



Comparative Study Between Emotional Intelligence, Life Satisfaction And Resilience Among Psychology And Non Psychology Students

Swasti Jain, DR Vibha Yadava

Student, Assistant Professor-1

Amity Institute of Psychology and Allied Sciences

Amity University, Noida, Uttar Pradesh

Abstract

The current study aimed to analyze the significant difference between mean scores of resilience, emotional intelligence, and life satisfaction between psychology students and non-psychology students. To test the hypotheses, data was collected using self-reported measures of Emotional Intelligence, Satisfaction with the Life Scale, and Resilience Questionnaire from a sample of 200 undergraduate students. The *t* tests compared the difference in the mean scores between the two groups of psychology and non-psychology students for each section of the assessment. The results highlight that there are no significant difference between the scores of psychology and non-psychology students for variables life satisfaction, emotional intelligence and Resilience. The significant difference of mean scores were shown for dimension of emotional intelligence which is managing other people's emotions. To conclude from previous literature, Psychology students mental health is not taken seriously leading to internalizing a number of disorders and Compassion Fatigue that lowers the level of satisfaction and Resilience and New education policies in India has introduced a number of workshops and mental health initiatives in colleges that can assist non psychology students to help them build emotional intelligence, resilience and Life Satisfaction.

Key words : *Psychology, Emotional Intelligence, Life satisfaction, Resilience, Undergraduate students*

Introduction

Psychology as a subject is gaining popularity in India. A lot of students are taking up psychology in their undergraduate courses, and many schools and universities have started introducing psychology as part of their curriculum. Since psychology is gaining so much popularity, The purpose of research was to know the different benefits of studying psychology. Even though the majority of students know about the limited scope and opportunities currently in India, many of them are still interested in studying psychology. More than

professional reasons there were personal reasons like enhancing their own wellbeing, which lead to the question : Does psychology as a subject even have an impact on our wellbeing?

To make this more specific, I took three variables to understand the effect of education in psychology on emotional intelligence, resilience, and life satisfaction.

To introduce these variables :

- *Emotional intelligence* : It is difficult to explain EI because of no single well accepted definition Mathews (et al., 2002) says that "EI is too generalized a construct to be useful." There is one well accepted definition by Malovey and Salovey which is “ability to perceive, integrate emotion and regulate emotion to promote personal growth”. It is an emotional skill set to effectively use information from emotions.
- *Life satisfaction* : It is evaluation of their life as a whole, having various domains such as work, relationships, fulfillment and health. Research on life satisfaction has identified factors that contribute to subjective well-being. Diener et al. (1999) examines the determinants of life satisfaction across various cultures and found causes like social relationships, income, health, and personal values. The study highlights the importance of both objective factors and subjective factors in shaping life satisfaction.
- *Resilience* : Resilience refers to the skill to bounce back from challenges. Research has shown that resilience is influenced by various factors like genetics, environment, and individual characteristics.

According to different reviews of literature, these variables are quite important for subjective well-being, and despite any population or subject, these variables are important factors, especially for students.

The proposal of a learning outcome-based curriculum framework (LOCF) for UGC net curriculum 2019 for psychology undergraduate courses also specifies how they are aiming to improve the self-understanding, reflexivity, and personal growth of students through psychology and their curriculum, hence by studying undergraduate students and these variables can help us establish benefits of studying psychology subject.

Review of Literature

Shapiro, S. L., Brown, K. W., & Biegel, G. M. (2007) highlighted importance of research in Mental health needs of Therapist Trainees, they found out that they are at risk of Psychological Problems, they planned self care based stress reduction for Therapist Trainee, These findings helps us to understand the importance of self-care and mindfulness for healthcare providers.

Rummell, C. M. (2015) studied students of clinical and counseling psychology with general population and found out rates of physical and mental health symptomatology are higher in Psychology students than general population including anxiety, depressive symptoms including chronic physical pain highlighting lack of mental health care for psychology students hence this specific research helped to understand the situation of

Psychology students and inspired to conduct similar study in India , they also recommend aid for trainee psychologist which can help further researchers to plan interventions.

The research by Hafiz, S., & Chouhan, M. (2015) studied University students of Jammu, and used Anova to Data analyze,the results showed people with High emotional Intelligence showed greater Life Satisfaction and also highlighted the role of gender in Life satisfaction,where Males scored higher on Life Satisfaction. Since the sample size was small , 40,a larger sample size with the Indian population was used in this study to know differences in these variables for the population of Psychology and Non psychology students.

The study by Sasiprapha, A. (2022) talks about the influence of attachment style on Life Satisfaction and Resilience,they used quantitative approach and Statistical analysis and results showed how attachment styles have a direct and negative relationship with life satisfaction

Research Methodology

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce the Research Methodology for the study regarding the Comparison between Young Adults who have Background in Psychology with young adults who have no Background in Psychology. The research studies and compares significance difference of Mean scores of Resilience,Life Satisfaction and Emotional Intelligence of psychology students and non psychology students.The chapter includes aim,objective,procedure,research design,sample design,statistical analysis and ethical analysis of the research

Aim

The aim of this study is to Compare Resilience,Life Satisfaction and Emotional Intelligence among Young adults who have Studied Psychology with Young adults having No Background in Psychology.

Objective

This study sought to :

- 1.) compare mean scores of emotional intelligence between psychology and non psychology students
- 2.) To compare means scores of level of satisfaction between psychology and non psychology students
- 3.) To compare mean scores resilience between psychology and non psychology students

Methodology

A quantitative approach was used in order to meet the objectives of the current research.

Hypothesis

1. There will be no significant difference in mean scores of emotion intelligence among students of psychology and non psychology
2. There will be no significant difference in mean scores of Life satisfaction among students of psychology and non psychology
3. There will be no significant difference in mean scores of resilience among students of psychology and non psychology

Variable

In this quantitative study, the independent variable for the research questions is Background in Psychology. The dependent variables were Resilience, Life Satisfaction and Emotional Intelligence. The study objectives were to Compare mean scores of the two populations between Resilience, Life Satisfaction and Emotional Intelligence of Psychology students and Non Psychology Students.

Research Design

A Comparative, cross sectional design was used with the quantitative research method. We performed a comparative analysis between two populations, Psychology students and Non Psychology for each dependent variable.

Sampling

A non-probability method of convenience sampling was used to measure the variables life Satisfaction, Resilience, and life satisfaction through self report measures.

Participants

Participants include 100 undergraduate students with education in Psychology and 100 undergraduate students with no education and Psychology. The participants who studied Psychology in only higher education were excluded. The data was collected from Private and Government Universities of Delhi Ncr. Average age of each participant is 18-25 including 160 female students, 40 Male students.

Tools

The three instruments of choice for this study consist of tools published to aid in Resilience, Life Satisfaction and Emotional Intelligence. The following tools were used to collect the data

- *Schutte Self Report Emotional Intelligence Test* was conducted From a pool of 62 items, this was developed to measure emotional intelligence. 33 items were found to be homogenous. 346 American participants were given these 62 items on five point scale with 1 denoting “strongly disagree” and 5 denoting “strongly agree” The test – retest reliability was 0.78 and internal consistency Cronbach’s

alpha 0.87) and validity was checked by different methods like predictive validity predicted grade point average in school students and discriminant validity with Big Five personality traits of the scale has been checked

- *The Satisfaction with Life Scale* was developed by Diener, Emmons, Larsen and Griffin (1985). It was developed to gauge the concept of life satisfaction that is overall assessment of their lives. A seven point likert scale with 1 denoting strongly disagree and 7 denoting strongly agree. It has high internal consistency and high temporal reliability, scores were moderately to highly associated with other measures of subjective well-being. and predictably correlated with specific personality characteristics
- *Nicholson McBride Resilience Questionnaire* consists 12 items that measure resilience, created by McBride (2010) includes likert scales of five points from strongly agree to strongly disagree ranging are used to test resilience. Scores between 44-48 suggest a strong level of resilience while scores 49-60 show an ordinary level of resilience. The reliability estimated by Cronbach's Alpha = .76.

Statistical Analysis

SPSS was used to analyze the data, overall score was calculated by adding the student score from each area of assessment. The result of statistical analysis demonstrated that data was normally distributed allowing application of independent T test. The two groups psychology and non psychology students means score were compared using T test.

Result Analysis

Table 1: Difference in Variables of resilience between Group A and Group B

Variable	Group A		Group B		t	df	sig	p-value
	M	SD	M	SD				
Resilience	38.770	6.5918	40.320	7.2389	-1.583	198	.115	0.05

note : M = Mean, SD= Standard Deviation, t= t value, df= Degree of freedom, p=significance level , $p < 0.05$

Table 1 shows a T test comparing the mean scores of Resilience for Group A (psychology students) and Group B (non psychology students). The means of Group P and Group NP for Resilience were found to be 38.770 and 40.320 respectively and the SDs were 6.5918 for Group P and 7.2398 for Group NP. The T test result indicated there are no significant differences between the two groups indicating there is no difference between Resilience scores of Psychology and Non Psychology students.

Table 2 : Difference in Variables of Life Satisfaction between Group A and Group B

Variable	Group A		Group B		t	df	sig	p-value
	M	SD	M	SD				
Satisfaction	20.400	6.8990	19.800	6.565	5.42	198	.558	0.05

note : M = Mean,SD= Standard Deviation,t= t value, df= Degree of freedom, p=significance level ,p<0.05

Table 2 shows a T test comparing the mean scores of Life Satisfaction for Group A(psychology students) and Group B (non psychology students). The means of Group A (Psychology students) and Group B (Non Psychology students) for overall Life Satisfaction regulation were found to be 20.400 and 19.800 respectively and the SDs were 6.8990 and .6565 respectively.The T test result indicated there are no significant difference between the two groups indicating there are no difference between Life Satisfaction scores of Psychology and Non Psychology students.

Table 3 : Difference in Emotional Intelligence between Group A and Group B

Variable	Group A		Group B		t	df	sig	p-value
	M	SD	M	SD				
Emotional Intelligence	121.320	10.8058	117.610	15.6308	5.42	198	.052	0.05

note : M = Mean,SD= Standard Deviation,t= t value, df= Degree of freedom, p=significance level ,p<0.05

Table 3 shows a T test comparing the mean scores of Emotional Intelligence for Group A(Psychology students) and Group B (Non psychology students).The means for Emotional Intelligence were found to be 121.320 and 117.610 respectively and the SDs were 10.8058 and 15.6308 respectively. The T test result indicated there are no significant differences between the two groups indicating there is no difference between Emotional Intelligence scores of Psychology and Non Psychology students.

Table 4 : Difference in Perception of Emotion between Group A and Group B

Variable	Group A		Group B		t	df	Sig value	p-value
	M	SD	M	SD				
perception of emotion	27.030	2.9523	26.650	3.8909	.778	198	.437	0.05

note : M = Mean,SD= Standard Deviation,t= t value, df= Degree of freedom, p=significance level ,p<0.05

Table 4 shows a T test comparing the mean scores of dimension of Emotional Intelligence which is Perception of Emotions for Group A (Psychology students) and B (Non psychology students).The means scores for the dimension of Perception of emotions were found to be 27.030 and 26.650 respectively and the SDs were 2.9523 and 3.8909 respectively. The T test result indicated there are no significant differences between the groups indicating there is no difference between Perception of Emotion scores of Psychology and Non Psychology students.

Table 5 : Difference in Managing our Emotions between Group A and Group B

Variable	Group A		Group B		t	df	sig	p-value
	M	SD	M	SD				
Managing our emotion	16.360	2.4184	16.020	2.8497	910	198	.364	0.05

note : M = Mean,SD= Standard Deviation,t= t value, df= Degree of freedom, p=significance level ,p<0.05

Table 5 shows a T test comparing the mean scores of dimension of Emotional Intelligence which is Managing our Emotion for Group A (Psychology students) and B (Non psychology students).The means of Group A (Psychology students) and Group B (Non psychology students) for the dimension managing our emotions were found to be 16.360 and 16.020 respectively and the SDs were 2.4184 and 2.8497 respectively. The T test result indicated there are no significant differences between the groups indicating there is no difference between Managing our Emotion scores of Psychology and Non Psychology students.

Table 6 : Difference in Managing other Emotions between Group A and Group B

Variable	Group A		Group B		t	df	sig	p-value
	M	SD	M	SD				
Managing other emotion	15.450	2.0220	14.540	2.4097	2.893	198	.004	0.05

note : M = Mean,SD= Standard Deviation,t= t value, df= Degree of freedom, p=significance level ,p<0.05

Table 6 shows a T test comparing the mean scores of dimension of Managing Other Emotion. The means of Group A (psychology students) and Group B (non psychology students) for the dimension Managing other emotions were found to be 15.450 and 14.540 respectively and the SDs were 2.0220 and .2850 respectively. The T test result indicated there are significant differences between the group there is difference between Managing our Emotion scores of Psychology and Non Psychology students.

Table 7 : Difference in Utilizing emotions between Group A and Group B

Variable	Group A		Group B		t	df	sig	p-value
	M	SD	M	SD				
Utilizing emotion	45.070	.4316	43.810	2.1457	1.481	198	.140	0.05

note : M = Mean,SD= Standard Deviation,t= t value, df= Degree of freedom, p=significance level ,p<0.05

Table 7 shows a T test comparing the mean scores of dimension of Utilizing Emotion. The means of Group A (psychology students) and Group B (non psychology students) for the dimension of understanding other emotions were found to be 45.070 and 43.810 respectively and the SDs were .4316 and 2.1457 respectively. The T test result indicated there are no significant difference between the groups.

Discussion

Psychology as subject can make a substantial contribution to life satisfaction, Resilience and Emotional Intelligence and was intrigued to understand how individuals who have studied psychology were different from individuals who have not studied psychology. Since psychology as subject teach us a lot about cognition, behavior and emotion we can learn some life skills and incorporate in our daily life

For example :

- Resilience : Psychology helps us to understand adversity, stressors, challenges and setbacks and how it can affect our mental wellbeing, then we can apply the right coping strategies that we study in psychology to navigate difficult situations, bounce back and adapt to change more effectively.
- Life Satisfaction : Psychology helps us to understand the importance of social support, developing such strong connections with friends and family can help increase life satisfaction .
- Emotional Intelligence : Psychology helps us to understand our triggers, understand our emotions, can help us be more self aware how we feel and we can learn ways to regulate them.

The aim was to compare how psychology as a subject and education in psychology will create differences in mean scores of both groups. The result showed there is no significant difference between psychology and non psychology students for variables Emotional Intelligence, life satisfaction and resilience and the only significant difference that came was in dimension managing other emotions. This made the research more intriguing to understand the factors that lead to this result. While psychology as a subject brings self awareness into various domains, too much awareness can also lead to a sense of hopelessness and helplessness as theory of information overload highlights because while reading too much about pathology, stressors and challenges students can actually get overwhelmed. They can internalize these signs and symptoms and might start analyzing everything in detail that can affect life satisfaction. Also since Psychology as a subject teaches psychology students “self help”, while self help can be helpful, overreliance on these resources without professional help cannot address the underlying. With review of Literature, it was also observed that psychology trainees do not receive adequate support due to the stigma Talking about India, Psychology is a relatively new subject and the professionals and teachers doesn't have the right resources and training to teach in schools and universities. Also the major research and theories are influenced by western culture and can lead to inadequate culture sensitivity. It may alienate certain groups, religions and contribute feelings of exclusion. Lack of cultural sensitivity can hinder ability to relate psychological concept and apply them in our own lives and it can also be misinterpreted and misguide

Conclusion

On comparing mean scores of Psychology and Non psychology students for variables emotional intelligence, life satisfaction and Resilience using T test on Spss software, the results indicated that there is no significant difference between mean scores of Both the groups. There are possible reasons for this, Firstly University Grants Commission states that Psychology curriculum is not grounded in Indian Context, and this needs to be changed in order to benefit both Psychology and Non Psychology Students. As reviewed from

previous researches, Psychology students mental health is not taken seriously leading to internalizing a number of disorders and Compassion Fatigue. Lastly, NEP has introduced a number of workshops and mental health initiatives in colleges that can assist non psychology students to help them build emotional intelligence, resilience and Life Satisfaction.

References

- 1.) Diener, E. D., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of personality assessment*, 49(1), 71-75.
- 2.) Hafiz, S., & Chouhan, M. (2015). Impact of emotional intelligence on life satisfaction of university employees. *Indian Journal of Positive Psychology*, 6(3).
- 3.) Herrman, H., Stewart, D. E., Diaz-Granados, N., Berger, E. L., Jackson, B., & Yuen, T. (2011). What is resilience?. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 56(5), 258-265.
- 4.) Kanesan, P., & Fauzan, N. (2019). Models of emotional intelligence: A review. *e-BANGI Journal*, 16(7).
- 5.) Kökçam, B., Arslan, C., & Traş, Z. (2022). Do psychological resilience and emotional intelligence vary among stress profiles in university students? A latent profile analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 788506
- 6.) McBride, N. (2020). *Resilience Questionnaire Nicholson McBride Resilience Question-Naire (NMRQ)*. UK: NHS England & Wales
- 7.) Neubauer, A. C., & Freudenthaler, H. H. (2005). Models of emotional intelligence. *Emotional intelligence: An international handbook*, 2005, 31-50.
- 8.) Pavot, W., & Diener, E. (2008). The satisfaction with life scale and the emerging construct of life satisfaction. *The journal of positive psychology*, 3(2), 137-152.
- Peltier, B. (2011). Emotional intelligence. *The Psychology of Executive Coaching*.(pp, 245-2)
- 9.) Proctor, C., Linley, P. A., Maltby, J., & Port, G. (2017). Life satisfaction. *Encyclopedia of adolescence*, 2(1), s2165-s2176.
- 10.) Rummell, C. M. (2015). An exploratory study of psychology graduate student workload, health, and program satisfaction. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 46(6), 391.
- 11.) Salovey, P., & Pizarro, D. A. (2003). *The value of emotional intelligence* (pp. 263-278). na.
- 12.) Salovey, P., Woolery, A., & Mayer, J. D. (2001). Emotional intelligence: Conceptualization and measurement. *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Interpersonal processes*, 279-307
- 13.) Sasiprapha, A. (2022). The impact of attachment styles on life satisfaction and emotional resilience of adolescent students mediated by self-compassion.
- 14.) Seligson, J. L., Huebner, E. S., & Valois, R. F. (2003). Preliminary validation of the brief multidimensional students' life satisfaction scale (BMSLSS). *Social indicators research*, 61, 121-145.
- 15.) Schutte, N. (1998). Schutte self-report emotional intelligence test (sseit). *Preuzeto*, 8, 2017
- 16.) Tapia, M. (2001). Measuring emotional intelligence. *Psychological Reports*, 88(2), 353-364.
- Trait, E. I. (2004). Emotional intelligence. *Psychologist*, 17(10), 574.
- Wu, G., Feder, A., Cohen, H., Kim, J. J., Calderon, S., Charney, D. S., & Mathé, A. A. (2013). Understanding resilience. *Frontiers in behavioral neuroscience*, 7, 10.