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Abstract: The study investigated the difference between the two variables with regard to gender groups that exist among principals of Kashmir Valley (n = 145). The results revealed that the two gender groups differed significantly in the mean scores on the emotional intelligence variable and on the other hand the gender groups didn’t differ significantly with regard to the personality characteristics of the principals of Kashmir Valley.
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I. Introduction

There is an increasing insight that much more than cognitive ability, emotional Proficiency not only occupies a central role in determining one's level of functioning but it also confirms the overall success in one’s life. This clarifies why we frequently find that people with the similar IQ and academic credentials deviate significantly in their specialized capacities and effectiveness. Over and above one’s capacity and a collection of personality characteristics have been famous in performing a critical role in defining one's performance. These comprise motivation, confidence, emotional stability, adjustment, and the ability to work with and relate to other people in a group. These discoveries have steered to substantial deviations in the out-dated notions with reference to the nature of intellectual potentialities in man. Imperative among the innovative advancements is the theory of multiple intelligences presented by Gardner (1983) and the theory of emotional intelligence (EI) initially proposed by Salovey and Mayer (1990) and later disseminated by Goleman (1995).

Gardner (1983, 1999) attempted to broaden the notion of intelligence and integrated numerous substantial faculties that were conventionally beyond its scope. According to him, intelligence is "the bio-psychological potential to process information that can be activated in a cultural setting to solve problems or create products that are of value in a culture". It is for this purpose that the performances on standardized psychometric tests fail to be valid indicators of success in later life.

The theory of emotional intelligence (EI) first put forward by Mayer and Salovey (1997) and later expansion of the theory was contributed by Mayer, Salovey and Caruso (1998) by portraying EI as a cognitive ability. Consequently, EI consists of four stages of abilities ranging from basic psychological processes to more complex processes integrating emotion and cognition. Later Bar-On (1998) categorised EI in the context of personality theory and Goleman (1998) formulated it in terms of a theory of performance. Goleman (2001) has noted that the common thread underlying all the different models of EI is an ability to regulate emotions in oneself and others. Accordingly, in a modified version of Mayer and Salovey's theory, he has suggested that the most parsimonious definition of EI involves four major domains, viz., self-awareness, social awareness, self management, and relationship management.

In yet another popular design, Bar-On (2005) defines emotional-social intelligence (ESI) as "a cross-section of interrelated emotional and social competencies, skills and facilitators that determine how effectively we understand and express ourselves, understand others and relate with them, and cope with daily demands". In addition to that, Bar-On points out that these competencies and skills can be taught and learned.

The attraction towards the concept of EI and the ample research output produced in recent years have led to the erroneous notion that high EI always guarantees success in life. However, pioneers in the discipline themselves have looked into this assumption (e.g., Goleman, 1998; Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 1998). They indicate that the level of performance and success of a person depends upon a variety of competencies and personality characteristics including intellectual competency, emotional competency, creativity, social support, and maladjustment patterns.

Another important point that should be kept in mind in this context is that gender of a person may have significant impact on his/her personality as well as behavioural characteristics. Thus, it is imperative that in any
study involving personality characteristics, one look into the possibility that organized alterations exist along gender lines. Springer and Deutsch (1998) observing on the sex dissimilarities in certain human abilities like verbal and spatial skills, point out that males tend to be more lateralized for verbal and spatial functions, whereas females display greater bilateral representation for both types of functions. Outspreading the association of lateralization and ability, they postulate that in men only the left hemisphere is involved in language, leaving visual-spatial functions intact in the right, whereas in women, language is established in both the hemispheres, crowding visual-spatial ability. This is believed to explain the superiority of females in language functions (Halpern, 1992) and males in visual-spatial functions (Schaie, 1994). However, it may also be possible to explain the gender differences observed in terms of differences in education and socialization. As noted by Lezak (2004), the nature-nurture issue remains unsettled in questions of sex differences in cognitive abilities. In view of these considerations, the present study explored the gender differences in Emotional Intelligence and personality characteristics.

II. Objectives of the Study

**Objective 1.** To study the Personality Characteristics of College Principals based on Gender.

**Objective 2.** To study the Emotional Intelligence of College Principals based on Gender.

**Objective 3.** To examine the relationship between Personality Characteristics and Emotional Intelligence of the College Principals.

III. Null Hypothesis

On the basis of above objectives, following null hypothesis were framed.

**Ho1.** There will be no significant difference between Personality Characteristics of college principals in relation to their Gender.

**Ho2.** There will be no significant difference between Emotional Intelligence of college principals in relation to their Gender.

**Ho3.** There will be no relationship between Personality Characteristics and Emotional Intelligence of College Principals.

IV. Operational definitions of Variables

A **Personality Characteristics:** In the present study the personality is considered as the total scored obtained by the college principals on the five dimensions (Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness) of Big Five scale prepared by Oliver P. John, & Sanjay Srivastava, (1999)

B **Emotional Intelligence:** In the present study the emotional intelligence is considered as the total scored obtained by the college principals on the ten dimensions of Emotional Intelligence scale prepared by Anukool Hyde, Sanjyot Pethe and Upinder Dhar (2002)

C **Gender:** Gender of the proposed investigation shall refer to the sex of an individual. In the present study gender was divided into two groups (1st Male; 2nd Female)

V. Methodology

Participants

The present study attempts to study the personality characteristics, emotional intelligence of college principals in relation to their gender. Therefore the principals of all the affiliated, non-affiliated, private grant-in-aid and constituent colleges of Kashmir valley serve as the population for the present study (N=145) See figure 1
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Figure 1 displays the Map with number of colleges in all the districts of Kashmir Valley
VI. Description of the Population

Population of the present study comprises of gender. The gender is comprised of male and female.

Data collection

Our study was based on a focussed population survey. To have a clear insight, Principals of all the affiliated, non-affiliated, private grant-aid and constituent colleges of Kashmir valley served as the population and as sample for the present study. All Principals of Kashmir valley were contacted personally through questionnaire excluding Tangdhar (because of continuous cross-border firing incidents). However, the Principal of the Tangdhar College was contacted through speed post. It took rigorous five months of the researcher to travel the length and breadth of the Kashmir valley.

The participants completed the questionnaires individually put forward by the researcher during his personal visit to the colleges of Kashmir valley. Instructions printed on the test booklets were read out by the investigator and doubts were cleared before the start of each test.

Instruments Used in the Study

1. Big Five inventory prepared by Oliver P John, & Sanjay Srivastava, (1999)
2. Emotional Intelligence scale prepared by Anukool Hyde, Sanjyot Pethe and Upinder Dhar (2002)

Analysis and Interpretation of the Results

Analysis and interpretation of data is considered to be of paramount significance. The data as such has no meaning, if it is not classified, analyzed and interpreted properly. It may be fair to say that research in general consists of two large steps—the collection of data and the analysis of data. Interpretation leads to a critical examination of the results of analysis in the light of all the limitations of gathered data. However, valid, reliable and adequate data may be, it does not serve any worthwhile purpose unless it is carefully edited, systematically classified, scientifically tabulated, intelligently analyzed and rationally concluded. To serve this purpose the null hypothesis of the study were tested so that we could come up with the conclusion.

Ho1: There will be no significant difference between Personality Characteristics of college principals in relation to their gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Difference in Personality Characteristics and Gender of College Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS Non significant

Interpretation of Table 1

The mean score of female college principals’ response on Personality Scale is 146.77, which is relatively close to the mean of male college principals 148.12. The calculated t-value (.67) is not significant at any level. As a result the null hypothesis, Ho1 stands established.

Ho2: There will be no significant difference between Emotional Intelligence of college principals in relation to their Gender
Table 2: Difference in Emotional Intelligence Gender of College Principals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>134.43</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>14.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>155.24</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at .01 level

**Figure 3 Difference in mean between Emotional Intelligence and gender**

**Interpretation of Table 2**

The mean score of female college principals is 155.24, which is higher as compared to the mean of male college principals 134.43 and the calculated t-value (14.32) is significant at 0.01 level. Therefore the null hypothesis Ho2 is rejected.

**Ho3. There will be no relationship between Personality Characteristics and Emotional Intelligence of College Principals.**

Table 3: Relationship of Personality Characteristics and Emotional Intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Intelligence</th>
<th>Personality Characteristics</th>
<th>.26**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>- .07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

* Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Interpretation of Table 3**

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation between Personality Characteristics and Emotional Intelligence as a whole among college principals as depicted in Table 3 wherein Significant and positive correlation as a whole was found between Personality Characteristics and Emotional Intelligence (r = .26; p < .01). Therefore, the H013 is rejected.

Furthermore, significant and positive correlation was also found in between Agreeableness and Emotional Intelligence (r = .34; p < .01) While as significant and negative correlation was found between Neuroticism and Emotional Intelligence (r = -.18; p < .05)

**VII. Findings of the Study**

1. There is no significant difference between Personality Characteristics of college principals in relation to their gender.
2. There is significant difference between Emotional Intelligence of college principals in relation to their gender.
3. There is a significant and positive relationship between Personality Characteristics and Emotional Intelligence of college principals.
VIII. Discussion

The results of the objective no. 1 revealed that there was no significant difference in the personality characteristics of male and female principals. This finding is in line with the findings of Adigwu’s (2004) who found that both male and female principals have above average performance in their supervisory roles. The study further revealed that mean average performance of male principals was just two points above that of female principals. The mean score of male and female principals were 148.12 and 146.77 respectively. The findings of the stated study are also in tune with the findings of Oseuzah (2000), which signified that there was no significant difference in male and female graduates in job performance in organizations in Nigeria. However, the reason for the insignificant difference in male and female principals’ may be due to improved commitment to duty by both sexes. Superior motivation by reward and possible commitment counteracts public stereotypic viewpoints, at least in Kashmir.

The findings of the objective 2 specify that there exists a significant difference in emotional intelligence and gender of principals. Female principals performed significantly better than males on all the dimensions of emotional intelligence scale. The finding is also in line with the earlier findings of the researchers in the field of emotional intelligence who have often conclude that female score higher than male on Emotional intelligence scale (e.g., Quarto, Blasi, Maddalena, Visconti, Lanciano, Soleti, Mangiulli, Taurisano, Fazio, 2016; Wojciechowski, Stolarski, Matthews, 2014; Barrocal, Cabello, Castillo & Extremera, 2012; Van Rooy, Dilchert, Viswesvaran, & Ones, 2006; Day, & Carroll, 2004; Ciarrochi, Chan & Caputi, 2000; Mayer & Geher, 1996). This statement is backed by a massive literature on the viewpoint of gender, presenting, that women are more proficient at decoding the nonverbal emotional information (Brody & Hall, 2000), have better emotional understanding (Ciarrochi, Hynes, & Crittenden, 2005), remain more sensitive to the emotions of others (Hall & Mast, 2008), and are more expressive and display larger interpersonal competencies (Hargie, Saunders, & Dickson, 1995). Further, it has been established that females are more familiar than males with the emotional realm (Candelan Barbera, Ramos, & Sarrio, 2001) and are groomed naturally to perceive emotions (Castro-Schilo & Kee, 2010; Jausovec & Jausovec, 2005; Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey., 1999). As Baron-Cohen (2002) advocates, the alterations in emotional intelligence between the genders is mainly due to the “extreme male brain theory of autism”, which maintains, men tend to “systematize”, while women tend to “empathize” more frequently appropriately when they utilizes their emotions than men. These statements and theoretical explanations help us to clarify why women score higher than men on EI measures, (e.g. Lumley, Gustavson, Partridge & Labouvie-Vief, 2005; Palmer, Gignac, Monocha, & Stough, 2005; Day & Carroll, 2004).

The findings of the objective 3 reveal that there exists a significant and positive relationship in personality and emotional intelligence. The study shows that traits of personality are more likely to engage in emotional intelligence in institutions, e.g. the higher the respondents’ level of emotional intelligence, the more improvement will be in their personality. A study was conducted by Skovholt & D’Rozario (2000) and they found that excellent teachers display empathy towards other individuals and they interact with their environment socially. Likewise, principals with high emotional intelligence excel in their workplace as they are always open to innovative ideas and welcome any feedback about any issue from colleagues and students. In correlation analysis, we found that emotional intelligence is correlated the personality of principals. This indicates that the principals were affected by personality traits and emotional intelligence. Principals with high in EI are more tough minded, more emotionally balanced, and are more committed. This reveals that emotional intelligence goes parallel with other traits of personality traits. The findings are in line with the findings of Athota, O’connor & Jackson (2009); McCrae (2000) and Day & Carrol.

IX. Conclusion

The results of the study have important ramifications for the theory and practice of Personality Characteristics and Emotional Intelligence. On the one hand the present study revealed that Personality Characteristics has no association with Gender, while as on other hand Emotional Intelligence are strongly associated with Gender. It was also discovered that there exists a positive relationship between Personality Characteristics and Emotional Intelligence of college principals.
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