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Abstract
The present study was conducted to find out the effect of different school environments on Wisdom and Emotional Intelligence. For this 200 Secondary School students from Govt. Schools and 200 students from Public Schools were tested on 3-dimension of wisdom and five dimensions of emotional intelligence. Obtained data were analyzed by applying descriptive statistics (Mean, SD and t-ratios). Results revealed the Public School Students scoring significantly high on all the three dimensions of wisdom. They have scored significantly high on four dimensions of emotional intelligence i.e. Motivating Oneself, Self-Awareness, Handling Relations and Managing Emotions and low on Empathy.
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1. Introduction
The concept of wisdom is ancient, although interest in empirical research in this construct has only been recent. Specific meaning of Wisdom as been transformed across different historical times and contexts. Some thoughts or actions might be considered to be wise at some point in time, but unwise at others. Several definitions of wisdom have been proposed. The Berlin Wisdom Paradigm (Baltes and Smith, 1990; Baltes and Staudinger, 2000) defined wisdom as an expert knowledge in fundamental pragmatics of life that permits exceptional insight, judgement and advice about complex and certain matters and expertise in the conduct and meaning of life. Sternberg (1998, 2000) his balance theory has conceptualised wisdom as an application of tacit knowledge and mediated by values towards achievement of a common good through a balance among multiple interpersonal, intrapersonal and extrapersonal interests in order to achieve a balance among adaptation to existing environments, shaping of existing Environments and selection of new environments. The epistemetic theory (Brugman, 2000, 2006) highlighted three key components of wisdom: meta cognition (acknowledging uncertainly and ability for dialectical thinking), personality/affect (emotional stability despite uncertainty and openness to new experience), and behaviour (ability to act in the face of uncertainty). More recently, scholars have conceptualized Wisdom under two sub-headings i.e. general and personal wisdom. General wisdom refers to an individual’s insights into life in general, from an observer’s view point. Personal wisdom, on the other hand, refers to individual’s insights into their selves and their own lives. Ardelt (2000, 2004) has stressed three primary dimensions of personal wisdom: Cognitive Wisdom (ability to understand a situation thoroughly, , knowing the positive and negative aspects of human nature, awareness of life’s inherent uncertainty, yet ability to make decisions inspite of this), Reflective Wisdom (ability and willingness to examine phenomena from multiple perspectives and absence of projections/blaming others for one’s own situation or feeling), and Affective Wisdom (positive emotions and behaviours with absence of indifferent or negative emotions toward others and remaining positive in the face of adversity). These components are both necessary and sufficient for the development of wisdom. Further, Ardelt (2008) sees the reflective component as a pre-requisite for proper cognitive development. Through reflective and insightful self-examination based on the willingness to learn from experiences, one can achieve a deeper understanding of life. This process reduces the personality characteristics that distort the perception of reality (self-absorption, subjectivity, and projections); and increases the ability to see the true nature of objects, people and relationships. Consequently, the affective characteristics are improved particularly those related to self-transcendence as a compassionate concern for others. Ardelt
(2004) has further emphasized that for a person to be wise all three components (reflective, cognitive and affective) need to be present simultaneously and the ultimate object of the wisdom pursuit is knowledge of the truth-universal answers to the questions of life. Wisdom emerges when the theoretical, abstract, and detached knowledge becomes applied, concrete and involved. Hence, the wisdom cannot exist independently of individuals, even the most profound wisdom literature remains intellectuals or theoretical knowledge until its inherent wisdom is realized or introjected by a person (Ardelt 2004). For measurement of wisdom, Ardelt (2003) has operationalized her model with development a self-report questionnaire called 3-Dimensional Wisdom scale (3-DWS). Positive correlates of 3D-WS include general well-being, mastery purpose in life, and subjective health whereas negative correlates include depressive symptoms, felling of economic pressure, death avoidance, and death anxiety.

**Objective of the Study**

The main objective of the present study is to examine differential effects of two types of school environments i.e. Public and Govt. on wisdom and emotional intelligence. Hence objectives are stated as:

1. Comparison of public and govt. school students on three dimensions of wisdom.
2. Comparison of public and govt. school students on five dimensions of emotional intelligence.

**Hypotheses:**

1. Public School students tend to be high on all the three dimensions of wisdom i.e. Cognitive, Reflective and Affective.
2. Public School students are likely to be high in all the five dimensions of Emotional Intelligence i.e. Empathy, Motivating Oneself, Self-Awareness, Handling Relations, and Managing Emotions.

**Method**

**Sample**

The sample consisted of 400 Secondary School students randomly drawn from various Govt. Secondary Schools and Public Secondary Schools of Kurukshetra District of Haryana of which 200 were from Govt. Schools and 200 from Public Schools. Participating students ranged in age from 14 to 16 years with the mean age of 15 years. Samples from two types of schools consisted of both male and female students. Data from male and female students were combined in view of the recommendations by Ardelt (2009) that there are no gender differences in overall wisdom.

**Measures**

Following measures were used for data collection:

1. **Three Dimensional Wisdom Scale**

Three Dimensional Wisdom Scales (3D-WS) developed by Monika Ardelt (2003) was used to measure three dimensions of wisdom i.e. Cognitive, Reflective, and Affective. High scores on all the three dimensions depict high level of wisdom. The scale consists of 39 items, of which 14 are for cognitive, 12 for reflective and 13 for affective dimension of wisdom. Items are responded on five point scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree) and from 1 (definitely true of myself) to 5 (not true of myself).

2. **Multi-Dimensional measure of Emotional Intelligence**

Multi-Dimensional Measure of Emotional Intelligence (MMEI) developed by Darolia (2003) consist of sixty five multiple response choice items indexing five dimensions of emotional intelligence viz, Empathy, Self-awareness, Motivating Oneself, Managing Emotions and Handing Relations. On each item subject is required to check and report one of the five response choices that describes his or her behaviour the best. The internal consistency coefficients for five scales have been assessed in terms of alpha coefficients and were found to be ranging from .76 to .83. The construct validity of scale was established through factor analysis and found to be satisfactory.

**Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Public Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Government Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>55.92</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>57.17</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>-1.99</td>
<td>P&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>58.27</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>56.20</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>P&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>45.46</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>46.86</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>P&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>57.63</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>55.70</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>P&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>52.46</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>50.40</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>P&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>41.60</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>P&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective</td>
<td>38.32</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>37.25</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>40.640</td>
<td>5.807</td>
<td>38.861</td>
<td>5.624</td>
<td>3.122</td>
<td>P&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-1 reveals that Public School students have scored significantly high on all the three dimensions of wisdom viz. Cognitive Wisdom (PSS Mean = 41.600; SD = 7.24; GSS Mean = 38.10, SD = 6.588; t = 5.05 p < .01), Reflective Wisdom (PSS Mean = 38.32, SD = 5.67; GSS Mean = 37.25, SD = 5.241; t = 1.95 (Near Significant) and Affective Wisdom (PSS Mean = 40.640, SD = 5.80, GSS Mean = 38.86, SD = 5.624; t = 3.122 p < .01) than their counterpart Govt. School students. It posits that Public School students tend to have more understanding and knowledge of the positive and negative aspects of human nature; ability and willingness to look at phenomena and events from different perspectives; and to be more sympathetic and compassionate for others as compared to the Govt. School students. With this finding Hypothesis no. 1 is partially supported positing that Public school students tend to be high on all the three dimensions of Wisdom.
In case of five dimensions of emotional intelligence, Public School students have scored significantly high on Motivating Oneself (PSS Mean = 58.245, SD = 7.411; GSS Mean = 56.20, SD = 6.517; t = 2.93 p < .01), Self-Awareness (PSS Mean = 48.46, SD = 5.43; GSS Mean = 46.86, SD = 4.70; t = 3.13 p < .01), Handling Relations (PSS Mean = 57.63, SD = 6.14; GSS Mean = 55.70, SD = 6.39; t = 3.08 p < .01) and Managing Emotions (PSS Mean = 52.460, SD = 6.75; GSS Mean = 50.40, SD = 6.956; t = 2.99 p < .01); and low on Empathy (PSS Mean = 55.920; SD = 6.705; GSS Mean = 57.17, SD = 5.787; t = -1.996 p < .01) than their counterpart Govt. School students. It suggests that Public School students tend to have high level of achievement drive, commitment, initiative, optimism, conflict management, apt communication, team capabilities, self-control, trustworthiness, adaptability and innovativeness than Govt. School students. Low score on Empathy here posits that Public School students tend to be lacking the capacity for understanding others, developing others, and service orientation to others as compared to the Govt. School students. This finding almost supports Hypothesis no.2 positing that Public School students tend to be scoring high on the measures of emotional intelligence than Govt. Schools students.

Conclusion
The significant differences between the scores of two types of students indirectly depict the differential effects of two types of school environments. These differences can be understood in-terms of their curriculum i.e. public schools provide more exposures to multiple occasions and situations which facilitate the cultivation of wisdom in the students. And hence the academic environment of Public schools is considered to be stimulating school environment. On the other hand Govt. Schools of Haryana provide non-stimulating school environments to the students as a result of which the students cannot get the varied occasions for the cultivation of wisdom and emotional intelligence. Obtained findings are understandable in terms of the conceptualization of wisdom that it develops in forms of tacit knowledge acquired through interactions with socio-cultural settings. Similarly emotional intelligence consist of group of abilities and skills of understanding of others’ emotions appropriately and of expulsion of one’s emotions appropriately during interpersonal interactions, which are cultivated through varied interpersonal and socio-cultural encounters. The Public Schools, in general, provide the opportunities for such interpersonal and socio-cultural encounters.

Suggestions
School administration, management can be advised to prepare curriculum oriented to cultivate wisdom and emotional competences among their students so that they can be adaptive and adjectives in their life in addition to their academic achievements.
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