The International Journal of Indian Psychology ISSN 2348-5396 (Online) | ISSN: 2349-3429 (Print) Volume 13, Issue 1, January- March, 2025 DIP: 18.01.038.20251301, ODI: 10.25215/1301.038 https://www.ijip.in



**Research Paper** 

# Are Men and Women Psychologically Different Does It Matters

Mansoor Ahmad Lone<sup>1</sup>\*, Rohi Jan<sup>2</sup>, Aqib Rehman<sup>3</sup>

### ABSTRACT

Across fields like psychology, neuroscience, and sociology, there has been much discussion about the psychological differences between men and women. The interpretation and importance of these differences are still up for debate, despite research suggesting some differences in behavioural tendencies, emotional reactions, and cognitive processing. The psychological differences between men and women are critically examined in this essay, along with their applicability in social, professional, and personal contexts. In areas like spatial reasoning, emotional regulation, and stress response, biological factors-such as hormonal influences and variations in brain structure-contribute to discernible differences. However, cultural norms, environmental factors, and societal expectations frequently amplify or lessen these biological differences. Men are generally thought of as having the ability to take risks and solve problems, whereas women are frequently found to have higher levels of empathy and emotional intelligence. These characteristics, however, show substantial overlap and are not always applicable, making strict gender binary classifications problematic. The paper looks at how these psychological variations affect leadership styles, workplace dynamics, and interpersonal relationships in particular. It makes the case that a focus on differences that is too great can limit personal potential, reinforce gender bias, and reinforce stereotypes. Understanding and valuing psychological diversity, on the other hand, can promote more welcoming settings where people are respected for their individual qualities rather than their conformity to gender norms. Additionally, a critical analysis is provided regarding the significance of these psychological differences in attaining both personal fulfilment and societal equity. According to the paper, although it is vital to recognize differences, the importance of these differences shouldn't overshadow the universal human experiences that cut across gender boundaries. Regardless of gender-based presumptions, the emphasis here is on creating opportunities for everyone to develop and flourish according to their skills, passions, and goals. The paper ultimately promotes a fair viewpoint that aims to comprehend the complex ways in which differences influence human behaviour and interaction rather than downplaying or exaggerating them. This paper adds to a more knowledgeable discussion on gender and psychology by tackling these topics with scientific rigor and cultural sensitivity. In order to separate biological factors from sociocultural influences and to refute reductive narratives that impede the development of a more inclusive and equitable society, it urges additional research.

\*Corresponding Author

**Received:** January 20, 2025; Revision Received: January 22, 2025; Accepted: January 25, 2025 © 2025, Lone, M.A., Jan, R. & Rehman, A.; licensee IJIP. This is an Open Access Research distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any Medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>PG Student, School of Education and Behavioural Sciences, University of Kashmir Hazratbal Srinagar. <sup>2</sup>Research Scholar, Zakir Husain centre for Education Studies, School of Social Sciences, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>University of Stirling Scotland United Kingdom

# Keywords: Psychological Differences, Man, Woman, Society, Gender and Psychology

For centuries, researchers, scientists, and the general public have been captivated by the question of whether men and women have different psychological makeup. The nature of gender, how it affects behaviour, and its applicability in modern society are all topics of discussion that have their roots in both biological research and cultural discourse. The fundamental question at the centre of this debate is whether psychological differences are real, if they are significant, and how society should deal with them. In order to understand the significance of psychological differences between genders, this paper aims to unravel these complexities by examining the intersection of biology, culture, and individual variation (Kenrick, D. T. 2013).

It is still amusing and irritating to hear that men and women are so different from each other that it is as if they are from different planets. When John Gray's best-selling book Men are from Mars, Women are from Venus was first published in the early 1990s, it sold millions of copies. Several comedic stage productions and parodies have also been influenced by it, such as the off-Broadway comedy Men are from Mars, Women are from Venus, Live! Our glaring physical differences in size and anatomy are only one aspect of the complicated and divisive topic of psychological differences between the sexes. There are issues with precisely quantifying the causes, and there are often disputes regarding whether they are social or biological (Reis, H. T., & Carothers, B. J. 2014).

Considering our differences in personality makes these questions much more challenging. Generally speaking, there are some notable distinctions between men and women. Are these differences, however, the result of cultural or biological influences? How important do they really are in the real world? One explanation is that although most variations are minuscule, they can have substantial impacts when combined (SPENCE, J. T. 1981).

In terms of warmth, friendliness, anxiety, and mood sensitivity, women consistently rated themselves higher than men. Conversely, the men consistently assessed themselves as more assertive and open to new ideas. In terms of personality psychology terminology, the women scored higher on Agreeableness, Neuroticism, and one facet of Openness to Experience, while the men scored higher on one extraverted component and a distinct facet of Openness to Experience (Henley, N. M. 1985).

More than 17,000 participants from 55 different cultures were given personality questionnaires by a different research team in 2008, yielding similar results. Again, women performed better than men in conscientiousness, agreeableness, neuroticism, and the warm and gregariousness components of extraversion. It was evidently a critique that the participants were evaluating their own personalities. Perhaps the only reason for the differences between the men and women was that they had different self-descriptions. However, this seems unlikely given the results of another study by McCrae and colleagues that asked 12,000 participants from 55 different cultures to rate the personality of a man or woman they knew well instead of their own personality Archer, S. L., & Waterman, A. S. 1988).

Disparities in male and female personalities appear to persist well into old age. As with studies on younger people, another study compared the average personality differences between men and women aged 65 to 98 and discovered that older women tended to score higher on agreeableness and neuroticism than older men. The degree to which personality

traits differ between the sexes is still up for debate. Although the majority of large studies tend to find the most consistent gender differences in the two most important traits, neuroticism and agreeableness, other researchers have pointed out that if one were to look more closely, there might be more significant differences (Simon, R. W., & Nath, L. E. 2004).

According to evolutionary psychologists, these findings support the idea that the demands of survival placed on our distant ancestors—demands that were different for men and women—are what gave rise to our psychological traits today. In the competition for mates, men with more assertive personalities would have excelled, and in raising vulnerable children, women with more nurturing personalities would have succeeded. All subsequent generations would have inherited these traits (Prince-Gibson, E., & Schwartz, S. H. 1998).

This seems to contradict the idea that our personalities are shaped by the cultural expectations surrounding traditional gender roles. This surprising conclusion can be explained by the fact that the biological traits that cause personality differences between men and women are more common in cultures with greater gender equality. A situation like this would be in line with our understanding of how genes and environment interact to influence other psychological traits. For example, the more hereditary intelligence influences academic achievement, the more equal education is for all students. Another approach to this issue is to use an unconscious personality test. This involves using speed of keyboard replies—hitting different keyboard keys as fast as possible in response to different words—to test how quickly people associate words that describe themselves with those that describe different aspects of their personalities. Attempts to conform to cultural gender norms are thought to have no effect on the participants' outcomes because they are not aware of what they are saying about their personalities (Hyde, J. S. 1990).

It was discovered that men were slightly more assertive than women. Compared to men, women exhibited higher levels of extraversion, anxiety, trust, and, most importantly, tendermindedness (e.g., nurturance). Gender did not significantly differ in terms of social anxiety, impulsivity, activity, ideas (such as reflectiveness), locus of control, or orderliness. Gender differences in personality traits were relatively consistent across countries, educational levels, ages, and data collection years. It has been demonstrated that older women are more likely to be career-focused and find retirement difficult. While older women were more likely to report "poor" psychological symptoms, older men were more likely to observe changes in social activity (Chu, Tsz. 2022).

Marco Del Giudice asserts that while researchers often warn against overestimating gender differences, the opposite is also true. When people pretend that gender differences are less significant than they actually are, they are depriving themselves of an important piece of information about ourselves and others. Women have influenced men for a very long time, and men have influenced women. Because of this rich and complex past, we are the people we are today. If we understand this, our judgment will be more comprehensive and less superficial, regardless of whether we like who we are or would like to change it(Eagly, Alice & Revelle, William. 2022).

# The basis of Inquiry:

Throughout history, people have attempted to recognize and comprehend the differences between men and women, from ancient philosophies to contemporary science. In the past, explanations frequently depended on essentialist viewpoints, attributing variations to

© The International Journal of Indian Psychology, ISSN 2348-5396 (e) | ISSN: 2349-3429 (p) | 395

unchangeable, natural, or divine laws. Notwithstanding their simplicity, these concepts opened the door for additional scientific research. Modern research in psychology, sociology, and neuroscience offers a more sophisticated understanding of the ways in which environment and biology interact to influence psychological traits (Salleh, Nurul & Mustaffa, Che Su. 2016).

Research shows some differences in cognitive abilities, communication styles, decisionmaking processes, and emotional processing. Research has indicated, for instance, that women typically perform better on tasks requiring emotional intelligence and empathy, whereas men typically perform better on tasks requiring spatial reasoning. But these results are far from universal because there is a lot of overlap and strict classifications are challenged by exceptions (Cao, Hongjian& Zhou, Nan & Qiao, Jinhui& Wang, Lin-Xin & Liang, Yue & Li, Yijing& Wu, Shijia& Jiang, Zexuan& He, Jinbo. 2024).

### Nature vs. Nurture:

The interaction between nature and nurture is a crucial aspect of this conversation. Undoubtedly, some psychological traits are influenced by biological factors, such as differences in brain structure and hormones. Hormones like estrogen and testosterone, for example, affect stress reactions, aggressive behavior, and nurturing. Similarly, structural differences between the male and female brains, including differences in connectivity patterns, are revealed by imaging studies (Xue, Danni & Sun, Binghai& Li, Weijian& Li, Xinwei& Xiao, Weilong. 2024).

However, biological factors alone are insufficient to account for all psychological variations. Individuals' expression and development of psychological traits are significantly shaped by socialization, cultural norms, and environmental factors. The expectations, toys, and activities that boys and girls are exposed to from an early age can subtly shape their cognitive and emotional development. Understanding gendered psychology requires taking into account both biological predispositions and societal constructs, as this bidirectional influence of nature and nurture emphasizes (Lazar, Aryeh & Gewirtz-Meydan, Ateret. 2024).

# The Impact of Psychological Differences:

Recognizing psychological differences prompts important inquiries regarding their importance in a variety of contexts, such as leadership, education, the workplace, and interpersonal relationships. For instance, in interpersonal relationships, disparities in communication and emotional expression can either strengthen bonds or lead to miscommunication. Mutual respect and closer ties can be promoted by being aware of these dynamics (Browning, Wesley & Yildiz, Mustafa & Pickering, Carolyn. 2024).

Perceptions of leadership and teamwork in professional contexts are influenced by psychological traits that are frequently associated with one gender, such as empathy or assertiveness. Women are frequently praised for their transformative leadership styles, whereas men are typically perceived as more task-oriented leaders. But these preconceptions can be restrictive, keeping people from adopting different strategies for achievement and creativity (Lazenby, Corie. 2015).

# The Dangers of Overgeneralization:

Even though there is evidence of some psychological tendencies, it is important to refrain from making too many generalizations. When differences are overstated or essentialized,

© The International Journal of Indian Psychology, ISSN 2348-5396 (e) | ISSN: 2349-3429 (p) | 396

stereotypes that support gender inequality run the risk of being strengthened. For example, discriminatory practices can occur in both personal and professional settings when people assume that men are more decisive or that women are better caregivers. In addition to limiting personal potential, these biases impede societal advancement by upholding antiquated norms and roles.

### WHY DOES IT MATTER?

The societal and individual ramifications of psychological differences are what make them important. Should these distinctions be reframed to support equity and inclusivity, or do they serve as justification for the continuation of traditional gender roles? How society decides to understand and use these findings will determine the solution. Differences ought to be used to celebrate diversity and promote cooperation rather than to defend inequality. Deconstructing binary thinking and advancing a more inclusive view of human potential can be facilitated by acknowledging that each person is shaped by a distinct blend of biological, cultural, and personal factors (Crenshaw, K. 1991).

### Moving Toward a Balanced Perspective:

The argument made in this paper for a fair viewpoint that recognizes psychological variations without overstating their significance (Boland, R. J., &Tenkasi, R. V. 1995). Using this strategy entails:

**1. Scientific Rigor:** Emphasizing evidence-based research to differentiate between biological determinants and sociocultural influences. A rigorous scientific approach that carefully separates the roles of biology and sociocultural factors is necessary to comprehend the psychological differences between men and women. Avoiding oversimplifications and making sure that conclusions are based on solid data rather than conjecture or stereotypes require evidence-based research (Lee, A. S., & Hubona, G. S. 2009).

Biological factors, including hormonal effects and variations in brain anatomy, are fundamental in forming psychological characteristics. Behaviors like aggression, nurturing tendencies, and stress reactions are influenced by hormones like estrogen and testosterone. Neuroscience developments have brought attention to the structural and functional distinctions between the male and female brains, including differences in processing patterns and connectivity. According to these results, there may be some predispositions, but they don't work alone. The impact of socio-cultural factors, which mold the expression and perception of biological predispositions, is equally important. Children are socialized into gender roles at an early age through media representations, educational methods, and family dynamics. For example, girls might be guided toward empathy and caring behaviors, while boys are frequently encouraged to demonstrate independence and assertiveness. In addition to upholding traditional roles, these social expectations have a long-term impact on cognitive and emotional development (Giudice D.M. 2015).

Research based on evidence makes it easier to distinguish between biology and culture. Cross-cultural comparisons, longitudinal research, and neuroimaging technologies shed light on the ways in which culturally specific behaviors coexist with universal traits. As an illustration of the malleability of psychological traits, cross-cultural studies have demonstrated that gender differences in leadership styles and emotional expression vary greatly based on societal norms. Scholars can refute preconceptions, improve theories, and offer a more complex understanding of gendered psychology by focusing on scientific rigor. In addition to promoting inclusivity, this well-rounded strategy guarantees that people are free from stereotypes and can realize their full potential, which is influenced by both nature and nurture (Baker, S. W. 1980).

**2. Cultural Sensitivity:** Recognizing the role of cultural norms in shaping psychological traits and challenging stereotypes that hinder growth. Men and women's self-perceptions and interactions with the outside world are greatly influenced by cultural norms, which also have a significant impact on psychological traits and behaviors. A more inclusive and equitable society must be fostered by acknowledging the effects of these norms. Cultural sensitivity means recognizing how norms influence psychological expression, recognizing the variety of gendered experiences in various societies, and confronting stereotypes that impede individual and collective development (Beeghly, E. 2021).

Expectations regarding communication preferences, emotional expression, and career goals are governed by traditional gender roles in many cultures. For example, women may be expected to put empathy and caregiving first, while men may be encouraged to repress vulnerability and adopt assertive behaviors. Although these standards have the power to shape psychological growth, they frequently limit people's potential by imposing strict classifications that don't adequately capture the range of human variation (Bauer, N. M. (2015).

Cross-cultural research demonstrates how psychological characteristics vary among societies and how much behavior is influenced by cultural norms. For instance, women are more likely to assume leadership positions and display characteristics like independence and assertiveness that are typically associated with men in matrilineal societies. These results highlight how cultural context shapes traits and cast doubt on the universality of gendered psychological differences. However, It takes active participation in representation, policymaking, and education to combat stereotypes that are based on cultural norms. Societies can destroy negative stereotypes and empower people to flourish on their own talents and goals by advancing narratives that celebrate the variety of gender expressions. In addition to supporting the freedom to defy constrictive conventions, cultural sensitivity entails appreciating and respecting cultural diversity. We can foster environments that enable people to define their identities outside of social norms by addressing the interaction between psychology and culture. This will promote both individual and group development (Hong, Y., & Cheon, B. K. 2017).

**3. Individual Variability:** Valuing individual differences over rigid categorizations, allowing people to transcend traditional roles and expectations. Understanding individual variability, which emphasizes the diversity within and between genders, is crucial to comprehending human psychology. The distinctive qualities and skills of each person should not be overshadowed by the trends and averages that are frequently found in research. To build a society that enables people to go beyond conventional roles and expectations, it is essential to value individual differences over strict categorizations (Stein, H. F. 1977).

There is no gender-specific restriction on psychological characteristics like emotional intelligence, problem-solving abilities, and leadership styles. There is a substantial overlap between the sexes, despite some research suggesting that men and women tend to differ in some areas. Contrary to stereotypes that link these qualities exclusively to one gender, many women can think spatially well, and many men can show high levels of empathy. Restrictive

norms resulting from overgeneralization can prevent people from fully pursuing their potential (Olawoyin, R. (2018).

Structural gender classifications frequently reinforce stereotypes that can impede individual development and the advancement of society. For instance, men may be deterred from pursuing careers in caregiving or women from pursuing technical fields by traditional roles. These restrictions not only impede personal goals but also deny society access to a variety of skills and viewpoints. To value individual variability, one must see beyond dichotomous thinking and recognize the range of human characteristics. In place of predetermined expectations, it promotes the development of environments where individuals are evaluated and assisted according to their distinct strengths and capabilities. This viewpoint encourages inclusivity as well, making sure that people feel free to choose their own paths in spite of social expectations (Rozell, E. J., Pettijohn, C. E., & Parker, R. S. 2006).

In order to unleash the full potential of its members, society must embrace diversity and reject strict classifications. By enabling people to live authentically, this strategy not only helps individuals but also advances society by incorporating the voices of diverse and powerful people (Jindra, M. 2014).

When society adopts this viewpoint, it gets closer to a time when gender differences will be bridges rather than obstacles. People can be respected for their contributions as distinct, dynamic individuals rather than for fitting into preconceived notions of what it means to be a member of a group by cultivating an inclusive and respectful culture. Society can progress toward a more equitable view of gender by addressing these factors, where distinctions are viewed as enhancing rather than dividing. To achieve this change, systemic measures are needed, such as media representation that takes into account the variety of human experiences, laws that support gender equity, and education that questions conventional gender norms. Rather than erasing individuality, recognizing and appreciating differences as a strength rather than a weakness means establishing environments in which people can live in harmony and authenticity with one another (Henderson, L. (1991).

# CONCLUSION

Studies in psychology show that women are generally better at interacting with others and demonstrating empathy, while also reducing hostility and conflict. Whereas men perceive connection as a threat, women perceive separation as one. These gender differences can be reflected in the format of ads, making them more appealing to both sexes. In 1974, Maccoby and Jacklin identified hostility and empathy as important gender differences. When it comes to expressing hatred, there is compelling evidence that men outperform women in the majority of violent situations. When it came to empathy, men performed better than women (Chaplin, J. 2008).

These studies consistently demonstrate that men are more aggressive than women in a range of situations because men appear to be the more aggressive sex. When someone intends to hurt another, that could be considered aggression. Conversely, hurt can also be the desire to injure someone for its own sake or the goal of controlling someone else (for other reasons) by making them fearful. All levels of hurt are possible, from physical assault to vindictive daydreams (Arneil, B. 2010).

The study of gender differences in psychology has significant ramifications for our perceptions of both ourselves and other people; it is not just an academic endeavour.

© The International Journal of Indian Psychology, ISSN 2348-5396 (e) | ISSN: 2349-3429 (p) | 399

Although differences may exist, care, nuance, and a dedication to equity must be taken in how they are interpreted and applied. In order to support this continuing conversation, this paper aims to provide insights that dispel myths, value diversity, and promote a more inclusive and knowledgeable comprehension of gendered psychology. By adopting this perspective, we can promote a culture in which people's motivations and abilities surpass the limitations of conventional gender roles.

#### REFERENCES

- Archer, S. L., & Waterman, A. S. (1988). Psychological Individualism: Gender Differences or Gender Neutrality? Human Development, 31(2), 65–81. http://www.jstor.org/stable/267 67591
- Arneil, B. (2010). Social Decline and Diversity: The Us versus the Us's. Canadian Journal of Political Science / Revue Canadienne de Science Politique, 43(2), 273–287. http://www.j stor.org/stable/20743150
- Baker, S. W. (1980). Biological Influences on Human Sex and Gender. Signs, 6(1), 80–96. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3173967
- Bauer, N. M. (2015). Emotional, Sensitive, and Unfit for Office? Gender Stereotype Activation and Support Female Candidates. Political Psychology, 36(6), 691–708. http://www.jstor.or g/stable/43785872
- Beeghly, E. (2021). What's Wrong with Stereotypes? The Falsity Hypothesis. Social Theory and Practice, 47(1), 33–61. http://www.jstor.org/stable/45378051
- Boland, R. J., &Tenkasi, R. V. (1995). Perspective Making and Perspective Taking in Communities of Knowing. Organization Science, 6(4), 350–372. http://www.jstor.org/sta ble/2634993
- Browning, Wesley & Yildiz, Mustafa & Pickering, Carolyn. (2024). Gender Differences in Types of Aggression Used Among Dementia Family Caregivers. Innovation in Aging. 8. 154-155 . 10.1093/geroni/igae098.0498.
- Cao, Hongjian& Zhou, Nan & Qiao, Jinhui& Wang, Lin-Xin & Liang, Yue & Li, Yijing& Wu, Shijia& Jiang, Zexuan& He, Jinbo. (2024). Gender Minority Stressors and Psychological Distress Among Chinese Transgender and Gender Diverse People: Variable-Centered, Person-Centered, and Psychological Network Approaches. Archives of Sexual Behavior. 53. 3945-3972. 10.1007/s10508-024-03003-3.
- Chaplin, J. (2008). Beyond Multiculturalism But to Where? Public Justice and Cultural Diversity. Philosophia Reformata, 73(2), 190–209. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24709578
- Chu, Tsz. (2022). Psychological Differences between Men and Women: Nature vs. Nurture. Journal of Student Research. 11. 10.47611/jsrhs.v11i4.3549.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color. Stanford Law Review, 43(6), 1241–1299. https://doi.org/ 10.2307/1229039
- Eagly, Alice & Revelle, William. (2022). Understanding the Magnitude of Psychological Differences Between Women and Men Requires Seeing the Forest and the Trees. Perspectives on Psychological Science. 17. 174569162110460. 10.1177/17456916211046 006.
- Henderson, L. (1991). Law's Patriarchy [Review of The Female Body and the Law; Toward a Feminist Theory of the State; Feminism and the Power of Law, by Z. R. Eisenstein, C. A. MacKinnon, & C. Smart]. Law & Society Review, 25(2), 411–444. https://doi.org/10 .2307/3053805
- Henley, N. M. (1985). Psychology and Gender. Signs, 11(1), 101–119. http://www.jstor.org/stable/ 3174289
- Hong, Y., & Cheon, B. K. (2017). How Does Culture Matter in the Face of Globalization? Perspectives on Psychological Science, 12(5), 810–823. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4859 6949
  - © The International Journal of Indian Psychology, ISSN 2348-5396 (e) | ISSN: 2349-3429 (p) | 400

- Hyde, J. S. (1990). Meta-Analysis and the Psychology of Gender Differences. Signs, 16(1), 55–73. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3174607
- Jindra, M. (2014). The Dilemma of Equality and Diversity. Current Anthropology, 55(3), 316–334. https://doi.org/10.1086/676457
- Kenrick, D. T. (2013). Men and Women Are Only as Different as They Look! Psychological Inquiry, 24(3), 202–206. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43865640
- Lazar, Aryeh & Gewirtz-Meydan, Ateret. (2024). The double-edged sword of sexual sanctification: Moderation of the associations between sexual dysfunctions and sexual and psychological well-being. Archive for the Psychology of Religion. 10.1177/00846724241 295780.
- Lazenby, Corie. (2015). Assertiveness and Leadership Perceptions: The Role of Gender and Leader-Member Exchange. 10.13140/RG.2.1.2536.3369.
- Lee, A. S., & Hubona, G. S. (2009). A Scientific Basis for Rigor in Information Systems Research. MIS Quarterly, 33(2), 237–262. https://doi.org/10.2307/20650291
- Olawoyin, R. (2018). Emotional Intelligence: Assessing Its Importance in Safety Leadership. Professional Safety, 63(8), 41–47. https://www.jstor.org/stable/48690086
- Prince-Gibson, E., & Schwartz, S. H. (1998). Value Priorities and Gender. Social Psychology Quarterly, 61(1), 49–67. https://doi.org/10.2307/2787057
- Reis, H. T., & Carothers, B. J. (2014). Black and White or Shades of Gray: Are Gender Differences Categorical or Dimensional? Current Directions in Psychological Science, 23(1), 19–26. http://www.jstor.org/stable/44319029
- Rozell, E. J., Pettijohn, C. E., & Parker, R. S. (2006). Emotional Intelligence and Dispositional Affectivity as Predictors of Performance in Salespeople. Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, 14(2), 113–124. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40470254
- Salleh, Nurul & Mustaffa, Che Su. (2016). Examining the Differences of Gender on Psychological Well-being. International Review of Management and Marketing. 6. 82-87.
- Simon, R. W., & Nath, L. E. (2004). Gender and Emotion in the United States: Do Men and Women Differ in Self-Reports of Feelings and Expressive Behavior? American Journal of Sociology, 109(5), 1137–1176. https://doi.org/10.1086/382111
- SPENCE, J. T. (1981). Changing Conceptions of Men and Women: A Psychologist's Perspective. Soundings: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 64(4), 466–484. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4116 7491
- Stein, H. F. (1977). Identity and Transcendence. The School Review, 85(3), 349–375. http://www .jstor.org/stable/1084780
- Xue, Danni & Sun, Binghai& Li, Weijian& Li, Xinwei& Xiao, Weilong. (2024). The Relationship between Resiliency, Psychological Empowerment, and Teacher Burnout across Different Genders: A Psychological Network Analysis. Behavioural Sciences. 14. 878. 10.3390/bs1 4100878.

#### Acknowledgment

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

### **Conflict** of Interest

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

*How to cite this article:* Lone, M.A., Jan, R. & Rehman, A. (2025). Are Men and Women Psychologically Different Does It Matters. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, *13*(1), 393-401. DIP:18.01.038.20251301, DOI:10.25215/1301.038