

# Emotional Intelligence and Gender Differences: A Study among the Youth in Bangalore City, India

**Jay Mamtora and Kazi Nabeeha Nadeem**

The Byramjee Jeejeebhoy College of Commerce, Mumbai, Maharashtra  
jay.mamtora@gmail.com

**Abstract:** *Emotional Intelligence (EI) assumes a critical part in an individual's scholar, expert and individual achievement. Youth, who are at the edge of section into their expert lives, need to develop their EI that has now turned into the most fundamental ability for endurance in an association alongside the gig explicit specialized capabilities. The point of this study was to survey the EI among the young people of Bangalore city. The example contained 800 youth in the age gathering of 18 to 24 years, comprising 333 young men and 467 young ladies. Results uncovered that by and large EI among the adolescent was higher ( $115.90 \pm 30.91$ ) than the ordinary reach ( $68 \pm 16$ ). However, the young men had somewhat higher scores ( $116.92 \pm 31.45$ ) than the young ladies ( $115.17 \pm 30.54$ ), the thing that matters was statically not critical. This might be expected to comparable socio-segment foundation (family structure, religion, monetary gatherings), up-acquiring metropolitan regions or potentially forward-looking society in the district. Regarding age gatherings, mean contrast was exceptionally critical where more established age bunch (22-24 years) had higher mean score ( $127.74 \pm 23.309$ ) of EI than the more youthful (18-20 years) age bunch ( $72.95 \pm 20.589$ ), confirming that EI creates with age*

**Keywords:** Youth, Emotional Intelligence, Orientation, Age

## I. INTRODUCTION

In this day and age, "growing up" isn't what it used to be a long time back. The existences of youth today present an extensive variety of instructive, familial, profession and wellbeing encounters that leave in significant ways from those young a couple of ages back and they invest longer energy in getting ready for adulthood than their folks (Nugent, 2005). Immaturity (10 to 19 years) and youth (15 to 24 years) is a time of progress when a singular changes truly and mentally from a youngster to a grown-up. This progress includes mental, profound, social and scholarly changes. At this stage, youth might require the abilities for adapting to the natural requests and tensions.

The capacity to understand people on a deeper level (EI) is a defensive element that can come to the guide at this stage, if by some stroke of good luck, the young are fittingly directed and made mindful. EI is a variety of non-mental capacities, capabilities and abilities that impact one's capacity to prevail with regards to adapting to ecological requests and tensions (Bar-On, 2006). EI is "a type of social insight that includes the capacity to screen one's own and others' sentiments and feelings, to separate among them, and to utilize this data to direct one's reasoning and action" (Salovey and Mayer, 1990). EI is a benefit in any space throughout everyday life; whether in personal connections, coexisting with individuals around us or getting the non-verbal standards that help outcome in hierarchical governmental issues (Goleman, 1995).

By and large, are more mindful of their feelings, show more sympathy, and are more capable relationally. Since ladies will generally be closer to home and personal in connections when contrasted with men, so their capacity to understand people on a profound level should be higher than that of men. Then again, men are more self-assured, hopeful, and versatile. It was observed that men are likewise ready to deal with pressure better compared to ladies (Kar et al., 2014). As a general rule, notwithstanding, definitely a larger number of likenesses exist than contrasts. A few men are compassionate as the most relationally reasonable ladies are, while certain ladies are similarly as ready to endure pressure as the most genuinely versatile men. While Bachchan et.al (2016) have uncovered in their review that men had higher profound shrewd than ladies, Anuradha and Kalapriya (2015) have detailed in their examination that lady have higher capacity to understand anyone on a deeper level than men. A few examinations have revealed that orientation

doesn't influence the degree of the capacity to understand people on a profound level (Tiwari and Srivastava, 2004; Kar, et al. 2014).

Bar-On (2006) has demonstrated and uncovered that mental capacities increment with age that achieves expanded social and the ability to understand individuals at their core. Boyatzis et.al. (2000) has likewise demonstrated that individuals can change their profound skills north of two to five years that in a progression of longitudinal examinations directed. In any case, no critical connection was found among age and the capacity to understand people on a profound level in a review that was led by Nasir and Masrur (2010). Fernandez-Berrocal, et.al. (2012) directed a concentrate on the interceding impact old enough on distinctions in sexual orientation in capacity to understand people on a profound level. Consequences of this study showed that while orientation might decide contrasts in EI, age intervenes this connection with the end goal that these distinctions might diminish significantly or vanish by and large.

Consequently, it was seen that there were a few examinations directed that uncovered various outcomes and no speculations are conceivable with such changed results. Taking into account the quantity of elements affecting the degrees of EI, it is obvious that leading a few investigations on this field, at various socioeconomics by utilizing various factors is fundamental. However, there is an overall examination on EI and distinctions in sexual orientation, a couple explores have been directed on this subject among the young in Bangalore that has arisen as a cosmopolitan city. Numerous previous specialists have zeroed in on the profound remainder of directors and experts previously working in the field sitting above the young who are the future chiefs and residents of the country. The current review was conceptualized considering the issues referenced previously. The target of the current review was to evaluate the capacity to understand people on a deeper level and dissect the distinctions as for orientation and age, if any, among the young in Bangalore city.

## II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The example of this study contained 800 youth in the age gathering of 18 to 24 years, comprising 333 young men and 467 young ladies drawn haphazardly from different instructive foundations inside the purview of Bangalore city in India. A normalized scale on Capacity to understand people on a profound level created by Hyde and Pethe (2002) was utilized to evaluate the EI. This self-detailing EI scale contains 34 things with 5 goal sorts of reactions for every assertion. This test estimates the ten elements of the capacity to appreciate people on a deeper level specifically mindfulness, sympathy, self-inspiration, profound soundness, overseeing relations, trustworthiness, self-improvement, esteem direction, responsibility and unselfish ways of behaving as well as by and large ability to understand individuals on a profound level. This scale has a legitimacy and parted half unwavering quality of 0.93 and 0.88 individually. Manual scoring was finished utilizing a 5-point scale for genuine sort of replies: 'unequivocally concur' scored with 5, 'concur' scored with 4, 'questionable' scored with 3, 'dissent' scored with 2 and emphatically differ scored with 1. The complete scores under each aspect and generally speaking score were taken as a base to distinguish the EI among youth. Higher scores show elevated degree of EI while lower scores demonstrate low degree of EI. Information was exposed to factual investigation involving SPSS bundle 16 rendition for Windows. The mean and standard deviation (SD) were figured. 't'test and F-test were applied to actually look at the huge contrasts between orientation (young ladies and young men) and age gatherings (18 to 20 years, 20 to 22 years and 22 to 24 years), individually.

## III. RESULTS

Table 1 shows the profile of the review test where higher rate were young ladies (58.4%) than young men (41.6%) and greater part were of 20-22 years (44.9%) trailed by 41.8% were of 22-24 years and 13.4% were in the age gathering of 18-20 years. Of the all-out example, 67.4% of them were chasing after under graduate projects while 32.6% were seeking after post-graduate projects in different instructive organizations in Bangalore city.

Table 2 uncovers the mean and SD score for EI under various aspects for the review bunch. The discoveries show that the young people of present review got higher mean score under every one of the aspects along with under generally EI. This shows that current review test has elevated degree of the ability to appreciate people on a deeper level under all aspects.

Table 3 uncovers the orientation wise mean, SD and t-esteem score for various elements of EI among the review test. The mean score of by and large EI was insignificantly higher for young men (116.92±38.45) than young ladies

(115.17±30.54) and no huge contrast was seen between the sexes. Under all aspects, mean score for young men and young ladies were viewed as comparable. This obviously expresses that young men and young ladies have comparative degree of the ability to understand individuals on a deeper level.

Table 4a uncovers the age bunches wise mean, SD and F an incentive for various elements of the capacity to appreciate people on a deeper level among the review test and Table 4b uncovers the numerous correlation post-hoc test for age bunches under various components of EI. The discoveries uncovered that mean contrast were exceptionally huge between age bunches under all aspects where more established age bunch (22-24 years) were having higher mean scores than the more youthful age group (18-20 years). Indeed, even concerning in general capacity to appreciate anyone on a deeper level, the mean distinction was exceptionally huge among three age bunches for example more established age bunch (22-24 years) were having essentially higher mean score (127.74±23.309) than the more youthful age bunch (72.95±20.589). The various examination post hoc test led between the age bunches additionally uncovered that the distinctions were exceptionally huge between the three age gatherings, with the more youthful gathering (18-20 years) having the higher mean contrast when contrasted and more seasoned bunch (22-24 years) than contrasted with centre gathering (20-22 years). These outcomes plainly affirm that EI creates with age.

#### IV. DISCUSSION

It's undeniably true that the ability to understand anyone on a profound level relies on the communication between different natural, humanistic and mental elements. According to prior examinations, there were massive distinction among young men and young ladies as to EI and in its connected perspectives (Anuradha and Kalapriya, 2015; Bachchanet.al., 2016). In opposite, a few examinations demonstrated that there were no huge distinctions in sexual orientation (Bar-on, 1997 and 2006; Goleman, 1998; Brackett and Mayer, 2003; Tiwari and Srivastava, 2004; Shah and Thingugam, 2008; Kar et. al., 2014). Despite the fact that orientation is a logical component of conduct, it generally works in complex association with other demographical and socio-social variables (Fernandez-Berrocalet.al., 2012). In the current review, no distinction in sexual orientation was noticed for generally EI and for its ten aspects. This might be expected to comparative socio-segment factors, for example, family structure, religion, monetary gatherings and parental variables. Age is one of the demographical factors generally applicable to grasp the advancement of EI. As per Mayer and Salovey (1997), EI increments with age and experience. According to explored writing, there were many supporting examinations to demonstrate the pertinence old enough for improvement of EI (Goleman, 1995; Mayer et.al., 2000; Bar-on, 2006; Carstensen, et.al., 2011). The discoveries of present review are predictable with prior examinations that have shown importance old enough with improvement of EI.

#### V. CONCLUSION

From the discoveries of the current review, it could be inferred that ability to understand individuals on a profound level was higher among the young people of Bangalore city. In any case, there is no critical distinctions in sexual orientation concerning the ability to understand people on a profound level and in its ten aspects. The more established gatherings of youth had higher capacity to understand individuals on a profound level than the more youthful gatherings. This for sure is an uplifting pattern and the young will benefit by deliberately upgrading their capacity to understand people on a profound level to prevail in their scholar, expert and individual lives.

#### REFERENCES

- [1]. Anuradha, K. and Kalapriya, C. (2015), 'Gender and Emotional Intelligence among Adolescents', Indian Journal of Applied Research, Feb, 5(2): 698-699.
- [2]. Bachchan, Mahatma F., Rabindranath, N. L, Azad, Srinivasa H. (2016), 'A contrast on the emotional intelligence of adolescent boys and girls', International Journal of Educational Research and Reviews, Vol. 4 (4): 712-716.
- [3]. Bar-On, R. (1997&2006), 'The Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i): A Test of Emotional Intelligence', Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems, Inc., 1997a; The Bar-on model of emotional-social intelligence, 2006, pp. 13-25.

- [4]. Boyatzis, R.E., Goleman, D. and Rhee, K. (2000), 'Clustering competence in emotional intelligence: insights from the emotional competence inventory (ECI)', in Bar-On, R. and Parker, D.A. (Eds), 'Handbook of Emotional Intelligence', Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA, pp. 343-62.
- [5]. Brackett, M. A., & Mayer, J. D. (2003), 'Convergent, discriminant, and incremental validity of competing measures of emotional intelligence', *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 2003, 1147-1158
- [6]. Carstensen, Laura L., Turan, Bulent., Scheibe, Susanne., Ram, Nilam., Ersner-Hershfield, Hal., Samanez-Larkin, Gregory R., Brooks, Kathryn P., Nesselroade, John R. (2011), 'Emotional Experience Improves With Age: Evidence Based on Over 10 Years of Experience Sampling', *Psychol Aging*, 2011 Mar; 26(1): 21-33.
- [7]. Fernández-Berrocal, Pablo., Cabello, Rosario., Castillo, Ruth., Extremera, Natalio. (2012), 'Gender Differences in Emotional Intelligence: The Mediating Effect of Age', *Behavioral Psychology, Psicología Conductual*, Vol. 20 (1): 77-89
- [8]. Goleman, Daniel. (1995, 1998), 'Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ', New York: Bantam Books; 'Working with emotional intelligence', New York: Bantam/ Doubleday/Dell.
- [9]. Hyde, Anukool., Pethe, Sanjyot and Dhar, Upinder. (2002), 'Manual for Emotional Intelligence Scale', Lucknow. Vedant Publications.
- [10]. Kar, Dhiman., Saha, Birbal., Mondal & Bhim Chandra. (2014), Measuring Emotional Intelligence of Secondary School Students in Relation to Gender and Residence: an Empirical Study, *American Journal of Educational Research*, vol. 2 (4): 193-196.
- [11]. Mayer, J. D. & Salovey, P. (1990), 'Emotional Intelligence', Baywood Publishing co. Inc., retrieved from [www.unh.edu/emotional\\_intelligence](http://www.unh.edu/emotional_intelligence).
- [12]. Mayer, J. D. & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey, & D. J. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications* (pp. 3-34). New York: Basic Books.
- [13]. Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P. & Caruso, D. R. (2000). Models of emotional intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of intelligence* (pp. 396-420). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- [14]. Nasir, Maliha. & Masrur, Rehana. (2010), 'An Exploration of Emotional Intelligence of the Students of IIUI in Relation to Gender, Age and Academic Achievement', *Bulletin of Education and Research*, June 2010, Vol. 32 (1): 37-51.
- [15]. Nugent, Rachel. (2005), 'Youth in a Global World', Population Reference Bureau, USAID, retrieved from <http://www.prb.org>.
- [16]. Shah, Mukti. & Thingujam, Nutankumar S. (2008), 'Perceived Emotional Intelligence and Ways of Coping among Students', *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, January 2008, Vol. 34 (1): 83-91.
- [17]. Tiwari, P. S. N. and Srivastava, N. (2004), 'Schooling and Development of Emotional Intelligence', *Psychological Studies*, 49, 151-154.

Table 1: Profile of the study sample

Sl. no	Parameters	N(%)	
<b>4.1.1</b>	<b>Personal Details of the Study Group</b>		
1	Gender	Female	467(58.4)
		Male	333(41.6)
2	Age	18-20	107(13.4)
		20-22	359(44.9)
		22-24	334(41.8)
3	Education	Pursuing Graduate Programs	539(67.4)
		Pursuing Post Graduate Programs	261(32.6)
4	Religion	Hindu	729(91.1)
		Non-Hindus	71(8.9)
5	Origin (Mother Tongue)	Kannadigas	396(49.5)
		Non-Kannadigas	404(50.5)

4.1.2 Personal Details of the Study Group			
1	Family Structure	Nuclear	710 (88.7)
		Joint	90 (11.3)
2	Father's Education	Graduates	218 (27.2)
		Non-graduates	582 (72.8)
3	Mother's Education	Graduates	170 (21.3)
		Non-graduates	630 (78.7)
4	Total Family Income per Month (inclusive of all sources of income, in INR)	≤ 10000	274 (34.3)
		10001-20000	186 (23.3)
		20001-30000	125 (15.6)
		>30000	215 (26.9)

Figures in parentheses denote percentage.

Table2: Mean and SD scores for emotional intelligence under different dimensions for total study sample

EI-Dimensions	Normal as per norms of the scale	Present study findings
	Mean±SD	Mean±SD
Self-awareness	7.1±2.85	13.96±4.52
Empathy	10.5±3.43	16.93±4.33
Self-motivation	12.87±3.94	20.47±5.70
Emotional Stability	7.85±2.66	13.63±4.06
Managing Relations	8.39±2.83	13.46±3.69
Integrity	5.37±1.83	10.20±3.35

EI-Dimensions	Normal as per norms of the scale	Present study findings
	Mean±SD	Mean±SD
Self-development	3.78±1.46	6.91±2.31
Value Orientation	3.74±1.77	6.72±1.99
Commitment	3.79±1.31	6.80±2.33
Altruistic Behaviour	3.87±1.51	6.82±2.08
Overall EI	68±16	115.90±30.91

Table3: Gender-wise mean and SD score for emotional intelligence under different dimensions for total study sample

Dimensions of EI	Girls(N=467)		Boys(N=333)		't' value	P value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Self-awareness	13.84	4.48	14.13	4.57	-0.881 <sub>NS</sub>	0.379
Empathy	16.80	4.17	17.12	4.55	-1.042 <sub>NS</sub>	0.298
Self-motivation	20.33	5.62	20.65	5.80	0-.782 <sub>NS</sub>	0.434
Emotional Stability	13.66	4.10	13.58	4.01	0.289 <sub>NS</sub>	0.773
Managing Relations	13.34	3.62	13.62	3.78	-1.035 <sub>NS</sub>	0.301
Integrity	10.17	3.38	10.24	3.32	-0.304 <sub>NS</sub>	0.761
Self-development	6.89	2.30	6.95	2.32	-0.364 <sub>NS</sub>	0.716
Value Orientation	6.67	1.95	6.80	2.04	-0.939 <sub>NS</sub>	0.348
Commitment	6.72	2.31	6.92	2.37	-1.204 <sub>NS</sub>	0.229
Altruistic Behaviour	6.75	2.09	6.91	2.08	-1.061 <sub>NS</sub>	0.289
Overall EI	115.17	30.54	116.92	31.45	-0.787 <sub>NS</sub>	0.431



NS: no significant difference at <math>0.05</math>

Table 4 a: Age group-wise mean and SD score for emotional intelligence under different dimensions for total study sample

EI dimensions	18-20(N=107)		20-22(N=359)		22-24(N=334)		F value	P value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Self-awareness	8.17	2.73	14.28	4.48	15.48	3.44	147.218**	0.001
Empathy	12.04	4.09	17.10	4.11	18.32	3.44	108.901**	0.001
Self-motivation	13.24	3.94	20.68	5.42	22.55	4.48	148.772**	0.001
Emotional Stability	8.36	2.91	13.91	3.88	15.01	3.13	151.911**	0.001
Managing Relations	8.81	2.61	13.67	3.46	14.72	3.00	142.050**	0.001
Integrity	5.79	2.02	10.44	3.25	11.34	2.59	156.702**	0.001
Self-development	4.02	1.64	6.97	2.26	7.78	1.73	147.386**	0.001
Value Orientation	4.44	1.60	6.82	1.88	7.35	1.66	112.397**	0.001
Commitment	3.87	1.61	6.90	2.20	7.63	1.89	143.974**	0.001
Altruistic Behaviour	4.21	1.53	6.92	1.91	7.54	1.73	142.218**	0.001
Overall EI	72.95	20.59	117.69	28.58	127.74	23.31	188.615**	0.001

\*\*indicates highly significant difference at  $p < 0.001$  level

Table 4 b: Multiple comparison test for age groups under different dimensions of emotional intelligence

Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence	Age Groups (in years)	Age groups (in years)	Mean Difference	P value
Self-awareness	18-20	20-22	-6.110**	0.001
		22-24	-7.311**	0.001
	20-22	18-20	6.110**	0.001
		22-24	-1.200**	0.001
	22-24	18-20	7.311**	0.001
		20-22	1.200**	0.001
Empathy	18-20	20-22	-5.060**	0.001
		22-24	-6.283**	0.001
	20-22	18-20	5.060**	0.001
		22-24	-1.223**	0.001
	22-24	18-20	6.283**	0.001
		20-22	1.223**	0.001
Self-motivation	18-20	20-22	-7.437**	0.001
		22-24	-9.305**	0.001
	20-22	18-20	7.437**	0.001
		22-24	-1.868**	0.001
	22-24	18-20	9.305**	0.001
		20-22	1.868**	0.001
Emotional Stability	18-20	20-22	-5.544**	0.001
		22-24	-6.650**	0.001
	20-22	18-20	5.544**	0.001
		22-24	-1.107**	0.001
	22-24	18-20	6.650**	0.001
		20-22	1.107**	0.001
	18-20	20-22	-4.855**	0.001





Managing Relations	20-22	22-24	-5.908**	0.001
		18-20	4.855**	0.001
		22-24	-1.053**	0.001
	22-24	18-20	5.908**	0.001
		20-22	1.053**	0.001
Integrity	18-20	20-22	-4.649**	0.001
		22-24	-5.550**	0.001
	20-22	18-20	4.649**	0.001
		22-24	-0.901**	0.001
	22-24	18-20	5.550**	0.001
		20-22	0.901**	0.001
Self-development	18-20	20-22	-2.953**	0.001
		22-24	-3.760**	0.001
	20-22	18-20	2.953**	0.001
		22-24	-0.806**	0.001
	22-24	18-20	3.760**	0.001
		20-22	0.806**	0.001
Value Orientation	18-20	20-22	-2.382**	0.001
		22-24	-2.911**	0.001
	20-22	2.382**	0.001	
	20-22	18-20	2.382**	0.001
		22-24	-0.529**	0.001
	22-24	18-20	2.911**	0.001
		20-22	0.529**	0.001
	Commitment	18-20	20-22	-3.031**
22-24			-3.766**	0.001
20-22		18-20	3.031**	0.001
		22-24	-0.735**	0.001
22-24		18-20	3.766**	0.001
		20-22	0.735**	0.001
Altruistic Behaviour	18-20	20-22	-2.714**	0.001
		22-24	-3.339**	0.001
	20-22	18-20	2.714**	0.001
		22-24	-0.626**	0.001
	22-24	18-20	3.339**	0.001
		20-22	0.626**	0.001
Overall Emotional Intelligence	18-20	20-22	-44.735**	0.001
		22-24	-54.783**	0.001
	20-22	18-20	44.735**	0.001
		22-24	-10.049**	0.001
	22-24	18-20	54.783**	0.001
		20-22	10.049**	0.001