

CHAPTER IV

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE, EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, OCCUPATIONAL STRESS AND ITS IMPACT ON WORK PERFORMANCE OF TEACHERS IN ARTS AND SCIENCE COLLEGE

This chapter consists of analysis and interpretation of results obtained from the study. The data collected through questionnaire have been analyzed with the help of appropriate statistical tools. The results were drawn according to the objectives and hypothesis of the study. This chapter gives a detailed analysis on emotional intelligence of teachers working in arts and science colleges. This part of the study analyses the demographic profile, Socio economic profile of the respondents.

PERCENTAGE ANALYSIS

Percentage Analysis is used to compute the frequency distribution of the data collected and design a contingency table to get a better idea on the descriptive particulars relating to the study.

Personal Profile

The frequency regarding the Teacher's Age, Gender and their Marital Status has been recorded post employing the aforementioned Percentage Analysis method.

Percentage Analysis

Table 4.1 Personal Profile

	Factors	Frequency	Percentage
Age	<25	24	5.6
	25-35	210	49
	35-45	167	38.9
	45-55	28	6.5
	Total	429	100

Factors		Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	151	35.2
	Female	278	64.8
	Total	429	100
Marital Status	Married	342	79.7
	Unmarried	87	20.3
	Total	429	100
Monthly Income	Upto 20,000	165	38.5
	20,001 - 30,000	132	30.8
	30,001 - 40,000	57	13.3
	Above 40,000	75	17.5
	Total	429	100

Source: Primary Data

It is inferred from the above table 1 that 49 per cent of the respondents are youngsters in the age group of 25 to 35 years, while 38.9 per cent are middle aged who are in the age group of 35-45 years. A merger 6.5 and 5.6 per cent of the respondents are within the age group of less than 25 and above 45 years. Most of the respondents (49%) are in the age group of 25-35 years. The above table indicates that majority 64.8 per cent of the respondents are female, while 35.2 per cent of them are male. Majority (64.8%) of the Teachers are Female.

It is observed from the above table that majority 79.7 per cent of the respondents are married and the rest 20.3 per cent of them are unmarried.

Majority (79.7 %) of the Teachers are (married).

Family Profile

The frequency regarding the teacher's no of Earning Members, total Family Income and Residential Area has been recorded post employing the aforementioned Percentage Analysis method.

Table 4.2 Family Profile

No of Earning Members	1	54	12.6
	2	273	63.6
	3	70	16.3
	4	32	7.5
	Total	429	100
Type of family	Joint Family	197	45.9
	Nuclear Family	232	54.1
	Total	429	100
Size of Family	2	16	3.7
	3	111	25.9
	4	159	37.1
	5	92	21.4
	6 and Above	51	11.9
	Total	429	100
Total Family Income	Upto 40,000	141	32.9
	40,000 - 60,000	112	26.1
	60,000 - 80,000	82	19.1
	Above 80,001	94	21.9
	Total	429	100
Residential Area	Rural	121	28.2
	Urban	224	52.2
	Semi-Urban	84	19.6
	Total	429	100

Source: Primary Data

The above table indicates that majority 63.6 per cent of the respondents have two earning members, while 16.3 per cent are three earning members. Majority (63.6 %) of the Teachers have two earning members. A merger 12.6 per cent of the respondents has one earning member's and 7.5 percent have four earning members in the family.

54.1 per cent of the Teachers live in a Nuclear family set up, while the rest 45.9 percent live in a Joint family setup. Majority (54.1 %) of the Teachers live in a Nuclear family set up.

37.1 percent of the Teachers have four members in their family, 25.9 percent have three family members and 21.4 percent of the Teachers have five members in their family.

Most of the respondents (37.1 %) of the Teachers have More than four members in their family.

The above table indicates that majority 32.9 per cent of the teachers have a family income Upto 40,000, while 26.1 per cent are earning between 40,000 - 60,000. 21.9 per cent of the teachers have total family income as above 80,001 and 19.1 per cent of the teachers have total family income is between 60,000 - 80,000. Most of the respondents 32.9 per cent of the teachers have family income Upto 40,000.

52.2 per cent of the teachers reside in Urban area, while 28.2 per cent resides in Rural area and 19.6 per cent of the teachers resides in Semi-Urban area.

Majority 52.2 per cent of the teachers resides in Urban area.

Professional Profile

The frequency regarding the Teacher's Educational Qualification, Additional Qualification, Nature of Employment and Designation has been depicted in the following tables.

Table 4.3 Professional Profile

Educational Qualification	Post Graduation	21	4.9
	M.Phil	207	48.3
	Ph.D	201	46.9
	Total	429	100
Additional Qualification	NET	76	17.7
	SLET	58	13.5
	Other(PGDCA & PGDBM)	240	55.9
	NET & SLET	36	8.4
	MBA	10	2.3
	MCA	9	2.1
	Total	429	100

Nature of Employment	Government College	25	5.8
	Aided College	83	19.3
	Self-Financing College	321	74.8
	Total	429	100
Designation	Assistant Professor	356	83
	Associate Professor	55	12.8
	Professor	18	4.2
	Total	429	100

Source: Primary Data

48.3 per cent of the teachers completed their M.Phil degree, while 46.9 per cent of the teachers completed their Ph.D degree and remaining 4.9 per cent of the teachers completed Post Graduation degree. Most of the respondents 48.3 per cent of the teachers completed their M.Phil degree.

55.9 per cent of the teachers have other additional qualification such as PGDCA & PGDBM, while 17.7 per cent of the teachers are NET qualified, 13.5 per cent of the teachers are SLET qualified and 8.4 are both NET & SLET qualified. A merger 2.3 and 2.1 per cent of the teachers are MBA & MCA qualified.

74.8 per cent of the teachers are employed in Self-Financing College, while 19.3 per cent of the teachers are employed in Aided College and 5.8 per cent of the teachers are employed in Government College. Majority 74.8 per cent of the teachers are employed in Self-Financing College.

83 per cent of the teachers are Assistant Professors, while 12.8 per cent of the teachers are Associate Professor and 4.2 per cent of the teachers are Professor.

Majority 83 per cent of the teachers are Assistant Professors.

Academic Profile

The frequency regarding the classes handled by teachers, Other Academic Activities, Department, No. of Members in the Department, Autonomous Status, Accreditation Status, ISO Certificate Institution and Years of Experience have been interpreted in the following table.

Table 4.4 Academic Profile

	Factor	Frequency	Percentage
Classes Handled Hours	Less than 12	53	12.2
	13-16	70	16.4
	17-20	277	64.6
	More than 20	29	6.8
	Total	429	100
Other Academic Activities	Less than 5	148	34.4
	6 to 10	119	27.8
	11 to 15	85	19.7
	16 to 20	52	12.2
	More than 20	25	5.9
	Total	429	100
Department	Basic Science	25	5.8
	Arts	81	18.9
	Computer Science	38	8.9
	Commerce & Management	246	57.3
	Humanities	39	9.1
	Total	429	100
No. of Members in the Department	Below 5	126	29.4
	6 to 10	167	39
	11 to 15	106	24.6
	16 to 20	18	4.2
	above 21	12	2.8
	Total	429	100
Autonomous Status	Yes	337	78.6
	No	92	21.4
	Total	429	100

	Factor	Frequency	Percentage
Accreditation Status	Yes	371	86.5
	No	58	13.5
	Total	429	100
ISO Certificate Institution	Yes	370	86.2
	No	59	13.8
	Total	429	100
Years of Experience	Below 5	116	27.0
	6 to 10	150	35.0
	11 to 15	83	19.3
	16 to 20	54	12.6
	above 21	26	6.1
	Total	429	100

Source: Primary Data

64.6 per cent of the teachers handle classes between 17-20 hours per week, while 16.4 per cent of the teachers handle classes between 13-16 hours per week, 12.2 per cent of the teachers handle classes Less than 12 hours per week and 6.8 per cent of the teachers handle classes More than 20 hours per week.

34.4 per cent of the teachers spent Less than 5 hours per week, while 27.8 per cent of the teachers spent between 6 to 10 hours per week, 19.7 per cent of the teachers spent between 11 to 15 hours per week and 5.9 per cent of the teachers spent More than 20 hours.

57.3 per cent of the teachers belong to Commerce & Management, while 18.9 per cent of the teachers belong to Arts, 9.1 per cent of the teachers belong to Humanities. A merger of 8.9 and 5.8 of the teachers belong to Computer Science and Basic Science.

39 per cent of the teachers have between 6 to 10 members in the department, 29.4 per cent of the teachers have Below 5 members in the department, while 24.6 per cent of the teachers have between 11 to 15 members in the department. A merger of 4.2 and 2.8 of the teachers belong to member's between 16 to 20 and above 21.

78.6 per cent of the teachers work in Autonomous College and 21.4 per cent of the teachers work in Non Autonomous college.

86.5 per cent of the teachers stated Yes for Accreditation Status and 13.5 per cent of the teachers stated No Accreditation for their colleges.

86.2 per cent of the teachers stated Yes for ISO Certification and 13.8 per cent have stated No for ISO Certification.

35 per cent of the teachers have between 6 to 10 years of experience, while 27 per cent of the teachers have Below 5 years of experience, 19.3 per cent of the teachers have between 11 to 15 years of experience. A Merger of 12.6 and 6.1 per cent of the teachers have between 16 to 20 and above 21 years of experience.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics has been applied to find mean rating for emotional intelligence factor. Four different factors have been identified under emotional intelligence. The factors include self awareness, self management, social awareness and relationship management. The factors are measured by the ratings given by the respondents at five point scaling technique. The ratings are assigned as one for 'strongly disagree', two for disagree, three for neutral, four for agree and five for strongly agree. High score indicates high level of self awareness in relation to the emotional intelligence.

Emotional Intelligence Factor - Self Awareness

Self awareness is a factors is considered under emotional intelligence which includes how the people aware at their emotion, imagination of their task and outcomes, self confidence, reactions towards problems, judgement about the character and confidence about their own skills and talents. The present description state has been pretend in the following table.

Table 4.5 Emotional Intelligence Factor - Self Awareness

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
I am aware of my emotions as I experienced them	429	3	5	4.39	.660
I motivate myself by imagining a good outcome of tasks which I would take on	429	2	5	4.34	.690
When I am upset I can usually pinpoint why I am distressed	429	1	5	4.00	.843
When I make mistakes I often shout & criticize myself for my abilities	429	1	5	3.54	1.153
I know my values and beliefs	429	1	5	4.35	.703
I have self confidence in all situations	429	1	5	4.28	.801
I tend to over react to problems	429	1	5	3.49	1.060
I know which motivates me	429	2	5	4.24	.765
I would describe myself as a good judge of character	429	2	5	4.22	.700
I feel confident about my own skills, talents and abilities	429	2	5	4.34	.702

Source: Primary Data

The above table shows the mean ratings for self awareness. The highest rating has been assigned for the statement ‘I am aware of my emotions as I experienced them’ (4.39), followed by ‘I know my values and beliefs’(4.35), ‘I feel confident about my own skills, talents and abilities’ and ‘I motivate myself by imagining a good outcome of tasks

which I would take on' indicates (4.34), the last score has been found for the statement, 'when I make mistakes I often shout & criticize myself for my abilities'(3.54), 'I tend to over react to problems' (3.49).

ANOVA

ANOVA has been applied to find the significant difference between emotional intelligence factors such as self awareness, self management, social awareness and relationship management factors. Personal factor includes age, gender, marital status, type of family, size of family, monthly income, number of earning members, total family income and residential area.

Job related factors include educational qualification, nature of employment, designation, years of experience, department and number of members in the department.

Selected Personal Factors and Factors that induce Self Awareness of Teachers

To examine whether there is any significant difference between the Factors inducing Self Awareness of Teachers and selected personal factors, the overall Self Awareness score of the Teachers has been taken as dependent variables whereas the Personal and study factors have been considered as the independent variables for analysis purposes. The ANOVA have been appropriately used based on the nature of the variables to derive the results.

The table depicts the influence of Factors that induce Self Awareness of teachers and various Selected Personal & study factors and their corresponding overall mean scores.

Ho: The average scores of self awareness does not vary significantly among the members for the selected personal factors.

Table 4.6 ANOVA – Personal Factor and Self Awareness Score

Personal Factors		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	t - Value	P- Value	S/NS
Age	<25	24	42.042	5.361	2.208		0.087	NS
	25-35	210	40.648	4.008				
	35-45	167	41.629	4.871				
	45-55	28	42.071	4.634				
Gender	Male	151	41.616	3.943		1.990	0.159	NS
	Female	278	40.975	4.769				
Marital Status	Married	342	40.977	4.507		4.203	0.041	S
	Unmarried	87	42.081	4.394				
Type of Family	Joint Family	197	40.756	4.031		3.568	0.060	NS
	Nuclear Family	232	41.578	4.841				
Size of Family	2	16	44.188	3.351	4.825		0.001	S
	3	111	40.072	4.295				
	4	159	41.547	4.644				
	5	92	41.880	4.865				
	6 and Above	51	40.412	3.269				
Monthly Income	Upto 20,000	165	41.200	4.509	5.527		0.001	S
	20,001 - 30,000	132	40.447	4.426				
	30,001 - 40,000	4057	40.632	4.443				
	Above,000	75	42.960	4.254				

Personal Factors		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	t - Value	P- Value	S/NS
Number of Earning Members	1	54	42.259	4.743	2.290		0.078	NS
	2	273	40.810	4.360				
	3	70	41.914	4.064				
	4	32	41.188	5.767				
Total Family Income	Upto 40,000	141	41.121	4.420	2.918		0.034	S
	40,000 - 60,000	112	40.295	4.431				
	60,000 - 80,000	82	41.585	3.836				
	Above 80,001	94	42.064	5.069				
Residential Area	Rural	121	41.826	4.652	3.057		0.048	S
	Urban	224	40.692	4.292				
	Semi-Urban	84	41.655	4.712				

Source: Primary Data

The average Self Awareness score has been found to be high (42.071) for Teachers between 45 and 55 years of age group. The high mean has been found for Male (41.616) and the members who are unmarried (42.621). It has been observed that the average scores are found to be high (41.578) among Nuclear family. The high mean has been found for family size of 2 members (44.188), monthly income above 40,000(42.960), Number of Earning members found to be high in 1 member earning family (42.259). It has been observed that the average scores are found to be high (42.064) among people earning above 80,001 per month and members residing in Rural area (41.826) Residential area have high score.

The Above ANOVA results indicate that there is a significant difference in the average Self Awareness score among the teachers in respect of different personal factors, namely, marital status, Size of family, Monthly Income Total Family Income and Area of

Residence. Hence, the null hypotheses are rejected. The average score does not vary significantly in case of age group, gender, type of family, and number of earning members. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

The t test result shows that no significant difference has been found in the average score of Self Awareness score between gender, marital status, type of family. Hence, the null hypotheses are accepted.

The personal factors namely marital status, Size of family, Monthly Income Total Family Income and Area of Residence has played a vital role in the Self Awareness of emotional intelligence. Hence, these factors have significantly differed in the Self Awareness Score in Emotional intelligence.

Job factors Vs Self Awareness

ANOVA has been applied to find out whether there is any significant difference in the mean score among the group members in respect of job factors, namely, Educational Qualification, Nature of Employment, Designation, Years of Experience, Department and Number of Members in the Department as far as the Self Awareness Score to teaching professionals are concerned.

Ho: The average scores of self awareness does not vary significantly among the members for the selected job factors.

Table 4.7 ANOVA – Job Factors Vs Self Awareness

Job Factors		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	P-Value	S/NS
Educational Qualification	Post-Graduation	21	39.333	2.576	2.776	0.063	NS
	M.Phil	207	41.010	4.949			
	Ph.D	201	41.592	4.111			
	Total	429	41.201	4.501			
Nature of Employment	Government College	25	42.4000	4.80451	2.568	.078	NS
	Aided College	83	41.9157	4.88203			
	Self-Financing College	321	40.9221	4.35138			
	Total	429	41.2005	4.50098			

Job Factors		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	P-Value	S/NS
Designation	Assistant Professor	356	40.933	4.663	3.802	0.023	S
	Associate Professor	55	42.600	3.473			
	Professor	18	42.222	2.942			
	Total	429	41.201	4.501			
Years of Experience	Below 5 Years	116	41.043	4.182	6.974	0.000	S
	6 – 10 Years	150	40.707	4.954			
	11 -15 Years	83	40.301	4.024			
	16 -20 Years	54	42.593	3.647			
	Above 20 Years	26	44.731	4.172			
	Total	429	41.201	4.501			
Department	Basic Science	25	42.960	4.632	1.243	0.292	NS
	Arts	81	41.370	4.614			
	Computer Science	38	41.474	4.825			
	Commerce & Management	246	40.931	4.201			
	Humanities	39	41.154	5.542			
	Total	429	41.201	4.501			
Number of Members in the Department	Below 5	126	41.222	4.336	3.608	0.007	S
	6 – 10	167	41.581	4.872			
	11 -15	106	40.453	4.209			
	16 -20	18	43.722	3.250			
	Above 20	12	38.500	2.236			
	Total	429	41.201	4.501			

Source: Primary Data

The average **self awareness** has been found to be high (41.592) for PhD holders as far educational qualification is concerned. The high mean has been found for government college (42.400) and while considering designation it is found to be high for associate professor (42.600).it has been observed that the average scores are found to be

high (44.731) for above 20 years of experience. The high mean has been found for basic science (42.960), number of members in the department are found to be high between 16 -20 members in department (43.722).

The above ANOVA results indicate that there is a significant difference in the average **self awareness score** among the teachers in respect of different job factors, namely designation, years of experience and number of members in the department. Hence, the null hypotheses are rejected. The average score does not vary significantly in case of educational qualification, nature of employment and department. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

The job factors namely designation, years of experience and number of members in the department have played a vital role in the **self awareness score of** emotional intelligence. Hence, these factors have significantly differed in the **self awareness score** of teachers in emotional intelligence.

Descriptive Statistics - Self Management

The second factor considered and emotional intelligence is self management which describes, understanding the self coaching techniques, taking actions towards the goals, positive thinking, overcome my challenges and control their anger/frustration. The prescribed description statistics presented in the following table.

Table 4.8 Descriptive Statistics - Self Management

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
I understand to use the self coaching techniques	429	2	5	4.21	.770
I understand the difference between self esteem and self respect	429	2	5	4.25	.695
I can able to become an effective role model	429	2	5	4.26	.730
I can manage my personal changes effectively	429	2	5	4.21	.660
I set my personal goals and take actions towards them	429	1	5	4.27	.698

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
I adopt positive thinking	429	1	5	4.35	.719
I will and I can be able to successfully overcome my challenges	429	1	5	4.25	.745
I am able to calm down quickly	429	1	5	4.00	.794
I will set goals to my self and try to achieve them to my level best	429	2	5	4.16	.750
I can able to control my anger/frustration	429	1	5	4.01	.922

Source: Primary Data

The above table shows the mean ratings for self management. The highest rating has been assigned for the ‘I adopt positive thinking’ (4.35), followed by ‘I set my personal goals and take actions towards them’ (4.27), ‘I can able to become an effective role model’, (4.26), ‘I understand the difference between self esteem and self respect’ and ‘I will and I can be able to successfully overcome my challenges’ (4.25), ‘I understand to use the self coaching techniques’ and ‘I can manage my personal changes effectively’ (4.21), ‘I will set goals to myself and try to achieve them to my level best’ (4.16), ‘I can able to control my anger/frustration’ (4.01), ‘I am able to calm down quickly’ (4.00), and it is inferred from the result that the respondents have self management.

Selected Personal Factors and Factors that induce Self-Management Score of Teachers

To examine whether there is any significant difference between the Factors inducing Self-Management of Teachers and selected personal factors, the overall Self-Management Score of the Teachers has been taken as dependent variables whereas the Personal and study factors have been considered as the independent variables for analysis purposes. The ANOVA have been appropriately used based on the nature of the variables to derive the results.

The table depicts the influence of Factors that induce Self-Management Score and various Selected Personal & study factors and their corresponding overall mean scores.

Ho: The average scores of self awareness does not vary significantly among the members for the selected personal factors.

Table 4.9 ANOVA – Personal Factor and Self-Management Score

Personal Factors		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	t - Value	P- Value	S/NS
Age	<25	24	43.000	5.030	2.277		0.079	NS
	25-35	210	41.343	4.761				
	35-45	167	42.581	5.438				
	45-55	28	42.143	3.969				
Gender	Male	151	42.556	4.412		3.186	0.075	NS
	Female	278	41.651	5.315				
Marital Status	Married	342	41.804	5.070		1.832	0.177	NS
	Unmarried	87	42.621	4.837				
Type of Family	Joint Family	197	42.533	5.255		4.609	0.032	S
	Nuclear Family	232	41.491	4.788				
Size of Family	2	16	45.250	2.978	6.783		0.000	S
	3	111	40.667	4.605				
	4	159	41.893	4.863				
	5	92	43.609	4.591				
	6 and Above	51	41.059	6.408				
Monthly Income	Upto 20,000	165	40.685	5.350	6.936		0.000	S
	20,001 - 30,000	132	42.682	4.920				
	30,001 - 40,000	57	42.088	4.090				
	Above 40,000	75	43.453	4.530				

Personal Factors		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	t - Value	P- Value	S/NS
Number of Earning Members	1	54	42.722	4.423	3.886		0.009	S
	2	273	41.788	4.857				
	3	70	43.114	4.322				
	4	32	39.750	7.607				
Total Family Income	Upto 40,000	141	41.915	4.995	0.915		0.434	NS
	40,000 - 60,000	112	41.643	4.454				
	60,000 - 80,000	82	42.768	6.403				
	Above 80,001	94	41.745	4.325				
Residential Area	Rural	121	41.529	4.987	0.818		0.442	NS
	Urban	224	42.040	5.024				
	Semi-Urban	84	42.417	5.114				

Source: Primary Data

The average Self-Management Score has been found to be high (43.000) for less than 25 years of age group. The high mean has been found for Male (42.556) and the members who are unmarried (42.621). It has been observed that the average scores are found to be high (42.533) among Joint family. The high mean has been found for family size of 2 members (45.250), monthly income above 40,000 (43.453), Number of Earning members found to be high in 3 member earning family (43.114). It has been observed that the average scores are found to be high (42.768) among people earning between 60001 and 80000 and members in Semi –Urban (42.417) Residential area have high score.

The Above ANOVA results indicate that there is a significant difference in the average Self-Management Score among the teachers in respect of different personal factors, namely, type of family, size of family, monthly income and number of earning members. Hence, the null hypotheses are rejected. The average score does not vary significantly in case of Age group, Gender, Marital status, and Total Family Income and Area of Residence. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

The t test result shows that no significant difference has been found in the average score of Self-Management between i) Gender ii) Marital Status iii) Type of family. Hence, the null hypotheses are accepted.

The personal factors namely type of family, size of family, monthly income and number of earning members have played a vital role in the Self-Management of emotional intelligence. Hence, these factor have significantly differed in the Self-Management Score in Emotional intelligence.

Job factors Vs Self Management

ANOVA has been applied to find out whether there is any significant difference in the mean score among the group members in respect of job factors, namely, Educational Qualification, Nature of Employment, Designation, Years of Experience, Department and Number of Members in the department as far as the **Self Management** to teaching professionals are concerned.

Ho: The average scores of self awareness does not vary significantly among the members for the selected job factors.

Table 4.10 ANOVA – Job Factors Vs Self Management Score

Job Factors		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	P- Value	S/NS
Educational Qualification	Post-Graduation	21	41.3810	2.80136	1.589	0.205	NS
	M.Phil	207	41.5845	5.54779			
	Ph.D	201	42.4279	4.60826			
	Total	429	41.9697	5.02903			
Nature of Employment	Government College	25	43.9600	5.89124	2.203	.112	NS
	Aided College	83	41.6145	4.36960			
	Self-Financing College	321	41.9065	5.09755			
	Total	429	41.9697	5.02903			

Job Factors		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	P-Value	S/NS
Designation	Assistant Professor	356	41.6798	5.01701	4.451	0.012	S
	Associate Professor	55	43.8364	5.18818			
	Professor	18	42.0000	3.54799			
	Total	429	41.9697	5.02903			
Years of Experience	Below 5 Years	116	40.9741	5.05012	4.660	0.001	S
	6 – 10 Years	150	41.7200	5.46388			
	11 -15 Years	83	42.3012	4.49318			
	16 -20 Years	54	44.4074	4.09103			
	Above 20 Years	26	41.7308	4.21955			
	Total	429	41.9697	5.02903			
Department	Basic Science	25	41.4400	4.77912	0.633	0.639	NS
	Arts	81	41.4815	5.81187			
	Computer Science	38	41.4211	6.00284			
	Commerce & Management	246	42.2927	4.73757			
	Humanities	39	41.8205	4.22319			
	Total	429	41.9697	5.02903			
Number of Members in the Department	Below 5	126	42.0635	5.21344	0.930	0.446	NS
	6 – 10	167	42.3114	4.89517			
	11 -15	106	41.1887	4.81093			
	16 -20	18	42.6667	6.16441			
	Above 20	12	42.0833	5.03548			
	Total	429	41.9697	5.02903			

Source: Primary Data

The average Self Management has been found to be high (42.4279) for Ph.D. holders as far educational qualification is concerned. The high mean has been found for government college (43.9600) and while considering designation it is found to be high for associate professor (43.8364).it has been observed that the average scores are found to be high (44.4074) for experience between 16 -20 years of experience. The high mean has been found for Commerce & Management (42.2927),number of members in the department are found to be high between 16 -20 members in department (42.6667).

The above anova results indicate that there is a significant difference in the average Self Management among the teachers in respect of different job factors, namely designation and years of experience. Hence, the null hypotheses are rejected. The average score does not vary significantly in case of educational qualification, nature of employment, department and number of members in the department. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

The job factors namely designation and years of experience have played a vital role in the Self Management score of emotional intelligence. Hence, these factors have significantly differed in the Self Management score of teachers in emotional intelligence.

Descriptive Statistics- Social Awareness

The Third factor considered and emotional intelligence is Social Awareness which describes, recognize value, empathy, understand and enter someone's world, I can always welcome the suggestions/recommendations of others, understand the emotions by the tone of their voices, The descriptive statistics is presented in the following table.

Table 4.11 Descriptive Statistics- Social Awareness

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
I recognize value difference and similarities between people and cultures	429	2	5	4.19	.696
I recognize and use empathy effectively	429	2	5	4.07	.767
I can understand and enter someone's world	429	1	5	3.84	.945
I can understand other's feelings	429	2	5	4.15	.735

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
I can always welcome the suggestions/recommendations of others	429	1	5	4.22	.781
I can tell how others feel by the tone of their voices	429	1	5	4.10	.786
It is easy for me to understand why people feel the way they do	429	2	5	4.12	.787
I compliment others when they have done something well	429	1	5	4.11	.874
In my friends group I am generally aware of how each person feels about the other person	429	2	5	4.17	.723

Source: Primary Data

The above table shows the mean ratings for Social Awareness. The highest rating has been assigned for the 'I can always welcome the suggestions/recommendations of others' (4.22), followed by 'I recognize value difference and similarities between people and cultures' (4.19), 'In my friends group I am generally aware of how each person feels about the other person' (4.17), 'I can understand other's feelings' (4.15), 'It is easy for me to understand why people feel the way they do' (4.12), 'I compliment others when they have done something well' (4.11), 'I can tell how others feel by the tone of their voices' (4.10), 'I recognize and use empathy effectively' (4.07), 'I can understand and enter someone's world'(3.84), and it is inferred from the result that the respondents have Social Awareness.

Personal factors Vs Social Awareness Score

ANOVA has been applied to find out whether there is any significant difference in the mean score among the group members in respect of personal factors, namely, age group, gender, marital status, type of family, size of family, monthly income, number of earning members, total family income and residential area as far as the social awareness to teaching professionals are concerned.

A paired t test has been applied to test the difference, if any, in respect of i) Gender ii) Marital Status iii) Type of family and the Social Awareness.

Ho: The average scores of Social Awareness does not vary significantly among the members for the selected personal factors.

Table 4.12 ANOVA – Personal Factor Vs Social Awareness Score

Personal Factors		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	t – Value	P- Value	S/NS
Age	<25	24	38.542	4.482	3.103		0.027	S
	25-35	210	36.752	4.276				
	35-45	167	37.323	4.490				
	45-55	28	35.143	5.275				
Gender	Male	151	37.007	3.957		0.016	0.900	NS
	Female	278	36.950	4.737				
Marital Status	Married	342	36.810	4.517		2.157	0.143	NS
	Unmarried	87	37.598	4.266				
Type of Family	Joint Family	197	36.827	4.424		0.368	0.544	NS
	Nuclear Family	232	37.091	4.521				
Size of Family	2	16	40.125	3.914	4.627		0.001	S
	3	111	36.144	4.043				
	4	159	37.428	4.413				
	5	92	37.315	4.550				
	6 and Above	51	35.726	4.936				
Monthly Income	Upto 20,000	165	36.576	4.831	1.344		0.260	NS
	20,001 - 30,000	132	37.152	4.270				
	30,001 - 40,000	57	36.667	3.671				
	Above 40,000	75	37.747	4.521				
Number of Earning Members	1	54	38.593	4.218	3.271		0.021	S
	2	273	36.612	4.306				
	3	70	37.329	4.218				
	4	32	36.500	6.112				

Personal Factors		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	t – Value	P- Value	S/NS
Total Family Income	Upto 40,000	141	36.950	4.247	1.189		0.314	NS
	40,000 - 60,000	112	36.839	4.210				
	60,001 - 80,000	82	37.732	4.949				
	Above 80,001	94	36.489	4.658				
Residential Area	Rural	121	36.579	4.813	3.762		0.024	S
	Urban	224	36.737	4.466				
	Semi-Urban	84	38.155	3.785				

Source: Primary Data

The average Social Awareness score has been found to be high (38.542) for less than 25 years of age group. The high mean has been found for Male (37.007) and the members who are unmarried (37.598). It has been observed that the average scores are found to be high (37.091) among nuclear family. The high mean has been found for family size of 2 members (40.125), monthly income above 40,000 (37.747), Number of Earning members found to be high in one member earning family (38.593). It has been observed that the average scores are found to be high (37.732) among people earning between 60001 and 80000 and members in Semi –Urban (38.155) Residential area have high score.

The Above ANOVA results indicate that there is a significant difference in the average Social Awareness score among the teachers in respect of different personal factors, namely, age group, size of family, number of earning members and area of residence. Hence, the null hypotheses are rejected. The average score does not vary significantly in case of gender, marital status, type of family, monthly income and total family income. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

The t test result shows that no significant difference has been found in the average score of Social Awareness between i) Gender ii) Marital Status iii) Type of family. Hence, the null hypotheses are accepted.

The personal factors namely Age group, Size of family, Number of Earning Members and Area of Residence have played a vital role in the Social Awareness of emotional intelligence. Hence, these factor have significantly differed in the Social Awareness of teachers in Emotional intelligence.

Job factors and Social Awareness Score

ANOVA has been applied to find out whether there is any significant difference in the mean score among the group members in respect of job factors, namely, Educational Qualification, Nature of Employment, Designation, Years of Experience, Department and Number of Members in the Department as far as the Social Awareness to teaching professionals are concerned.

Ho: The average scores of Social Awareness does not vary significantly among the members for the selected job factors.

Table 4.13 ANOVA – Job Factors and Social Awareness Score

Job Factors		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	P-Value	S/NS
Educational Qualification	Post-Graduation	21	36.8571	2.65115	0.256	0.774	NS
	M.Phil	207	36.8213	4.98073			
	Ph.D	201	37.1343	4.06409			
	Total	429	36.9697	4.47334			
Nature of Employment	Government College	25	36.6800	4.97259	.057	.945	NS
	Aided College	83	37.0120	4.70209			
	Self-Financing College	321	36.9813	4.38602			
	Total	429	36.9697	4.47334			
Designation	Assistant Professor	356	36.9719	4.60426	0.001	0.999	NS
	Associate Professor	55	36.9455	4.30941			
	Professor	18	37.0000	1.45521			
	Total	429	36.9697	4.47334			

Job Factors		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	P-Value	S/NS
Years of Experience	Below 5 Years	116	36.5776	4.74782	2.893	0.022	S
	6 – 10 Years	150	36.6000	4.70470			
	11 -15 Years	83	37.4940	3.48297			
	16 -20 Years	54	38.5556	3.48402			
	Above 20 Years	26	35.8846	5.68737			
	Total	429	36.9697	4.47334			
Department	Basic Science	25	37.1600	4.65188	0.833	0.505	NS
	Arts	81	37.3210	4.75612			
	Computer Science	38	36.2895	5.21385			
	Commerce & Management	246	37.0894	4.27620			
	Humanities	39	36.0256	4.23946			
	Total	429	36.9697	4.47334			
Number of Members in the Department	Below 5	126	37.0317	4.51121	2.100	0.080	NS
	6 – 10	167	37.4611	4.71060			
	11 -15	106	36.2075	4.33747			
	16 -20	18	37.8333	3.32990			
	Above 20	12	34.9167	.79296			
	Total	429	36.9697	4.47334			

Source: Primary Data

The average **Social Awareness Score** has been found to be high (37.1343) for Ph.D holders as far educational qualification is concerned. The high mean has been found for Aided College (37.0120) and while considering designation it is found to be high for professor (37.000). It has been observed that the average scores are found to be high (38.5556) for experience between 16 -20 years of experience. The high mean has been found for Arts (37.3210), number of members in the department are found to be high between 16 -20 members in department (37.8333).

The above anova results indicate that there is a significant difference in the average **Social Awareness Score** among the teachers in respect of different job factors, namely years of experience. Hence, the null hypotheses are rejected. The average score does not vary significantly in case of educational qualification, nature of employment, designation, department and number of members in the department. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

The job factors namely years of experience have played a vital role in the **Social Awareness Score** of emotional intelligence. Hence, these factor have significantly differed in the **Social Awareness Score** of teachers in emotional intelligence.

Descriptive Statistics- Relationship Management

The fourth factor considered in emotional intelligence is **Relationship Management** which describes, assertive, long term relationship, drives & motivates others, maintain openness, trust and honesty, change catalyst, work in team, achieve goals, sensitive to others emotions and seek solutions & solve problems. The descriptive statistics is presented in the following table.

Table 4.14 Descriptive Statistics- Relationship Management

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
I actively help others to be more assertive	429	1	5	4.10	.840
I can establish and build a long term relationship	429	1	5	4.08	.877
I recognize which drives & motivates others	429	1	5	4.06	.897
I can develop and maintain openness, trust and honesty	429	1	5	4.12	.907
I can act as a change catalyst	429	1	5	4.03	.897
I can collaborate and work in team	429	1	5	4.20	.926
I can set and achieve goals	429	1	5	4.12	.906
I am sensitive to others emotions & moods	429	1	5	4.06	.882
I actively seek solutions & solve problems by knowing when to fight & when to walk away	429	1	5	4.06	.873

Source: Primary Data

The above table shows the mean ratings for Relationship Management. The highest rating has been assigned for the ‘I can collaborate and work in team’ (4.20), followed by ‘I can develop and maintain openness, trust and honesty’ and ‘I can set and achieve goals’ (4.12), ‘I actively help others to be more assertive’ (4.10), ‘I can establish and build a long term relationship’ (4.08), ‘ I recognize which drives & motivates others’, ‘I am sensitive to others emotions & moods’ and ‘I actively seek solutions & solve problems by knowing when to fight & when to walk away’(4.06) and ‘I can act as a change catalyst’ (4.03) and it is inferred from the result that the respondents have Relationship Management.

Personal factors Vs Relationship Management Score

ANOVA has been applied to find out whether there is any significant difference in the mean score among the group members in respect of personal factors, namely, age group, gender, marital status, type of family, size of family, monthly income, number of earning members, total family income and residential area as far as the relationship management to teaching professionals are concerned.

A paired t test has been applied to test the difference, if any, in respect of i) Gender ii) Marital Status iii) Type of family and the Relationship Management.

Ho: The average scores of Relationship Management does not vary significantly among the members for the selected personal factors.

Table 4.15 ANOVA – Personal Factor and Relationship Management Score

Personal Factors		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	t - Value	P- Value	S/NS
Age	<25	24	37.125	4.919	0.808		0.490	NS
	25-35	210	37.214	4.871				
	35-45	167	36.563	7.639				
	45-55	28	35.464	8.257				
Gender	Male	151	37.358	5.795		1.552	0.214	NS
	Female	278	36.561	6.594				

Personal Factors		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	t - Value	P- Value	S/NS
Marital Status	Married	342	36.693	6.599		0.929	0.336	NS
	Unmarried	87	37.425	5.121				
Type of Family	Joint Family	197	36.965	5.826		0.137	0.711	NS
	Nuclear Family	232	36.737	6.737				
Size of Family	2	16	40.000	2.608	4.546		0.001	S
	3	111	37.090	4.010				
	4	159	35.522	8.221				
	5	92	38.500	4.692				
	6 and Above	51	36.431	6.136				
Monthly Income	Upto 20,000	165	36.903	5.145	3.523		0.015	S
	20,001 - 30,000	132	37.742	4.727				
	30,001 - 40,000	57	37.211	3.473				
	Above 40,000	75	34.840	10.894				
Number of Earning Members	1	54	33.685	11.287	8.396		0.000	S
	2	273	37.487	4.537				
	3	70	37.957	4.020				
	4	32	34.219	9.363				
Total Family Income	Upto 40,000	141	37.348	4.827	7.052		0.000	S
	40,000 - 60,000	112	36.884	4.411				
	60,001 - 80,000	82	38.610	4.863				
	Above 80,001	94	34.489	9.833				
Residential Area	Rural	121	34.785	8.793	9.241		0.000	S
	Urban	224	37.656	4.692				
	Semi-Urban	84	37.631	5.197				

Source: Primary Data

The average Relationship Management score has been found to be high (37.214) Between 25 years and 35 years of age group. The high mean has been found for Male (37.358) and the members who are unmarried (37.425). It has been observed that the average scores are found to be high (36.965) among Joint family. The high mean has been found for family size of 2 members (40.000), monthly income between 20,001 and 30000 (37.742), Number of Earning members found to be high in three member earning family (37.957). It has been observed that the average scores are found to be high (38.610) among people earning between 60001 and 80000 and members in Urban (37.656) Residential area have high score.

The Above ANOVA results indicate that there is a significant difference in the average Relationship Management score among the teachers in respect of different personal factors, namely size of family, monthly income, number of earning members, total family income and area of Residence. Hence, the null hypotheses are rejected. The average score does not vary significantly in case of age group, gender, marital status and type of family. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

The t test result shows that no significant difference has been found in the average score of Relationship Management between i) Gender ii) Marital Status iii) Type of family. Hence, the null hypotheses are accepted.

The personal factors namely Size of family, Monthly Income, number of earning members, total family income and area of residence have played a vital role in the Relationship Management of emotional intelligence. Hence, these factor have significantly differed in the Relationship Management of teachers in Emotional intelligence.

Job Factors and Relationship Management Score

ANOVA has been applied to find out whether there is any significant difference in the mean score among the group members in respect of job factors, namely, Educational Qualification, Nature of Employment, Designation, Years of Experience, Department and Number of Members in the Department as far as the **Relationship Management Score** to teaching professionals are concerned.

Ho: The average scores of Relationship Management does not vary significantly among the members for the selected job factors.

Table 4.16 ANOVA – Job Factors and Relationship Management Score

Job Factors		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	P-Value	S/NS
Educational Qualification	Post-Graduation	21	36.2381	2.89663	2.325	0.099	NS
	M.Phil	207	37.5217	5.11122			
	Ph.D	201	36.2040	7.55203			
	Total	429	36.8415	6.32847			
Nature of Employment	Government College	25	35.7600	7.50156	10.635	.000	S
	Aided College	83	34.1687	9.51612			
	Self-Financing College	321	37.6168	4.85730			
	Total	429	36.8415	6.32847			
Designation	Assistant Professor	356	36.6545	6.56678	1.083	0.339	NS
	Associate Professor	55	38.0000	4.40538			
	Professor	18	37.0000	6.40772			
	Total	429	36.8415	6.32847			
Years of Experience	Below 5 Years	116	36.2500	5.71934	3.093	0.016	S
	6 – 10 Years	150	36.9067	5.34243			
	11 -15 Years	83	38.0964	6.45739			
	16 -20 Years	54	37.5926	6.28120			
	Above 20 Years	26	33.5385	11.19011			
	Total	429	36.8415	6.32847			
Department	Basic Science	25	31.0400	12.23206	7.887	0.000	S
	Arts	81	36.7654	6.59786			
	Computer Science	38	35.6842	7.05233			
	Commerce & Management	246	37.8252	4.54433			
	Humanities	39	35.6410	7.22017			
	Total	429	36.8415	6.32847			

Job Factors		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Value	P-Value	S/NS
Number of Members in the Department	Below 5	126	35.5952	8.64516	3.140	0.015	S
	6 – 10	167	37.9162	4.57654			
	11 -15	106	36.9151	4.53582			
	16 -20	18	37.1111	7.21835			
	Above 20	12	33.9167	8.43648			
	Total	429	36.8415	6.32847			

Source: Primary Data

The average **Relationship Management Score** has been found to be high (37.5217) for M.Phil holders as far educational qualification is concerned. The high mean has been found for Self-Financing College (37.6168) and while considering designation it is found to be high for associate professor (38.0000). It has been observed that the average scores are found to be high (38.0964) between 11-15 years of experience. The high mean has been found for Commerce & Management (37.8252), numbers of members in the department are found to be high between 6 – 10 members in department (37.9162).

The above anova results indicate that there is a significant difference in the average **Relationship Management Score** among the teachers in respect of different job factors, namely nature of employment and department, years of experience, department and number of members in the department. Hence, the null hypotheses are rejected. The average score does not vary significantly in case of educational qualification, designation. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

The job factors namely nature of employment and department, years of experience, department and number of members in the department have played a vital role in the **Relationship Management Score** of emotional intelligence. Hence, these factor have significantly differed in the **Relationship Management Score** of teachers in emotional intelligence.

RANK ANALYSIS - KENDALL'S COEFFICIENT OF CONCORDANCE

Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance has been used to find whether the ranks assigned by the respondents have any similarities. The Kendall's (w) vary between 0 and 1. Higher the value of (w), higher the similarity among the respondents in assigning ranks. It is applied to find out whether the respondents have assigned similar ranks in expressing their opinion.

The respondents were asked to rank a set of 6 items regarding teaching profession. The most important item was given rank 1. The least important item has given a rank of 6. Mean ranks were found out for each item and were again ordered based on the mean values. The details are given in the following table.

RANK ANALYSIS FOR SELECTING TEACHING PROFESSION

Table 4.17

Elements	Mean Rank
Ambition	2.50
Passion	2.62
Good Working Environment	3.22
Job Security	4.08
Social and Economic Status	3.76
Salary and Benefits	4.82

Source: Primary Data

It is inferred from the above table that most of the respondents have given top priority for 'Ambition' (2.50), 2nd priority for Passion (2.62), 3rd priority for Good Working Environment (3.22), 4th priority for Social and Economic Status (3.76), 5th priority for Job Security (4.08), and have given last priority for Salary and Benefits (4.82)

Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance

Kendall's W	0.229
--------------------	-------

Kendall's co-efficient of concordance (W) was used to find is there any similarity among the respondents in their order of assigning the ranks. Kendall's (W) will vary between 0 and 1. Higher the value of (w) more will be the similarity of the respondents in their rank order. The Kendall's W found for the 6 items is 0.229. This shows that there is very low similarity among the respondents in assigning the ranks.

RANK ANALYSIS - LEVEL OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

The Rank analysis has been applied to find the level of emotional intelligence of faculty. Ten different elements have been considered for the analysis.

Table 4.18

Elements	Mean Rank
Assertiveness	6.37
Positive Thinking	3.32
Understanding & reacting to others emotions	5.73
Building a long term relationship	6.06
Self regulation	4.67
Self Discipline & Sense of duty	4.41
Sense of timing	5.53
Surrendering Control	7.30
Sense of Motivation	6.46
Self Motivation	5.14

Source: Primary Data

It is seen from above table that the lowest mean rank is 3.32 is found for 'Positive Thinking'. It has the highest rank order value of 1. The highest mean rank is 7.30 is found for 'Surrendering Control'. It has the lowest rank of 10.

Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance

Kendall's W	0.146
--------------------	-------

Kendall's co-efficient of concordance (W) was used to find is there any similarity among the respondents in their order of assigning the ranks. Kendall's (W) will vary between 0 and 1. Higher the value of (w) more will be the similarity of the respondents in their rank order. The Kendall's W found for the 10 items is 0. 146. This shows that there is very low similarity among the respondents in assigning the ranks.

Regression Analysis of Emotional Intelligence

The emotional intelligence of the teachers are influenced by various predictor variables (independent variable) is explained by Multiple Regression analysis. Regression analysis was applied to find the effect of personal, job and emotional intelligence factors of the teachers. The score found for emotional intelligence was considered as the dependent variable and the following independent variables were identified to be included in the model.

Age

Gender

Marital Status

Type of Family

Size of Family

Monthly Income

No of Earning Members

Total Family Income

Residential Area

Educational Qualification

Nature of Employment

Designation

Years of Experience Department

Table 4.19: Dependent Variable: Overall Emotional Intelligence

	Regression Coefficients (B)	Std. Error	Beta	T	p-value	Sig.
(Constant)	142.938	10.261				
Age	-3.524	1.782	-.159	-1.978	.049	*
Gender	-1.498	1.662	-.046	-.901	.368	NS
Marital Status	4.253	2.110	.110	2.016	.044	*
Type of Family	-1.039	2.097	-.033	-.495	.621	NS
Size of Family	-.421	1.064	-.028	-.395	.693	NS
Monthly Income	.702	.965	.050	.728	.467	NS
No of Earning Members	-.180	1.209	-.009	-.149	.881	NS
Total Family Income	-.326	.859	-.024	-.380	.704	NS
Residential Area	2.946	1.132	.130	2.602	.010	**
Educational Qualification	.285	1.533	.011	.186	.853	NS
Nature of Employment	3.093	1.545	.105	2.003	.046	*
Designation	.155	1.877	.005	.082	.934	NS
Years of Experience	.700	.261	.264	2.679	.008	**
Department	.192	.724	.013	.265	.791	NS

(*5% significant level; ** 1% significant level; NS-Not Significant)

Table - R Square value

R	R Square	F	P-value	Sig.
.258	.066	2.104	0.011	*

(*5% significant level; ** - 1% significant level; NS-Not Significant)

The Table shows the results of regression analysis, giving details of multiple correlation coefficient R, R^2 , F –ratio and significance. The R value indicate that a low correlation (0.258) exists between the dependent variables (overall emotional intelligence score) and set of independent variables, which explains that 6 % of the variations in the dependent variable is due to the 6 predictor variables included in the equation. The P value (0.011) is used to find whether R value is significant or not. The associated significance level indicates that R is significant at 5 % level.

The variable, Type of family was found to have negative regression coefficient. (The variable was coded as 0-Nuclear family and 1-Joint family). The results indicate that respondents who are from nuclear family have higher emotional intelligence score on average, compared to the respondents from joint family.

The regression table shows that among the 14 independent variables considered for the regression analysis. The variables such as, marital status, residential area, nature of employment and years of experience have positive effect on overall emotional intelligence score, which means increase in these variables will increase the emotional intelligence score proportionately and age have negative effect on overall emotional intelligence score.

From the Beta co-efficient it shows that year of experience is more influential on the overall emotional intelligence score compared to other factors/ variables. Nature of employment is the least contributing variables to overall emotional intelligence score.