

Relationship Between Strategic Emotional Intelligence and Family Climate of Punjabi Adolescents

R. Kaur and S. Jaswal

*Department of Human Development and Sociology, Punjab Agricultural University,
Ludhiana 141001, Punjab, India*

KEYWORDS Intelligence. Emotions. High Performance. Competent. Family climate

ABSTRACT The study was conducted on 200 female adolescents (17–18 years), studying in schools affiliated to CBSE of Ludhiana city, Punjab. The socio-economic status (SES) of the respondents was assessed by administering a standardized socio-economic scale – urban by Shrivastava (1991) and MSCEIT (Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test, 2000) was used to assess strategic emotional intelligence. Family climate of respondents was assessed by using family climate scale by Shah (1990). Significant and positive relationship was found between high performers for strategic emotional intelligence and family climate. Negative correlation was observed for six dimensions of family climate among competent level of strategic emotional intelligence whereas eight dimensions of family climate were found to be negatively correlated with consider developing level of strategic emotional intelligence.

INTRODUCTION

Adolescents as a group have long been regarded searching for themselves to find some form of identity and meaning in their lives (Erickson, 1968). One aspect of adolescents is their emotions, and within families, schools and society as a whole, this aspect has often been overlooked. Teaching adolescents about their emotions and how they deal with others as well as their own actions can be very helpful in their daily struggles and maintaining good relationships. Emotional development in children and adolescents stems from their interactions at home with parents and siblings. Parent-child interaction and parent's way to deal with their children/develop certain attitude among children, which govern their relationships and interactions at home and outside. Genes remain the prime movers but the developmental results depend upon reciprocal interaction between genetic endowment and the social context. The probability that biological sensitive points in the child and the social and environmental resources of the family will come together to produce certain outcomes depend on these two factors (Lerner, 1989).

The social, physical and emotional activities of the family constitute the "family climate". Emotional intelligence is now considered by many as being essential for successful living (Goleman, 1995). Mayer and Salovey (1993) define emotional intelligence as "a type of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one's own and other's emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use the information to guide

one's thinking and actions" ". Mayer and Salovey (1997) proposed four branch model of emotional intelligence that includes a) Emotional perception and expression b) Emotional facilitation of thought i.e. using emotional intelligence c) Emotional understanding d) Emotional management. The last two branches of this model constitute "Strategic Emotional Intelligence"

The perception of the individual of one's family climate seems to affect the understanding of emotions and skills required to manage the emotions so as to solve various psycho-social and emotional problems. Lewin (1955) reported that parents with unsatisfactory family climate were found to be causative in children's psychological disorders. Nagaraja (1977) concluded that the parent-child relationship is paramount predictor of emotional development in the children. Anshu (1986) revealed that family climate is singularly responsible for the emotional adjustment of adolescents irrespective of their locality and sex.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Sample (n=200) was drawn from the senior secondary schools affiliated to Central Board of Secondary Education of Ludhiana city. Four such schools were selected randomly. The socio-economic status scale of Shrivastava (1991) was administered to retain only those who belong to the middle socio-economic status. A list was prepared of those female adolescents who met the following criteria:

Those who were from nuclear families.
Both parents were alive and living together.

Both parents were educated at least up to Matriculation.

The female adolescents had at least one younger or older sibling alive and living with the family.

MSCEIT – Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (2000) was used to assess the strategic emotional intelligence of selected subjects. It is ability based scale i.e. it measures how well people perform tasks and solve emotional problems, rather than simply asking them about their subjective assessment of their emotional skill. The scoring criteria employed in the present study followed expert scoring approach. A group of 30 experts responded to the test items and their collective response indicate the correct answer. The “consensual” answer to each question was calculated and respondents were given points in proportion to how much they agree with the consensus. The different levels of performance for understanding, managing and strategic emotional intelligence were determined by using cumulative cube root frequency method. Pre-testing of the MSCEIT was done to find out the nature of responses and clarity of statements. Family climate of each subject was measured by administering Family Climate Scale of Shah (1990). Family Climate means an inter-personal relationship between parents and the child. It includes parent’s attitude towards the child as perceived by him/her in the 10 dimensions of Family Climate Scale.

The instrument has 3 point rating scale, indicating extremely unfavourable, balanced and most favourable family climate.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 1 shows percentage distribution of adolescents from ‘Balanced Family Climate’ as per different levels of “Strategic Emotional Intelligence”. Ten dimensions of family climate have been taken into consideration. Z-value showed statistically non-significant differences between ‘High Performance’ (HP) and ‘Competent’ (C), ‘High Performance’ (HP) and ‘Consider Developing’ (CD) and ‘Competent’ (C) and ‘Consider Developing’ (CD) levels. However, statistically significant ($P < 0.001$) differences were found for “Indulgence Vs Avoidance” for comparison between ‘High Performance’ (HP) and ‘Competent’ and differences in ‘Balanced Family Climate’. Similarly ‘High Performance’ (HP) and ‘Considered developing’ (CD) Comparison was found to be statistically significant ($P < 0.01$) for “Trust Vs Distrust”. Whereas the family climate

dimensions “Acceptance Vs Rejection” ($P < 0.05$) were found to be significantly different in proportion in ‘Competent’ (C) and ‘Consider Developing’ (CD) levels of “Strategic Emotional Intelligence”.

From Table 2 it is evident that proportion of respondents for ‘Competent’ (C) and ‘Consider Developing’ (CD) levels of “Strategic Emotional Intelligence” were found to be significantly different for 40% dimensions of ‘Unfavourable Family Climate’. Only 20 % dimensions of ‘Unfavourable Family Climate’ were found to be significantly different in proportions of respondents of ‘High Performance’ (HP) and ‘Competent’ (C) and ‘High Performance’ (HP) and ‘Consider Developing’ (CD) levels of “Strategic Emotional Intelligence”.

Table 3 shows that all dimensions of ‘Favourable Family Climate’ were not significantly different for ‘High Performance’ (HP) and ‘Consider Developing’ (CD) levels of “Strategic Emotional Intelligence”. “Attention Vs Negligence” dimension of ‘Favourable Family Climate’ was significantly different between ‘High Performance’ (HP) and ‘Competent’ (C), whereas “Trust Vs Distrust” dimension showed significance difference between ‘Competent’ (C) and ‘Consider Developing’ (CD) levels of “Strategic Emotional Intelligence”.

Table 4 is not at variance with these findings. It details correlation of various dimensions of “Family Climate” with different levels of “Strategic Emotional Intelligence”, ‘Competent’ category shows no correlation, whereas ‘Consider Developing’ shows significant ($P < 0.05$) positive correlation for “Partiality Vs Fairness” and “Open Communication Vs Closed Communication” whereas significant ($P < 0.05$) negative correlation was found for “Warmth Vs Cold Relations” and “Trust Vs Distrust”. High performers show significant positive correlation for “Partiality Vs Fairness” ($P < 0.001$), “Open Communication Vs Controlled Communication” ($P < 0.001$), “Indulgence Vs Avoidance” ($P < 0.05$), “Attention Vs Negligence” ($P < 0.05$), “Trust Vs Distrust” ($P < 0.05$), “Expectation Vs Hopelessness” ($P < 0.05$), “Acceptance Vs Rejection” ($P < 0.01$), thus significantly high positive correlation coefficient was found between high performers for “Strategic Emotional Intelligence” scores and “Family Climate” score for its seven out of 10 dimensions. Negative correlation was observed for six dimensions of family climate among ‘Competent’ level of “Strategic Emotional Intelligence”. On other hand eight family climate dimensions were found to be negatively correlated

Table 1: Percentage distribution of female adolescents from “Balanced Family Climate” as per the different levels of “ Strategic Emotional Intelligence”

Dimensions of family climate	Number of Respondents scoring “Balanced Family Climate” for different Levels of Strategic Emotional Intelligence						Statistical significance of difference between proportions of respondents for					
	High Performance (HP) n=77		Competent (C) n=62		Consider Developing (CD) n=61		HP & C		HP & CD		C & CD	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	Z- value	Significance level	Z- value	Significance level	Z- value	Significance level
1. Restrictiveness Vs Freedom	2	2.59	3	4.83	5	8.19	0.74	NS	1.5	NS	0.75	NS
2. Indulgence Vs Avoidance	6	7.79	2	3.22	4	6.56	6	(P<0.001)	0.5	NS	0.75	NS
3. Partiality Vs Fairness	2	2.59	1	1.61	2	3.28	0	-	0	-	0.5	NS
4. Attention Vs Negligence	4	5.19	9	14.51	8	13.11	1.8	NS	1.6	NS	0.16	NS
5. Acceptance Vs Rejection	1	1.29	0	-	1	16.39	0.93	NS	-	-	2	(P<0.05)
6. Warmth Vs Cold Relations	13	16.88	15	24.19	8	13.11	1.3	NS	0.6	NS	1.5	NS
7. Trust Vs Distrust	1	1.29	0	-	2	3.28	0.93	NS	10	(P<0.01)	1.5	NS
8. Dominance Vs Submissiveness	13	16.88	7	11.29	6	6.83	1	NS	1.6	NS	0.4	NS
9. Expectation Vs Hopelessness	1	1.29	0	-	1	16.39	0.93	NS	0	-	2	(P<0.05)
10. Open Communication Vs Controlled Comm.	6	7.79	4	6.45	5	8.19	0.5	NS	0	-	0.4	NS

NS: Non-significant

Table 2: Percentage distribution of female adolescents from "Unfavorable Family Climate" as per the different levels of Strategic Emotional Intelligence

Dimensions of family climate	Number of Respondents scoring "Unfavourable Family Climate" for different Levels of Strategic Emotional Intelligence				Statistical significance of difference between proportions of Respondents for					
	High performance (HP) n=77		Competent (C) n=62		Consider developing (CD) n=61		HP & C		HP & CD	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	Z- value	Significance level	Z- value	Significance level
1. Restrictiveness Vs Freedom	3	3.89	6	9.67	4	6.55	1.4	NS	2.6	(P<0.05)
2. Indulgence Vs Avoidance	2	2.59	5	8.06	8	13.1	1.5	NS	2.3	(P<0.05)
3. Partiality Vs Fairness	0	-	3	4.83	0	-	2.4	(P<0.05)	-	-
4. Attention Vs Negligence	5	6.49	7	11.2	5	8.19	1	NS	0.38	NS
5. Acceptance Vs Rejection	0	-	3	4.83	0	-	2.4	(P<0.05)	-	-
6. Warmth Vs Cold Relations	46	59.74	35	56.45	44	72.13	0.39	NS	1.62	NS
7. Trust Vs Distrust	1	1.29	0	-	3	4.91	0.93	NS	1.3	NS
8. Dominance Vs Submissiveness	12	15.58	9	14.5	6	9.83	0.18	NS	0.96	NS
9. Expectation Vs Hopelessness	0	-	0	-	0	-	-	-	-	-
10. Open Communication Vs Controlled Comm.	5	6.49	7	11.2	3	4.91	0.94	NS	0.25	NS

NS: Non-significant

Table 3: Percentage distribution of female adolescents from “Favourable Family Climate” as per the different levels of Strategic Emotional Intelligence

Dimensions of family climate	Number of Respondents scoring “Favourable Family Climate” for different Levels of Strategic Emotional Intelligence				Statistical significance of difference between proportions of respondents for			
	High performance (HP) n=77		Competent (C) n=62		HP & C		HP & CD	
	n	%	n	%	Z- value	Significance level	Z- value	Significance level
1. Restrictiveness Vs Freedom	72	93.5	53	85.48	1.6	NS	1.6	NS
2. Indulgence Vs Avoidance	69	89.61	55	88.7	0.2	NS	1.6	NS
3. Partiality Vs Fairness	75	97.4	58	93.54	1.3	NS	0.6	NS
4. Attention Vs Negligence	68	88.31	46	74.19	2.3	(P<0.05)	1.5	NS
5. Acceptance Vs Rejection	76	98.7	59	95.16	1.5	NS	1	NS
6. Warmth Vs Cold Relations	21	27.27	12	19.35	0.57	NS	1.87	NS
7. Trust Vs Distrust	75	97.4	62	100	1.5	NS	1.75	NS
8. Dominance Vs Submissiveness	52	67.53	46	74.19	0.5	NS	1.5	(P<0.05)
9. Expectation Vs Hopelessness	76	98.7	62	100	1	NS	0.75	NS
10. Open Communication Vs Controlled Comm.	66	85.71	51	82.25	0.57	NS	-	NS

NS : Non-Significant

Table 4: Correlation of various dimensions of “Family Climate” with different levels of “Strategic Emotional Intelligence”

Dimensions of family climate	Levels of Strategic Emotional Intelligence		
	High Performance (HP) n=77	Competent (C) n=62	Consider Developing (CD) n=61
	‘r’ Correlation Coefficient	‘r’ Correlation Coefficient	‘r’ Correlation Coefficient
1. Restrictiveness Vs Freedom	0.008	-0.001	-0.016
2. Indulgence Vs Avoidance	.107*	-0.05	-0.092
3. Partiality Vs Fairness	.325***	0.084	.236**
4. Attention Vs Negligence	.167*	.109*	-0.048
5. Acceptance Vs Rejection	.215**	-0.091	-0.076
6. Warmth & Vs Cold Relations	0.018	0.093	-.130*
7. Trust Vs Distrust	.183*	-.102*	-.197*
8. Dominance Vs Submissiveness	0.077	-0.02	-0.01
9. Expectation Vs Hopelessness	.142*	0.045	-0.034
10. Open Communication Vs Controlled Comm.	.363***	-0.035	.102*

with scores of “Consider Developing” level of “Strategic Emotional Intelligence”. All negative correlations however, were not significant being of low magnitude except for the dimension of ‘Trust vs. Distrust’ for both competent and ‘Consider Developing’ levels of “Strategic Emotional Intelligence”. Significant positive correlation coefficient was observed for ‘Consider Developing’ level of “Strategic Emotional Intelligence” for ‘Partiality vs. Fairness’.

CONCLUSION

- Family climate is significantly and positively related to high performance level of strategic emotional intelligence.
- Number of respondents scoring ‘unfavourable family climate’ was far less for various dimensions for ‘High performance’ level of strategic emotional intelligence.
- Significantly more number of respondents of ‘consider developing’ level of ‘strategic emotional intelligence’ displayed unfavourable family climate as compared to ‘high performance’ and ‘competent’ level of strategic emotional intelligence.
- Balanced family climate was found for more number of respondents among ‘high performance’ level of strategic emotional intelligence for more dimensions of family climate as compared to the other two levels of performance i.e. ‘competent’ and ‘consider developing’.
- Significant positive correlation coefficient

was observed for ‘consider developing’ level of strategic emotional intelligence for one dimension of family climate i.e. ‘Partiality vs. Fairness’.

- Results indicate that ‘high performance’ level of strategic emotional intelligence is strongly correlated positively with 70% dimensions of family climate.

REFERENCES

- Anshu: The effect of family climate in level of aspiration, achievement motivation and adjustment of adolescents. *Ind. J. Psychol.*, 20: 94-95 (1986).
- Erickson, E.: *Identity Youth and Crises*. Norton, New York (1968).
- Goleman, D.: *Emotional Intelligence: Why It can Matter More than IQ*. Bantam Books, New York (1995).
- Lerner, R.: www.unu.edu/unpress/unupbooks/uu13se/uu13se06.htm (1989).
- Lewin, H.: Unsatisfactory parents and psychological disorders in their children. *Eugen. Review*, 47: 153-62 (1955).
- Mayer, J. and Salovey, P.: The intelligence of emotional intelligence. *J. Intelligence*, 17: 433-42. (1993).
- Mayer, J. and Salovey, P.: *What is emotional intelligence?* pp. 3-31, In: *Emotional Development and Emotional Intelligence for Educators*. P. Salovey and D. Sluyter (Eds.). Basic Books, New York (1997).
- Mayer, J. Salovey, P. and Caruso, D.: *MSCEIT (Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test)*. Multi-Health Systems, Inc., New York (2002).
- Nagaraja, J.: *The Failing Student*. *Growing Minds*, 2: 17-19 (1977).
- Shrivastava, G. P.: *Socio Economic Status Scale – Urban*. National Psychological Corporation, Agra (1991).
- Shah, B.: *Family Climate Scale*. National Psychological Corporation, Agra (1999).