requires emotional competencies such as rapport, harmony and comfort while dealing with groups. A teacher with high IQ may not necessarily be high in these emotional competencies. Teachers with high EQ seem to exhibit open and free expression of ideas that lead them to creativity and mutual respect. Teacher's personal emotional stability is very crucial for the proper emotional development of the child. The basic personality pattern of the teacher, his emotional maturity and attitudes are an important factor in building an emotionally balanced personality of the child. Teachers can create an emotionally safe classroom environment by providing targeted, positive feedback on successful elements of work in conjunction with suggestions for improvement. However, there is a little information on the degree to which teachers understand the importance of EI or receive any training in emotional intelligence.

Till now very few studies have been conducted in this area of emotional intelligence and personality patterns of teachers from the Indian perspective. Hence researcher decided to conduct a study of personality factors in relation to emotional intelligence of student-teachers. The purpose of this study is to examine the effect of emotional intelligence on personality factors of student-teachers.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The present study has been entitled as “A Study of Personality Factors in relation to Emotional Intelligence of student-teachers.”

Concepts of terms used in the study

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

Emotional intelligence is the capacity for recognizing our own feelings and those of others, for motivating ourselves, for managing emotions well in ourselves and in our relationships.

Mayer & Salovey (1997) defined emotional intelligence as the ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions so as to assist thought, to understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and to reflectively regulate emotions so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth.

Personality

Personality is defined as the totality of character attributes and behavioural traits of a person. It is the totality of one's behaviour towards oneself and another and others as well. It includes everything about the person, his physical, social, emotional, mental and spiritual make-up. It is all that a person has about him.

Student-teachers

Student-teacher means a pre-service college student who is teaching under the supervision of a teacher-educator in order to qualify for the degree of bachelor of education.

Related Literature

Sjöberg (2001); Day, Therrien and Carroll (2005) and Petrides et al. (2010) investigated the relationships between emotional intelligence and personality dimensions. The results of these studies reported correlation between emotional intelligence and personality dimensions. Lopes, Salovey and Straus (2003) and Vanderzee and Wabeke (2004) found positive correlation between emotional intelligence and Big five personality factors extraversion, agreeableness, emotional stability and autonomy. Austin, Saklofske and Egan (2005) research results shows that emotional intelligence is more strongly associated with personality factors. Upadhyaya (2006) also found significant difference in personality traits of student-teachers possessing high and low emotional intelligence.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

1. To find out difference between student-teachers possessing high and low emotional intelligence on personality factors.

Hypothesis

1. There is no significant difference between student-teachers possessing high and low emotional intelligence on personality factors.

METHODOLOGY

Sample: Random Sampling technique was used in the selection of sample of the present study. The present study was conducted on 600 student-teachers from the 12 colleges of education affiliated to the University of Jammu, Jammu. Finally 80 student-teachers were selected randomly for present study as per the requirement.

Parameters: Personality factors of the student-teachers were taken as dependent variable whereas Emotional Intelligence was considered as independent variable in present investigation.

Tools Used:

1. Emotional Intelligence Scale (EIS) by Ankuool Hyde, Sanjyot Pethe and Upinder Dhar

This scale contains 34 items and measures emotional intelligence through 10 factors – self-awareness, empathy, self-motivation, emotional stability, managing relation, integrity, self-development, value orientation, commitment and altruistic behaviour. The reliability of the scale was determined by calculating reliability co-efficient on a sample of 200 students. The split-half reliability co-efficient was found to be 0.88. Besides face validity, as all items were related to the variable under focus, the scale has high content validity.

2. 16 P.F. Questionnaire by R. B. Cattell (adopted version by S. D. Kapoor.)

To measure personality factors of student-teachers, 16 P.F. Questionnaire constructed and standardized by R. B. Cattell and adopted by S. D. Kapoor in Hindi was used. As a test of normal adult personality the 16 P.F. form A to E effectively measures 16 factors viz., A (reserved vs. outgoing), B (less intelligent vs. more intelligent), C (affected by feelings vs. emotionally stable), E (humble vs. assertive), F (sober vs. happy-go-lucky), G (expedient vs. conscientious), H (shy vs. venturesome), I (tough minded vs. tender minded), L (trusting vs. suspicious), M (practical vs. imaginative), N (forthright vs. shrewd), O (placid vs. apprehensive), Q1 (Conservative vs. experimenting), Q2 (group dependent vs. self-sufficient), Q3 (undisciplined vs. controlled) and Q4 (relaxed vs. tense).

Procedure of Data Collection: The data for present study was collected in two phases. In Phase-I Emotional Intelligence Scale (EIS) was administered on 600 student-teachers of various colleges of education under University of Jammu, Jammu for classification of high and low emotional intelligence. After excluding incomplete scale and non-serious respondents 520 students' response were selected. Out of 520, only 80 student-teachers were selected randomly as per the requirement of t-test. In phase-II the 16 P.F. Questionnaire by R. B. Cattell (adopted version by S. D. Kapoor.) is used for measuring the personality factors on the selected student-teachers.

Scoring: After collection of data, responses of all respondents on 16 P.F. were scored according to their manual instructions. After completion of scoring datasheets were prepared according to objectives of the study for computer analysis.

Method of Research Adopted: Keeping in view the nature of present problem, an analytical research method was undertaken.

Statistical Analysis: In the present investigation, including

descriptive statistics Percentiles (P60 and P40) and t-test were applied.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To find out significant difference between student-teachers possessing low and high emotional intelligence on Personality Factors t-test was used. Summary of t-test for 16 personality factors is given in Table-1-16.

Table-1

Summary of t-test for difference between student-teachers possessing low and high emotional intelligence on personality factor A (reserved vs. outgoing)

Statistics	Low EI Group (N ₁ = 40)	High EI Group (N ₂ = 40)	t-ratio
Sum	390	427	1.758
Mean	9.750	10.675	
S.D.	2.718	1.929	

Table-1 shows that obtained t-value is 1.758 which is less than table value 1.99 for significance at 0.05 level for df 78. This result indicates that significant difference does not exist between low and high emotional intelligent student-teachers on personality factor A (reserved vs. outgoing).

Therefore, null hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between student-teachers of high and low emotional intelligence on personality factors”, is accepted for personality factor A (reserved vs. outgoing).

Table-2

Summary of t-test for difference between student-teachers possessing low and high emotional intelligence on personality factor B (less intelligent vs. more intelligent)

Statistics	Low EI Group (N ₁ = 40)	High EI Group (N ₂ = 40)	t-ratio
Sum	266	329	3.118*
Mean	6.650	8.225	
S.D.	2.424	2.103	

* p < 0.01 (Significant at 0.01 level)

Table-2 shows that obtained t-value is 3.118 which is greater than table value 2.64 for significance at 0.01 level for df 78. This result indicates that significant difference exists between student-teachers possessing low and high emotional intelligence on personality factor B (less intelligent vs. more intelligent). Table-2 shows that mean values for the student-teachers having low and high emotional intelligence are 6.650 and 8.225 respectively. This means that student-teachers with high emotional intelligence scored high on personality factor B.

Therefore, null hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between student-teachers of high and low emotional intelligence on personality factors”, is rejected for personality factor B (less intelligent vs. more intelligent).

Table-3

Summary of t-test for difference between student-teachers possessing low and high emotional intelligence on personality factor C (affected by feelings vs. emotionally stable)

Statistics	Low EI Group (N ₁ = 40)	High EI Group (N ₂ = 40)	t-ratio
Sum	450	639	6.393*
Mean	11.250	15.975	
S.D.	3.389	3.229	

* p < 0.01 (Significant at 0.01 level)

Table-3 shows that obtained t-value is 6.393 which is greater than table value 2.64 for significance at 0.01 level for df 78. This result indicates that significant difference exists between student-teachers possessing low and high emotional intelligence on personality factor C (affected by feelings vs. emotionally stable).

Therefore, null hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between student-teachers of high and low emotional intelligence on personality factors”, is rejected for personality factor C (affected by feelings vs. emotionally stable).

Table-4

Summary of t-test for difference between student-teachers possessing low and high emotional intelligence on personality factor E (humble vs. assertive)

Statistics	Low EI Group (N ₁ = 40)	High EI Group (N ₂ = 40)	t-ratio
Sum	439	501	1.899
Mean	10.975	12.525	
S.D.	3.946	3.332	

Table-4 shows that obtained t-value is 1.899 which is less than table value 1.99 for significance at 0.05 level for df 78. This result indicates that no significant difference exists between low and high emotional intelligent student-teachers on personality factor E (humble vs. assertive).

Therefore, null hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between student-teachers of high and low emotional intelligence on personality factors”, is accepted for personality factor E (humble vs. assertive).

Table-5

Summary of t-test for difference between student-teachers possessing low and high emotional intelligence on personality factor F (sober vs. happy-go-lucky)

Statistics	Low EI Group (N ₁ = 40)	High EI Group (N ₂ = 40)	t-ratio
Sum	445	512	2.120*
Mean	11.125	12.800	
S.D.	3.816	3.226	

* p < 0.05 (Significant at 0.05 level)

Table-5 shows that obtained t-value is 2.120 which is greater than table value 1.99 for significance at 0.05 level for df 78. This result indicates that significant difference exists between low and high emotional intelligent student-teachers on personality factor F (sober vs. happy-go-lucky).

Therefore, null hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between student-teachers of high and low emotional intelligence on personality factors”, is rejected for personality factor F (sober vs. happy-go-lucky).

Table-6

Summary of t-test for difference between student-teachers possessing low and high emotional intelligence on personality factor G (expedient vs. conscientious)

Statistics	Low EI Group (N ₁ = 40)	High EI Group (N ₂ = 40)	t-ratio
Sum	436	544	3.515*
Mean	10.900	13.600	
S.D.	3.239	3.625	
* p < 0.01 (Significant at 0.01 level)			

Table-6 shows that obtained t-value is 3.515 which is greater than table value 2.64 for significance at 0.01 level for df 78. This result indicates that significant difference exists between low and high emotional intelligent student-teachers on personality factor G (expedient vs. conscientious).

Therefore, null hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between student-teachers of high and low emotional intelligence on personality factors”, is rejected for personality factor G (expedient vs. conscientious).

Table-7

Summary of t-test for difference between student-teachers possessing low and high emotional intelligence on personality factor H (shy vs. venturesome)

Statistics	Low EI Group (N ₁ = 40)	High EI Group (N ₂ = 40)	t-ratio
Sum	541	713	4.048*
Mean	13.525	17.825	
S.D.	4.680	4.826	
* p < 0.01 (Significant at 0.01 level)			

Table-7 shows that obtained t-value is 4.048 which is greater than table value 2.64 for significance at 0.01 level for df 78. This result indicates that significant difference exists between low and high emotional intelligent student-teachers on personality factor H (shy vs. venturesome).

Therefore, null hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between student-teachers of high and low emotional intelligence on personality factors”, is rejected for personality factor H (shy vs. venturesome).

Table-8

Summary of t-test for difference between student-teachers possessing low and high emotional intelligence on personality factor I (tough minded vs. tender minded)

Statistics	Low EI Group (N ₁ = 40)	High EI Group (N ₂ = 40)	t-ratio
Sum	364	438	2.660*
Mean	9.100	10.950	
S.D.	3.176	3.049	
* p < 0.01 (Significant at 0.01 level)			

Table-8 shows that obtained t-value is 2.660 which is greater than table value 2.64 for significance at 0.01 level for df 78. This result indicates that significant difference exists between low and high emotional intelligent student-teachers on personality factor I (tough minded vs. tender minded).

Therefore, null hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between student-teachers of high and low emotional intelligence on personality factors”, is rejected for personality factor I (tough minded vs. tender minded).

Table-9

Summary of t-test for difference between student-teachers possessing low and high emotional intelligence on personality factor L (trusting vs. suspicious)

Statistics	Low EI Group (N ₁ = 40)	High EI Group (N ₂ = 40)	t-ratio
Sum	333	353	0.902
Mean	8.325	8.825	
S.D.	2.630	2.333	

Table-9 shows that obtained t-value is 0.902 which is less than table value 1.99 for significance at 0.05 level for df 78. This result indicates that significant difference does not exist between low and high emotional intelligent student-teachers on personality factor L (trusting vs. suspicious).

Therefore, null hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between student-teachers of high and low emotional intelligence on personality factors”, is accepted for personality factor L (trusting vs. suspicious).

Table-10

Summary of t-test for difference between student-teachers possessing low and high emotional intelligence on personality factor M (practical vs. imaginative)

Statistics	Low EI Group (N ₁ = 40)	High EI Group (N ₂ = 40)	t-ratio
Sum	450	503	2.044*
Mean	11.250	12.575	
S.D.	2.913	2.889	
* p < 0.05 (Significant at 0.05 level)			

Table-10 shows that obtained t-value is 2.044 which is greater than table value 1.99 for significance at 0.05 level for df 78. This result indicates that significant difference exists between low and high emotional intelligent student-teachers on personality factor M (practical vs. imaginative).

Therefore, null hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between student-teachers of high and low emotional intelligence on personality factors”, is rejected for personality factor M (practical vs. imaginative).

Table-11

Summary of t-test for difference between student-teachers possessing low and high emotional intelligence on personality factor N (forthright shrewd)

Statistics	Low EI Group (N ₁ = 40)	High EI Group (N ₂ = 40)	t-ratio
Sum	402	390	0.492
Mean	10.050	9.750	
S.D.	2.983	2.447	

Table-11 shows that obtained t-value is 0.492 which is less than table value 1.99 for significance at 0.05 level for df 78. This result indicates that significant difference does not exist between low and high emotional intelligent student-teachers on personality factor N (forthright vs. shrewd).

Therefore, null hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between student-teachers of high and low emotional intelligence on personality factors”, is accepted for personality factor N (forthright vs. shrewd).

Table-12

Summary of t-test for difference between student-teachers possessing low and high emotional intelligence on personality factor O (placid vs. apprehensive)

Statistics	Low EI Group (N ₁ = 40)	High EI Group (N ₂ = 40)	t-ratio
Sum	469	371	2.740*
Mean	11.725	9.275	
S.D.	4.237	3.755	

* p < 0.01 (Significant at 0.05 level)

Table-12 shows that obtained t-value is 2.740 which is greater than table value 2.64 for significance at 0.01 level for df 78. This result indicates that significant difference exists between low and high emotional intelligent student-teachers on personality factor O (placid vs. apprehensive).

Therefore, null hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between student-teachers of high and low emotional intelligence on personality factors”, is rejected for personality factor O (placid vs. apprehensive).

Table-13

Summary of t-test for difference between student-teachers possessing low and high emotional intelligence on personality factor Q1 (conservative vs. experimenting)

Statistics	Low EI Group (N ₁ = 40)	High EI Group (N ₂ = 40)	t-ratio
Sum	356	401	1.510
Mean	8.900	10.025	
S.D.	3.754	2.859	

Table-13 shows that obtained t-value is 1.510 which is less than table value 1.99 for significance at 0.05 level for df 78. This result indicates that no significant difference exists between low and high emotional intelligent student-teachers on personality factor Q1 (conservative vs. experimenting). Hence, they have equal chances of being 'conservative or experimenting'.

Therefore, null hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between student-teachers of high and low emotional intelligence on personality factors”, is accepted for personality factor Q1 (conservative vs. experimenting).

Table-14

Summary of t-test for difference between student-teachers possessing low and high emotional intelligence on personality factor Q2 (group dependent vs. self-sufficient)

Statistics	Low EI Group (N ₁ = 40)	High EI Group (N ₂ = 40)	t-ratio
Sum	407	312	3.893*
Mean	10.175	7.800	
S.D.	2.836	2.629	

* p < 0.01 (Significant at 0.01 level)

Table-14 shows that obtained t-value is 3.893 which is greater than table value 2.64 for significance at 0.01 level for df 78. This result indicates that significant difference exists between low and high emotional intelligent student-teachers on personality factor Q2 (group dependent vs. self-sufficient).

Therefore, null hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between student-teachers of high and low emotional intelligence on personality factors”, is rejected for personality factor Q2 (group dependent vs. self-sufficient).

Table-15

Summary of t-test for difference between student-teachers possessing low and high emotional intelligence on personality factor Q3 (undisciplined vs. controlled)

Statistics	Low EI Group (N ₁ = 40)	High EI Group (N ₂ = 40)	t-ratio
Sum	392	521	4.660*
Mean	9.800	13.025	
S.D.	3.288	2.894	
* p < 0.01 (Significant at 0.0 level)			

Table-15 shows that obtained t-value is 4.660 which is greater than table value 2.64 for significance at 0.01 level for df 78. This result indicates that significant difference exists between low and high emotional intelligent student-teachers on personality factor Q3 (undisciplined vs. controlled).

Therefore, null hypothesis that "There is no significant difference between student-teachers of high and low emotional intelligence on personality factors", is rejected for personality factor Q3 (undisciplined vs. controlled).

Table-16

Summary of t-test for difference between student-teachers possessing low and high emotional intelligence on personality factor Q4 (relaxed vs. tense)

Statistics	Low EI Group (N ₁ = 40)	High EI Group (N ₂ = 40)	t
Sum	456	307	3.747*
Mean	11.400	7.675	
S.D.	4.067	4.803	
* p < 0.01 (Significant at 0.01 level)			

Table-16 shows that obtained t-value is 3.747 which is greater than table value 2.64 for significance at 0.01 level for df 78. This result indicates that significant difference exists between low and high emotional intelligent student-teachers on personality factor Q4 (relaxed vs. tense). Therefore, null hypothesis that "There is no significant difference between student-teachers of high and low emotional intelligence on personality factors", is rejected for personality factor Q4 (relaxed vs. tense).

DISCUSSION

Significant differences were found between high and low emotional intelligent student-teachers on personality factors B, C, F, G, H, I, M, O, Q2, Q3, and Q4. Means of high emotional intelligent student-teachers were found higher on personality factors B, C, F, G, H, I, M and Q3. While means of low emotional intelligent student-teachers were found higher on personality factors O, Q2, and Q4 than high emotional intelligent student-teachers. High emotional intelligent student-teachers higher on factor B indicates that they are abstract thinker, more intelligent, bright, higher in general mental capacity and fast learner while low emotional intelligent student teachers have

concrete thinking, lower in general mental ability, less intelligent and unable to handle abstract problems. Results of this study are in tune with Sidana and Bharti (2012). Differences on other factors indicate that high emotional intelligent student-teachers are emotionally stable, adaptive mature, face reality, lively, animated, spontaneous, enthusiastic, happy go lucky, rule conscious, dutiful, conscientious, conforming, moralistic, socially bold, venturesome, sensitive, aesthetic, sentimental, abstract, imaginative, etc. While low emotional intelligent student-teachers have qualities like apprehensive, self-doubting, worried, guilt prone, worrying, self-blamed, tense, high energy, impatient, driven, frustrated, over wrought, time driven, etc. Sjoberg (2001) found that emotional intelligence correlated positively and significantly with personality factors agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, extraversion and intellect/autonomy. Dominance also associated with all factors except agreeableness. EI also correlated significantly and positively with extraversion but negatively with neuroticism. Lopes, Salovey and Straus (2003) and VanderZee and Wabeke (2004) found positive correlation between emotional intelligence and Big five personality factors extraversion, agreeableness, emotional stability and autonomy. Austin, Saklofske and Egan (2005) research results shows that emotional intelligence is more strongly associated with personality factors

Upadhyaya (2006) was found that student-teachers with low emotional intelligence are more uneasy and worried about future unhappy feelings and failures; are less cautious, irregular and like to take more rest, restrain others, have lack of energy and feel tired and uninterested and conform to the opinion or accepted path taken by most people. Student-teachers with high emotional intelligence are more competent and have more self confidence, hard working, help others constructive way, more motivated, energetic and full of enthusiasm and turn away from accepted or given path or opinion. Petrides et al. (2010) also found that EI is positively related to extraversion, openness experience, agreeableness and conscientiousness while negatively and significantly related to neuroticism.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, the results of this study showed that there is a significant difference between high and low emotional intelligent student-teachers on personality factors.

1. Student-teachers with high emotional intelligence tend to be quick to grasp ideas, are fast learners and intelligent.
2. Student-teachers with high emotional intelligence tend to be emotionally mature, stable, realistic about life, unruffled, possessing ego strength, better able to maintain solid group morale.
3. Student-teachers possessing high emotional intelligence are cheerful, active, talkative, frank, expressive, effervescent, and carefree.
4. Student-teachers having high emotional intelligence tend to be exacting in character, dominated by sense of duty, preserving, responsible and planful. They are usually conscientious and moralistic, and they prefer hard-working people to witty companions.
5. Student-teachers possessing high emotional intelligence

are sociable, bold, ready to try new things, spontaneous, and abundant in emotional response.

6. Student-teachers having high emotional intelligence are tender-minded. They tend to be emotionally sensitive, day-dreaming, artistically fastidious, and fanciful. They are sometimes demanding of attention and help, impatient, dependent, temperamental, and not very realistic. They dislike crude people and rough occupations.

7. Student-teachers possessing high emotional intelligence tend to be unconventional, unconcerned over everyday matters, self-motivated, imaginatively creative, concerned with "essentials," often absorbed in thought, and oblivious of particular people and physical realities

8. Student-teachers possessing low emotional intelligence have a strong sense of obligation and high expectations of themselves. They tend to worry and feel anxious and guilt-stricken over difficulties. Often they do not feel accepted in groups or free to participate.

9. Student-teachers having low emotional intelligence are temperamentally independent, accustomed to going their own way, making decisions and taking action on their own. They discount public opinion, but are not necessarily dominant in their relations with others.

10. Student-teachers with high emotional intelligence have strong control of their emotions and general behaviour, are inclined to be socially aware and careful, and evidence what is commonly termed "self-respect" and high regard for social reputation. They sometimes tend, however, to be perfectionistic and obstinate and are effective leaders.

11. Student-teachers possessing low emotional intelligence tend to be tense, restless, fretful, impatient, and hard driving. They are often fatigued, but unable to remain inactive. Their frustration represents an excess of stimulated, but undischarged, drive.

EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, it is imperative that emotional intelligence should be considered not only for academic interest but also of future success in life. With the aim of building a resilient and capable human face of globalization and changing demands, efforts to increase student-teachers' emotional intelligence should be considered during the process of training. Student-teachers should be provided with early interventions that involve emotional intelligence skills building. Therefore, this is responsibility of teacher educators, administrators, psychologists and other persons working in the field of education that they make every effort to develop emotional skills among the student-teachers to overcome personality gap during training.

Certainly these results are encouraging, and support the importance of developing emotional skills among the student-teachers in the teacher training institutions, a task still pending in most institutions. If we wish to build a complete individual, prepared for the society of the future, we must train our teachers and children in the affective and emotional world.

REFERENCES

Austin, E.J., Saklofske, D.H. & Egan, V. (2005). Personality,

well-being and health correlates of trait emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 38(3), 547-558. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2004.05.009.

Day, A.L. Therrian, D.L. & Carrolle, S.A. (2005). Predicting psychological health: Assessing the incremental validity of emotional intelligence beyond personality, type a behaviour, and daily hassle. *European Journal of personality*, 19(6), 519-536.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. New York: Bantam Books.

Hyde, A. Pethe, S. & Dhar U. (2002). *Emotional Intelligence Scale*. Lucknow Vedant Publication.

Kapoor, S.D. (1970). Indian adaptation of 16 PF Questionnaire.

Agra: National Psychological Corporation.

Lopes, P.N., Salovey, P., & Straus, R. (2003) Emotional Intelligence, personality and the perceived quality of social relationships. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35, 641-658.

Mayer, J.D. & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P.Salovey & D.J.Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications* (pp. 3-31). New York: Basic Book.

Petrides, K.V., Vernon, P.A., Schermer, J.A., Ligthart, L., Boomsma, D.I. & Veselka, L. (2010). Relationships between trait emotional intelligence and the Big Five in the Netherlands. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48, 906-910.

Sidana, Jeewan Jyoti and Bharti, Rakesh (2012). A study of emotional intelligence in relation to intelligence and adjustment of student-teachers. *International Journal of Education and Allied Sciences*, 4(2), 17-20.

Singh, D. (2006). *Emotional intelligence at work: A professional guide* (3rd ed.). New Delhi: Response Books.

Sjöberg, L. (2001). Emotional intelligence: A psychometric analysis. *European Psychologist*, 6(2), 79-95.

Upadhyaya, P. (2006). Personality of emotionally intelligent student-teachers. *Journal of Educational Studies*, 4(1 & 2), 37-41. Retrieved from

http://www.ncert.nic.in/new_ncert/ncert/publication/journals/pdf_files/iea/july-06/IEA_July06.pdf

Vander Zee, K. & Wabeke, R. (2004). Is trait-emotional intelligence simple or more than just a trait? *European Journal of Personality*, 18(4), 243-263. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/per.517/abstract>