

Impact of Age on Emotional Intelligence and Its Components

Deeksha Sharma

Senior Research Fellow Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) Roorkee, Roorkee, Uttarakhand, India

Abstract: The present study involves the analysis of Emotional Intelligence (EI) for different age-groups ranging from 17-60 years. The age taken as continuous statistic for every respondent and clustered as: Young-Adulthood (17-23 years), Middle-age (24-34 years) and Mature-age (35-60) for analysis. EI and its components: Emotional-Competency, Emotional-Sensitivity and Emotional-Maturity were measured for 186 respondents. The results indicated significant impact of age on the EI and its components. Total EI increased with age. Emotional-Competency decreased from young adulthood to middle age and then increased for mature age. Maturity was maximum for mature age, whereas competency and sensitivity were maximum for middle age.

Keywords: Emotional Intelligence (EI), Emotional Competency, Emotional Sensitivity, Emotional Maturity, Age

I. INTRODUCTION

“It is very important to understand that emotional intelligence is not the opposite of intelligence, it is not the triumph of heart over head — it is the unique intersection of both.” — David Caruso

Emotions have a significant role in defining the activities and behaviour of an individual on personal and professional front. And Emotional intelligence (EI) defines the ability of the individual to sense, access, control and manage emotions of oneself and others. EI is the construct that “involves the ability to perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotion; the ability to access and/or generate feelings when they facilitate thought; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; and the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth” (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). EI was defined as an aptitude by Mayer and Salovey (1997) and as mix of skills and traits (Bar-On, 1996; Goleman, 1995; Schutte et al., 1998; Petrides, 2004).

The Emotional Intelligence is the key factor ability which can be developed (Emmerling & Goleman, 2003) and learned (Shapiro 1997; Goleman, 1998) at all ages as per most of the EI theories. EI is neither developed at early childhood age nor is hereditary. With age, one becomes more socially and emotionally intelligent (Bar-On, 2006). EI has tremendous impact and potential value not only for managers and HR professionals but also for educationalists, teachers and counsellors (Higgs and Dulewicz, 1999). This has led to questions on its role and ability to develop within learning managerial aspect (Fineman, 1997; Ho'pfl and Linstead, 1997).

The core capabilities which are developed at childhood stage are malleable, changeable and capable of being developed (Ho'pfl and Linstead, 1997). Further, the life and workplace experience has an impact in shaping it. EI has an impact on work performance (Carmeli 2003; O'Boyle et al. 2011) and on psychological and physical health (Ciarrochi et al. 2002; Tsaousis and Nikolau 2005). That's main reason to find the relevance and measure of EI at different stages of EI.

An individual moves through different stages of life in age spans. And each stage exhibits a characteristic which comes in through learning and experience. EI in particular when taken as ability (Mayer & Salovey) also exhibit different patterns with age. It becomes imperative to understand the EI levels and its nature in different age groups. The present study aims to find the EI of different age groups involved and to find the differences among age groups for EI components. The age groups taken for the study are three- Young Adulthood (17-23 years), Middle age (24-34 years), Mature age (35-60).

1.1 Emotional Intelligence

Emotions are the reactions to stimuli (1579) and Intelligence comprises the mental abilities necessary for adaptation to, as well as shaping and selection of, any environmental context (Sternberg, 1997). EI is considered as intelligence as it has the ability to solve problems and monitor emotions in themselves and others. The term EI came into account in 1985 in their doctoral thesis, “A study of Emotion: Developing Emotional Intelligence.” by Wayne Payne. The term EI was used in publication by Keith Beasley in article in British Mensa Magazine in 1987. Also this term was used in work of Beldoch (1964), Leuner (1966). Mainly, there are three basic models of EI- Ability Model (John Mayer and Peter Salovey), Mixed Model (Daniel Goleman) and Trait Model (K V Petrides). Mayer, Salovey and colleagues have defined EI as ability which emphasis on individual differences in cognition of impactful information and considered as an ability which can be learned and is not innate characteristic. Mixed models (Bar-On, 1997; Goleman, 1995) have included emotional abilities together with personality, motivation and affective dispositions, i.e., emphasising on array of competencies and skills. Ability EI has typically been assessed by maximal-performance measures, like IQ measures, and such measures have generally been more correlated to intelligence constructs than to personality (Brackett & Mayer, 2003; Lopes, Salovey, & Straus, 2003; O'Connor & Little,

2003). Mixed EI models have been assessed by self-report measures, which tend to correlate with personality dimensions (Dawda & Hart, 2000; Saklofske, Austin, & Miniski, 2003; Van Der Zee, Thijs, & Schakel, 2002). The measure of ability EI is MSCEIT and for mixed model it is ECI-Emotional Competency Inventory and ESCI-Emotional Social Competency Inventory. The third model is trait model by K V Petrides. It is based on self-perception of emotional abilities.

The components of EI considered in the present study are - Emotional Competency, Emotional Sensitivity and Emotional Maturity (Dr Dalip Singh & Dr. N.K. Chadha, 2003). Emotional Competency consists of Tackling emotional upsets, High self-esteem, Tactful response to emotional stimuli, Handling egoism. Emotional Sensitivity contains Understanding threshold of emotional arousal, Empathy, Improving inter-personal relations and Communicability of emotions. Emotional Maturity consist of Self-awareness, Developing others, Delaying gratification and Adaptability and flexibility.

1.2 Emotional Intelligence and Age

There is a positive relation between EI and age. EI develops or increases with age and experience (Goleman, 1998; Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Maddocks & Sparrows, 1998). In certain studies it has been found that EI increases with age at least up to (40-50 years of age) fourth or fifth decade in life (Bar-on, 2000; Kafetsios, 2004; Stein, 2009; Bradberry & Greaves, 2005; Singh 2006). There are certain aspects of EI that can only be developed with training (Fariselli, Ghini, & Freedman, 2006). Research was conducted for EI Bar-on model (Bar-on, 1988) with the use of EQ-i (Emotional Quotient Inventory) tool on sample size of 3891 in the age ranging 20 to 50 years. The study showed that older people scored higher than the younger ones. Also respondent in their late 40s obtained highest mean scores (Bar-On, 1997b; Bar-On, 2004). Another study indicates that youth with age 7 to 18 years shows higher score for EI in the oldest groups of the sample size (Bar-On & Parker, 2000b).

Another research data collected from 2001 to 2010 for the responses collected on individual Effectiveness (i.e.) questionnaire of EI by JCA (Maddocks & Sparrow, 1998) on sample size of 12,417 with the age between 16 to 50 plus years. It showed that the overall score increases consistently with age. But one of the study conducted on sample of 405, ageing between 22 and 70 years using the tool SEI 2- Six seconds' Emotional Intelligence Assessment showed that some part of EI increases with age ($r=0.13$, $p<0.01$). This change in EI with age is slight but significant but there are certain elements of EI that do not increase with age indicating that certain competencies need to be developed by training (Fariselli, Ghini & Freedman, 2006).

As per the research studies discussed above, the present study aims to find the pattern of change in EI and its components with age (range of 17 to 60 years of age). As till now none of the studies gives a solid evidence for the pattern of EI with

age, this study tries to find the pattern by grouping age in three different stages (Young Adulthood (17-23 years), Middle age (24-34 years), Mature age (35-60)). This helps in giving a defined pattern for each age group. These age groups are inspired and directed by Erik Erikson (1950, 1963) psychosocial stages.

The Young Adulthood group is youngest group of all which has the basic learning stage. This stage is also considered inexperienced and naïve. The Middle age group is considered to be the mid-life experience where the maximum events are to be handled on professional and personal front. The Mature age is also experienced by complexities but the maturity and experience makes this stage more responsible and it is able to convert their knowledge into wisdom. These definitions of the age groups are generic and may differ person to person with certain exceptions.

II. METHODS

2.1 Participants, procedure and statistical approach

The study was conducted with a sample of 186 respondents in the age group of 17-60 years. The respondents were of Indian origin living in North India. All the participants were well educated with their educational background ranging from high school education to higher level education (post-graduation). Young-adulthood age group consisted of engineering students and higher age groups consisted of engineers working in firms. This sampling helped in neutralizing the effect of regional and professional bias. The continuous age was clustered as Young-Adulthood (17-23 years), Middle-age (24-34 years) and Mature-age (35-60). The age groups had continuous respective EI score for each age value. Therefore the data collected for age is interval data. The study is based on exploratory research where a self-report questionnaire by Singh & Chadha (2006) was filled on the basis of the EI and its components. Total sample size of 186 was taken for the study in which regression analysis and ANOVA test was used to analyse the pattern of EI and its components. The analysis was done using Eviews and Excel. The main objective of the study is to analyse EI and its components among all the age groups. And then to find the impact of three components of EI on the total EI among all the age groups and compare three components of EI among all the age groups. The hypothesis formulated as per the previous studies and present objectives of the study hypothesized for no significant change in the EI score with age, no significant change in the Sensitivity, Competency and Maturity with age, no significant impact on EI due to its components in respective age groups and no significant correlation between three components of EI.

2.2 Measures

Emotional Intelligence

The tool contains 22 situational questions with test-retest and split-half reliability of 0.94 and 0.89 respectively and validity of 0.89 with sample size of 150. The empirical validity was confirmed by correlating with Daniel Goleman test with 60

subjects and it came out to be 0.92. Also for validity index the scale was co-related with EI scale developed by Chadha (2001) for 60 subjects and it came out to be 0.78. To avoid socially desirable responses situation selection method was used in the scale. The situations are used which were relatively neutral to avoid response bias. In order to achieve this, the situations were analysed by five experts/judges on psychological, emotional and behavioural aspects with nine point rating scale ranging from 'extremely desirable' to 'neutral' to 'extremely undesirable'. The instructions given to experts were based on Edward socially desirable dimensions.

III. RESULTS

3.1 Measurement analysis of EI and its components

Table1: Measurement analysis of EI and its components: Mean(standard deviation)

	<u>Mean EI</u>	<u>Mean Sensitivity</u>	<u>Mean Maturity</u>	<u>Mean Competency</u>
G1	347.96(29.09)	86.76(11.65)	105.56(12.00)	155.63(17.54)
G2	342.74(40.10)	85.08(14.39)	105(14.17)	152.66(20.38)
G3	355.77(42.59)	85.87(13.16)	113.37(15.86)	156.54(22.87)
Author's calculations				

It can be seen that EI is highest for mature age (G3). Maturity and competency is also highest for G3. But Sensitivity is highest in Young adulthood (G1). The possible reason may be early age of life is more sensitive to outer world as experience and learning is in a naïve stage. A pattern can be analysed in almost all components and in EI itself, the measure decreases from G1 to G2 (except in emotional competency) but increase from G2 to G3. It has the possible reasoning, the EI structure if taken as ability, is active at young stage but with time in middle age it may degrade due to pragmatic behavioural pattern and may increase in mature age with more developed thinking process (Fariselli, Ghini, & Freedman, 2006). But with the standard deviation involved, the clear picture can be taken from median values.

Table2: Measurement analysis of EI and its components: Median(actual scores median)

	<u>Median EI</u>	<u>Median Sensitivity</u>	<u>Median Maturity</u>	<u>Median Competency</u>
G1	350.00	90.00	105.00	160.00
G2	355.00	90.00	107.50	155.00
G3	370.00	90.00	115.00	160.00
Author's calculations				

It can be seen that there is an increment in the total EI score with age (G1 < G2 <G3). Thereby meaning, the EI can be considered as an ability which can be learned with experience, wisdom and knowledge (Fariselli, Ghini, & Freedman, 2006). Also, increment can be seen in emotional maturity which can be explained with a positive correlation of age with maturity. The emotional sensitivity has almost remained constant not showing any impact of increasing age. Whereas, a different pattern can be seen in emotional competency that is low in middle age, but increased in mature age (exhibiting pattern from mean table above).

3.2 Impact of the Competency, Sensitivity and Maturity on EI in all the age groups independently. (*percentile scores)

3.2.1 Competency within age groups

Figure 1: Regression Analysis of EI & competency for young adulthood-G1(Eviews)

Dependent Variable: G1_EI_P_ Method: Least Squares

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	9.754464	15.62640	0.624230	0.5345
G1_C_P_	0.879464	0.176302	4.988383	0.0000
R-squared	0.265050	Mean dependent var	87.60563	
Adjusted R-squared	0.254399	S.D. dependent var	7.693186	
S.E. of regression	6.642928	Akaike info criterion	6.652747	
Sum squared resid	3044.866	Schwarz criterion	6.716485	
Log likelihood	-234.1725	Hannan-Quinn criter.	6.678094	
F-statistic	24.88396	Durbin-Watson stat	2.037976	
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000004			

Figure 2: Regression Analysis of EI & competency for middle age-G2(Eviews)

Dependent Variable: G2_EI_P_ Method: Least Squares

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	-74.16667	15.85087	-4.679029	0.0000
G2_C_P_	1.805556	0.179699	10.04768	0.0000
R-squared	0.627227	Mean dependent var	84.83871	
Adjusted R-squared	0.621014	S.D. dependent var	11.55769	
S.E. of regression	7.115125	Akaike info criterion	6.794049	
Sum squared resid	3037.500	Schwarz criterion	6.862666	
Log likelihood	-208.6155	Hannan-Quinn criter.	6.820990	
F-statistic	100.9558	Durbin-Watson stat	2.255716	
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

Figure 3: Regression Analysis of EI & competency for mature age-G3(Eviews)

Dependent Variable: G3_EI_P_
Method: Least Squares

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	5.152116	9.450028	0.545196	0.5880
G3_C_P_	0.931878	0.108317	8.603248	0.0000
R-squared	0.596826	Mean dependent var	86.15385	
Adjusted R-squared	0.588762	S.D. dependent var	9.108033	
S.E. of regression	5.840783	Akaike info criterion	6.405309	
Sum squared resid	1705.737	Schwarz criterion	6.480357	
Log likelihood	-164.5380	Hannan-Quinn criter.	6.434081	
F-statistic	74.01584	Durbin-Watson stat	1.828096	
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

Dependent Variable: G3_EI_P_
Method: Least Squares

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	63.45661	4.680143	13.55873	0.0000
G3_S_P_	0.306956	0.061702	4.974827	0.0000
R-squared	0.331094	Mean dependent var	86.15385	
Adjusted R-squared	0.317716	S.D. dependent var	9.108033	
S.E. of regression	7.523280	Akaike info criterion	6.911584	
Sum squared resid	2829.987	Schwarz criterion	6.986632	
Log likelihood	-177.7012	Hannan-Quinn criter.	6.940356	
F-statistic	24.74891	Durbin-Watson stat	2.030633	
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000008			

From the figures 1, 2 and 3, it can be analysed that EI for three age groups is dependent on emotional competency (p=0.00). But if see the adjusted r- square for three groups, (adjusted r², G1=0.25, G2=0.62, G3=0.59) and the F-statistics (F-stat, G1=24.88, G2= 100.96, G3= 74.02), it shows that the emotional competency effects emotional intelligence maximum during middle age and higher during mature age. Meaning thereby, competency has a greater impact on EI in middle and mature stage than in young adulthood. The reason may be as in young stage, the experience and learning is in naïve stage.

From the figures 4, 5 and 6, it can be analysed that EI for three age groups is dependent on emotional sensitivity (p<0.05). But if see the adjusted r- square for three groups, (adjusted r², G1=0.11, G2=0.37, G3=0.32) and the F-statistics (F-stat, G1=9.58, G2= 36.36, G3= 24.75), it shows that the emotional sensitivity effects emotional intelligence maximum during middle age and higher during mature age. Meaning thereby, sensitivity has a greater impact on EI in middle and mature stage than in young adulthood. The reason may be as in young stage, the experiences are less and decision making is weak. With time and learning, sensitivity increases (Fariselli, Ghini, & Freedman, 2006).

3.2.2 Sensitivity within age groups

Figure 4: Regression Analysis of EI & sensitivity for young adulthood-G1 (Eviews)

Dependent Variable: G1_EI_P_
Method: Least Squares

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	76.05886	3.829666	19.86044	0.0000
G1_S_P_	0.157204	0.050802	3.094447	0.0028
R-squared	0.121865	Mean dependent var	87.60563	
Adjusted R-squared	0.109138	S.D. dependent var	7.693186	
S.E. of regression	7.261250	Akaike info criterion	6.830746	
Sum squared resid	3638.077	Schwarz criterion	6.894483	
Log likelihood	-240.4915	Hannan-Quinn criter.	6.856092	
F-statistic	9.575601	Durbin-Watson stat	2.117807	
Prob(F-statistic)	0.002847			

3.2.3 Maturity within age groups

Figure 7: Regression Analysis of EI & maturity for young adulthood-G1(Eviews)

Dependent Variable: G1_EI_P_
Method: Least Squares

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	74.62791	3.882491	19.22165	0.0000
G1_M_P_	0.199874	0.058344	3.425765	0.0010
R-squared	0.145361	Mean dependent var	87.60563	
Adjusted R-squared	0.132975	S.D. dependent var	7.693186	
S.E. of regression	7.163446	Akaike info criterion	6.803624	
Sum squared resid	3540.732	Schwarz criterion	6.867361	
Log likelihood	-239.5287	Hannan-Quinn criter.	6.828970	
F-statistic	11.73587	Durbin-Watson stat	2.100712	
Prob(F-statistic)	0.001037			

Figure 5: Regression Analysis of EI & sensitivity for middle age-G2 (Eviews)

Dependent Variable: G2_EI_P_
Method: Least Squares

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	57.81218	4.630787	12.48431	0.0000
G2_S_P_	0.374028	0.062016	6.031190	0.0000
R-squared	0.377434	Mean dependent var	84.83871	
Adjusted R-squared	0.367057	S.D. dependent var	11.55769	
S.E. of regression	9.195028	Akaike info criterion	7.306929	
Sum squared resid	5072.913	Schwarz criterion	7.375546	
Log likelihood	-224.5148	Hannan-Quinn criter.	7.333870	
F-statistic	36.37525	Durbin-Watson stat	1.686290	
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

Figure 8: Regression Analysis of EI & maturity for middle age-G2 (Eviews)

Dependent Variable: G2_EI_P_
Method: Least Squares

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	59.39521	6.004746	9.891377	0.0000
G2_M_P_	0.380120	0.087611	4.338733	0.0001
R-squared	0.238816	Mean dependent var	84.83871	
Adjusted R-squared	0.226130	S.D. dependent var	11.55769	
S.E. of regression	10.16728	Akaike info criterion	7.507953	
Sum squared resid	6202.419	Schwarz criterion	7.576571	
Log likelihood	-230.7466	Hannan-Quinn criter.	7.534894	
F-statistic	18.82460	Durbin-Watson stat	1.588409	
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000056			

Figure 6: Regression Analysis of EI & sensitivity for mature age-G3(Eviews)

Figure 9: Regression Analysis of EI & maturity for mature age-G3 (Eviews)

Dependent Variable: G3_EL_P_
Method: Least Squares

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	56.29893	4.991672	11.27857	0.0000
G3_M_P_	0.408541	0.067015	6.096222	0.0000
R-squared	0.426368	Mean dependent var	86.15385	
Adjusted R-squared	0.414896	S.D. dependent var	9.108033	
S.E. of regression	6.966927	Akaike info criterion	6.757928	
Sum squared resid	2426.904	Schwarz criterion	6.832976	
Log likelihood	-173.7061	Hannan-Quinn criter.	6.786700	
F-statistic	37.16392	Durbin-Watson stat	2.170312	
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

From the figures 7, 8 and 9, it can be analysed that EI for three age groups is dependent on emotional maturity ($p < 0.05$). But if see the adjusted r- square for three groups, (adjusted r^2 , $G1=0.13$, $G2=0.23$, $G3=0.41$) and the F-statistics (F-stat, $G1=11.74$, $G2= 18.82$, $G3= 37.16$), it shows that the emotional maturity effects emotional intelligence maximum during mature age and higher during middle age. Meaning thereby, maturity has a greater impact on EI in mature and middle stage than in young adulthood. The reason may be as in young stage, the maturity to access emotions is less.

It can be seen that unlike the similar patterns of competency and sensitivity, maturity exhibit a different pattern. The impact of maturity on EI is seen maximum in mature age, whereas the impact of competency and sensitivity is seen maximum in the middle age on EI. It states that competency and sensitivity have better hand on defining EI in middle age, with the possible reasoning of middle age being the most interactive, good experience and learned stage of life (Goleman, 1998; Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Maddocks & Sparrows, 1998).

3.3 Analysis of three age groups for EI and its components

Figure 10: Regression Analysis of EI & its components for young adulthood-G1 (Eviews)

Dependent Variable: G1_EL_P_
Method: Least Squares

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	-3.113662	14.26463	-0.218278	0.8279
G1_C_P_	0.824531	0.159600	5.166226	0.0000
G1_M_P_	0.113139	0.050310	2.248862	0.0278
G1_S_P_	0.141384	0.042423	3.332690	0.0014
R-squared	0.440378	Mean dependent var	87.60563	
Adjusted R-squared	0.415320	S.D. dependent var	7.693186	
S.E. of regression	5.882546	Akaike info criterion	6.436545	
Sum squared resid	2318.491	Schwarz criterion	6.564020	
Log likelihood	-224.4974	Hannan-Quinn criter.	6.487238	
F-statistic	17.57454	Durbin-Watson stat	1.950955	
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

Figure 11: Regression Analysis of EI & its components for middle age-G2 (Eviews)

Dependent Variable: G2_EL_P_
Method: Least Squares

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	-62.25114	13.25137	-4.697714	0.0000
G2_C_P_	1.418611	0.162749	8.716558	0.0000
G2_M_P_	0.143630	0.056019	2.563944	0.0130
G2_S_P_	0.173637	0.045790	3.792004	0.0004
R-squared	0.758263	Mean dependent var	84.83871	
Adjusted R-squared	0.745759	S.D. dependent var	11.55769	
S.E. of regression	5.827655	Akaike info criterion	6.425447	
Sum squared resid	1969.770	Schwarz criterion	6.562682	
Log likelihood	-195.1889	Hannan-Quinn criter.	6.479329	
F-statistic	60.64324	Durbin-Watson stat	2.169837	
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

Figure 12: Regression Analysis of EI & its components for mature age-G3 (Eviews)

Dependent Variable: G3_EL_P_
Method: Least Squares

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	3.555816	7.384279	0.481539	0.6323
G3_C_P_	0.691767	0.094622	7.310817	0.0000
G3_M_P_	0.222673	0.052086	4.275098	0.0001
G3_S_P_	0.083784	0.045118	1.856996	0.0695
R-squared	0.765808	Mean dependent var	86.15385	
Adjusted R-squared	0.751171	S.D. dependent var	9.108033	
S.E. of regression	4.543335	Akaike info criterion	5.939003	
Sum squared resid	990.8109	Schwarz criterion	6.089099	
Log likelihood	-150.4141	Hannan-Quinn criter.	5.996546	
F-statistic	52.32011	Durbin-Watson stat	1.889558	
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

From the figures 10, 11 and 12, it can be analysed from the three EI structures (different age groups: G1, G2, G3) that in young adulthood G1 and middle age G2, the three components of EI- Sensitivity, Competency and Maturity has a significant impact on the respective EI ($P < 0.05$) but in mature age G3, the impact of sensitivity is not significant ($p=0.0695$, $p > 0.05$). The adjusted r-squares of three structures (adjusted R^2 , $G1: 0.42$, $G2: 0.75$, $G3: 0.75$) shows that middle age G2 and mature age G3 structure models are better fit than young childhood G1. The F-Statistics (probability) for three structures is $p=0.0000$ ($p < 0.05$), thereby all having overall significance. But, F-statistics ($G1: 17.57$, $G2: 60.64$, $G3: 52.32$), showing again that G2 and G3 are better fit than G1. This shows that the responses for the young childhood G1 have more variations. This may be due to the fact the young people may not have the right idea about their own emotions as they must not be clear about their SWOT (strength, weakness, opportunity and threat) analysis.

3.4 Correlation between components of EI in each age group

Table3: Analysis of Young Adulthood for EI components

	G1 SENSITIVITY	G1 COMPETENCY	G1 MATURITY
G1 SENSITIVITY	1.0000	0.1517	0.1818

G1 COMPETENCY	0.1517	1.0000	0.3461
G1 MATURITY	0.1818	0.3461	1.0000
Author's calculations			

Table4: Analysis of Middle Age for EI components

	G2 SENSITIVITY	G2 COMPETENCY	G2 MATURITY
G2 SENSITIVITY	1.0000	0.5724	0.5247
G2 COMPETENCY	0.5724	1.0000	0.4073
G2 MATURITY	0.5247	0.4073	1.0000
Author's calculations			

Table5: Analysis of Mature Age for EI components

	G3 SENSITIVITY	G3 COMPETENCY	G3 MATURITY
G3 SENSITIVITY	1.0000	0.4465	0.5210
G3 COMPETENCY	0.4465	1.0000	0.5232
G3 MATURITY	0.5210	0.5232	1.0000
Author's calculations			

From the above correlation table, it can be observed that Young adulthood G1 does not show any significant correlation among the components of EI. The main reasoning for not having any relevant correlation is that this stage of age is naïve and is unable to exhibit a generic pattern of emotional processing and is deviated from external sources as this age is vulnerable and personality building stage. Also it can be observed that middle age G2 has maximum and relevant correlation of 0.57 between sensitivity and competency, meaning thereby that higher the sensitivity toward emotional stimuli, higher is the competency for emotional processing. In G2, correlation between sensitivity and maturity is 0.52 Also in G2, correlation between maturity and sensitivity is 0.52, which is less than 0.8 but comparatively higher including all models. Similar trend can be seen in mature age G3 in sensitivity-maturity, competency-maturity correlations.

IV. CONCLUSION

The total EI increases with age (Bar-on, 2000; Kafetsios, 2004; Stein, 2009; Bradberry & Greaves, 2005; Singh 2006). Also the median Maturity increases with age. But the pattern of competency is different, i.e., decreasing from young adulthood to middle age and then increasing from middle age to mature age, supporting that certain competencies have to be developed by training and are not governed by age factor

(Fariselli, Ghini & Freedman, 2006). Also it was observed that emotional sensitivity is not impacted by age.

The emotional competency significantly impacts EI in middle and mature age than in young adulthood stage (Fariselli, Ghini & Freedman, 2006). Also, emotional sensitivity and maturity significantly impacts EI in middle and mature age than in young adulthood stage. Maturity exhibits a different pattern than the competency and sensitivity, as maximum for mature age, whereas competency and sensitivity are found maximum for middle age.

Young adulthood and middle age has significant impact of all the three components on EI. Whereas, emotional sensitivity does not significantly impact EI in mature age (In direction to the above finding of emotional sensitivity is not impacted by age). The overall significance in middle and mature age is more than in young adulthood group, thereby depicting that with age, these components of EI are more relevant and significant due to constant learning, training and experience (Fariselli, Ghini, & Freedman, 2006).

The young adulthood group has no significant correlation between components of EI. The middle age has maximum and relevant correlation between sensitivity and competency, meaning thereby that higher the sensitivity toward emotional stimuli, higher is the competency for emotional processing. In mature maximum correlation is between maturity and sensitivity, meaning thereby higher the maturity for emotions, higher is the sensitivity towards emotions. So, for young adulthood no certain pattern was found but for middle and mature age, it can be detected (Goleman, 1998; Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Maddocks & Sparrows, 1998).

REFERENCES

- [1]. Baker, T., & Bichsel, J. (2006). Personality Predictors of Intelligence: Differences between young and cognitively healthy older adults. Department of Psychology, York University, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, and department of Psychology, Harrisburg Campus, The Pennsylvania State University, US.
- [2]. Bar-On, R. (1988). The development of a concept of psychological wellbeing. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, South Africa, Rhodes University.
- [3]. Bar-On, R. (1997). Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory: User's manual. New York: Multi-Health Systems.
- [4]. Bar-On, R. (2004). The Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i): Rationale, description, and summary of psychometric properties. In Glenn Geher (Ed.), Measuring emotional intelligence: Common ground and controversy. Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers, pp. 111-142.
- [5]. Bar-On, R. (2006). The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence (ESI). *Psicothema*, 18, suppl., 13-25.
- [6]. Bar-On, R., & Parker, J.D.A. (2000b). Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory: Youth Version. Technical Manual. North Tonawanda, NY: Multi-Health Systems.
- [7]. Boyatzis, R., Goleman, D., & Hay/McBer. (1999). Emotional Competence Inventory.
- [8]. Boyatzis, R. E., & Sala, F. (2004). Assessing emotional intelligence competencies. In G. Geher (Ed.), Measuring emotional intelligence. Common ground and controversy (pp. 147-180). Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science.
- [9]. Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., & Salovey, P. (2011). Emotional intelligence: implications for personal, social, academic, and

- workplace success. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 5, 88-103.
- [10]. Brody, L. R., & Hall, J. A. (2000). Gender, emotion, and expression. In M. Lewis, & J. M. Haviland (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (pp. 338-349). New York: Guilford.
- [11]. Carulli & Com (2003). A study of emotional intelligence and organizational leadership in Asia Pacific. Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of Hull.
- [12]. Chapman, B. P., & Hayslip, B. Jr., (2006). Emotional intelligence in young and middle adulthood: Cross-sectional analysis of latent structure and means. *Psychology and Aging*, 21, 411-418.
- [13]. Charles, S., Mather, M., & Carstensen, L. L. (2003). Aging and emotional memory: The forgettable nature of negative images for older adults. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 132, 310-324.
- [14]. Craig, A., Tran, Y., Hermens, G., Williams, L. M., Kemp, A., Morris, C., et al. (2009). Psychological and neural correlates of emotional intelligence in a large sample of adult males and females. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 46, 111-115.
- [15]. Davis, S. K., & Humphrey, N. (2012). Emotional intelligence predicts adolescent mental health beyond personality and cognitive ability. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52, 144-149.
- [16]. Day, A. L., & Carroll, S. A. (2004). Using an ability-based measure of emotional intelligence to predict individual performance, group performance, and group citizenship behaviours. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36, 1443-1458.
- [17]. Downey, L. A., Mountstephen, J., Lloyd, J., Hansen, K., & Stough, C. (2008). Emotional intelligence and scholastic achievement in Australian adolescents. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 60(1), 10-17.
- [18]. Emmerling, R.J., & Goleman, D. (2003). Emotional intelligence: issues and common misunderstandings. *Issues in Emotional Intelligence - 1*(1). Retrieved from www.eiconsortium.org
- [19]. Fariselli, L., Ghini, M., & Freedman J. (2006). White Paper: Age and Emotional Intelligence, Sixseconds.
- [20]. Fleenor, J. W., Smither, J. W., Atwater, L. E., Braddy, P. W., & Sturm, R. E. (2010). Self-other rating agreement in leadership: A review. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21 (6), 1005-1034.
- [21]. Fleenor, J., McCauley, C., & Brutus, S. (1996). Self-other rating agreement and leader effectiveness. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 487-506.
- [22]. Forteza, J. A., & Prieto, J. M. (1994). Aging and work behavior. In H. C. Triandis, M. D. Dunnette, & L. M. Hough (Eds.), Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- [23]. Goleman, D (2001). Emotional intelligence: Issues in paradigm building. In C. Cherniss & D.
- [24]. Goleman (Eds.), *The emotionally intelligent workplace*, (pp. 13-26), Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.
- [25]. Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- [26]. Goleman, D. (1998a). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- [27]. Goleman, D. (1998b). 'What makes a leader?', *Harvard Business Review*, Nov-Dec: 93-102.
- [28]. Goleman, D. (2001). 'An EI-based theory of performance', In: Cherniss, C & Goleman, D. (eds). *The emotionally intelligent work place*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [29]. Gross, J. J., Carstensen, L. L., Pasupathi, M., Tsai, J., Skorpén, C. G., & Hsu, A. Y. C. (1997). Emotion and aging: Experience, expression and control. *Psychology and Aging*, 12, 590-599.
- [30]. Harris, M., & Schaubroeck, J. (1988). A meta-analysis of self-supervisor, self-peer, and peer supervisor ratings. *Personnel Psychology*, 41, 43-61.
- [31]. Hay Group, McClelland Center for Research and Innovation, & Wolff, S. B. (2005). *The emotional competence inventory (ECI) technical manual*.
- [32]. Hofstee, W.K.B. (1994). Who should own the definition of personality? *European Journal of Personality*, 8, 142-162.
- [33]. Hough, L., Keyes, M., & Dunnette, M. (1983). An evaluation of three "alternative" selection procedures. *Personnel Psychology*, 36, 261 - 275.
- [34]. John, O.P., & Robins, R.W. (1993). Determinants of inter-judge agreement on personality traits: the big five domains, observability, evaluativeness, and the unique perspective of the self. *Journal of Personality*, 61(4), 985-1007.
- [35]. Joseph, D. L., & Newman, D. A. (2010). Emotional intelligence: An integrative meta-analysis and cascading model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95, 54-78.
- [36]. Kafetsios, K. (2004). Attachment and emotional intelligence abilities across the life course. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37,129-145.
- [37]. Kooij, D., De Lange, A. H., Jansen, P. G. W., Kanfer, R., & Dikkers, J. (2011). Age and work-related motives: Results of a meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32, 197-225.
- [38]. Levine, L. J., & Bluck, S. (1997). Experienced and remembered emotional intensity in older adults. *Psychology and Aging*, 12, 514-523.
- [39]. Mabe, P., & West, S. (1982). Validity of self-evaluation of ability: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, 280-286.
- [40]. Maddocks, J. (2011). A decade of emotional intelligence: Trends and implications from the Individual Effectiveness (ie) questionnaire. JCA (Occupational Psychologist) Ltd., Cheltenham, UK.
- [41]. Maddocks, J., & Sparrow, T. (1998). *The individual effectiveness Manual*. JCA (Occupational Psychologist) Ltd., Cheltenham, UK.
- [42]. Mayer, J.D., & Salovey, P. (1993). 'The intelligence of emotional intelligence', *intelligence*, 12, 433-422.
- [43]. Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D., R. (2002) *Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test(MSCEIT) user's manual*. Toronto, ON: MHS.
- [44]. McCoy, C. L., & Masters, J. C. (1985). The development of children's strategies for the social control of emotion. *Child Development*, 1214-1222.
- [45]. McIntyre, M. H. (2010). Gender differences in the nature and linkage of higher-order personality factors to trait and ability emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48, 617-622.
- [46]. Mirowsky, J., & Ross, C. E. (1992). Age and depression. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 33, 187-205.
- [47]. Nowack, K. (1997). Congruence between self-other ratings and assessment center performance. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality & 12*(5), 145-166.
- [48]. O'Boyle, E. H., Humphrey, R. H., Pollack, J. M., Hawver, T. H., & Story, P. A. (2010). The relation between emotional intelligence and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. DOI: 10.1002/job.714.
- [49]. Podsakoff, P.M., & Organ, D.W. (1986). Self-reports in Organizational Research: Problems and Prospects. *Journal of Management*, 12(4), 531-544.
- [50]. Petrides, K. V., Pita, R., & Kokkinaki, F. (2007). The location of trait emotional intelligence in personality factor space. *British Journal of Psychology*, 98, 273-289.
- [51]. Rhodes, S. R. (1983). Age-related differences in work attitudes and behavior: A review and conceptual analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 93, 328-367.
- [52]. Ruffman, T., Henry, J. D., Livingstone, V., & Phillips, L. H. (2008). A meta-analytic review of differences in emotion recognition between younger and older adults. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 32, 863-881.
- [53]. Salovey, P., & Mayer, J.D. (1990). 'Emotional intelligence', *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9: 185-211.
- [54]. Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Simunek, M., Hollander, S., & McKenley, J. (2002). Characteristic emotional intelligence and emotional well-being. *Cognition and Emotion*, 16, 769-786
- [55]. Shapiro, L.E. (1997). *How to raise a child with a higher EQ*. New York: Harper Collins.
- [56]. Singh, D. (2006). *Emotional Intelligence at Work: A Professional Guide* (third Ed.). New Delhi:

- [58]. Response Books.
- [59]. Stein, J.S. (2009). *Emotional Intelligence for Dummies*. ON: John Wiley & Sons Canada, Ltd.
- [60]. Vakola, M., Tsaousis, I., & Nikolaou, I. (2004). The Effects of emotional intelligence and personality variables on attitudes toward organizational change. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19, 88–110.
- [61]. Watson, T. L., & Blanchard-Fields, F. (1998). Thinking with your head and your heart: Age differences in everyday problem-solving strategy preferences. *Neuropsychology and Cognition*, 5, 225–240.
- [62]. Wechsler, D. (1958). *The measurement and appraisal of adult intelligence* (fourth ed.). Baltimore (MD): Williams & Wilkins. Chapter 3.
- [63]. Yammarino, F., & Atwater, L. (1993). Understanding self-perception accuracy: Implications for human resource management. *Human Resource Management*, 32, 231-247.
- [64]. Yammarino, F., & Atwater, L. (1997). Do managers see themselves as others see them? Implications of self-other rating agreement for human resources management. *Organizational Dynamics*, 25 (4), 35-44.

IJRIS