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Abstract

There has been much interest in emotional and social intelligence (EQ) since the publication of the seminal work on the topic by Goleman (1998). EQ has been identified as a factor that is at least as important as the traditional intelligence quotient. This study was done to investigate the relationship of factors such as sex, the gender role orientation of androgyny, and the personality trait of extroversion with EQ. A sample of 179 (41 male, 138 female) college students completed the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI; 1974) to measure gender role orientation, the extroversion subscale of Eysenck’s Personality Inventory (EPI; 1964), the subscales of Gardner’s measure of multiple intelligences (1983) and BarOn’s Emotional Quotient Inventory (1997).

Results supported two of the study’s hypotheses in that more female participants were classified as androgynous compared with males and participants who were classified as androgynous had significantly higher emotional and social intelligence scores than those falling into the other gender role orientations. Contrary to the study’s second hypothesis, those in the high extroversion group did not have higher emotional and social intelligence scores than those in the low extroversion group. An interaction effect of sex by gender role category was found where there were larger differences in mean emotional and social intelligence scores across sex role groups for males than there were for their female counterparts.
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The concept of emotional and social intelligence was first identified decades ago and refers to the ability to identify and cope with one’s emotions and successfully interact with other people (Thorndike & Stein, 1937). Emotional and social intelligence is demonstrated when one is able to perceive and express one’s own emotions and adapt those emotions accurately to understand and cope with situations (Salovey & Pizarro, 2003). Goleman popularized the notion of emotional and social intelligence and motivated a good deal of work involving the development of assessment tools and research into correlates of emotional and social intelligence with the publication of his book, *Emotional Intelligence* (Goleman, 1995).

Research since then has shown that social and emotional intelligence correlates with psychological well-being in both children and adults and may correlate with academic achievement in children (Kampfe & Mitte, 2010). Significant relationships have also been found between self-reported emotional and social intelligence and life satisfaction, affect, health aspects, and stress reaction in both adults and children (Ciarrochi, Chan, & Caputi, 2000; Gignac, 2006; Dawda & Hart, 2006; Slaski & Cartwright, 2002). Having good emotional and social intelligence positively impacts mental health and increases pleasing emotional experiences (Austin, Saklofske, & Egan, 2005). As a result, pleasing emotions are sought out and displeasing emotions are avoided by those individuals with high levels of emotional and social intelligence. People high in emotional intelligence are not disillusioned by negative emotions; they, instead, have a better ability to control or regulate emotions in a healthy way and, therefore, achieve goals unphased (Salovey & Grewal, 2005).

**Theoretical Development of the Concepts of Social and Emotional Intelligence**
In 1983, Gardner presented a model of multiple intelligences. The accepted models of intelligence at the time viewed intelligence as being one factor of cognition, referred to as the $g$ factor. These models viewed intelligence as a combination of multiple mental abilities or factors (Gardner, 1983). Viewed in the traditional way, intelligence was the cognitive ability (or abilities) most responsible for academic achievement in school. Gardner introduced the idea that there are several other modes of intelligence. His model proposed additional types of intelligence including interpersonal intelligence, intrapersonal intelligence, and existential intelligence, among others.

Later, psychologists expanded on Gardner’s model and explored in more depth what we now refer to as social and emotional intelligence. Salovey and Mayer (1990) introduced the concept of emotional intelligence which later was explored by Goleman (1995). Emotional and social intelligence became labels referring to the ability to understand emotions in one’s own self as well as others, and to be able to regulate this ability successfully to improve internal well-being and interpersonal relationships, both personally and professionally (Killian, 2012; Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Goleman, 1995). Goleman (1995) became renowned because of his radical view that emotional and social intelligence, which he referred to as EQ, is more important than IQ in predicting success and well-being.

**Sex differences in Emotional and Social Intelligence**

There have been few studies examining sex differences in social and emotional intelligence and the findings have been complex and often conflicting. Some researchers have reported sex differences in emotional and social intelligence, especially for skills that are more interpersonal in nature (e.g., communication). These studies reported that women score higher on self-report measures of these skills than men. In contrast, skills that are more intrapersonal in
nature (e.g., positive decision making or visualization) were found to be performed better by men (Bar-On, Brown, Kircaldy, & Thome, 2000; Saklofske, Austin, & Minski, 2003). This may be due to the fact that women tend to express feelings more often than men due to the gender socialization in our society (Garner & Estep, 2001).

In our culture, we view women as the more supportive or affective sex having those abilities normally associated with emotional and social intelligence. Ironically, being able to manage emotions, a defining factor of emotional and social intelligence, is also in conflict with another historical social perception of women as the more irrational, emotionally unstable sex. Nevertheless, it has been shown that women tend to score higher on emotional and social intelligence than men (Ciarocchi et al., 2000; Dawda & Hart, 2006). Given these conflicting views of women as the less rational, more emotional sex, but able to score higher on tests of emotional stability, it seems obvious that further research on sex differences in emotional and social intelligence is needed. For example, it could be that the real factors responsible for any sex differences in EQ are social and personality factors that tend to correlate with sex such as gender socialization, sex/gender role orientation, and the Big Five personality trait of extroversion.

Sex/Gender Role Orientation

Jung (1959, 1960) proposed that the human psyche has both a feminine component (the anima) and a masculine component (the animus). “Androgynous” individuals are those able to express both the anima and the animus portions of their minds, Jung argued that androgynous individuals have better integrated personalities. Heilbrun (1973) revisited Jung’s concept that androgyny was related to better psychological health and argued that integrating both our anima and animus into our gender socialization should lead to a more internal, psychological balance. Bem (1974), expanding on this idea, developed an assessment tool, the Bem Sex Role Inventory
(BSRI) to identify a person’s gender role orientation based on Jung’s (1959, 1960) theoretical model. However, where Jung saw a continuum in his concept of the *animus* and the *anima*, Bem saw a compartmentalized separation in the variety of ways one may identify with a gender role (Bem, 1974). The BSRI self-report test instrument is used to classify an individual’s gender role orientation as masculine, feminine, androgynous, or undifferentiated. Since the 1970s, the BSRI has been used extensively in thousands of research studies investigating the role of gender role orientation in psychological well-being and life success.

The results of these studies have generally been consistent. Adolescent boys and girls who are androgynous have been found to have a healthier mental and psychological well-being than boys and girls holding more stereotyped attitudes (Markstrom-Adams, 1989). Adult men and women who associate with this type of sex role also tend to exhibit a healthy well-being (O’Heron & Orlofsky, 1990). Androgynous individuals, whether male or female, have been found to have the highest self-esteem (Flaherty & Dusek, 1980), more effective leadership capabilities including those abilities that coincide with effective leaders, such as extroversion (Hall, Workman, & Marchioro, 1998), and higher emotional and social intelligence (Guastello & Guastello, 2003). Markstrom-Adams (1989) concluded that the reason androgynous individuals, male or female, are psychologically healthier is due to the inclusion of masculinity as a component of their gender role identities, but obviously if this were the only factor then stereotypical boys and men should have been among the most healthy. Gender integration seems a more probable candidate to explain these results.

Nevertheless, there has been controversy in the literature regarding the explanation for the relationship between androgyny and self-esteem. Two theoretical models have been presented. Bem supported the model which suggests that the positive impact of androgyny on
self-esteem is because the person having an integrated personality “a la” Jung’s theory, i.e., integrating femininity and masculinity, is better equipped to deal with psychological conflict without the limitations of stereotypical expectations (Flaherty & Dusek, 1980). However, other researchers such as Kelly and Worrell supported the model that proposes there are coping benefits of an increased amount of masculinity in the gender role, i.e., self-reliance, determination, rational thinking, and emotional control. Increased self-esteem, in this model, is due an attitude of rational task-oriented problem solving combined with self-determination. Further investigation yielded results that paint a more complicated picture (Flaherty & Dusek, 1980). This line of research has indicated that degree of masculinity is related to self-esteem for males, while the integration of both masculinity and femininity is what correlates with self-esteem in females. Since masculine traits and feminine traits are often opposite strategies, one might predict that this second model would argue that androgynous males should be more conflicted than stereotyped males and, thus, have lower self-esteem.

However, that is not what has been generally found. Androgynous individuals, male or female, have been found to be more able to regulate their behaviors to match the situational context (Bem, 1975). Guastello and Guastello (2003) examined androgyny, gender role behavior, and emotional and social intelligence among college students and their parents. They found that androgyny was significantly linked to higher emotional and social intelligence for each group (mothers, fathers, sons, and daughters). Across all comparisons, androgyny was associated with higher emotional and social intelligence, which is directly correlated with self-esteem and psychological well being.

**Extroversion and Social and Emotional Intelligence**
Currently, the most accepted model of personality is the Five Factor model. The idea that all individual differences in personality can be explained by examining five personality factors was proposed by Fiske and also by Norman (Djuric-Jocić & Petot, 2005). The five factors in this model are: Neuroticism vs. Emotional Stability; Extroversion vs. Introversion; Openness to Experience vs. Closedness; Agreeableness vs. Toughmindedness; and Conscientiousness vs. Lack of Control.

To date, there has been much research applying the Five Factor model for describing individual differences in personality and relating these personality traits to psychological health, well-being, and success in work and life. Regulating mood and other determinants of emotional and social intelligence has been found to be positively correlated with extroversion. Extroversion has been positively associated with social understanding and interpersonal perception (Ciarrochi, et al., 2000; Davies, Stankov, & Roberts, 1998; Dawda & Hart, 2006; Newsome, Day, & Catano, 2000; Warwick & Nettlebeck, 2004; Wood, Heimpel, & Michela, 2003). Some of these studies have examined rather complex relationships. For example, Hall et al. (1998) found a significant relationship between Extroversion and self-esteem and suggest that those qualities are linked to leadership skills. Importantly, they also reported that androgynous individuals were high in extroversion and leadership skills.

The Present Study

Prior research has yielded a good deal of information about social and emotional intelligence. However, that research has not explored the potentially complex interrelationships between social and emotional intelligence and the factors of sex, gender role orientation, and the personality trait of extroversion. The present study addressed that gap in our knowledge. This study was designed to add to the research on sex differences in social and emotional intelligence
as well as to examine whether sex differences in emotional and social intelligence are influenced by gender role orientation and the personality factor of extroversion. Based on prior findings, I hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 1: More women than men would fall into the sex role category of androgyny.

Hypothesis 2: Those who fall into the sex role category of androgyny were expected to have higher emotional and social intelligence than those who fall into either the feminine or masculine categories.

Hypothesis 3: Those who are higher in extroversion were predicted to have higher emotional and social intelligence than those who are lower in extroversion.

Method

Participants

The participants in this study were 179 undergraduate psychology students from a medium sized private university in the Northeast. There were 41 males (22.90%) and 138 females (77.10%) in the sample whose ages ranged from 18 to 68 years, with a mean age of 20.20 (SD = 4.93). A majority of the participants were Caucasian (79.90%); 39.10% were freshmen, 26.30% were sophomore, 23.50% were juniors, and 10.60% were seniors. Participants were recruited using a convenience sample from an online undergraduate subject pool. Each participant received credit for participation in this study.

Materials

The materials for this study included questionnaires to measure sex role identification, emotional and social intelligence, extroversion/introversion, and to collect demographic information.
**Sex Role Identification Questionnaire.** The Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974) was used to measure gender role type: masculine, feminine, androgynous, or undifferentiated. The BSRI has 60 words listed in which individuals are asked to rate, on a scale from 1 (never true) to 7 (always true), how each word describes their personality. The words describe stereotypical characteristics of masculinity, femininity, or are neutral. For example, “aggressive” is a masculine word, whereas “warm” is a feminine word, and “tactful” is neutral. Using these examples, a stereotypical male would select a rating closer to a 7 for “aggressive,” a 1 for “warm,” and somewhere in the middle of the scale for “tactful.” Those who score high on masculinity and low on femininity fall into the masculine category, those who fall into the feminine category score high on femininity and low on masculinity, and those who score high on both masculinity and femininity fall into the androgynous category, those who do not meeting any of those criteria are classified as “undifferentiated.” A more recent examination of the BSRI since it was first developed showed that it is both reliable and a valid measure of masculinity and femininity (Holt & Ellis, 1998)

**Extroversion/Introversion Questionnaire.** This study measured participants’ level of extroversion by using the Extroversion/Introversion subscale of Eysenck’s Personality Inventory (EPI; Eysenck, 1964). The EPI uses a scale from 0 (introversion) to 24 (extroversion) to measure Extroversion/Introversion. For the purposes of this study, participants who had a score below the median were categorized as low in extroversion and participants with a score at or above the median were categorized as high in extroversion. The EPI consists of 24 yes/no questions such as “Would you do almost anything for a dare?” and “Do you prefer to have a few special friends?”

The EPI has been reported to have good internal consistency, test-retest reliability, and concurrent validity for each of the personality domain scales (Sato, 2005).
Emotional/Social Intelligence Questionnaire. Emotional and Social Intelligence was measured as the dependent variable in this study. A questionnaire was created by combining two separate tests for these intelligences: Howard Gardner’s Multiple Intelligence Survey (1983) and the Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i; 1997; See Table 2). Three of the subscales from Gardner’s test (interpersonal intelligence, intrapersonal intelligence, and existential/spiritual intelligence) were combined with 15 subscales from the EQ-i (emotional self-awareness, assertiveness, self-regard, self-actualization, independence, empathy, interpersonal relationship, social responsibility, problem solving, reality testing, flexibility, stress tolerance, impulse control, happiness, and optimism). The 30 items from Gardner’s test included statements such as “I get upset when other people get upset” and “I love being with other people.” Participants answered each statement with either “Y” for yes or “N” for no. The 60 items from the EQ-i included statements such as “I like to get an overview of a problem before I solve it” and “I’m fun to be with.” Participants rated how true to themselves a statement was on a scale from 1 (never true) to 4 (always true).

The Bar-On EQ-i has been reported to have good internal consistency and validity (Dawda & Hart, 2006). Its validity was tested by comparing scores on the scale with measures of normal personality, depression, somatic symptomatology, intensity of affective experience and alexithymia (Dawda & Hart, 2006). The subscales measuring the domains of intelligence on Gardner’s Multiple Intelligences test have been found to have good internal consistency, however the validity of the test has not been established and large inter-correlations between the subscales have been found (Visser, Ashton, & Vernon, 2006).
**Demographic Form.** Participants were asked to complete a Demographic Form which collected information on participants’ age, gender, year in college, major/minor, and ethnic background.

**Procedure**

Participants were recruited from a web-based participant pool and signed up for the study by appointment. Between one and seven participants were able to sign up for any given time slot. All participants were given an informed consent form to sign along with an unsigned copy to keep, and asked to read along while the researcher read it aloud. When the informed consent forms were signed participants placed them into an envelope kept separately from the study materials in order to assure them of their anonymity in this study.

Once consent was obtained, packets with the BSRI, the Emotional/Social Intelligence questionnaire, the EPI, and finally the demographic form placed in random order were distributed to the participants. Each questionnaire had directions for how to complete it and participants were asked to answer each questionnaire to the best of their ability and, on completion, to put their packets in another different folder, separate from their informed consent forms, to further assure them of their anonymity.

Once all participants completed their packets and filed them away, they received a debriefing form. Participants were asked to read along as the debriefing form was read aloud. The debriefing form thanked the participant and informed him/her of the study’s purpose which was to study the relationship between androgyny, extroversion, and emotional and social intelligence and of the hypotheses that androgynous and extroverted individuals would have higher emotional and social intelligence scores. Participants were also asked to please not tell anyone else about the study’s hypotheses and purpose. Last, they were given contact information
to use if they had any further questions about the study and contact information for psychological services in case they felt uncomfortable in any way due to their participation in the study.

**Design**

This study used a between-subjects, $2 \times 3 \times 2$ factorial design. It was a quasi-experiment. The independent variables were gender (male or female), sex role (stereotyped, androgynous, or other), and extroversion (high or low). The dependent variable was emotional and social intelligence.

After all data was collected, the BSRI scoring method was used to classify participants as masculine, feminine, androgynous, or undifferentiated. Participants were then placed into one of four Sex Role groups: stereotyped gender role category (masculine males and feminine females), an androgynous category, or an “other” category (masculine females, feminine males, and undifferentiated). The median split technique was used to divide participants into a high category and low category of Extroversion. Participants were then assigned to a Gender group (male or female). Participants’ emotional and social intelligence score was the dependent variable in this study.

A Pearson Chi Square test was used to test the hypothesis that more females would be classified as androgynous compared with males. A three way, Gender (male, female) x Sex Role (stereotyped, androgynous, and other) x Extroversion (high, low) ANOVA was used to test the hypotheses regarding differences in social emotional intelligence scores.

**Results**

This study had three hypotheses: 1) More women than men would fall into the sex role category of androgyny; 2) Those who fall into the sex role category of androgyny were expected to have higher emotional and social intelligence than those who fall into either the feminine or
masculine categories; and 3) Those who are higher in extroversion were predicted to have higher emotional and social intelligence than those who are lower in extroversion.

A Chi Square test was used to examine the relationship between gender and sex role in order to test hypothesis 1. A three way, Gender x Sex Role x Extroversion, ANOVA with follow-up Post Hoc tests was used to test the hypotheses 2 and 3. An alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical tests.

**Gender and Sex Role Category**

The Chi Square test on sex by sex role category yielded a coefficient of .20 which indicated that there was a significant relationship between sex and sex role category \((df = 2, p = .03)\). More females (26.81\%) fell into the androgynous category than did males (14.63\%) (see Figure 1).

**Emotional and Social Intelligence Scores**

The ANOVA results indicated that there was no significant difference in emotional and social intelligence mean scores between males and females \((F (1, 167) = .94, p = .33;\) Males: \(M = 265.63, SD = 20.63, n = 41;\) Females: \(M = 271.93, SD = 20.04, n = 138)\). There was no significant difference found between the emotional and social intelligence mean scores between the Extroversion groups \((F (1, 167) = 1.19, p = .28;\) High Extroversion: \(M = 274.94, SD = 19.44, n = 81;\) Low Extroversion: \(M = 265.11, SD = 20.11, n = 98)\). There was also no significant interaction between Gender and Extroversion although the result was trending toward significance \((F (1, 167) = 3.69, p = .06)\). The trend in the data is toward a difference between mean scores in females in the high extroversion group compared to those for the female, low extroversion group, but no difference between extroversion groups for the males (see Figure 2).
There was a significant difference associated with a large effect size found for Sex Role category \((F(2, 167) = 13.95, p = .001, n^2 = .14)\). A Tukey’s HSD Post Hoc test showed that the mean scores for the Androgynous group were significantly higher than the Stereotyped group \((p = .001)\) and the mean scores of those in the Other group \((p = .001)\). The mean score for the Stereotyped group was significantly higher than that of the Other group \((p = .04)\). The mean scores for the Androgynous, Stereotyped, and Other groups were 282.67 \((SD = 18.00, n = 43)\), 270.12 \((SD = 17.67, n = 73)\), and 262.60 \((SD = 20.83, n = 63)\), respectively (see Figure 3).

There was a significant interaction between Gender and Sex Role \((F(2, 167) = 3.09, p = .05, n^2 = .04)\). As can be seen in Figure 4, Sex Role category influenced emotional and social intelligence scores more in the male group than in the female group with males’ mean scores across sex role group showing greater variation compared to females’ mean scores. Males in the androgynous group showed significantly higher gains compared to their peers in the other groups than was seen for the female group.

There was also no significant interaction between Sex Role and Extraversion and no three way interaction between the factors of Gender, Sex Role, and Extraversion \((F(2, 167) = .47, p = .63; F(2, 167) = .37, p = .69;\) respectively).

**Discussion**

This study was conducted to examine the relationship between the factors of sex, sex/gender role, and extroversion and emotional and social intelligence. It was also done to examine whether the relationship that has been routinely found in prior research between gender and sex role still exists. Specifically, the study was conducted in order to test the hypotheses that: 1) More women than men would fall into the sex role category of androgyny; 2) Those who fall into the sex role category of androgyny were expected to have higher emotional and social
intelligence than those who fall into either the feminine or masculine categories; and 3) Those who are higher in extroversion were predicted to have higher emotional and social intelligence than those who are lower in extroversion.

The results of the study supported the first hypothesis in that a significantly higher percentage of female participants fell into the androgynous sex role category than did males. This finding is consistent with prior research. Female participants were also found to be more evenly distributed across the three sex role categories used in the study: “androgynous,” “stereotyped,” and “other” compared to male participants. The majority of males fell into the stereotyped category, i.e. met the criteria for masculinity on the BSRI.

The results of the study regarding the relationship between these factors and emotional and social intelligence yielded some significant findings. While there were no differences in emotional and social intelligence scores between males and females, or for those with high versus low extroversion, there were significant differences between sex role orientations and a significant interaction between gender and sex role orientation. Males who were classified as androgynous had substantially higher mean emotional and social intelligence scores compared to their peers in the other sex role orientation categories. There was far less variation across mean scores of each of the three sex role orientation for the female participant.

Limitations

There were several limitations of the study. The overall sample size precluded there from being an acceptable number of participants in all 12 cells. There were fewer male participants than female participants in the study. This led to there being very small sample sizes in some of the three way cells, e.g., only two males in the androgynous/low extroversion.
The majority of participants in this study were Caucasian and all were undergraduate students. The results of this study therefore cannot be generalized to other populations. Also, all measures of the key variables were self report. In particular, the measure of emotional and social intelligence was a self report measure that asked participants to make judgments about their own skills and how they think others perceive their emotional and social skills. It is important not to misinterpret these scores as objective measures but to view these scores as participants’ perceptions of their own skills.

**Implications for Future Research**

This study should be replicated with a larger sample and a sample that has an even distribution of males and females. Investigations of emotional and social intelligence should include studies of non-college populations and samples with greater ethnic diversity as well, to improve the external validity of the research.

As shown by the results, males who were found to have the strongest emotional and social skills were classified as androgynous. It is important for future research studies to determine the underlying causal relationship between male androgyny and emotional and social skills. Also, the surprising finding of larger distances in average emotional and social intelligence seen between each gender role categorized male, being more varied than those of the gender role categorized females, should be studied to look at underlying reasons for this variation when it comes to the male sex. This certain interaction may give insight to the real power our culture or societal moldings has on the male sex, the masculine gender role, and how emotional and social intelligence is understood or conceptualized by those within these restrictions.

**Conclusion**
The findings of this study confirmed that females are still more likely than males to perceive themselves as having the characteristics of the androgynous sex role. Since this sex role has been found to correlate with health and well being, it is important that we address the obstacles to the development of androgyny in males. Further, those who were classified as androgynous in this study had significantly higher emotional and social intelligence scores which is another positive outcome that can be associated with identifying with an androgynous sex role.
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Figure 1.

Results of Chi Square Analysis: Number of Males and Females who were Stereotyped, Androgynous, or Other

Chi square $x^2 = .20$, $df = 2$, $p = .03$
Figure 2.

*Results of ANOVA: Mean EQ Score by Sex and Extroversion Group*

Sex*Extroversion $F(1,167) = 3.69, p = .06$
Results of ANOVA: Mean EQ Score by Gender Role Orientation
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Stereotyped vs. Other \((p = .04)\)
Figure 4.

*Mean EQ Score by Sex and Gender Role Orientation*
Appendix A

Bem Sex Role Inventory

Rate yourself on each item on a scale from 1 (never or almost never true) to 7 (always or almost very true).

1. self reliant____
2. yielding____
3. helpful____
4. defends own beliefs____
5. cheerful____
6. moody____
7. independent____
8. shy____
9. conscientious____
10. athletic____
11. affectionate____
12. theatrical____
13. assertive____
14. flatterable____
15. happy____
16. strong personality____
17. loyal____
18. unpredictable____
19. forceful____
20. feminine____
21. reliable____
22. analytical____
23. sympathetic____
24. jealous____
25. leadership ability____
26. sensitive to other’s needs____
27. truthful____
28. willing to take risks____
29. understanding____
30. secretive____
31. makes decisions easily____
32. compassionate____
33. sincere____
34. self-sufficient____
35. eager to soothe hurt feelings____
36. conceited____
37. dominant____
38. soft spoken____
39. likable____
40. masculine____
41. warm____
42. solemn____
43. willing to take a stand____
44. tender____
45. friendly____
46. aggressive____
47. gullible____
48. inefficient____
49. acts as a leader____
50. childlike____
51. adaptable____
52. individualistic____
53. does not use harsh language____
54. unsystematic____
55. competitive____
56. loves children____
57. tactful____
58. ambitious____
59. gentle____
60. conventional____
Appendix B

Emotional and Social Intelligence Scale

Using the following 4 point scale, rate each statement in terms of how true this is of you. Please provide an answer for all the statements even if one or more seem silly or obvious.

1 = Never True if Me
2 = Just a Little True of Me
3 = Pretty Much True of Me
4 = Always True of Me

___ 1. I always ask “Why” rather than “what” or “how.”
___ 2. People often come to me to talk.
___ 3. I would rather go to a party or social gathering than sit at home by myself.
___ 4. I have hobbies or play sports that involve only me.
___ 5. I am good at debates and resolving disputes.
___ 6. I am fascinated by philosophical questions like “what is the meaning of life?”
___ 7. I often reflect on events and question what they mean.
___ 8. I like to learn about myself and my feelings.
___ 9. I see counseling and mediation as beneficial ways of self-reflection.
___ 10. I get upset when other people are upset.
___ 11. I am a natural leader and can get people to come around to my train of thought.
___ 12. At school, I really enjoyed sciences like astronomy and creation/evolution.
___ 13. I like spending time alone.
___ 15. I am a very social person.
___ 16. I can easily pick up on people’s feelings and body language.
___ 17. My friends think I think too much.
___ 18. I am in touch with my feelings and know how I would react in different situations.
___ 19. I value close friendships.
___ 20. I would rather work alone than as part of a team.
___ 21. I like watching documentaries on the great philosophers and philosophical debates.
___ 22. I am a bit of a loner.
___ 23. I think a lot about life and my future.
___ 24. I enjoy personality profiling tests and other ways of finding out about myself.
___ 25. I prefer team sports to individual ones.
___ 26. I regularly write in a personal diary or journal.
___ 27. People think that I crave attention and I seem to like the limelight.
___ 28. I would rather work as part of a team than on my own.
___ 29. I love being with other people.
___ 30. I would rather go somewhere quiet than go to a party or noisy bar.
___ 31. It’s fairly easy for me to express feelings.
___ 32. I’m in touch with my emotions.
___ 33. It’s hard for me to share my deep feelings with others.
___ 34. It’s hard for me to understand the way I feel.
35. I’m unable to express my ideas to others.
36. When I’m angry with others, I can tell them about it.
37. When I disagree with someone, I’m able to say so.
38. It’s hard for me to say “no” when I want to.
39. I feel sure of myself in most situations.
40. I lack self-confidence.
41. I have good self-respect.
42. I don’t feel good about myself.
43. I try to make my life as meaningful as possible.
44. I really don’t know what I’m good at.
45. In the past few years I’ve accomplished little.
46. I don’t get enjoyment from what I do.
47. I prefer a job in which I’m told pretty much what to do.
48. When working with others, I tend to rely more on their ideas than my own.
49. I prefer others to make decisions for me.
50. It’s hard for me to make decisions on my own.
51. I’m unable to understand the way other people feel.
52. I’m good at understanding the way other people feel.
53. My friends can tell me intimate things about themselves.
54. I would stop and help a crying child find his or her parents even if I had to be somewhere else at the same time.
55. I’m unable to show affection.
56. It’s hard for me to share my deep feelings with others.
57. I’m a fairly cheerful person.
58. It’s easy for me to make friends.
59. I like helping people.
60. It doesn’t bother me to take advantage of people especially if they deserve it.
61. Others find it hard to depend on me.
62. I care what happens to other people.
63. My approach to overcoming difficulties is to move step by step.
64. When faced with a difficult situation, I like to collect all the information about it that I can.
65. I like to get an overview of a problem before trying to solve it.
66. When facing a problem, the first thing I do is stop and think.
67. I try to see things as they really are, without fantasizing or daydreaming about them.
68. I have had strange experiences that can’t be explained.
69. People don’t understand the way I think.
70. I tend to fade out and lost contact with what happens.
71. It’s difficult for me to begin new things.
72. It’s hard for me to make adjustments in general.
73. It’s difficult for me to change my opinion about things.
74. It’s easy for me to adjust to new conditions.
75. I know how to deal with upsetting problems.
76. I believe that I can stay on top of tough situations.
77. I can handle stress without getting too nervous.
78. I don’t hold up well under stress.
79. It is a problem controlling my anger.
80. When I start talking, it is hard to stop.
81. My impulsiveness creates problems.
82. People tell me to lower my voice in discussions.
83. It’s hard for me to enjoy life.
84. It’s hard for me to smile.
85. I am satisfied with my life.
86. I’m fun to be with.
87. I’m optimistic about most things.
88. I generally hope for the best.
89. I’m generally motivated to continue even when things get difficult.
90. I generally expect things will turn out all right despite setbacks from time to time.
Appendix C

Introversion/Extroversion Subscale of Eysenck’s Personality Inventory

Answer each question as it best describes you with either a “Y” for yes or a “N” for no.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Do you often long for excitement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Are you usually carefree?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Do you stop and think things over before doing anything?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Do you generally do and say things quickly without stopping to think?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Would you do almost anything for a dare?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Do you often do things on the spur of the moment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Generally do you prefer reading to meeting people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Do you like going out a lot?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Do you prefer to have a few special friends?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. When people shout at you, do you shout back?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Can you usually let yourself go and enjoy yourself a lot at a lively party?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Do other people think of you as being very lively?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13. Are you mostly quiet when you are with other people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14. If there is something you want to know about, would you rather look it up in a book than talk to someone about it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15. Do you like the kind of work that you need to pay close attention to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16. Do you hate being with a crowd who play jokes on one another?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17. Do you like doing things in which you have to act quickly?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18. Are you slow and unhurried in the way you move?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19. Do you like talking to people so much that you never miss a chance of talking to a stranger?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20. Would you be very unhappy if you could not see lots of people most of the time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21. Would you say that you were fairly self-confident?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22. Do you find it hard to really enjoy yourself at a lively party?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23. Can you easily get some life into a dull party?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24. Do you like playing pranks on others?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Demographics Sheet

Please do not write your name on this form. It will be stored separately from any other information that you complete in this study and will not be linked with your responses in any way. The information will allow us to provide an accurate description of the sample.

For the following items, please select the ONE response that is most descriptive of you or fill in the blank as appropriate.

Sex:
__ Female
__ Male
__ Other

Age: _____

Ethnicity:
__ Asian or Pacific Islander
__ Asian Indian
__ Black/African American (non-Hispanic)
__ Caucasian/White
__ Native American
__ Latino/Hispanic
__ Puerto Rican
__ More than one race/Other (specify): _____________________________

Major(s): ____________________

Minor(s): ____________________

Year in College:
__ First Year
__ Sophomore
__ Junior
__ Senior
__ Other