Mind and Society ISSN 2277-6907
Vol. 11, No.II June, 2022, Page No.99 to 108

Study of Emotional Intelligence and Well-Being among Working Professionals

***Megha Kochhar**
****K. N. Tripathi**

Received: 30 May 2022
Revision Received:19 June 2022
Accepted :20 June 2022
DOI:10.56011/mind-mri-112-202211

Abstract

Working professionals' social and mental capacities are critical to the smooth operation of organizations. Emotional intelligence (EI) nowadays has become synonymous with mental health, happiness, and well-being. Looking at the importance of emotional intelligence, the present study examined the pattern of emotional intelligence and wellbeing with its dimensions of professionals working as managers in private and government sector banks. It was also investigated whether professional hierarchy and work tenure produced any significant differences for the aforementioned variables. The results of the study indicated that professionals working in different sectors, in different cadres, and in different work tenures indicated significant differences in their perceptions. Similarly, co-relational analysis results demonstrated that all essential components of well-being (WB) are profoundly, fundamentally, and decisively linked (p.01) with EI. To be sure, emotion influences how individuals think and act and influences judgement and information processing. Employees with higher EI can discover appropriate arrangements all the more easily, work and apply emotional resources sensibly and can frequently rapidly get social help in correspondence and cooperation with individuals, thereby lessening the chance of disappointment and the depersonalization achieved by disappointment.

Keywords: Emotional Intelligence, Well-Being, Life Satisfaction, Mental Health, Interpersonal Relations

Introduction

Human connections include everyday associations and relations of individuals with each other at work as well as at home, making social intelligence an extremely pivotal part of everybody's lives. Nowadays, the articulation of 'emotional intelligence' [EI] has become parallel to mental health, happiness, and well-being. This term contains "the capacity to see precisely, evaluate and express feeling; the capacity to get to and additionally create feelings-sentiments-emotions when they work with thought; the capacity to understand feeling/emotion and emotional knowledge; and the capacity to normalize feelings to advance fervent, emotional and intellectual expansion" (Mayer & Salovey, 1997,). EI is also considered the main indicator of job execution, i.e., performance, and the top entertainers in work environments are supposed to be the individuals with high EI. Skillful and adroit human power is quite possibly the most wanted and fundamental part that assists organizations with accomplishing their targets and objectives (Khalili, 2011).

According to the general perspective, well-being is considered as the quality of life in terms of health or otherwise, satisfaction in terms of social help and fulfilment with life and effect on life. A multi-dimensional construct incorporates natural, mental-psychological, social, and profound measurements (McDowell, 2010). It refers to the appraisal of subjective encounters, both emotional and cognitive, arising because of evaluations while going through personal aspects of life. In simple terms, well-being can be alluded to as harmony between personal goals – ambitions – aspirations – targets – purposes and values and life encounters (Ryff et al., 2004), and is identified with the self-development, i.e., personal

**Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, Barkatullah University, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh, India*
***Retd. Professor, Department of Psychology, Barkatullah University, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh, India*

advancement of individuals (Ryan & Deci, 2001). In the field of positive psychology, it has been well recognized (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000) that ideal human working requires more than the shortfall of hazard, risk, or pathology have been trying to understand factors that add to the advancement of hedonic and eudaimonic well-being (Ryan & Deci, 2001; Ryff & Singer, 2008; Waterman et al., 2010). Hedonic well-being involves the acceptance of delight achievement, happiness, pleasure, joy, and torment, suffering, distress, agony, or pain aversion/avoidance, while eudaimonic well-being reflects the satisfaction or realization of one's maximum capacity, i.e., full potential (Ryan & Deci, 2001). Hedonic well-being has been characterized in research as subjective well-being (SWB) (Kahneman et al., 1999), operationalized as the pervasiveness of positive affect (PA) over adverse/ negative affect (NA). Eudaimonic well-being is alluded to in research as both PWB (Ryff& Singer, 2008) and EWB – eudaimonic well-being (prosperity) (Waterman et al., 2010), underlines self-improvement (personal growth), dominance, life purpose, and meaning (Ryff& Singer, 2008). Albeit a feeling of SWB regularly goes with PWB, pleasureful exercises are considered inadequate to support, nurture, and sustain PWB in the long haul (Ryan & Deci, 2001).

Researches show higher scores in EI bring about more prominent health and bliss (Sánchez-Álvarez et al., 2016), better occupation execution (Muchhal&Solkhe, 2017), less aggressive conduct, and more pro social conduct (García-Sancho et al., 2014). Also, different meta-investigations affirm that EI has a huge relationship with better psychological wellness and is an arbiter of stress (Martins et al., 2010). Definite degrees of EI associate adversely (negatively) with low mental and actual well-being and are identified with solid propensities like not smoking or drinking liquor and with a sound eating routine or more exercise (Tsaousis & Nikolaou, 2005). Cherniss and Goleman (2000) proposed that emotional intelligence is the person's capacity to check adverse feelings of outrage, i.e., curb negative emotions about anger, low confidence, and nervousness (anxiety). And supplanting them with good feelings (i.e., to enhance positive emotions) like certainty, belief, confidence, sympathy, empathy, companionship, and friendship.

Objective:

In the light of above the present study was planned to address the following objectives:

1. To explore the intergroup differences in perceived emotional intelligence and dimensions of well-being of working professionals in relation to sector, experience and hierarchy.

2. To see the pattern of relationships between emotional intelligence and dimensions of wellbeing.

METHOD

Participants

Four hundred working professionals working in private and government sector banks (vis. Kotak Mahindra Bank and Punjab National Bank) participated in the study. The participants were Senior managers/ Managers and assistant managers having work experience of < 5 years and > 5 years. The participants were approached purposively for this study.

Research Design

In the present study co-relational design was used. Although to investigate the intergroup differences for the perceived variables (emotional intelligence, well-being, organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness) a 2x2x2 factorial design was applied. Efforts were also made to examine the relationships between emotional intelligence and wellbeing with its dimensions.

Tools

Emotional Intelligence Scale

The scale (5-point) comprises 34 statements developed by Hyde, Pethe, and Dhar (2002) was used in the study. Cronbach's Alpha of the scale was obtained $\alpha = 0.95$.

The Well-being Scale

The Well-being (WB) scale (5-point) comprises 50 statements developed and standardized by Sisodia and Choudhary (2012) to measure several dimensions of well-being vis. Life Satisfaction (LS), Mental Health (MH), Interpersonal Relations (IR), Sociability (SC), and Efficiency (E). Cronbach's Alpha of the scale was obtained as $\alpha = 0.97$.

Procedure

After obtaining informed consent the tools (questionnaires) were administered using an online survey procedure to the participants. Participants were requested to give a self-assessment to the structured questionnaire. They were informed to ask queries if any. They were encouraged and allowed to discuss..

Results

The present study was designed to investigate the intergroup difference between the professionals of different sectors (Private/Government), tenure of experience (<5years &.> 5 years) and hierarchies

(Senior and Assistant Managers) for perceived emotional intelligence and wellbeing and its dimensions.

Emotional Intelligence

To examine the intergroup difference in perceived emotional intelligence a 2 (sector) x2 (experience) x2 (hierarchy) ANOVA was performed. Result indicates that the main effect of the sector is statistically significant, (F = 57.28, p <.01, Table 2). The private sector professionals observed higher level of emotional intelligence as compared to the government sector professionals. The main effect of the experience is also obtained significant (F = 42.65, p <.01, Table 2). The employees with long experience displayed a higher level of emotional intelligence as compared to the employees having less experience. Similarly the main effect of the hierarchy is statistically significant (F = 22.60, p <.01, Table 2). The senior managers indicated **a higher level of emotional intelligence** as compared to the assistant managers. The interaction of sector and experience is highly statistically significant (F = 16.50, p <.01, Table 2). It supports that employees with different levels of experience show a distinction in terms of emotional intelligence accounting for a statistically different picture for private and government employees. The interaction of sector and hierarchy is highly statistically significant (F = 10.25, p <.01, Table 2). Thus, employees with different hierarchical levels differ in terms of emotional intelligence accounting for a statistically different picture for private and government employees. The interaction of experience and hierarchy is highly statistically significant (F = 25.80, p <.01, Table 2). Thus, employees with different hierarchical levels differ in terms of emotional intelligence as per the level of experience.

The 3-way interaction (2*2*2) of sector* experience* and *hierarchy is highly statistically significant (F = 9.90, p <.01, Table 2). Thus, employees with different levels of experience show a distinction in terms of emotional intelligence accounting for a statistically different picture for private and government employees and (in addition) a clear, distinct depiction for assistant managers and senior managers.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of the scores indicating Emotional Intelligence

	Private Sector Bank				Government sector Bank			
	<5 years experience		>5 years experience		<5 years experience		>5 years experience	
	Astt. Manager	Senior Manager	Astt. Manager	Senior Manager	Astt. Manager	Senior Manager	Astt. Manager	Senior Manager
Means	124.53	131.87	133.80	133.00	86.68	120.75	126.30	15.73
SDs	19.19	7.29	10.6	11.01	32.49	19.74	17.08	13.42

Summary of 3 way ANOVA for Emotional Intelligence

Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F
Sector	18267.564	1	18267.564	57.280**
Experience	13602.815	1	13602.815	42.653**
Hierarchy	7207.826	1	7207.826	22.601**
Sector * Experience	5263.961	1	5263.961	16.506**
Sector * Hierarchy	3269.018	1	3269.018	10.250**
Experience * Hierarchy	8228.875	1	8228.875	25.803**
Sector * Experience * Hierarchy	3158.916	1	3158.916	9.905**
Error	125015.275	392	318.917	

Note: **p <.01; *p <.05

Well-Being and it's dimensions

Means and standard deviations of the scores obtained on wellbeing dimensions are shown in table 3. Summaries of ANOVAs for the well being dimensions are presented in Table 4 & 5 respectively.

Table 3
Means and SDs of the scores indicating Well being and its dimensions

	Private Sector Bank				Government sector Bank			
	<5 years experience		>5 years Experience		<5 years experience		>5 years experience	
	Assistant Manager	Senior Manager	Assistant Manager	Senior Manager	Assistant Manager	Senior Manager	Assistant Manager	Senior Manager
Mental Health	37.55 (8.45)	40.67 (3.16)	40.67 (3.78)	40.14 (4.42)	25.66 (12.03)	39.63 (7.09)	36.35 (8.32)	40.07 (4.84)
Interpersonal Relations	38.38 (7.85)	39.72 (4.20)	39.31 (4.96)	39.98 (3.98)	25.52 (11.68)	38.63 (8.16)	36.87 (8.15)	40.13 (4.54)
Life Satisfaction	35.98 (8.82)	39.51 (3.42)	39.77 (4.10)	40.30 (4.88)	24.00 (10.76)	34.81 (8.24)	37.96 (7.27)	39.53 (3.73)
Efficiency	38.21 (7.71)	38.54 (4.77)	38.50 (5.07)	39.75 (4.96)	24.84 (12.02)	35.75 (8.04)	35.83 (9.83)	39.53 (3.96)
Sociability	36.62 (7.85)	40.03 (4.20)	38.84 (4.86)	39.27 (4.83)	25.16 (11.33)	36.88 (7.61)	35.48 (7.35)	36.83 (4.54)
Well-being	166.74 (32.55)	198.46 (9.20)	197.10 (10.31)	199.44 (11.94)	125.18 (53.80)	185.69 (33.43)	182.48 (28.19)	196.10 (11.53)

(A). Mental Health

The main effect of the sector is statistically significant (F = 27.56, p <.01, Table 4). The private sector professionals evinced a higher level of mental health as compared to the government sector employees. The main effect of the experience is statistically significant (F = 17.27, p <.01, Table 4). The employees with > 5 years of experience appear to have a higher level of mental health (M = 39.31) as compared to the employees who have d" 5 years of experience . The main effect of the hierarchy is statistically significant (F = 37.69, p <.01, Table 4). The senior managers appear to have a higher level of mental health as compared to the junior level employees ranked as assistant managers in hierarchy terms. The interaction of sector and experience is highly statistically significant (F = 6.69, p <.05, Table 4). Thus, employees with different levels of experience show a distinction in terms of mental health accounting for a statistically different picture for private and government employees. The interaction of sector and hierarchy is highly statistically significant (F = 20.93, p <.01, Table 4). Thus, employees with different hierarchical levels differ in terms of mental health accounting for a statistically different picture for private and government employees.

Table 4
Summaries of ANOVAs for wellbeing and its dimensions

Source of variation	d. f	Mental Health		Interpersonal Relations		Life Satisfaction	
		Ms	**F**	**Ms**	**F**	**Ms**	**F**
Sector (A)	1	1349.74	27.56	1186.96	24.66	1669.32	36.13
Experience (B)	1	846.16	17.27	888.71	18.47	2431.94	52.64
Hierarchy (C)	1	1846.13	37.69	1518.48	31.55	1216.94	26.34
AXB	1	327.75	6.69	611.73	12.71	893.57	19.34
AXC	1	1025.41	20.93	928.17	19.29	311.74	6.75
BXC	1	867.95	17.72	497.37	10.33	672.86	14.56
AXBXC	1	195.60	3.99	378.29	7.86	174.96	3.79
Within	392	48.98		48.13		46.20	

Note: **p <.01; *p <.05

The interaction of experience and hierarchy is highly statistically significant (F = 17.72, p <.01, Table 4). Thus, employees with different hierarchical levels differ in terms of mental health as per the level of experience. The interaction of sector* experience* and *hierarchy is statistically significant (F = 3.99, p <.05, Table 4). Thus, employees with different levels of experience show a distinction in terms of mental health accounting for a statistically different picture for private and government employees and (in addition) a clear, distinct depiction for assistant managers and senior managers.

(B). Interpersonal relation

The main effect of the sector is statistically significant (F = 36.13, p <.01, Table 4). Furthermore, the private sector professionals showed higher level of life satisfaction as compared to the government sector employees . The main effect of the experience is statistically significant (F = 52.64, p <.01, Table 4). The employees with more experience showed a higher level of life satisfaction as compared to the employees having less experience. The main effect of the hierarchy is statistically significant (F = 26.34, p <.01, Table 4). The senior managers appear to have a higher level of life satisfaction as compared to the junior level employees ranked as assistant managers in hierarchy terms. The 2-way interaction of sector and experience is highly statistically significant (F = 19.34, p <.01, Table 4). As a result, employees with varying degrees of experience differ in terms of life satisfaction, resulting in a statistically diverse image for private and public sector professionals.

The 2-way interaction of sector and hierarchy is statistically significant (F = 6.75, p <.05, Table 4). As a result, employees at different levels of the hierarchy have varied degrees of life satisfaction, resulting in a statistically distinct image for private and government workers. The 2-way interaction of experience and hierarchy is highly statistically significant (F = 14.56, p <.01, Table 4). Thus, employees with different hierarchical levels differ in terms of life satisfaction as per the tenure of experience.

(C) Life Satisfaction

The main effect of the sector is statistically significant (F =36.13, p <.01, Table 4). Furthermore, the private sector employees appear to have a higher level of life satisfaction) as compared to the government sector employees. The main effect of the experience is statistically significant (F = 52.64, p <.01, Table 4). The employees with long experience appear to have a higher level of life satisfaction as compared to the employees who have less years of experience. The main effect of the hierarchy is statistically significant

(F = 26.34, p <.01, Table 4). The senior managers appear to have a higher level of life satisfaction as compared to the junior level employees ranked as assistant managers in hierarchy terms .

The 2-way interaction of sector and experience is highly statistically significant (F = 19.34, p <.01, Table 4). Professionals with different levels of experience show a distinction in terms of life satisfaction accounting for a statistically different picture for professionals working in private and government setup.

The 2-way interaction of sector and hierarchy is statistically significant (F = 6.75, p <.05, Table 4). Thus, employees with different hierarchical levels differ in terms of life satisfaction accounting for a statistically different picture for private and government employees. The 2-way interaction of experience and hierarchy is highly statistically significant (F = 14.56, p <.01, Table 4). Thus, employees with different hierarchical levels differ in terms of life satisfaction as per the level of experience.

(D) Efficiency

The main effect of the sector is statistically significant (F = 30.57, p <.01, Table 5). Furthermore, the private sector employees appear to have a higher level of efficiency as compared to the government sector professionals. The main effect of the experience is statistically significant (F = 22.32, p <.01, Table 5). The employees with > 5 years of experience appear to have a higher level of efficiency as compared to the employees who have d" 5 years of experience. The main effect of the hierarchy is statistically significant (F = 22.11, p <.01, Table 5). The senior managers appear to have a higher level of efficiency as compared to the junior level employees ranked as assistant managers in hierarchy terms. The 2-way interaction of sector and experience is highly statistically significant (F = 14.85, p <.01, Table 5). Thus, employees with different levels of experience show a distinction in terms of efficiency accounting for a statistically different picture for private and government employees.

The 2-way interaction of sector and hierarchy is highly statistically significant (F = 14.34, p <.01, Table 5). Thus, employees with different hierarchical levels differ in terms of efficiency accounting for a statistically different picture for private and government employees. The 2-way interaction of experience and hierarchy was found to be insignificant (F = 3.34, p >.069, Table 5).

The 3 -way interaction (2*2*2) of sector* experience* and *hierarchy is statistically significant (F = 5.55, p <.05, Table 5). Thus, employees with different levels of experience show a distinction in terms of efficiency accounting for a statistically different picture for private and government employees and (in addition) a clear, distinct depiction for assistant managers and senior managers.

Table 5
Summaries of ANOVAs for wellbeing and its dimensions

Source of Variance	df	Efficiency		Sociability		Well-being	
		Ms	F	Ms	F	Ms	F
Sector (A)	1	1630.35	30.57	1874.02	39.38	38304.74	50.05
Experience (B)	1	1190.25	22.32	620.36	13.04	28097.12	36.72
Hierarchy (C)	1	1179.27	22.11	1284.96	27.00	34971.18	45.70
AXB	1	791.86	14.85	348.52	7.32	14289.43	18.67
AXC	1	764.75	14.34	383.22	8.05	16224.18	21.20
BXC	1	177.91	3.34	799.15	16.79	14234.85	18.60
AXBXC	1	296.27	5.55	245.23	5.15	6325.86	8.27
Within	392	53.34		47.59		765.27	

Note: **p <.01; *p <.05

(E) Sociability

The main effect of the sector is statistically significant (F = 39.38, p <.01, Table 5). Furthermore, the private sector employees appear to have a higher level of sociability as compared to the government sector employees. The main effect of the experience is statistically significant (F = 13.04, p <.01, Table 5). The employees with > 5 years of experience appear to have a higher level of sociability as compared to the employees who have d" 5 years of experience. The main effect of the hierarchy is statistically significant (F = 27.00, p <.01, Table 5). The senior managers appear to have a higher level of sociability as compared to the junior level employees ranked as assistant managers in hierarchy terms.

The 2-way interaction of sector and experience is highly statistically significant with (F = 7.32, p <.01, Table 5). Thus, employees with different levels of experience show a distinction in terms of sociability accounting for a statistically different picture for private and government employees.

The 2-way interaction of sector and hierarchy is highly statistically significant (F = 8.05, p <.01, Table 5). Thus, employees with different hierarchical levels differ in terms of sociability accounting for a statistically different picture for private and government employees.

The 2-way interaction of experience and hierarchy is highly statistically significant (F = 16.79, p <.01, Table 5). Thus, employees with different hierarchical levels differ in terms of sociability as per the level of experience.

The interaction of sector* experience* and *hierarchy is statistically significant (F = 5.15, p <.05, Table 5). Thus, employees with different levels of experience show a distinction in terms of sociability accounting for a statistically different picture for private and government employees and (in addition) a clear, distinct depiction for assistant managers and senior managers.

(F) Wellbeing (total)

The main effect of the sector is statistically significant (F = 50.05, p <.01, Table 5). Furthermore, the private sector employees appear to have a higher level of well-being as compared to the government sector employees. The main effect of the experience is statistically significant (F = 36.72, p <.01, Table 5). The employees with > 5 years of experience appear to have a higher level of well-being as compared to the employees who have d" 5 years of experience. The main effect of the hierarchy is statistically significant (F = 45.70, p <.01, Table 5). The senior managers enjoyed a higher level of well-being as compared to the assistant managers in hierarchy terms. The interaction of sector and experience is highly statistically significant (F = 18.67, p <.01, Table 5). Thus, employees with different levels of experience show a distinction in terms of well-being accounting for a statistically different picture for private and government employees.

The interaction of sector and hierarchy is highly statistically significant with (F = 21.20, p <.01, Table 5). Thus, employees with different hierarchical levels differ in terms of well-being accounting for a statistically different picture for private and government employees.

The interaction of experience and hierarchy is highly statistically significant (F = 18.60, p <.01, Table 5). Thus, employees with different hierarchical levels differ in terms of well-being as per the level of experience they have got.

The interaction of sector* experience* and *hierarchy is highly statistically significant (F = 8.27, p <.01, Table 5). Thus, employees with different levels of experience show a distinction in terms of well-being accounting for a statistically different picture for private and government employees and (in addition) a clear, distinct depiction for assistant managers and senior managers.

Co-relational Analysis

Relationship of emotional intelligence with the dimensions of well being (mental health, interpersonal relations, life satisfaction, efficiency, sociability and total wellbeing was also investigated and shown in

Table 6
Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Well-Being and its sub-dimensions

		Mental Health Relations	Inter personal	Satisfaction	Efficiency	Sociability	Well -Being
Emotional Intelligence	Pearson correlation	.687	704	763	663 .	707 .	811

Note: **p <.01; *p <.05

The relationships of Emotional Intelligence with Well-Being and its dimensions were positive and significant (total wellbeing 0.81**,** Mental Health 0.68**, Interpersonal Relations 0.70**, Satisfaction 0.76**, Efficiency 0.66**, and Sociability 0.70**).

Discussion

Peter Salovey and John Mayer during the 1990s initiated the importance of emotional intelligence [EI]. Gradually, it has become one of the most relevant business abilities and skills. However, this specific knowledge has little to do with what we learn in school and surpasses the scholarly inclination and specialised mastery required for work. EI capacities, skills, and abilities are increasingly becoming more prevalent and indispensible in a wide range of contexts, from effective leadership and team building to global thinking, social abilities, financial, and political life (Chopra & Kanji, 2010).As indicated by the American psychologist Howard Gardner, a high EI assists us with doing the following: better negotiating arrangements, going about as a judge, forestalling, and resolving conflict. EI affects an individual's obligations toward organisations and affects business-related achievements. A few analysts accept and believe that understanding the emotions of working (workplace) personnel is essential to comprehending the organization's structure (Muchinsky, 2000). Moreover, workers should have the option to apply fitting control of their emotions in their dealings with senior managers (ranking directors) and clients for the association to work effectively (Moon & Hur, 2011). Working and being smart (intelligent) during work, i.e., settling on exact business-related choices, great critical thinking abilities, and so forth, is an important showcase of work power. EI and its backers have a significant relationship with well-being, joy, health, and prosperity at work and home. For instance, a meta-examination by Schutte et al. (2007) concluded that EI was related to better health and well-being, including mental and actual prosperity, i.e., well-being.

Taylor, 2001).Nonetheless, specialists are now investigating how employees oversee emotions further to develop work results (Grandey, 2000). An investigation into the harmony between work and life**,** as it pinpoints with EI, is a significant one. Various organisations that focus on EI are corporate, social assistance, and community-related associations. Earlier research has shown that higher EI negatively correlates with emotional problems such as stress, anxiety, and depression; additionally, the positive relationship is well recognised with various measures of well-being (Zeidner et al., 2012).

Analysts have shown the altogether certain job of EI in life fulfilment. EI's self-awareness and 'clearness of feelings' (subdomain of self-administration) show more significant connections to life satisfaction (Palmer et al., 2002). Likewise, a similar picture is shown in our results, wherein emotional intelligence surely leads to the life satisfaction aspect of well-being of employees.

EI encompasses areas such as, for example, relational and intrapersonal skills, stress supervision, versatility, adaptability, and general temperament. This way, it isn't surprising that EI impacts mental health purity (Bibi et al., 2020). The effect of EI on employees' mental health is comprehensively proven and shown.

An immediate affiliation has been found between EI and interpersonal distress levels. A high level of EI enables an individual to regulate and manage feelings, thereby reducing stress and gaining those they communicate with (Mayer et al., 2008). Findings revealed a positive relationship of emotional intelligence on employees' interpersonal relations. As high EI has a greater probability of yielding more certain social results and low EI has been associated with interpersonal contentions and maladjustment (Mayer et al., 2000). Empathy as an essential part of EI is deemed as a multidimensional structure that infers affective and cognitive reactions to someone else. It supports pro social practices and is related to better friendly connections, i.e., enhances social relationships (Van der Graaff et al., 2018). The results affirmed a definite positive connection of emotional intelligence with the sociability dimension.

The study reveals a definite positive connection between emotional intelligence and efficiency of employees. There is evidence that EI is a significant factor in further developing work execution(Karimi et al., 2020) and that EI training can foster relevance at work and bliss (Callea et al., 2019). Earlier exploration demonstrates that higher EI prompts improved mental prosperity, higher paces of positive emotional states, and psychological well-being (Lin et al., 2016).The investigation alludes that emotional intelligence results in enhancing life satisfaction, mental health, interpersonal relations, sociability, and efficiency, all mentioned considered as a pre-requisite of well-being.

As indicated by Goleman, there are five fundamental abilities to master: self-awareness, self-

motivation, emotional control, empathy, and dealing with connections. In addition, they don't generally go connected at the hip: somebody who is empathic may battle with anger issues. EI's particular significance and effect are well noticed amongst individuals in their various aspects of life journey, such as its empathetic connection with coping strategies, sociability, happiness, etc. Contrarily higher EI has been identified to relate adversely with maladaptive practices, sadness, stress, burnout, anxiety, etc. The study results prove that a higher level of EI was found to be correlated with well-being and its formative sub-dimensions of life effectiveness, mental health, interpersonal relations, sociability, and efficiency. The investigation acknowledges that the organizations need to invest in training programs that nurture and enhance employees' emotional intelligence and, in turn, their well-being. Notwithstanding your own potential improvement regions, expanding EI knowledge at work is a mutually beneficial arrangement for everybody.

References

Bibi, A., Saleem, A., Khalid, M. A., & Shafique, N. (2020). Emotional intelligence and aggression among university students of Pakistan: a correlational study. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, *29*(10), 1189-1203.

Callea, A., De Rosa, D., Ferri, G., Lipari, F., & Costanzi, M. (2019). Are more intelligent people happier? Emotional intelligence as mediator between need for relatedness, happiness and flourishing. *Sustainability*, *11*(4), 1022.

Cherniss, C., & Goleman, D. (2000). Emotional intelligence. In *Annual Meeting for the Scioety for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. New Orleans, LA*.

Chopra, P. K., & Kanji, G. K. (2010). Emotional intelligence: A catalyst for inspirational leadership and management excellence. *Total quality management*, *21*(10), 971-1004.

García-Sancho, E., Salguero, J. M., & Fernández-Berrocal, P. (2014). Relationship between emotional intelligence and aggression: A systematic review. *Aggression and violent behavior*, *19*(5), 584-591.

Grandey, A. A. (2000). Emotional regulation in the workplace: A new way to conceptualize emotional labor. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, *5*(1), 95.

Kahneman, D., Diener, E., & Schwarz, N. (Eds.). (1999). *Well-being: Foundations of hedonic psychology*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Karimi, L., Leggat, S. G., Bartram, T., & Rada, J. (2020). The effects of emotional intelligence training on the job performance of Australian aged care workers. *Health care management review*, *45*(1), 41-51.

Khalili, A. (2011). Gender differences in emotional intelligence among employees of small and medium enterprise: An empirical study. *Journal of International Management Studies*, *6*(2), 184-193.

Lin, D. T., Liebert, C. A., Tran, J., Lau, J. N., & Salles, A. (2016). Emotional intelligence as a predictor of resident well-being. *Journal of the American College of Surgeons*, *223*(2), 352-358.

Martins, A., Ramalho, N., & Morin, E. (2010). A comprehensive meta-analysis of the relationship between emotional intelligence and health. *Personality and individual differences*, *49*(6), 554-564.

Mayer, J. D., Roberts, R. D., & Barsade, S. G. (2008). Human abilities: Emotional intelligence. *Annual review of Psychology*, *59*(1), 507-536.

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R., & Sternberg, R. J. (2000). Models of emotional intelligence. *JD Mayer*.

Mayer, J. D. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? P Salovey, DJ Sluyter,(Eds.), Emotional Development and Emotional Intelligence. *Basic Books, New York*, *3*, 34.

McDowell, I. (2010). Measures of self-perceived well-being. *Journal of psychosomatic research*, *69*(1), 69-79.

Moon, T. W., & Hur, W. M. (2011). Emotional intelligence, emotional exhaustion, and job performance. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, *39*(8), 1087-1096.

Muchhal DS, Solkhe A.(2017). An empirical investigation of relationship between emotional intelligence and job performance in Indian manufacturing sector. *Clear Int J Res Commer Manag*, 8(7), 18–21.

Muchinsky, P. M. (2000). *Psychology applied to work: An introduction to industrial and organizational psychology*. Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Palmer, B., Donaldson, C., & Stough, C. (2002). Emotional intelligence and life satisfaction. *Personality and individual differences*, *33*(7), 1091-1100.

Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (2001).To be happy or to be self-fulfilled: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Rview of Psychology*, 52(16), 141-66.

Ryff, C. D., Singer, B. H., & Dienberg Love, G. (2004). Positive health: connecting well–being with biology. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, *359*(1449), 1383-1394.

Ryff, C. D., & Singer, B. H. (2008). Know thyself and become what you are: A eudaimonic approach to psychological well-being. *Journal of happiness studies*, *9*(1), 13-39.

Sánchez-Álvarez, N., Extremera, N., & Fernández-Berrocal, P. (2016). The relation between emotional intelligence and subjective well-being: A meta-analytic investigation. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *11*(3), 276-285.

Schutte, N.S. Malouff, J. M., Thorsteinsson,E B.Bhullar, N., & Rooke,S.E (2007). A meta-analytic investigation of the relationship between emotional intelligence and health. *Personality and individual differences*, *42*(6), 921-933

Seligman, M.E., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). *Positive Psychology: An Introduction*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Talents (2007).mart (n.d.). About emotional intelligence. *https://www.talentsmart.com/about/emotional-intelligence.php*

Taylor, C. G. J. (2001). Low Emotional Intelligence. *Emotional intelligence in everyday life: A scientific inquiry*, 67.

Tredgold G. (2016). 55 inspiring quotes that show the power of emotional intelligence.. *https://www.inc.com/gordon-tredgold/55-inspiringquotes-that-show-the-importance-of-emotional-intelligence.html*

Tsaousis, I., & Nikolaou, I. (2005). Exploring the relationship of emotional intelligence with physical and psychological health functioning. *Stress and Health: Journal of the International Society for the Investigation of Stress*, *21*(2), 77-86.

Van der Graaff, J., Carlo, G., Crocetti, E., Koot, H. M., & Branje, S. (2018). Prosocial behavior in adolescence: Gender differences in development and links with empathy. *Journal of youth and adolescence*, *47*(5), 1086-1099.

Waterman, A. S., Schwartz, S. J., Zamboanga, B. L., Ravert, R. D., Williams, M. K., Bede Agocha, V., ... & Brent Donnellan, M. (2010). The Questionnaire for Eudaimonic Well-Being: Psychometric properties, demographic comparisons, and evidence of validity. *The journal of positive psychology*, *5*(1), 41-61.

Zeidner, M., Matthews, G., & Roberts, R. D. (2012). The emotional intelligence, health, and well being nexus: What have we learned and what have we missed?. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well Being*, *4*(1), 1-30.

✦