The Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence Dimensions And Conflict Management Strategies Of Academics In Selected Turkish Universities

Aslı ÖZDEMİR[*]
Muhammet KÖSECİK[**]
Sabahat Bayrak KÖK[***]

Abstract: This study aims to identify dimensions of emotional intelligence of academics and to reveal their conflict management strategies at selected Turkish Universities with focusing whether there are significant changes in dimensions and conflict management strategies of respondent academics depending on demographic variables. The research carried out at four Turkish universities further investigated the relationships between emotional intelligence and conflict management strategies of academics. Findings indicated that motivation and social skills dimensions of academics in general and of academics lacking PhD degree need improvement as does male academics' empathy dimension. Integrating strategy was found to be the most preferred strategy of academics while obliging strategy seemed to be the least used style in handling conflicts. Results revealed that motivation, social skills and dimensions of respondent academics are positively associated with integrating strategy as the effective way of handling interpersonal conflicts and enhancing job performance.
Keywords: Emotional intelligence, Conflict management, Academics.

Seçilen Türk Üniversitelerinde Akademisyenlerin Duygusal Zeka Boyutları Ve Çatışma Yönetimi Stratejileri Arasındaki İlişki

Özet: Bu çalışmanın amacı, cevaplayıcıların demografik değişkenlere bağlı olarak duygusal zeka boyutları ve çatışma yönetimi stratejilerinde değişme olup olmadığına odaklanarak seçilen Türkiye üniversitelerindeki akademisyenlerin duygusal zeka boyutlarını saptamak ve çatışma yönetimi stratejilerini ortaya koymaktır. Araştırma dört Türk üniversitesinde gerçekleştirilerek akademik personelin duygusal zekaları ve çatışma yönetimi stratejileri arasındaki ilişkiler incelenmiştir. Bulgular, genel olarak akademisyenlerin ve doktora derecesi olmayan akademisyenlerin motivasyon ve sosyal beceriler boyutları ile erkek akademisyenlerin empati boyutunun geliştirilmesi gerektiğini ortaya koymuştur. Çatışmaların yönetiminde, işbirliği stratejisi en çok ve başkasını tanıma stratejisi de en az tercih edilen strateji olarak görülmektedir. Sonuçlar, cevaplayıcı akademisyenlerin motivasyon ve sosyal beceriler boyutları ile kişilerarası çatışmaları çözmenin ve işteki performansı arttırmanın etkin bir yolu olan işbirliği stratejisinin pozitif ilişkili olduğunu ortaya koymuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Duygusal Zeka, Çatışma Yönetimi, Akademisyenler.

[*] Araş. Gör. Dr., Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi İşletme Bölümü Sayısal Yöntemler Anabilim Dalı
[**] Doç. Dr., Pamukkale Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü Yönetim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı
[***] Prof. Dr.,Pamukkale Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi İşletme Bölümü, Yönetim ve Organizasyon Anabilim Dalı

INTRODUCTION: EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

Emotional intelligence (EI) has become a popular concept or topic today for individuals and all types of organizations since it is suggested by considerably number of studies in recent years as one of major factors affecting individual and organizational success. The term, EI, had its roots in Thorndike (1920) and Thorndike and Stein (1937) with concept of "social intelligence" used to describe the skills of getting along with other people. Wechsler (1940) defined intelligence as "the aggregate or global capacity of the individual to act purposefully, to think rationally, and to deal effectively with his environment." Leuner (1966) used the term as the first time discussing those women who reject their social roles due to their separation at an early age from their mothers and they had a low "emotional intelligence". The work of these early pioneers of the term largely forgotten or overlooked until Gardner (1983) wrote about "multiple intelligence", as Cherniss (2000) emphasised. Gardner proposed that "intrapersonal" (or emotional) and "interpersonal" (or social) intelligences are as important as the type of intelligence traditionally measured by intelligence quotient (IQ) and related tests.

Weisenger (1985, 1998) documented and illustrated the effect of emotions in personal and work settings. He defined emotional intelligence as the intelligent use of emotions. He emphasized the importance of intentionally learning and making emotions work to enhance results both intrapersonally (helping self) and interpersonally (helping others). Mayer and Salovey defined emotional intelligence in 1990, a first formal theory of emotional intelligence, "as the subset of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one's own and other's feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions" (Salovey and Mayer, 1990: 189). In 1997, they updated this approach with the four-branch model by a slightly redefining emotional intelligence as "the ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions so as to assist thought, to understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and to reflectively regulate emotions so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth" (Mayer & Salovey, 1997: 5). This definition of emotional intelligence describes four areas of capacities or skills, simply repeating, accurately perceiving emotions, using emotions to facilitate thinking, understanding emotional meanings and managing emotions to promote one's own and other's personal and social goals.

It was Goleman (1995) who popularized the term in 1990s by the publication of his book on emotional intelligence. He defined emotional intelligence as "abilities such as being able to motivate oneself and persist in the face of frustrations; to control impulse and delay gratification; to regulate one's moods and keep distress from swamping the ability to think; to empathize and to hope." He argued that IQ contributes only about 20% to success in life, and other forces contribute the rest. Emotional intelligence can be powerful as IQ and sometimes even more and emotionally intelligent people are more likely to succeed in everything they undertake. He widened the definition of emotional intelligence later (1998) even further suggesting that emotional intelligence includes over 25 characteristics everything from self awareness and to such diverse qualities as teamwork and collaboration, service orientation, initiative, achievement motivation nearly every human style or capacity that was not IQ itself. Goleman's version of EI is known as a "mixed model" which claims that emotional intelligence has a higher predictive validity for performance in the work place than traditional measures.

According to Bar-On's (1996) definition, emotional intelligence reflects our ability to deal successfully with other people and with our feelings. He developed the Bar-On EQ-i (1997) after 17 years of research which is the first scientifically developed and validated measure of emotional intelligence reflecting one's ability to deal with environmental challenges and helps predict one's success in life both for professional and personal pursuits. Bar-On renamed term as "emotional-social intelligence" (ESI) which is composed of a number of intrapersonal and interpersonal competencies, skills and facilitators that combine to determine effective human behaviour (2000, 2006).
Relevant studies argued that cognitive abilities such as memory and problem solving named as IQ is not a very good predictor of job performance and non-cognitive abilities called emotional intelligence are also important. Hunter and Hunter estimated that at best IQ accounts for 25 percent of the variance (1984). According to Sternberg (1996), 10 percent may be a more realistic estimate. In some studies, IQ accounts for as little as 4 percent of the variance. Another interesting example is a study of 80 Ph.D.'s in science who underwent a series of personality tests and interviews in the 1950s when they were graduate students at Berkeley. Forty years later, when they were in their early seventies, they were tracked down and estimates were made of their success based on resumes, evaluations by experts in their own fields, and sources like American Men and Women of Science. It turned out that social and emotional abilities were four times more important than IQ in determining professional success and prestige (Feist and Barron, 1996). Cooper and Sawaf (1998) asserted that many people with a higher IQ would not consistently succeed in their personal or professional life, due to scarcity of control over their emotions, or they could manage a full control of their emotions and anxiety, but not be able to emotionally tune in with others.

However, in a recent meta-analysis examining the correlation and predictive validity of emotional intelligence when compared to IQ or general mental ability, IQ was found to be better predictor of work and academic performance than EI (Van Rooy and Viswesvaran, 2004). Indeed, it was found that academic intelligence was low and inconsistently related to emotional intelligence (Zee, Thijs and Schakel, 2002). Another study found none of the EQ-I factor scores, nor the total EQ-i score, was significantly related to academic achievement while both cognitive ability and personality were significantly associated with academic achievement (Newsome, Day and Catana, 2000). Contrary to these findings, in recent studies, Parker et al., (2001, 2002, 2004), Parker et al. (2003) discovered that several dimensions of emotional intelligence strongly associated with academic success. Nevertheless, as it comes to the question of whether a person will become a "star performer" (in the top ten per cent) within that position or to be an outstanding leader, however, IQ may be less powerful predictor than emotional intelligence (Emmerling and Goleman, 2003).

Summing up the debate, emotional intelligence can not be considered as a replacement or substitute for ability, knowledge or skills. Emotional intelligence enhances workplace success but does not guarantee it in the absence of suitable skills. Cognitive and non-cognitive abilities complement each other and they are very much related in fact, emotional intelligence and social skills actually help improve cognitive functioning (Cherniss, 2000). For instance, in a study at Stanford University, a group of students were asked to stay in a room alone and with a marshmallow and wait for a researcher to return, and told that they could have two if they could wait until the researcher came back before eating the marshmallow. Ten years later, the kids were tracked down and found that the kids who were able to resist temptation had a considerably higher SAT score than those kids were unable to wait (Schoda, Mischel and Peake, 1990). In another study, emotional intelligence was found to be significantly related to college students' GPA scores, student cognitive ability scores and student age and emphasised that academic achievement is related to students' ability to recognize, use and manage their emotions (Drago, 2004).

Arguing that the notion of "emotional intelligence is important for success in work and in life" is somewhat simplistic and misleading (Cherniss, 2000: 7). The suggestion presented by Goleman (1998) and Mayer, Salovey and Caruso (1998) seems to be more realistic, emotional intelligence probably is not a strong predictor of job performance, rather it provides the bedrock for competencies.

Various inventories were developed to measure abilities in emotional intelligence models. Most used ones of those models are Salovey and Mayer's (1990) (Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS), Mayer-Salovey-Caruso (1999) Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT), Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI) 360 (Goleman 1995), Bar-On (1997) Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-I).
In this study, Goleman's model of emotional intelligence (1998) is used to examine relationship between emotional intelligence and conflict management strategies of academics who work at selected universities in Turkey. Emotional intelligence in the model contains five components, self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy and social skills. *Self Awareness* associated with emotional awareness (recognising one's emotions and their effects), accurate self-assessment (knowing one's strengths and limits) and self confidence (a strong sense of one's self worth and capacities). *Self-regulation* is associated with self-control (keeping disruptive emotions and impulses in check), trustworthiness (maintaining standards of honesty and integrity, conscientiousness (taking responsibility for personal performance), adaptability (flexibility in handling change) and innovation (being comfortable with novel ideas, approaches and new information). *Motivation* refers to achievement drive (striving to improve or meet a standard or excellence), organizational commitment (aligning with the goals of the group or organization), initiative (readiness to act on opportunities), and optimism (persistence in pursuing goals despite obstacles and setbacks). *Empathy* refers to understanding and developing others (sensing others' feelings and perspectives and taking an active interest in their concern, sensing others' development needs and encouraging their abilities), service orientation (anticipating recognising and meeting customers' needs), leveraging diversity (cultivating opportunities through different kinds of people), and political awareness (reading a group's emotional currents and power relationships). *Social Skills* refers to influence (wielding effective tactics for persuasion), communication (listening openly and sending convincing messages), conflict management (negotiating and resolving disagreements), leadership (inspiring and guiding individuals and groups), change catalyst (initiating or managing change), building bonds (nurturing instrumental relationships), collaboration and co-operation (working with others towards shared goals) and team capabilities (creating group synergy in pursuing collective goals).

CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

Conflict is a certain aspect of human nature and seen in all social relations or groups and professional organizations. "It occurs among family members, friends, colleagues and even between superiors and subordinates. As long as there is a

human element present, conflict is certain" (Suppiah and Rose, 2006: 1905). Individuals who never experience conflict at the workplace are "living in a dream world, blind to their surroundings or are confined to solitary confinement" as Rose *et a*l. (2007: 121) quoted from Boohar (2001).

Conflict in the workplace or among colleagues/employees requires sensitive handling as its management is one of the crucial investment for long term viability and success for a business (Oudeh, 1999). Robbins (2001) argued that when conflict based on real problems is ignored, suppressed, or denied, it may cause distrust and defensiveness, as well as have the negative effect on group self-improvement and productivity. It was found that managers spent up to 20% of their time dealing with conflict or its consequences (Thomas and Schmidt, 1976, Rahim, 1990). A similar situation was seen in higher education, deans of student affairs at a college reported that they spent up to three-fourths of their time in dealing with conflict. McElhaney (1996) suggested that "conflict management is equal to if not slightly higher than in importance than planning, communication, and motivation and decision-making." Well-managed conflicts create a conducive workplace for its workers where relationships trust and respect will prevail among its employees (Gill, 1992). Such a working environment will result in stimulated team spirit and increased productivity (Suppiah and Rose, 2006).

Various definitions are available for conflict management with the absence of a comprehensive definition. These definitions vary according to researcher's perception of conflict, whether they see it a process, a struggle or an interaction. Thomas (1976) defined conflict as "the process which begins when one party perceives that the other has frustrated, or is about to frustrate, some concern of his." For Wall and Callister (1995), conflict is "a process in which one party perceives that its interests are being opposed or negatively affected by another party". According to Rahim (2001) conflict is "an interactive process manifested incompatibility, disagreement, or dissonance within or between social entities (i.e., individual, group, organization, etc.)". Hocker and Wilmot (1985) viewed conflict as an expressed struggle between at least two interdependent parties who perceive incompatible goals, scarce rewards, and interference from the other parties in achieving their goals. Putnam and Poole (1987) described conflict as "the interaction of interdependent people who perceive opposition of goals, aims and values and who see the other party as potentially interfering with the realization of these goals." In these definitions, "the aspects of differing needs, goals or interests and the perceived or real interference from one party unto the other party to achieve these needs, goals or interests" are common themes (Rose et al., 2007: 121).

Various styles to handle conflicts are suggested. Follett (1940) discovered three major strategies to handle conflict, domination, compromise and integration. Blake and Mouton (1964) presented five styles for managing interpersonal conflict as problem-solving, smoothing, forcing, withdrawal and sharing which are based on two dimensions, concern for production and concern for people. Thomas (1976) renamed these styles as avoiding, accommodating, competing, compromising and collaborating based on cooperativeness and assertiveness. Based on the conceptualization of above writers, Rahim and Bonoma (1979) differentiated the styles of handling interpersonal conflict on two basic dimensions, concern for self and for others. The first dimension shows the degree to which an individual attempt to satisfy his or her own wishes and needs. The second dimension explains the degree to which an individual attempts to satisfy the concern of others.

Combining the two dimensions results in five specific styles of handling conflict as described below (Rahim, 1983, 2001). *Integrating* (high concern for self and others) style involves openness, exchange of information, and examination of differences to reach an effective solution acceptable to both parties. It is associated with problem solving, which may lead to creative solutions. *Obliging* (low concern for self and high concern for others) style is associated with attempting to play down the differences and emphasizing commonalities to satisfy the concern of the other party. *Dominating* (high concern for self and low concern for others) style has been identified with win–lose orientation or with forcing behaviour to win one's position. *Avoiding* (low concern for self and others) style has been associated with withdrawal, buck-passing, or sidestepping situations. *Compromising* (intermediate in concern for self and others) style involves give-and-take whereby both parties give up something to make a mutually acceptable decision.

Based on Prein (1976) and Thomas (1976), Rahim, Antonioni and Psenicka (2001:196-197) and Rahim and Psenicka, 2002: 308-309), used integrative and distributive dimension to reclassify five styles of handling conflict. The integrative dimension, the difference between one's integrating style and avoiding style, represents a party's concern (high-low) for self and others and named the problem solving strategy. A positive score in problem solving indicates joint gains, while negative scores indicate losses for both parties. The distributive dimension, the difference between one's dominating and obliging styles. A positive score indicates one's gain but to the loss the other party, while a negative score indicates one's loss, but gain to the other party (Rahim, 2001). A High-High use of the problem solving strategy (integrating) indicates attempts to increase the satisfaction of concern of both parties through finding unique solutions to problems acceptable to them. A Low–Low use of this style (avoiding) indicates reduction of satisfaction of the concerns of both parties as a result of their failure to confront and solve their problems. A High–Low use of the bargaining style (dominating) indicates attempts to obtain high satisfaction of concerns of self and providing low satisfaction of concerns of others while a Low–High use of this style (obliging) indicates attempts to obtain the opposite.

Among these styles for handling conflict, integrating style is positively associated with individual and organizational outcome in the literature. Blake and Mouton (1964) suggested the integrating style is the most appropriate for managing conflict. Lawrence and Lorsch (1967) argued that a confrontation (integrating) style handling intergroup conflict was used a significantly greater degree in higher than lower performing organizations. Confrontation style was suggested by Burke (1970) as related to the effective management in general, while forcing (dominating) and withdrawing (avoiding) were related to ineffective management of conflict. Likert and Likert (1976) suggested that organizations which encourage participation and problem solving behaviours gain higher level of performance. McFarland (1992) emphasised that integrative (collaborating style is best for resolving interpersonal conflicts because it also enriches interpersonal relationships as well as solving the problem. Several studies on the integrating style of handling conflict show consistent results (Rahim, Antonioni and Psenicka (2001, 197-198). They also found (2001: 204) in their studies conducted among senior managers and their subordinates that the problem solving style (more integrative behaviour in interpersonal conflict) was positively associated with job performance.

Various inventories are used in researches examining conflict management strategies. Most important ones are developed by Hall (1969, *Conflict Management Survey*,CMS), Thomas and Kilmann (1974, *Management-of-Differences Exercise*,MODE), Renwick (1975, *Employee Conflict Inventory*,ECI), Rahim (1983a, *Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory*, ROCI-I and ROCII-II).

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STYLES

Various studies examined the relationship between emotional intelligence and conflict management strategies. Ivshin's study (2001) found that there was no significant relationship between emotional intelligence and conflict management styles. It was also found that there were no significant differences between males and females, marital status, age, education, and type of employment and any conflict style and emotional intelligence. In contrast, Malek's study (2000) found a statistically significant relationship between emotional intelligence and collaborative (integrating) conflict management styles and positive correlations with emotional intelligence, while no significant differences between males and females with respect to collaborating conflict management style and total emotional intelligence. Rahim and Psenicka (2002: 302) carried out a study in seven countries investigating the relationships of the five dimensions of emotional intelligence, self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills of supervisors to subordinates' strategies of handling conflict; problem solving and bargaining. They found that self-awareness is positively associated with self-regulation, empathy, and social skills; self regulation is positively associated with empathy and social skills; empathy and social skills are positively associated with motivation; and motivation in turn, is positively associated with problem solving strategy and negatively associated with bargaining strategy. Goleman (1998) suggested that emotionally intelligent employees are better able to negotiate and effectively handle their conflicts with organizational members.

Jordan and Troth (2002) found that that individuals with higher emotional intelligence preferred to seek collaborative solutions when confronted with conflict. They (2004: 211) also discovered that emotional intelligence indicators were positively linked with team performance and were differentially linked to conflict resolution methods. Some academics (Barry and Friedman, 1998; Davidson and Greenhalgh, 1999; Singer, 1995) carried out researches on the role of emotions on negotiations. Results of these studies showed that a negative relationship between negative emotions and integrating strategy exists (Lee, 2003).

Within a college or university, there are at least three major constituencies (academics, staff and students) that can conflict with each other as groups or have intragroup conflicts that need resolution or management (Frank, 1999). Gmelch and Carroll (as cited in Lee, 2003) pointed out potentials of conflict in higher education departments. One of those organizational characteristics is that faculty have a great autonomy, and the potential for interpersonal conflict because roles and expectations become less clear and more difficult to monitor and supervise. Thus, understanding the organizational characteristics helps managers in general and in higher education in particular to develop conflict management skills with faculty that can serve as a model for effective communication in conflict situations (Berryman-Fink, 1998).

Lee (2003) examined conflict management styles and emotional intelligence of staff at a college and their analyses indicated that majority of faculty and staff members used the integrating style most often and the obliging style least often. In regard to the five dimensions of emotional intelligence-self-awareness, managing emotions, self-motivation, empathy, and handling relationships-the faculty and staff members' scores were highest in self-motivation and lowest in managing emotion. The results also showed that emotional intelligence level, gender, and position affected faculty and staff members' conflict-management styles. In addition, gender, academic rank, and position influenced emotional intelligence. It was found that male faculty and staff manage emotions better than females, while female faculty and staff demonstrated greater empathy than their male colleagues. Married faculty and staff were found better than singles at managing emotions, self-motivations, handling relationships and total emotional intelligence. Faculty and staff with doctoral degrees managed emotions better than those who have associate, bachelor's, or master degrees. Significant interaction effects were found between emotional intelligence level and academic rank as well as between emotional intelligence level and age in faculty and staff members' conflict-management styles. The results also revealed that both integrating and compromising styles have significant and positive relationships with emotional intelligence.

Effects of significant variables on the use of emotional intelligence and conflict management styles were emphasised by other related studies. Bar-on and Parker (2000) found that women were more aware of emotions, demonstrate more empathy, relate better interpersonally, and act more socially than men. They also found that emotional and social intelligence increased with age. Brenner and Salovey (1997) supported this view by arguing that use of emotion-regulation strategies increased with age and differed by gender, girls are better to regulate negative emotions than boys. In their studies on conflict management styles of academics at four Turkish universities, Cetin and Hacifazlioglu (2004) found positive relations between working period or experience and integrating style of handling conflict, while male academics were found to be more accommodating (obliging) than females. Their studies also showed that academics having lower academic status due to academic education level were found to be using collaborating style more than their colleagues in higher academic career, and academics at foundation universities (employing academics on a yearly basis assessing their performance) use competition (dominating) style of managing conflict compared to public universities. A study conducted by Ozdemir and Ozdemir (2007) carried out on relationship between emotional intelligence and conflict management styles of academics and administrative staff at one Turkish university found out that no significant relationship existed between gender, age and working period and preferences of any conflict management styles. Their study indicated that married academics and administrative preferred compromising style more than singles personnel and academics used compromising, domination and integrating styles more than administrative staff. Rahim (1983b) found women to be more integrating, avoiding, compromising and less obliging then men. However, the relationship between gender and conflict style is not explicit according to other studies (Lee, 2003). Finally, a study of employed master students found significant influence of emotional intelligence on both integrating and compromising styles of conflict management while integrating style can be most predicted by emotional intelligence (Yu et al., 2006).

ANALYZING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STYLES AT TURKISH UNIVERSITIES

Research Sample and Methodology

Research is conducted at Faculties of Economics and Administrative Sciences of Dokuz Eylül, Kültür and Pamukkale Universities and Ankara University's Faculty of Political Sciences comprising 35% of academics working for these universities. A questionnaire to examine the relationship between emotional intelligence and conflict management strategies of academics was conducted. Details of sampling are given in Table 1 (Appendix). 192 respondents were included to the analysis.

The questionnaire consisted of two main parts, focusing on emotional intelligence and conflict management styles of respondent academics. *Emotional Intelligence Scale* developed by Wu in 1999 was used to test emotional intelligence of respondents including 55 questions related to Goleman's five dimensions of emotional intelligence. Rahim's ROC-II questionnaire (1983) was applied to examine five strategies of conflict management.

Objectives and Hypotheses of the Research

The objectives of this study are to identify dimensions of emotional intelligence of academics and reveal their conflict management strategies, to find out whether there are significant changes in dimensions of emotional intelligence and conflict management strategies of respondent academics depending on their demographic attributes, and to examine whether there are significant relationships between emotional intelligence and conflict management strategies of academics. Three hypotheses are developed as presented below.

Hypothesis $_{I}$: Dimensions of emotional intelligence of academics change depending on their demographic attributes.

Hypothesis $_{II}$: Conflict management strategies of academics changes depending on their demographic attributes.

Hypothesis $_{III}$: Significant relationships exist between emotional intelligence and conflict management strategies of academics.

Reliability of the Test

Using the Cronbach's Alpha Test, reliability coefficient of the questionnaire in all four universities was found above the acceptable percentage (%70 in social sciences) as seen in Table 2, and the questionnaire was considered reliable.

Demographic Attributes of Respondent Academics

Demographic attributes of academics who work in four different universities are examined so as to find out whether their emotional intelligence and strategies in conflict situations changes significantly according to their demographic attributes. Results are summarised in Table 3. Table 3 shows demographic attributes of respondent academics. 55.2% of all are male, %49.5 are between 25-34 years old, 56.3% are married, 62% have PhD degrees and 32.3% work for five years or less.

Dimensions of Emotional intelligence of Academics Depending on their Demographic Attributes

Results of standard deviation and mean regarding five dimensions of emotional intelligence are given in Table 4. According to the results, empathy dimension has the highest mean and the lowest standard deviation among academics who work at Dokuz Eylül University, while social skills dimension has the lowest mean of 3.40 and the highest standard deviation. This dimension of emotional intelligence of academics at this university needs to be improved more than other dimensions. At Kültür University, empathy again has the highest mean (3.62) with self-awareness following (3.55), while other dimensions, motivation, self-regulation and social skills, have significantly lower means and appear to be requiring improvement more than other two dimensions of emotional intelligence. Empathy has the highest mean (3.61) again at Pamukkale University; with motivation having relatively lower mean compared to others implying that improving motivation of academics at this university is a high priority. Finally, at Ankara University, empathy again has the highest mean and social skills with motivation appear to be entailing improvement more than others.

The first hypothesis of the research, "*Emotional intelligence dimensions of academics change depending on their demographic attributes"*, was tested at $\alpha=0,05$ significance level. Independent samples t-test was used to test whether there was a significant difference on the academics' dimensions of emotional intelligence according to demographic attributes (gender and marital status). Results are given in Table 5. Findings indicate that there is no significant difference at any dimension of emotional intelligence according to gender of academics who work at Dokuz Eylül University. So Hypothesis$_{I}$ is rejected for gender. A significant difference exists according to marital status on empathy dimension of emotional intelligence, and it was seen that there is no significant difference at other dimensions of emotional intelligence according to marital status. Empathy is higher among singles than their married colleagues with the mean of 46.556. No significant difference on dimensions of emotional intelligence of academics at Kültür University was found according to gender and marital status except for the differences on self-regulation dimension according to gender and empathy dimension according to marital status. Female academics seem to have a higher mean (34.824) then male academics for self-regulation dimension and single academics have a higher mean (44.882) for empathy. Hence, Hypothesis $_{I}$ was rejected with the exception of these differences. Findings indicated that no significant difference exists on emotional intelligence dimensions of Pamukkale University' academics according to gender and Hypothesis $_{I}$ is rejected for gender variable. As an exception, there is a significant difference on self-regulation dimension of academics according to marital status and it seems that married academics have a higher mean (34.269) for self-regulation. The Hypothesis $_{I}$ was rejected for other cases. As for academics of Ankara University, no significant difference on emotional intelligence was determined according to marital status. The Hypothesis $_{I}$ was rejected this variable. However there is a significant difference only on empathy dimension according to gender. As seen in Table 5, female academics' mean score is higher for this dimension. For other dimensions according to gender Hypothesis $_{I}$ was rejected.

One-way ANOVA, was performed to determine whether there was statistically significant difference in dimensions of emotional intelligence of academics depending on their demographic attributes (age, education and working period). Results are given in Table 6. One way ANOVA results indicate a significant difference in self-awareness dimension of academics at Dokuz Eylül University depending on their age, academics that are above 55 have the highest mean. Significant differences were also found in dimensions of motivation and social skills according to education, academics with PhD degree have the highest means in these two dimensions. Depending on working period, a significant

difference was only seen in motivation dimension and academics with working experience of 15-19 years have the highest mean. There is no significant difference in other dimensions of emotional intelligence at this university according to these demographic variables. According to findings of analysis for Kültür, Pamukkale and Ankara Universities, no significant difference was found in dimensions of emotional intelligence of academics depending on their age, education and working period, therefore, Hoypethesis$_I$ was rejected for them on these variables.

In addition to our main hypothesis, using all questionaires together, we also investigated whether there is a significant difference among universities for emotional intelligence dimensions, also for conflict management strategies at the end of the next section. One-way ANOVA results are in Table 7. Results show that there is significant difference in all emotional intelligence dimensions among universities. According to the results of post-hoc test, Tukey, performed to make pairwise comparisons between groups; there is difference only between Dokuz Eylül and Pamukkale Universities on self-awareness dimension of EI, between Dokuz Eylül-Pamukkale and Pamukkale-Kültür Universities on motivation dimension, and finally between Dokuz Eylül and Ankara on self-regulation, empathy and social skills dimensions. Dokuz Eylül is higher on all dimensions and Kültür University has a higher mean score than Pamukkale on motivation dimension.

Conflict Management Strategies of Academics Depending on their Demographic Attributes

Mean and standard deviation of variables about conflict management strategies are given in Table 8. According to descriptive statistics analysis performed for conflict management strategies, integrating strategy has the highest mean (4.06) among academics of Dokuz Eylül University, while obliging strategy has the lowest mean (3.08). Results indicated that academics of Dokuz Eylül University prefer integrating strategy in handling conflicts, but avoid obliging strategy. Findings found for Kültür University also indicate the same results that the most preferred strategy is integrating and the least is obliging for conflict management. Integrating strategy again has the highest mean (3.84) at Pamukkale University and also has the lowest standard deviation, while the least used strategy is obliging with a mean of 2.79. Finally, results for Ankara University also indicated that integrating strategy have the highest mean, while compromising strategy has the lowest standard deviation. Dominating and obliging strategies appear as the least used strategies with lower means compared to other dimensions.

Following these findings, *Hypothesis $_{II}$: Conflict management strategies of academics change depending on their demographic attributes*, was tested at α=0,05 significance level. Independent samples t-test was used again to test whether there was a significant difference in conflict management strategies of academics according to gender and marital status variables. Results are summarised in Table 9. Results in Table 9 show that there is no significant difference in conflict management strategies of academics of Dokuz Eylül University according to gender. H_I hypothesis was rejected for this variable. However, a significant difference was found in obliging strategy of academics depending on their marital status. Married academics appeared to have a higher mean for obliging strategy. No significant difference in conflict management strategies of academics at Kültür University was revealed depending on their marital status and Hypothesis $_{II}$ was rejected for that variable. A significant difference was only seen in dominating strategy of academics depending on gender; females have a higher mean for this strategy. Females prefer this strategy more frequently than their male colleagues. As for academics of Pamukkale University, a significant difference only exists in integrating strategy of academics depending on gender and in obliging strategy according to their marital status. Results show that females are more likely to use integrating strategy and married academics to use obliging strategy. Finally, results indicate no significant difference in conflict management strategies of academics at Ankara University depending on their gender and marital status and Hypothesis $_{II}$ was rejected for both variables.

Results of One–way ANOVA are given in Table 10 which was performed to determine whether there was a significant difference in conflict management strategies of academics depending on other demographic attributes, age, education level and working period. According to results, a significant difference was found in obliging strategy of academics at Dokuz Eylül University according to age and working period and in integrating strategy according to education. The 45-54 age group has the highest mean (20.875, which is slightly higher than 20.500 mean of the 55+ age group) for obliging strategy, and the academics those whose working periods were about twenty years and above. For integrating strategy the highest mean is of the academics having PhD degree. No significant difference exists in conflict management strategies of academics at Kültür University depending on their ages, education and working period and Hypothesis $_{II}$ was rejected for all variables. A significant difference was only found in avoiding strategy of academics who work for Pamukkale University according to working periods, with the highest mean of academics whose working period is between 5-9 years. In all strategies no significant difference was found depending on age and education variable denying Hypothesis $_{II}$ for these two variables. Finally, results showed no significant difference in conflict management strategies of academics at Ankara University depending on age and working period but according to education levels, only in integrating strategy of academics a significant difference was found. Academics with master degree have the highest mean since they are more likely to use integrating strategy.

Findings of One-way ANOVA carried out for all questionnaires to examine whether a significant difference exists in conflict management strategies of academics among different universities are given in Table 10. According to the results, significant differences appear among universities in terms of integrating, dominating, and compromising strategies. Dokuz Eylül University has the highest mean in dominating and compromising strategies, while Kültür University has the highest mean in integrating strategy. According to the results of Tukey test, there is difference only between Pamukkale and Kültür (higher) Universities on integrating strategy; between Dokuz Eylül-Pamukkale, Dokuz Eylül-Ankara, Kültür-Ankara and Kültür-Pamukkale Universities on dominating strategy, and finally between Dokuz Eylül (higher) and Pamukkale on compromising strategy. For dominating strategy means can be listed in order from the hishest one as Dokuz Eylül, Kültür, Ankara and Pamukkale Universities.

Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Conflict Management Strategies of Academics

In this part of the study, the relationship between emotional intelligence and conflict management strategies of respondent academics is analysed. Correlation coefficients were calculated and findings are presented in Table 12. According to the results, for academics at Dokuz Eylül University, no significant relationship was found between self-awareness and any strategies of conflict management. On the other

hand, self-regulation dimension of academics was found to be positively related with their integrating and compromising strategy. Results revealed that significant and positive relationship between motivation dimension of academics and their conflict management strategies apart from avoiding strategy existed. In addition, empathy dimension of academics was found to be positively associated with their integrating, dominating and compromising strategies and also there exist significant relationship between social skills dimension of academics and their integrating and compromising strategies. Correlation analysis results for Kültür University show significant relationships between some dimensions of emotional intelligence of academics and their conflict management strategies, thus, Hypothesis $_{III}$ was not denied for those strategies. Self-awareness is positively associated with obliging and compromising strategies. Self-regulation is positively related with obliging and dominating strategies. Significant relationships were also found between motivation dimension and integrating and dominating, and between empathy dimension and obliging and avoiding strategies. Finally, social skills are positively correlated only with obliging strategy among others. Results of correlation analysis for Pamukkale University revealed a significant relationship between self-awareness dimension and avoiding strategy. Self regulation is positively correlated with integrating, obliging and avoiding strategies. Motivation dimension was found to be significantly correlated with integrating and avoiding, while empathy is significantly correlated with obliging strategy and social skills with avoiding and compromising strategies. As for Ankara University, self-awareness, self-regulation and motivation dimensions are significantly associated with integrating and obliging strategies. Significant relationships were also found between empathy and four conflict management strategies except for avoiding, and between social skills and all conflict management strategies with the exception of dominating strategy. Empathy dimension was found to be negatively associated with dominating strategy.

CONCLUSION

This study sought to identify dimensions of emotional intelligence of academics at selected Turkish universities and to reveal their strategies in handling conflicts with special focus to what extent significant differences exist in these dimensions and strategies depending on their demographic attributes. The question whether there are significant relationships between dimensions of emotional intelligence of academics and their strategies in handling conflict was also examined. The findings revealed that significant effort to improve social skills and motivation dimensions of emotional intelligence of academics is required. Significant relationships were found in considerable analyses. Empathy was found higher among female academics that were also found better on self-regulation dimension and single academics appeared better in empathy dimension while married ones seemed to be better in self-regulation. With the exception of one university, no significant relationship was found between dimensions of emotional intelligence of academics and their age, education and working period. Significant differences were found that academics who are 55 and over appeared to be better on self-awareness, those who have PhD degree are better on motivation and social skills, and academics with working period of 15-19 years are better on motivation dimensions.

In four selected universities, integrating strategy was found to be the most preferred strategy of academics in handling conflict situations while obliging strategy appeared to be the least used one. While no significant relationship was found in some cases in conflict management strategies of academics according to their gender and marital status, existence of significant differences was seen in some analyses that female academics are more likely to use integrating and dominating strategies and married academics are to use obliging strategy. Depending on age, education and working period, some significant differences were found in conflict management strategies of academics. Those academics whose ages are between 45-54 and experience is over 20 years use obliging strategy, younger academics with working experience between 5-9 years prefer avoiding strategy, those academics who hold Master or PhD degree prefer integrating strategy.

Results revealed significant relationships between emotional intelligence of academics and their conflict management strategies. Looking at integrating strategy as the most effective way of managing interpersonal conflicts and enhancing job performance, positively associated dimensions with that strategy were found as motivation, social skills and empathy in most cases while self-awareness and self-regulation were also seen as positively correlated in some analyses. Motivation, social skills and empathy were also found to be positively associated with other useful strategy in handling conflict, compromising strategy while self-awareness and self-regulation were also found to be positively associated with that strategy.

Based on the findings, several recommendations to administrators of universities might be presented. University administrators should spend considerable effort to enhance emotional intelligence of academics working for their universities, particular attention should be given to motivation, social skills and empathy dimensions. Improvement in these dimensions would strengthen academics' emotional intelligence which in turn ensures that academics prefer integrating or at least compromising strategy as a conflict management style. Emotionally intelligent academics with enhanced motivation, social skills and empathy would enhance their performance in individual studies and institutional works or projects as well as effectively handling interpersonal conflicts through negotiating and finding creative solutions for all parties involved. Organising programmes, seminars, workshops to discuss problems and factors affecting academics' emotions, particularly motivation, social skills and empathy, and using practical recommendations of those discussions in organising administrative structure/functioning of universities would be practical and beneficial recommendations to university administrators.

REFERENCES

BAR-ON, R. (1996). The Emotional Quotient inventory (EQ-i): A test of emotional intelligence. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.

BAR-ON, R. (1997). Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory: Technical manual. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.

BAR-ON, R. (2000). Emotional and social intelligence: insights from the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i). In R. Bar-On & J.D.A. Parker (Eds.), *Handbook of emotional intelligence.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

BAR-ON, R. (2006) The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence (ESI). *Psicothema, 18* [supl.], 13-25.

BAR-ON, R., Parker, J.D.A. (2000). The Handbook of Emotional Intelligence: Theory, Development, Assessment, and Application at Home, School and in the Workplace. San Franscisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

BARRY, B., & FRIEDMAN, R. A. (1998). Bargainer characteristics in distributive and integrative negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 345–359.

BERRYMAN-Fink, C. (1998). Can we agree to disagree? Faculty to Faculty conflict. *Mending the cracks in the ivory tower: strategies for conflict management in higher education,* S. A. Holton (ed.). Bolton: MA: Anker.

BLAKE, R.R. and J.S. Mouton (1964) The managerial grid. Key orientations for achieving production through people. Houston, Texas: Gulf Publishing Company.

BOOHAR, D. (2001). Resolving conflict without punching someone out. *Fort Worth Business Press*, Retrieved 24 June 2004 from Regional Business News database.

BRENNER, E. M., & SALOVEY, P. (1997). Emotion regulation during childhood: Developmental, interpersonal, and individual considerations. In P. Salovey & D. J. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications*, (pp. 168–195). New York: BasicBooks.

BURKE, R. J. (1970). Methods of resolving superior–subordinate conflict: The constructive use of subordinate differences and disagreements. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 5*, 393–411.

CETIN, M. O. and HACIFAZLIOGLU, O. (2004). Academics' Conflict Management Styles, *Dogus Universitesi Dergisi, 5*, 155-162.

CHERNISS, C. (2000). Emotional intelligence: What it is and Why It matters. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, New Orleans, LA, April 15.

COOPER, R. K., & SAWAF, A. (1998) Emotional intelligence in leadership organizations. http://www.feel.org/articles/cooper_sawaf.html.

DAVIDSON, M. N. & GREENHALGH, L. (1999). The role of emotion in negotiation: The impact of anger and race. In R. J. Bies & R. L. Lewicki & B. H. Sheppard (Eds.), *Research in negotiation in organizations, 7,* 3-26. Stamford: CT: JAI Press, Inc.

DRAGO, J. M. (2004). The relationship between emotional intelligence and academic achievement in nontraditional college students. PhD Thesis, Walden University.

EMMERLING, R. J., & GOLEMAN, D. (2003). Emotional intelligence: Issues and common misunderstandings. Reprinted in K.B.S Kumar (Ed.), *Emotional Intelligence: Research Insights.* ICFAI University Press.

FEIST, G. J., & BARRON, F. (1996). Emotional intelligence and academic intelligence in career and life success. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Society, San Francisco, CA.

FOLLETT, M. P. (1940). Constructive conflict. In H. C. Metcalf & L. Urwick (Eds.), *Dynamic administration: The collected papers of Mary Parker Follett* (pp. 30–49). New York: Harper & Row.

FRANK, K. K. (1999). Attributes of stability in higher education, ADR programs in the United States. Unpublished master's thesis. Missouri, Colombia College.

GARDNER, H. (1983). *Frames of mind*. New York: Basic Books.

GILL, S.K. (1992). Handling conflicts. In A. Abdullah, (Ed.), *Understanding the Malaysian workforce – Guidelines for managers* (pp:107-115). Kuala Lumpur: Malaysian Institute of Management.

GMELCH, W. H. and CARROLL, J. B. (1991). The three Rs of conflict management for department chairs and faculty. *Innovative Higher Education, 16 (2),* 107-122.

GOLEMAN, D. (1995). Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ. New York: Bantam Books.

GOLEMAN, D. (1998) *Working with emotional intelligence,* New York: Bantum Books.

HALL, J. (1969). Conflict management survey: A survey of one's characteristic reaction to and handling of conflicts between himself and others. Houston, TX: Telemetrics.

HOCKER, J.L. and WILMOT, W.W. (1985). *Interpersonal Conflict* (2nd edition), Dubuque, IA: W. C. Brown.

HUNTER, J. E., and HUNTER, R. F. (1984) Validity and utility of alternative predictors of job performance. *Psychological Bulletin, 76 (1),* 72-93.

IVSHIN, E. (2001). The study of the meaning of work, emotional intelligence and conflict styles in the workplace in the 21st century. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 62 (02B),* 1127.

JORDAN, P. J. and TROTH, A. C. (2002). Emotional intelligence and conflict resolution: Implications for Human Resource Development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 4 (1),* 62-79.

JORDAN, P. J. and TROTH, A. C. (2004). Managing Emotions During Team Problem Solving: Emotional Intelligence and Conflict Resolution. *Human Performance, 17 (2),* 195-218.

LAWRENCE, P. R., & LORSCH, J. W. (1967). Differentiation and integration in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 12*, 1–47.

LEE, F. M. (2003). *Conflict Management Styles and Emotional Intelligence of Faculty and Staff at a Selected College in Southern Taiwan*. PhD thesis, University Of South Florida

LEUNER, B. (1966). Emotional intelligence and emancipation. *Praxis der Kinderpsychologie und Kinderpsychiatrie, 15*, 193-203.

LIKERT, R., & LIKERT, J. G. (1976). *New ways of managing conflict.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

MALEK, M. (2000). Relationship between emotional intelligence and collaborative conflict resolution styles. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61(5-B)*, 2805.

MAYER, J, SALOVEY, P & Caruso, D (1999). Instruction Manual for the MSCEIT: Mayer Salovey Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.

MAYER, J. D. & SALOVEY, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence. In P. Salovey & D. Sluyter (Eds), *Emotional Development and Emotional Intelligence: Implications for Educators* (pp. 3-31). New York: Basic Books.

MAYER, J. D., SALOVEY, P., & Caruso, D. (1998). Competing models of emotional intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of human intelligence* (2nd ed.,). New York: Cambridge University Press.

MCELHANEY, R. (1996). Conflict management in nursing. *Nursing Management, 27(3)*, 49-50.

MCFARLAND, W. P. (1992). Counselors teaching peaceful conflict resolution., *Journal of Counseling and Development, 71 (1)*, 18-21.

NEWSOME, S., DAY, A. L., CATANO, Victor M. (2000). Assessing The Predictive Validity of Emotional Intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 29 (6)*, 100-1016.

OUDEH, N. (1999). Solving conflicts at work. *Manitoba Business, 21 (5)*.

PARKER, J .D.A.; CREQUES, R.; HARRIS, J.; Majeski, S.A.; Wood, L.M., & Hogan. M.J (2003). *Academic Success in High School: Does Emotional Matter?* ERIC Clearing House.

PARKER, J. et al (2004) Academic achievement in high school: does emotional intelligence matter? *Personality and Individual Differences, 37*, 1321-1330.

PARKER, J.D.A., SUMMERFIELDT. L.J; HOGAN, M.J., & MAJESTIC, S. (2001). Emotional intelligence and academic achievement. A Paper presentation at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, Quebec City, Quebec.

PARKER, J.D.A.; SUMMERFIELD, L.J., HOGAN, M.J., & MAJESKI, S. (2002). Emotional Intelligence Academic Success: Examining the Transition from High School to University. ERIC Clearing House.

PREIN, H. C. M. (1976). Stijlen van conflicthantering [Styles of handling conflict]. *Nederlands Tijdschrift voor de Psychologie*, *31*, 321–346.
PUTNAM, L.L. and M.S. Poole (1987) Conflict and Negotiation. *Handbook of Organizational Communication.* In F.M. Jablin, L. L. Putnam, K. H. Roberts and L. W. Porter (Eds.), *An Interdisciplinary Perspective* (pp. 549-599. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
RAHIM, M. A. (1983a). Rahim organizational conflict inventories: Professional manual. New York:
RAHIM, M. A. (1983b). A measure of styles of handling interpersonal conflict. *Academy of Management Journal*, *26*, 368–376.
RAHIM, M. A. (1990) *Theory and research in conflict management*, New York, NY: Praeger Publishing.
RAHIM, M. A., & ANTONIONI, D., & PSENICKA, C. (2001). A structural equations model of leader power, subordinates' styles of handling conflict, and job performance. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *12*, 191–211.
RAHIM, M. A., PSENICKA, C., POLYCHRONIOU, P., ZHAO, J., et. Al. (2002). A model of emotional intelligence and conflict management strategies: A study in seven countries. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 10 (4)*, 302-327.
RAHIM, M.A. (2001) *Managing Conflict in Organizations, 3rd Edn*. Westport, Connecticut: Quorum Books.
RAHIM, M.A. and T.V. BONOMA (1979). Managing organizational conflict: A model for diagnosis and intervention. *Psychological Reports*, *44*, 323-1344.
RENWICK, P. A. (1975). Perception and management of superior-subordinate conflict. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13, 444–456.
ROBBINS, S. P. (2001). *Organizational behavior, (9th ed.).* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
ROBBINS, S. P. (2003). *Organizational Behaviour, 10th edition*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
ROSE, Raduan Che, SUPPIAH, Waitchalla RRV, ULI, Jegak and OTHMAN, Jamilah (2007). A Face Concern Approach to Conflict Management – A Malaysian Perspective. *Journal of Social Sciences, 2 (4)*, 121-126.
SALOVEY, P & Mayer, J (1990). Emotional Intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition & Personality*, *9 (3)*, 185-211.
SHODA, Y., MISCHEL, W., & PEAKE, P. K. (1990). Predicting adolescent cognitive and selfregulatory competencies from preschool delay of gratification: Identifying diagnostic conditions", *Developmental Psychology*, 26(6), 978-986.
SINGER, J. A. (1995). Putting emotions in context: Its place within individual and social narratives. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 5, 255-267.
STERNBERG, R. (1996) *Successful intelligence*, New York: Simon & Schuster.
SUPPIAH, Waitchalla, R. R. V. and ROSE, Raduan Che (2006). A Competence-based View to Conflict Management. *Amerikan Journal of Applied Sciences, 3 (7)*, 1905-1909.
THOMAS, K. W., & KILMANN, R. H. (1974). *Thomas-Kilmann conflict mode instrument.* Tuxedo, NY: Xicom, Inc.
THOMAS, K.W. (1976). Conflict and Conflict Management. In M.D. Dunnette (ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 889-935). Chicago: Rand McNally.
THOMAS, K.W. and W.H. Schmidt (1976). A survey of managerial interests with respect to conflict. *Acad. Management J*., *19*, 315-318.
THORNDIKE, E. L. (1920). Intelligence and its uses. *Harper's Magazine, 140*, 227–235.
THORNDIKE, R. L., and STEIN, S. (1937). An evaluation of the attempts to measure social intelligence. *Psychological Bulletin, 34*, 275-284.
VAN ROOY, D.L. & VISWESVARAN, C. (2004). Emotional intelligence: a meta-analytic investigation of predictive validity and nomological net. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, *65*, 71-95.
WALL, J.A. and R.R. Callister (1995). Conflict and its management. *Journal of Management*, 21: 515-558.
WECHSLER, D. (1940). Nonintellective factors in general intelligence. *Psychological Bulletin, 37*, 444-445.
WEISENGER, H. (1985). *Dr. Weisenger's anger work-out book.* New York: Quill Press.
WEISENGER, H. (1998). *Emotional intelligence at work.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
WU, S. M. (1999). The Study on the relationship of expectancy for success with self-esteem, emotional intelligence of college students. *Educational Research*, *8*, 161-176.
YU, Chun-Sheng, RON M. Sardessai, JUNE Lu, Jing-Hua Zhao (2006). Relationship of emotional intelligence with conflict management styles: an empirical study in China. *International Journal of Management and Enterprise Development, 3 (1/2)*, 19 – 29.
ZEE, K. VAN DER, Thijs, M. And SCHAKEL, L. (2002). The relationship of emotional intelligence with Academic Intelligence and the Big Five, *European Journal of Personality*, *16*, 103-125.

APPENDIX

Table 1. Sampling Details

University / Faculty	total number of academics	number of contact	return numbers	number included to the analysis
Dokuz Eylul University Faculty of Economics and Adm. Sciences	214	65	59	52
Kultur University Faculty of Economics and Adm. Sciences	39	35	32	32
Pamukkale University Faculty of Economics and Adm. Sciences	134	50	45	41
Ankara University Faculty of Political Sciences	162	80	72	67
Total	549	230	208	192 (%35 of the total)

Table 2. Results of Reliability Analysis

University	Coefficient of reliability	
Dokuz Eylül	number of sample = 52	number of questions = 83
	Alpha = 0.7954	
Kültür	number of sample = 32	number of questions = 83
	Alpha = 0.8265	
Pamukkale	number of sample = 41	number of questions = 83
	Alpha = 0.8423	
Ankara	number of sample = 67	number of questions = 83
	Alpha = 0.8488	

Table 3. Demographic Attributes of Respondents

Demographic Attributes	Dokuz Eylül University		Kültür University		Pamukkale University		Ankara University		General	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
GENDER										
Male	34	65.4	15	46.9	23	56.1	34	50.7	106	55.2
Female	18	34.6	17	53.1	18	43.9	33	49.3	86	44.8

AGE										
25-	6	11.5	4	12.5	5	12.2	2	3.0	17	8.9
25-34	26	50.0	14	13.8	16	39.0	39	58.2	95	49.5
35-44	8	15.4	6	18.8	16	39.0	22	32.8	52	27.1
45-54	8	15.4	2	6.3	3	7.3	3	4.5	16	8.3
55+	4	7.7	6	18.8	1	2.4	1	1.5	12	6.3
MARITAL STATUS										
Married	29	55.8	15	46.9	26	63.4	38	56.7	108	56.3
Single	23	44.2	17	53.1	15	36.6	29	43.3	84	43.8
EDUCATION										
Undergraduate / vocational school	3	5.8	1	3.1	1	2.4	1	1.5	6	3.1
Master	16	30.8	17	53.1	17	41.5	17	25.4	67	34.9
PhD	33	63.5	14	43.8	23	56.1	49	73.1	119	62
WORKING PERIOD										
5 years -	22	42.3	12	37.5	14	34.1	14	20.9	62	32.3
5-9 years	13	25.0	4	12.5	6	14.6	25	37.3	48	25
10-14 years	6	11.5	6	18.8	14	34.1	20	29.9	46	24
15-19 years	7	13.5	1	3.1	3	7.3	6	9.0	17	8.9
20 years +	4	7.7	9	28.1	4	9.8	2	3.0	19	9.9

Table 4. Results of Descriptive Statistics Analysis of Questions on five dimensions of Emotional Intelligence

UNIVERSITY	Dimensions of emotional intelligence	Number of variables	Total of variable means	Mean of variable means	Standard deviation
DOKUZ EYLÜL	Self-awareness	11	39.94	3.63	0.68
	Self regulation	10	35.15	3.52	0.69
	Motivation	11	40.56	3.69	0.99
	Empathy	12	45.44	3.79	0.66
	Social skills	11	37.40	3.40	0.88
	TOTAL	55	198.5	18.02	
KÜLTÜR	Self-awareness	11	39.06	3.55	0.71
	Self regulation	10	33.34	3.33	1.21
	Motivation	11	35.94	3.27	1.03
	Empathy	12	43.41	3.62	1.56
	Social skills	11	36.84	3.35	1.04
	TOTAL	55	188.59	17.12	
PAMUKKALE	Self-awareness	11	37.76	3.43	0.86
	Self regulation	10	33.39	3.34	1.44
	Motivation	11	33.59	3.05	1.40
	Empathy	12	43.34	3.61	2.19
	Social skills	11	36.27	3.30	1.65
	TOTAL	55	184.34	16.73	
ANKARA	Self-awareness	11	38.69	3.52	1.08
	Self regulation	10	33.46	3.35	1.94
	Motivation	11	34.58	3.14	1.74
	Empathy	12	43.52	3.63	1.94
	Social skills	11	35.28	3.21	1.74
	TOTAL	55	185.54	16.84	

Table 5. Results of t-tests for Hypotheses [I]

UNIVERSITY	Demographic Attributes / Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence	Gender				Marital Status			
		Male	Female	t test	p	Married	Single	t test	p
DOKUZ EYLÜL	Self-awareness	39.882	40.056	-0.215	0.830	40.000	39.870	0.169	0.866
	Self regulation	35.276	35.000	0.374	0.710	34.912	35.611	-0.913	0.365
	Motivation	41.241	39.696	1.710	0.094	40.706	40.278	0.442	0.661
	Empathy	45.724	45.087	0.809	0.422	44.853	46.556	-2.151	0.036*
	Social skills	37.448	37.348	0.114	0.909	37.206	37.778	-0.626	0.534
KÜLTÜR	Self-awareness	38.067	39.941	-1.982	0.057	39.267	38.882	0.383	0.704
	Self regulation	31.667	34.824	-2.838	0.008*	33.333	33.353	-0.016	0.988
	Motivation	35.333	36.471	-0.954	0.348	35.533	36.294	-0.633	0.531
	Empathy	43.000	43.765	-0.493	0.626	41.733	44.882	-2.176	0.038*
	Social skills	36.733	36.941	-0.170	0.866	36.067	37.529	-1.228	0.229
PAMUKKALE	Self-awareness	37.609	37.944	-0.343	0.734	37.538	38.133	-0.591	0.558
	Self regulation	32.957	33.944	-0.824	0.415	34.269	31.867	2.028	0.049*
	Motivation	33.217	34.056	-0.673	0.505	33.654	33.467	0.145	0.885
	Empathy	42.261	44.722	-1.551	0.129	43.538	43.000	0.320	0.751
	Social skills	35.217	37.611	-1.835	0.074	35.462	37.667	-1.627	0.112
ANKARA	Self-awareness	37.971	39.424	-1.755	0.084	38.421	39.034	-0.72	0.474
	Self regulation	32.706	34.242	-1.44	0.155	33.500	33.414	0.079	0.937
	Motivation	34.000	35.182	-1.107	0.272	34.211	35.069	-0.793	0.431
	Empathy	41.882	45.212	-2.989	0.004*	42.658	44.655	-1.703	0.093
	Social skills	35.147	35.424	-0.258	0.797	34.526	36.276	-1.645	0.105

p*<0.05, a difference exists at 5% significance level.

Table 6. Results of One-way ANOVA for Hypothesis$_1$

UNIVERSITY	Demographic Attributes / Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence	Age		Education		Working Period	
		F test	p	F test	p	F test	p
DOKUZ EYLÜL	Self-awareness	2.703	0.042 *	1.214	0.306	0.610	0.657
	Self regulation	1.399	0.249	0.077	0.926	0.808	0.526
	Motivation	2.381	0.065	5.400	0.008 *	2.955	0.029 *
	Empathy	1.262	0.298	1.819	0.173	0.641	0.636
	Social skills	0.795	0.535	4.137	0.022 *	0.386	0.818
KÜLTÜR	Self-awareness	0.864	0.498	0.532	0.593	0.233	0.917
	Self regulation	0.767	0.556	1.946	0.161	0.626	0.648
	Motivation	0.165	0.954	1.766	0.189	0.144	0.964
	Empathy	0.52	0.722	0.111	0.895	0.802	0.534
	Social skills	0.263	0.899	2.198	0.129	0.491	0.742
PAMUKKALE	Self-awareness	0.264	0.899	0.195	0.824	0.086	0.986
	Self regulation	0.767	0.554	0.451	0.640	0.597	0.667
	Motivation	0.469	0.758	1.859	0.170	0.462	0.763
	Empathy	1.052	0.394	0.966	0.390	0.428	0.787
	Social skills	1.848	0.141	1.168	0.322	2.617	0.051
ANKARA	Self-awareness	0.509	0.729	1.676	0.195	1.509	0.211
	Self regulation	2.054	0.098	0.92	0.404	1.749	0.151
	Motivation	0.349	0.844	1.309	0.277	2.115	0.090
	Empathy	0.469	0.758	2.033	0.139	1.582	0.190
	Social skills	0.425	0.790	3.406	0.039	2.435	0.057

A difference exists depending on demographic attributes of academics at p*<0,05.

Table 7. Results of One-way ANOVA for the difference between universities on Emotional Intelligence dimensions

Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence / Variable		Self-awareness	Self-regulation	Motivation	Empathy	Social skills
University	F test	4,004	2,795	5,203	2,675	3,134
	p	0,009*	0,042*	0,002*	0,049*	0,027*

A difference exists between universities at p*<0,05, %5 significance level.

Table 8. Results of Descriptive Statistics Analyses for Variables of Conflict Management Strategies

UNIVERSIT	Conflict	Number	Total of	Mean of	Standard

Y	Management Strategies	of variables	variable means	variable means	deviation
DOKUZ EYLÜL	Integrating	7	28.40	4.06	1.60
	Obliging	6	18.46	3.08	1.13
	Dominating	5	17.40	3.48	1.41
	Avoiding	6	21.25	3.54	0.81
	Compromising	4	14.77	3.69	1.19
	TOTAL	28	100.29	17.85	
KÜLTÜR	Integrating	7	28.97	4.14	1.32
	Obliging	6	17.44	2.91	1.60
	Dominating	5	16.63	3.33	1.47
	Avoiding	6	21.69	3.61	1.56
	Compromising	4	14.09	3.52	1.22
	TOTAL	28	98.81	17.51	
PAMUKKALE	Integrating	7	26.85	3.84	1.05
	Obliging	6	16.76	2.79	2.08
	Dominating	5	14.90	2.98	1.80
	Avoiding	6	20.27	3.38	1.68
	Compromising	4	13.54	3.38	1.55
	TOTAL	28	92.32	16.37	
ANKARA	Integrating	7	27.60	3.94	1.06
	Obliging	6	18.10	3.02	2.16
	Dominating	5	15.04	3.01	1.65
	Avoiding	6	20.51	3.42	1.30
	Compromising	4	13.81	3.45	1.01
	TOTAL	28	95.06	16.84	

Table 9. Results of t-tests for Hypothesis $_{II}$

UNIVERSITY	Demographic Attributes / Conflict Management Strategies	Gender				Marital Status			
		Male	Female	t test	p	Married	Single	t test	p
DOKUZ EYLÜL	Integrating	28.059	29.056	-1.021	0.312	28.724	28.000	0.771	0.444
	Obliging	18.824	17.778	1.388	0.171	19.345	17.348	2.941	0.005*
	Dominating	17.235	17.722	-0.626	0.534	17.69	17.043	0.871	0.388
	Avoiding	21.235	21.278	-0.065	0.948	21.448	21.000	0.725	0.472
	Compromising	14.500	15.278	-1.228	0.225	15.241	14.174	1.788	0.080

KÜLTÜR	Integrating	29.133	28.824	0.283	0.779	28.933	29.000	-0.061	0.952
	Obliging	16.733	18.059	-1.216	0.233	16.800	18.000	-1.096	0.282
	Dominating	15.600	17.529	-2.121	0.042*	16.267	16.941	-0.697	0.491
	Avoiding	21.667	21.706	-0.036	0.972	21.000	22.294	-1.201	0.239
	Compromising	13.733	14.412	-0.865	0.394	13.733	14.412	-0.865	0.394
PAMUKKALE	Integrating	25.739	28.278	-3.336	0.002*	27.192	26.267	1.056	0.297
	Obliging	16.565	17.000	-0.387	0.701	17.577	15.333	2.033	0.049*
	Dominating	14.739	15.111	-0.390	0.699	14.885	14.933	-0.049	0.961
	Avoiding	19.696	21.000	-1.319	0.195	20.538	19.800	0.714	0.479
	Compromising	12.870	14.389	-2.011	0.051	13.385	13.800	-0.510	0.613
ANKARA	Integrating	27.441	27.758	-0.473	0.638	27.368	27.897	-0.785	0.435
	Obliging	18.294	17.909	0.435	0.665	18.211	17.966	0.274	0.785
	Dominating	15.147	14.939	0.294	0.770	15.526	14.414	1.588	0.117
	Avoiding	20.618	20.394	0.325	0.746	20.237	20.862	-0.905	0.369
	Compromising	13.794	13.818	-0.049	0.961	13.842	13.759	0.167	0.868

A difference exists depending on demographic attributes at p*<0,05, %5 significance level.

Table 10. Results of One-way ANOVA for Hypothesis $_{II}$

UNIVERSITY	Demographic Attributes / Conflict Management Strategies	Age		Education		Working Period	
		F test	p	F test	p	F test	p
DOKUZ EYLÜL	Integrating	1.423	0.241	3.553	0.036 *	1.314	0.279
	Obliging	4.139	0.006 *	0.512	0.602	2.738	0.040 *
	Dominating	0.724	0.580	0.292	0.748	1.936	0.120
	Avoiding	0.398	0.809	1.739	0.186	2.001	0.110
	Compromising	0.982	0.426	3.028	0.058	1.438	0.236
KÜLTÜR	Integrating	1.554	0.215	0.983	0.386	1.239	0.318
	Obliging	0.273	0.893	0.696	0.507	0.234	0.917
	Dominating	0.571	0.686	0.801	0.459	0.199	0.937
	Avoiding	1.408	0.258	0.593	0.559	1.251	0.313
	Compromising	0.323	0.860	0.138	0.872	1.224	0.324
PAMUKKALE	Integrating	0.551	0.700	0.114	0.893	0.200	0.937
	Obliging	0.899	0.475	0.407	0.668	0.579	0.680
	Dominating	0.539	0.708	0.579	0.565	0.176	0.949
	Avoiding	2.386	0.069	0.533	0.591	2.848	0.038 *
	Compromising	0.181	0.947	0.091	0.913	0.317	0.865

ANKARA	Integrating	0.115	0.977	3.912	0.025 *	0.407	0.803
	Obliging	0.062	0.993	1.707	0.190	0.984	0.423
	Dominating	1.605	0.184	0.401	0.671	0.651	0.629
	Avoiding	0.154	0.961	1.414	0.251	1.164	0.335
	Compromising	0.728	0.576	2.092	0.132	1.029	0.400

A significant difference exists at p*<0,05, %5 significance level depending on demographic attributes.

Table 11. Results of One-way ANOVA for the difference between universities on Conflict Management Strategies

Conflict Management Strategies / Variable		Integrating	Obliging	Dominating	Avoiding	Compromising
University	F test	3.848	2.441	9.425	2.257	2.879
	p	0.011*	0.066	0.000*	0.083	0.037*

A difference exists between universities at p*<0,05, %5 significance level.

Table 12. Results of Correlation Analysis for Hypothesis $_{III}$.

UNIVERSITY	Conflict Management Strategies / Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence		Integrating	Obliging	Dominating	Avoiding	Compromising
DOKUZ EYLÜL	Self-awareness	Pearson Correlation	0.225	-0.109	0.036	0.237	0.280
		p (2-tailed)	0.108	0.442	0.801	0.091	0.044
	Self-regulation	Pearson Correlation	0.328	0.081	0.160	0.207	0.294
		p (2-tailed)	0.018*	0.567	0.257	0.141	0.034*
	Motivation	Pearson Correlation	0.497	0.359	0.377	0.034	0.560
		p (2-tailed)	0.000*	0.009*	0.006*	0.809	0.000*
	Empathy	Pearson Correlation	0.366	0.170	0.370	-0.034	0.375
		p (2-tailed)	0.008*	0.229	0.007*	0.811	0.006*
	Social skills	Pearson Correlation	0.448	0.068	0.203	-0.126	0.464
		p (2-tailed)	0.001*	0.630	0.149	0.372	0.001*
KÜLTÜR	Self-awareness	Pearson Correlation	0.330	0.377	0.050	0.074	0.360
		p (2-tailed)	0.065	0.034*	0.785	0.687	0.043*

	Self-regulation	Pearson Correlation	0.083	0.500	0.370	0.180	0.143
		p (2-tailed)	0.650	0.004*	0.037*	0.324	0.435
	Motivation	Pearson Correlation	0.451	0.052	0.412	0.327	0.210
		p (2-tailed)	0.010*	0.776	0.019*	0.068	0.249
	Empathy	Pearson Correlation	0.337	0.631	0.110	0.380	-0.011
		p (2-tailed)	0.059	0.000*	0.550	0.032*	0.953
	Social skills	Pearson Correlation	0.084	0.384	0.071	-0.045	0.188
		p (2-tailed)	0.648	0.030*	0.701	0.806	0.304
PAMUKKALE	Self-awareness	Pearson Correlation	0.247	0.258	-0.130	0.337	-0.038
		p (2-tailed)	0.119	0.103	0.418	0.031*	0.814
	Self-regulation	Pearson Correlation	0.444	0.399	0.146	0.452	0.295
		p (2-tailed)	0.004*	0.010*	0.361	0.003*	0.061
	Motivation	Pearson Correlation	0.502	0.228	0.134	0.376	0.291
		p (2-tailed)	0.001*	0.151	0.402	0.015*	0.065
	Empathy	Pearson Correlation	0.261	0.318	-0.047	0.259	-0.073
		p (2-tailed)	0.099	0.043*	0.773	0.103	0.648
	Social skills	Pearson Correlation	0.092	0.001	0.139	0.375	0.506
		p (2-tailed)	0.566	0.994	0.386	0.016*	0.001*
ANKARA	Self-awareness	Pearson Correlation	0.394	0.291	0.057	0.188	0.004
		p (2-tailed)	0.001*	0.017*	0.649	0.127	0.973
	Self-regulation	Pearson Correlation	0.288	0.288	0.159	-0.023	0.110
		p (2-tailed)	0.018*	0.018*	0.199	0.853	0.377
	Motivation	Pearson Correlation	0.480	0.461	0.236	-0.022	0.079
		p (2-tailed)	0.000*	0.000*	0.054	0.860	0.528
	Empathy	Pearson Correlation	0.457	0.357	-0.309	0.155	0.015
		p (2-tailed)	0.000*	0.003*	0.011*	0.210	0.902
	Social skills	Pearson Correlation	0.452	0.329	-0.077	0.246	0.307
		p (2-tailed)	0.000*	0.007*	0.535	0.045*	0.012*

A significant relationship exists at p*<0,05, %5 significance level.