



Emotional Intelligence and Stress in Relation to Nature, Type of Organization and Hierarchy

Radhika Sahu¹ & H.G.R. Tripathi²

¹Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, A.P.S. University, Rewa (M.P.) India

²Professor & Head, Department of Psychology, Govt. P.G. Girls College, Rewa (M.P.) India

ARTICLE INFO

*Correspondence:

Radhika Sahu
radhikasahu2705
@gmail.com
Research Scholar,
Department of Psychology,
A.P.S. University, Rewa (M. P.)
India

Dates:

Received: 09-06-2026

Accepted: 19-06-2026

Published: 06-07-2026

Keywords:

Emotional Intelligence,
Stress, Public and Private
Sector, Banking and
Education, Hierarchical
Levels

How to cite:

Sahu, R., Tripathi, H.G.R.
(2025) Emotional
Intelligence and Stress in
Relation to Nature, Type of
Organization and Hierarchy
Mind and Society,15(2):49-57
doi: 1056011/mind-
mri-15220266

Abstract

Emotional intelligence and stress have emerged as significant determinants of professional effectiveness and psychological well-being across a variety of organizational settings. The present research paper describes and discusses the pattern of emotional intelligence and stress perceived by participants working in different (academic institutions and banking) sectors, specifically across public and private organizations and at different hierarchical levels (lower and higher). Two hundred (N=200) participants from public and private sectors working in academic institutions and banks took part in the study. These participants were working in higher and junior categories. Standardized scales (Emotional Intelligence & stress scale) were used for data collection. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, three-way ANOVA, and correlational analysis. The findings revealed significant differences in the perception of participants on emotional intelligence and stress working in public and private sector employees. It was reported that public sector participants evinced higher emotional intelligence as compared to participants belonged to private sectors. Similarly, higher stress level was observed in private sector organizations due to increased performance demands and work pressure. Results indicated that junior -level participants experienced greater stress as compared to higher-cadre participants. Furthermore, emotional intelligence was negatively correlated with stress, indicated its protective role in managing workplace challenges. The study highlighted the importance of emotional intelligence in stress management among participants across sectors, with implications for training, organizational policies, and professional development.

INTRODUCTION

Emotional Intelligence (EI) concept has received much attention in the recent past in the fields of education psychology and other disciplines of social science. It was considered as important determining factor to improve professionalism, developing and understanding relationships, and insuring mental wellbeing (Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Goleman, 1995; Carmeli, 2003). EI can be understood as one's ability to recognize, comprehend, control, and use emotions in oneself and in others (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Goleman (1995) mentioned that emotional abilities have key role in achieving success in the professional field, often overshadowing cognitive intelligence.

At the higher level of education, teachers are supposed to assume various roles, among which include teaching, mentoring, research, and managerial

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence, which permits use, sharing, adaptation in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to original author(s) and the source, Provided a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons Licence. Unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article creative Commons article and your intended use is not permitted by the statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence. Visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0>.

Emotional Intelligence and Stress

responsibilities. All these factors contribute to making tutoring a demanding profession in terms of continuous contact with students, empathy, and communication skills (Boyer, 1990; Ramsden, 2003). In this connection, EI plays a significant role in helping tutors, cope with teaching difficulties, maintain healthy teacher-student relationships, and create productive learning environment (Goleman, 1995; Brackett et al., 2011). Similarly, exploration has found that emotionally intelligent preceptors exhibit high tutoring effectiveness along with better cerebral adaptation, thus emphasizing the importance of emotional intelligence within education (Brackett & Katulak, 2006).

The issue of stress has gained importance among the concerns associated with the psychological well-being of teachers. It can be defined as a multidimensional phenomenon that emerges as a result of perception of an imbalance between the environment and coping resources of individuals (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). The sources of stress in educational settings include a wide range of personal, social, and occupational challenges that educators face regularly, ranging from emotional, to interpersonal, to role-related difficulties. As a psychological phenomenon, stress has been found to cause adverse impacts on individual's health and performance by affecting their psychological state, cognitive abilities, and life satisfaction (Selye, 1976; Cohen et al., 2007). In the Indian context, there is evidence suggesting that educators suffer from stress that affects their well-being and performance (Bidi et al., 2024; Girija & Ramani, 2024).

Furthermore, Sahu et al. (2024) evaluated the levels of stress among teachers in the higher educational institutions of Odisha and observed that the levels of stress were affected by a number of variables such as work load, job security, and resources at disposal in organizations, where private sector institutions recorded high stress levels than public sector institutions (Sahu et al., 2024). Moreover, Basera et al. (2025) documented an increasing trend in stress levels among teachers in India, which had adverse effects on mental well-being, causing stress-related conditions such as anxiety, depression, and poor wellbeing.

Additional studies in the organization context suggest that emotional intelligence is essential in the managing the stress of the employees working in both the public and private sectors (Ashhar, 2023; Karimi et al., 2021). Empirical findings of researches on

bank workers in India have demonstrated that emotional intelligence negatively correlated with stress levels, meaning that people who possessed higher emotional intelligence had low stress levels (Ashhar, 2023; Ashhar, 2024). Comparatively, a study conducted on public and private sector employees demonstrated differences in emotional intelligence dimensions, whereby public sector workers exhibited high levels of emotional regulation and empathy than those in the private sector who had high levels of motivation (Yadav & Urawn, 2025)

Researches related with corporate firms point out that high emotional intelligence is an important contributor to effective stress management for workers operating in stressful conditions, long work hours, and performance goals (Abirami & Jayasudha, 2025). Moreover, literature asserts that emotional intelligence positively impacts psychological well-being, empowerment, and job performance among employees at various organizational ranks and hierarchical levels, including low-level employees as well as high-level managers (Karimi et al., 2021). Overall, these evidences support that emotional intelligence serves as a coping strategy for stress and can contribute to enhancing psychological well-being and organizational efficiency.

Stress exposure over time has been extensively linked to detrimental psychological effects such as teacher burnout, emotional exhaustion, and decreased professional effectiveness (Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Selye, 1976). In the educational setting, teachers' burnout can be attributed to their constant emotional needs and professional roles (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). Similarly, Indian researches confirm that burnout is a result of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and lack of personal achievement, primarily due to excessive workload and poor institutional assistance (Tripathi, 2025). The studies provide evidence that stress can have devastating psychological consequences on teachers (Kyriacou, 2001; Cohen et al., 2007).

Nevertheless, emotional intelligence is continuously regarded as an essential buffer for mitigating stress and its effects (Goleman, 1995; Mayer et al., 2004). Individuals with adequate emotional intelligence are more adept at controlling emotions, adopting effective coping mechanisms, and handling inter-personal and work-related stressors (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Brackett et al., 2011). Researches have shown that emotionally intelligent persons experience lower stress, greater job satisfaction, and increased

psychological well-being among occupational populations (Carmeli, 2003; Sy et al., 2006). In the Indian organizational context employees with high EI levels have shown lower stress levels and superior adjustment capabilities (Ashhar, 2023; Karimi et al., 2021).

Yadav and Urwan (2025) have demonstrated that Public and private sector organizations differ in terms of emotional intelligence and stress due to differences in work environments, job demands, and organizational cultures. Researches within the banking sector indicate that employees working in the private sector experience higher levels of stress because of performance pressure and target-based activities as compared to those employed in the public sector who possess better emotional regulation and job security (Ashhar, 2024; Abirami & Jayasudha, 2025). In the context of higher education, the Indian university system comprises both public and private institutions that differ significantly in organizational structure, governance, and performance expectations (Altbach, 2015). Public sector universities are generally characterized by stability, structured administrative systems, and job security, whereas private universities emphasize accountability, performance metrics, and competitiveness (Tilak, 2015). These structural differences are likely to influence both emotional intelligence and stress levels among university teachers, with private sector educators experiencing higher performance-related stress and public sector educators encountering challenges related to bureaucracy and role ambiguity (Basu, 2016; Yadav & Urwan, 2025).

Although the importance of emotional intelligence and stress is increasingly recognized as important factors affecting teachers' efficiency and welfare, the empirical literature comparing these concepts in public and private universities in India has been scanty (Basu, 2016; Karimi et al., 2021). Indeed, most previous studies on the subject focused on the separate aspects of emotional intelligence and stress without sufficiently studying how the former affects the latter depending on the organizational context (Carmeli, 2003; Sy et al., 2006).

Consequently, the proposed study is designed to explore the pattern of emotional intelligence, and stress perceived by teachers and bank employees employed in public and private sectors. Specifically, by establishing the connection between these two variables and taking into account sectoral and hierarchical differences, the study will help fill some

gaps in the literature and provide practical recommendations concerning improving the emotional skills of teachers and lowering stress (Goleman, 1995; Mayer et al., 2004).

In the light of above the following objectives were selected for in depth study.

OBJECTIVES

- To investigate the pattern of emotional intelligence and stress of the participants in relation to nature (Private/Public), types of organization (Academic Institutions/Banks) and hierarchical (Junior/Higher) levels of the participants.
- To examine the pattern of relationship between emotional intelligence and stress.

Hypotheses

H1. There would be difference in the perception of pattern of emotional intelligence and stress perceived by participants working in different nature and type of organizations at different hierarchical positions.

H2. There would be inter relationship between stress and emotional intelligence as perceived by the participants.

METHOD

Sample

A total 200 participants working in public and private organizations and in academic and banking sectors were chosen in this study. These participants were working at different hierarchical positions. The selection of participants was done through the application of the convenient sampling approach.

Design

In the present research, a co-relational design was used. However, 3-way factorial design was applied to examine the intergroup differences about the perceived emotional intelligence and stress levels. To determine the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Stress, co-relational analysis was conducted to explore the strength and pattern of relationships between level of emotional intelligence and stress.

MEASURES:

Emotional Intelligence Scale

Emotional Intelligence was measured using the Emotional Intelligence Scale developed by Hyde, Pethe, and Dhar (2002). The scale consists of 34 items designed to assess various dimensions of emotional

intelligence, including self-awareness, empathy, emotional stability, managing relations, integrity, self-development, value orientation, commitment, altruistic behavior, and self-motivation. The responses were recorded on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The scale has reported high internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of approximately 0.88.

Stress Scale

Stress was assessed using the Stress Scale developed by Singh (2002). This scale was designed to measure the level of perceived stress experienced by professionals in occupational settings. The scale consisted of multiple items that assessed various aspects of stress, such as work pressure, emotional strain, and psychological tension. Responses are typically obtained on a Likert-type format, and higher scores indicate higher levels of stress. The Cronbach's alpha value was found 0.70, indicating adequate internal consistency.

PROCEDURE

In the present study data were collected using Google Forms, which included three sections: informed consent, demographic details, and standardized questionnaires measuring Emotional Intelligence and Stress. Participants were approached through email, professional networks, and online platforms. They were requested to participate voluntarily and were assured that their responses would remain confidential and used solely for academic purposes.

Clear instructions were provided at the beginning of the questionnaire to guide participants in responding appropriately. The estimated time to complete the questionnaire was approximately 15–20 minutes. After data collection, responses were screened for completeness, and incomplete or inconsistent responses were excluded from the analysis. Participants were thanked for their cooperation and support. The collected data were then coded and tabulated for statistical analysis.

RESULT

The descriptive statistics, 3-way analysis of variance and co-relational analysis were applied to analyze and interpret the data.

Emotional Intelligence:

Means and standard deviations of the scores indicating pattern of the emotional intelligence is

shown in Table1. Summary of Analysis of Variance is displayed in Table 2. ANOVA results reflected that effect of nature of organization was significant, $F(1,192) = 38.41, p < .001$. It indicated that participants working in public sector had a higher level of emotional intelligence ($M=103.13$) as compared to those in working in Private sector ($M=82.10$). Effect of type of organization was significant, $F(1, 192) = 16.636, p < .001$. This implied that employees working in academic institutions perceived higher level ($M=99.58$) of emotional intelligence as compared to employees working in the banking sector ($M=85.65$). Effect of hierarchy was also **highly significant**, $F(1, 192) = 373.926, p < .001$. It was observed that higher cadre participants ($M=124.81$) reported higher emotional intelligence than junior cadre participants ($M=57.73$). The interaction of Organization and Type was significant, $F(1, 192) = 7.418, p < .007$, implying that the contrast between the academic and banking sectors changes between public and private organizations. Result indicated that level of emotional intelligence in academic and banking sectors was perceived differently across private and public sector organizations.

The interaction effect due to organization and type was significant, $F(1, 192) = 7.41, p < .001$. It supported that the influence of organization on shaping the emotional intelligence depends on the organizational type. Results supported that level of emotional intelligence was perceived differently by the participants belonging to public and private organizations and academic and banking sectors. The interaction effect due to organization and hierarchy was significant, $F(1, 192) = 11.205, p < .001$. This reflects that pattern of emotional intelligence is different in public and private organizations for the participants belonged to different hierarchies. Nevertheless, the interaction of type and hierarchy was not significant, $F(1, 192) = 2.438, p > .120$. A 3-way interaction effect due to organization, type $\times$ and hierarchy was significant, $F(1, 192) = 18.475, p < .001$. This showed that the organization, organizational type, and hierarchy had produced significant effect on emotional intelligence. The pattern of 3-way interaction clearly reflected that participants affiliated to higher cadre or junior cadre and worked in academic or banking organizations showed varied pattern of emotional intelligence. It was also influenced by type of organization too. For example, higher-level employees in private banks exhibited substantially greater emotional intelligence than junior-level employees, whereas this hierarchical

Emotional Intelligence and Stress

difference was perceived smaller in public banks and followed a different pattern in academic institutions.

Table 1 : Mean and Standard Deviation of the Scores indicating Emotional Intelligence

Organiza- tion	Type	Hierarchy	Means	Std. Deviations	N
Private	Academic	Lower	38.79	8.429	24
		Higher	126.96	28.756	26
		Total	84.64	49.348	50
	Bank	Lower	43.58	8.612	24
		Higher	112.77	21.267	26
		Total	79.56	38.532	50
	Total	Lower	41.19	8.770	48
		Higher	119.87	26.046	52
		Total	82.10	44.121	100
Public	Academic	Lower	96.25	36.299	24
		Higher	131.38	26.166	26
		Total	114.52	35.807	50
	Bank	Lower	52.33	8.686	24
		Higher	128.12	35.113	26
		Total	91.74	46.121	50
	Total	Lower	74.29	34.266	48
		Higher	129.75	30.703	52
		Total	103.13	42.644	100
Total	Academic	Lower	67.52	39.019	48
		Higher	129.17	27.312	52
		Total	99.58	45.446	100
	Bank	Lower	47.96	9.631	48
		Higher	120.44	29.767	52
		Total	85.65	42.722	100
	Total	Lower	57.74	29.930	96
		Higher	124.81	28.764	104
		Total	92.62	44.545	200

Table 2: Summary of Analysis of Variance on the Scores indicating Emotional Intelligence

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Organization	23063.48	1	23063.48	38.40	.000
Type	9990.35	1	9990.35	16.63	.000
Hierarchy	224546.71	1	224546.71	373.92	.000
Organization * Type	4454.50	1	4454.50	7.41	.007
Organization * Hierarchy	6728.56	1	6728.56	11.20	.001
Type * Hierarchy	1464.23	1	1464.23	2.43	.120
Organization * Type * Hierarchy	11094.42	1	11094.42	18.47	.000
Error	115298.01	192	600.51		
Total	2110371.00	200			
Corrected Total	394863.35	199			

Stress

Means and standard deviations of the scores indicating perceived stress by the participants are displayed in Table 3. Summary of 3-way analysis of variance is presented in Table 4. It was observed that the main effect of **organization** was significant, **F (1, 192) = 3.985, p < .05**. It supported that stress differs significantly between employees working in public and private sectors. Results appeared in Table 3) indicated that participants working in private sector organizations (M = 46.63) experienced higher level of stress as compared to participants belonging to public sector organizations (M = 44.20). The main effect of **type of organization** was not significant, **F (1, 192) = 0.176, p > .05**. The main effect of **hierarchical position** of the participants indicated a significant effect, **F (1, 192) = 12.069, p < .01**. Pattern of results indicated that participants belonging to junior cadre observed higher stress (M=47.66) as compared to higher cadre participants (M=43.35) respectively. Interaction effect of organization × type was not significant, **F (1, 192) = 0.48, p > .05**. The effect of the interaction between organization × hierarchy was also not significant, **F (1, 192) = 0.88, p > .05**.

Table 3: Mean and Standard Deviation of the Scores indicating Stress

Organiza- tion	Type	Hierarchy	Means	Std. Deviations	N
Private	Academic	Lower	54.29	4.07	24
		Higher	38.85	11.67	26
		Total	46.26	11.75	50
	Bank	Lower	44.67	9.66	24
		Higher	49.15	7.20	26
		Total	47.00	8.68	50
	Total	Lower	49.48	8.80	48
		Higher	44.00	10.92	52
		Total	46.63	10.28	100
Public	Academic	Lower	48.79	7.99	24
		Higher	41.12	8.40	26
		Total	44.80	9.00	50
	Bank	Lower	42.87	9.62	24
		Higher	44.27	9.28	26
		Total	43.60	9.37	50
	Total	Lower	45.83	9.24	48
		Higher	42.69	8.90	52
		Total	44.20	9.16	100
Total	Academic	Lower	51.54	6.86	48
		Higher	39.98	10.13	52
		Total	45.53	10.43	100
	Bank	Lower	43.77	9.58	48
		Higher	46.71	8.58	52
		Total	45.30	9.15	100
	Total	Lower	47.66	9.16	96
		Higher	43.35	9.94	104

Emotional Intelligence and Stress

Organiza-tion	Type	Hierarchy	Means	Std. Deviations	N
Private	Academic	Lower	54.29	4.07	24
		Higher	38.85	11.67	26
		Total	46.26	11.75	50
	Bank	Lower	44.67	9.66	24
		Higher	49.15	7.20	26
		Total	47.00	8.68	50
	Total	Lower	49.48	8.80	48
		Higher	44.00	10.92	52
		Total	46.63	10.28	100
Public	Academic	Lower	48.79	7.99	24
		Higher	41.12	8.40	26
		Total	44.80	9.00	50
	Bank	Lower	42.87	9.62	24
		Higher	44.27	9.28	26
		Total	43.60	9.37	50
	Total	Lower	45.83	9.24	48
		Higher	42.69	8.90	52
		Total	44.20	9.16	100
Total	Academic	Lower	51.54	6.86	48
		Higher	39.98	10.13	52
		Total	45.53	10.43	100
	Bank	Lower	43.77	9.58	48
		Higher	46.71	8.58	52
		Total	45.30	9.15	100
	Total	Lower	47.66	9.16	96
		Higher	43.35	9.94	104
		Total	45.42	9.79	200

Table 4: Summary of Analysis of Variance on the Scores Indicating Stress

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Organization	306.22	1	306.22	3.98	.047
Type	13.50	1	13.50	.176	.676
Hierarchy	927.36	1	927.36	12.06	.001
Organization * Type	37.03	1	37.03	.482	.488
Organization * Hierarchy	68.22	1	68.22	.88	.347
Type * Hierarchy	2624.50	1	2624.50	34.15	.000
Organization * Type * Hierarchy	368.11	1	368.11	4.79	.030
Error	14753.41	192	76.84		
Total	431591.00	200			
Corrected Total	19086.55	199			

Interestingly, three-way interaction effect due to organization $\times$ type $\times$ hierarchy was found to be significant, $F(1, 192) = 4.791$, $p < .05$. This finding implies

that there exists an interaction effect on the stress based on organization type and sector type as a function of participant's hierarchical level. In other words, the interaction effect between organization and type is dependent on whether the employee is of a low hierarchical level or high hierarchical level.

Inter relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Stress

To examine the relationship between Emotional Intelligence (EI) and Stress, coefficient of correlation was computed. The result of correlation indicated **negative and statistically significant relationship between emotional intelligence and stress ($r = -0.220$, $p < .01$)**. This suggests that individuals with higher emotional intelligence demonstrated lower levels of stress.

DISCUSSION:

This current research aims at analyzing the variations that exist regarding emotional intelligence and stress between workers employed in public and private sector institutions such as educational institutions and banks. The research further intends to identify the relationships that exist between emotional intelligence and stress. The findings obtained from this research have been found to be significant in terms of providing insights regarding the impact of organizational environment, occupation, and hierarchy on employees' emotional and psychological experiences.

Findings of the study showed that the level of emotional intelligence differed significantly as a function of organization, institution, and hierarchy. The main effect for organization was found to be statistically significant, meaning that individuals employed in public organizations differ significantly in terms of emotional intelligence when compared with employees of private organizations. This supports that the structure and context of these organizations may have an impact on individuals' ability to understand their emotions.

While public sector organizations feature more job security, structured environment, and stable performance requirements, private organizations tend to offer less security and more stress. Therefore, these characteristics may result in a difference in employees' ability to perceive their emotions. The findings of the study are similar to the ideas developed by Goleman (1995) who argues that emotional intelligence depends on environmental and organizational factors. Mayer &

Emotional Intelligence and Stress

Salovey (1997) also defined emotional intelligence as a set of skills that is determined by experience.

The findings also revealed that individuals employed in academic institutions differed significantly from their counterparts from banking institutions in terms of emotional intelligence. Scholarly activities usually involve prolonged interpersonal interactions, mentoring, teaching, and counseling of students, all of which require empathy, emotional awareness, and good communication skills. However, bank staff members usually operate under stringent regulations, numeric goals, and pressures to deliver excellent customer services. The varying job requirements of these occupations might explain differences in emotional intelligence across industries. This outcome is consistent with the research by Reuven Bar-On (2006), who found out that emotional and social skills are influenced by occupational roles and occupational requirements.

The impact of hierarchy of the participants was statistically significant, suggesting that workers at various hierarchical levels displayed varied level of emotional intelligence. Persons holding higher ranks frequently perform roles such as leadership, conflict resolution, decision-making, and supervising other employees, all of which necessitate high-level emotional skills. The present outcome corresponds with the researches carried out by Boyatzis (2001) and Hoy & Hoy (2003), who have revealed that people with emotional intelligence make better leaders and perform better interpersonal roles.

The interaction effect between organization and type was significant, which supported that there was a difference in the effect of being an academic or banking employee on emotional intelligence, depending on whether the organization was private or public. Thus, the role played by specific work-related requirements characteristic for particular industries on emotional intelligence was mediated by the overall organizational context, such as the level of autonomy and interpersonal support provided by the organization to its members.

The interaction effect between organization and hierarchy was also reported significant. It reflected that there was a difference in the impact of hierarchy on emotional intelligence, depending on whether the organization belonged to the private or public sector. In other words, the leadership responsibilities that are required at a certain organizational level are determined by a range of factors, including organizational culture and performance expectations.

Above all, the interaction effect between organization, type, and hierarchy was significantly evident. The result showed that the way emotional intelligence differs in terms of academic and banking industries and hierarchy depends upon whether the employees were employed in public or private institutions. It indicates the context-specific nature of emotional intelligence and evinces that the emotional competencies depend on the joint effect of organizational property, profession, and hierarchy.

Thus, the findings of the study confirm the competence-based theory advanced by Goleman (1998) that the emotional intelligence is not an individual matter but largely depends upon situational and organizational factors. Researches (Konstantinos V. Petrides and Adrian Furnham (2003)) support that emotional intelligence also changes according to occupational and environmental needs.

The obtained findings on the level of stress indicated that the main effect of organization was significant, thus supported that employees in private organizations perceived higher level of stress than those working in public organizations. The finding is consistent with the common perception that private organizations have more performance pressure, competition, and job insecurity, hence resulting in increased stress.

The present finding was with the evidence of the Transactional Model of stress proposed by Lazarus and Folkman (1984). This model proposed that stress occurs when individuals perceive their environment as being more demanding and stressful than the resources, they possess to manage the situation. Thus, the participants belonging to private organizations observed their environment as highly demanding and unpredictable, hence caused increased stress.

The effect of hierarchy was significant in the context of stress. It was observed that the stress scores of junior-level participants were significantly higher than those of higher-cadre participants. In contrast, Junior cadre workers tend to have less independence, fewer chances to make decisions, and less control over their tasks. High demands and low control in the workplace, as described in the demand-control framework by Robert A. Karasek (1979), were related to higher stress levels and may help to explain why junior-level participants reported higher stress levels. The three-way interaction between organization, type, and hierarchy was statistically significant. This result indicated that there were differences in the combined effect of organizational type and hierarchy on stress

depending on whether organizations are governmental or non-governmental. In other words, while lower-level employees at private universities experienced higher levels of stress compared to public universities, the same was not true for banking employees.

The value of correlation coefficient obtained using Pearson's product-moment correlation indicated a negative significant relationship between emotional intelligence and stress. The pattern of relationship indicates that emotional intelligence improves one's capacity for recognizing the triggers for emotions, regulating one's emotional state, having a broader view on events, and using adaptive coping techniques. Thus, people with high emotional intelligence were more capable of handling their job requirements without becoming psychologically stressed.

The above findings were supported by previous research findings. Nikolaos M. Schutte et al. (2007) observed that emotional intelligence was correlated positively with adaptive coping strategies and negatively with stress and psychological distress. Similarly, Moshe Zeidner, Gerald Matthews, and Richard D. Roberts (2012) also demonstrated that emotional intelligence was related to psychological adaptation. The low value of the co-relation coefficient implied that numerous other factors also affect an individual's psychological stress levels. Nevertheless, emotional intelligence remains an important psychological resource that can buffer the adverse effects of occupational stress.

CONCLUSION

Findings from the current research indicated that there was an influence of the aforementioned variables on both emotional intelligence and stress. Specifically, findings of the research demonstrated that there was an effect of context as well as the person's individuality regarding their emotional performance and stress levels. Moreover, it was confirmed that emotional intelligence and stress were negatively related to each other, implying that individuals high on emotional intelligence cope with work-related demands effectively.

In conclusion, the outcomes of the analysis showed that emotional intelligence could be considered a protective factor that helps employees manage work-related stress. Therefore, organizations should strive to develop conditions conducive to this phenomenon.

REFERENCES

- Abirami, K., & Jayasudha, S. M. (2025). Emotional intelligence and its impact on workplace stress: Insights from private sector banks. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 2(5).
- Ashhar, V. (2023). *Emotional intelligence and stress among bank employees. International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 11(2), 1862–1867.
- Baba, M. M. (2020). Emotional intelligence and demographic profile in the Indian education system. *Global Business Review*, 25(2), 275–301.
- Bar-On, R. (2006). The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence. *Psicothema*, 18, 13–25.
- Basera, N., Srivastava, R., Agrawal, A., Bansal, S., & Jha, P. (2025). Effect of stress among school teachers. *International Journal of Research in Medical Sciences*, 13(10), 4168–4173. <https://doi.org/10.18203/2320-6012.ijrms20253160>
- Bidi, S. B., Alapati, V., Dmello, V. J., et al. (2024). Prevalence of stress and its relevance on psychological well-being of the teaching profession. *FI000Research*, 12, 424.
- Brackett, M. A., & Katulak, N. A. (2006). Emotional intelligence in the classroom: Skill-based training for teachers and students. In J. Ciarrochi & J. D. Mayer (Eds.), *Applying emotional intelligence: A practitioner's guide* (pp. 1–27). Psychology Press.
- 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(1), 88–103.
- Boyatzis, R. E. (2001). How and why individuals are able to develop emotional intelligence. In C. Cherniss & D. Goleman (Eds.), *The emotionally intelligent workplace* (pp. 234–253). Jossey-Bass.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton University Press.
- Carmeli, A. (2003). Emotional intelligence and work attitudes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(8), 788–813.
- Cherniss & D. Goleman (Eds.), *The emotionally intelligent workplace* (pp. 234–253). Jossey-Bass.
- Cohen, S., Janicki-Deverts, D., & Miller, G. E. (2007). Psychological stress and disease. *JAMA*, 298(14), 1685–1687.
- Girija, C., & Ramani, D. (2024). A review on stress management among college teachers. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 12(4), 2826–2831.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. Bantam Books.

Emotional Intelligence and Stress

- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. Bantam Books.
- Hoy, A. W., & Hoy, W. K. (2003). Instructional leadership: A learning-centered guide (2nd ed.). Allyn & Bacon.
- Karasek, R. A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24(2), 285–308.
- Karimi, L., Leggat, S. G., Bartram, T., Afshari, L., & Sarkeshik, S. (2021). Emotional intelligence: Predictor of employees' wellbeing and performance. *BMC Psychology*, 9, 93.
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. Springer.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). Burnout in organizational settings. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 2, 99–113.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2004). Emotional intelligence: Theory and research. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15(3), 197–215.
- Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2003). Trait emotional intelligence. *European Journal of Personality*, 17(1), 39–57.
- Petrides, K. V., Pita, R., & Kokkinaki, F. (2007). Trait emotional intelligence and well-being. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 147(6), 597–607.
- Sahu, K., Lenka, S., Nayak, S., Kanungo, D., & Tripathy, A. (2024). A study on stress management among university teachers in Odisha. *Journal of Informatics Education and Research*, 4(3). <https://doi.org/10.52783/jier.v4i3.1928>
- Salovey, P., & John D. Mayer (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9(3), 185–211. <https://doi.org/10.2190/DUGG-P24E-52WK-6CDG>
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Thorsteinsson, E. B., Bhullar, N., & Rooke, S. E. (2007). A meta-analytic investigation of emotional intelligence and health. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42(6), 921–933.
- Selye, H. (1976). *The stress of life* (Rev. ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Sy, T., Tram, S., & O'Hara, L. (2006). Emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 461–473.
- Tripathi, P. (2025). Burnout among teachers: A qualitative study. *GBS Impact: Journal of Multi Disciplinary Research*, 10(2), 205–218. <https://doi.org/10.58419/gbs.v10i2.1022416>.
- Yadav, M. K., & Urawn, G. (2025). Impact of emotional intelligence between public and private sector bank employees. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 13(1), 3363–3374. <https://doi.org/10.25215/1301.329>
- Zeidner, M., Matthews, G., & Roberts, R. D. (2012). The emotional intelligence, health, and well-being nexus. Springer.