

## Analysis of Emotional Intelligence and Personality Traits of Students In Faculty of Sports Sciences

### Análisis de inteligencia emocional y rasgos de personalidad de estudiantes de la Facultad de Ciencias del Deporte

**Melih Balyan**

Faculty of Sport Sciences, Ege University / İzmir, Turkey  
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3833-7456>

**Ahmet Köksal**

Faculty of Sport Sciences, Ege University / İzmir, Turkey  
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3777-6609>

**Pelin Gönkek**

Faculty of Sport Sciences, Ege University / İzmir, Turkey  
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9123-4440>

**Aylin Zekioğlu**

Faculty of Sport Sciences, Celal Bayar University / Manisa, Turkey  
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7455-4845>

**Umut Davut Başoğlu**

School of Physical Education and Sports, Nisantası University / İstanbul, Turkey  
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8885-9543>

Received 09-08-20 Revised 10-10-20

Accepted 12-12-20 On line 03-17-21

**\*Correspondence**

Email: [melih.balyan@ege.edu.tr](mailto:melih.balyan@ege.edu.tr)

**Cite as:**

Balyan, M., Köksal, A., Gönkek, P., Zekioğlu, A., & Başoğlu, U.D. (2021). Analysis of Emotional Intelligence and Personality Traits of Students In Faculty of Sports Sciences. *Propósitos y Representaciones*, 9 (SPE3), e1157. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.20511/pyr2021.v9nSPE3.1157>

## Summary

This study it was aimed to examine the emotional intelligence and personality traits of the students who study in different departments of the Faculty of Sport Sciences at Ege University and actively do sports in different sports branches. In total 549 students participated in the study voluntarily. To evaluate the variables of the study, the Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale developed by Schutte et al. (1998) and adapted into Turkish by Tatar et al. (2011), and to evaluate personality traits, five-factor personality inventory developed by Somer, Tatar, and Korkmaz (2004) and whose short form was validated and reliable by Tatar (2005) were used. In this study, the data set was SPSS 22.0, and it was completed by using frequency tables, reliability analysis, independent sample t-test, one-way variance analysis, Tukey test, and correlation analysis in analyzes. There is both a significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) and an insignificant ( $p > 0.05$ ) difference between emotional intelligence and subscales of personality according to the department, type of education, average grade, class, gender, age and branches. There is no significant difference between emotional intelligence and personality ( $p > 0.05$ ). They are independent of each other. As a result, as the concepts of emotional intelligence and personality affect individuals deeply, the main purpose of this study is to find the necessary information with the necessary studies to better understand the students in the sports science faculty. This study is to measure the emotional intelligence and personality traits of the students studying at the Faculty of Sport Sciences at Ege University and to examine the relationship between emotional intelligence and personality. We think that it is an important study as it will make a serious contribution to the studies by repeating similar studies and applying them to large sample groups in different fields in different universities and different branches.

**Keywords:** Faculty of Sport Sciences, Emotional Intelligence, Personality.

## Resumen

Este estudio tuvo como objetivo examinar la inteligencia emocional y los rasgos de personalidad de los estudiantes que cursan sus estudios en diferentes departamentos de la Facultad de Ciencias del Deporte de la Universidad Ege y practican deporte activamente en diferentes ramas deportivas. En total 549 estudiantes participaron en el estudio de forma voluntaria. Para evaluar las variables del estudio, la Escala de Inteligencia Emocional de Schutte desarrollada por Schutte et al. (1998) y adaptado al turco por Tatar et al. (2011), y para evaluar los rasgos de personalidad se utilizó el inventario de personalidad de cinco factores desarrollado por Somer, Tatar y Korkmaz (2004) y cuya forma abreviada fue validada y confiable por Tatar (2005). En este estudio, el conjunto de datos fue SPSS 22.0 y se completó mediante el uso de tablas de frecuencia, análisis de confiabilidad, prueba t de muestra independiente, análisis de varianza unidireccional, prueba de Tukey y análisis de correlación en los análisis. Existe una diferencia tanto significativa ( $p < 0,05$ ) como insignificante ( $p > 0,05$ ) entre la inteligencia emocional y las subescalas de personalidad según el departamento, tipo de educación, nota media, clase, sexo, edad y ramas. No hay diferencia significativa entre inteligencia emocional y personalidad ( $p > 0,05$ ). Son independientes entre sí. Como resultado, como los conceptos de inteligencia emocional y personalidad afectan profundamente a los individuos, el objetivo principal de este estudio es encontrar la información necesaria con los estudios necesarios para comprender mejor a los estudiantes de la facultad de ciencias del deporte. Este estudio tiene como objetivo medir la inteligencia emocional y los rasgos de personalidad de los estudiantes de la Facultad de Ciencias del Deporte de la Universidad de Ege y examinar la relación entre la inteligencia emocional y la personalidad. Creemos que es un estudio importante ya que hará una contribución seria a los estudios repitiendo estudios similares y aplicándolos a grandes grupos de muestra en diferentes campos en diferentes universidades y diferentes ramas.

**Palabras clave:** Facultad de Ciencias del Deporte, Inteligencia Emocional, Personalidad.

## Introduction

The concept of “emotion”, which has an important place in the concept of emotional intelligence, is one of the most important issues that should be addressed before defining emotional intelligence. Feelings are defined as psychological and biological stimuli, perceptions, reactions, and internal events that coordinate the mental subsystems including consciousness (Ersanlı, 2012). Frijda (1986) defines feeling as “... passive motion preparation and natural movement control, including readiness for change or maintaining relationships depending on the environment and/or internal elements”. Emotions do not come about by chance or randomly, but since they have several functions, just like in the human organism, they continue their existence throughout the growing process of the individual. The basic function of emotions is to make it easier for the individual to adapt to nature and society. Besides, emotions are a source of morale for the individual to sustain his life and they increase the quality of life (Dökmen, 2004). Damasio (1999) defines intelligence as “... a concept arising from the many different mental activities and functioning of many systems formed by the combination of these activities...”. Emotional intelligence is defined as “... the impact cognition state in which joy, sorrow, fear, hate or interest, the state of being experienced in distinguishing the cognitive and voluntary structures of consciousness from each other” (Random House Dictionary, 1973). Goleman is defined emotional intelligence more comprehensively as being able to mobilize oneself, to progress without giving up despite all the adversities, to delay reaching satisfaction by controlling motives, to balance the mental state, not to allow the problems experienced to negatively affect the ability to think, to understand the feelings and thoughts of another person, to think optimistically and to hope (Goleman, 1995). Based on these definitions and studies; emotional intelligence can be expressed as one of the most important basic life skills. The effects of the abilities included in this concept on the life of the individual cannot be denied. These capabilities are self-awareness, emotion management, motivation, empathy, and social skills, and emotional intelligence skills. Unlike the cognitive intelligence found in the individual genetically, emotional intelligence can be improved with the better recognition of education, experience, and emotions over time. Being aware of the capacity and strengths/weaknesses of a person, being able to take responsibility, control his/her emotions, and manage his/her relationships reveal how talented s/he is in emotional intelligence (Dalbudak, 2020).

Personality has been one of the most interesting subjects of human beings from past to present. Personality is one of the topics that psychology is most interested in. Today, it is one of the areas that many scientists wonder about. It is not possible to make a single definition of personality. There are many definitions. Personality is the relatively permanent characteristics and tendencies that distinguish the individual from the others” (Veccohio, 1988) or the traces of the psychological characteristics that come together in determining the causes of the emotional, behavioral and cognitive structures of the individuals that become permanent over time, and the characteristics that indicate who the individuals are (Mount et al., 2005). According to Greenberg, personality can be defined as “the original and relatively fixed pattern of behavior, thought and emotion exhibited by individuals” (Greenberg, 1999). As a result of the studies of the researchers to classify personality traits, one of these trait approaches that are common today in explaining personality is the “Five Factor” personality trait with its frequently encountered form in the literature since they have five separate grouping/classification or five different factors. The personality traits classification model represented by these five factors is called the “Five-Factor Model-5FM” (Five-Factor Model-FFM / 5FM) (Digman, 1990; Goldberg, 1990; Goldberg, 1992; Goldberg, 1993). The five-factor personality model represents the predominant theory of personality in current literature. This model places the Big Five personality factors including emotional instability (neuroticism), extraversion, openness to experience, adaptability, and responsibility, at the top of the personality hierarchy. These factors are thought to encompass the entire range of narrower personality traits at the lower level of the hierarchy (McCrae & Costa, 1997). The five-factor personality model is interesting in terms of integrating a wide range of personality structures and thus facilitating communication between researchers with different orientations, enabling the systematic examination of the relationships between personality traits and behaviors, and providing a general definition by basing personality on five sub-factors. The

five-factor personality model suggests that personality consists of five basic dimensions/factors. The model is implemented as a result of factor analysis of adjectives used in everyday language to describe the personality structures of individuals (Girgin, 2007). The five-factor personality scale is preferred because it integrates personality structures, examines the correlation between personality traits and behaviors, and limits personality with five sub-factors (Tutar, 2016).

Since the concepts of Emotional Intelligence and personality affect individuals deeply, the main purpose of this study is to find the necessary information with the necessary studies to better understand the students of the sports science faculty. This study is to measure the emotional intelligence and personality traits of students studying at the sports science faculty of Ege University and to examine the relationship between emotional intelligence and personality.

## Materials and Method

The emotional intelligence scale, five Factor personality inventory, “Personal Information Form” prepared by the researcher regarding demographic characteristics were used in obtaining data and there are three parts.

In the first part, there is a personal information form for the students (age, gender, department, sports branch, grade point average, education level, and grade).

In the second part, the Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale is consisting of 41 items to determine the level of Emotional Intelligence. It was developed by Schutte et al. (1998). The test includes the answer statements “Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, No Idea = 3, Agree = 4, Strongly Agree = 5”, which are ranked according to the rating scale increasing from 1 to 5. (Tatar, Tok, Saltukoğlu, 2011). The internal consistency coefficient of the original form of the scale was determined by Austin et al. (2004) in the study revised as 41 items from a sample of 500 people, it was found to be 0.85. Also, According to the study report of Austin et al. (2004), the internal consistency coefficients of the scale presented by different researchers from different application results vary between 0.66 and 0.90 (Tok, 2008).

In the third part, the five-factor personality inventory developed by Somer, Tatar, and Korkmaz (2004) and the short form of it developed by Tatar (2005) was used to evaluate personality. This inventory was designed to evaluate five main personality traits. In the inventory, items are questioning Extraversion, Agreeableness, Self-Control, Neuroticism, Openness to Experience, and Social Willingness. In these items, there are emotional, behavioral, and intellectual traits that the person evaluates himself. The items in the inventory consist of 85 items in Likert type with 5 digits: Fully Appropriate (FA), Somewhat Appropriate (SA), Neutral (?), Not Very Appropriate (NVA), Not At All Appropriate (NAA).

## Results

### Demographic Findings

**Table 1. Distribution of Demographic Profiles of Students Participating in the Study**

Variable		n	%
Department	Sports Management	170	31
	Physical education and sports teaching	166	30,2
	Coaching	213	38,8
	Total	549	100
Education	Formal Education	359	65,4
	Evening Education	190	34,6
	Total	549	100,0
Gender	Female	177	32,2
	Male	372	67,8
	Total	549	100
Grade	Grade 1	134	24,4

	Grade 2	129	23,5
	Grade 3	134	24,4
	Grade 4	152	27,7
	Total	549	100
Branch	Team Sports	400	72,9
	Individual Sports	149	27,1
	Total	549	100
Age	20 or less	136	24,8
	21-25	370	67,4
	26 or over	43	7,8
	Total	549	100
Grade Point Average	1,01 – 1,50	12	2,2
	1,51 – 2,00	76	13,8
	2,01 – 2,50	176	32,1
	2,51 – 3,00	212	38,6
	3,01 – 3,50	63	11,5
	3,51 OR PLUS	10	1,8
	Total	549	100

Note: n: Frequency

The demographic information distribution of 549 individuals who participated in the study was analyzed by frequency analysis and given in the table.

#### Five Factor Personality Scale

Scores between 1 and 5 can be obtained from each question in the Five-Factor Personality Scale. 1: not appropriate at all, 2: not very appropriate, 3: neutral, 4: somewhat appropriate, and 5: fully appropriate.

#### Scale Reliability of the Five-Factor Personality Scale

**Table 2. Cronbach's Alpha Values of "5 Factor Personality Scale" and "Subscales"**

Scale and Subscales	Cronbach's Alpha Value
5 Factor Personality Scale	0,852
Extroversion	0,767
Gentleness/Agreeableness	0,802
Self-Control / Conscientiousness	0,714
Neuroticism	0,836
Openness to Experience	0,640
Social Willingness	0,595

The Cronbach's Alpha value which measures the reliability of the "5 Factor Personality Scale" in which 549 individuals participated, was found to be  $\alpha = 0.852$ . Also, the Cronbach's alpha value of the extraversion subscale was  $\alpha = 0.767$ , the Cronbach's alpha value of the gentleness/agreeableness subscale was  $\alpha = 0.802$ , the Cronbach's alpha value of the self-control/conscientiousness subscale was  $\alpha = 0.714$ , the Cronbach's alpha value of the emotional inconsistency subscale was  $\alpha = 0.836$ , The Cronbach's Alpha value of the openness subscale was  $\alpha = 0.640$  and the Cronbach's Alpha value of the social willingness subscale was  $\alpha = 0.595$ . It is

concluded that the 5 Factor Personality Scale and its subscales are quite reliable and acceptable. Scores between 1 and 5 can be obtained from each question in the Five-Factor Personality Scale. 1: not appropriate at all, 2: not very appropriate, 3: neutral, 4: somewhat appropriate, and 5: fully appropriate.

**ANALYSIS OF THE “5 FACTOR PERSONALITY SCALE” AND SUBSCALE SCORES ACCORDING TO THE DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION OF STUDENTS**

Summary statistics of the mean scale scores based on the demographic information are given in the tables below. Besides, since the scale and subscale mean scores provide the normal distribution assumption, the differences between groups were tested with the “Independent samples t-test” and “One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA)” tests, and which groups caused the differences were tested with the “Tukey Post Hoc” test.

**Table 3. Change of the Five-Factor Personality Scale According to the Departments**

Department		Extroversion	Gentleness/Agreeableness	Self-Control/Conscientiousness	Neuroticism	Openness to Experience	Social Willingness	5 Factor Personality Scale
Sports Management	Mean	2,1613	2,3198	2,3920	3,6262	1,9436	2,5617	3,1208
	St. Dev.	0,5512	0,6302	0,5241	0,6616	0,4807	0,8208	0,2530
Physical education and Coaching	Mean	2,2740	2,2688	2,4936	3,6092	1,9173	2,4638	3,1084
	St. Dev.	0,5859	0,6417	0,5314	0,7026	0,4146	0,7287	0,2290
Coaching	Mean	2,2374	2,5449	2,4487	3,5201	2,0637	2,4788	3,1260
	St. Dev.	0,5634	0,5394	0,5111	0,6652	0,4508	0,7373	0,2375
p- value		0,175	0,556	0,202	0,250	0,003*	0,438	0,771

A significant difference was obtained at a 95% confidence level between the mean scores of the “openness to experience” subscale according to the departments of the individuals. Accordingly, individuals whose department is “Physical Education and Sports Teaching” have lower mean scores than those with “sports management” and “coaching”. The mean scores of other subscales and the “5 Factor Personality Scale” do not differ significantly at the 95% confidence level according to the departments of individuals.

**Table 4 Change of Five Factor Personality the Scale According to the Type of Instruction**

Education		Extroversion	Gentleness/Agreeableness	Self-Control/Conscientiousness	Neuroticism	Openness to Experience	Social Willingness	5 Factor Personality Scale
Formal Education	Mean	2,2091	2,2491	2,4650	3,5816	1,9606	2,4628	3,1114
	St. Dev.	0,5546	0,6042	0,5269	0,6971	0,4440	0,7769	0,2465
Evening Education	Mean	2,2548	2,3361	2,4065	3,5768	2,0233	2,5701	3,1336
	St. Dev.	0,5912	0,5890	0,5115	0,6362	0,4703	0,7280	0,2258
p- value		0,369	0,106	0,212	0,937	0,124	0,116	0,304

The mean scores obtained by individuals from the “5 Factor Personality Scale” and its subscales according to their education types do not differ significantly at the 95% confidence level. The mean scores of “Formal Education” and “Evening Education” students are similar.

**Table 5. Change of Five-Factor Personality Scale by Grade Point Average**

Grade Point Average		Extroversion	Gentleness/Agreeableness	Self-Control/Conscientiousness	Neuroticism	Openness to Experience	Social Willingness	5 Factor Personality Scale
1,01 – 1,50	Mean	1,9761	2,2291	2,4068	3,5444	2,0595	2,5138	3,1922
	St. Dev.	0,5476	0,5044	0,6499	0,5209	0,4677	0,7228	0,2015
1,51 – 2,00	Mean	2,2556	2,2220	2,4411	3,4692	2,0883	2,6622	3,1441
	St. Dev.	0,4909	0,5377	0,4719	0,6085	0,3786	0,6423	0,2198
2,01 – 2,50	Mean	2,2532	2,3544	2,4849	3,4825	2,0178	2,6429	3,1376
	St. Dev.	0,6017	0,6171	0,5188	0,7357	0,4887	0,7724	0,2518
2,51 – 3,00	Mean	2,2021	2,2706	2,4997	3,6506	1,9801	2,4221	3,1044
	St. Dev.	0,5407	0,6000	0,5110	0,6507	0,4355	0,7757	0,2417
3,01 – 3,50	Mean	2,2335	2,2142	2,2110	3,7227	1,8214	2,2248	3,0891
	St. Dev.	0,6493	0,6469	0,5421	0,6685	0,3237	0,7222	0,2334
3,51 – 4,00	Mean	2,2214	2,0437	2,1176	3,7800	1,8573	2,1166	3,0153
	St. Dev.	0,5568	0,4778	0,4794	0,5398	0,4502	0,6806	0,1514
p- value		0,652	0,321	0,001*	0,038*	0,001*	0,000*	0,247

Individuals’ “extraversion” and “gentleness/agreeableness” subscales and “5 Factor personality scale” point averages do not show a significant difference at 95% confidence level according to their grade point averages. However, when other subscales are examined, individuals with a grade point average of 3.01 or above (3.01 - 3.50 and 3.51 - 4.00) have lower “self-control/conscientiousness”, “openness to experience” and “social willingness” average points than the individuals whose grade point average is lower. Also, individuals with a grade point average of 3.01 or above have higher average scores for “neuroticism” than individuals with lower grade point averages.

**Table 6. Change of Five-Factor Personality Scale by Grade Level**

Grade		Extroversion	Gentleness/Agreeableness	Self-Control/Conscientiousness	Neuroticism	Openness to Experience	Social Willingness	5 Factor Personality Scale
Grade 1	Mean	2,2889	2,3376	2,4227	3,5577	2,0820	2,5820	3,1270
	St. Dev.	0,5138	0,6566	0,5060	0,6408	0,4651	0,7034	0,2296
Grade 2	Mean	2,2037	2,2335	2,4336	3,5875	1,9158	2,4250	3,1184
	St. Dev.	0,5441	0,5639	0,5242	0,6492	0,4079	0,7606	0,2186
Grade 3	Mean	2,2468	2,2863	2,4938	3,4791	2,0021	2,5995	3,1372
	St. Dev.	0,5805	0,6224	0,5398	0,7776	0,4679	0,7986	0,2620
Grade 4	Mean	2,1672	2,2602	2,4303	3,6820	1,9332	2,4035	3,0967
	St. Dev.	0,6166	0,5569	0,5201	0,6223	0,4557	0,7661	0,2451
p- value		0,302	0,535	0,661	0,085	0,010*	0,056	0,524

A significant difference was obtained at a 95% confidence level between the mean scores of the “openness to experience” subscale according to the grades of the individuals. Accordingly, the “openness to experience” mean scores of the individuals in the first grade were higher than the mean scores of the individuals in higher grades. The mean scores of other subscales and the “5 Factor Personality Scale” do not differ significantly according to the grades of individuals at the 95% confidence level.

**Table 7. Change of Five-Factor Personality Scale by Gender**

Gender		Extroversion	Gentleness/Agreeableness	Self-Control/Conscientiousness	Neuroticism	Openness to Experience	Social Willingness	5 Factor Personality Scale
Female	Mean	2,1456	2,2302	2,3805	3,5517	1,8781	2,3342	3,1275
	St. Dev.	0,5316	0,6164	0,5188	0,7067	0,4294	0,7345	0,2230
Male	Mean	2,2626	2,3025	2,4753	3,5933	2,0318	2,5788	3,1151
	St. Dev.	0,5806	0,5912	0,5213	0,6616	1,8781	0,7622	0,2473
p- value		0,024*	0,187	0,047*	0,501	0,000*	0,000*	0,571

A significant difference was obtained at a 95% confidence level between the mean scores of the subscales of “extraversion,” self-control/conscientiousness“, ”openness to experience“ and ”social willingness“ according to the gender of the individuals. For these three subscales, the mean scores of men were higher than the mean scores of women. The mean scores of other subscales and the “5 Factor Personality Scale” do not differ significantly according to the gender of the individuals at the 95% confidence level.

**Table 8. Change of Five-Factor Personality Scale by Age Groups**

Age		Extroversion	Gentleness/Agreeableness	Self-Control/Conscientiousness	Neuroticism	Openness to Experience	Social Willingness	5 Factor Personality Scale
20 and below	Mean	2,2521	2,3331	2,4152	3,5470	2,0640	2,4852	3,1202
	St. Dev.	0,5058	0,6224	0,5059	0,6163	0,4261	0,6738	0,2233
21-25	Mean	2,2028	2,2660	2,4394	3,5789	1,9563	2,5117	3,1242
	St. Dev.	0,5767	0,6024	0,5187	0,7050	0,4637	0,7902	0,2455
26 and above	Mean	2,3289	2,2223	2,5841	3,6930	1,9468	2,4457	3,0714
	St. Dev.	0,6624	0,4980	0,5868	0,5996	0,4308	0,7831	0,2378
p- value		0,315	0,436	0,170	0,467	0,052	0,837	0,392

The mean scores obtained by individuals from the “5 Factor Personality Scale” and its subscales by age groups do not differ significantly at the 95% confidence level.

**Table 9. Change of Five Factor Personality Scale According to Sports Branch**

Branch		Extroversion	Gentleness/Agreeableness	Self-Control/Conscientiousness	Neuroticism	Openness to Experience	Social Willingness	5 Factor Personality Scale
Team Sports	Mean	2,2446	2,2725	2,4666	3,5608	1,9842	2,4916	3,1180
	St. Dev.	0,5755	0,5861	0,5241	0,6752	0,4348	0,7351	0,2391



<b>Individual Sports</b>	<b>Mean</b>	2,1721	2,2973	2,3861	3,6313	1,9769	2,5223	3,1221
	<b>St. Dev.</b>	0,5434	0,6371	0,5130	0,6780	0,5029	0,8300	0,2416
<b>p- value</b>		0,183	0,666	0,108	0,278	0,867	0,675	0,859

The mean scores of the individuals from the “5 Factor Personality Scale” and its sub-scales do not differ significantly at the 95% confidence level. The mean scores of the individuals dealing with team sports and those dealing with individual sports are similar.

### Emotional Intelligence Scale

Each question on the Emotional Intelligence Scale can score between 1 and 5. For positive questions, 1: strongly disagree, 2: disagree, 3: neutral, 4: agree, and 5: strongly agree. For negative questions, 5: strongly disagree, 4: disagree, 3: neutral, 2: agree, 1: strongly agree.

### Scale Reliability of Emotional Intelligence Scale

**Table 10. Cronbach’s Alpha Values of “Emotional Intelligence Scale” and “Subscales”**

Scale and Subscales	Cronbach’s Alpha Value
Emotional Intelligence Scale	0,884
Optimism / Mood Regulation	0,871
Evaluation of Emotions	0,838
Use of Emotions	0,656

The Cronbach’s Alpha value, which measures the reliability of the “Emotional Intelligence Scale” in which 549 individuals participated, was found to be  $\alpha = 0.884$ . Besides, the Cronbach’s Alpha value of the “optimism/mood regulation” subscale was  $\alpha = 0.871$ , the Cronbach’s alpha value of the “evaluation of emotions” subscale was  $\alpha = 0.838$ , and the Cronbach’s Alpha value of the “use of emotions” subscale was  $\alpha = 0.656$ . It is concluded that the Emotional Intelligence Scale and its subscales are quite reliable and acceptable.

### Analysis of The “Emotional Intelligence Scale” and Sub-Scale Scores According To The Demographic Characteristics of Students

Summary statistics of the mean scale scores based on the demographic information are given in the tables below. In addition, since the scale and subscale mean scores provide the normal distribution assumption, the differences between groups were tested with the “Independent samples t-test” and “One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA)” tests, and which groups caused the differences were tested with the “Tukey Post Hoc” test.

**Table 11. Change of Emotional Intelligence Scale According to Departments**

Department		Optimism/ Mood Regulation	Evaluation of Emotions	Use of Emotions	Emotional Intelligence Scale
Sports Management	Mean	4,0157	3,7982	3,0529	3,7824
	St. Dev.	0,3856	0,6464	0,4844	0,3703
Physical education and Coaching	Mean	3,9507	3,7961	2,9587	3,7323
	St. Dev.	0,4271	0,5593	0,4842	0,3948
	Mean	3,8978	3,7923	3,0067	3,7122

<b>St. Dev.</b>	0,4961	0,5783	0,4588	0,3949
<b>p- value</b>	0,036*	0,995	0,192	0,014*

A significant difference was obtained at a 95% confidence level between the “optimism/regulation of mood” subscale mean scores according to the departments of the individuals. For this subscale, the mean scores of the individuals in the “sports management” section were found to be the highest and the scores of the individuals in the “coaching” section were the lowest. Mean scores of other subscales do not differ significantly at the 95% confidence level according to the departments of the individuals. The “emotional intelligence scale” mean scores of the individuals also show a significant difference at the 95% confidence level. According to this, the emotional intelligence levels of the individuals whose department is “management” were higher than the individuals in other departments.

**Table 12. Change of Emotional Intelligence Scale by Education Groups**

Education		Optimism/ Mood Regulation	Evaluation of Emotions	Use of Emotions	Emotional Intelligence Scale
<b>Formal Education</b>	<b>Mean</b>	3,9747	3,8226	2,9865	3,7577
	<b>St.</b>	0,4400	0,5835	0,4856	0,3896
<b>Evening Education</b>	<b>Mean</b>	3,9043	3,7437	3,0444	3,7065
	<b>St.</b>	0,4530	0,6105	0,4537	0,3834
<b>p- value</b>		0,078	0,139	0,175	0,142

The mean scores obtained by individuals from the “Emotional Intelligence Scale” and its subscales according to their education types do not show a significant difference at the 95% confidence level. The mean scores of “Formal Education” and “Evening Education” students are similar.

**Table 13. Change of Emotional intelligence by Grade Point Average**

Average Score		Optimism/ Mood Regulation	Evaluation of Emotions	Use of Emotions	Emotional Intelligence Scale
<b>1.01 - 1.50</b>	Mean	3,9635	3,8103	3,0952	3,7496
	St. Dev.	0,4167	0,6704	0,4009	0,398
<b>1.51 - 2.00</b>	Mean	3,9529	3,6761	2,9925	3,6755
	St. Dev.	0,4791	0,6798	0,4699	0,4182
<b>2.01 - 2.50</b>	Mean	3,9169	3,7369	2,957	3,696
	St. Dev.	0,4598	0,6306	0,5045	0,415
<b>2.51 - 3.00</b>	Mean	3,9248	3,8153	3,0391	3,7388
	St. Dev.	0,4401	0,5267	0,4415	0,3569
<b>3.01-3.50</b>	Mean	4,1429	4,0329	3,0385	3,9536
	St. Dev.	0,3538	0,5578	0,5297	0,3458
<b>3.51 - 4.00</b>	Mean	4,1405	4,0346	2,9857	3,9183
	St. Dev.	0,2904	0,4225	0,4065	0,2345
<b>p- value</b>		0,006*	0,025*	0,595	0,003*

The “use of emotions” subscale mean scores of individuals do not show a significant difference at 95% confidence level according to their grade point averages. However, when the other subscales and the “emotional intelligence scale” were examined, individuals with a grade point average of 3.01 or above (3.01 - 3.50 and 3.51 - 4.00) were considered to have higher mean scores of “optimism/mood regulation”, “evaluation of emotions” subscales and “emotional intelligence scale” than the mean scores of the individuals with lower grade point average.

**Table 14. Change of Emotional Intelligence Scale by Grade Level**

Grade		Optimism/ Mood Regulation	Evaluation of Emotions	Use of Emotions	Emotional Intelligence Scale
Grade 1	Mean	3,9318	3,6992	2,9701	3,6938
	St. Dev.	0,4325	0,6490	0,4939	0,3857
Grade 2	Mean	4,0007	3,7420	2,9779	3,7758
	St. Dev.	0,4537	0,5939	0,4448	0,4023
Grade 3	Mean	3,9254	3,8503	3,0576	3,7217
	St. Dev.	0,3649	0,5821	0,4749	0,3490
Grade 4	Mean	3,9458	3,8801	3,0179	3,7665
	St. Dev.	0,5103	0,5398	0,4836	0,4080
p- value		0,510	0,042*	0,410	0,262

A significant difference was obtained at a 95% confidence level between the mean scores of the “evaluation of emotions” subscale according to the grades of the individuals. Accordingly, the mean scores of the individuals in the 3rd and 4th grades were higher than the average scores of the individuals in the lower grades. The other subscales and “Emotional Intelligence Scale” mean scores do not differ significantly according to the grades of individuals at the 95% confidence level.

**Table 15. Change of Emotional Intelligence Scale by Gender**

Gender		Optimism/ Mood Regulation	Evaluation of Emotions	Use of Emotions	Emotional Intelligence Scale
Female	Mean	3,9007	3,7595	3,0449	3,0798
	St. Dev.	0,4633	0,6108	0,4761	0,4003
Male	Mean	4,0546	3,8705	2,9257	3,8035
	St. Dev.	0,3861	0,5499	0,4641	0,3530
p- value		0,000*	0,041*	0,006*	0,008*

There is a significant difference at 95% confidence level between “emotional intelligence scale” and the subscale mean scores of individuals according to their gender. Accordingly, the “use of emotions” subscale mean scores were higher in women than in men. Mean scores of other subscales and “emotional intelligence scale” were higher in men than in women.

**Table 16. Change of Emotional Intelligence Scale by Age Groups**

Age		Optimism/ Mood Regulation	Evaluation of Emotions	Use of Emotions	Emotional Intelligence Scale
<b>20 and below</b>	<b>Mean</b>	3,9513	3,7172	2,9580	3,7075
	<b>St. Dev.</b>	0,4080	0,6040	0,4382	0,3590
<b>21-25</b>	<b>Mean</b>	3,9523	3,8162	3,0236	3,7506
	<b>St. Dev.</b>	0,4631	0,5991	0,4919	0,4015
<b>26 and above</b>	<b>Mean</b>	3,9302	3,8623	3,0133	3,7521
	<b>St. Dev.</b>	0,4102	0,4938	0,4395	0,3572
<b>p- value</b>		0,954	0,187	0,387	0,530

The mean scores obtained by individuals from the “Emotional Intelligence Scale” and its subscales by age groups do not show a significant difference at the 95% confidence level.

**Table 17. Change of Emotional Intelligence Scale by Branches**

Branch		Optimism / Mood Regulation	Evaluation of Emotions	Use of Emotions	Emotional Intelligence Scale
<b>Team Sports</b>	<b>Mean</b>	3,9502	3,7833	3,0061	3,7361
	<b>St. Dev.</b>	0,4522	0,5932	0,4749	0,3876
<b>Individual Sports</b>	<b>Mean</b>	3,9505	3,8276	3,0077	3,7505
	<b>St.Dev.</b>	0,4281	0,5956	0,4775	0,3897
<b>p- value</b>		0,996	0,437	0,972	0,699

The mean scores obtained by individuals from the “Emotional Intelligence Scale” and its subscales according to their branches do not show a significant difference at the 95% confidence level.

#### **Interpretation of The Relationship Between The Mean Scores of “5 Factor Personality Scale” and The “Emotional Intelligence Scale” With Pearson Correlation Coefficient**

In the table below, Pearson correlation coefficient values and related p-values of the “5-factor personality scale” and “emotional intelligence scale” and their subscales are given. Since the mean scores of the “Emotional Intelligence Scale” and “5 Factor Personality Scale” and its subscales provide the assumption of the normal distribution, the relationship between the scale and subscale mean scores were measured with the help of the Pearson Correlation coefficient.

**Table 18. Relationship Between Five Factor Personality Scale and Emotional intelligence Scale**

Dimensiones	Optimism/Mood Regulation	Evaluation of Emotions	Use of Emotions	Emotional Intelligence Scale
Extroversion	-0,266** 0	-0,298** 0	0,002 -0,961	-0,300** 0

Gentleness / Agreeableness	-0,216**	-0,225**	-0,121**	-0,262**
	0	0	-0,004	0
Self-Control /	-0,179**	-0,159**	-0,231**	-0,231**
Conscientiousness	0	0	0	0
Neuroticism	0,188**	0,457**	0,282**	0,391**
	0	0	0	0
Openness to	-0,330**	-0,332**	0,054	-0,344**
Experience	0	0	-0,207	
Social	-0,114**	-0,221**	-0,127**	-0,201**
Willingness	-0,008	0	-0,003	0
5 Factor Personality Scale	0,009	-0,265**	-0,127**	-0,150**
	-0,828	0	-0,003	0

\* The correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

Looking at the table, there is a visible inverse relationship between the two scales and their subscales, except for some cases.

Considering the relationship between the subscales of the two scales, between the mean scores of the subscales of “extraversion” and “use of emotions” ( $p=0,961$ ), and also between the subscale mean scores of “openness to experience” and “use of emotions” ( $p=0,207$ ) no significant relationship was found. There is a statistically significant relationship at 99% confidence level between the “neuroticism” subscale mean scores and “optimism/regulation of mood”, “evaluation of emotions” and “use of emotions” subscale mean scores. There is a statistically significant inverse relationship at a 99% confidence level for all other subscales of the two scales.

When the relationship between the Emotional Intelligence subscales and the “5-factor personality scale” was examined, there was no significant relationship between the “optimism/regulation of mood” subscale mean scores and the “5-factor personality scale” mean score ( $p=0.828$ ), and it is observed that there is an inverse relationship between the “evaluation of emotions” and “use of emotions” subscale mean scores and the “5-factor personality scale” mean scores.

There is a relationship between all 5-factor personality scale subscales and “emotional intelligence scale”. Accordingly, there is a statistically significant same-direction relationship between “neuroticism” subscale mean scores and “emotional intelligence scale” mean scores. In addition, there is an inverse relationship between “extroversion”, “gentleness/agreeableness”, “self-control/conscientiousness”, “openness to experience” and “social willingness” subscale mean scores and “emotional intelligence scale” mean scores.

A statistically significant inverse relationship was found between the “5 Factor Personality Scale” and the “Emotional Intelligence Scale” at the 99% confidence level (correlation=  $-0,150$  \*\* and  $p=0,000$ ). Accordingly, while the mean scores of the “5 Factor Personality Scale” of the individuals increase, the mean scores of the “Emotional Intelligence Scale” decrease. Or, while the mean scores of the “5 Factor Personality Scale” of the individuals decrease, the mean scores of the “Emotional Intelligence Scale” increase.

## Discussion

In this study, in which emotional intelligence and personality traits of the students in the faculty of sports sciences were examined, expected results were obtained in terms of both concepts. In this section, the findings will be discussed with the support of the literature and it will be clarified whether there is a relationship between emotional intelligence and personality and to what extent students at the Faculty of Sports Sciences affect these two variables.

According to the results obtained from the research;

A significant difference was obtained between the mean scores of the “openness to experience” subscale according to the individual’s departments ( $p<0,05$ ). Accordingly, individuals whose

department is “teaching” have a lower mean score of openness to experience than those with “sports management” and “coaching”. The mean scores of students studying physical education and sports teaching departments were lower than the “sports management” and “coaching” departments. Students in the department of sports management and coaching are constantly open to all experiences to improve themselves and to stand out in society, to be at the top of their field, and to improve themselves. If they are not open to experience or cannot improve themselves, they disappear in their field. In the physical education and sports teaching department, the things mentioned above may not be necessary. The mean scores of the other subscales and the “5 Factor Personality Scale” do not differ significantly according to the departments of the individuals ( $p > 0,05$ ). Işık (2014) could not find any difference between the departments and personality traits of students studying at physical education and sports schools. The fact that there is no difference between the departments of the students in the faculty of sports sciences can be thought as that the departments of the students do not have any effect on their personalities. This study supports the findings of this study.

There is no significant difference in the mean scores obtained by the individuals from the “Five Factor Personality Scale” and its subscales according to their education types ( $p > 0,05$ ). The mean scores of “Formal Education” and “Evening Education” students are similar. As there is no difference between the education types of the students in the faculty of sports sciences, it can be thought that whether the students are in formal education or evening education does not affect their personalities. As a result, we can state that the education-training programs that students took in daytime education are the same as the education-training program that students took in evening education. There is only a time difference between them. Since there are no similar studies to this study, findings that support this study could not be reached.

Individuals’ “extraversion” and “gentleness/agreeableness” subscales and “5 Factor personality scale” mean scores do not differ significantly in their grade point averages ( $p > 0,05$ ). We think that the students’ extraversion, gentleness, and the 5 Factor personality scale do not affect their grade point averages. However, when other subscales are examined, individuals with a grade point average of 3.01 or above (3.01 - 3.50 and 3.51 - 4.00) have lower mean scores about “self-control/conscientiousness”, “openness to experience” and “social willingness” than the individuals with lower grade point average ( $p < 0,05$ ). The reason why the students with lower grade point average have a higher level of “self-control”, “openness to experience” and “social willingness” than the students with higher grade point average is due to their personality. A student with a low-grade point average brings him to the forefront in different areas because s/he will close his/her deficit here. If his/her personality trait in the social field is proper and draws attention according to the rules of the society, it does not attract the attention of the society, even if his/her grade point average is low. Or, we can say that the student with a low-grade point average has developed some personality traits to improve him/herself. Besides, individuals with a grade point average of 3.01 or above had higher mean scores for neuroticism than individuals with lower grade point averages. We can explain that the reasons for the high neuroticism of students with high-grade point average are the expectation that their grades are always high and the loss of themselves by overworking. The incomplete personality and disconnected communication with people may lead the student to possible neuroticism. Studies supporting our study could not be reached.

A significant difference was obtained between the mean scores of the “openness to experience” subscale according to the grades of the individuals ( $p < 0,05$ ). Accordingly, the “openness to experience” mean scores of the individuals in the first grade were higher than the average scores of the individuals in higher grades. The reason why the student in the first year is open to experience compared to the other upper grades is that s/he has just started school, is curious about his/her profession, does not think about his/her future anxiety, and does not think what s/he will do when s/he graduates. The mean scores of other subscales and the “5 Factor Personality Scale” do not differ significantly according to the grades of individuals ( $p > 0,05$ ). By looking at the finding that there is no difference between the grades of the students in the faculty of sports sciences, we can say that although the grades of the students are different, it does not affect their personalities. We can state that the personality traits of the fourth-grade students and the first-grade students are similar. We can explain that although the grade is different, it does not affect

personality. Since there were no studies similar to the one we conducted, studies to support us couldn't be reached.

Significant differences were found between the subscale mean scores of “extraversion,” self-control/conscientiousness “,” openness to experience “and” social willingness “according to the gender of the individuals ( $p < 0,05$ ). For these three subscales, the mean scores of men were higher than the mean scores of women. Other subscales and the “5 Factor Personality Scale” do not differ significantly according to the gender of the individuals ( $p > 0,05$ ). According to the genders of the individuals, the mean scores of the men in the subscales of “extraversion,” “self-control/conscientiousness”, “openness to experience” and “social willingness” were higher than the mean scores of women. We can say that the reason why the averages of the personality subscales of men are higher than that of women is due to the cultural characteristics we experience or the social prominence of men. There is no evidence to support this result. Similar studies have been reached on personality and its subscales. Watson and Pulford (2004) found no difference in the personality traits of amateur and professional female and male athletes in various high-risk sports branches. Egloff and Gruhn (1996) could not find a significant difference in terms of the gender of athletes involved in endurance sports branches. Lonchbaum et al. (2010), in this study with a large sample group, found that male and female participants who exercise regularly and who do not have similar personality traits. In this context, these studies in written sources support the findings of this study.

There is no significant difference between the mean scores of the individuals from the “5 Factor Personality Scale” and its subscales according to age groups ( $p > 0,05$ ). Considering the age range of the participants, it can be said that there is no significant difference between different age groups due to the well-established character and personality traits of the individuals.

There is no significant difference in the mean scores of the individuals from the “5 Factor Personality Scale” and its subscales according to their branches ( $p > 0,05$ ). The mean scores of the individuals dealing with team sports and those dealing with individual sports are similar. The behaviors of students who do team sports or individual sports are seen to be associated with balanced personality traits. Personality traits are related to sports success (Allen et al. 2011). It is inevitable for individuals who do sports to be successful if their personalities are well established. Athletes with established personalities are people appreciated by society. They can handle anything. They act with their mind, not their emotions, and they are successful.

A significant difference was found between the “optimism/regulation of mood” subscale mean scores according to the individuals' departments ( $p < 0,05$ ). For this subscale, the mean scores of the individuals in the “management” department were found to be the highest and the scores of the individuals in the “coaching” department were the lowest. The mean scores of the other subscales do not differ significantly according to the departments of the individuals ( $p > 0,05$ ). There is a significant difference in the mean scores of the individuals' emotional intelligence scale ( $p < 0,05$ ). Accordingly, the emotional intelligence levels of individuals with a department of “sports management” were higher than those in other departments. In Özdenk's (2018) study, which examined the emotional intelligence levels of university students taking sports education, there is no significant difference in emotional intelligence scores according to the department. There was no significant difference between sports science students and conservatory students (dalbudak & Çelik, 2020). Barış et al. (2016) found a statistically significant difference between coaching and recreation, and also between sports management and recreation departments of the physical education and sports college students in terms of emotional intelligence.

In our study, the reason for the higher emotional intelligence level of sports management compared to other departments is the difference in education in sports management. In other words, we think that the reason is that the field of sports management is different and the working opportunities are different than other departments. Findings that support our study have been reached. There is almost no work done.

There is no significant difference in the mean scores of the individuals from the “Emotional Intelligence Scale” and its sub-scales according to the types of education ( $p > 0,05$ ). The mean scores of “Formal Education” and “Evening Education” students are similar. Since there are no studies similar to the one we conducted, no studies to support it were found. We can state that the

fact that students in sports sciences faculty are in formal education or evening education does not affect emotional intelligence. We can say that emotional intelligence levels of formal education and evening education are similar.

Individuals' "use of emotions" subscale mean scores do not differ significantly according to their grade point averages ( $p > 0,05$ ). However, when the other subscales and the "emotional intelligence scale" were examined, the mean scores of the individuals with a grade point average of 3.01 or above (3.01 - 3.50 and 3.51 - 4.00) for "optimism/mood regulation", "evaluation of emotions" subscale and "emotional intelligence scale" were higher than the mean scores of the individuals with lower grade point averages ( $p < 0,05$ ). Since there were no studies similar to the one we conducted, no evidence was obtained to support them. As the grade point averages of the students are getting higher, the level of emotional intelligence is getting higher. We can say that emotional intelligence is directly proportional to the grade point average.

A significant difference was obtained between the mean scores of the "evaluation of emotions" subscale according to the grades of the individuals ( $p < 0,05$ ). Accordingly, the mean scores of the individuals in the 3rd and 4th grades were higher than the average scores of the individuals in the lower grades. The other subscales and the "Emotional Intelligence Scale" did not show a significant difference according to the grades of individuals in terms of mean scores ( $p > 0,05$ ). Özdenk (2018) found a significant difference in emotional intelligence scores according to the grade variable in his study, which examined the emotional intelligence levels of university students taking sports training. Avşar and Kaşıkçı (2010), in their study examining the emotional intelligence level of nursing school students, found that the emotional intelligence scores of the senior students were higher than the other students. Barış et al. (2016) found that the emotional intelligence levels of physical education and sports college students did not differ significantly according to their grade levels. Although our study is similar to many of the studies in this field, there are other studies with different results. We can say that although the students are at different grade levels, it is not effective on emotional intelligence. We can say that the feelings and thoughts of the students studying in the faculty of sports sciences in different grades are the same.

There is a significant difference between the "emotional intelligence scale" and subscale mean scores of individuals according to their gender ( $p < 0,05$ ). Accordingly, the "use of emotions" subscale mean scores were higher in women than in men. Mean scores of other subscales and "emotional intelligence scale" were higher in men than in women. Harrod and Scheer (2005) found that young women achieved higher emotional intelligence scores than men. According to the findings obtained from the study conducted by Tok (2008) on the same measuring tool, there is no difference in emotional intelligence between genders. Findings obtained from this study also contradict the findings of other studies. In Ergin's (2000) study on university students, he concluded that the Emotional Intelligence levels of male students are higher than female students. It can be said that this difference between men and women in terms of emotional intelligence is related to the socialization process. Men are generally more sociable and extrovert than women, and they can easily express everything more successfully. We can say that this situation stems from cultural characteristics. Since studies similar to our study have been conducted, a finding to support this idea has been reached.

There is no significant difference in the mean scores of the individuals from the "Emotional Intelligence Scale" and its subscales by age groups ( $p > 0,05$ ). Dalbudak (2020) found in his study that there is no significant difference between the age groups and emotional intelligence levels of b2 and b3 visually impaired individuals between the ages of 18-20 who do sports and not. Oğan and Toy (2017) found that there was no significant difference between the age groups and emotional intelligence levels of vocational school students as a result of his research. In this respect, the results of our study are similar to the results of studies conducted by other researchers. Halilbeyoğlu and Salman (2018) reported that there was no statistically significant difference in the emotional intelligence levels of badminton athletes with the sub-dimensions of the emotional intelligence scale of the age groups according to some variables. As the reason why emotional intelligence does not differ significantly in individuals, we think that it is effective in all lives of people, its importance is increasing day by day in individuals' lives and it is important for individuals of all ages. Since similar studies were conducted in our study, findings that support this idea were obtained.



There is no significant difference in the mean scores of the individuals from the “Emotional Intelligence Scale” and its subscales according to their branches ( $p > 0,05$ ). In the study conducted by Salar et al. (2012) for the comparison of emotional states of individuals at 15-18 age group who do team and individual sports, it was determined that there was no statistically significant difference between the emotional characteristics of the 15-18 age group individuals who are interested in the team and individual sports in daily life. In the study conducted by Kırımoglu et al. (2014), the Emotional Intelligence Levels of Teacher Candidates according to doing sports practice were examined in terms of Individual and Team Sports and observed that there was no significant difference. As a result of the research conducted by Taşkın and his friends in 2010, it was reported that there was no significant difference between the emotional intelligence levels of physical education and sports college students and the emotional intelligence levels of the students who do individual and team sports according to some variables. In the study of Dalbudak (2020) no significant difference was found between the emotional intelligence levels of b2 and b3 visually impaired individuals, between the ages of 18-20 who do and do not do sports, in terms of individual and team sports. Emotional intelligence provides broader fields in sports. Since sports is a skill, we can say that individuals with good skills also have high emotional intelligence. If emotional intelligence has a positive relationship with the team and individual sports and people can control and regulate their emotions, according to this situation, we think that it is because the fact that it will increase the performance in sports in a positive way and emotional intelligence and there is no significant difference between them in individual and team sports. Since similar studies have been conducted, a finding that supports this idea in our study has been reached.

When emotional intelligence and personality are examined, there is a noticeable inverse relationship between the two scales and their subscales, except for some cases. Considering the relationship between the subscales of the two scales, no statistically significant correlation was found between the subscale mean scores of “extraversion” and “use of emotions”, and also between the “openness to experience” and “use of emotions” subscale mean scores ( $p > 0,05$ ). There is a statistically significant same-directional relationship between the mean scores of the “neuroticism” subscale and the “optimism/regulation of mood”, “evaluation of emotions” and “use of emotions” sub-scale scores ( $p < 0,05$ ). There is a statistically significant inverse relationship (one increases while the other decreases) for all other subscales of the two scales. When the relationship between the Emotional Intelligence subscales and the “5-factor personality scale” was examined, there was no significant relationship between the “optimism/regulation of mood” subscale mean scores and the “5-factor personality scale” mean scores of the “evaluation of emotions” and “use of emotions” subscale. It is observed that there is a reverse correlation between the mean scores and the “5-factor personality scale” mean scores ( $p > 0,05$ ). There is a relationship between all 5-factor personality scale subscales and “emotional intelligence scale” ( $p < 0,05$ ). Accordingly, there is a statistically significant same-direction relationship between “neuroticism” subscale mean scores and “emotional intelligence scale” mean scores. In addition, there is an inverse relationship between “extroversion”, “gentleness/agreeableness”, “self control/conscientiousness”, “openness to experience” and “social willingness” subscale mean scores and “emotional intelligence scale” mean scores. A statistically significant inverse relationship was found between the “5 Factor Personality Scale” and the “Emotional Intelligence Scale” at the 99% confidence level (correlation= -0,150 \*\* and  $p = 0,000$ ). Accordingly, while the mean scores of the “5 Factor Personality Scale” of the individuals increase, the mean scores of the “Emotional Intelligence Scale” decrease. Or, while the mean scores of the “5 Factor Personality Scale” of the individuals decrease, the mean scores of the “Emotional Intelligence Scale” increase. In our study, it was concluded that emotional intelligence is not related to personality. We can say that emotional intelligence does not affect personality. We can state that they are independent of each other. In his study, Tok (2008) concluded that emotional intelligence affects personality. This result does not coincide with our work.

According to the results obtained in this research, how much emotional intelligence and personality are effective on students studying at the faculty of sports sciences were found. The most important of these findings is that emotional intelligence does not affect personality. It has been observed that emotional intelligence and personality do not match.

## References

- Allen MS, Greenlees I, Jones M. (2011). *An investigation of the five-factor model of personality and coping behaviour in sport. Journal of sports sciences*, 29(8), 841-850.
- Austin, E. J., Saklofske, D. H., Huang, S. H. S., McKenney D. (2004). measurement of trait emotional intelligence: testing and cross-validating a modified version of Schutte et al.'s (1998) *Measure. Personality and Individual Differences*, 36: 555-562.
- Avşar, G., Kaşıkçı, M. (2010). Hemşirelik yüksekokulu öğrencilerinde duygusal zekâ düzeyi. *Anadolu Hemşirelik ve Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*, 13(1): 1-6.
- Dalbudak, İ. (2020). *18- 20 Yaş Arası Spor Yapan ve Yapmayan B2 ve B3 Görme Engelli Bireylerin Duygusal Zekâ ve Saldırganlık Düzeyleri*, 1.Baskı, Ankara: Gece Kitaplığı.
- Dalbudak, İ., Çelik, S. (2019). Investigation of Aggression and Emotional Intelligence Characteristics of the Students from Faculty of Sport Sciences and State Conservatory of Turkish Music. *International Education Studies*; 12 (9) 117-129.
- Damasio, A.R., (1999). *Descartes'in yanlıgısı*. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları.
- Digman JM. (1990). Personality Structure: Emergence of the five factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 41, 417-440.
- Dökmen, Ü. (2004). *Evrenle uyumlaşma sürecinde var olmak, gelişmek, uzlaşmak*. 11. Baskı, İstanbul: Sistem Yayıncılık.
- Egloff, B., Gruhn, A.J.(1996). Personality and endurance sports. *Personality and Individual Differences*; 21(2), 223–229.
- Ergin, F. E. (2000). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin sahip oldukları duygusal zekâ düzeyi ile kişilik özelliği arasında ilişki üzerine bir araştırma*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Konya.
- Ersanlı, K., (2012). *Davranışlarımız*. Ankara: DH Basın Yayın, Bileşik Dağıtım Yayınevi.
- Frijda, N.H. (1986). *The emotions*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Girgin, B. (2007). Beş Faktör Kişilik Modelinin İşyerinde Duygusal Tacize (Mobbing) Etkileri. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İşletme Anabilim Dalı, Kütahya.
- Goldberg LR. (1990). An alternative “Description of personality”: The Big-Five factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(6), 1216-1229.
- Goldberg LR. (1992). The Development of markers for the Big-Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment*, 4(1), 26-42.
- Goldberg LR. (1993). The Structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist*, 48(1), 26-34.
- Goleman, D., (1995). *Emotional intelligence*, New York: Bantam.
- Greenberg, J. (1999). *Managing Behavior in Organizations*. 2. Basım. Prentice Hall New Jersey.ABD.
- Halilbeyoğlu., F.H, Salman., N. M. (2018). Badminton sporcularının duygusal zekâ düzeylerinin bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi, *Social Sciences Studies Journal (SSSJournal)*, 4(13): 242-248.
- Harrod, N.R., Scheer, S.D., (2005). An exploration of adolescent emotional intelligence in relation to demographic characteristics. *Adolescence*, 40, 503-512.
- Işık, U.(2014). *Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Yüksekokulunda Okuyan Ciddi Boş Zaman Katılımcılarının Kişilik Özelliklerinin İncelenmesi*, Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Dumlupınar Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Kütahya.

- Karaoğlu, B., Behzat Turan B.M., Pepe, O.(2016). Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Yüksekokulu Öğrencilerinin Yaratıcılık Düzeyleri İle Duygusal Zekâ Seviyelerinin İncelenmesi, Gaziantep Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi, C.1, S.2, 85-99.
- Kırımoğlu, H., Yeniad., S , Çoban, E . (2014). Evaluation of Emotional Intelligence Levels of Candidate Teachers in Terms of Status of Playing Sports (Mustafa Kemal University Sample). Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences, 13 (1), 201-209.
- Lonchbaum, M.R., Rhode, R.E., Stevenson, S.J., Surlis, J., Stevens, T., Wang, C.K.J.(2010). Does gender moderate the exercising personality? An examination of continuous and stage-based exercise. *Psychology, Health and Medicine*; 15(1), 50–60.
- McRae, R.R., & Costa, P.T.Jr. (1997). “Personality Traits Structure as a Human Universal”. *American Psychologist*, 52, 509-516.
- Mount, M. K., Murray, R. B., Steve M. S. & Rounds, J. (2005). Higher-order dimensions of the big five personality traits and the big six vocational interest types, *Personnel Psychology*,58, 447–478.
- Oğan, E., Toy, Y.B., (2017). Meslek yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin duygusal zekâ düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Ordu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 7(3), 445-461.
- Özdenk, S. (2018). Spor Eğitimi Alan Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Duygusal Zeka Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi, *Turkish Studies Social Sciences*, Volume 13/18, P. 1033-1045.
- Random House Dictionary (1973). New York: Random House.
- Salar, B., Hekim, M., Tokgöz, M. (2012). 15-18 Yaş Grubu Takım ve Ferdi Spor Yapan Bireylerin Duygusal Durumlarının Karşılaştırılması, *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 4(6), 123-135.
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D. J., Cooper, J. T., Golden, C. J. ve Dornheim, L., (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 25: 167- 177.
- Somer, O., Korkmaz, M. & Tatar, A. (2004). Kuramdan uygulamaya beş faktör kişilik modeli ve beş faktör kişilik envanteri (5FKE). Ege Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi, Yayın No: 128, İzmir.
- Taşkın AK., Taşgın Ö., Başaran M.H., Taşkın C. (2010). Beden eğitimi ve spor yüksekokulu öğrencilerinde duygusal zekâ düzeylerinin bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilim Dergisi*, 12(2): 98-103.
- Tatar, A. (2005). Çok Boyutlu Kişilik Envanteri'nin Madde-Cevap Kuramına Göre Kısa Formunun Geliştirilmesi ve Psikometrik Özelliklerinin İncelenmesi. Doktora Tezi, Ege Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İzmir.
- Tatar, A., Tok, S., Saltukoğlu, G. (2011). Gözden geçirilmiş Schutte duygusal zekâ ölçeğinin Türkçeye uyarlanması ve psikometrik özelliklerinin incelenmesi. *Klinik Psikofarmakoloji Bülteni*, 21(4). 325-338.
- Tok, S., (2008). *Performans sporcusu ve spor yapmayan üniversite öğrencilerinde duygusal zekâ ile kişilik özelliklerinin karşılaştırılması*, Doktora Tezi, Ege Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir.
- Tutar, H. (2016). Sosyal Psikoloji, Ankara, Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Veccohio, R.P. (1988). *Organizational Behavior*. The Dryden Press International Edition, ABD.
- Watson, A.E., Pulford, B.D.(2004). Personality differences in high risk sports and amateurs and instructors. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*; 83-94.