

Study on T-Test for Marital Status and Qualification-Wise Analysis of Respondents

Nirmal Kumar B.¹ Dr. Chandrapal Yadav²

¹Research Scholar, CMJ University, Shillong, Meghalaya

²Assistant Professor, S.K. Govt. College, Kanwali Rewari, Haryana

Abstract - Mean values for respondents on qualification of analysis of negative emotions (El_1) are 50.383, 50.609 and 48.623 with S.D. value of 6.912, 7.069 and 7.302. The value of F-test is 1.979 at significant level of 0.14. To letting up, it is concluded that there is no significant difference found (the value of significance level for F-test is greater than 0.05) between the opinion of respondents on qualification regarding El_1 . The mean values for the respondents on qualification regarding analysis of positive emotions are 40.539, 41.232 and 40.026 with S.D. values of 6.934, 5.578 and 5.109. The value of F-test is 0.775 at 0.462 significance level. It is extracted that there is no significant difference found (the value of significance level for F-test is greater than 0.05) between the scores of respondents on qualification regarding El_2 .

Key words; significant level, letting up, positive emotions, respondents.



INTRODUCTION

Traits and behaviours fall into certain categories and, when an individual exhibits one or more of those traits or behaviours, the perceiver puts them into that category, attributing all the other traits and behaviours to them as well. Linking certain traits and behaviours helps to organize impressions and can be seen as prototypes or stereotypes. Prototypes and stereotypes are a necessity in making sense of the world (Schneider *et al.*, 1979). Pavitt, *et al.* (1995) had listed the traits and behaviours they believed an ideal leader would possess, resulting in an idea of a prototypical leader. Their impressions of leadership stem from the leadership constructs that they have developed.

Goffman (1959) viewed that when an individual presents himself before others, his performance will tend to incorporate and exemplify the officially accredited values of the society, more so, in fact, than does his behaviour as a whole. Day, *et al.* (2002) expressed that the goal of impression management is to "positively influence evaluations of oneself and to win approval from others". Individuals are constantly making impressions in day to day life, but one area where impression management has significant impact is in the workplace.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Gardner and Stough (2002) investigated level of emotional intelligence in Swinburne University. Emotional Intelligence Test predicted transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles measured by the multifactor leadership questionnaire in 110 senior level managers. Effective leaders were identified as those who reported transformational rather than transactional behaviour.

Cavallo and Brienza (2002) described that emotional competence differentiates successful leaders. High performing managers at the Johnson & Johnson Consumer and Personal Care Group were seen to possess significantly higher levels of Self-Awareness, Self-Management Capability, Social Skills, and Organisational Savvy, all considered part of the Emotional Intelligence domain. The research has shown that Emotional Intelligence, like technical skill, can be developed through a systematic and consistent approach to building competence in personal and social awareness, self-management, and social skill.

Kumar (2002) examined the relationship and direction of path between emotional intelligence and leadership behaviour. To test the hypotheses a detailed investigation of 390 middle and top level executives from six Indian organisations was done. Analyses of data showed that an emotionally intelligent leader balances the two styles of leadership, incorporated in

this study (transformational and transactional), according to the situational requirements, rather than being only transformational.

MATERIAL AND METHOD

Table 1 depicts that mean values for married and unmarried respondents regarding appraisal of negative emotions (EI₁) are 50.790 and 48.643 with S.D. value of 6.841 and 7.297, respectively. The value of t-test is 2.574 at significance level of 0.011. To sum up, it is concluded that responses of married and unmarried respondents are significantly different (the value of significant level for t-test is less than 0.05) in case of EI₁. The mean values for the respondents dissimilar on the basis of marital status regarding appraisal of positive emotions (EI₂) are 41.478 and 39.116 with S.D. value of 5.549 and 6.809, respectively. The value of t-test is 3.272 at 0.00 significance level (the value of significance level is less than 0.05). It is extracted that in this case also, the responses of married and unmarried respondents are significantly different.

The mean values for the married and unmarried respondents regarding interpersonal conflict and difficulty (EI₃) are 22.692 and 21.875 with value of S.D. of 4.040 and 3.946, respectively. The value of t-test is 1.708 at 0.089 significance level. In case of EI₄ (interpersonal skill and flexibility), the mean values for the married and unmarried respondents were 22.617 and 22.545. The value of t-test is 0.191 at 0.849 significance level.

Table.1:T-test for Marital Status-wise Analysis of Emotional Intelligence

Factors	Marital Status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Value of t-test	Sig. (2-tailed)
EI ₁	Married	188	50.790	6.841	2.574(*)	0.011
	Unmarried	112	48.643	7.297		
EI ₂	Married	188	41.479	5.549	3.272(**)	0.001
	Unmarried	112	39.116	6.809		
EI ₃	Married	188	22.692	4.040	1.708	0.089
	Unmarried	112	21.875	3.946		
EI ₄	Married	188	22.617	2.874	0.191	0.849
	Unmarried	112	22.545	3.622		
EI ₅	Married	188	21.362	3.296	1.055	0.292
	Unmarried	112	20.929	3.666		
EI _n	Married	188	158.947	14.255	3.207(**)	0.001
	Unmarried	112	153.107	16.803		

** Significant at 1% level

* Significant at 5% level

Source: Field Survey

The mean values regarding emotional facilitation and goal orientation (EI₅) are 21.362 and 20.929 with S.D. value 3.296 and 3.666 for married and unmarried respondents, respectively. The value of t-test is 1.055 at significance level of 0.292. It can be said that the responses of married and unmarried respondents are not significantly different in case of interpersonal

conflict and difficulty (EI₃), interpersonal skill and flexibility (EI₄) and emotional facilitation and goal orientation (EI₅) (the value of significant level for t-test is greater than 0.05). Finally, in case of overall emotional intelligence, the mean values for married and unmarried respondents are 158.947 and 153.107 with S.D. of 14.255 and 16.803, respectively. The value of t-test is 3.207 at 0.00 significance level. At most recent, it can be said that the scores of married and unmarried respondents are significantly different in case of overall emotional intelligence (the value of significance level for t-test is less than 0.05).

ONE-WAY ANOVA FOR QUALIFICATION-WISE ANALYSIS OF RESPONDENTS

Table 2 shows that mean values for respondents on qualification of analysis of negative emotions (EI₁) are 50.383, 50.609 and 48.623 with S.D. value of 6.912, 7.069 and 7.302. The value of F-test is 1.979 at significant level of 0.14. To letting up, it is concluded that there is no significant difference found (the value of significance level for F-test is greater than 0.05) between the opinion of respondents on qualification regarding EI₁. The mean values for the respondents on qualification regarding analysis of positive emotions are 40.539, 41.232 and 40.026 with S.D. values of 6.934, 5.578 and 5.109. The value of F-test is 0.775 at 0.462 significance level. It is extracted that there is no significant difference found (the value of significance level for F-test is greater than 0.05) between the scores of respondents on qualification regarding EI₂.

The mean values for the respondents on the basis of qualification regarding interpersonal conflict and difficulty (EI₃) of emotional intelligence is 23.085, 22.232 and 21.273 with S.D. value of 4.052, 4.047 and 3.691, respectively. The value of F-test is 5.298 at 0.005 significance level. It can be said, in trouble-free words that regarding EI₃, the scores of the respondents, on the basis of qualification are significantly different (the significance level for F-test is less than 0.05). The mean values for the respondents on the basis of qualification with regard to interpersonal skill and flexibility (EI₄) were 22.497, 22.842 and 22.494 with S.D. values of 3.440, 2.822 and 3.016, respectively. The value of F-test is 0.354 at significant level of 0.702. Further, in case of emotional facilitation and goal orientation (EI₅), the mean values for the respondents on qualifications are 21.206, 21.415 and 20.961 with S.D. values of 3.725, 3.205 and 3.147, respectively. The value of F-test is 0.344 at 0.702 significant level. In above both the cases, it is extracted that there is no significant difference found between the scores on the basis of qualification regarding EI₄ and EI₅ (the value of significance level for

F-test is greater than 0.05).

Table 2: One-way ANOVA for Qualification-wise Analysis of Emotional Intelligence

Factors	Qualification	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F value	Sig. level
EI ₁	Graduation	141	50.383	6.912	1.979	0.140
	Post Grad.	82	50.609	7.069		
	Professional	77	48.623	7.302		
EI ₂	Graduation	141	40.539	6.934	0.775	0.462
	Post Grad.	82	41.232	5.578		
	Professional	77	40.026	5.109		
EI ₃	Graduation	141	23.085	4.052	5.298(**)	0.005
	Post Grad.	82	22.232	4.047		
	Professional	77	21.273	3.691		
EI ₄	Graduation	141	22.497	3.440	0.354	0.702
	Post Grad.	82	22.842	2.822		
	Professional	77	22.494	3.016		
EI ₅	Graduation	141	21.206	3.725	0.344	0.709
	Post Grad.	82	21.415	3.205		
	Professional	77	20.961	3.147		
EI ₆	Graduation	141	157.709	15.885	2.549	0.080
	Post Grad.	82	158.329	16.452		
	Professional	77	153.377	13.216		

** Significant at 1% level

* Significant at 5% level

Source: Field Survey

CONCLUSION

Finally, regarding overall emotional intelligence, the mean values for the respondents on the basis of qualification are 157.709, 158.329 and 153.377 with S.D. values of 15.885, 16.452 and 13.216, respectively. The value of F-test is 2.549 at 0.08 significance level. It can be said that there is no significance difference found between the scores of the respondents on the basis of qualification in case of emotional intelligence (the value of significance level for F-test is greater than 0.05).

REFERENCES

Anju (2008). *A Study of 360-degree appraisal and feedback system in indian corporate sector*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Haryana School of Business, GJUS&T, Hisar, India.

Burbach, M. E. (2004). *Testing the relationship between emotional intelligence and full range leadership as moderated by cognitive style and self-concept*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of NEBARSKA, LINCOLN. Available at: www.emeraldinsight.com.as on 01-05-2008.

Byrne, J. C. (2003). *Leadership measures: The role of emotional intelligence in predicting leadership and related work behaviour*. Doctoral Dissertation, Stevens Institute of Technology. Available at: www.emeraldinsight.com.as on 03-05-2008.

Collins, V.L. (2001). *Emotional intelligence and leadership success*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis,

University of Nebraska. Available at: www.emeraldinsight.com.as on 03-05-2008.

Gottlieb, M. F. (2006). *Humanistic leadership: emotional intelligence and team learning*. D.M. Dissertation, University of PHOENIX. Available at: www.eiconsortiam.com.as on 08-05-2008.

Hopkins M. M. (2005). *The impact of gender, emotional intelligence competencies and styles on leadership success*. Unpublished Ph.D.Thesis, Case Western Reserve University. Available at: www.emeraldinsight.com.as on 03-05-2008.

Jacques, F.J. (2003). *An examination of the relationship between self-differentiation and transformational leadership through the lens of emotional intelligence*. Unpublished Ph.D.Thesis, University of Calgary, Canada. Available at: www.emeraldinsight.com.as on 09-05-2008.

Jenifer, M. G. (2000). *Emotions and leadership: The role of emotional intelligence*. Rice University, USA. Available at: www.emeraldinsight.com.as on 05-05-2008.

Kapore, D. (2001). *Organisational Culture*. On line Research Report, IIM, Kozhikod. Available at: www.emeraldinsight.com.as on 03-05-2008.

Leban, W. V. (2003). *The relationship between leader behaviour and emotional intelligence of the project manager and the success of complex projects*. Unpublished Ph.D.Thesis, Benedictive University. Available at: www.emeraldinsight.com.as on 08-05-2008.

Purkable, T.L. (2003). *Emotional intelligence, leadership style and coping mechanisms of executives*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, The Catholic University of America. Available at: www.emeraldinsight.com.as on 08-05-2008.

Rice, C.L. (1999). *A quantitative study of emotional intelligence and team performance*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA, Available at: www.emeraldinsight.com.as on 03-05-2008.

Sharma, P. (2008). *Impact of HRM practices on employee retention in Indian I.T. Industry*. Unpublished Ph.D.Thesis, Haryana School of Business, GJUS&T, Hisar, India.

Topuz, H. (2005). *The relationship between leadership and emotional intelligence: A proposed development model for enhancing leadership qualities among the officers in the TURKISH NAVY*. Unpublished

Ph.D.Thesis, Available at: www.emeraldinsight.com.as
on 09-05-2008.

Verma, A. (2007). *A study of marketing practices in life insurance in India*. Unpublished Ph.D.Thesis, Haryana School of Business, GJUS&T, Hisar, India.