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ABSTRACT

The study investigated the effect of demographic determinants on Emotional Intelligence (EI) of University students. The EI scale developed by Bhattacharya and associates with some modifications was introduced on a sample of 200 respondents pursuing PG, MPhil and PhD courses. Descriptive statistics and test instruments: t-test and F-test facilitated the objectives. It is found that higher education students are more goal oriented and facilitates emotions but make it difficult to overcome interpersonal conflict may be due to their less experience. Further, results corroborated urban residents and male students with higher EI, but mean scores also differed on certain EI components in favour of their counterparts. No clear-cut trend became visible on educational qualifications yet some EI dimensions privileged the research students and others favoured students of PG for their elevated EI. Commerce academics ranked high on ‘management of negative emotions’, ‘appraisal of positive emotions’ and ‘emotional facilitation and goal-orientation’. Science academics obtained high EI on interpersonal dimensions but students from Arts faculty exhibited low EI on all the components. The results on family income originated uniform on all EI dimensions where students from high-status families were found having high EI.
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Health, now a days, is viewed in more optimistic terms, rather than simply absence of disease. It is quite possible for a person to be free of disease but still not enjoy a vigorous satisfying life. Researches have shown that clinical psychology for years have mainly focused on diagnosis and treatment of psychopathology, but eliminating excess negative does not produce happiness, it produce emptiness (Lewis, 2006). Henry Sigerist, in 1941, defined health in positive terms “Health is…….. not simply the absence of disease: it is something positive, a joyful attitude towards life, and a cheerful acceptance of responsibilities that life put upon the individual.” Now Psychology has shifted its intellectual energy to the study of positive aspects of human experience as a challenge against the disease model of Psychology, shifting the focus from understanding and remedy of human problem and diseases to what makes life productive, fulfilling happy and worth living.

Recently, researches have focused on understanding, explaining and enhancing happiness and subjective well-being, and accurately predicting factors that influence such states. Well-being and Happiness refers to both positive feelings such as joy or serenity, and to positive states such as those involving flow or absorption. But one of the most fundamental problem in research in this field is uncertainty about which factors are the causes and which are the consequences. However, most the variables identified as the causes are also described as the consequences such as social support, life events, spiriuyality, personality, intelligence.

Emotional intelligence is a significant predictor of life satisfaction and health (Petrides, Pita and Kokkinaki, 2007; Extrema, Duran and Rey, 2007 and Hooda, Sharma and Yadava, 2008; Kong, Zhao and You, 2012).

Emotional Intelligence is attaining attention of researchers for elaborating the competencies of individuals that works beyond the traditional concept of academic intelligence. In the words of Singh (2006), academic intelligence which is measured as Intelligent Quotient (IQ) is related to the thinking part (the head) and emotional intelligence which is gauged with Emotional Quotient (EQ) is engaged with the feelings (the heart). For achieving success, the two must be synchronised and the thinking should be directed together with bright and breezy emotions. Goleman (1995) and Singh (2006) maintain that solely EQ factor explains 80% of one’s success in life; the nominal balance is the IQ which ultimately function with EQ. For this reason, emotional intelligence has received much attention in understanding and predicting individuals’ performance at home, education, occupation and society. The work of Mayer et al. (1999); Bar-On (2000) and Goleman (1995; 2001) provides some guiding principles concerning implementation and development of EI, which can improve individual’s performance level. Here a point is worth mentioning that if EI strongly affects performance, there must be factors which influence EI too. Singh (2006)
emotional intelligence varies with certain demographic characteristics of individuals. Higher education students are targeted as they are near to begin their carrier, and it is the level of EQ in their personality which can predict their success rate. The next section, in this way, demonstrates the concept of EI and the means of measuring it.

**Emotional Intelligence**

Emotional Intelligence was defined differently by academics. Goleman (1995) described EI as a skill of self-control, zeal, persistence and the ability to motivate oneself. Mayer *et al.* (1999) viewed EI as a set of individual abilities: to perceive accurately, to appraise and express emotions, to access and generate feelings when they facilitate thought, to understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth. According to Bar-On (1997), emotional intelligence get reflected in one’s ability to deal with daily environment challenges and help predict one’s success in life including professional and personal pursuits. In a later study, the same author described it as an array of emotional and social knowledge and abilities that influence one’s overall capability to effectively cope with environmental demands (Bar-On, 2000). In this way, as the work began on EI, various authors viewed and worded it differently and now it can be understood that it is an umbrella term that captures a range of both interpersonal and intrapersonal skills. Interpersonal skills consist of a person’s aptitude to understand the feeling of others. Intrapersonal, on the other hand, comprise of the abilities to understand one’s own emotions. To measure these interpersonal and intrapersonal abilities of individuals i.e. EI, researchers have developed various standardised instruments and scales.

Times ago, Mayer *et al.* (1999) developed and tested Multi-Branch Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS) based on Mental Ability Model as a measure of EI with twelve sub-scales. Schutte *et al.* (1998) too targeted the Mental Ability Model and constructed his Self Report Emotional Intelligence Test (SREIT). Quite the reverse, Bar-On (1997) introduced Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory on the basis of Mixed Model. After that Mayer-Salovey – Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) was designed to overcome the problems associated with previously prevailing MEIS scale (Pant and Prakash, 2004). The Emotional Competency Inventory (ECI) is another multi-rater instrument based on a series
of behavioural indicators of emotional intelligence. Some other scales that are
developed includes: Emotional Intelligence Appraisal (EIA); Work Profile
Questionnaire Emotional Intelligence Version (WPQEI) and The Levels of
Emotional Awareness Scale (LEAS). Hence, a variety of instruments are developed
to measure EI.

Further, authors have also provided some different ideas and views.
Bhattacharya et al. (2004) and Pant and Prakash (2004), by highlighting the
importance of cultural context in EI, mention that cultural aspects may be
important as it provides beliefs about emotional states, a vocabulary for
discriminating them and a set of socially acceptable attributes. In the light of this
fact, Bhattacharya and his associates developed a 40 item; psychometrically
valid scale and identified its factor structure in India. The scale is divided into
five factors: Appraisal of Negative Emotions, Appraisal of Positive Emotions,
Interpersonal Conflict and Difficulties, Interpersonal Skills and Flexibility, and
Emotional Facilitation and Goal Orientation. In their publication, they mentioned
that the scale is based on Mental Ability Model and both intrapersonal (self-
referential) and interpersonal in nature. The first two factors are ‘self-referential’
as these measure the ability to recognise and control one’s own emotions and
understand what these emotions are telling them. The third and forth factors are
interpersonal meant for forms of EI which are necessary for building trust,
creating a sense of identity and efficacy, cooperating and solving problems with
others and participating productively in a group. The present study employs the
same scale for measurement of EI with some preferred modifications according
to student sample.

The studies have demonstrated that individuals with high emotional intelligence
are more productive, better motivated, self-controlled and more satisfied than
those who are not emotionally intelligent. Thus, emotional intelligence became a
hot topic of research in Industry to find out its relationship with job satisfaction,
productivity and work performance (Zeidner et al., 2004; Hosseinian et al.,
2008). Some researchers correlated EI with leadership behaviour and team work
(Kailash et al., 2004; Jayan, 2006). The work of Harrod and Scheer (2005) and
Jorfi et al. (2011) highlighted the effect of demographic and cultural variables
on EI. Some studies, among demographic features, specifically concentrated on
gender differences (Katyal and Awasthi, 2005; Bindu and Thomos, 2006). Health
related studies too emphasised on inclusion of emotional intelligence (Extremerra
and Fernandez-Berrocal, 2006). However, the present literature review is limited
to only those studies which match with the present purpose of identifying the
influence of socio-demographic influencers on EI.

Harrod and Scheer (2005) conducted a study on a sample of 200 adolescents
of Midwestern States, USA. A significant positive correlation of emotional
intelligence was found with level of education and household income. Male and
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female students differed significantly on the measure of EI. Age and location of residence showed no significant association. However, a positive correlation has also been obtained between mother’s education, household income and EI.

Katyal and Awasti (2005) explored gender differences in emotional intelligence among adolescents of Chandigarh. The findings revealed that majority of boys, girls and the total sample had good level of emotional intelligence. Girls were found having higher emotional intelligence than boys but due to insignificant results they concluded that the above finding may not be conclusive but may suggestive of the trend.

Aremu et al. (2006) investigated the relationship among emotional intelligence, parental involvement and academic achievement. Sample of 500 secondary school students was drawn from Ibadan, Oyo state, Nigeria. Significant positive relationship was obtained between emotional intelligence and academic achievement inferring that EI assertively contribute to one’s academic success in life.

Adeyemo (2008) examined demographic characteristics and emotional intelligence among workers in some selected organisations in Oyo State, Nigeria. Female workers were obtained with high emotional intelligence. Age, marital status and educational qualifications did not reveal any significant relationship with EI.

Waddar and Aminabhavi (2010) investigated emotional intelligence of post graduate students who stayed at home or in hostels. Two hundred post graduate students from different departments of Karnataka University were selected in sample. The findings revealed that students differed significantly according to their stay in homes or in hostels. Some of the demographic variables such as age, gender, order of birth and caste significantly contributed in making students’ emotional intelligence.

Jorfi et al. (2011) examined the relationship between demographic factors, emotional intelligence, communication effectiveness, motivation and job satisfaction. They concluded that emotional intelligence was the most important factor in sustaining communication effectiveness and job satisfaction. The demographic variables: age, gender, job position, educational level and work experience also had positive relationship with EI.

Kumar and Muniandy (2012) while studying polytechnic teachers in Malaysia observed no significant difference between male and female lecturers, however female lecturers’ level of EI was slightly high compared to male lecturers. Age group greater than 40 recorded the highest score with significance. Occupational level and academic qualifications were found positively correlated with EI. Working experience of respondents’ as a Lecturer showed a significant difference in between groups, but the prior working experience (other than lecturer) revealed no reliable mean difference.

Marzuki et al. (2012) investigated demographic differences in emotional intelligence among students selected from 10 public universities in Malaysia. The
findings revealed that majority of male-female showed low scores in emotional intelligence; however, no significant difference was obtained. Rural areas and small towns’ residents significantly differed from people belonging to cities and had low emotional intelligence. Also, students from full boarding schools and majority of students who took science and technical courses had high emotional intelligence levels than students from arts orientation with statistically reliable differences.

Nasir and Iqbal (2012) studied 595 randomly selected students for their emotional intelligence chosen from three public universities in Islamabad. The research instrument was divided into two sections. The first section obtained demographic information and the second section included a validated version of Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory to measure emotional intelligence. Age, mother’s education and father’s education appeared as significant predictors of emotional intelligence. On the other hand, gender and locality did not show any significant result.

S Rao (2012) studied the effect of emotional intelligence on the sample of 561 MBA students in Bangalore. Convenience sampling technique was used to select the colleges. The EI inventory was composed of 20 statements. Analysis showed no significant difference in EI scores of male and female students and students belonging to nuclear and joint families. The educational level, place of stay and family income did not affect EI levels as statistically the results were insignificant.

Objectives

Emotional Intelligence as a factor is seen contributing to the overall success of human being in work, education and social life. Therefore the present study is centred towards exploring the factors that drive this intelligence (EI). Specifically, the study is designed to achieve the following objective.

1. To investigate Emotional Intelligence of students across demography.

METHOD

Tools

(i) Personal Data Sheet: Personal Data Sheet consisted of information regarding socio-demographical variables such as age, gender, residential status, educational level etc. Socio-demographic variables: gender, residential place and field of study were measured on a nominal scale while educational level and family income are ordinal measures.

(ii) Emotional Intelligence (EI) Scale: EI scale developed by Bhattacharya and his associates was used to assess the emotional intelligence of the subjects. Originally, the scale contained forty items but to exercise it on students’ sample, two items which seemed specifically related to
workplace EI were not included. For simplification, some of items are little changed and worded in a manner that students can easily understand them and mark their response appropriately. The second part dealt with socio-demographic variables which are analysed as determinants of students’ emotional intelligence. EI is measured on five point scale ranging from never true to always true. Never true is scored as ‘1’ and always true as ‘5’. This scoring is reversed for the negative worded items. The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient (α = 0.803) indicates a high level of internal consistency among the scale items.

Sample

The sample comprised 200 higher education students doing PG, MPhil and PhD in the faculty of Science, Commerce and Arts from Kurukshetra University. Science students exceedingly participated (% = 51.5) and filled the questionnaire handled to them while the least percentage was obtained for students from Commerce faculty (% = 20.5); 56 others (% = 28) originated from Arts background. A high sample percentage belonged to urban background (N = 123; % = 61.5) and majority of the students were female (N = 114; % = 57).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive statistics and inferential statistics both are utilised. Mean comparison as an average measure and standard deviation as a measure of dispersion is used. In case of variables with two categories (e.g. gender) t-test is performed and for variables more than two categories, one way analysis of variance with Scheffe post hoc multiple comparisons is applied as tests of significance. The analysis is run with the help of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS-Version 16).

During the stage of analysis, two of the EI items became useless because of inconsistent responses and were removed. Thus, the analysis is completed on 36 statements of EI measure. The present analysis is run on overall EI vis-a-vis on each EI factor. The corresponding statements of each factor as given by Bhattacharya et al. (2004) are added into their measurement indices namely: management of negative emotions, appraisal of positive emotions, overcoming interpersonal conflict and difficulty, interpersonal skill and flexibility and emotional facilitation and goal orientation. The factor “appraisal of negative emotions” is renamed as “management of negative emotions” and “interpersonal conflict and difficulty” is designated as “overcoming interpersonal conflict and difficulty”. The labels are little changed for the factors because the earlier description seemed misrepresenting the core meaning of emotional intelligence measure. Both the factors were previously worded in anti-EI direction, but the authors are of the view that as we are attempting to measure emotional intelligence not
reverse of it, the anti-EI indication seems inappropriate. Thus, in the first factor the word “appraisal” is changed with “management” and a prefix “overcoming” is added before the name of third factor. All the EI factors with their role and across students’ demographic features are defined.

**EI of Students across Demography**

The findings of emotional intelligence and its components on each socio-demographic variable is assessed and defined in this section. The results are described according to percentage, mean and inferential statistics and then the likely reasons of any specific finding are hypothesised. Previous studies are also contacted to obtain their agreement or disagreement about the present results.

**Gender and EI:** Table 1 reveals that majority of the sample respondents are female students (N = 114; % = 57) and presents gender mean across overall EI and its components. The overall EI index demonstrates males as high emotionally intelligent from their female counterparts (μ<sub>Male</sub> = 131.72 > μ<sub>Female</sub> = 128.13). The results contradicts Katyal and Awasti (2005); Shanwal (2005); Adeyemo (2008) and Kumar and Muniandy (2012). They all have obtained that emotional intelligence of females are superior to their male counterparts. However, the difference is statistically insignificant (t = 1.683; p > 0.05) and this also go against the finding of Harrod and Scheer (2005) for their significant results. In spite of this, the results may differ on separate EI dimensions and are also explained next in the line.

**Table 1: Emotional Intelligence across Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EI and its Components</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management of Negative Emotions</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>37.48</td>
<td>7.814</td>
<td>3.878</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>32.93</td>
<td>8.493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal of Positive Emotions</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>35.69</td>
<td>5.890</td>
<td>-1.476</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>36.82</td>
<td>4.923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcoming Interpersonal Conflict and Difficulties</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>16.01</td>
<td>3.376</td>
<td>3.191</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Skill and Flexibility</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>14.44</td>
<td>3.507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Facilitation and Goal-Orientaiton</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>20.14</td>
<td>3.354</td>
<td>-1.773</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall EI</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>20.92</td>
<td>2.869</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Management of Negative Emotions: A mean comparison confirms that males give little value to negative emotions in their life and remain consistent even in adverse situations. As female mean is less than male mean (μ<sub>Female</sub> = 32.93 < μ<sub>Male</sub> = 37.48), it is concluded that they are more emotionally disturbed, not able to manage negative emotions and feel helplessness in bad moods. The
highly significant t-value (t = 3.878; p < 0.01) further clarifies that this difference is statistically reliable. The reason may be the difference in the nature of males and females. Females are more able to freely express their emotions. When women experience something bad, their mind tends to stay with those feelings. Quite the opposite, men experience these feelings for a moment, can easily turn out from them and switch to other work areas soon.

**Appraisal of Positive Emotions:** The mean value for this component goes in favour of female respondents as they have obtained high mean compared to male students (μ<sub>Female</sub> = 36.82 > μ<sub>Male</sub> = 35.69). The insignificant t-value however shows that the mean difference is not statistically significant (t = –1.476; p > 0.05). The likely reason for the finding is about the female high sense and sensations of others feelings. Men mostly think from their conscious mind which is based on logic, reasons, rules and regulations and most often ignore emotions over them. Females on the other hand, put into practice the subconscious mind, the essence of which is emotions based. That’s the reason they exhibit emotional empathy more highly than men and the positive emotions too.

**Overcoming Interpersonal Conflicts and Difficulties:** A significant gender difference is obtained for this factor (t = 3.191; p < 0.01). Calculated mean values reveal that male sense to control interpersonal conflict and difficulty is more, as their mean is higher than female segment. The reason may be attributed to more transactions that male experience as they remain occupied with out of home jobs in comparison to female, who confined themselves either at home or when in office, to less touring jobs. This enables the male to easily handle such conflict and difficulties.

**Interpersonal Skill and Flexibility:** Descriptive analysis on this dimension finds that although female mean is slightly high than male mean (μ<sub>Female</sub> = 23.29 > μ<sub>Male</sub> = 22.41), statistically this difference has not so much importance as t-value is insignificant (t = –1.665; p > 0.05). Women slightly have an edge over men may be because of their superiority in emotional empathy. Women can better feel the others’ feelings and thus are able to make and maintain good relationships with others. The kind of empathy fosters affinity and sympathy in them and they sense in few moments about others’ feeling and reactions.

**Emotional Facilitation and Goal-Orientation:** Female students’ mean is again slightly high over male students (μ<sub>Female</sub> = 20.92 > μ<sub>Male</sub> = 20.14). This explains women ability to understand others and their focus on their surroundings originate a quality of selflessness in them. Strengthening by this element in their personality they experience more stronger, satisfying and healthy relationships. All this facilitate them and contribute to their goal-orientation. But insignificant t-value confirms no noteworthy mean difference as it is less than the tabulated (t = –1.773; p > 0.05).
Residential Status and EI: According to residential status, 77 students (% = 38.5) belong to rural areas while 123 students (% = 61.5) belong to urban living places. Urban-rural comparison for EI is presented in table 2 in which the result goes in favour of students from urban living places, however with insignificance. Harrod and Scheer (2005) and Marzuki et al. (2012) are supported for the statistically insignificant results and low emotional intelligence for rural residents. Shanwal (2005) however is contradicted for findings in favour of rural individuals. The results acquired on the components of EI are described separately.

Table 2: Emotional Intelligence according to Residential Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EI and its Components</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management of Negative Emotions</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>36.57</td>
<td>7.512</td>
<td>2.244</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>32.83</td>
<td>8.921</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal of Positive Emotions</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>34.87</td>
<td>5.959</td>
<td>-3.104</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>37.24</td>
<td>4.778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcoming Interpersonal Conflict and Difficulties</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>3.284</td>
<td>1.912</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>3.639</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Skill and Flexibility</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>21.95</td>
<td>3.182</td>
<td>-2.942</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>23.51</td>
<td>3.926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Facilitation and Goal-Orientaiton</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>20.03</td>
<td>3.660</td>
<td>-2.031</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td>2.654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall EI</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>129.13</td>
<td>16.090</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>130.02</td>
<td>14.333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Management of Negative Emotions: Mean comparison on first component shows that students who belong to rural areas are able to manage their negative emotions more firmly than students living in urban areas ($\mu_{\text{Rural}} = 36.57 > \mu_{\text{Urban}} = 33.83$). Statistically also, this difference is significant at 5% probability level ($t = 2.244; P < 0.05$). The reason for the finding may be attributed to differences in family structure to which the students belong. In rural areas, most people live in joint families but in urban places, majority of the families are nuclear. While living in a joint family, a child develops mutual trust and more able to share and express feelings, so able to manage their negative feelings as well. Students who live in urban areas may be living in nuclear families and usually get less time and concentration of their parents and may feel isolated. This deprives them from the opportunity to express their thoughts, sorrows and feelings which lead them into stress and depression.

Appraisal of Positive Emotions: As against the results on first factor, here students who reside in urban places have an edge over students who reside in rural areas. Urban students obtain high average than their rural counterparts ($\mu_{\text{Urban}} = 37.24 > \mu_{\text{Rural}} = 34.87$) and the difference in mean is also significant.
Assessment of Emotional Intelligence Across Demographic Variables

A child in urban environment progresses with freedom and openness in ideas and opinions. A more open mind understands and reflects imaginative ideas; then an individual obtains a position to consider all possibilities in a positive manner. That’s why urban students are highly appraising the positive emotions.

**Overcoming Interpersonal Conflicts and Difficulties:** As can be seen from the mean values of next factor, ($\mu_{\text{Rural}} = 15.71 > \mu_{\text{Urban}} = 14.74$); students from rural background are able to conquer interpersonal conflict and difficulties. This mean difference, however, is not significant on 5% significance level but can be expressed significant at 10% significance. The reason may again be the same of students’ origination from different family structures. Individuals face different system, cultures and working in the kind of families which may shape their emotional values too.

**Interpersonal Skills and Flexibility:** The mean difference among rural-urban categories, for this factor is significant at 1% probability level ($t = –2.942; p < 0.01$). As urban students scored high mean on this dimension they are ahead of rural students ($\mu_{\text{Urban}} = 23.51 > \mu_{\text{Rural}} = 21.95$). Students from urban cities may better apply interpersonal emotional skills and maintain flexibility in relationships by availing more amenities available in urban areas besides through various activities as joining of clubs, recreational activities and use of latest computer technology such as internet. However, for an effective communication, rural students need both skills and infrastructure for social interactions and development of interpersonal relationships.

**Emotional Facilitation and Goal-Orientation:** Urban students are again significantly high regarding their ability in managing emotions to facilitate them towards their goal-orientation ($\mu_{\text{Urban}} = 20.93 > \mu_{\text{Rural}} = 20.03; t = –2.031; p < 0.05$). This difference may be explained on the similar ground of more opportunities, social activities, learning facilities and information technology facilities which can be utilised more in cities in comparison with rural places.

**Field of Study and EI:** It is evident from table 3A that taken as a whole (overall EI), students who belong to commerce background are emotionally intelligent ($\mu_{\text{Commerce}} = 133.95$) followed by science and arts academics ($\mu_{\text{Science}} = 129.73 > \mu_{\text{Arts}} = 126.45$). The result is very near to significance ($F = 3.024; p = 0.051$) and is said to match with Marzuki et al. (2012) as they have obtained that students who took science courses showed high emotional intelligence compared to arts courses.
Table 3A: Emotional Intelligence as per Field of Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EI Components</th>
<th>Field of Study</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management of Negative Emotions</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>34.65</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>0.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36.15</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>34.39</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal of Positive Emotions</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>36.08</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.351</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38.17</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35.45</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcoming Interpersonal Conflict and Difficulties</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14.98</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Skill and Flexibility</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>23.44</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.438</td>
<td>0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22.68</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22.11</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Facilitation and Goal-Orientation</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>20.23</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>7.456</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22.20</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20.05</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall EI</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>129.73</td>
<td>14.51</td>
<td>3.024</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>133.95</td>
<td>14.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>126.45</td>
<td>15.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3B: Scheffe Post Hoc Multiple Comparisons of Field of Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of EI</th>
<th>(I) Field of Study</th>
<th>(J) Paired Comparison</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal of Positive Emotions</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>-2.093</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>0.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2.093</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>2.724</td>
<td>1.092</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>-0.631</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>0.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>-2.724</td>
<td>1.092</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Facilitation and Goal-Orientation</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>-1.962</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1.962</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>2.141</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>-0.179</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Facilitation and Goal-Orientation</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>4.223</td>
<td>2.742</td>
<td>0.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>3.282</td>
<td>2.466</td>
<td>0.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2.282</td>
<td>2.966</td>
<td>0.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>7.505</td>
<td>3.052</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Management of Negative Emotions: Although, the mean differences in between science, commerce and arts categories are highly insignificant (F = 0.583; p > 0.05) but calculated mean scores present a unique scenario. Students from commerce background are high on the factor with highest mean score (μ = 36.15) revealing that they can more appropriately manage their negative emotions as compared to students studying science and arts courses. The probable reason of elevated EI of commerce group is the changing dimensions and parameters upon which the businesses were conducted previously. Now, EI has a unique place and there are courses about how this intelligence can be enhanced.

Appraisal of Positive Emotions: The result on this factor again complements the previous result of high mean score of commerce academics than their correspondents (μ\textsubscript{Commerce} = 38.17 > μ\textsubscript{Science} = 36.08 > μ\textsubscript{Arts} = 35.45). Noteworthy mean differences are also obtained at a 5% significance level. Scheffe post-hoc multiple comparisons (table 3B) further clarify this significant difference on the ground of noteworthy mean difference between students of arts and commerce courses (Mean Difference = 2.72; p < 0.05). An explanation of this result can be obtained on the similar ground as defined in the earlier point.

Overcoming Interpersonal Conflict and Difficulties: As can be seen by the insignificant ANOVA value (F = 0.44; p > 0.05) the mean differences are not statistically generalisable but science oriented students are ahead of their two counterparts. Conflict arises because different people have different perspectives regarding any topic of discussion. The factor which is contributing to high mean score of science academics is the value they give to logical and scientific reasoning to overcome the conflicting situations and difficulties.

Interpersonal Skill and Flexibility: Once again, students from science background are scoring high mean compared to their other two equivalents (μ\textsubscript{Science} = 23.44 > μ\textsubscript{Commerce} = 22.68 > μ\textsubscript{Arts} = 22.11). As they follow more logic as compared to arts and commerce academics, they are high on interpersonal dimensions of emotional intelligence.

Emotional Facilitation and Goal Orientation: The result on this factor once again goes in favour of students from commerce background; followed by science and arts academics. (μ\textsubscript{Commerce} = 22.20 > μ\textsubscript{Science} = 20.23 > μ\textsubscript{Arts} = 20.05). This mean difference is also found statistically significant at 1% significance level (F = 7.456; p < 0.01). According to post-hoc test among the three categories (table 3B), the mean difference for science and commerce courses and commerce and arts courses students are considerable, leading the whole result towards significance. The subjects which are taught to commerce students divert their mind only in one direction of achieving the enterprise goals and managing all the inputs and resources to this direction. Perhaps, this subjective approach is reflecting in this finding.
Educational Level and EI: In terms of educational level, the maximum students are in the course of post-graduation (N = 113); 39 are doing M.Phil and 48 others are the doctoral candidates. Although, the mean differences are not significant (F = 1.426; p > 0.05) but as measured by the overall EI index, the students at M.Phil level are found with high mean value (μ = 132.85). Therefore, there is said to be an inverted U relationship between academic level and EI which disagree with Harrod and Scheer (2005) and Jorfhi et al. (2011) for significant positive results on EI in relation with educational qualifications.

Table 4A: Emotional Intelligence with Educational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EI Components</th>
<th>Education Levels</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management of Negative Emotions</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>34.37</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>2.882</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.Phil</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37.74</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33.77</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal of Positive Emotions</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>36.90</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>3.419</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.Phil</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36.82</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34.58</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcoming Interpersonal Conflict and Difficulties</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>15.04</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.Phil</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14.69</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15.65</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Skill and Flexibility</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>23.09</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.Phil</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22.59</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22.75</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Facilitation and Goal-Orientation</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>20.41</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td>0.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.Phil</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20.67</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall EI</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>129.54</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>1.426</td>
<td>0.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.Phil</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>132.85</td>
<td>15.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>127.68</td>
<td>17.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4B: Scheffe Multiple Comparisons of Educational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component of EI</th>
<th>Educational Level (I)</th>
<th>Paired Comparison (J)</th>
<th>Mean (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal of Positive Emotions</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>M.Phil</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>0.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.Phil</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>-0.082</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>0.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>2.319</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>M.Phil</td>
<td>2.237</td>
<td>1.145</td>
<td>0.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>-2.319*</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.Phil</td>
<td>M.Phil</td>
<td>-2.237</td>
<td>1.145</td>
<td>0.151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Management of Negative Emotions: An inverted U relationship is again attained for the factor but with insignificance (F = 2.882; p > 0.05). The PhD scholars are showing the least mean value. This is not the education which
causes negativity but is the adverse external environment which we often fail to realise. The unfortunate conditions and unhealthier competition promote negative feelings of helplessness and powerlessness in students and demote their optimism, positivity and self-confidence. On the high level of study, the expectations of individual from himself/herself and the associated expectations of others from him/her become prominent. Many problems are faced in the process of enduring these expectations which generates the negative feelings of fear, distress, disappointment and guilt in them. Then, they did not act on desire but because of duty, force and obligation. That’s why although it may be expected that the persons who are in the process of high education must be capable of managing their negative emotions but there also remains a dark side because of bad experiences of life.

**Appraisal of Positive Emotions:** It is obvious from table 4A that there is a significant negative relationship between appraisal of positive emotions and educational level. The students at post-graduation level are highly apparent in positive emotions. The reason may be their tension free mind and a good informal circle of friends and fellows. In the company of good friends, people always experience a lot of positive emotions such as joy, happiness, pleasure and satisfaction. On the opposite side, the impact of negative emotions may be too trembling that may overcome the time of positivity for students at higher courses (such as PhD) because of tension for their job and future.

**Overcoming Interpersonal Conflict and Difficulties:** By the way of mean values it can be concluded that these are the doctoral candidates who are able to overcome and govern any conflicts and difficulties they experience while transacting interpersonally (μ = 15.65). The reason may be their high age as compared to other groups. Their maturity develops this ability in them.

**Interpersonal Skill and Flexibility:** In trouble-free words, it is demonstrated that the mean differences for the factor have not much importance as obtained insignificant (F = 0.315; p > 0.05). Slightly different mean values, however reveals that the mean score of post-graduation level students is high than their other two counterparts. As the factor measures students’ good relationships with their friends and teachers and their ability to change their views if are found wrong. The result is reinforced with the previous explanation as students at this level may be living an informal life with their friends and associates and may have flexibility in thoughts at this age.

**Emotional Facilitation and Goal-Orienta:** The results on the factor are attained not significant (F = 0.549; p > 0.05) but students of M.Phil scored high mean, followed by PhD scholars and post-graduate students. M.Phil and PhD, both are the research degrees and scholars have to individually face their research problem which enables them to become goal oriented. Further while collecting data and other related research tasks they have to approach so many different people which require both patience and articulation that attain facilitation.
**Economic Status and EI:** Consistent with table 5A, maximum number of students belong to families that are average in economic status (N = 79; % = 39.5) and symmetrically distributed in the other two (low-High) categories. The students from families with high economic status are exceedingly high in their emotional intelligence as their mean score is very high on the measure of overall EI index (μ = 136.25). These mean differences are also highly significant (F = 8.903; p < 0.05). Scheffe post-hoc multiple comparisons further explains significant mean differences between low-high and average-high paired groups. The finding of positive correlation between economic status and emotional intelligence by Harrod and Scheer (2005) is highly supported here.

**Table 5A: Emotional Intelligence in relation to Economic Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EI and its Components</th>
<th>Income Levels</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management of Negative Emotions</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>33.75</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>7.968</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>33.09</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>38.40</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal of Positive Emotions</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>36.13</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>4.710</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>35.23</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>37.98</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcoming Interpersonal Conflict and Difficulties</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14.31</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.322</td>
<td>0.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>15.42</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15.53</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Skill and Flexibility</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23.10</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.594</td>
<td>0.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>22.35</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23.45</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Facilitation and Goal-Orientation</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>20.30</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.541</td>
<td>0.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>20.58</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20.88</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall EI</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>127.10</td>
<td>15.14</td>
<td>8.903</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>126.67</td>
<td>15.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>136.25</td>
<td>12.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Management of Negative Emotions:** The results on the factor reveals that low status and average status families differ slightly in mean but the mean of students from high status families is significantly excessive than the other two groups (μ = 38.40; F = 7.968; p < 0.01). According to post-hoc test in table 5B, the significant difference is between low-high and average-high status families, because of which, the F-value is also reflecting as significant. The likely reason on the part of high-status group is their reach to the resources and means which can pull them out from the moments of despondency. Due to available financial and other means, they may enjoy many alternatives and can easily get rid off from the adverse circumstances.
Table 5B: Post-hoc Multiple Comparison of Economic Status and EI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>I (Economic Status)</th>
<th>J (Paired Comparison)</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management of Negative Emotions</td>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.399</td>
<td>0.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>-4.65</td>
<td>1.493</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>1.399</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>-5.31</td>
<td>1.406</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.493</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.406</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal of Positive Emotions</td>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>0.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>-1.85</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-.90</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>-2.76</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall EI</td>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>2.461</td>
<td>0.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>-9.15</td>
<td>2.625</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>2.461</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>-9.58</td>
<td>2.472</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>2.625</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>2.472</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appraisal of Positive Emotions:** The outcome on the factor again reflects the previous finding. High status group is intensely appraising the positive emotions ($\mu = 37.98$), may be because of their easy accessibility to resources besides social circle and network. They get opportunities to share their feelings with others and have the means to fully exploit the opportunities of life.

**Overcoming Interpersonal Conflicts and Difficulties:** The insignificant F-value ($F = 2.322; p < 0.05$) demonstrates no noteworthy mean differences between the three income categories but a little high mean again favours the high earning group ($\mu = 15.53$). Students from this category are more able to overcome the problems and difficulties in interpersonal relationships; again may be because of their financial standing and support. Today, relations are based on materialism and money is a mechanism by which the undesirable situations can be dealt with.

**Interpersonal Skill and Flexibility:** If viewed from the mean perspective, there comes out to be direct relationship between economic status and interpersonal skills and flexibility ($\mu_{High} = 23.45 > \mu_{Average} = 22.35 > \mu_{Low} = 23.10$). The F value however exclaims that the difference between these mean values are not of much concern due to insignificance ($F = 1.594; p > 0.05$). The matter with the low status group is the scarcity and deficiency of resources. All in all,
financial satisfaction again promotes the skills in wealthier people with which they can maintain warm and healthy relationships with others.

**Emotional Facilitation and Goal-Orientation:** The mean difference for this factor again come out as insignificant ($F = 0.541; p > 0.05$) but high economic status group is again favoured as they are also able to deflect their emotions in the direction of their goal accomplishment. They have again got slightly high mean from the other two categories ($\mu = 20.88$). The base for the finding is constant. When students from high earning class are able to manage the negative emotions and highly appraising the positive ones, the task of facilitating these emotions to achieve their goals are appropriately done. Their head and heart both endeavour for the same and work only in one direction without any controversy.

**CONCLUSION**

The study contains measurement of emotional intelligence and its dimensions. On average, the level of students’ emotional intelligence is satisfactory but they are struggling in overcoming conflict and difficulties in interpersonal relationships. As they will be the future makers and caretakers of society and country, they need to enhance the emotional skill of maintaining healthy relationships with others. Summarising the results, it is concluded that on the substantive EI dimensions, the level of EI vary according to students’ socio-demographic profile. The results on family income are only found consistent on all five EI dimensions where students from high-status families originate with high EI. Commerce academics remain high on ‘management of negative emotions’, ‘appraisal of positive emotions’ and ‘emotional facilitation and goal-orientation’. Students from science background are high on two interpersonal EI components and students from Arts background remained low on all the measures. Educational level showed no clear cut trend. Consistent with residential status and gender, urban residents and male students achieved high EI levels but mean scores significantly differed on various EI components in favour of their rural and female counterparts respectively and these are the areas for further research. Thus, it can be implied that Emotional Intelligence vary across socio-demographical variables. So, relationship of EI with various dimensions of health may also vary across the demographical groups. Therefore, different intervention programmes to enhance EI and health should be designed accordingly.
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