CHAPTER-3
RESULTS

The researcher basically geared to test the effect of emotional intelligence of primary care giver's on optimism and social competence of children. According to the objectives of the study, result were analyzed using independent t-test to identify the mean difference between upper and lower quartile of the sample. Researcher has divided the results in to two groups.

Group one comprise the analysis of the mean difference of optimistic attribution style (Optimism) and social competence of children between high and low emotionally intelligent primary care giver.To get the mean difference of upper and lower score of emotional intelligence we prepared frequency distribution and took out quartile of emotional intelligence total. The upper quartile is 75% and lower quartile is 25% of total EI (Emotional intelligence) score of primary care giver's. The 25% of EI Score is 216 and 75% is 255.The upper quartile is considered as high score on emotional intelligence and lower quartile as low score on emotional intelligence. This usage is done for ease of convenience of expression and interpretation of the results.

Group two comprise the analysis of mean difference of emotional intelligence of primary care giver's, and optimism of children between upper and lower quartile of SSBS score of children.The 25% of school social behavior scale score is 61 and 75% is 144. The upper quartile is considered as high score on social competence and lower quartile as low score on social competence. This usage is done for ease of convenience of expression and interpretation of the results.

Pearson product moment correlation analysis was performed to find out the intra correlation between the dimensions of emotional intelligence of primary care giver's, optimism and social competence of their children.

In addition liner regression analysis is used to identify the role of primary care givers emotion intelligence in predicting optimism of children and social competence of children.

3.1 Mean Differences Between Primary Care Givers High And Low EI, Across Dimensions Of Optimism And Social Competence Of Their Children.

Data was subjected to independent t-test to examine the mean difference for the CASQ dimensions (Good event, bad event and total score of optimism) and SSBS dimensions, (PR, AB, SM, SC Total, HI, AA, DD, AS Total And SSBS Total) of children.Table 1 includes means,standard deviation,t- score and significance level obtained.

Table 3.1.1 ***Mean Difference Between The Optimism, Social Competence Of Children Of Primary Care Giver's With High And Low Emotional Intelligence.***

Variable	**Lower quartile of primary care giver's *EQ(n=75)***		**Higher quartile of primary care giver's *EQ(n=76)***			
	Mean	***Sd***	***Mean***	***Sd***	***t***	***Significance level***
G TOTAL	***14.32***	***3.09***	***13.79***	***2.73***	***1.11***	***.26***
B TOTAL	***8.45***	***3.59***	***8.59***	***2.98***	***-.26***	***.79***
AS TOTAL	***5.87***	***5.05***	***5.20***	***4.31***	***0.88***	***.38***
PR	***54.04***	***12.58***	***54.34***	***11.26***	***-0.16***	***.87***
SM	***40.23***	***7.96***	***39.67***	***6.85***	***0.46***	***.65***
AB	***32.67***	***6.65***	***32.26***	***5.86***	***0.39***	***.69***
SCTOTAL	***126.93***	***26.22***	***126.28***	***22.84***	***0.16***	***.87***
HI	***19.89***	***8.16***	***21.39***	***10.63***	***-0.97***	***.33***
AA	***13.16***	***5.46***	***14.58***	***7.69***	***-1.30***	***.19***
DD	***11.00***	***4.68***	***12.09***	***6.36***	***-1.20***	***.23***
AS TOTAL	***44.05***	***17.43***	***48.07***	***24.28***	***-1.16***	***.24***
SSBS TOTAL	***82.88***	***34.00***	***78.21***	***36.93***	***0.80***	***.42***

The above table shows the mean difference between CASQ and SSBS with high and low score of emotional intelligence of primary care giver. However there is no significant difference between optimism and social competence of children of high and low emotionally intelligent primary care giver.

In order to validate these findings the children were divided in to two groups, on the basis of their score in social competence and then independent t test is used to examine the mean difference between EI of primary care givers with socially competent and socially incompetent. The upper quartile of SSBS were considered as socially competent and lower quartile of SSBS is consideed as socially incompetent.

Table 3.1.2 Mean Difference Between The Scores Of Emotional Intelligence Of Primary Care Givers With High And Low Social Competence Of Children.

Variable	**Socially incompetent *(n=73)***		**Socially competent *(n=77)***			
	Mean	***Sd***	***Mean***	***Sd***	***t***	***Significance level***
EAE	**81.01**	**10.44**	**79.95**	**12.48**	**0.56**	**.57**
UE	**70.23**	**8.77**	**70.23**	**10.28**	**-.001**	**1.00**
MES	**49.63**	**6.38**	**48.34**	**9.27**	**.99**	**.32**
MEO	**41.44**	**6.12**	**40.58**	**6.58**	**.82**	**.41**
EITOTAL	**233.41**	**26.02**	**230.17**	**31.94**	**.68**	**.49**

The above table shows the mean difference between the score of EI of primary care givers of socially competent and socially incompetent children. Results indicate that emotional intelligence of primary care giver's between high and low score of social competence does not have significant mean difference.

Table 3.1.3 ***Mean Difference Between The Sample Taken From Vadodara And Sample Taken Form Hyderabad.***

Variable	Hyderabad Sample*(N=172)*		Vadodara sample*(N=129)*			
	Mean	***Sd***	***Mean***	***Sd***	***t***	***Significance level***
EAE	**81.41**	**10.33**	**81.56**	**12.45**	**-.11**	**.91**
UE	**69.56**	**9.26**	**72.07**	**9.44**	**-2.31**	**.02***
MES	**48.77**	**7.44**	**50.12**	**7.93**	**-1.51**	**.13**
MEO	**40.37**	**6.39**	**41.74**	**6.19**	**-1.87**	**.62**
EITOTAL	**231.25**	**27.19**	**236.25**	**30.42**	**-1.49**	**.13**
G TOTAL	**13.92**	**2.92**	**14.09**	**2.83**	**-.48**	**.63**
B TOTAL	**8.26**	**2.96**	**9.11**	**3.03**	**-2.43**	**.16**
AS TOTAL	**5.66**	**4.27**	**4.98**	**4.52**	**1.34**	**.18**
PR	**52.77**	**12.52**	**54.71**	**12.35**	**-1.34**	**.18**
SM	**38.68**	**8.65**	**40.63**	**7.29**	**-2.06**	**.04***
AB	**31.30**	**7.25**	**33.18**	**6.10**	**-2.38**	**.02***
HI	**21.53**	**11.41**	**19.64**	**7.54**	**1.64**	**.10**
AA	**14.56**	**8.04**	**12.91**	**4.98**	**2.06**	**.04***
DD	**11.97**	**6.69**	**10.87**	**4.2**	**1.63**	**.10**
SSBS TOTAL	**74.68**	**37.30**	**85.10**	**33.64**	**-2.50**	**.01***

The above table indicates the mean difference of EI, CASQ and SSBS scores for sample taken from Hyderabad and Vadodara.

Results indicate that EI dimension, understanding emotions in Hyderabad and Vadodara city has significant mean difference, which mean that primary care givers in Vadodara are better in understanding emotions. EI dimensions, express and appraise emotion, manage emotion in self, manage emotion in other of primary care giver's in Hyderabad and Vadodara does not have significant mean difference.

Results indicate that CASQ dimensions, good event and bad event score of children in Hyderabad and Vadodara does not have significant mean difference. Optimism of children in Hyderabad and Vadodara does not have significant difference.

Results indicate that SSBS total in Hyderabad and Vadodara city has significant mean difference. SSBS subscale dimensions, self management skills, academic skills and antisocial- aggressiveness of children in Hyderabad and Vadodara city has significant mean difference.This means that Vadodara children are more socially competent with respect to self management skills, academic skills, while Hyderabad children are more antisocial- aggressive.

Table 3.1.4 ***Mean Difference Between The Score Of Residential Mobile And Local Sample Taken From Vadodara And Hyderabad.***

Variable	**Local sample (*n*=201)**		**Residential mobile sample (*n*=77)**			
	Mean	***Sd***	***Mean***	***Sd***	***t***	***Significance level***
EAE	**83.04**	**11.24**	**78.62**	**10.52**	**3.15**	**.002***
UE	**71.57**	**9.66**	**68.63**	**8.85**	**2.45**	**.015***
MES	**50.21**	**7.72**	**47.60**	**7.36**	**2.69**	**.007***
MEO	**41.64**	**6.24**	**39.63**	**6.54**	**2.49**	**.013***
EITOTAL	**237.18**	**28.9**	**225.96**	**26.98**	**3.10**	**.002***
G TOTAL	**13.74**	**3.08**	**14.44**	**2.38**	**-.89**	**.05***
B TOTAL	**8.73**	**3.10**	**8.56**	**2.90**	**.42**	**.67**
AS TOTAL	**5.01**	**4.60**	**5.88**	**3.91**	**-1.53**	**.13**
PR	**53.07**	**13.27**	**55.01**	**10.52**	**-1.22**	**.22**
SM	**39.37**	**8.54**	**40.10**	**7.30**	**-.69**	**.48**
AB	**31.94**	**7.20**	**32.67**	**5.89**	**-.84**	**.39**
SCTOTAL	**124.39**	**28.06**	**127.79**	**22.12**	**-1.01**	**.31**
HI	**19.63**	**9.62**	**22.01**	**9.75**	**-1.93**	**.05***
AA	**13.38**	**6.70**	**14.29**	**6.86**	**-1.06**	**.29**
DD	**10.98**	**5.68**	**11.90**	**5.30**	**-1.30**	**.19**
AS TOTAL	**43.98**	**21.50**	**48.20**	**21.08**	**-1.55**	**.12**
SSBS TOTAL	**80.41**	**36.19**	**79.58**	**35.23**	**.18**	**.85**

Results indicate that EI dimensions, express and appraise emotions, understand emotions, manage emotions, manage emotions in others and emotional intelligence total score in local and residentially mobile sample has significant mean difference. It reflects that local primary care givers are more emotionally intelligent.

Result indicates that CASQ dimension, good event total in local and residential mobile sample has significant mean difference. CASQ dimension, bad event total in local and residential mobile sample does not have significant mean difference.CASQ score in local and residential mobile sample does not have significant mean difference.

Result indicates that SSBS subscale, social competence dimensions (PR, SM, AB) in local and residential mobile sample does not have significant mean difference. Result indicates that school social behavior antisocial subscale, hostile - irritable dimension in local and residential mobile sample has significant mean difference. Children who are residentially mobile have high hostility and irritability. SSBS total score in local and residential mobile sample does not have significant mean difference.It implies that children's overall social competence in local and residential mobile sample does not differ significantly.

3.2 Correlation Analysis

As per the objectives of the study,the results has been analyzed using correlation to know the relationship between emotional intelligence of primary care givers, social competence of children and optimism of children.

1 Emotional intelligence and optimism

Emotional intelligence dimensions, express and appraise emotions, understand emotion, manage emotion in self and manage emotion in others (EAE, UE, MES, MEO) does not correlate significantly with CASQ dimensions (Good event total and bad event total). The EI total does not have significant correlation with CASQ total.

2 Emotional intelligence and social competence

Emotional intelligence dimension, express and appraise emotion (EAE) has significant negative correlation with SSBS dimension, academic skills. However EI dimension, express and appraise emotion (EAE) does not correlate with other SSBS dimensions (PR, SM, SC total, HI, AA, DD, AS total).

EI dimensions, understand emotion, manage emotion in self and manage emotion in others and emotional intelligence total does not have any correlation with SSBS dimensions, pro-social and interpersonal relation skill, self management skill, academic skills, social competence subscale total, hostile-irritable, antisocial aggressive, disruptive demanding, antisocial subscale total and SSBS total (PR, SM, AB, SC total, HI, AA, DD, AS total and SSBS total).EI total does not have any corelation with SSBS Total.

3 Optimism and social competence

CASQ dimensions, good event total (G total) have positive significant correlation with SSBS dimensions, (PR, SM, AB) and social competence subscale total (SC Total). CASQ dimensions, good Event (G total) has no correlation with SSBS subscale, antisocial total and its dimensions, (HI, AA, and DD). CASQ dimensions, good event total (G total) has positive significant correlation with SSBS Total. CASQ dimensions, bad event total (B Total) has significant negative correlation with SSBS subscale, social competence (PR, SM, AB and SC total). However CASQ dimension, bad event (B total) has no correlation with SSBS subscale, antisocial subscale and its dimensions, (HI, AA, DD and AS total). CASQ dimensions, bad event (B total) has significant negative correlation with SSBS total. CASQ total (AS total) has positive significant correlation with social competence subscale dimensions, (PR, SM, AB and SC Total). CASQ total (AS Total) has no correlation with antisocial subscale dimensions, (HI, AA, DD and AS Total). CASQ total (AS total) has significant positive correlation with SSBS Total.

Correlation between emotional intelligence, optimism and social competence from Hyderabad and Vadodara

To see if the variable correlate differently from sample taken from Hyderabad and Vadodara . Separate correlations were correlated from both the sample groups. However trend shown for both the groups were similar and showed same trend as found out for the total sample.

Table no.3.2.1 ***Correlations of Emotional Intelligence, Optimism and Social Competence***

		EIEAE	EIUE	EIMES	EIMEO	EI TOTAL	G TOTAL	B TOTAL	AS TOTAL	PR	SM	AB	SC Total	HI	AA	DD	AS Total	SSBS Total
EIEAE	Pearson Correlation	1																
EIUE	Pearson Correlation	.626**	1															
EIMES	Pearson Correlation	.640**	.701**	1														
EIMEO	Pearson Correlation	.697**	.642**	.648**	1													
EITOTAL	Pearson Correlation	.879**	.870**	.858**	.834**	1												
GTOTAL	Pearson Correlation	-.104	-.044	.002	.010	-.050	1											
BTOTAL	Pearson Correlation	.015	-.008	-.015	.043	.007	-.105	1										
ASTOTAL	Pearson Correlation	-.078	-.023	.011	-.023	-.038	.729**	-.757**	1									
PR	Pearson Correlation	-.072	.019	-.017	-.015	-.028	.245**	-.164**	.274**	1								
SM	Pearson Correlation	-.082	.001	-.010	-.019	-.036	.222**	-.144*	.245**	.889**	1							
AB	Pearson Correlation	-.118*	.011	-.012	-.021	-.047	.263**	-.184**	.299**	.875**	.853**	1						
SC Total	Pearson Correlation	-.090	.012	-.014	-.018	-.036	.253**	-.170**	.283**	.976**	.952**	.938**	1					
HI	Pearson Correlation	-.053	.022	.005	.031	-.005	.024	.042	-.013	-.082	-.167**	-.107	-.118*	1				
AA	Pearson Correlation	-.010	.030	.027	.057	.024	.000	.030	-.021	-.044	-.138*	-.097	-.089	.918**	1			
DD	Pearson Correlation	-.040	.039	.026	.044	.014	-.005	.032	-.025	-.056	-.129*	-.119*	-.097	.925**	.888**	1		
AS Total	Pearson Correlation	-.038	.029	.017	.043	.009	.009	.037	-.019	-.066	-.153**	-.110	-.107	.984**	.963**	.960**	1	
SSBS Total	Pearson Correlation	-.043	-.009	-.021	-.040	-.032	.179**	-.147*	.218**	.752**	.787**	.751**	.795**	-.687**	-.653**	-.657**	-.689**	

. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

3.3 Regression Analysis

Regression analysis was performed to examine the predictive relationship between emotional intelligence of primary care giver's on children's optimism (CASQ score) and social competence (SSBS score).

Table 3.3.1 ***Emotional Intelligence As A Predictor Of Pro-Social And Interpersonal Relation Of Children.***

R	*R Square*	*Adjusted R Square*	*F*	*Sig.*
.108	.012	-.002	.88	.48

The table indicates that F value is not significant which shows all dimensions of EI together not predicting the variable pro social and interpersonal relation. Thus there is no requirement of interpreting the contribution of each dimension of EI towards social competence. Adjusted R square shows the contribution made by the contributing variable is negligible in explaining the criterion variable.

Table 3.3.2 ***Emotional Intelligence As A Predictoro Self Management Skills Of Children.***

R	*R Square*	*Adjusted R Square*	*F*	*Sig.*
.107	.011	-.002	.85	.49

The table indicates that *F value* is not significant which indicate all dimensions of EI together not predicted the variable self management skills. Thus there is no requirement of interpreting the contribution of each dimension of EI towards social competence. Adjusted R square shows the contribution made by the contributing variable is negligible in explaining the criterion variable.

Table 3.3.3 ***Emotional Intelligence As A Predictor Of Academic Skills Of Children.***

R	*R Square*	*Adjusted R Square*	*F*	*Sig.*
.17	.03	.014	2.09	.082

The table indicatesthat *F* value is not significant which indicate all dimensions of EI together not predicted the variable academic skills. Thus there is no requirement of interpreting the contribution of each dimension of EI towards social competence. Adjusted R square shows the contribution made by the contributing variable is negligible in explaining the criterion variable.

Table 3.3.4 ***Emotional Intelligence As A Predictor Of Social Competence Total.***

R	*R Square*	*Adjusted R Square*	*F*	*Sig.*
.126	.016	.003	1.19	.31

The table indicate that *F* value is not significant which indicate all dimensions of EI together not predicted the variablesocial competence skills (subscale). Thus there is no requirement of interpreting the contribution of each dimension of EI towards social competence. Adjusted R square shows the contribution made by the contributing variable is negligible in explaining the criterion variable.

Table 3.3.5 ***Emotional Intelligence As A Predictor Of Hostile-Irritable Behavior Of Children.***

R	*R Square*	*Adjusted R Square*	*F*	*Sig.*
.13	.016	.003	1.24	.29

The table indicate that *F* value is not significant which indicate all dimensions of EI together not predicted the variable hostile –irritable. Thus there is no requirement of interpreting the contribution of each dimension of EI towards social competence. Adjusted R square shows the contribution made by the contributing variable is negligible in explaining the criterion variable.

Table3.3.6 ***Emotional Intelligence As A Predictor Of Antisocial – Aggressive Behavior Of Children .***

R	*R Square*	*Adjusted R Square*	*F*	*Sig.*
.11	.012	-.002	.87	.48

The table indicate that *F* value is not significant which indicate all dimensions of EI together not predicted the variableantisocial aggressive. Thus there is no requirement of interpreting the contribution of each dimension of EI towards social competence. Adjusted R square shows the contribution made by the contributing variable is negligible in explaining the criterion variable.

Table 3.3.7 ***Emotional Intelligence As A Predictor Of Destructive-Demanding Behavior Of Children*****.**

R	***R Square***	***Adjusted R Square***	***F***	***Sig.***
.13	.016	.003	1.19	.31

The table indicate that *F* value is not significant which indicate all dimensions of EI together not predicted the variable destructive-demanding. Thus there is no requirement of interpreting the contribution of each dimension of EI towards social competence. Adjusted R square shows the contribution made by the contributing variable is negligible in explaining the criterion variable.

Table 3.3.8 ***Emotional Intelligence As A Predictor Of Antisocial Total.***

R	***R Square***	***Adjusted R Square***	***F***	***Sig.***
.12	.015	.002	1.13	.34

The table indicate that *F* value is not significant which indicate all dimensions of EI together not predicted the variableantisocial total. Thus there is no requirement of interpreting the contribution of each dimension of EI towards social competence. Adjusted R square shows the contribution made by the contributing variable is negligible in explaining the criterion variable.

Table3.3.9 ***Emotional Intelligence As A Predictor Of Social Competence Of Children (SSBS Total).***

R	*R Square*	*Adjusted R Square*	*F*	*Sig.*
.06	.004	-.01	.26	.90

The table indicate that *F* value is not significant which indicate all dimensions of EI together not predicted the variable social competence . Thus there is no requirement of interpreting the contribution of each dimension of EI towards social competence. Adjusted R square shows the contribution made by the contributing variable is negligible in explaining the criterion variable.

Table3.3.10 ***Emotional Intelligence As A Predictor Of Good Event Dimension Of Optimism.***

R	*R Square*	*Adjusted R Square*	*F*	*Sig.*
.16	.03	.01	1.96	.100

The table indicate that *F* value is not significant which indicate all dimensions of EI together not predicted the variable good event total. Thus there is no requirement of interpreting the contribution of each dimension of EI towards social competence. Adjusted R square shows the contribution made by the contributing variable is negligible in explaining the criterion variable.

Table ***3.3.11 Emotional Intelligence As A Predictor Of Bad Event Dimension Of Optimism.***

R	*R Square*	*Adjusted R Square*	*F*	*Sig.*
.07	.005	-.009	.36	.84

The table indicate that *F* value is not significant which indicate all dimensions of EI together not predicted the variable bad event total. Thus there is no requirement of interpreting the contribution of each dimension of EI towards social competence. Adjusted R square shows the contribution made by the contributing variable is negligible in explaining the criterion variable.

Table 3.3.12 ***Emotional Intelligence As A Predictor Of Optimism Of Children (CASQ Total).***

R	*R Square*	*Adjusted R Square*	*F*	*Sig.*
.11	.01	-.001	.91	.46

The table indicate that *F value* is not significant which indicate all dimensions of EI together not predicted the variable optimism . Thus there is no requirement of interpreting the contribution of each dimension of EI towards social competence. Adjusted R square shows the contribution made by the contributing variable is negligible in explaining the criterion variable.

3.4 Analysis Of Social Exercise

Results indicate that 47% primary care givers who participated in the social exercise were high EI and 53 % parents were low EI. Mann Whitney U test was used to see the difference in parent child interaction of these high EI and low EI parents. The result suggested that there is no significant difference in both the groups however 75% low EI parents showed high parent child interaction as compared to 36% high EI parents showing high parent child interaction.

The social exercise score ranging from -18 to +21 and group median of social exercise score was 14.40. The minimum score obtained in the social exercise is 3 and maximum score obtained in the social exercise is 21. Based on the median score researcher split it into two group's i.e. high parent child interaction and low parent child interaction.

Table 3.4.1 ***Table Showing The Division Of Parents According To Their Parent-Child Interaction.***

High EI Parents			Low EI parents		
High parent-child interaction	Low parent- child interaction	Total	High parent-child interaction	Low parent-child interaction	Total
5 (36%)	9 (64%)	14	12 (75%)	4 (25%)	16

Results from the above table indicates that emotional intelligence of parents is not directly proportionate with parent - child interaction.

Both from the Mann Whitney U test and the cross tab, results shows that emotional intelligence of parents and their interaction with their children does not have significant relationship.

- **Stress management strategy**

  In order to understand whether and how often parents use play with children as an effective coping strategy to handle stress. Researcher has asked the respondent to mention their major stress reducing strategy. The options mentioned were sleeping, eating, exercise, socializing, playing with children and spending time with family as major stress busting strategy. Playing with children and spending time with family was used by 57% of high EI parents out of 14 parents as major stress busting strategy. Music was opted by 22 % of high EI parents and an exercise is chosen by 21% high EI parents as stress busting strategy.

Playing with children and spending time with family was used by 56% of low EI parents' out16 parents. 19 % low EI parents choose music as stress reducing strategy. 13 % and 12 % low EI parents choose meditation and sleeping as stress reducing activity.

Here also, the findings don't suggest any particular trend to show the difference between high EI and low EI parents in terms choosing playing with children as a stress busting strategy.

- **Field notes**

Most of the parents understood the instructions and helped their children when needed. Few parents have shown peculiar behavior at the social exercise session.

Three high EI parents out of 14 parents have shown no interaction, nod or encouragement with their children when their child was solving the puzzle. Another observation with these parents was that the children were also expressionless, they also didn't ask for help from their parents.

Three high EI parents out of 14 parents did showed very positive interaction as after every level of task completion they complimented the children. They were constantly interested in their children task and whenever children asked for help they gave the instruction very calmly.

In contrast ten low EI parents out of 16 parents showed positive interaction with their children. They were interested in what their children were doing, helped them when child needed it and used encouragement and smile when child was solving the puzzle.