



## Emotional Intelligence among Police Personnel: Socio-Demographic Analysis

Lokesh, L\*, Swathi Patra\*\* & Venkatesan, S\*\*\*

\* Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, DOS in Psychology, University of Mysore, : 570 006.

\*\* Associate Professor in Psychology, School of Social Sciences, IGNOU, New Delhi: 110068.

\*\*\* Professor in Clinical Psychology, All India Institute of Speech and Hearing, Mysore: 570 006.

### Abstract

Received: 20 May 2016  
Revised: 26 May 2016  
Accepted: 13 Jun 2016

#### Keywords:

Emotional Intelligence, Police Personnel

This purposive one shot cross sectional sample survey uses a standardized Emotional Intelligence Scale to elicit responses from 687 police persons spread across 17 police stations in and around Mysore, Karnataka, based on various organismic and socio-demographic variables. Results in terms of the profile of overall Emotional Intelligence Scores and in relation to various socio-demographic variables, domain analysis, and, item analysis are presented and discussed with implications for their training in identified deficit areas or domains in order to optimize their resources for the benefit of police workforce as well as society at large.

© 2016 Guru Journal of Behavioral and Social Sciences

Cognitive aspects have always remained a defining ingredient of most definitions of intelligence. The importance of feelings, emotions, sentiments, and/or other conative features to be made an integral part of human intelligence was proposed for first time in the concept of emotional intelligence (EI; Goleman, 1995). It was defined as capacity of individuals to recognize their own and other people's emotions, to discriminate between different feelings and label them appropriately, and use emotional information to guide thinking and behavior (Coleman, 2008). The description of its nature, content, components and/or dimensions vary among its proponents. There are 'trait' models (Petrides & Furnham, 2001), 'ability' model (Salovey & Mayer, 2004) and 'mixed' models to explain the construct. Its components, such as, self-awareness and self-honesty, knowledge about cause of emotions, motivation and good decision-making, ability to analyze or understand relationships, intuitiveness, creative and flexible thinking, integrated self and balanced life are deemed as key to healthy successful living (Singh, 2003).

The measurement of EI depends on the model espoused. An emotion-based problem solving ability approach is advocated in 'Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test' (MSCEIT; Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2002). The 'Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire' (TEIQue; Petrides, 2009) illustrate traits-model approach. The Emotional Competency Inventory (ECI; Hay Group, 2005), its newer edition called as 'Emotional and Social Competency Inventory' (ESCI; Hay Group, 2011) or its group version called 'Group Emotional Competence Inventory' (GECI; Koman, Wolff & Howard, 2008) highlight the 'mixed' approach to measurement of EI. Some measures of EI from the West are: The Genos Emotional Intelligence Inventory (Genos EI; Palmer, Stough, Harmer & Gignae, 2009), The Profile of Emotional Competence (PEC; Brasseur & Mikolajczak, 2013), Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale (SSEIT; Austin, Saklofske, Huang & McKenney, 2004; Schutte et al. 1998), Work Group Emotional Intelligence Profile (WGEIP; Jordan, Ashkansay, Harlet, & Hooper, 2002), Wong's Emotional Intelligence Scale (WEIS; Wong, Law & Wong, 2004), and others. Available scales to measure EI in our country are: Emotional Intelligence Scale (EIS; Hyde, Pethe & Dhar, 2002), Emotional Intelligence Test (EIT; Zainuddin & Ahmed, 2011), Situational Judgment Test of Emotional Intelligence (SJET; Sharma, Gangopadhyay, Austin & Mandal, 2013), Emotional Intelligence Inventory (EII; Mangal & Mangal, 2011), Emotional Intelligence Scale (EIS; Singh & Narain,

2014), Emotional Intelligence Scale (EIS; Srinivasan & Murugesan, 2014), etc. Caution must be struck that many of the tests that have appeared in recent times promising to measure emotional intelligence might not have been empirically evaluated.

Police department is one of the most important organizations in any society. Its main function is to provide security, safety and shield from unlawful acts to both individuals as well as society. Even though bestowed with special powers, the police share varied roles and responsibilities. They have to maintain law and order, undertake patrolling and prevention of crime, initiate investigation of crime, manage crowds, provide security to VIPs, monitor unlawful assemblies and public agitations, help weaker sections of society, and handle special occasions like processions, elections, communal riots, or natural disasters. They blend a leader, manager, and friend. Even as they handle themselves, they need to hold the public at another end. Their job is fraught with challenges and frustrations imposed by their supervisors, call of duty and discipline, and the relatively prolonged psychological and physical separation from their friends and family (Bharati, 2006; Srivastava, 1999). Under these circumstances it would be worthwhile to explore how these persons manage their own emotions vis-à-vis those with others.

Literature on EI has targeted variety of populations including teachers or college students, industrial or non-industrial workers, health care providers, and others. Research on EI in police personnel in our country is sparse (Kidwai, 2012). By excluding age and marital status, variables like education, monthly salary, years of experience, type of family and number of training programs attended were reported to influence the 'moderate' levels of EI scores obtained by the sample of 200 women police constables covered in their study (Mohanraj & Natesan (2014). Studies have shown significant correlations between EI and job performance in police officers after controlling for their general mental abilities and personality traits (Ali, Garner & Magadley, 2011), psychological well being in male police persons (Chauhan & Joshi, 2013), adjustment (Alam, 2014), work-life balance, or occupational stress in Indian Border Force Personnel (Chhabra & Chhabra, 2013). Under the circumstances, it would be pertinent to explore or profile the scenario of EI of police personnel in contemporary times. It was the chosen aim of this study to profile the nature, content, type, frequency, intensity and extensity of EI for various cadre of police personnel belonging to a major city of south India in relation to associated personal and socio-demographic variables. A subsidiary aim was also to determine the reliability and validity of the instrument being used for measurement of EI in the targeted population of police personnel.

### **Objective**

1. To measure emotional intelligence scores of police personnel in relation to various socio-demographic variables
2. To assess domain wise distribution of emotional intelligence scores of police personnel
3. To determine inter correlation coefficients between domains of emotional intelligence of police personnel.

### **Method**

#### **Participants**

Available population data from official records at the time of this study carried out between January-December, 2015, was reportedly 1155 police personnel across 17 police stations in Mysore Urban District, Karnataka, India. Out of them, 687 respondents (59.48%) participated in the survey. The sample included 623 men and 64 women which was proportional and representative of the gender wise distribution in their larger population. Their ages varied from 21-30 years (N: 100), 31-40 years (N: 238), 41-50 years (N: 148), and 51-60



years (N: 201). Their cadre included: 'Police Constable' (N: 382), 'Head Constable' (N: 221), 'Assistant Sub Inspector' (N: 45), 'Sub Inspector' (N: 23), and 'Police Inspector' (N: 16).

### Instruments

1. Emotional Intelligence Scale (EIS; Hyde, Pethe & Dhar, 2002). The 34-item 'Emotional Intelligence Scale' covers 10 factors designated by specific item numbers, viz., self-awareness, empathy, self-motivation, emotional stability, managing relations, integrity, self-development, value orientation, commitment and altruistic behavior. For example, the statement 'I believe in myself measures' 'self-awareness'. Another statement 'I am able to encourage people to take initiative' determines 'altruistic behavior'. This Likert Scale provides options for respondents to mark their preferences as 'strongly agree' (Score: 5), 'agree' (Score: 4), 'neutral' (Score: 3), 'disagree' (Score: 2), or 'strongly disagree' (Score: 1). Higher scores on this tool indicate positive or better EI. Norms are based on variance constants below or higher than one standard deviation from the mean for any given population. The split-half reliability coefficient for this scale is reported as 0.88. Apart from face validity, as all items are related to the variable under focus, the scale has high content validity reported as 0.93.
2. Demographic Data Sheet: This instrument was exclusively prepared to elicit personal and demographic background details of respondents.

### Procedure

The study was initiated after securing permission from District Level Commissioner of Police. To ease test administration, the scale was subjected to reverse translation in regional language by using two mutually blinded examiners with post graduation in psychology. Respondents were explained any test item for which clarification was sought. No time limit was prescribed to complete the tool. The instruments chosen for this study was then distributed to consenting and eligible respondents after explaining its rationale in their respective police station limits. The base data collected were individual response sheets of the participating police personnel across each item on the designated tool. They were then coded and tabulated in excel spread sheets before attempting appropriate statistical treatments and analysis on SPSS/PC (Pallant, 2013).

### Results

The findings of this study are presented below in three broad but inter-connected headings: (a) Overall EI Scores and in relation to various socio-demographic variables; (b) Domain Analysis; and, (c) Item Analysis.

#### Overall EI Scores and in relation to various socio-demographic variables

The overall sample of police personnel (N: 687) in this study show mean EI score of 126.53 (SD: 21.14; 74.43%) out of maximum possible score of 170 on the measuring instrument (Table 1). If this is taken as reference point or bench mark, it is seen that women respondents have scored significantly ( $p < 0.001$ ) higher on EI (N: 64; Mean: 135.05; SD: 13.00; 79.44%) compared to men in uniform (N: 623; Mean: 125.65; SD: 21.62; 73.91%). It appears that married police people (N: 623; Mean: 126.31; SD: 21.06; 74.30%) show significantly lower ( $p = 0.04$ ) EI scores than their unmarried or single counterparts (N: 64; Mean: 128.66; SD: 21.94; 75.68%). Similarly, the younger police between 21-30 years (N: 100; Mean: 128.34; SD: 21.34; 75.49%) and the oldest age group between 51-60 years (N: 201; Mean: 132.96; SD: 14.00; 78.21%) score significantly higher ( $p = 0.05$ ) on EI than their middle-aged colleagues between 41-50 years (N: 148; Mean: 122.80; SD: 22.23; 72.24%). This corroborates and goes with the police staff having 20+ years experience (N: 269; Mean: 130.54; SD: 16.76; 76.79%) and/or those with five+ transfers

during their service (N: 199; Mean: 133.40; SD: 16.30; 78.47%) showing significantly higher EI scores ( $p: 0.001$ ).

Table1

*Distribution of overall EI scores and in relation to various socio-demographic variables*

| Variable           |           | N   | Mean   | SD    | Probability                             |
|--------------------|-----------|-----|--------|-------|-----------------------------------------|
| Overall            |           | 687 | 126.53 | 21.14 |                                         |
| Gender             | Men       | 623 | 125.65 | 21.62 | T: 3.410; Df: 685; SED: 2.75; P: 0.0007 |
|                    | Women     | 64  | 135.05 | 13.00 |                                         |
| Marital status     | Married   | 623 | 126.31 | 21.06 | T:0.8640; Df: 685; SED: 2.776; P:0.0418 |
|                    | Unmarried | 64  | 128.66 | 21.94 |                                         |
| Number of children | Unmarried | 64  | 128.66 | 21.94 | f(4,682); 1.989; p= 0.094               |
|                    | 0         | 35  | 125.86 | 22.87 |                                         |
|                    | 1         | 180 | 124.68 | 22.24 |                                         |
|                    | 2         | 333 | 125.89 | 21.11 |                                         |
|                    | 3+        | 75  | 132.28 | 15.76 |                                         |
| No. of dependents  | 1-2       | 138 | 128.22 | 22.02 | f (2,684); 0.870; p=0.419               |
|                    | 3-4       | 376 | 126.59 | 20.80 |                                         |
|                    | 5+        | 173 | 125.04 | 21.18 |                                         |
| Age                | 21-30     | 100 | 128.34 | 21.34 | f (3,683); 11.123; p=0.05               |
|                    | 31-40     | 238 | 122.65 | 23.90 |                                         |
|                    | 41-50     | 148 | 122.80 | 22.23 |                                         |
|                    | 51-60     | 201 | 132.96 | 14.00 |                                         |
| Education          | S.S.L.C   | 101 | 128.68 | 18.39 | f (3,683); 1.780; p=0.150               |
|                    | P.U.C     | 194 | 123.98 | 21.50 |                                         |
|                    | U.G       | 268 | 126.61 | 21.03 |                                         |
|                    | P.G       | 124 | 128.81 | 22.51 |                                         |
| Cadre              | P.I       | 16  | 145.38 | 12.78 | f (4,682); 15.215; p=0.000              |
|                    | S.I       | 23  | 142.70 | 12.56 |                                         |
|                    | A.S.I     | 45  | 139.67 | 10.54 |                                         |
|                    | H.C       | 221 | 127.36 | 17.33 |                                         |
|                    | P.C       | 382 | 122.73 | 23.17 |                                         |
| Experience         | 0-10      | 202 | 125.80 | 22.78 | f (2,684); 9.702; p=0.000               |
|                    | 11-20     | 216 | 122.21 | 23.47 |                                         |
|                    | 20+       | 269 | 130.54 | 16.76 |                                         |
| Transfers          | 0-2       | 284 | 124.68 | 22.67 | f (2,684); 16.198; p=0.000              |
|                    | 3-4       | 204 | 122.39 | 21.59 |                                         |
|                    | 5+        | 199 | 133.40 | 16.30 |                                         |

Socio-demographic correlates like number of dependents, or children in married persons, and level of education do not emerge as significant variable to influence or determine the EI scores in the sample of police personnel included in this study ( $p: >0.05$ ).

### Domain Analysis

A domain wise distribution of EI scores (Table 2) shows that the police personnel show highest 'commitment' (Mean: 8.18 out of 10; SD: 1.35; 81.85%), followed by 'self awareness' (Mean: 16.07 out of 20; SD: 2.55; 80.33%), and 'value orientation' (Mean: 7.86 out of 10; SD: 1.36; 78.63%). They score low in decreasing order on the dimensions of 'emotional stability' (Mean:

13.14 out of 20; SD: 3.63; 65.68%), 'self development' (Mean: 6.80 out of 10; SD: 1.96; 67.98%) and 'empathy' (Mean: 18.13 out of 20; SD: 3.73; 72.51%).

Table 2

*Domain wise Distribution of EI scores*

| Sl. No | Domains             | No. of Items | Max Score | Mean   | SD    | %     | Rank |
|--------|---------------------|--------------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|------|
| 1      | Self Awareness      | 4            | 20        | 16.07  | 2.55  | 80.33 | 2    |
| 2      | Empathy             | 5            | 25        | 18.13  | 3.73  | 72.51 | 8    |
| 3      | Self Motivation     | 6            | 30        | 22.85  | 3.89  | 76.18 | 5    |
| 4      | Emotional Stability | 4            | 20        | 13.14  | 3.63  | 65.68 | 10   |
| 5      | Managing Relation   | 4            | 20        | 14.58  | 2.73  | 72.92 | 7    |
| 6      | Integrity           | 3            | 15        | 11.11  | 2.47  | 74.05 | 6    |
| 7      | Self Development    | 2            | 10        | 6.80   | 1.96  | 67.98 | 9    |
| 8      | Value Orientation   | 2            | 10        | 7.86   | 1.36  | 78.63 | 3    |
| 9      | Commitment          | 2            | 10        | 8.18   | 1.35  | 81.85 | 1    |
| 10     | Altruistic Behavior | 2            | 10        | 7.81   | 1.42  | 78.09 | 4    |
|        | Total               | 34           | 170       | 126.53 | 21.14 | 74.43 |      |

A correlation analysis (Table 3) to check within and between domain internal consistency on EI Scale revealed content validity coefficients or within item total correlation coefficients ranging between  $r: 0.42$  (SD-VO) to  $r: 0.79$  (SA-SM) within acceptable limits ( $p: <0.05$ ). The split half odd-even reliability ( $r: 0.93$ ) on EI Scale followed by stepped up estimates using Spearman-Brown Prediction Formula ( $r: 0.96$ ) for overall tool, along with measures of internal consistency by Cronbachs alpha ( $r: 0.95$ ) vouch the reliability and validity of the instrument being used for measurement of EI in the targeted population of police personnel.

Table 3

*Domain-wise Inter-Correlation Matrix of EI scores*

|    | SA   | E    | SM   | ES   | MR   | I    | SD   | VO   | C    | AB |
|----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|----|
| SA | -    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |    |
| E  | 0.74 | -    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |    |
| SM | 0.79 | 0.81 | -    |      |      |      |      |      |      |    |
| ES | 0.70 | 0.81 | 0.76 | -    |      |      |      |      |      |    |
| MR | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.74 | 0.68 | -    |      |      |      |      |    |
| I  | 0.74 | 0.76 | 0.77 | 0.78 | 0.65 | -    |      |      |      |    |
| SD | 0.61 | 0.65 | 0.63 | 0.68 | 0.55 | 0.72 | -    |      |      |    |
| VO | 0.45 | 0.47 | 0.49 | 0.44 | 0.46 | 0.44 | 0.42 | -    |      |    |
| C  | 0.68 | 0.64 | 0.68 | 0.60 | 0.57 | 0.63 | 0.52 | 0.47 | -    |    |
| AB | 0.66 | 0.66 | 0.69 | 0.58 | 0.64 | 0.60 | 0.46 | 0.45 | 0.55 | -  |

(KEY: Cronbachs Alpha: 0.954; Split-Half (Odd-Even) Correlation: 0.931; Spearman-Brown Prophecy: 0.964)  
 (SA: Self-Awareness; E: Empathy; SM: Self-Motivation; ES: Emotional Stability; MR: Managing Relations; I: Integrity; SD: Self-Development; VO: Value Orientation; C: Commitment; AB: Altruistic Behavior)

### Item Analysis

Analysis of individual items (Table 4) show that most police personnel report immense 'belief in self' (Item #18; Rank: I; Mean: 4.33 out of 5; SD: 0.65; 86.55%). They report other

highly positive attributes like 'ability to build rapport, maintain personal friendships with colleagues', 'belief in happiness as positive attitude', 'as being able to meet commitments and keep their promises', etc. On the negative or low-end side, they admit for a need to develop themselves even though their job did not demand it' (Item #33; Rank: 34; Mean: 3.09 out of 5; SD: 1.31; 61.74%). Other low scoring attributes on the EI scale are related to their relatively 'low levels of comfort to novel ideas and new information', their 'tendency to mix emotions with issues in hand', admitted 'inability to remain composed in good and bad situations', etc.

Table 4

*High-End and Low-End Items Distribution of EI scores*

| Rank                       | Item | Description                                                              | %     | Mean | SD   |
|----------------------------|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------|------|
| <b>High Scoring Items:</b> |      |                                                                          |       |      |      |
| 1                          | 18   | I believe in my self                                                     | 86.55 | 4.33 | 0.65 |
| 2                          | 29   | I have built rapport, made & maintained friendships with work associates | 82.91 | 4.15 | 0.76 |
| 3                          | 34   | I believe that happiness is a positive attitude                          | 82.67 | 4.13 | 0.70 |
| 4                          | 23   | I am able to meet commitments and keep promises                          | 82.32 | 4.12 | 0.76 |
| 5                          | 21   | I am able to maintain the standards of honesty and integrity             | 81.77 | 4.09 | 0.79 |
| 6                          | 16   | I can stand up for my beliefs                                            | 81.54 | 4.08 | 0.84 |
| 7                          | 9    | I pay attention to the worries and concerns of others                    | 81.39 | 4.07 | 0.77 |
| 8                          | 24   | I am organized and careful in my work                                    | 81.36 | 4.07 | 0.83 |
| 9                          | 17   | I can see the brighter side of my situation                              | 80.58 | 4.03 | 0.77 |
| 10                         | 12   | I have my priorities clear                                               | 78.16 | 3.91 | 0.93 |
| <b>Low Scoring Items:</b>  |      |                                                                          |       |      |      |
| 25                         | 1    | I can encourage others to work even when things are not favorable        | 68.96 | 3.45 | 1.13 |
| 26                         | 25   | I am able to handle multiple demands                                     | 68.50 | 3.43 | 1.13 |
| 26                         | 27   | I pursue goals beyond what is required and expected of me                | 68.50 | 3.43 | 1.17 |
| 28                         | 20   | I am able to stay focused even under pressure                            | 68.15 | 3.41 | 1.20 |
| 29                         | 10   | I can listen to someone without the urge to say something                | 68.03 | 3.40 | 1.11 |
| 30                         | 5    | I do not depend on others encouragement to do my work well               | 66.84 | 3.34 | 1.28 |
| 31                         | 19   | I am able to stay composed in both good and bad situations               | 65.29 | 3.26 | 1.15 |
| 32                         | 14   | I do not mix unnecessary emotions with issues at hand                    | 64.57 | 3.23 | 1.16 |
| 33                         | 26   | I am comfortable with and open to novel ideas and new information        | 63.66 | 3.18 | 1.23 |
| 34                         | 33   | I feel I must develop myself even when my job does not demand it         | 61.74 | 3.09 | 1.31 |

## Discussion

In attempting to profile the EI of police personnel employed in a major city of south India, it is found that the respondents score an overall mean score of nearly 75 % out of on the

chosen measuring instrument. This is in line with earlier findings of 'moderate' levels of EI in women police constables (Mohanraj & Natesan, 2014) or in conjunction with their felt or expressed psychological well being (Dar, Alam & Lone, 2011).

In relation to *gender* variable, the women police score significantly higher on EI compared to the men in uniform. Previous studies have consistently shown that girls are higher than boys in their EI (Naghavi & Redzuan, 2011). It is posited that gender differences in EI can be glimpsed from infancy due to the differential teaching or societal expectations. Culturally, women are expected to be more expressive of their feelings, whereas abstaining from such expression is strengthened as macho. It is contested that women are superior to men only in certain domains of EI (Ahmad, Bangash & Khan, 2009). The finding that *married* respondents have significantly different EI scores than their unmarried counterparts is reported in college students (Madahi, Javidi & Samadzadeh, 2013) and executives (Singh, 2003; p. 149). While there is no ground to suspect why marital status by itself may lead to lower EI scores, it may be perhaps due to other factors like overwork and additional responsibilities.

There is indication to suggest that different careers require various levels or intensities among the components of EI to be successful. There seems to be a linear rise of EI scores with increasing cadre of police personnel. The oldest among them, with more transfers and/or longer tenure of employment score significantly higher on EI than their younger less experienced colleagues. Although popular literature and 'common sense' assert that older people are more aware, wise or restrained, and hence, possibly, have higher scores on EI measures, it is found that only some parts of EI increase with age. Other components of EI need to be developed through training (Fernández-Berrocal, Cabello, Castillo & Extremera, 2012, Fariselli, Ghini & Freedman, 2006). Socio-demographic correlates like number of dependents, or children in married persons, and their level of education did not emerge as significant variable to influence or determine the EI scores in the sample of police personnel targeted in this study.

## Conclusion

In sum, it is to be noted that the profile of EI for any given population or profession is likely to vary by time, space, region, culture and/or country. From this study, one can only approximate a theoretical profile of a married women police person in age group of above 50 years with frequent job transfers and long experience as having higher EI than a younger aged peer. It is seen that EI differs with gender, age, cadre, experience and number of transfers, while socio-demographic variables like number of dependents, or children in married persons, and their level of education did not emerge as significant variable to influence or determine the EI scores in the sample of police personnel targeted in this study. All this implies that there is dynamic need for periodic training of the police workforce in identified deficit areas or domains of EI in order to optimize their individual resources for their own benefits as well as for the society at large.

## References

- Ahmad, S., Bangash, H., & Khan, S. A. (2009). Emotional intelligence and gender differences. *Sarhad Journal of Agriculture*, 25, 1, 127-130.
- Alam, S. (2014). Influence of emotional intelligence on adjustment of police personnel. *The Indian Police Journal*, 61, 1, 210-226.
- Ali, O. E. A., Garner, I., & Magadley, W. (2011). An exploration of the relationship between emotional intelligence and job performance in police organizations *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 27, 1, 1-7.
- Austin, E., Saklofske, D., Huang, S., & McKenney, D. (2004). Measurement of trait EI: Testing and cross validating a modified version of Schutte et al.'s (1998) measure. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36, 555-562.



- Bharati, D. (2006). *Police and people: role and responsibilities*. New Delhi: APH Publishing Corporation.
- Brasseur, S., Gregoire, J., Bourdu, R., & Mikolajczak, M. (2013). The profile of Emotional Competence: Development and validation of a measure that fits dimensions of emotional competence theory. *PLoS One*, 8, 5, e62635.
- Chauhan, A. S., & Joshi, G. R. (2013). Relationship between emotional intelligence and psychological well being among police personnel. *Indian Journal of Positive Psychology*, 4, 1, 115.
- Chhabra, M., & Chhabra, B. (2013). Emotional intelligence and occupational stress: a study of Indian Border Security Force Personnel. *Police Practice and Research: An International Journal*, 14, 5, 355-370.
- Coleman, A. (2008). *A dictionary of psychology* (3rd Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dar, O. H., Alam, S., & Lone, Z. A. (2011). Relationship between emotional intelligence and psychological well being of male police personnel. *Journal of Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 37, 1, 47-52.
- Fariselli, L., Ghini, M., & Freedman, J. (2006). Age and emotional intelligence. Retrieved from: [https://www.6seconds.org/sei/media/WP\\_EQ\\_and\\_Age.pdf](https://www.6seconds.org/sei/media/WP_EQ_and_Age.pdf) on 20.06.2016.
- Fernández-Berrocal, P., Cabello, R., Castillo, R., & Extremera, N. (2012). Gender differences in emotional intelligence: The mediating effect of age. *Behavioral Psychology*, 20, 1, 77-89.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence: why it can matter more than IQ*. New York. Bantam Books.
- Hay Group. (2005). *The Emotional Competency Inventory: Technical Manual*. Available at: [http://www.eiconsortium.org/pdf/ECI\\_2\\_0\\_Technical\\_Manual\\_v2.pdf](http://www.eiconsortium.org/pdf/ECI_2_0_Technical_Manual_v2.pdf) Retrieved on: 12.06.2016
- Hay Group. (2011). *The Emotional and Social Competency Inventory: A user guide for technical practitioners*. Available at: [http://www.eiconsortium.org/pdf/ESCI\\_user\\_guide.pdf](http://www.eiconsortium.org/pdf/ESCI_user_guide.pdf) Retrieved on: 12.06.2016
- Hyde, A., Pethe, S., & Dhar, U. (2002). *Manual for Emotional Intelligence Scale*. Lucknow: Vedant Publications.
- Jordan, P. J., Ashkansay, N. M., Harlet, C. E. J., & Hooper, G. S. (2002). Work Group Emotional Intelligence Scale: Development and relationship to team process effectiveness and goal focus. *Human Resources Management Review*, 12, 195-214.
- Kidwai, F. (2012). *Emotional intelligence among police personnel: An Indian study*. Germany: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Koman, E., Wolff, S. B., & Howard, A. (2008). The cascading impact of culture: Group emotional competence as a cultural resource. In R. Emmerling, V. Shanwal, & M. Mandal. (Eds.). *Emotional Intelligence: Theoretical and Cultural Perspectives*. San Francisco: Nova Science Publishers.
- Madahi, M. E., Javidi, N., & Samadzadeh, M. (2013). The relationship between emotional intelligence and marital status in sample of college students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 84, 9, 1317-1320.
- Mangal, S. K., & Mangal, S. (2011). *Emotional Intelligence: Managing emotions to win life*. New Delhi: PHI Learning Limited.
- Mayer, J., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. (2002). *The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test: User's Manual*. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.
- Mohanraj, C., & Natesan, M. R. (2014). Emotional Intelligence Profile of Women Police Constables. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary and Multidisciplinary Studies*, 1, 9, 44-48.





- Naghavi, F., & Redzuan, M. (2011). The relationship between gender and emotional intelligence. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 15, 4, 555-561.
- Pallant, J. (2013). *SPSS Survival Manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS*. New Delhi: McGraw Hill.
- Palmer, B. R., Stough, C., Harmer, R., & Gignae, G. (2009). The Genos Emotional Intelligence Inventory: A measure designed specifically for workplace applications. In J. D. A. Parker, D. H. Saklofske & C. Stough. (Eds.). *Assessing Emotional Intelligence: Theory, Research & Applications*. New York: Springer. Pp. 103-117.
- Petrides, K., & Furnham, A. (2001). Trait emotional intelligence: psychometric investigation with reference to established trait taxonomies. *European Journal of Personality*, 15, 6, 425-448.
- Petrides, K. V. (2009). Technical Manual for the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire. London: London Psychometric Laboratory.
- Salovey, P, Meyer, J., & Caruso, D. (2004). Emotional intelligence: theory, findings, and implications. *Psychological Inquiry*, 197-215.
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D. J., Cooper, J. T., Golden, C. J., et al. (1988). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personal Individual Differences*. 25, 2, 167-77.
- Sharma, S., Gangopadhyay, M., Austin, E., & Mandal, M. K. (2013). Development and Validation of Situational Judgment Test of Emotional Intelligence. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 21, 1, 57-73.
- Singh, A. K., & Narain, S. (2014). *Manual of Emotional Intelligence Scale*. Agra: National Corporation.
- Singh, D. (2003). *Emotional intelligence at work. A professional guide*. New Delhi: Response Books, Pp. 19- 50 & 149
- Srinivasan, P., & Murugesan, S. (2014). Construction and standardization of Emotional Intelligence Scale. *Journal of Educational Research and Extension*, 51, 2, 39-47.
- Srivastava, A. (1999). *Role of Police in a changing society*. New Delhi: APH Publishing Corporation.
- Wong, C. S., Law, K. S., & Wong, P. M. (2004). Development and validation of a forced choice emotional intelligence for Chinese respondents in Hong Kong. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 21, 4, 535-559.
- Zainuddin, R., & Ahmed, A. (2011). *Raqan Emotional Intelligence Test*. Agra: National Psychological Corporation.