

Development of Emotional Intelligence (EI) Scale for Students of the University of Jordan (UJ) and Verification of its Validity and Reliability at Jordanian Environment.

Abdullah Ahmad Hussain¹ and Mohammed Abu Shaira²

¹Special Education Dept , Arab East Colleges

²Special Education Dept, King Abdulaziz University

m_abushaira@hotmail.com abdkhater@yahoo.com

Abstract: This study aimed to set up and develop a Jordanian version of the (EI) Scale, and to detect the levels of (EI) among students of (UJ), and to find out the differences between participants' (EI) level according to some variables as: sex (male, female), age, school year, and the type of college (scientific, humanities). The study sample consisted of (156) students from the UJ (79 males, 77 girls) drawn from (4) faculties (two scientific, two humanities). The validity of the scale in its Jordanian version has been checked through the rate of arbitrators' agreement which was (9.9), and the internal construction validity by getting correlation coefficient between performance on all dimensions and performance on the total score of the scale. The results showed that the correlation coefficient between the total score of the scale and the score of each dimension has a significant difference at the level of (0,05). For the scale Cronbach's alpha result was (0.465), and Split-Half Method was (0.527). The study result found that The Students of the UJ have normal (average) level of (EI). There was no statistically significant differences in the level of (EI) among students of the (UJ), according to gender variable, with the exception of the fifth dimension in favor of males. There were no statistically significant differences in the level of (EI) among students of the (UJ), according to age variable. There were no statistically significant differences in the level of (EI) among students of the (UJ), according to the school year variable. There was no statistically significant differences in the level of (EI) among students of the (UJ), according to the college variable (scientific, humanities) with the exception of two dimensions (fifth and seventh) in favor of faculties of humanities.

[Abdullah Ahmad Hussain and Mohammed Abu. **Development of Emotional Intelligence (EI) Scale for Students of the University of Jordan (UJ) and Verification of its Validity and Reliability at Jordanian Environment.** *Life Sci J* 2013; 10(4):3684-3700] (ISSN: 1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 497

Keywords: intelligence, emotional intelligence, measurement, special education.

Introduction

The concept of intelligence is one of the most concepts that have gained attention of psychologists, in order to explore its nature and components. Based on many researchers conducted on this concept, it is found out that the intelligence consists of a set of components "capabilities" which were given different titles and kinds of intelligence, and it is from these components the term "Emotional Intelligence" has emerged. The term of (EI) was used for the first time in the study of Bar-on, in (1989) to gain a doctorate. He was the first one to build a tool in the same year to measure emotional intelligence. The book entitled "Imagination, Knowledge and Personality" written by Mayer and Salovey (1990), was the first real attempts focused on this subject. Daniel Goleman (1995) also published his famous book entitled: "Emotional Intelligence", which in turn contributed to the crystallization and spread of the concept.

(EI) is concerned with the ability of the individual to understand his emotions and the emotions of others, and how to evaluate or manage these emotions, which represents with IQ coefficient an integral form of our general intelligence, and perhaps this is why the educationalists examine in

their studies the nature of the link between intelligence and the positive emotional intelligence, and what is the relationship between the high proportion of the individual's intelligence and the extent of (EI) he has.

It is noted that the detection tools for students and individuals may have neglected to identify emotional aspects they have, so the efforts of educators have focused on building tools and scales to measure (EI) of individuals within different age groups, so the importance of this study is represented in the development of a scale to be used as a detection criterion for individuals and students in specific age stage and in undergraduate stage and beyond.

The Importance of The Study

The importance of the research is represented in the detection of the degree of (EI) of (UJ) students by providing a measurement tool to help in measuring it, and in identifying and diagnosing the strengths and weaknesses of their social and emotional skills. So, the importance of the study can be highlighted both theoretically and practically as follows:

1. Development of a measurement tool that has validity and reliability significances to measure (EI)of students in undergraduate level.
2. Revealing the characteristics of individual who is characterized by emotional intelligence.
3. Disclosure of the strengths and weaknesses of individuals with (EI)according to the eight dimensions of the measure, namely: emotional learning, positivity and negativity, mood, independence and dependency, energy and efficiency, leadership and dependence, independence, sentiments.
4. Providing workers in the field of psychological application with basic information about the characteristics of (EI) of university students, which help in the preparation of outreach programs or training courses to develop their emotional intelligence.
5. Classification of students into categories according to their (EI)and then try to set up appropriate psychological and educational programs for each student according to their needs and abilities.
6. The current study will help university management in the development of plans and to set up programs that take into account the students' social and psychological needs by education of skills and abilities of emotional intelligence, which in turn contribute to the development of the educational process in the university, and may help in reducing social problems among students.

Purpose of the Study

The present study aims to achieve the following objectives:

1. To find out the degree of (EI)of the students of (UJ).
2. To identify the correlation among the members of the sample with regard to (EI)in its eight dimensions.
3. To verify the validity and reliability significances of the scale in the detection (EI)of the students of (UJ).
4. Identify the relationship between (EI)of the students of the UJ according to the following variables: gender (male, female), type of college (scientific / humanities), age, school year.

Problem of the Research

Because of the lack of Arabic (EI) scales, the researchers have tried to develop this version of the (EI)measure, and by reviewing the literature on (EI)and measures of emotional intelligence, the problem of the study was formulated in the form of the following questions:

1. What are the reliability and validity significances of the (EI)measure in its Jordanian version?
2. Are there any statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \geq 0.05$) in the level of (EI)among the students

of the UJ according to gender variable (male, female)?

3. Are there any statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \geq 0.05$) in the level of (EI)among the students of the University of Jordan, according to the age variable?
4. Are there any statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \geq 0.05$) in the level of (EI)among the students of the UJ depending on the school year variable?
5. Are there any statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \geq 0.05$) in the level of (EI)among the students of the UJ depending on the variable of type of college?

Study Justification

1. Lack of Jordanian studies and research that have dealt with the (EI)and its measurement for the university students.
2. The limited number of available measurement tools and diagnostics in Jordan to measure emotional intelligence, with validity and reliability significances. In the knowledge of the researchers, this measure is the first in its kind in Jordan, which detects and measures (EI) of the students of the University of Jordan.

The Study Terms

Emotional Intelligence:

Bar-on defines (EI)as a set of personal and social emotional skills that affect the individual's total capacity to adapt to situations and environmental conditions surrounding them (bar-on, 2006).

In this study (EI)is procedurally defined as the score which the study sample member gets on the scale of (EI)used in this study.

Students of the (UJ):

They are students currently enrolled at the UJ– at the time of the application of the study-, and regularly studying in the faculties of: Engineering, Science, Arts, Educational Sciences (Education), and are still in the university.

Literature Review

Some researchers trace back the beginning of research in (EI)to the observations of Darwin, who noted " the importance of emotional expressions for humans and animals for survival and adaptation (Emotional Intelligence: the concept and theoretical background), but the real beginning emerged as a result of Goleman works in his book "Emotional Intelligence" published in (1995), which contributed to the wide spread of the concept, and showed the importance of (EI)in human life (Khadir, 2002). (EI)has many definitions where Bourey & Miller, (2001) defined it as the ability to understand and assess and manage our emotions and the emotions of others, while Goleman, (1995) defined it as the ability to understand and identify the emotions and to distinguish between them as well as the ability to

adjust and positively deal with them. And Mayer & Salovey, (1990) defined it as a set of presumed skills that contribute to the accurate assessment and expression of emotions of the individual and others, and the effective regulation of emotions of the individual and others, and the use of sentiments in planning the individual's objectives and in stimulating him to achieve them.

Bar-on, (2006) defined (EI) as a set of skills and non-cognitive personal, emotional and social competencies, which affect an individual's ability to deal successfully with the environmental requirements and pressures, and that these competencies and skills are factor compounds, and Bar-on has reached this definition due to his work as a clinical psychologist and due to his long clinical experience as well as his research and studies that began in the 1980s, (Bukhari, 2007).

Goleman, (1998) explained that the mental intelligence and (EI) are not contradictory as every individual has a certain amount of both of them, and it is rare that there is a person with a high degree in one type without the other (Jabir, 2004). In his theory of multiple intelligences, Gardner, (1983) considered the (EI) as part of multiple intelligences.

Importance of Emotional Intelligence

Goleman (2000) believed that (EI) is important in the success and progress of the individual in the areas of practical life, and has a prominent role in the individual's educational life, and it helps people to know and manage their feelings, and efficiently deal with the feelings of others, and that the most emotionally intelligent individuals are more able to feel satisfied with themselves and are characterized by efficiency in their lives, and most able to control the mental environment.

Salovey & Mayer (1990) believed that (EI) was closely linked to mental health, while Fahmi (1987) confirms that the most important functions of (EI) is guiding/orientation of thinking and allocation of capabilities that contribute to the problem solving, and (Salovey, & Sluyter, 1997) believed that individuals with high (EI) have greater ability to control their emotions and impulsivity, making them more tolerant, more understanding of the views of others, establish good relationships at work, and manage professional pressures, have greater ability to plan for the work, and they believed also that (EI) is a good forecaster for professional life.

Accordingly, the individuals with high (IE) are more able to comply with the changes that occur in their environment and more capable of success in personal relationships, and in building social support networks compared to individuals with low (EI) (Abu Zeid, 2009).

Components of Emotional Intelligence

We'll show some findings of the researchers on the components of emotional intelligence, as Salovey & Mayer (1990) identified four dimensions of emotional intelligence, namely:

1. Recognition and expression of feelings: includes the ability to recognize personal feelings and the feelings of others and the ability to express emotions accurately and in a socially appropriate way.
2. Clarity of thinking through the control of emotions, in which feelings become part of the cognitive process such as creativity or problem-solving or memory and decision-making, that is to say employing emotions to influence the clarity of thought processes and to give emotional atmosphere for the management of the feelings by the mind.
3. Understanding of emotions: This includes cognitive capabilities in the treatment of emotional information, and includes the ability to understand through the foresight of the relations between the different types of emotions, the causes and consequences of these emotions, as well as understand the emotions and the changes that occur at the moment of agitation of the individual and groups.
4. Management of emotions: This includes the ability of the person to regulate, control, adjust and direct their emotions in diverse social situations with others. This dimension is now taught in psychology as (Meta emotional) that is awareness and management of emotion.

But Golman (1995) divided (EI) into five dimensions, they are:

1. Self-awareness dimension: It means the individual's capacity to understand his feelings, inclinations and trends as a result of awareness and continuous, follow-up evaluation and direction of them.
2. Dimension of emotions management: This includes the individual's ability to display his feelings and express them in a socially acceptable manner far from provocation and roughness in judging the behavior of others and thus an individual's ability to control his emotions.
3. Motivation Dimension: The individual's ability to use and employ emotions to achieve goals.
4. Sympathy Dimension: It means the individual's ability to understand the feelings of others and respond to them with warmth and tenderness.
5. Social skills dimension: This includes the ability to deal with others in various social situations, and that means reciprocity in terms of listening and responding to others in a friendly and candid atmosphere.

Farouq and Mohammed (2001) said that (EI) consists of five dimensions, namely: emotional knowledge, emotions management, regulation of emotions, sympathy, and communication.

Models of Interpretation of the Emotional Intelligence

There are two forms of interpretation of emotional intelligence: the cognitive abilities models such as Mayer and Salovey model, this model discusses the cognitive aspects of emotional intelligence, such as: awareness and expression of feelings, clarity of thinking, emotions understanding, and emotions management.

And models of cognitive and non-cognitive abilities (mixed) such as Goleman model, which includes: self-awareness, motivation, sympathy and social skills, and Bar-on model which includes: personal intelligence competencies, intelligence competencies between individuals, compatibility competencies, stress management competencies and general mood competencies, (AL-Qadi, 2012).

(EI) Measurement

There are three methods for measuring emotional intelligence:

1. The first approach: measuring (EI) through maximum performance tests (Ability Measures). This refers to the direction of the real cognitive abilities owned by the individual related to emotion, and this model explains (EI) as ability. Mayer and Salovey are supporters of this trend.
2. The second approach: measures (EI) through self-report questionnaires, (Self - Report Tests), it is a trend that depends on the individual's self-assessment. Bar-on, Goleman, Singh and others are supporters of this approach. The researchers have adopted this approach in their research through Bar-On scale.
3. The third approach: the so-called Informant Test or observers Scales: in this method, evaluation is done by someone else and not by the individual himself who answers the measurement tool, and this method relies on trait models or mixed models of Bar-On, Goleman, Singh and others.

Previous Studies

The study of Beall, (1990) which was conducted on 34 male students and 33 girl students, of university students, indicated that the ability of males to express their emotions in the presence of an audience is larger as opposed to females who prefer to express their emotions in the absence of an audience.

The study of Vera & Betz (1991), which was conducted on 200 university students found a correlation between the satisfaction of university students about the relations between them and the emotional or sympathetic self-disclosure and self-

esteem, and that females are higher than males in sympathetic self-disclosure (emotional).

Swart (1996) conducted a study aimed to show the ability of (EI) test to distinguish between the academic performance of gifted and average students. The study sample was made up of (448) first-year students at the University of South Africa, divided into two groups, gifted and average students. According to the results of the first semester exam of the academic year for the two groups, there were statistically significant differences between the two groups on the total score of (EI) and its dimensions in favor of the group of the gifted students. The results also indicated that (EI) is an important factor in the prediction of academic success.

Mayer, Caruso and Salovey, (1999) conducted a study aimed to determine how the (EI) is fit to traditional intelligence standards, through the application of a multifactor measure of (EI) which they applied to (290) high school students, aged between 11 and 18 years. The study found that (EI) relates to realistic conduct of an individual, more than to his mental ability or personality traits, and that females are superior to males in (EI) in general, and the older teens, male and female, have higher efficiency in the (EI) than younger ones.

In the study of Martha and George (2001), which aimed to detect the effect of gender, academic achievement and race in emotional intelligence, where the study sample consisted of 319 students (162 male students, 157 girl students) in high school in Mexico City, the study concluded that the effect of the study variables in the dimensions of (EI) was weak, and that there was an impact of the variables of sex and academic achievement on only two dimensions of emotional intelligence: i.e. management and engagement in relationships and self-restraint, favoring males, and scientific colleges.

And (Radhi, 2001) studied the relationship of (EI) to gender and capabilities of creative thinking on a sample of university students consisted of 289 students from the fourth year English Department, Faculty of Education at the University of Mansoura (Egypt), of whom 135 were male students, and (154) girl students. The study found that (EI) among females was higher than males, and that the students with high (EI) are the best in innovative capabilities opposed to students with low emotional intelligence.

Ajwa's study (2002) aimed to find out the relationship between emotional and cognitive intelligence, age, academic achievement and psychological adjustment. The study sample consisted of 64 male and 149 female students from the Universities of Khartoum. The study results showed a lack of statistically significant relationship between (EI) and cognitive intelligence and academic

achievement, and there is a relationship between (EI) and psychological adjustment, and the lack of statistically significant differences between boys and girls on the three measures of emotional intelligence, and the lack of differences between people majoring scientific disciplines and those majoring literary ones on (EI) measures. The study also found a correlation between (EI) and educational level, and that there were significant differences attributable to demographic variables: gender, age and social status.

Karen et al, (2002) also conducted a study aimed to identify the relationship between (EI) and wit and the five personality patterns. The study sample consisted of 116 male and female students, and the results showed that there is a simple relationship between intelligence and emotional intelligence, and it showed as well that the dimensions of (EI) can predict academic success more than the conventional indicators of intelligence.

In Farraj's study (2005) about (EI) and its relation to the feelings of anger and aggression among the students of the Faculty of Education, Division of Basic Education at the University of Alexandria, the study sample consisted of 142 male and female students from the first year of the Division of Basic Education with (65) male students and (77) girl students). The researcher found statistically significant differences in feelings of anger and aggressive behavior in favor of those with low emotional intelligence, and statistically significant differences in feelings of anger and aggression in favor of males.

Zeidner *et al.* (2005) studied the relationship of (EI) to the achievement of the gifted students at the secondary level compared to average ones. The study was applied to (83) gifted students and (125) average students, the results showed that the degree of (EI) for gifted students were higher than those of average students in the total score.

Zoheily (2011) conducted a study aimed to identify the (EI) among the students of Open Education in sections of kindergarten and grade teacher at the University of Damascus and its relation to age, gender, academic specialization and the type of certificate. The study was conducted on a sample of (321) kindergarten students and (97) students from grade teacher specialty, and the results revealed a lack of correlation between (EI) and the variables of age, and the type of certificate, and the lack of differences related to the gender, but after deliberation in favor of females. Regarding the differences between students in kindergarten and students of grade teacher in emotional intelligence, the result of the study shows the lack of differences between them, only after dealing effectively with the other, the result favors the students of kindergarten.

In a study carried out by Rabih (2011) and aimed to identify the (EI) of students at some universities in the state of Khartoum, Sudan, the study sample consisted of 140 randomly selected students. The findings of the study showed that (EI) among university students was high and no statistically significant differences between the sample members due to sex, certificate or age.

The aim of the study carried out by Al-Qadi (2012) to determine the level of (EI) and the level of integration into the university, and the differences in (EI) among freshmen in the Faculty of Education, according to gender and specialization variable (scientific / humanities). The study sample consisted of 340 male and female students, and the researcher found in the study that (EI) was low among the students of the Faculty of Education at the University of Taiz, and there were differences in some of the components of (EI) between males and females, and no differences in emotional intelligence, according to the variable of specialization.

Alwan (2012) studied the relationship of (EI) to both social skills and patterns of attachment among the university students. The study sample consisted of (475) male and female students from the University of Al-Hussein Bin Talal in the Jordanian city of Ma'an. The study findings suggest that (EI) among females is better than among males, and (EI) among students of scientific disciplines is better than among the students of humanity disciplines, and there is a correlation between (EI) and the social skills and patterns of attachment.

Study Population

The study population includes all students enrolled in the UJ in the faculties of Engineering, Science, Arts, Educational Sciences, in the academic year 2012/2013.

Study Sample

The study sample was selected in two stages in order to match the objectives and requirements of each stage.

First stage: Selection of the sample according to the college (academic specialty), where the sample was distributed on four essential faculties in the University

of Jordan, two scientific faculties namely: Engineering, Science, and two faculties of humanities namely: Arts, Educational Sciences (Education), and the sample was selected by a class sample intentionality to suit the size of the sample in each class (college).

Second stage: selection of the basic research sample (students), this sample was selected

Study Tool

In order to achieve the objectives of the study a Jordanian version of Mark Daniel's Self-Scoring

(EI)Tests was developed to assess emotional intelligence. The scale which is originally a measure of self-esteem, aims to measure the (EI)of students at the university level and beyond. The measure consists of (8) dimensions with (12) items in each dimension. The items include phrases represent situations related to the individual's capabilities to understand himself and control his emotions, and the extent of his ability to understand others, and how he is associated with them. The respondent answers these items through options.

In its original version, the measure includes application and debugging instructions, but in a simple random sample manner, it's a sample where each item of the research population has the same opportunity of choice. The sample size was (156) male and female students at the UJ from the four above-mentioned faculties. Table (1) illustrates this. The manual doesn't include the psychometric properties of the scale.

Development of the Study Tool in its Jordanian Version

A Jordanian version of the scale was developed with validity and reliability significances suiting the Jordan Environment. The researchers have developed this version according to the following steps:

1. The scale items and the application and debugging guide were translated, and reviewed more than once to ensure the correctness of the language and grammar of the items, and to prepare a preliminary version of the scale.
2. The preliminary version of the measure was presented to (10) specialist arbitrators in measurement, educational evaluation, psychology and special education.
3. The items which were approved by (9) arbitrators out of (10) have been preserved, but the items that got less than (9) out of (10), here the observations and recommendations of the arbitrators were considered, and based on those notes the language of some items was modified and only one paragraph was changed, and item (5) of the fifth dimension was deleted, because it got a very low rate in the evaluation of the arbitrators. Eventually, the average agreement of the arbitrators on the scale was (9.9) as described in Table (2).
4. After giving observations of the arbitrators, the measure was applied to a trial sample of twenty male and female students, and the aim of the trial study was to identify the extent of understanding of the sample members of the items of the (EI)measure, check the clarity of statements of the measure and good wording of its items. After the application of the scale to this sample, the item was amended according to the students' remarks,

and based on that an (EI)scale for students of the UJ has been prepared in its final version.

The final formulation of the scale is of (8) dimensions, with (12) items for each dimension, (with the exception of the fifth dimension that consists of 11 items). The dimensions of the scale, are respectively: emotional learning, positivity and negativity, mood, independence and dependency, energy and efficiency, leadership and dependency, independence, sentiments.

Validity and reliability significances of the Arabic version of the (EI)measure for students of the University of Jordan.

To achieve the objectives of the study the validity and reliability significances of the scale were verified on the study sample students (n = 156).

Scale validity: in its final form, the scale validity was verified through:

1. Content Validity

The scale was presented to (10) specialist arbitrators in measurement, educational evaluation, psychology and special education, and table (2) shows the average agreement of arbitrators on the items of the eight dimensions. The lowest average agreement of the arbitrators has reached (8.88) on the fifth dimension, and the highest average agreement of the arbitrators was (9.91) on the eighth dimension which are acceptable averages. The arbitrators' comments have been taken into account in the preparation of the final version of the scale.

2. Internal Construct Validity

The internal construction of the measure was detected by calculating the correlation coefficient between performance on the dimension and the total score on the scale. Table (3) shows the correlation coefficient between dimensions.

It is shown in Table (3) that: the correlation coefficient between the total score and each dimension has a statistical significance at the level of ($\alpha \geq 0.05$). It is an acceptable internal validity indicator.

Scale Reliability: the reliability of the (EI)measure for students of the UJ in its final version has been verified in two ways: Cronbach's alpha coefficient method, and the Split-Half method.

It is noticed from table (4) that the values of reliability coefficient by Cronbach's alpha = (0.465) and the values of reliability using the Split-Half method = (0.527), which is an acceptable reliability indicator. How to apply the (EI)measure for students of the University of Jordan

1. The researchers explained to the students that the goal of the application of the scale at this stage is for research and scientific purposes only, and the information, data and results will not be displayed

to any party whatsoever, and it will be handled confidentially.

2. The researchers explained to the students that there is no one correct answer, but each student should choose the answer that suits his personality and what he does in real life, not what he loves to be, and if he feels there are more than one correct answers, he should choose the closest answer to him.
3. The researchers asked the students to answer all questions.
4. The measure was applied to the students collectively, in the teaching halls at the University of Jordan, and it was applied in each college separately from the other.

Correction Method of the Measure

The original version has been adopted in the correction of performance of the participants which was mentioned by the author in the original version of the scale, the scale consists of: (8) dimensions, with (12) items for each dimension, and each item has (3) choices for the answer, and the respondent has to choose one answer of the three answers, and the score of each dimension is ranging between (3) levels. The degree of (EI) is weak, ranging between 12-19 degrees

The degree of (EI) is average (Normal), ranging between 20-27 degrees

The degree of (EI) is good (high), ranging between 28-36 degrees and therefore each respondent can determine his degree, and recognize the level of his emotional intelligence.

Results of the Study

To answer the first question of the study "What are the reliability and validity significances of the (EI) measure in its Jordanian version?"

The study found an Arabic formula of the (EI) measure with acceptable psychometric characteristics (validity and reliability) as noted previously, and through the application of the Jordanian version to the study sample, the level of (EI) of the participants in the study was determined. table (5) shows the average of the whole performance on the scale.

In table (5) it is clear that (EI) for students of the UJ in general is normal (average) based on the scale validity evidence in its original version.

To answer the second question: Is there a difference between the level of (EI) on the basis of gender variable (male/female), the averages were calculated as in table (6).

To find out whether the differences between the averages are statistically significant, the (T) value of

independent samples was calculated, as shown in Table 7.

The results of T-test indicated that there was no statistically significant difference except for the fifth dimension only, in favor of males.

To answer the third question: Is there a difference in the level of (EI) among the students of the UJ according to age variable? To answer this question, the performance averages were calculated depending on age variable as shown in table (8). Table 8 shows the existence of differences in the average performance according to the gender variable. To find out whether these differences are statistically significant, an ANOVA was made as shown in Table (9).

Table 9 shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the performance averages on the scale depending on the age variable.

To answer the fourth question: Is there statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \geq 0.05$) in the level of (EI) among students of the UJ depending on the school year variable? Performance averages on the scale were calculated depending on the school year variable, as in Table 10.

There are differences in performance means on the scale depending on the variable of the school year. To find out whether these differences are statistically significant differences between the performance means depending on the school year variable, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was carried out as in Table (11).

Average performance based on the school year variable and there is no statistically significant difference.

To answer the fifth question:

Is there a difference in the level of (EI) among the students of the UJ according to the variable of faculty type? To answer this question, the performance means were calculated depending on the variable of faculty type as in table (12).

According to table 12, there is a difference in the performance means on the scale depending on the variable of the college type. To find out whether these differences are statistically significant, the (t) value of independent samples was calculated as in table (13).

The results in Table (13) show a statistically significant difference in performance on the scale depending on distribution of the total score over the fifth and seventh dimensions only, favoring students of humanities.

Table (1): sample size and characteristics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Sex	Male	79	50.6	50.6	50.6
	Female	77	49.4	49.4	100.0
	Total	156	100.0	100.0	
College	Scientific	84	53.8	53.8	53.8
	Humanities	72	46.2	46.2	100.0
	Total	156	100.0	100.0	
Academic achievement	Excellent	26	16.7	16.7	16.7
	Very good	20	12.8	12.8	29.5
	Good	77	49.4	49.4	78.8
	Pass	33	21.2	21.2	100.0
	Total	156	100.0	100.0	
Age	under 19	2	1.3	1.3	1.3
	19-20	46	29.5	29.5	30.8
	21-22	80	51.3	51.3	82.1
	Over 22	28	17.9	17.9	100
	Total	156	100	100	
Academic year	First year	3	1.9	1.9	1.9
	second year	52	33.3	33.3	35.3
	third year	53	34.0	34.0	69.2
	Fourth year	42	26.9	26.9	96.2
	Fifth year	6	3.8	3.8	100.0
	Total	156	100.0	100.0	

Table (2): the proportion of arbitrators' agreement on the items

D	I	Av	D	I	Av	D	I	Av	D	I	Av
Emotional learning	1	10	Positivity and negativity	1	9	mood	1	10	Independency and dependence	1	10
	2	10		2	10		2	10		2	9
	3	10		3	10		3	10		3	10
	4	9		4	10		4	9		4	10
	5	10		5	10		5	9		5	10
	6	10		6	10		6	10		6	10
	7	10		7	9		7	10		7	10
	8	9		8	10		8	10		8	9
	9	10		9	10		9	10		9	10
	10	9		10	10		10	10		10	10
	11	9		11	9		11	10		11	9
	12	9		12	10		12	10		12	9
	T	115		T	117		T	118		T	116
M	9.54	M	9.75	M	9.83	M	9.66				
Energy and efficiency	1	9	Leadership and dependency	1	9	independency	1	10	Sentiments	1	10
	2	9		2	8		2	10		2	10
	3	9		3	10		3	9		3	10
	4	10		4	10		4	10		4	10
	5	3		5	10		5	10		5	10
	6	9		6	10		6	9		6	10
	7	10		7	10		7	10		7	10
	8	9		8	10		8	10		8	10
	9	9		9	10		9	10		9	10
	10	9		10	9		10	9		10	10
	11	9		11	10		11	9		11	10
	12	9		12	10		12	9		12	10
	total	104		total	116		total	115		Total	119
M	8.66	M	9.66	M	9.58	M	9.91				

Table 3: The correlation coefficient between performance on the dimension and the total score on the scale

Dimension		Total score on the scale
The score on the first dimension (emotional learning)	Pearson Correlation	.216(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.007
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	495.577
	Covariance	3.197
	N	156
The score on the second dimension (positivity and negativity)	Pearson Correlation	.406(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	1058.33
	Covariance	6.828
	N	156
The score on the third dimension (mood)	Pearson Correlation	.406(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	1059.44
	Covariance	6.835
	N	156
The score on the fourth dimension (independency and dependency)	Pearson Correlation	.425(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	1688.73
	Covariance	10.895
	N	156
The score on the fifth dimension (energy and efficiency)	Pearson Correlation	.290(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	741.712
	Covariance	4.785
	N	156
The score on the six dimension (leadership and dependency)	Pearson Correlation	.394(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	1176.9
	Covariance	7.593
	N	156
The score on the seventh dimension (independency)	Pearson Correlation	.381(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	1010.67
	Covariance	6.52
	N	156
The score on the eighth dimension (sentiments)	Pearson Correlation	.486(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	1548.79
	Covariance	9.992
	N	156

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table (4) shows the values of reliability coefficients by Cronbach's alpha and the Split-Half method.

Cronbach's Alpha	Part 1	Value	0.336
		N of Items	5(a)
	Part 2	Value	0.539
		N of Items	4(b)
	Total N of Items		9
Correlation Between Forms			0.465
Spearman-Brown Coefficient	Equal Length		0.635
	Unequal Length		0.637
Guttman Split-Half Coefficient			0.572

Table 5: average intelligence of the whole performance of the students on the dimensions of the scale

Dimension	Average performance	Performance rating based on the evidence scale
1.	21.39	average
2.	24.98	average
3.	24.99354	average
4.	23.85897	average
5.	20.46793	average
6.	22.71154	average
7.	25.0192	average
8.	25.01921	average

Table 6: Average (EI) according to the gender variable (Male/Female)

gender		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
the score on the first dimension	male	79	21.43	1.97214	0.22188
	Female	77	21.36	1.9729	0.22483
the score on the second dimension	male	79	25.2	2.27235	0.25566
	Female	77	24.75	2.20141	0.25087
the score on the third dimension	Male	79	25.22	2.26992	0.25539
	Female	77	24.75	2.20141	0.25087
the score on the fourth dimension	male	79	23.86	2.47414	0.27836
	Female	77	23.85	4.1761	0.47591
the score on the fifth dimension	Male	79	20.53	1.96009	0.22053
	Female	77	20.4	2.42389	0.27623
the score on the sixth dimension	male	79	22.02	2.4336	0.2738
	Female	77	23.41	2.5254	0.2878
the score on the seventh dimension	Male	79	24.78	2.25133	0.25329
	Female	77	25.25	2.29647	0.26171
the score on the eighth dimension	male	79	25.4	2.70099	0.30389
	Female	77	25.32	2.78833	0.31776
the total score of the scale	male	79	188.74	7.187	0.8086
	Female	77	190.15	7.81036	0.89007

Table (7): (T) value of independent samples of the difference between average performances on the scale depending on the gender variable

t-test for Equality of Means							Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		
95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		Std. Error Difference	Mean Difference	Sig. (2-tailed)	df	T	Sig.	F	
Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	
.69076	-.55728	.31588	.06674	.833	154	.211	.659	.196	Equal variances assumed the core on the first dimension
.69077	-.55728	.31588	.06674	.833	153.894	.211			Equal variances not assumed
1.15717	-.25860	.35834	.44928	.212	154	1.254	.811	.057	Equal variances assumed the core on the second dimension
1.15688	-.25831	.35819	.44928	.212	153.995	1.254			Equal variances not assumed
1.18209	-.23289	.35814	.47460	.187	154	1.325	.814	.055	Equal variances assumed the core on the third dimension
1.18181	-.23261	.35799	.47460	.187	153.996	1.326			Equal variances not assumed
1.08605	-1.07882	.54793	.00362	.995	154	.007	.333	.945	Equal variances assumed the core on the fourth dimension
1.09497	-1.08774	.55134	.00362	.995	122.883	.007			Equal variances not assumed
.82542	-.56733	.35251	.12905	.715	154	.366	.015	6.073	Equal variances assumed the core on the fifth dimension
.82761	-.56951	.35346	.12905	.716	145.974	.365			Equal variances not assumed
-.60591	-2.17462	.39704	1.39027	.001	154	-3.502	.727	.123	Equal variances assumed the core on the sixth dimension
-.60551	-2.17502	.39723	1.39027	.001	153.395	-3.500			Equal variances not assumed
.24438	-1.19424	.36412	-.47493	.194	154	-1.304	.284	1.155	Equal variances assumed the core on the seventh dimension
.24457	-1.19443	.36421	-.47493	.194	153.680	-1.304			Equal variances not assumed
.94861	-.78784	.43950	.08039	.855	154	.183	.801	.064	Equal variances assumed the core on the eighth dimension
.94899	-.78822	.43968	.08039	.855	153.491	.183			Equal variances not assumed
.96402	-3.78204	1.20124	1.40901	.243	154	-1.173	.561	.339	Equal variances assumed The total score of the scale
.96679	-3.78480	1.20252	1.40901	.243	152.202	-1.172			Equal variances not assumed

Table (7): (T) value of independent samples of the difference between average performances on the scale depending on the gender variable

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower
the core on the first dimension	Equal variances assumed	0.196	0.659	0.211	154	0.833	0.06	0.31588	-0.557	0.69076
	Equal variances not assumed			0.211	153.894	0.833	0.06	0.31588	-0.557	0.69077
the core on the second dimension	Equal variances assumed	0.057	0.811	1.254	154	0.212	0.44	0.35834	-0.258	1.15717
	Equal variances not assumed			1.254	153.995	0.212	0.44	0.35819	-0.258	1.15688
the core on the third dimension	Equal variances assumed	0.055	0.814	1.325	154	0.187	0.47	0.35814	-0.232	1.18209
	Equal variances not assumed			1.326	153.996	0.187	0.47	0.35799	-0.232	1.18181
the core on the fourth dimension	Equal variances assumed	0.945	0.333	0.007	154	0.995	0.00	0.54793	-1.078	1.08605
	Equal variances not assumed			0.007	122.883	0.995	0.00	0.55134	-1.087	1.09497
the core on the fifth dimension	Equal variances assumed	6.073	0.015	0.366	154	0.715	0.12	0.35251	-0.56	0.82542
	Equal variances not assumed			0.365	145.974	0.716	0.12	0.35346	-0.569	0.82761
the core on the sixth dimension	Equal variances assumed	0.123	0.727	-3.502	154	0.001	-1.39	0.39704	-2.17	-0.60591
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.5	153.395	0.001	-1.39	0.39723	-2.17	-0.60551
the core on the seventh dimension	Equal variances assumed	1.155	0.284	-1.304	154	0.194	-0.47	0.36412	-1.19	0.24438
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.304	153.68	0.194	-0.47	0.36421	-1.19	0.24457
the core on the eighth dimension	Equal variances assumed	0.064	0.801	0.183	154	0.855	0.08	0.4395	-0.78	0.94861
	Equal variances not assumed			0.183	153.491	0.855	0.08	0.43968	-0.78	0.94899
The total score of the scale	Equal variances assumed	0.339	0.561	-1.173	154	0.243	-1.40	1.20124	-3.78	0.96402
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.172	152.202	0.243	-1.40	1.20252	-3.78	0.96679

Table 8: Average (EI) according to age variable

age	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	the score on the first dimension	the score on the second dimension	the score on the third dimension
Under 19	2	1.3	1.3	22	27	24
19-20	46	29.5	30.8	21.36	25.43	25.34
21-22	80	51.3	82.1	21.26	25.27	24.59
Over 22	28	17.9	100	21.06	26.58	24.48
Total	156	100		21.39	25.36	24.99

age	the score on the fourth dimension	the score on the fifth dimension	the score on the sixth dimension	the score on the seventh dimension	the score on the eighth dimension	The total score of the scale
Under 19	188	27	22	188	27	188
19-20	191.67	25.43	24.98	191.67	25.43	191.67
21-22	188.19	25.27	25	188.19	25.27	188.19
Over 22	188.66	26.58	25.07	188.66	26.58	188.66
Total	189.44	25.36	25.01	189.44	25.36	189.44

Table 9: calculation of ANOVA to find out the difference in performance based on age variable

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
the score on the first dimension	Between Groups	3.634	3	1.211	0.309	0.819
	Within Groups	595.725	152	3.919		
	Total	599.359	155			
the score on the second dimension	Between Groups	8.07	3	2.69	0.53	0.662
	Within Groups	770.872	152	5.072		
	Total	778.942	155			
the score on the third dimension	Between Groups	8.205	3	2.735	0.539	0.656
	Within Groups	770.788	152	5.071		
	Total	778.994	155			
the score on the fourth dimension	Between Groups	16.518	3	5.506	0.468	0.705
	Within Groups	1786.38	152	11.752		
	Total	1802.9	155			
the score on the fifth dimension	Between Groups	2.583	3	0.861	0.176	0.913
	Within Groups	744.257	152	4.896		
	Total	746.84	155			
the score on the sixth dimension	Between Groups	43.262	3	14.421	2.24	0.086
	Within Groups	978.757	152	6.439		
	Total	1022.02	155			
the score on the seventh dimension	Between Groups	9.849	3	3.283	0.628	0.598
	Within Groups	795.093	152	5.231		
	Total	804.942	155			
the score on the eighth dimension	Between Groups	27.612	3	9.204	1.235	0.299
	Within Groups	1132.56	152	7.451		
	Total	1160.17	155			
The total score of the scale	Between Groups	142.996	3	47.665	0.843	0.473
	Within Groups	8599.49	152	56.576		
	Total	8742.48	155			

Table 10: Average (EI) according to the variable of the school year

Academic year	Score on the first dimension	Score on the second dimension	Score on the third dimension	Score on the fourth dimension	Score on the fifth dimension	Score on the sixth dimension	Score on the seventh dimension	Score on the eighth dimension	Total score of the scale
First	24.3	23.3	23.3	24.3	21.6	24.0	24.0	26.3	190.6
second	21.2	24.7	24.7	23.9	20.2	25.3	25.3	25.2	189.5
Third	21.4	25.1	25.1	23.5	20.4	24.7	24.7	25.6	188.5
fourth	21.1	25.2	25.210	24.1	20.9	25.0	25.0	25.2	190.9
Fifth	21.3300	24.9	24.0	23.7	20.3	25.0	25.0	25.4	189.2
T total	21.3974	24.9	24.9	23.8	20.4	25.0	25.0	25.3	189.4

Table 11: calculation of Analysis of variance (ANOVA) to find out the difference in performance according to the variable of the school year.

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Score on the first dimension	Between Groups	10.05	3	3.35	0.86	0.461
	Within Groups	589.309	152	3.877		
	Total	599.359	155			
Score on the second dimension	Between Groups	25.924	3	8.641	1.74	0.16
	Within Groups	753.018	152	4.954		
	Total	778.942	155			
Score on the third dimension	Between Groups	25.69	3	8.563	1.72	0.164
	Within Groups	753.304	152	4.956		
	Total	778.994	155			
Score on the fourth dimension	Between Groups	12.399	3	4.133	0.35	0.789
	Within Groups	1790.5	152	11.78		
	Total	1802.9	155			
Score on the fifth dimension	Between Groups	5.417	3	1.806	0.37	0.775
	Within Groups	741.422	152	4.878		
	Total	746.84	155			
Score on the sixth dimension	Between Groups	36.316	3	12.105	1.86	0.138
	Within Groups	985.703	152	6.485		
	Total	1022.02	155			
Score on the seventh dimension	Between Groups	8.858	3	2.953	0.56	0.64
	Within Groups	796.084	152	5.237		
	Total	804.942	155			
Score on the eighth dimension	Between Groups	8.748	3	2.916	0.38	0.764
	Within Groups	1151.43	152	7.575		
	Total	1160.17	155			
Total score of the scale	Between Groups	177.116	3	59.039	1.04	0.373
	Within Groups	8565.37	152	56.351		
	Total	8742.48	155			

Table 12: Average (EI) according on the variable of college type

	College	N	Mean	Std. D	Std. Error Mean
D1 Score	Scientific	84	21.7024	1.96217	0.21409
	Humanities	72	21.0417	1.92418	0.22677
D2 Score	Scientific	84	24.881	2.27297	0.248
	Humanities	72	25.0972	2.21493	0.26103
D3 Score	Scientific	84	24.881	2.27297	0.248
	Humanities	72	25.125	2.21351	0.26087
D4 Score	Scientific	84	23.869	2.56848	0.28024
	Humanities	72	23.8472	4.20483	0.49554
D5 Score	Scientific	84	20.2619	1.95811	0.21365
	Humanities	72	20.7083	2.43471	0.28693
D6 Score	Scientific	84	22.4405	2.6176	0.2856
	Humanities	72	23.0278	2.48926	0.29336
D7 Score	Scientific	84	24.7976	1.91871	0.20935
	Humanities	72	25.2778	2.62824	0.30974
D8 Score	Scientific	84	25.4524	2.63162	0.28713
	Humanities	72	25.2639	2.86795	0.33799
	Scientific	84	188.774	7.08528	0.77307
	Humanities	72	190.222	7.95626	0.93765

Table (13): (t) value of independent samples of the difference between the performance means according to college type

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	
D1 Score	Equal variances assumed	0.084	0.772	2.115	154	0.036	0.66071	0.31233	0.0437	1.27773	
	Equal variances not assumed			2.119	151.212	0.036	0.66071	0.31186	0.04454	1.27688	
D2 Score	Equal variances assumed	0.006	0.939	-0.599	154	0.55	-0.21627	0.36078	0.92899	0.49645	
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.601	151.461	0.549	-0.21627	0.36006	0.92766	0.49512	
D3 Score	Equal variances assumed	0.006	0.938	-0.677	154	0.5	-0.24405	0.36068	0.95656	0.46847	
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.678	151.485	0.499	-0.24405	0.35994	0.95519	0.4671	
D4 Score	Equal variances assumed	0.389	0.534	0.04	154	0.968	0.02183	0.54951	1.06373	1.10739	
	Equal variances not assumed			0.038	113.726	0.969	0.02183	0.5693	1.10598	1.14963	
D5 Score	Equal variances assumed	8.666	0.004	-1.269	154	0.206	-0.44643	0.35185	1.14149	0.24864	
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.248	135.835	0.214	-0.44643	0.35774	1.15388	0.26103	
D6 Score	Equal variances assumed	0.565	0.453	-1.429	154	0.155	-0.5873	0.41102	1.39927	0.22467	
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.434	152.32	0.153	-0.5873	0.40943	1.39619	0.22159	
D7 Score	Equal variances assumed	8.315	0.004	-1.315	154	0.19	-0.48016	0.36514	1.20148	0.24116	
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.284	127.86	0.201	-0.48016	0.37385	-1.2199	0.25958	
D8 Score	Equal variances assumed	1.314	0.253	0.428	154	0.669	0.18849	0.44055	0.68182	1.0588	
	Equal variances not assumed			0.425	145.593	0.671	0.18849	0.44349	0.68802	1.065	
Total score	Equal variances assumed	0.859	0.356	-1.203	154	0.231	-1.44841	1.20444	3.82776	0.93094	
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.192	143.58	0.235	-1.44841	1.21525	-3.8505	0.95368	

Discussion

This chapter includes a presentation of the study questions and answers, and the results of the study, in addition to the presentation of the most important conclusions reached by the researchers, and then the presentation of recommendations and proposals that emerged from the current study.

Discussion of the First Question:

What is the degree of (EI) of the students of the University of Jordan? to answer this question, the means and standard deviations of the (EI) measure were calculated.

The results indicated that the students of the UJ are characterized by an appropriate level (Normal) of emotional intelligence. the level of (EI)resulted from this study is similar to the level of (EI)among a sample of students of the University of Al-Aqsa, which amounted to (70.67 %), which resulted from a

study carried out by Jodah (2007), and it is also similar -to some extent- to the level of (EI)in a sample of university students in Greece, which amounted to (67%), which resulted from the findings of a study carried out by Tsaousis and Nikolaou (2005), which was higher than the findings of Al-Qadi's study (2012), on a sample of students from the Faculty of Education at the University of Taiz in Yemen, as it pointed out that the students lack the skills of emotional intelligence, meaning that they have a low level of (EI).

The level of (EI)in the current study is less than the findings of the study conducted by (Al-Masdar, 2008), on a sample of students from the third level at the Faculty of Education at Al Azhar University in Gaza, as it indicated that the level of (EI)at Al-Azhar University students was high.

The level of (EI) in the current study is also less than the findings of a study conducted by (Maktouf, al-Obeidi, 2008) on a sample of students of the first and fourth years in the University of Mosul in Iraq, as it indicated that the level of (EI) of students of the University of Mosul was high.

Discussing the second question: Is there statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \geq 0.05$) in the level of (EI) of the students of the University of Jordan, according to the gender variable (male/female)?

To find out the result of this question, the average scores of male and female students on (EI) measure and its eight dimensions were calculated, as well as the standard deviations, as shown in Table 6.

To find out whether the differences between the averages are statistically significant a (T. test) administered on two independent samples and a comparison was drawn between (Table 7).

The Table results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \geq 0.05$) for performance on (EI) scale due to the sex variable, and the findings of this study are consistent with a number of studies that focused on the measurement of (EI) among university students, such as the studies of (Shinawi Khalil 2005), (Mousa, 2005), (Jodah, 2007), (Rabih, 2011), Lindley (2001) and (Schutte, et al, 2001).

This result can be explained as the nature of the Jordanian university community and university educational life allow both sexes to express themselves and communicate with others, and provides them with equal opportunities for education and self-management, and to realize their personal achievements and ambitions, which is positively reflected in the development of (EI) skills for both sexes without any differences. Furthermore we can justify this result by saying that the (EI) skills are acquired learned skills, which the students gain through training, practice, and self-learning, and such skills do not differentiate between male and female, but they are primarily personal skills.

As for the presence of statistically significant differences at the level of ($\alpha \geq 0.05$) in the fifth dimension of the (EI) measure (the dimension of: power and efficiency), which is attributed to the sex variable, where the differences favoring males, and this result means that males are more leading and less dependent than females. This result coincided with the study of (Al-Masdar, 2008), and the study of (Fatt & Hiwe, 2003), which pointed to the presence of differences in (EI) in favor of males, and this result can be interpreted in the light of the emotional formation of males and females, as males may be more able to adjust their emotions and control their

reactions, and this helps them to lead and assume the presidency and leadership, in contrast to the women tendency of stepping aside, and that they cannot relinquish their passion when making decisions or when leading a group of people, and this is contrary to the male who can relinquish his passion during leadership and decision-making.

And this result is also linked to the nature of the upbringing of the male and female children in some categories of Jordanian society, which prefer to introduce the male to the audience and motivate him to the leadership and authority, and in return urges and encourages the female child to respect the leadership of the man.

Discussing the Third Question:

Is there statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \geq 0.05$) in the level of (EI) among students of the University of Jordan, according to the age variable? To answer this question, the statistical method (ANOVA) was used to find out the difference in performance pursuant to the age variable. Table (9) shows the average performance on the (EI) scale depending on the age variable. According to the table (9) there aren't statistically significant differences between groups in (EI) pursuant to the age variable, and this result is consistent with the study of (Rabih, 2011), and the study of (Harrod & Scheer, 2005) and it can be explained by saying that the study sample members are close in age, which led to the lack of differences between them.

Discussing the Fourth Question:

Is there a statistically significant difference at the level of ($\alpha \geq 0.05$) in the level of (EI) among the students of the University of Jordan, according to the variable of the school year?

To answer this question, the statistical method (ANOVA) was used to find out the difference in performance depending on the variable of the school year. Table (11) shows the average performance on the (EI) scale depending on the school year variable.

The table shows a lack of statistically significant differences between groups based on the variable of the school year, and the result is consistent with the study of (Rabih, 2011), which indicated no differences in (EI) among students of some universities in Khartoum State depending on the educational degree and academic level, and the result of the current study is inconsistent with the result of the study of (Maktouf, Obeidi 2008), as it indicated the presence of a strong relationship between the variables of (EI) and social adjustment of students (first level), at the University of Mosul (Iraq), while the relationship was weak between the variables of (EI) and social adjustment of students of the fourth level.

This can be explained that there is a lack of differences in (EI) depending on the variable of the school year, and the school year has no important role in the increase or decrease of emotional intelligence, and to socially succeed a student needs more exposure to the experiences and more university years, and their success emotionally and socially depends apparently on skills that are not directly related to the academic year.

Discussing the Fifth Question:

Is there statistically significant differences at the level of ($\alpha \geq 0.05$) in the level of (EI) among students of the University of Jordan, according to the variable of college type (scientific / humanity)?

To answer this question, the researchers used the (t. Test) on two independent samples, and Table (13) shows the differences and means and standard deviations and the (T) value of the scores of the sample members on the components of (EI) based on the faculty type variable (scientific / humanity).

The results indicated that there were statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \geq 0.05$) in the means of the components of emotional intelligence, according to the variable of faculty type (scientific / humanity), in the fifth and seventh dimensions only, while there is no statistically significant difference in the other dimensions. And this result is consistent with the study of (Ajwa 2002), and (Al-Qadi, 2012), while is inconsistent with the study of (Maktouf, al-Obeidi, 2008), which indicated that the relationship between (EI) and adjustment among the students of scientific specialization was weak, and among the students of humanitarian specialization was strong. This result can be explained that the environment of the UJ and the Jordanian society in general do not impose specific conditions to adapt and live with, based on the educational background of the student, but it may be on the contrary, as what is required from a university student to harmonize with their university environment and to coincide with their colleagues as well as the necessary skills they need to withstand the pressures and burdens of adjustment, all of this is not linked to the type of educational qualification and the nature of the university specialization.

This result indicates that the university with all its faculties do not offer programs and activities that raise the (EI) of students, and this was clear from the result of this study.

As for the presence of statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \geq 0.05$) in the fifth dimension (energy and efficiency), and the seventh dimension (independence), due to the faculty type variable, because the differences were in favor of the humanities faculties, this result means that humanitarian faculty students are better able to learn agitations and their organization compared to

students of scientific faculties. The reason for this may be attributed to the amount of time spent by scientific students in the achievement, research and study as well as in the scientific laboratories, besides the nature of the subjects they learn, as they study abstract science subjects, and purely scientific equations, and this is contrary to their colleagues at the faculties of humanities, who have a longer time inside the university to establish social relationships and communicate with each other, and the nature of the subjects they study, which are humanitarian subjects, associated with human life and self, and this provides them with better opportunities for self-understanding, sympathy with others, harmony and mingle with each other, thereby increasing their social effectiveness and self-independence.

Recommendations of the Study:

1. Strengthen (EI) among university students through training.
2. Create educational outreach programs for the development of (EI) of university students.
3. Conduct longitudinal studies of (EI) pattern through other colleges, and other educational stages, such as postgraduates.
4. Conduct longitudinal studies of (EI) pattern by the addition of new variables: such as the comparison between students of public universities, and private universities.
5. Examine the (EI) of the students of other Jordanian universities.

References

1. Ajwa, Abdel Aal (2002). Emotional Intelligence and its relationship to Cognitive Intelligence, Age, Academic Achievement and Psychological Adjustment among University Students. Journal of the Faculty of Education in Alexandria, Volume 13, Issue (1) PP 250 to 324.
2. Al-Masdar, Suleiman Abdel Azim (2008). Emotional Intelligence and its Relationship to some Emotional Variables among University Students. Journal of the Islamic University, Volume 16, Issue (1) PP 587 to 632.
3. Al-Qadi, Adnan Mohammed Abdo (2012). Emotional Intelligence and its Relation to the University Integration among Students of the Faculty of Education / University of Taiz. Arab Journal for the development of excellence Volume (3), Issue (4) PP 26 to 80
4. Alwan, A. (2012). Emotional intelligence and its relationship to social skills and attachment patterns among the students of the university in light of the variables of specialization and gender. Unpublished thesis. 2012.
5. Beall, Anne E. (1990) : How emotional are males and females around others? *paper presented at the*

- annual convention of the American Psychological Association (August 10-14).*
6. Fahmi, Mustafa (1987). Mental Health, studies in the psychology of adjustment, 2nd Floor, Khanji Bookshop, Egypt.
 7. Fatt, J. & Howe, I.(2003). Emotional intelligence of foreign and local university students in Singapore: Implications for managers. *Journal of Business & Psychology*. 17(3). 533-542.
 8. Gardner, Howard. (1983). *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
 9. Goleman . D (1995) *Emotional Intelligence . Why it can matter more than I.Q.* New-york, Bantam
 10. Goleman, D.G. (1998). Working with Emotional Intelligence. New York: bantam Books.
 11. Goleman, Daniel (2000), Emotional Intelligence (translated by Leila Jabali), a series of World of Knowledge.
 12. Harrod,N & Scheer,S.(2005). An Exploration of adolescent emotional intelligence in relation to demographic characteristics. *Journal of Adolescence*. 40(159).503-512.
 13. Jaber, Abdul Hamid (2004), Towards Learning Better academic achievement and better social learning and emotional intelligence, Cairo: Arab Thought House.
 14. Jodah, (2007). Emotional Intelligence and its relationship to happiness and self-confidence among the students of the University of Al-Aqsa. *Najah University Journal for Research (Humanities)* , Volume 21, Issue (3) PP 697 to 738.
 15. Jodah, Amal (2007). Emotional intelligence and its relationship to happiness and self-confidence among the students of the University of Al-Aqsa. *Najah University. Journal for Research (Humanities), Volume 21, Issue (3) 0.697 to 738.*
 16. Karen,v., Melanie.T., & Lolle ,S. (2002). The Relationship of Emotional Intelligence with Academic Intelligence and the Big Five. *European Journal of Personality*. Vol (16). P 103-125.
 17. Maktouf, Sabiha Yassir, al-Obeidi, Sirri Ghanem (2008). Emotional Intelligence and its Relationship to Social Coping among University Students, *Journal of Education and Science*, Volume 15, Issue (3) PP 337 to 362.
 18. Martha, T. & George, M. (2001). Emotional Intelligence: The effect of gender, GPA, ethnicity. Paper presented at the *Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association. Mexico city, November 14-16.*
 19. Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D., & Salovey, P. (1999). Emotional intelligence meets traditional standards for an intelligence. *Intelligence*, 27, pp.267-298.
 20. Mousa, Faten Farouk Abdul-Fattah (2005). Emotional Intelligence and its Relationship to Achievement and General Intelligence of University Students, *Journal of the Faculty of Education, University of Zagazig*, Volume 15, Issue (60) PP 105 to 133.
 21. Rabih, Anas Tayeb Al-Hussein (2011). Emotional Intelligence for workers in some universities in the State of Khartoum, Sudan. *Arab Journal for the Development of Excellence*, Volume 2, Issue (3) PP 58 to 72.
 22. Radhi , Fowqia Mohammed (2001). Emotional intelligence and its relationship to academic achievement and the ability to innovative thinking among university students, *Journal of the Faculty of Education*, Issue No. (45) PP 73 to 103
 23. Salovey, P. Mayer, J.D. & (1990). Emotional Intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality* 9(3), 185-211.
 24. Salovey,P. & Sluyter D. (1997). *Emotional Development and Emotional Intelligence: Educational Implication*. New York: Basic Books.
 25. Schutt, N, Malouff, M,Bobik, C,Coston, D, Greeson, C, Jedlicka, C. & Wendorf, G.(2001). Emotional intelligence and interpersonal relations. *Journal of Social Psychology*. 141(4).523-236
 26. Shinawi, Amina Ibrahim Khalil, Elham Abdul Rahman (2005). Relative Contribution of Bar-On Components of Emotional Intelligence Proportion in the Prediction of Methods of Confrontation among University Students. *Psychological studies*.
 27. Swart A. (1996). *The Relationship Between Well-Being And Academic Performance*. Unpublished master's thesis, Un. of Pretoria, South Africa.
 28. Tsaousis, I. & Nikolaou, I. (2005). "Exploring the relationship of emotional intelligence with physical and psychological health functioning". *Stress & Health: Journal of the International Society for the Investigation of Stress*. 21(2). 77-86.
 29. Vera, Elizabeth M and Betz , Nancy E. (1991): *Relationship of self-regard and affective self-disclosure to relationship satisfaction in college student*, ERIC Document Reproduction Service.
 30. Zeidner, M., Zinovich, I., Matthews, G., and Richard, D. (2005). Assessing Emotional, Intellectual In Gifted And NonGifted High School Students: Outcomes Depend On The Measure. *Intelligence*. (33) pp.369-391
 31. Zoheily, Ghassan (2011). Study of Differences in Emotional Intelligence among the Students of Open Education at the University of Damascus, according to some variables, *Damascus University Journal*, Volume 27, Issue (3 +4) PP 233 to 278.