



Journal of Fundamentals
of Mental Health



Mashhad University
of Medical Sciences



Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Research Center

Original Article

A study of the concept of wisdom in adults using personality traits

*Hossein Malek Mohammadi¹; Hassan Rahmani Shams²; Ghasem Heshmat³; Behrouz Faramarzi Rad³

¹Ph.D. in psychology and education of exceptional children, Social Welfare Organization, Rey, Tehran, Iran.

²MA. in general psychology, Social Welfare Organization, Rey, Tehran, Iran.

³MA. in psychology and education of exceptional children, Iran.

Abstract

Introduction: Wisdom is not a new concept that nowadays can be regarded as being technically advanced in the information age, but wisdom is also associated with an implicit concept of “antiquity” which is apparently beyond its own time, knowledge and culture. The presented study aimed to examine the concept of wisdom in adults using personality traits.

Materials and Methods: The study consisted of 1016 individuals using the convenient sampling method with age range of 18-71 years (519 women and 497 men). A researcher-made questionnaire including 206 personality traits was used for data collection and exploratory factor analysis was used for data analysis.

Results: Factor analysis indicated three effective factors: self-centeredness, intellectuality, philanthropy. The results obtained from the present study indicated that the mean value of 2.49 for the first factor is less than the mean values of 5.62 and 5.46 for intellectuality and philanthropy, respectively.

Conclusion: The results of the present study revealed that wisdom is a multidimensional concept. In other words, wise people are also intellectual and philanthropic. In contrast, unwise people are those who are self-centered indicating traits associated with implacability.

Keywords: Adults, Personality traits, Wisdom.

Please cite this paper as:

Malek Mohammadim H, Rahmani Shams H, Heshmat Gh, Faramarzi Rad B. A study of the concept of wisdom in adults using personality traits. *Journal of Fundamentals of Mental Health* 2017; 19(3-Special Issue): 185-190.

Introduction

The marriage contract in Islam is one of the most popular and happiest kinship duties between the creator and the creature. The religion of Islam has given great value to marriage. The healthiest human society is a society whose smallest unit, the family, is healthy. Husband and wife should love each other so that love for God can be

achieved on the basis of that, and the warm heart of the family will attract the blessings and blessings of God and give a pure and healthy generation to the society. The first step of forming a family is marriage, which prepares people to leave the state of celibacy and to build a great society (1). Marital satisfaction is an overall assessment of the state of a person's current

*Corresponding Author: Social Welfare Organization, Rey, Tehran, Iran.

hmm.psy@gmail.com

Received: Feb. 13, 2017

Accepted: Mar. 15, 2017

marital or romantic relationship. Marital satisfaction can be a reflection of people's level of happiness from marital relationships or a combination of satisfaction due to many factors specific to marital relationships. A person's satisfaction with married life is considered as his satisfaction with the family, and satisfaction with the family means satisfaction with life, and as a result, it will facilitate the growth and excellence and the material and spiritual progress of the society (2). Marital satisfaction can be considered as a psychological situation that does not arise by itself, but requires the efforts of both partners. Especially in the early years, marital satisfaction is very unstable and relationships are at the highest risk (3). Kaplan and Sadock (4) state that marital satisfaction is a personal experience in marriage that can only be evaluated by the person himself in response to the level of enjoyment of the marital relationship. They believe that marital satisfaction depends on people's expectations. Married life can be a successful life when the parties have cultural and class homogeneity and have similar values because with the emergence of machine civilization, the relationship between men and women has become complicated. Therefore, marriage has techniques that couples should be aware of, otherwise they will face problems that lead to separation (5).

Marital intimacy as an important aspect of married life has a long history, the attempt to classify it goes back to the time of Aristotle, and today part of the knowledge in this field confirms his observations, but the scientific study about it started in the 1990s. has begun and with the introduction of a topic such as interpersonal relationships in family psychology and considering intimate relationships between husband and wife as one of its important types, this relationship has found a special place and meaning in married life in such a way that in Theorizing about the family emphasizes the importance of intimate bonding between spouses and considers it necessary to create a secure family identity. Intimacy is a protective and powerful factor against personal and social problems by creating a special and positive dimension in married life and ensuring the mental health of family members. In this sense, it emphasizes the intimacy between husband and wife in the family (6). Recognizing intimacy

means recognizing diversity in family structures, and for this reason, family therapists try not to consider individual problems as the result of individual growth and development by considering the person in intimate relationships in the family, and in treating a situation Make couples increase their intimacy with each other and understand different styles of intimacy. Definitely, intimacy is useful and necessary for parents and children, for spouses, and for the stability and strength of family and marital relationships. An intimate relationship includes caring, mutual trust, and acceptance, and the quality of the relationship is stability for both sexual and non-sexual intimacy of couples (7).

In a research that examined the marital satisfaction of the families of working women and housewives, the results indicated that the marital satisfaction of housewives is higher than that of working women. Also, the results showed that the marital satisfaction of men with a housewife wife is higher than men with a working wife (8). In a research by examining the prediction of marital satisfaction based on the variables of communication beliefs and marital intimacy in divorced and normal women of Mashhad (9), the results showed that marital satisfaction can be determined by the variables of communication beliefs and marital intimacy in two groups.

The applicant predicted a normal divorce. Syvnily et al., in the research, investigated the effect of burden of responsibility on sexual intimacy and marital satisfaction in Alzheimer's couples. The findings showed that there was a difference between the experimental group and the control group regarding marital satisfaction and emotional and sexual intimacy (8). Mirgain investigated the relationship between emotional skills, intimacy and marital satisfaction. The results show that emotional skills can be reliably observed in relationships between spouses. Also, the results support the model in which emotional skills affect marital satisfaction through their impact on intimacy. And high intimacy increases marital satisfaction (10,11). In their research, Daghaghleh, Asgari and Heydari investigated the relationship, love, intimacy with marital satisfaction among the employees of the Islamic Azad University of Ahvaz. The results showed that there is a significant positive relationship

between intimacy and marital satisfaction (12). Hiyoten and, Berat came to the conclusion that there is a positive and significant correlation between the practice of religious beliefs and the level of intimacy, agreement, honesty, affection and adherence to commitments, in the sense that the higher the level of practice of religious beliefs in couples, they experience more satisfaction (13).

In a study that compared sexual satisfaction, marital commitment, marital intimacy and body image in married working women and housewives.

The results showed that there is a significant difference between working women and housewives in terms of sexual satisfaction, marital commitment, marital intimacy and body image, meaning that working women reported better results in all four variables (14,15). According to the presented materials, the aim of this research is to compare the marital satisfaction and marital intimacy of working and non-working female students of Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz branch.

Materials and Methods

The statistical population of this research includes all working and non-working married female students of Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz branch, who were examined in the academic year 2013-2014. The size of the statistical population is 3500 people, and according to Morgan's table, the sample of this research consists of 246 people from the mentioned population, and available sampling method was used to select them.

Research instruments

A) Enrich Marital Satisfaction Questionnaire: This scale was created in 1989 by Olson, Forni and Drankman in America with the aim of evaluating potentially problematic areas or identifying areas of strength and fruitfulness in the marital relationship (16).

The validity and reliability of this questionnaire was calculated by Soleimani. The criterion validity of this questionnaire with the family compatibility questionnaire was obtained as 0.86 and 0.92 respectively (all were significant at the 0.05 level), which indicates its acceptable validity and its reliability is 0.95. It is calculated by

Cronbach's alpha method. In this research, Cronbach's alpha method was used to determine the reliability of the marital satisfaction questionnaire, which is equal to 0.70 for the entire questionnaire, which indicates the acceptable reliability coefficients of the mentioned questionnaire (17).

B) Bagaroozi Marital Intimacy Questionnaire: Bagaroozi Needs Survey Questionnaire (18) is designed to evaluate the needs of intimacy in emotional, psychological, intellectual, sexual, physical, spiritual, aesthetic and recreational-social dimensions. It contains 41 questions that the subject answers each question in a ranked form, from 1 meaning "there is no such need at all" to 10 meaning "there is a great need". The highest score is 50 in each dimension and 60 in the dimension of spiritual intimacy.

Emetadi et al. (15) obtained the reliability of this questionnaire with Cronbach's alpha test of 0.94 and to determine the content validity, the questionnaire was given to 15 counseling professors and 15 married couples, and its content validity was confirmed.

The reliability coefficient of the whole questionnaire was obtained by Cronbach's alpha method of 0.94. In addition, Khamse and Hosseini (20) in a study calculated the reliability of each dimension of intimacy with the test-retest method, which for emotional, psychological, intellectual, sexual, physical, spiritual, aesthetic and social-recreational intimacy, respectively, 0.89, 0.82, 0.81, 0.91, 0.80, 0.65, 0.76, 0.51 were obtained and it indicates the acceptable reliability of this scale. In the current research, Cronbach's alpha method was used to determine the reliability of the emotional intimacy questionnaire, which was 0.89 for the whole questionnaire (emotional intimacy 0.70, psychological intimacy 0.58, intellectual intimacy 0.61, sexual intimacy 0.54, physical intimacy (0.65), spiritual intimacy (0.59), aesthetic intimacy (0.74) and social intimacy (0.70), which indicate the desired reliability coefficients of the mentioned questionnaire.

Results

The descriptive findings of this research including statistical indicators such as mean, standard deviation for all variables studied in this research are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Grading of 206 personality traits based on average scores

Score	Trait
6-7	Responsible, thoughtful
5-6	Thoughtful, polite, forward-looking, alert, reasoning, conscientious, well-educated, intellectual, self-respecting, logical, loyal, realistic, reliable, intelligent, stable, restrained, understanding, steadfast, honest, prudent, wise, intelligent, secretive, just, patient, grateful, helpful, peaceful, powerful, brave, strong, good-natured, insightful, self-sacrificing, pleasant, reliable, tolerant, trustworthy, ethical Compassionate, sober, self-aware, law-abiding, kind-hearted, orderly, punctual, compassionate, loving, hard-working, thoughtful, fair, dignified, efficient, creative, sociable, brave, lovable, outgoing, active, calculating, happy, healthy, pleasant, reserved, serious, curious, energetic, social, efficient, friendly, optimistic, determined, flexible, independent, thrifty, kind, passionate, generous, skilled, happy, admirable, modest, groomed, empathetic, idealistic, dynamic, calm, spiritual, fearless, warm-hearted, protective, broad interests, stubborn, and gentle
4-5	Bold, progressive, relaxed, smooth and straightforward, adventurous, agile, outspoken, restrained, cautious, charming, hypocritical, emotional, artistic, intimate, sensitive, reckless, head down, ambitious, low Anticipation, hedonism, opportunism, excitement, fanatic, and stupid
3-4	Traditionalist, submissive, irritable, easy-going, quiet, self-centered, self-interested, dreamer, objector, self-righteous, dependent, talkative, spendthrift, expectant, quick-tempered, and worried
2-3	Obsessive, anxious, shy, arrogant, biased, hasty, sad, distrustful, sarcastic, domineering, pretentious, showy, stubborn, selfish, restless, aggressive, restless, angry, nervous, greedy, suspicious, miserly, indifferent, capricious, bored, inconsiderate, insidious, pessimistic, timid, complacent, distracted, self-willed, distracted, belligerent, showy, displeased, hot-tempered, inconsistent, bully, crafty, callous, careless, grumpy, frivolous, inexperienced, vain, shallow, inept, immature, wicked, desperate, superstitious, ridiculous, lazy, hypocrite, liar, vindictive, sloppy, ungrateful, ungrateful, unwilling, weak-minded, and ungrateful
1-2	Unscrupulous, weak, cruel, rude, stupid, and ignorant

The main axis factorization method and two orthogonal (Varimax) and inclined (Oblimin) rotation methods were used to check the factorial structure of the evaluation scale of wise traits. The significance of the information in a matrix was determined through Bartlett's chi-square test, the significance of this test being the minimum necessary condition to perform factor analysis. In this study, the value of Bartlett's sphericity test ($\chi^2=73626$, $P=0.001$) with a degree of freedom of 9180 showed that this assumption is true. In addition, the results showed that the value of the Keyser-Meyer-Elkin sampling adequacy index (8) was equal to 0.97. As a result, the factorial structure of the questionnaire was provided (9). After checking the indicators of sphericity and sampling adequacy, the factor structure of the questionnaire with factor loadings higher than 0.45 was followed up because it is the first time that the microstructure has been investigated in Iranian culture. In the next step, the eigenvalues of each factor, the variance explained by each factor, the matrix of residuals, the graph of pebbles, and the factor loadings obtained from each attribute on all three factors were examined. The results indicated that three factors best fit the data, so the first, second, and third factors with eigenvalues of 32.94, 11.41, and 4.76 and variance Explained 24.22, 8.39, and 3.50 explain

36.12% of the total variance of the scale. However, the following factors explained the variance at the one percent level, which was excluded. Factor loadings were another indicator that was examined. The results showed that the traits loaded on each factor have little in common with other factors, which was why Varimax rotation was used as an orthogonal rotation that factor considered independently of each other.

After loading the attributes on the factors, the semantic analysis of each factor indicated that the first factor could be called self-centeredness, the second factor being thoughtful, and the third factor was philanthropic. Before examining the relationship between the three factors extracted from the traits of a wise person, their weighted average was calculated. The obtained results show that the average of the first factor with a value of 2.49 is much lower than the average of the two factors of being a thinker and being a philanthropist, which is 5.62 and 5.46. Furthermore, the average of the response spectrum in this scale is equal to 4, which shows that the average of the first factor is much lower than the average of the spectrum, and the second and third factors are higher than the average. The results obtained from the trait recognition coefficient on each factor showed that the remaining traits in the exploratory factor analysis

model have the power to distinguish wise people from non-wise people. Also, the value of Cronbach's alpha was checked by removing each attribute in each factor, and the results obtained in this section also indicated that the attributes have a high value in the factors, and for this reason, no attribute was found that could be removed. Increase the value of alpha. The results of this factor analysis provided an insight into what traits of people can be an indicator of wisdom and non-wisdom. For example, wise people are those who are thoughtful and people-friendly. On the other hand, unwise people are self-centered and show characteristics combined with malice.

Discussion

This study aimed to investigate the concept of wisdom using personality traits. The results of factor analysis showed three factors: self-centeredness, thoughtfulness, and philanthropy. The factors obtained are similar to the factors obtained in other studies. The thinking factor (the second factor) in this research with the cognitive component (experienced, intelligence) and reflection (intuition and introspection). Other studies have the components of reasoning ability (has a unique ability to examine a problem or situation and solve it, high ability to solve problems, logical thinking, an excellent ability to distinguish right from wrong, the ability to apply knowledge to particular problems) (3) and quick use of information (experienced, seeking information) (5), general competence component (intelligent, education seen) (4), the component of intelligence (intelligence, ability to solve problems, genius) (10), the component of skills and knowledge (a person has a desire for knowledge and truth, the ability to analyze and solve problems and their causes, clear thinking and high mental capacity) (6) and thinking component (analyst, humanist, good knowledge of others, contemplative, in-depth) (11) are consistent. The philanthropic factor (the third factor) in this research with an emotional component (peaceful, understanding, compassionate) (3), knowledge component (concern for others, understanding, fair, open to

learning from others) (5), skill component interpersonal skills (positive, respectful, and accepting ways with others) (4), warmth component (having humor, kindness, compassion, liveliness) (10), and philanthropy component (humorous, good manners, communication skills, good manners) (12) is consistent. The selection of positive and negative traits made it possible for us to grade stupidity in addition to wisdom. Entering negative traits as an indicator of stupid people made it possible to get information about the traits that describe stupid people. In particular, we found that a person who is thought of as spiteful, hot-tempered, nervous, pessimistic, selfish, etc., cannot be considered wise. This research, like the research of Douglas and Farrell (13) and unlike other research, has paid attention to the negative traits that describe stupid people.

The present study, like other mentioned studies, showed that wisdom is a multidimensional structure and a combination of cognitive and reflective elements (thinking) and emotional elements (philanthropy) play a role in it (14). Wisdom is different from other human abilities because it requires the harmony of mind and virtue, reason and character.

This harmony leads to a unified and overall vision of life. Wisdom, as the integration of reasoning and behavior, is the embodiment of tacit and symbolic knowledge that deals with real benevolent life in an open and profound way, which can ultimately positively provide the possibility of human flourishing. We hope the current research has shown that wisdom is a unique concept and deserves a central position in contemporary psychological research.

Conclusion

The results of the present study showed that the concept of wisdom is a multidimensional concept. This factor analysis provided an insight into what traits of people can be an indicator of wisdom and non-wisdom.

For example, wise people are thoughtful and people-friendly people. On the other hand, unwise people are self-centered and show characteristics combined with malice.

References

1. Mashayekhi M. [Its wisdom and happiness in compliance with the poetry of the poet Ferdowsi's Shahnameh and Persian and Arabic languages]. *Comparative literature* 2008; 3: 213-33. (Persian)

2. Sternberg R. [Training wisdom, intelligence, creativity and success]. Malek Mohammadi H. (translator). Tehran: Venus; 2015. (Persian)
3. Clayton V, Birren JE. The development of wisdom across the life span: A re-examination of an ancient topic. In: Baltes PB, Brim OG. (editors). Life-span development and behavior. New York: Academic Press; 1980: 103-35.
4. Holliday SG, Chandler MJ. Wisdom: Explorations in adult competence. New York: Karger; 1986.
5. Sternberg RJ. Implicit theories of intelligence, creativity, and wisdom. *J Pers Social Psychol* 1985; 49: 607-27.
6. Yang SY. Conceptions of wisdom among Taiwanese Chinese. *J Cross-Cultur Psychol* 2001; 32: 662-80.
7. Sarmad G, Bazargan, AS, Hijazi A. [Research methods in the behavioral sciences]. Tehran: Cognizant; 2000. (Persian)
8. Kaiser HF. An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika* 1974; 39: 31-6.
9. Myers AS, Gamst G, Garynv J. *Applied Multivariate Research*. Pasha Sharifi H. (translator). Tehran: Roshd; 2012. (Persian)
10. Jason LA, Reichler A, King C, Madsen D, Camacho J, Marchese W. The measurement of wisdom: A preliminary effort. *J Commun Psychol* 2001; 29(5): 585-98.
11. Malek Mohammadi H, Hashemi Azar Pilerud ZH, Beige, Pezeshk SH, Sarrami GhR. Qualitative and quantitative evaluation of the concept of reason is based on nonlinear analysis. *Psychology of exceptional individuals* 2014; 4: 81-102. (Persian)
12. Malek Mohammadi H, Hashemi Azar Pilerud ZH, Beige Pezeshk SH, Sarrami GhR. [Broken relationship with personality factors in adults]. *Proceedings of the First Congress of the Humanities and social damage*. 2014. (Persian)
13. Douglas HA, Farrell AH. Perceptions of wisdom associated with selected occupations. *Curr Psychol* 1997; 16(2): 115.
14. Birren JE, Fisher LM. The elements of wisdom: overview and integration. In: Sternberg RJ. (editor). *Wisdom, its nature, origins and development*; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1990: 317-32.