International Journal of Sport Culture and Science
September 2025 : 13(3)
ISSN : 2148-1148
Doi : 10.14486/IntJSCS.2025.755

Examining the Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence Levels and Psychological Resilience and Psychological Well-Being Levels of Faculty of Sports Sciences Students

Emre BOZ[1], Murat KUL [2]
[1]Bayburt University, Bayburt, Turkey
https://orcid.org/ 0000-0001-8117-9329
[2]Bayburt University, Bayburt, Turkey
https://orcid.org/ 0000-0001-6391-8079

Email: emrebboz@gmail.com, muratkul@bayburt.edu.tr

Type: *Research Article (**Received:** 22.04.2025 – **Accepted:** 06.08.2025)*

Abstract

The primary aim of the research is to examine the relationship between the emotional intelligence levels of students in the Faculty of Sports Sciences and their psychological resilience and psychological well-being levels. In line with this objective, a total of 314 students from all departments of Bayburt University's Faculty of Sports Sciences were included in the study. This study, conducted using the relational screening model, utilized 4 different forms of data collection. These are, respectively: "Personal Information Form", the "Rotterdam Emotional Intelligence Scale" and "Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale Short Form" and "Brief Psychological Resilience Scale". All collected data were analyzed in the SPPS (24th version) software package. During this process, frequency and percentage calculations were performed, followed by t-tests, ANOVA, Pearson and Spearman correlation analyses, as well as regression analyses significant findings were observed in relation to participants' emotional intelligence based on variables such as gender, department-class level, and years of sports experience. In terms of psychological well-being, significant differences were found for gender, class level, and years of sports experience, whereas in the psychological resilience parameter, only gender was found to have a significant effect. The relationship analyses revealed that all sub-dimensions of the Rotterdam Emotional Intelligence Scale were positively correlated with psychological well-being and psychological resilience. Regression analysis results indicated that emotional intelligence, as the independent variable, explained 52% of psychological well-being and 17% of psychological resilience. In conclusion, there is a relationship between emotional intelligence, psychological well-being, and psychological resilience levels of students in the Faculty of Sports Sciences.

Keywords: Sports sciences, student, emotional intelligence, psychological resilience, psychological well-being.

Introduction

Conducting research in various fields on university students and presenting unique data within each area contributes to the relevant field and is important for providing insights to various stakeholders. Among these areas, one of the most notable is undoubtedly research conducted to determine the areas of intelligence of university students (İzci & Sucu, 2014). Among the areas of intelligence, the study of emotional intelligence and attempts to explain it through various variables/parameters maintain their popularity. The main reason for this is that individuals with high emotional intelligence are more successful in their social lives because they are better at controlling negative emotions such as anger, low self-esteem, and anxiety, replacing them with positive emotions such as trust, empathy, and friendship (Geng, 2018).

In the literature, different views have been put forward regarding the definition of emotional intelligence, which has the characteristic of regulating social life and emotions. In this context, the most well-known definition is attributed to Salovey and Mayer (1990), and the mentioned researchers define emotional intelligence as the ability to recognize and regulate one's own emotions, as well as the ability to understand and respond effectively to the emotions of others. According to Goleman (1995), emotional intelligence is the ability to be aware of one's own mood, attitude, and preferences, as well as the ability to discern certain nonverbal aspects of communication.In another definition by Goleman (2001), this type of intelligence is defined as the ability to effectively perceive and understand the application of power and emotional sensitivity, as the source of human energy, information, connection, and influence. Mayer et al. (2001) add that emotional intelligence is the ability to monitor one's own or others' feelings and emotions and that this information can be used to guide thinking and behavior.

Based on these approaches to emotional intelligence in the literature, it is possible to say that individuals with high emotional intelligence are people who can make a difference in both their social and professional lives. In this context, individuals with high emotional intelligence are expected to also have high psychological resilience. Because, under stressful conditions, behaviors that possess emotional intelligence are adaptive in nature. Salovey et al. (1999) suggest that individuals with high emotional intelligence are better able to cope with emotional demands when confronted with negative situations. The reason for this is that they can accurately perceive and assess their emotions, know how and when to express them, and communicate more effectively. Therefore, emotional intelligence is assumed to buffer the effects of negative events through emotional self-awareness, expression, and management, and, as a result, it is considered a predictor of high psychological resilience.

Psychological resilience is a skill that emerges when encountering stressful situations and refers to the ability to cope with challenges. This skill encompasses elements such as coping with stress, maintaining emotional balance, and focusing positively on the future. Psychological resilience is a mental skill that an individual possesses when facing life's challenges (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013). This skill can help people act more resiliently and flexibly against challenges they encounter in their personal and social lives. Psychological resilience is an important resource that individuals can use to manage stressful situations, maintain their emotional well-being, and move forward with confidence into the future (Vella & Pai, 2019). Psychological resilience, which enhances an individual's inner strength and flexibility, enables more effective coping with and overcoming the challenges life presents. Psychological resilience helps a person understand, accept, and cope with the challenges they face (Graber, Pichon & Carabine, 2015). This characteristic enables an individual to have the psychological skills and resources necessary to cope with stress, trauma, loss, obstacles, or

challenges encountered in life. The process of increasing inner strength and flexibility helps an individual establish a healthy balance emotionally, mentally, and physically. By getting to know oneself better, an individual can discover their strengths and improve their weaknesses. Additionally, an individual gains mental flexibility by increasing their psychological resilience. This enables more effective coping with life's unexpected situations and enhances psychological well-being (Yöndem & Bahtiyar, 2019).

While psychological resilience refers to the ability to cope with challenges, psychological well-being refers to positive emotional states and overall life satisfaction. There is a strong relationship between these two concepts (Duman et al., 2020). Research shows that individuals with high psychological resilience generally have higher psychological well-being. An increase in psychological resilience improves coping skills for stress, enabling an individual to think more positively and live a healthier life (Sagone & De Caroli, 2014). Therefore, psychological resilience and psychological well-being are two important concepts that support each other. Indeed, when examining studies that explore the relationships between emotional intelligence, psychological resilience, and psychological well-being, which are considered to be interconnected, these relationships are substantiated. In this area, the research results of Akbari and Khormaiee (2015) emphasize that the three mentioned parameters have a predictive effect on each other. Bano and Pervaiz (2020) also emphasized the existence of the relationship between emotional intelligence, psychological resilience, and psychological well-being in university students and pointed out the importance of these parameters for university-level students. Based on the relevant data, it is thought that at this educational level, where university students acquire skills for both their social and professional lives, emotional intelligence, psychological resilience, and psychological well-being are important parameters, and further research is being conducted on these topics. Also, based on the thought that studies addressing these parameters should be increased in the local literature, this research aims to examine the relationships between emotional intelligence, psychological resilience, and psychological well-being levels of students studying in the Faculty of Sports Sciences.

Material and Method

Ethics committee permission: At the beginning of the study, approval was received from the Bayburt University Ethics Committee with document number 11.10.2023 E-15604681-100-161109.

Research Model

In the research, the relational survey model, which is one of the descriptive survey models, was used. The primary objective of this model is to determine the existence of a relationship between two or more variables and, if such a relationship is present, to assess its direction and magnitude (Büyüköztürk et al., 2017). Through the application of this model, the study seeks to analyze the relationship between the emotional intelligence levels of students enrolled in the Faculty of Sports Sciences and their psychological resilience and psychological well-being, taking into account various influencing factors.

Research Group

The study research group consists of students enrolled in the Faculty of Sports Sciences at Bayburt University during the Fall semester of the 2023-2024 academic year, who were selected through a convenience sampling method. Registered number of students in this semester is 1021 and the number of registered students constitutes the population. The sample consists of 314 voluntarily participating students.

Data Collection Instruments

In order to collect data, four distinct forms were administered to the participants. These forms include, respectively: the "Personal Information Form," the "Rotterdam Emotional Intelligence Scale," the "Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale – Short Form," and the "Brief Psychological Resilience Scale.".

Personal Information Form

This form, developed by the researchers, was used to collect demographic data from the participants. Within this framework, the form includes information on variables such as age, gender, academic department and class level, as well as sports experience.

Rotterdam Emotional Intelligence Scale

The Rotterdam Emotional Intelligence Scale, originally developed by Pekaar et al. (2017), was later adapted into Turkish by Tanrıöğen and Türker (2019). The scale consists of 28 items and is structured into four subdimensions. In terms of reliability of the scale, Cronbach Alpha Coefficient was .91 in the dimension of evaluating their own emotions, .91 in the dimension of evaluating the feelings of others, .89 in the dimension of controlling their own emotions, .93 in the dimension of controlling others' emotions, and .94 in the overall scale (Tanrıöğen & Türker, 2019)

Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale Short Form (WEMWBS-SF)

Warwick Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale was developed by Tennant et al. (2007) to measure the mental well-being levels of individuals in England. The scale consists of 14 positive items covering “psychological well-being” and “subjective well-being”. High scores obtained from the scale are indicative of high mental well-being. Reliability and validity studies of the Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale Short Form (WEMWBS-SF) in Turkish language were conducted by Keldal (2015) and it is a 5-point Likert-type scale with a total of 7 items consisting of positive statements. In the application, participants are asked to consider their experiences in the last two weeks. Alpha coefficient of the scale is 0.89.

Brief Psychological Resilience Scale

The Brief Psychological Resilience Scale developed by Smith et al. (2008) and adapted into Turkish by Akın et al. (2014) is a 5-point Likert-type and unidimensional scale consisting of 6 items. In the scale 2nd, 4th and 6th items were reverse coded. After the items of the scale are reverse coded, the psychological resilience score is obtained by summing the scores obtained from all items, and the possible score range that can be obtained from the scale varies between 6 and 30. High scores obtained from the scale indicate that psychological resilience is high (Akın et al., 2014).

Analysis of the Data

SPSS (version 24) software package was used for statistical analysis of the data. In this analysis process, first descriptive statistics were used. Then, Independent Sample t-test was used to compare paired groups and One-Way ANOVA was used to test variables with three or more groups. Spearman correlation analysis was used for age and sport age variables, while Pearson correlation analysis was used for scale sub-dimensions. Finally, regression analysis was used for predictive relationship tests. In the use of all these tests, the significance level “$p<0.05$” value range was taken into consideration.

Findings

The findings obtained as a result of the statistical analysis of the data collected within the scope of the research are presented in tables in this section of the study.

Table 1. Frequencies and percentages of demographic characteristics of the research group.

Variables	Groups	*f*	%
Gender	Female	127	40.4
	Male	187	59.6
Study Department	Physical Education and Sports	61	19.4
	Coaching Education	51	16.2
	Sports Management	120	38.2
	Recreation	82	26.1
Grade Level of Study	1st grade	104	33.1
	2nd grade	120	38.2
	3rd grade	26	8.3
	4th grade	64	20.4
Total		314	100

Table 1 presents data on the frequency and percentage values of the demographic characteristics of the research group. According to these data, 40,4% (*f*=127) of the university students constituting the research group were female, while 59,6% (*f*=187) were male. According to the variable of the department of study, 19,4% of them are studying in the department of "Physical Education and Sports Education" (*f*=61), 16,2% in the department of "Coaching Education" (*f*=51), 38,2% in the department of "Sports Management" (*f*=120) and 26,1% in the department of "Recreation" (*f*=82). According to the data related to the grade level variable, 33,1% of the students are studying in "1st grade" (*f*=104), 38,2% in "2nd grade" (*f*=120), 8,3% in "3rd grade" (*f*=26) and 20,4% in "4th grade" (*f*=64).

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for age, sport age and scales.

	n	$\bar{X}$	Median	sd.	Mini.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis
Age (Year)	314	21.00	21.000	2.503	18.00	40.00	2.433	12.789
Sports Age (Year)	314	6.46	6.000	3.851	1.00	27.00	1.062	2.513
Assessing Own Emotions	314	24.59	24.571	4.176	11.43	30.71	-0.430	0.218
Assessing the Emotions of Others	314	23.34	23.571	4.390	12.14	30.71	-0.083	-0.486
Controlling Own Emotions	314	23.02	23.071	4.686	9.57	30.71	-0.284	-0.148
Controlling the Emotions of Others	314	23.01	23.357	4.586	12.29	30.71	0.033	-0.716
Emotional Intelligence Total Score	314	93.97	92.785	14.770	55.86	122.86	0.162	-0.427
Psychological Well-Being	314	27.18	27.000	4.817	11.00	35.00	-0.427	-0.019
Psychological Resilience	314	18.94	19.000	3.666	6.00	30.00	-0.127	0.769

Table 2 shows descriptive statistics related to age, sport age and scales. According to these data, the mean age of the research group was 21,00 (±2,503), while the mean sport age was calculated as 6,46 (±3,851). When the skewness and kurtosis values are analyzed, it is seen that age and sport age variables do not exhibit a normal distribution, but all other scale total scores and sub-dimensions exhibit a normal distribution. It is also possible to say that the normally distributed parameters are within the reference value range based on the relevant sources (see George, & Mallery, 2010; Tabachnick, & Fidell, 2013).

Table 3. T-test results of emotional intelligence, psychological well-being and psychological resilience values related to gender variables.

	Gender	n	X̄	sd.	t	p
Assessing Own Emotions	Female	127	23.67	4.306	-3.264	**.001***
	Male	187	25.22	3.978		
Assessing the Emotions of Others	Female	127	22.76	4.067	-1.991	**.047***
	Male	187	23.74	4.565		
Controlling Own Emotions	Female	127	22.55	4.668	-1.446	.149
	Male	187	23.33	4.685		
Controlling the Emotions of Others	Female	127	22.54	4.338	-1.483	.139
	Male	187	23.32	4.732		
Emotional Intelligence Total Score	Female	127	91.54	14.075	-2.421	**.016***
	Male	187	95.62	15.056		
Psychological Well-Being	Female	127	26.29	4.792	-2.746	**.006***
	Male	187	27.79	4.750		
Psychological Resilience	Female	127	18.21	3.458	-2.943	**.003***
	Male	187	19.43	3.728		

p<0,05

Table 3 presents the t-test results for emotional intelligence, psychological well-being, and psychological resilience values concerning the gender variable. According to these data, a statistically significant difference was found in favor of male participants in the sub-dimensions of "Evaluating Own Emotions" and "Evaluating the Emotions of Others" and "Emotional Intelligence Total Score" averages (p<0,05). At the same time, it was found that there were statistically significant differences in the mean scores of "Psychological Well-Being" and "Psychological Resilience" of the research group in terms of gender variable (p<0,05) and the findings were also in favor of male participants.

Table 4. ANOVA results of emotional intelligence, psychological well-being and psychological resilience values related to the department of study variable.

		Sum of Squares	sd.	Average of Squares	F	p	Difference
Assessing Own Emotions	Intergroup	93.165	3	31.055	1.794	.148	-
	Intragroup	5367.433	310	17.314			
	Total	5460.598	313				
Assessing the Emotions of Others	Intergroup	210.653	3	70.218	3.738	**.012***	Recreation > Sports Management
	Intragroup	5823.562	310	18.786			
	Total	6034.214	313				
Controlling Own Emotions	Intergroup	178.847	3	59.616	1.760	.122	-
	Intragroup	6695.916	310	21.600			
	Total	6874.762	313				

Controlling the Emotions of Others	Intergroup	206.425	3	68.808	3.345	**.020***	Recreation > Sports Management
	Intragroup	6377.076	310	20.571			
	Total	6583.500	313				
Emotional Intelligence Total Score	Intergroup	2617.576	3	872.525	4.115	**.007***	Recreation > Sports Managemen - Physical and Sports Education
	Intragroup	65724.382	310	212.014			
	Total	68341.958	313				
Psychological Well-Being	Intergroup	167.070	3	55.690	2.433	.065	-
	Intragroup	7096.844	310	22.893			
	Total	7263.914	313				
Psychological Resilience	Intergroup	36.430	3	12.143	.903	.440	-
	Intragroup	4170.538	310	13.453			
	Total	4206.968	313				

p<0,05

Table 4 shows the ANOVA results of emotional intelligence, psychological well-being and psychological resilience values related to the department of study variable. According to these data, a statistically significant difference was found in the sub-dimensions of "Evaluating the Emotions of Others" and "Controlling the Emotions of Others" (p<0,05). The results of the Tukey test indicated that this difference stemmed from recreation department students having higher average scores than sports management department students. In addition to these data, it was determined that there was a statistically significant difference in the total emotional intelligence scores of the research group (p<0,05). This difference is due to the fact that recreation department students have higher mean scores than both sport management and physical education and sport education department students. In psychological well-being and psychological resilience variables, no statistically significant difference was found according to the department of study (p>0,05).

Table 5. ANOVA results of emotional intelligence, psychological well-being and psychological resilience values for the grade level variable.

		Sum of Squares	**sd.**	**Average of Squares**	**F**	**p**	**Difference**
Assessing Own Emotions	Intergroup	142.025	3	47.342	2.759	**.042***	4th Grade > 1st Grade – 2nd Grade
	Intragroup	5318.572	310	17.157			
	Total	5460.598	313				
Assessing the Emotions of Others	Intergroup	70.116	3	23.372	1.215	.304	-
	Intragroup	5964.098	310	19.239			
	Total	6034.214	313				
Controlling Own Emotions	Intergroup	211.625	3	70.542	3.282	**.021***	4th Grade > 1st Grade – 2nd Grade
	Intragroup	6663.137	310	21.494			
	Total	6874.762	313				
Controlling the Emotions of Others	Intergroup	184.102	3	61.367	2.973	**.032***	4th Grade > 1st Grade – 2nd Grade
	Intragroup	6399.398	310	20.643			
	Total	6583.500	313				
Emotional Intelligence	Intergroup	1804.674	3	601.558	2.803	**.040***	4th Grade – 2nd Grade > 1st Grade
	Intragroup	66537.284	310	214.636			

Total Score	Total	68341.958	313				
Psychological Well-Being	Intergroup	234.328	3	78.109	3.445	**.017***	1st Grade > 3rd Grade – 4th Grade
	Intragroup	7029.586	310	22.676			
	Total	7263.914	313				
Psychological Resilience	Intergroup	87.373	3	29.124	2.192	.089	-
	Intragroup	4119.595	310	13.289			
	Total	4206.968	313				

p<0,05

Table 5 shows the ANOVA results of emotional intelligence, psychological well-being and psychological resilience values related to the grade level variable. According to these data, it was found that there was a statistically significant difference in the sub-dimensions of "Evaluating Own Emotions", "Controlling Own Emotions" and "Controlling Emotions of Others" (p<0,05). At the same time, it was determined that there was a statistically significant difference between the groups in total emotional intelligence scores (p<0,05). When the results of the post-hoc test were examined, it was seen that all these differences were due to the fact that students studying at the 4th grade level had higher mean scores than those studying at the 1st and 2nd grade levels. While there was no statistical difference between the groups regarding the psychological resilience values of the research group (p>0,05), it was determined that 1st grade students had higher mean scores in psychological well-being levels compared to 3rd and 4th grade students (p<0,05).

Table 6. Spearman correlation analysis results regarding age variable and emotional intelligence, psychological well-being and psychological resilience values.

		Assessing Own Emotions	Assessing the Emotions of Others	Controlling Own Emotions	Controlling the Emotions of Others	Emotional Intelligence Total Score	Psychological Well-Being	Psychological Resilience
Age	**r**	.041	.078	-.030	.084	.044	-.017	-.062
	p	.465	.166	.593	.137	.436	.770	.273
	n	314	314	314	314	314	314	314

Table 6 shows the results of the Spearman correlation analysis regarding the age variable of the research group and emotional intelligence, psychological well-being and psychological resilience values. According to these data, there is no statistical relationship between the participants' biological age and their emotional intelligence, psychological well-being and psychological resilience values (p>0.05).

Tablo 7. Results of Spearman correlation analysis regarding the sports age variable and emotional intelligence, psychological well-being and psychological resilience values.

		Assessing Own Emotions	Assessing the Emotions of Others	Controlling Own Emotions	Controlling the Emotions of Others	Emotional Intelligence Total Score	Psychological Well-Being	Psychological Resilience
Sports age	**r**	.098	**.132***	.105	**.195****	**.149****	**.116***	.026
	p	.083	.019	.064	.001	.008	.040	.649
	n	314	314	314	314	314	314	314

p<0,05; **p<0,01

Table 7 shows the results of the Spearman correlation analysis of emotional intelligence, psychological well-being and psychological resilience values of the research group with the sport age variable. According to these data, it was determined that there was a positive low-level relationship between the participants' sports age and the sub-dimensions of "Evaluating the Emotions of Others" (p<0,05) and "Controlling the Emotions of Others" (p<0,01). Similarly, it was found that there was a positive low-level relationship between the participants' sport age and their emotional intelligence total scores (p<0,01). While there was no statistical relationship between the psychological resilience values of the research group and sport age (p>0,05), it was found that there was a positive low-level relationship between psychological well-being and sport age (p<0,05).

Table 8. Pearson correlation analysis results for Rotterdam emotional intelligence scale and psychological well-being and psychological resilience values.

		Assessing Own Emotions	Assessing the Emotions of Others	Controlling Own Emotions	Controlling the Emotions of Others	Emotional Intelligence Total Score
Psychological Well-Being	**r**	**.686****	**.526****	**.587****	**.447****	**.675****
	p	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	n	314	314	314	314	314
Psychological Resilience	**r**	**.359****	**.191****	**.370****	**.225****	**.345****
	p	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000
	n	314	314	314	314	314

p<0,01

Table 8 shows the results of Pearson correlation analysis regarding the responses of the research group to the Rotterdam emotional intelligence scale and their psychological well-being and psychological resilience values. According to these data, it was determined that there was a high positive correlation between psychological well-being and all sub-dimensions and total scores of the Rotterdam emotional intelligence scale (p<0,01). While there was a moderate positive correlation between psychological resilience and the sub-dimensions of "Appraisal of Own Emotions", "Control of Own Emotions" and total scores of the scale, there was a low positive correlation in the sub-dimensions of "Assessing the Emotions of Others" and "Controlling the Emotions of Others" (p<0,01).

Table 9. Regression analysis results regarding the effects of Rotterdam emotional intelligence scale sub-dimensions on psychological well-being.

	Non-Standard Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	t	p	Model 1		
	B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**			**Adjusted R^2**	**F**	**p**
Constant	5.206	1.240		4.197	.000	.519	85.413	**.000**
Assessing Own Emotions	.553	.062	.479	8.977	**.000**			
Assessing the Emotions of Others	.106	.065	.096	1.628	.105			
Controlling Own Emotions	.249	.054	.243	4.598	**.000**			
Controlling the Emotions of Others	.007	.058	.007	.127	.899			

Described Variable: Psychological Resilience
R=0,725; R^2=0,525; p=,000

As seen in Table 9 as a result of the regression analysis; the sub-dimensions of the Rotterdam Emotional Intelligence Scale are statistically significant predictors of psychological well-being (R=0,725; R^2=0,525; Adjusted R^2=0,519; p<0,05). These 4 variables together explain 52% of the change in the psychological well-being scores of the research group (Adjusted R^2=0,519). When the t-test results regarding the significance of the regression coefficients are examined, it is seen that the sub-dimensions of "Emotional Evaluation" and "Control of Emotions" are significant predictors of the psychological well-being variable (p<0,05).

Tablo 10. Regression analysis results regarding the effects of Rotterdam emotional intelligence scale sub-dimensions on psychological resilience.

	Non-Standard Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	t	p	Model 1		
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Adjusted R^2	F	p
Constant	.000	1.242		8.412	.000			
Assessing Own Emotions	.231	.062	.263	3.738	**.000**			
Assessing the Emotions of Others	-.130	.065	-.156	-1.999	**.046**	.167	16.652	**.000**
Controlling Own Emotions	.215	.054	.275	3.960	**.000**			
Controlling the Emotions of Others	.039	.058	.049	.672	.502			

Described Variable: Psychological Resilience
R=0,421; R^2=0,177; p=,000

According to the regression analysis results in Table 10, the Rotterdam emotional intelligence scale sub-dimensions together are statistically significant predictors of psychological resilience (R=0,421; R^2=0,177; Adjusted R^2=0,167; p<0,05). Together, these 4 variables explain 17% of the change in the psychological resilience scores of the research group (Adjusted R^2=0,167). When the t-test results regarding the significance of the regression coefficients are analyzed, it is seen that the sub-dimensions of "Assessing Own Emotions", "Assessing the Emotions of Others" and "Controlling Own Emotions" are significant predictors of the psychological resilience variable (p<0,05).

Discussion and Conclusion

The study was conducted to examine the relationship between the emotional intelligence levels of the students of the faculty of sport sciences and their psychological resilience and psychological well-being levels depending on various variables. In line with this purpose, findings related to variables such as gender, department, grade level, age and sports age of the participants were obtained. When these data were examined in relation to the gender variable, it was found that there was a statistically significant difference in favour of male participants in the sub-dimensions of '"Assessing Own Emotions'" and ''Assessing the Emotions of Others' from the emotional intelligence values of the participants and in the averages of 'Emotional Intelligence Total Score'. When the literature on the subject is examined, it is possible to find findings that overlap with our research findings. As a matter of fact, Gür et al. (2019), as a result of their research with adult individuals, stated that men have more skills in controlling their emotions and evaluating their emotions compared to women and that men's emotional intelligence is more developed. However, the results of many studies found in the literature review indicate that gender difference is not a predictor of emotional intelligence (Tunca, 2022; Fernández-Berrocal et al., 2012; Ahmad et al., 2009). This situation can be

explained by the process related to the development of emotional intelligence (Ekici & Ardahan, 2023). Because it is thought that emotional intelligence is a skill based on experiences in life, it can develop as a result of various stimuli, and for this reason, the gender variable does not have the ability to provide a definite idea on behalf of the individual's emotional intelligence.

Other data obtained regarding the gender variable are related to the psychological well-being and psychological resilience of the participants. Similarly, it was found that there were statistically significant differences in the mean scores of psychological well-being and psychological resilience regarding the gender variable and these findings were in favour of male participants. Firstly, when we examine the result of the research conducted by Duman et al. (2020), who obtained data contrary to our findings, with university students like our research group, no difference was found regarding the gender variable related to both psychological well-being and psychological resilience levels of university students. Değirmenci (2019) stated that demographic data such as gender are not determinative for both variables, but these data can be accessed due to the relationship between psychological well-being and psychological resilience and taking into account individual differences. Similarly, Sagone and De Caroli (2014) argue that psychological well-being and psychological resilience can develop through various stimuli and do not differ in terms of gender. These differences, which are in the opposite direction of our findings, are thought to be due to the individual differences of university students.

According to the data related to the department variable in which the students of the faculty of sport sciences who constitute the research group study, it was determined that the students of the department of recreation had higher average scores than the students of the department of sport management in the sub-dimensions of “Assessing the Emotions of Others” and “Controlling the Emotions of Others” among the emotional intelligence values and there was a statistically significant difference in the total scores of emotional intelligence. The difference in the data related to the total score of the scale is due to the fact that the students of the recreation department have a higher average score than the students of both sports management and physical education and sports education departments. In contrast to our findings, Karaoğlu et al. (2016) found that there was no difference in the emotional intelligence values of the students studying in these departments. Similarly, Özdenk (2018) found that there was no difference in emotional intelligence among students studying in the field of sports sciences. However, Yaykıran's (2021) research findings are in parallel with our results and indicate that the emotional intelligence scores of recreation department students are higher than those of sports management department students. The researcher argues that this situation is related to the nature of the recreation department. Yıldırım and Latifoğlu (2020) associated this situation with receiving training on leisure time utilisation. Researchers have stated that receiving recreational education increases the life satisfaction of individuals and accordingly, they are quite successful in evaluating both their own emotions and the emotions of the individuals around them.

No statistically significant difference was found in psychological well-being and psychological resilience variables according to the department of study. There are various sources in the literature on the subject related to these data obtained. When the results of these sources, which provide data specific to both students studying in the field of sports sciences and students studying in other fields, were examined, it was seen that no research found a statistical difference (Öntürk et al., 2020; Karademir & Açak, 2019; Gönener et al., 2017). In the light of all the data, it is thought that both psychological resilience and psychological well-being cannot be predicted on the basis of the department studied in the field of sport sciences.

It was determined that there was a statistically significant difference between the groups in the sub-dimensions of "Assessing Own Emotions", "Controlling Own Emotions" and "Controlling the Emotions of Others" and in the total scores of emotional intelligence depending on the class of study. All these differences were found to be due to the fact that the students studying at the 4th grade level had higher mean scores than the students studying at the 1st and 2nd grade levels. Yıldız (2016), who obtained data overlapping with our findings, found that the emotional intelligence of university students differed statistically depending on the increase in their grade levels. The researcher argues that this difference is due to the increase in bilateral relations and interactions required over time by studying in institutions that include interactive education programmes such as universities. Similarly, Yılmaz and Zembat (2019), who found that the emotional intelligence levels of 4th grade students were higher than 1st grade students, found a statistically significant difference between these class groups, as well as findings that this situation is related to the adaptation of students to the university. The researchers argue that the data are distributed in this direction as a result of the increase in the time spent in the university environment and adaptation to the university environment. It is thought that emotional intelligence, which is thought to be developed based on experience, may differ between individuals depending on all these reasons.

While there was no statistically significant difference between the groups regarding the psychological resilience values of the research group depending on the class variable, it was determined that 1st grade students obtained higher average scores in psychological well-being levels compared to 3rd and 4th grade students. As a result of Kırdemir and Karahüseyinoğlu's (2022) research in which they examined the flow experiences and psychological well-being levels of sport sciences faculty students, it was found that there was a statistically significant difference regarding the class variable. This difference showed that the mean psychological well-being scores of the 1st grade students were higher than the other grade groups and the lowest mean scores belonged to the 3rd and 4th grade students. Doğru (2018) also found that the highest mean score of psychological well-being among university students belonged to first-year students. As mentioned in the aforementioned studies and other studies in the literature, the anxiety and stress levels of individuals who are approaching their senior year and expect to enter professional life may increase (Altınay, 2022; Morales-Rodríguez et al., 2020). Accordingly, it is thought that the psychological well-being levels of 3rd and 4th grade students are lower.

There was no statistical relationship between the biological ages of the research group and emotional intelligence, psychological well-being and psychological resilience values. Regarding these data, firstly, when the studies on emotional intelligence were examined, various findings were not found. In this regard, statistically significant results were obtained in the research of Somoğlu and Zengin (2023), in which they examined the emotional intelligence levels of sports sciences faculty students regarding the age variable, and these results were that the group between the ages of 18-21 had high emotional intelligence compared to older age group individuals. Alkış and Akpınar (2019) presented findings that the emotional intelligence levels of university students did not differ in terms of age variable. Although statistical differences are seen in the age variable, it is thought that there is no consensus on this issue in the literature and that the biological age of individuals is not suggestive for emotional intelligence levels. Similarly, it is also possible to say that the biological age factor is insufficient to predict psychological resilience and psychological well-being, considering the literature on the subject (Kim et al., 2021; Kumar, 2019).

It was found that there was a positive low-level relationship between the participants' sporting age and their "'Assessing the Emotions of Others'" - "'Controlling the Emotions of Others'"

and emotional intelligence total scores. Toktaş and Demir (2023) also obtained data overlapping with our research findings and stated that there was a difference in the sports age of university students who actively participated in sports. In Karademir's (2023) study, it was found that there was a significant difference in the use of emotions and this difference was due to the fact that the group with older sports age had higher emotional intelligence averages than the younger group. Somoğlu and Zengin (2023), who also presented data parallel to our findings, found that the emotional intelligence levels of the students of the faculty of sport sciences differed according to the sport age variable. As a matter of fact, various research results have also determined that participation in sports activities for many years helps to manage emotions in a controlled manner (Magrum et al., 2018; Laborde et al., 2016). Both in our research group and in the literature on the subject, it is thought that the data on sports age is based on the competitive emotion control in the nature of sports.

While there was no statistical relationship between the psychological resilience values of the research group and sport age, it was determined that there was a positive low-level relationship between psychological well-being and sport age. When the results of Biricik's (2023) research on psychological well-being are examined, the data obtained show that participants with older sport age have higher psychological well-being than younger participants. Similarly, Ersöz (2021) mentioned the benefits of doing sports on behalf of psychological well-being in his research. Şahin et al. (2015) stated that as a result of their research in which they examined subjective well-being on the basis of sport, individuals have psychological well-being with the pleasure they receive depending on the duration of their participation in sport. For this reason, the psychological well-being of individuals with high sports age is also determined at a high level.

Finally, as a result of the analysis conducted to examine the relationship between emotional intelligence, psychological well-being and psychological resilience levels of the research group; it was determined that there was a positive high level relationship between psychological well-being and all sub-dimensions and total scores of the Rotterdam emotional intelligence scale. While there was a positive medium-level relationship between psychological resilience and the sub-dimensions of “Assessing Own Emotions”, “Controlling Own Emotions” and total scores of the scale, it was found that there was a positive low-level relationship in the sub-dimensions of “Assessing Others’ Emotions” and “Controlling the Emotions of Others”. In other words, it is thought that with the increase of a related parameter between emotional intelligence, psychological well-being and psychological resilience, the others may also exhibit positive development. As a result of the regression analyses conducted to explain these data more clearly, it was determined that emotional intelligence, which is our independent variable, explained 52% of psychological well-being and 17% of psychological resilience. The relationship between the related variables is supported not only by our research findings but also by the data in the literature. In this sense, all the research results found a positive relationship between these three variables (Lee & Kim, 2023; Kökçam et al., 2022; Guerra-Bustamante et al., 2019; Trigueros et al., 2019; Özer & Deniz, 2014). In addition to the aforementioned studies, the scarcity of studies on these three variables draws attention and the research results support our findings. The research conducted by Shou et al. (2022) with university students can be given as an example in this sense. These researchers stated that there is a positive relationship between emotional intelligence, psychological well-being and psychological resilience of university students and that advanced emotional intelligence is a predictor of psychological well-being and psychological resilience. This situation is explained by various researchers that people who are successful in perceiving and controlling their own emotions and the emotions of

individuals around them feel psychologically well and feel more resilient in all possible relationships and situations (Lee et al., 2017; Akbari & Khormaiee, 2015). For this reason, it is thought that there is a relationship between emotional intelligence, psychological well-being and psychological resilience.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, S., Bangash, H., & Khan, S. A. (2009). Emotional intelligence and gender differences. *Sarhad J. Agric, 25*(1), 127-130.

Akbari, A., & Khormaiee, F. (2015). The prediction of mediating role of resilience between psychological well-being and emotional intelligence in students. *International Journal of School Health, 2*(3), 1-5.

Akın, A., Sahranç, Ü., Turan, M. E., Akın, Ü., Kaya, M., & Ercengiz, M. (2014). Validity and reliability of the Turkish form of the Brief Psychological Resilience Scale. III. Sakarya Educational Research Congress, 12.

Alkış, H., & Akpınar, F. (2019). Emotional intelligence and entrepreneurship tendency: A research on Adıyaman University students. *Adıyaman University Social Sciences Institute Journal*, (32), 341-379.

Altınay, N. (2022). *The relationship between interaction anxiety levels of prospective teachers and psychological well-being* (Master's Thesis). Uludağ University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Bursa.

Biricik, Y. S. (2023). The mediating effect of resilience on the relationship between burnout levels and psychological well-being of Turkish Olympic Preparation Center (TOHM) athletes. *The Online Journal of Recreation and Sports (TOJRAS), 12*(2), 70-84.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö.E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel F. (2017). *Scientific research methods (*23rd Edition). Ankara: Pegem Academy.

Değirmenci, B. (2019). The mediating role of optimism in the relationship between psychological resilience and psychological well-being of public employees. *Turkish Journal of Social Sciences Research, 4*(1), 47-63.

Doğru, N. (2018). *Investigation of psychological well-being levels of university students in terms of stress, coping styles and social support variables* (Doctoral Thesis). Ankara University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.

Duman, N., Göksu, P., Köroğlu, C., & Talay, A. (2020). The relationship between mental well-being and psychological resilience in university students. *Life Skills Journal of Psychology, 4*(7), 9- 17.

Ekici, M., & Ardahan, M. (2023). *On emotional intelligence*. Ankara: Akademisyen Kitabevi.

Ersöz, G. (2021). Eating disorders and their psychological foundations in sports and exercise. *Fenerbahçe University Journal of Sports Sciences, 1*(1), 33-52.

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.

Fletcher, D., & Sarkar, M. (2013). Psychological resilience. *European Psychologist, 18*(1), 12-13.

Geng, Y. (2018). Gratitude mediates the effect of emotional intelligence on subjective well-being: A structural equation modeling analysis. *Journal of Health Psychology, 23*(10), 1378-1386.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2010). In GEN (Ed.), *SPSS for Windows step by step. A simple study guide and reference*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc, 10.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.

Goleman, D. (2001). Emotional intelligence: Issues in paradigm building. *The Emotionally Intelligent Workplace, 13*, 26.

Gönener, A., Öztürk, A., & Yılmaz, O. (2017). The effect of mental (psychological) well-being levels of Kocaeli University Faculty of Sports Sciences students on their happiness levels. *Sportive View: Journal of Sports and Education Sciences, 4*(1), 44-55.

Graber, R., Pichon, F., & Carabine, E. (2015). *Psychological resilience*. London: Overseas Development Institute.

Guerra-Bustamante, J., León-del-Barco, B., Yuste-Tosina, R., López-Ramos, V. M., & Mendo-Lázaro, S. (2019). Emotional intelligence and psychological well-being in adolescents. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *16*(10), 1720.

Gür, E. Y., Öztürk-Altınayak, S., & Ejder-Apay, S. (2019). Examining emotional intelligence in terms of gender variable. *Gümüşhane University Journal of Health Sciences*, *8*(2) , 35-42.

İzci, E., & Sucu, H. (2014). Examining the multiple intelligence profiles of university students (Nevşehir University example). *Journal of İnönü University Institute of Educational Sciences, 1*(1), 12-21.

Karademir, M. B. (2023). The effect of emotional intelligence levels of volleyball players on team resilience: Antalya province example. *Yalova University Journal of Sports Sciences, 2*(3), 87-109.

Karademir, T., & Açak, M. (2019). Examining the psychological endurance levels of university athletes. *Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University Journal of Social Sciences*, *16*(2), 803-816.

Karaoğlu, B., Turan, M. B., & Pepe, O. (2016). Investigation of creativity levels and emotional intelligence levels of physical education and sports school students. *Gaziantep University Journal of Sports Sciences, 1*(2), 85-99.

Keldal, G. (2015). Warwick-Edinburgh Mental İyi Oluş Ölçeği'nin Türkçe formu: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *The Journal of Happiness & Well-Being, 3*(1), 103- 115.

Kırdemir, A., & Karahüseyinoğlu, M. F. (2022). *Flow experiences and psychological well-being of sports science students during distance education.* Ankara: İksad Publishing House.

Kim, E. S., Tkatch, R., Martin, D., MacLeod, S., Sandy, L., & Yeh, C. (2021). Resilient aging: Psychological well-being and social well-being as targets for the promotion of healthy aging *Gerontology and Geriatric Medicine*, 7, 23337214211002951.

Kökçam, B., Arslan, C., & Traş, Z. (2022). Do psychological resilience and emotional intelligence vary among stress profiles in university students? A latent profile analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 788506.

Kumar, R. (2019). Resilience, psychological well-being, and coping strategies in medical students. *Indian Journal of Psychiatric Nursing, 16*(2), 92-97.

Laborde, S., Dosseville, F., & Allen, M. S. (2016). Emotional intelligence in sport and exercise: A systematic review. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports, 26*(8), 862-874.

Lee, M., & Kim, B. (2023). Effect of the employees' mental toughness on organizational commitment and job satisfaction: Mediating psychological well-being. *Administrative Sciences, 13*(5), 133.

Lee, Y. E., Kim, E., Park, S. Y., Lee, Y. E., Kim, E., & Park, S. Y. (2017). Effect of self-esteem, emotional intelligence and psychological well-being on resilience in nursing students. *Child Health Nursing Research, 23*(3), 385-393.

Magrum, E. D., Waller, S., Campbell, S., & Schempp, P. G. (2019). Emotional intelligence in sport: A ten-year review (2008-2018). *International Journal of Coaching Science, 13*(2), 3-32.

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R., & Sitarenios, G. (2001). Emotional intelligence as a standard intelligence. *Emotion, 1*(3), 232–242.

Morales-Rodríguez, F. M., Espigares-López, I., Brown, T., & Pérez-Mármol, J. M. (2020). The relationship between psychological well-being and psychosocial factors in university students. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *17*(13), 4778.

Önturk, Y., Efek, E., & Yıldız, M. (2020). Investigating the psychological resilience of students in sports sciences faculty. *International Journal of Educational Methodology, 6*(2), 393-403.

Özdenk, S. (2018). Examining the emotional intelligence levels of university students receiving sports education. *Electronic Turkish Studies, 13*(18), 1033-1045.

Özer, E., & Deniz, M. (2014). Examining the psychological resilience levels of university students in terms of emotional intelligence. *Primary Education Online*, *13*(4), 1240-1248.

Sagone, E., & De Caroli, M. E. (2014). Relationships between psychological well-being and resilience in middle and late adolescents. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *141*, 881-887.

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality,9*(3), 185-211.

Salovey, P., Bedell, B. T., Detweiler, J. B., & Mayer, J. D. (1999). *Coping intelligently: Emotional intelligence and the coping process*. C.R. Snyder (Ed.), Coping: The Psychology of What Works, New York: Oxford University Press.

Shuo, Z., Xuyang, D., Xin, Z., Xuebin, C., & Jie, H. (2022). The relationship between postgraduates' emotional intelligence and well-being: the chain mediating effect of social support and psychological resilience. *Frontiers in psychology*, *13*, 865025.

Somoğlu, M. B., & Zengin, S. (2023). Determination of emotional intelligence levels of sports science faculty students. *Mediterranean Journal of Sports Sciences, 6*(3), 817-834.

Şahin, M., Baş, M., & Çelik, A. (2015). Subjective well-being and sports. *Journal of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, 17*(1), 23-31.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Tanrıöğen, A., & Türker, Y. (2019). Factor structure, validity and reliability study of the Turkish form of the Rotterdam Emotional Intelligence Scale. *Pamukkale University Faculty of Education Journal, 47*, 1-18.

Toktaş, S., & Demir, A.(2023). Investigation of emotional intelligence and mental endurance levels in sports of university students who actively participate in sports. *ROL Journal of Sports Sciences, Special Issue*(1), 455- 472.

Trigueros, R., Aguilar-Parra, J. M., Álvarez, J. F., González-Bernal, J. J., & López-Liria, R. (2019). Emotion, psychological well-being and their influence on resilience. A study with semi-professional athletes. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 16*(21), 4192.

Tunca, A. (2022). Examining emotional intelligence in children and adolescents according to gender: A meta-analysis study. *Celal Bayar University Journal of Social Sciences, 20*(2), 134-148.

Vella, S. L. C., & Pai, N. B. (2019). A theoretical review of psychological resilience: Defining resilience and resilience research over the decades. *Archives of Medicine and Health Sciences, 7*(2), 233-239.

Yaykıran, E. (2021). *Examining the relationship between emotional intelligence and personal and social responsibilities of university students* (Master's Thesis). Pamukkale University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Denizli.

Yıldırım, B., & Latifoğlu, G. (2020). The Relationship Between Leisure Time Satisfaction, Life Satisfaction and Emotional Intelligence. Congress Full Paper Book (p. 68). 2nd International Conference on Reflections in Interdisciplinary Education, 19-20 June, Near East University Campus, Nicosia/Cyprus.

Yıldız, M. (2016). The effects of emotional intelligence, life satisfaction and depression among university students according to gender and grade levels. *OPUS International Journal of Society Research, 6*(11), 451-474.

Yılmaz, H., & Zembat, R. (2019). Examining the relationship between emotional intelligence levels of preschool teacher candidates and their adaptation to university life. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Faculty of Education Journal*, (52), 118-136.

Yöndem, Z. D., & Bahtiyar, M. (2019). Psychological resilience and coping with stress in adolescents. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies, 4*(45), 53-62.