

Emotional Intelligence, Personality and Self Esteem: A Comparison of the Characteristics among Two Categories of Subjects

Nurul Hudani Md Nawi*

Ma'rof Redzuan

Faculty of Human Ecology

Universiti Putra Malaysia

E-mail: nuruldin01@yahoo.com*

Abstract

The main objective of this cross-sectional study is to determine the differences characteristic between volunteers and non-volunteers in terms of emotional intelligence, self-esteem and personality based on four dimension aspects of personality such as psychoticism, neuroticism, extraversion and lie. Three sets of questionnaire to measure Emotional Intelligence, Self-Esteem and Personality were administered to 276 subjects. One hundred and sixty eight of them were volunteers and one hundred and eight were non-volunteers. Findings showed that there was no significant difference between volunteers and non-volunteers in term of emotional intelligence ($t=0.13$, $p>0.05$). As for self-esteem, there was a significant difference between the two groups, it was showed that the non-volunteers scored lower than volunteers in self-esteem, (meaning a higher level of self-esteem) ($t=2.67$, $p<0.05$). In term of personality as for psychoticism dimension, it was found a significant differences between these two group ($t=9.72$, $p<0.05$) indicated that volunteers have high in psychoticism scores (tough minded people) than non-volunteers. Whereas, in extraversion there was no significant difference between these two groups. However, volunteers have higher Lie scores than non-volunteer in personality that showed a significant differences between them ($t=2.34$, $p<0.05$). Moreover, for neuroticism, it was found a significant differences between these two group which indicated that volunteers have lower Neuroticism scores than non-volunteers ($t=-4.70$, $p<0.05$). The results also showed that emotional intelligence was moderately correlated with neuroticism, psychoticism, and extraversion. The results seem to suggest that people are in volunteer organizations due to having the required personality. It is not the case that voluntary activities act as a channel of their personality. However, on a practical note the assessment of personality in voluntary workers could possibly assist in enhancing for screening potential voluntary workers in order to ensure the effectiveness these services to the society.

Keyword: Emotional Intelligence, Religious Orientation, Volunteers

Introduction

A proper and structured management of voluntary workers in organizations is vital to ensure the effectiveness of these services to the community. Volunteers should be protected against too much physical and emotional burden. The tolerance towards the emotional aspects of volunteer work, in turn, can be influenced by a person's characteristics such as emotional intelligence (EI). The volunteers in an organized group, like other profit oriented employees, require appropriate management. As of the beginning of the 21st century, volunteer program management is only less than 40 years old (Ellis, 1985). The need for good management comes from the fact that volunteering can be cost-effective, but not cost-free. Effective management of the people in voluntary organizations can help minimize cost, and ensuring continuity of service. People do volunteer work in various ways. By pooling available resources, people can do much more than they can do alone. That is why there is a need to mobilize individuals in an organized manner. To manage volunteers professionally, much like the human resource department in many organizations, the volunteer organization needs professional input. In Malaysia, there are organisations that recruit volunteers.

These organisations' platform may be political, animal welfare, charity, health-related, advocacy, or sports. The existence of many volunteer organisations, however, does not necessary mean that all are functioning well. There may be organisations that exist in name only because of lack of volunteer staff. Therefore, it is imperative study such as this is carried out to help identify the factors that influence people to be engaged in organised voluntary activities. Wilson and Beville (2003) highlighted the need to screen volunteers for minimizing the risks, such as sexual abuse, for the recipients of the voluntary service. The authors put forward a model for screening potential sexual offenders, specifically pedophilia. The model does not explicitly state psychological variables as important criteria for screening. However, this does not mean that variables, such as personality, are not useful. The exclusion of psychological variables may reflect the fact that the model is based on another model provided by a law enforcement agency.

In the Manual of Eysenck Personality Scale (Eysenck, & Eysenck, 1991), dimensions of personality are reported to be correlated with sex and sexuality (e.g. attitude towards forced and unconventional sexual activities) and occupation (e.g. choice of leisure activities and types of occupational choice). So, it does make sense to at least investigate how personality is related to voluntary activities.

Volunteerism

Volunteerism refers to a “set of activities in which people engage, usually without pay, on behalf of others in need” (Wilson & Janowski, 1995). Other related words and concepts include pro-social behaviour, helping behaviour, and organizational citizenship behaviour. Another definition of voluntary activity is “any activity intended to help others that is provided without obligation for which the volunteer does not receive pay or other material compensation. Voluntary behavior is a type of prosocial behavior. It can either be spontaneous (as in an emergency situation) or non-spontaneous (as in organised or planned). However, volunteering is not at the same level of spontaneous helping behavior or other simple forms of civic engagement (Uslaner, 2002). Uslaner argued that giving to charity requires material resources. But, volunteering requires moral resources. This becomes the important tenet for discussing the relationship between volunteering and personality.

There are several functions served by voluntary activities (Clary, E., Snyder, M., Ridge, R., Copeland, J., Stukas, A., Haugen, J., & Miene, P., 1998). These include the following:

1. career – to gain experience related to one’s career
2. ego enhancement – to increase one’s self-esteem
3. ego protective – to reduce negative feelings
4. social – to strengthen social relationship
5. value expressive – to express one’s important values
6. understanding – to gain better understanding of a particular domain

The works done by organized voluntary groups are beneficial. They help to create a stable and cohesive society, add value to the services that government provide and promote good health and emotional well-being. In this study, volunteerism is defined as the involvement in activity that benefits others without necessarily benefiting oneself. Operationally, volunteerism is conceptualized as belonging to at least one formal voluntary organization. The length of membership and level of involvement in the organization are not considered.

Volunteerism and Individual Characteristics

Altruism is an important concept that has been studied in relation to spontaneous and non-spontaneous helping behavior. Other individual characteristics had obtained lesser attention. Thus, this study looked at other individual characteristics such as self-esteem, emotional intelligence, and personality among volunteers and non-volunteers.

Self-esteem

Self-esteem is one of the components to the self concept that Rosenberg defined as “*totality of the individual’s thoughts and feelings with reference to himself as an object*”. In addition to self-esteem, *self-efficacy* and *self-identity* are important components for the self concept. The authors posited that self-esteem can either be the attitudinal consequence of voluntary actions. As a dependent variable, self-esteem results from a successful action that benefits others. The helpers feel justifiably good about themselves due to their ability to leave positive effects on others. This is consistent with the empathic joy hypothesis for pro-social behaviour.

Personality

A common psychological explanation for voluntary behaviour is altruistic motive. This motive is exemplified in the Good Samaritan parable. The altruistic motive is often related to religiosity based on the observation that many world religions encourage selflessness and love for other human beings. Egbert and Parrot (2003) found that hospice volunteers and conventional health care organizations have different individual characteristics especially in dispositional empathy. The study of personality does not stop at altruism. Other psychological traits were investigated. According to Eisenberg et al. (1989) dispositional sympathy was associated with helping behaviour. Meanwhile, emotional intensity and regulation influence vicarious emotional responding which has been posited to affect helping behaviour (Okun et al., 2000). Among AIDS volunteers, dispositional helping influences satisfaction and integration but not duration of service, whereas greater motivation and less social support predict longer active volunteer service (Omoko & Snyder, 1995).

Emotional Intelligence

Salovey and Mayer (1990) defined emotional intelligence as three adaptive abilities namely the ability (1) to appraise and express emotion, (2) to regulate emotions, and (3) to utilize emotions in solving problems.

The first two abilities apply to oneself and others. Another definition contains an elaboration of the components of appraisal and utilizing emotion. Emotional intelligence is said to refer to “an ability to recognize the meanings of emotions and their relationships, and to reason and problem-solve on the basis of them” (Mayer, Caruso & Salovey, 2000, p267). Their model of emotional intelligence involves four branches namely ‘reflectively regulating emotions’, ‘understanding emotions’, ‘assimilating emotion in thought’ and ‘perceiving and expressing emotion’. Other models also offer different numbers of EI component. The model by Dulewicz and Higgs (1999) has seven components (self-awareness, emotional resilience, motivation, interpersonal sensitivity, influence, intuitiveness, and conscientiousness and integrity). Meanwhile, Bar-On’s (1997) definition of emotional intelligence includes non-cognitive capabilities. Bar-On’s Emotional Quotient Inventory consists of five composite factors (intra-personal, inter-personal, adaptability, stress management, and general mood) and 15 sub-scales.

Daniel Goleman helped to popularize the term emotional intelligence. According to Goleman (1995 & 1998), emotional intelligence is an important factor in determining personal success as a student, teacher, parent, manager, and leader. However, hard evidence on the link between emotional intelligence and leadership is sparse (Higgs & Aitken, 2003; Palmer, Walls, Burgess & Stough, 2001). This paucity can be attributed to, among other, the differing ways of conceptualizing emotional intelligence. Petrides and Furnham (2000) listed three main models namely hierarchical model, (cognitive) ability model, and mixed models (personality variables plus cognitive ability). It is in the same publication that Petrides and Furnham distinguish trait EI from information-processing EI. Therefore, we can measure EI as a trait or as an information-processing skill or a combination of both.

Researchers have reported studies investigating relationship between emotional intelligence and other variables such as problem behaviour among Malaysian secondary school students (Liau, Liau, Teoh, & Liau, 2003), smoking behaviour among adolescent (Trinidad, & Johnson, 2002; Trinidad, Unger, Chou, & Johnson, 2004), academic achievement, cognitive ability, and personality (O’Connor, & Little, 2003), stress and mental health (Ciarrochi, Deane, & Anderson, 2002), and emotional well-being (Schutte, Malouff, Simunek, McKenly, & Hollander, 2002). Emotional intelligence as a construct has been showed to be an independent construct from personality (Caruso, Mayer, Salovey, 2002). Those researchers used an ability measure of emotional intelligence and 16PF as personality measure. However, Higgs (2001) found a positive correlation between emotional intelligence and the function of Intuition, but not Feeling, in Myer-Briggs Type Indicator. This findings show that the relationship between emotional intelligence and personality is still far from clear. For the current study, the authors retained the original items for translation Malay Language. The translation work was done to suit the scale for the student participants and more importantly, for future use in the general local population. Therefore, the definition of emotional intelligence is the same as adopted by Schutte et al(1988) The construct is operationally defined as the score on the EI scale developed by Schutte et al (1998).

Study Objectives

The objectives of this study are as follow:

- a) To investigate the difference of emotional intelligence, personality, self-esteem between volunteers and non-volunteers.
- b) To determine the relationship between personality and emotional intelligence.

Definitions of Concepts

Based on the literature review and taking into account the objectives of this study, definitions of the main variables are defined. Both conceptual and operational definitions are provided.

Volunteerism

In this study, volunteerism is defined as the involvement in activity that benefits others without necessarily benefiting oneself. Operationally, volunteerism is conceptualized as belonging to at least one formal voluntary organization. The length of membership and level of involvement in the organization are not considered

Personality

Personality refers to relatively stable individual traits. It is not the same as cognitive or emotional abilities. Self-esteem also considered as elements of personality. However, strictly speaking, personality is operationally defined as scores on the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire- Short Form Revised version for Adult. The three dimensions of personality as measured by the EPQ are psychoticism, neuroticism, and extraversion. Another sub-scale of the EPQ is Lie which measures one’s social desirability in responding to the questionnaire.

Self-esteem

According to Rosenberg (1961), self-esteem is a positive or negative orientation towards the self. It is part of an individual's trait. It refers to the overall evaluation of one's worth. In this study, self-esteem refers to an individual's score on the Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale.

Emotional Intelligence Scale

Noting the "need for a brief and validated measures of EI based on a cohesive and comprehensive model of EI" (p. 169), Schutte, Malouff, Hall, Haggerty, Cooper, Golden, & Dornheim (1998) developed the self-report EI scale. The 33-item trait EI scale is based on the model of EI developed by Salovey and Mayer (1990). It was meant "to provide a solid foundation for a measure of individuals' current level of EI" (Schutte et al., 1998, p. 169). In their validation study, Schutte et al. found that their measure of EI correlates with other relevant measures of emotional intelligence. Modifications (changes in some items, addition of new items, and inclusion of item reversals) to the original scales did not improve the scale's internal reliability (Austin, Saklofske, Huang & McKenney, 2004). This study indirectly support the idea that response to the scale is not influenced by social desirability effect (which the Lie scale of the EPQ measures). For the current study, the authors retained the original items for translation into Bahasa Melayu. The translation work was done to suit the scale for the student participants and more importantly, for future use in the general local population. Therefore, the definition of emotional intelligence is the same as adopted by Schutte et al. The construct is operationally defined as the score on the EI scale developed by Schutte et al (1998).

Research Design

The authors opted for a cross-sectional design due to time constraints. The phenomena under scrutiny is observed among people of different age group at the same time. Only the survey method was used due to the fact that this study is a fundamental type of study. It is meant to be the foundation for further studies.

Instruments

The questionnaire pack comprises sections that measures demographic information, self-esteem, personality and emotional intelligence. All parts of the questionnaire have both English and Malay Language versions. Back translation method was used to ensure the accuracy of the translation.

Demographic Items

The respondents were required to answer questions about their age, sex, race, religion, marital status and frequency of involvement in planned volunteer work.

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale consists of 10 items for measuring global self-esteem. Five items are reversed scored (item no. 2, 5, 6, 8, and 9). In this study, respondents rated themselves on four-point scale: 1 (strongly agree) to 4 (strongly disagree). Therefore, the range of possible score is 10 to 40. For interpretation purpose, the lower the score, the higher the level of self-esteem. Reliability indices for this scale are high with alpha between .77 to .88. Meanwhile, test-retest correlations are between .82 to .88.

Eysenck Personality Questionnaire – Revised Short Scale.

The EPQ-R Short Scale for Adults (EPQ) consists of 48 items. There are four subscales of the EPQ, namely Psychoticism, Neuroticism, Extraversion, and Lie. The response format is 1 for "Yes" and 2 for "No". Later, for data analysis purpose, 2 was recoded into 0. The EPQ was translated into Bahasa Melayu by Rahmattullah Khan and Upadhyaya (1990).

Emotional Intelligence Scale

This part is the 33-item emotional intelligence scale (Schutte et al., 1998) that has been translated into Malay Language by the authors. The scale uses 5-point scale where "1" represents "strongly disagree" and "5" represents "strongly agree". Thus, the higher the total score, the higher is the EI. The original authors reported that the scale is unidimensional, reflecting a general EI factor (Schutte et al., 1998). However, in an exploratory factor analysis using varimax-rotated solution, Petrides and Furnham (2000) came out with four factors in which they labeled 'optimism/mood regulation', 'appraisal of emotion', 'social skills', and 'utilization of emotions.' With a more complex analysis, Saklofske, Austin and Minski (2003) suggested a hierarchical factor structure with a super-ordinate factor and four lower-level factors. They suggested that the scale could be analyzed according to the total score and also according to the four factors. [The items in their four factors do not match those reported by Petrides and Furnham (2000).]. The scale's internal consistency range from .90 to .87, and its test-retest reliability was reported at 0.78 (Schutte et al., 1998).

Procedure

The questionnaire packs were distributed to volunteers through contact persons in different organizations.

These contact persons then either collect the questionnaire on the same day or at a later date. The questionnaires were later returned to the researchers. These organizations are located in Kota Kinabalu, Sandakan and Tawau. Non-volunteers were sampled from the public in different locations in Sabah.

Respondents

There were 276 respondents who completed the study. All 276 questionnaires were included in the analysis. However, different variables were analyzed based on different *N* size, depending on complete answers given for each variable. Therefore, not all variables are based on 276 respondents.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using *SPSS for Windows 9.00*. Statistical analysis like frequency, mean, standard deviation, correlation and independent sample *t*-test were used.

Measures Reliability

Internal consistency is used as the reliability estimate for all scales. For this purpose, α -Cronbach was calculated and presented in Table 1. The measures were found to vary widely in their internal reliability, with Cronbach alpha ranging from .60 to .77.

Table 1: Internal Reliability (α -Cronbach) of the Scales

Measures	<i>N</i>	α -Cronbach
Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale	267	.75
Emotional Intelligence Scale	266	.76
EPQ-R Short Scale		
Neuroticism	263	.82
Psychoticism	263	.82
Extraversion	265	.69
Lie	261	.81

Descriptive Statistics Result

The descriptive statistics are presented to provide background information of the scales used and respondents. The analysis for the scales was done based on all respondents. However, the information about the respondents themselves was analyzed by groups.

Table 2: The Number and Percentage of Respondent by Sex

Sex	Volunteers		Non-volunteers		All	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Males	73	43.5	43	39.8	116	42.0
Females	93	55.4	65	60.2	158	57.2
Missing value	2	1.2	0	0.0	2	.7
Total	168	100.0	108	100.0	276	100

Table 2 presents the number and percentages of the volunteers and non-volunteers who are males and females. Overall, there are more females respondents. There are slightly more females (in terms of percentage) in the non-volunteers group.

Table 3: The Number and Percentage of Respondent by Race

Race	Volunteers		Non-volunteers		All	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Malay	10	6.0	34	31.8	44	15.9
Chinese	83	49.4	1	.6	84	30.4
Indian	7	4.2	0	0.0	7	2.5
Kadazandusun	41	24.4	39	36.1	80	29.0
Bajau	1	0.6	12	11.1	13	4.7
Melayu Brunei	5	3.0	9	8.3	14	5.1
Others	22	13.1	12	11.1	34	12.3
Total	169	100.0	107	100.0	276	100.0

From Table 3, we can see that the largest racial group among the volunteers is Chinese, while for the non-volunteers it is the KadazanDusun. There were no Indians in the non-volunteers group compared to seven in the volunteers group. The Chinese is highly represented in the volunteer group, but is underrepresented in the non-volunteer group. The reverse representation is observed for the Malay and Bajau races. These asymmetries make it hard to compare the two groups based on race.

Table 4: The Number and Percentage of Respondent by Religion

Religion	Volunteers		Non-volunteers		All	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Islam	16	9.5	77	71.3	93	33.7
Buddhism	41	24.4	0	0.0	41	14.9
Hinduism	4	2.4	0	0.0	4	1.4
Christianity	104	61.9	30	27.8	134	48.6
Others	2	1.2	1	.9	3	1.1
Missing	1	.6	0	0.0	1	.4
Total	168	100.0	108	100.0	276	100.0

The majority of the volunteers are Christians while the majority of the non-volunteers are Muslim (see Table 4). Again, asymmetry between the groups is observed. The asymmetry is even more noticeable than for race in Table 3.

Table 5: The Number and Percentage of Respondent by Marital Status

Marital status	Volunteers		Non-volunteers		All	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Married	93	55.4	68	63.0	161	58.3
Single	74	44.0	29	26.9	103	37.3
Widowed / Divorced / Single mother	1	.6	11	10.2	12	4.3
Total	168	100.0	108	100.0	276	100.0

As evident from Table 5, a majority of the volunteers and non-volunteers are married. However, there is a higher proportion of singles in the volunteers group compared to non-volunteers. Among the non-volunteers, the lower proportion of singles is matched with a higher proportion of widowers, divorcees, or single mothers.

Table 6: The Number and Percentage of Respondent by Frequency of Participation in Voluntary Activities

Frequency of participation	Volunteers		Non-volunteers		All	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
At least once a week	57	33.9	0	0	57	20.7
At least once a month	45	26.8	1	.9	46	16.7
At least once a year	33	19.6	0	0	33	12.0
Never	31	18.5	106	98.1	137	49.6
Missing	2	1.2	1	.9	3	1.1
Total	168	100.0	107	100	276	100.0

Table 6 revealed some surprising results. Among the volunteers, a majority were involved at least once a week. What is surprising is that 18.5% reported that they never participated in any planned voluntary activities despite belonging to a voluntary organization. Another unexpected outcome is observed in the non-volunteer group where one respondent reported having participated at least once a month. Data for this person is then transferred to the volunteers group.

Table 7: Range of Possible Scores, Mean and Standard Deviation for Age and Scales for Volunteers and Non-Volunteers

Scales	N	Score Range		Volunteers		Non-volunteers	
		Min	Max	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Age	167	-	-	35.05	9.86	38.52	15.12
Self-esteem	164	10.00	40.00	22.61	2.76	21.71	2.47
EI	164	33.00	165.00	127.84	12.20	128.05	12.54
Psychoticism	162	0.00	12.00	5.03	3.52	1.97	1.49
Neuroticism	160	0.00	12.00	3.95	3.12	5.86	3.35
Extraversion	160	0.00	12.00	8.31	2.41	8.11	2.78
Lie	160	0.00	12.00	8.01	3.48	7.13	2.56

In comparing volunteers with non-volunteers, the actual mean values for each scale do not reveal a lot of differences except for personality sub-scales. The non-volunteers scored higher on neuroticism, but not in extraversion, psychoticism and lie. The self-esteem scores for both groups are near the upper 50% of possible score which means they have a moderately low self esteem. Both groups are also moderately high in their level of emotional intelligence, scoring about 77% of the maximum score. Moreover, the standard deviation of scores in each group is about the same. This indicates that the emotional intelligence scores for both groups could have come from the same distribution.

Table 8 indicated that there was no significant difference between volunteers and non-volunteers in term of emotional intelligence ($t=0.13$, $p>0.05$). As for self-esteem, there was a significant difference between the two groups, it was showed that the non-volunteers who have a lower score (meaning a higher level of self-esteem) ($t=2.67$, $p<0.05$). In term of personality as for psychoticism, it was a significant differences between the two group ($t=9.72$, $p<0.05$) (volunteers have lower psychoticism scores than non-volunteers). There was no significant difference between the two groups in term of extraversion. Meanwhile, volunteers have higher lie scores than non-volunteer that showed a significant differences between them ($t=2.34$ $p<0.05$). For neuroticism, it was showed a significant differences between two group which indicated that volunteers have lower Neuroticism scores than non-volunteers ($t=-4.70$, $p< 0.05$)

Table 8: Independent Samples (Volunteers vs Non-volunteers) t-test Results for Scales

Scales	<i>n</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>Sig</i>
EI	164	255.89	24.74	0.136	.892
Self-Esteem	164	44.32	5.23	2.672	.008
Psychoticism	162	7.00	5.01	9.724	.000
Neuroticism	160	9.81	6.47	-4.708	.000
Extraversion	160	16.42	5.19	0.616	.538
Lie	160	15.14	6.04	2.341	.020

$p>.05$

As for the relationship between personality and emotional intelligence, Neuroticism scores and emotional intelligence scores are negatively correlated. It means that the higher someone's emotional intelligence, the less neurotic he or she is. Then, psychoticism scores and emotional intelligence scores are also negatively correlated. It indicates that people high in emotional intelligence are less likely to show psychoticism characteristics. Meanwhile, extraversion scores and emotional intelligence scores are correlated positively. The higher the respondents' level of emotional intelligence, the more extraverted he or she is. Only personality dimension (lie scores and emotional intelligence scores are not correlated) is supported.

Table 9: Correlations between dimension of personality and emotional intelligence for Volunteers and Non-volunteers

Variable	N	Correlation (r)	Sig.
Psychoticism	162	-.191*	.032
Neuroticism	160	-.238**	.001
Extraversion	160	.190*	.000
Lie	160	.038	.161

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

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

Discussion

Self-esteem level was found to be higher among non-volunteers than volunteers. This could mean volunteers either start with a lower self-esteem, or the voluntary activities led to a decrease in self-esteem. If we take the former, then the results of this study lends support to the empathic joy hypothesis where "a helper responds to the needs of a victim because he or she wants to accomplish something, and interpersonal accomplishment is rewarding" (Baron, Byrne, & Branscombe, 2006). According to this hypothesis, people are motivated to participate in voluntary activities partly due to the anticipated positive effect it has. An increase in self-esteem is a possible reward for the volunteers. This explanation relates well with the enhancement function of volunteering as described by Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen, and Miene (1998). According to these authors, the enhancement function refers to the psychological benefits such as feeling good about oneself – which is very much related to self-esteem.

In term of personality, the volunteers are more tough-minded than the non-volunteers. In fact, this is the most obvious personality difference among the two groups. Perhaps psychoticism can be the single personality dimension that needs to be measured when studying volunteers. The differences between the two groups on other personality dimensions are as expected. Volunteers were more emotionally stable and more affected by the social desirability effect. No difference was observed on the Extraversion dimension. Perhaps participation in voluntary activities better fits existing traits rather than reinforcing existing traits. In other words, tough minded people (who scored high on Psychoticism) are better suited as volunteers.

That is why we observe a significant difference between the two groups. Voluntary activities certainly provide channels for Extraverts to fulfil their desires, but it is only one type of activities. There are other activities that can reinforce the tendencies of Extraverts. That is why we do not observe the difference between the two groups on Extraversion. Overall, the sub-scales mean scores of both volunteers and non-volunteers are lower than that reported by Upadhyaya and Rahmatullah Khan (1990) except for neuroticism among volunteers. This is consistent with the trend for the score across age group. Upadhyaya and Rahmatullah's subjects are younger ($M=22.37$ for males and $M=22.12$ for females) compared to this study's subjects ($M=35.05$). However, it should be noted the Upadhyaya and Rahmatullah used a version of the questionnaire that has 90 items. The mean scores found in this study are closer to the scores reported in the Eysenck Personality Scale (EPS) manual. Direct comparison to the EPS' norm is not possible due to small numbers of subjects in each age-group category. Looking at the mean scores for subjects in the 31 to 40 age group, it can be said that the present samples scored lower for psychoticism (non-volunteers only) and neuroticism (volunteers only). The non-volunteers' neuroticism score is comparable to the norm. For other sub-scales, the volunteers and non-volunteers scored higher than the norm.

As for emotional intelligence, no difference was observed between volunteers and non-volunteers. It shows that both group felt justifiably good about their emotion such as have the ability to recognize emotion in their relationship with others and able to leave positive effect on others. This is consistent the empathic joy hypothesis for pro-social behaviour. However this results inconsistent to the study by Salovey and Meyer (1990) show that emotional intelligence is a critical component of successful outcomes in organization management especially for the volunteer works. This support by Goleman (1995) claimed that emotional intelligence is at least as important as IQ in predicting various forms of success and determine personal success as a social worker, student, teacher and manager. Rosenthal (1977) reports that the ability to identify people's emotion, i.e. empathy, contributes positively to one's professional and social success. Similarly, Bachman (1988) reports in a study that most effective leaders in the US Navy are warmer, more outgoing, emotionally expressive, dramatic and sociable. Thus, looking at the finding of these studies, it can be concluded that emotional intelligence and its competencies certainly augment people's performance in organisational lives especially voluntary work. It does not seem that the EI measure can discriminate volunteers from non-volunteers. Thus, the importance of EI training for volunteers has not been realized from this study.

As for correlation analysis, emotional intelligence correlated with all dimension of personality but not for the Lie scale. This means the subjects was not affected by the social desirability scale. People high in EI are more tough minded, more emotionally stable, and outward oriented. This indicates that emotional intelligence goes hand in hand with other positive traits. The strongest correlation is observed for Extraversion. Perhaps some items in the EI scale also measure extraversion. The results also suggest the particular measure of EI (Schutte et al., 1998) reflects emotional intelligence as a trait. This is in contrast with findings by Caruso et al. (2002) where EI is found to be an independent construct from personality. It is possible that the independence is observed because Caruso et al. used an ability based measure of EI. On the other hand, in a discriminant validity study conducted by Schutte et al. (1998), their EI measure did not correlate with the big five personality measures except for openness to experience. Nevertheless, the validation study was conducted on 23 college students whose average age is lower than the present sample. The results obtained by Schutte et al. (1998) could have been obtained due to the narrow range of data. Therefore, we might still conclude that the connection between personality and emotional intelligence depends on the type of measure used.

Conclusion

Self-esteem of volunteers is marginally lower than non-volunteers. Overall, the participants have high self-esteem. However, the result is inconclusive due to the low internal reliability index for the measure. Moreover, the role of self-esteem in volunteerism is not clear. Self-esteem can be either an input or output variable to voluntary behaviour. Non-volunteers scored marginally higher on the emotional intelligence scale. Thus, both self-esteem and emotional intelligence are found to be lower in the volunteers. The explanation for these findings should await further research, most suitably of longitudinal nature. The EI scale itself appears to be suited for the Malaysian population, having sufficient internal consistency and producing comparable results with population in a different country. Personality does serve as a useful measure with psychoticism being the most obvious dimension on which volunteers and non-volunteers differ. The results seem to suggest that people are in volunteer organizations due to having the required personality. It is not the case that voluntary activities act as a channel of their personality. To borrow the religious orientation taxonomy, the participants in this study have an intrinsic orientation towards volunteering. They volunteer because it is their calling – due to the way they are built.

They do not become volunteers for extrinsic rewards. Even though they are extraverts, they do not join volunteer organizations to reap rewards from the social opportunities available in the organizations. In short, personality trait, such as measured by the EPQ, is a more useful measure for differentiating volunteers from non-volunteers. Self-esteem and emotional intelligence are less useful in the sense that they do not discriminate much, and the direction of discrimination is the opposite of expected. Emotional intelligence as a concept should not be discarded as a psychological variable that is important in understanding volunteerism. What researchers need to do is use an ability based measure of EI or other such measures that conceptualize EI as a cognitive ability, and not trait. The importance of measuring extrinsic religious orientation separately for the personal and social dimensions is highlighted in this study. This separation can resolve some inconsistency in the data regarding the relationship of religious orientation and other psychological variables. Contrary to expectation, personality (except for the lie scale) and EI are correlated. The correlation could have been due to the nature of the EI measure that measure emotional intelligence as trait, rather than cognitive ability. In conclusion, there is a fertile ground for conducting research on volunteerism from the psychological perspective. More research needs to be done to understand why Malaysians participate and, just as important, not participate in planned voluntary activities. We need more volunteers to contribute to the realization of the caring society vision.

REFERENCES

- Baron, A.R., Byrne, D. & Branscombe, N.R. (2006). *Social psychology*. 11th ed. Pearson Education, Inc: Boston.
- Bachman, W. (1988). Nice guys finish first: A SYMLOG analysis of US Naval Commands. In R.B. Polley (Eds.), *The SYMLOG practitioner: Application of small group research*. New York: Praeger. Praeger.
- Batson, C.D., Floyd, R.B., Meyer, J.M., & Winner, A.L. (1999). "And who is my neighbour?:" Intrinsic religion as a source of universal compassion. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 38(4), 445-457.
- Batson, C.D., & Schoenrade, P.A. (1991). Measuring religion as quest: 1) validity concerns. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 30, 416-429.
- Batson, C.D., & Schoenrade, P.A. (1991). Measuring religion as quest: 1) reliability concerns. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 30, 430-447.
- Ciarrochi, J.V., Deane, F.P., & Anderson, S. (2002). Emotional intelligence moderates the relationship between stress and mental health. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 32, 197-209.
- Clary, E., Snyder, M., Ridge, R., Copeland, J., Stukas, A., Haugen, J., & Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1516 – 1530.
- Donahue, M.J. (1895). Intrinsic and extrinsic religiousness: The empirical research. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 24, 418-423.
- Egbert, N., & Parrot, R. (2003). Empathy and social support for the terminally ill: Implications for recruiting and retaining hospice and hospital volunteers. *Communication Studies*, 54(1), 18-34.
- Ellis, S.J. (1985). Research on volunteerism...what needs to be done. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research*, 14 (2-3), 11-14.
- Eysenck, H.J., & Eysenck, S.B.G. (1991). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Scales (EPS Adult)*. Hodder & Stoughton: London.
- Gorsuch, R.L., & McPherson, S.E. (1989). Intrinsic/extrinsic measurement: I/E-Revised and single-item scales. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 28, 348-354.
- Hansen, D.E., Vandenberg, B., & Patterson, M.L. (1994). The effects of religious orientation on spontaneous and nonspontaneous helping behaviours. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 19(1), 101-104.
- Liau, A.K., Liau, A.W.L., Teoh, G.B.S., & Liau, M.T.L. (2003). The case for emotional literacy: The influence of emotional intelligence on problem behaviours in Malaysian secondary school students. *Journal of Moral Education*, 32, 51-66.
- Lukka, P., & Mocke, M. (2000). Faith, voluntary action and social policy: A review of research. *The Journal of the Institute for Volunteering Research*, 3(1). Retrieved from www.ivr.org.uk/faith.htm, 5 July 2004.
- Maltby, J. & Lewis, C.A. (1997). The reliability and validity of a short scale of attitude towards Christianity among U.S.A., English, Republic of Ireland, and Northern Ireland adults. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 22, 649-654.
- Maltby, J. (1999). Religious orientation and Eysenck's personality dimensions: The use of the amended religious orientation scale to examine the relationship between religiosity, psychoticism, neuroticism and extraversion. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 26, 79-84.

- Maltby, J. (2002). The age universal I-E Scale-12 and orientation toward religion: Confirmatory factor analysis. *The Journal of Psychology*, 136, 555-560.
- Maltby, J., & Day, L. (1998). Amending a measure of the Quest Religious Orientation: Applicability of the scale's use among religious and non-religious persons. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 25, 517-522.
- Maltby, J., & Lewis, C.A. (1996). Measuring intrinsic and extrinsic orientation toward religion: Amendments for its use among religious and non-religious samples. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 21, 937-946.
- Martha K. Wilson, M.K. & Beville, B.A. (2003). Preemployment and volunteer screening: reducing the risk of child sexual abuse for social service agencies. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services*, 84(2), 179-185.
- Mayer, J.D., Caruso, D.R., & Salovey, P. (2002). Relation of an ability measure of emotional intelligence to personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 79(2), 306-320.
- O'Connor Jr, R.M. & Little, I.S. (2003). Revisiting the predictive validity of emotional intelligence: Self-report versus ability-based measures.
- Okun, M.A., Shepard, S.A., & Eisenberg, N. (2000). The relations of emotionality and regulation to dispositional empathy-related responding among volunteers-in-training. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28, 367-382.
- Omoto, A.M., & Snyder, M. (1995). Sustained helping without obligation motivation, longevity of service, and perceived attitude change among AIDS volunteers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(4), 671-686.
- Park, J.Z., & Smith, C. (2000). "To whom much has been given...": Religious capital and community voluntarism among churchgoing Protestants. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 39, 272-286.
- Penner, L.A., & Finkelstein, M.A. (1998). Dispositional and structural determinants of volunteerism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(2), 525-537.
- Rosenthal, R. (1977). The PONS Test measuring sensitivity to nonverbal cues. In P. McReynolds (Eds.), *Advances in nonverbal cues*. In P. McReynolds (Eds.), *Advances in psychological assessment*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey – Bass.
- Saroglou, V. (2002). Religion and the five factors of personality: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 32, 15-25.
- Schutte, J.W., Hosch, H.M. (1996). Optimism, religiosity, and neuroticism: A cross-cultural study. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 20, 239-144.
- Schutte, N.S., Malouff, J.M., Hall, L.E., Haggerty, D.J., Cooper, J.T., Golden, C.J., & Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 25, 167-177.
- Schutte, N.S., Malouff, J.M., Simunek, M., & Mckenley, J. (2002). Characteristics emotional intelligence and emotional well-being. *Cognition and Emotion*, 16, 769-785.
- Trinidad, D.R. & Johnson, C.A. (2002). The association between emotional intelligence and early adolescent tobacco and alcohol use. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 32, 95-105.
- Trinidad, D.R., Unger, J.B., Chou, C., & Johnson, C.A. (2004). The protective association of emotional intelligence with psychosocial smoking risk factors for adolescents. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36, 945-954.
- Uphdyaya, S., & Rahmatullah Khan, R.K. (1990). Malaysian adaptation of Eysenck Personality Questionnaire – some preliminary findings. In Othman, A.H., Abdul Rahman, W.R., (Eds.). *Psychology and Socio-Economic Development*, Collection of Working Papers 12. Penerbit UKM: Bangi.
- Uslaner, E.M. (2002). Religion and civic engagement in Canada and the United States. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 41, 239-254.
- Wilde, A., & Joseph, S. (1997). Religiosity and personality in a Moslem context. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 23, 899-900.
- Wilson, J., & Janoski, T. (1995). The contribution of religion to volunteer work. *Sociology of Religion*, 56(2), 137-152.