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Abstract

Objective: The purpose of this paper is to describe the relationship between emotional intelligence (EI) and managerial decision making styles as a critical competency for managers of 21st century and develop a generic model for EI vs. decision making styles.

Theoretical Framework: Based on the above construction, two models of EI have emerged. First, the ability model that describes EI as "abilities that involve perceiving and reasoning abstractly with information that emerges from feeling". Second, the mixed model that defines emotional intelligence as "ability with social behaviors, traits and competencies "The ability model of EI is largely upheld by Mayer and Salovey; while, the mixed model is espoused by Goleman and Bar-On. There are slight differences in these models and EI remains a fashionable current research topic and debate. In our study, we measure EI with respect to Goleman model. Regarding to different definitions of EI, this concept refers to a feeling or thought beyond all individual activities that affects their reactions to different situations.

Methodology: we provide the methodology for operationalizing the variables and factors, acquiring the data, and determining the reliability of factor grouping. The data used in this study are consisted of responses of managers in Iranian oil industry to the questionnaire. At the targeting viewpoint, this research is developmental-applicable ones, but from implementation view it is descriptive and analytical. Population of survey is defined by the entire Iranian managers and experts in oil industry and masters. Sampling method was judgmental and based on available sample of experts. Sample size was 70 in which all of the people have enough knowledge we use two questionnaires include emotional intelligence (EI) and managerial decision making styles. In EI assessment of sample size we used standard questionnaire include 33 questions, while Scott & Bruce questionnaire in managerial decision making style is considered (25 questions). To validate the framework presented in the preceding section, a linear SEM approaches used to validate the causal relationships between the different latent constructs of emotional intelligence and managerial decision making styles.

Findings and conclusions: This paper provides a number of contributions to the theoretical debate; that is, "Relationship between Emotional Intelligence (EI) and Management Decision Making Styles and develops a new generic conceptual model based on literature review and field research. The most important contribution of this research points to the effects of emotional intelligence on different managerial dimensions such as managers decision making style. Therefore we can consider emotional intelligence as a critical subject to be considered in management training programs.
1. Introduction

Turbulent environments make organizations look for employees who have various skills to cope with changes in appropriate ways. One of the most important personal factors affecting employees’ responses in such situations is their emotional capability which management scholars, educators and development practitioners have evidenced their interest in understanding it in the work place for more than a decade. As Grant (2007) believes, emotional intelligence (EI) is an important factor in work place performance both on individual level and group level. On individual level, EI helps to predict individual leadership behavior workplace performance; however, on group level, it is seen that leaders’ emotional intelligence is associated with high levels of group effectiveness. Despite the undeniable effect of EI on employees performance in different organizational levels and confirmation of its positive effects on employees growth (e.g. Zaccaro et al., 2003), their general health improvement (Jain & Sinha, 2005), and workplace development (e.g. Suliman et al., 2007), one may assumes that people in higher levels of organizations need to be in higher level of EI to do their work more effectively. The reason for this assumption is that managers are more involved in situations demanding more capabilities than IQ; also, different dimensions of EI seem to be more related to their job contingencies. In other words, as an individual goes higher in organizational hierarchy, the positive effect of emotional intelligence on coping with situations and doing tasks in effective ways increases.

For several years, what makes a manager successful has been a principle research question for organizational scholars. Since Goleman popularized the concept of EI in 1995, different researches have tented to measure how EI helps managers' success in changing environments. In this way, empirical studies on emotional intelligence in managerial levels have expanded. Each of these studies investigates managers' emotional intelligence regarding to one of the managerial aspects or responsibilities; such as, studying relation between managers' EI score and their performance (Longhorn, 2004), EI and management leadership style (Downey et al., 2006), EI and managers' work attitudes, behaviors, and outcomes (Carmeli, 2003), and studying the impact of managers’ emotional intelligence on employees' satisfaction (Glaso & Einarsen, 2005). Results of these researches revealed that EI predicts positive outcomes for managers and at the higher level for their organizations. Based on this finding, some researchers recently have sought to answer the question that whether EI can be developed through training programs or not (e.g. Groves et al., 2008; Dulwicz & Higgs, 2003).

Studies on the importance of EI in management have focused on some parts of managers' responsibilities and their performance aspects. Even though, decision making is one of the most important managers' tasks with inevitable influences on their activities, its relation with managers' EI or the predicted effect of EI on managers' decision making style have not been investigated. The present study aims to fill the above gap and attempts to explore the differences among managers’ EI of National Iranian Oil Company (a public sector organization), and how this affects their decision making styles. Managers in different public and private organizations face with changing factors that have to be considered in decision making task. Beside various organizational and environmental factors, managers' responses to decision making situations seem to be different because of their personal characteristics and orientations. Therefore, it has recently mentioned that to consider special factors that influence decision making, managers in public organizations should look for effective personal characteristics that affect their responses to decision making situations positively, instead of just relying on traditional and bureaucratic approaches. In this case it is predicted that EI as an important personal factor can play an important role in public managers' orientation or disorientation to a special decision making style. We are going to show this effect by modeling the relationship between EI and five general decision making styles; that is,
rational, intuitive, dependent, spontaneous, and avoidance styles (Spicer & Sadler-Smith, 2005). The purpose of this study is three-fold. First, we measure EI of managers in national oil company based on available EI models and standardized questionnaires. Next, we study which decision making style is more popular among public managers, considering to General Decision Making Style Model. Finally, we make a model for the predicted effect of managers' EI on their decision making style.

The rest of this paper is organized into 5 sections. In section 2, literature review will be done that includes the history of EI, different definitions of the concept and five dimensions of EI by Goleman, concept of decision making style, and the role of EI in managers' decision making style. Section 3, describes the mythology of the study and research methodology. In section 4 discusses the results. In section 5, discussion and implications will be presented. In final section, the conclusions and final remarks will be described.

2. Literature review

2.1. Emotional Intelligence (EI)
Over the past several years, studies on intelligence have mainly focused on the adaptive use of cognition (Rahim & Minors, 2003). With the dawn of 21st century, human mind added a new dimension which is now considered as a more important factor for success than intelligence. This is termed as Emotional Intelligence (EI) and measured as Emotional Quotation (EQ). During these years, the term Emotional Intelligence (EI) has received much attention as a useful factor to understand and predict individuals' performance at workplace, home, school, etc. (Katyal & Awasthi, 2005). According to Van Maanen & Kunda (1989), emotions are "ineffable feeling of the self-referential sort" and comprehensively defined as "self-referential feeling an actor (employee) experiences or at least claims to experience in regard to the performance she or he bring off in the social world" (Carmeli, 2003).

As longer ago as 1920s, Thorandike reviewed the predictive intelligence to explain the aspects of success which could not be allocated for by IQ (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2003). He defined social intelligence as the ability to understand and manage men and women, boys and girls, and to act wisely in human relations (Law et al., 2004). Therefore, it is true to say that EI has its roots in studies of "social intelligence" and perhaps earlier (Tischler et al., 2002). However, it was not until the early 1980s that Gardner (1993) resurrected interest in factors other than IQ which may influence individual success. In an educational context, he developed the concept of multiple intelligence subjects. In particular, his "Personal Intelligence" included inter-personal, self-awareness, and emotional traits (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2003). In addition to being born with various multiple intelligence subjects, Gardner suggested that some of intelligences are potentially determined by the cultural environment in which individuals are socialized, including their work environment (Green et al., 2005). In 1990, Mayer & Salovey first termed it as "Emotional Intelligence" (Carmeli, 2003) and Goleman popularized the concept of EI in his 1995 book. Also, he mentioned that EI might matter more than IQ (Tischler et al., 2002); in other words, he believes that EI gives you a competitive edge (Lam & Kirby, 2002). Harris states that emotional intelligence is a rare concept; it is both an academic and a popular phenomenon that has generated a vast literature (Harris, 2005).

Although, today, there is general agreement that EI encapsulates personal qualities commonly held as positive tools toward effective interactions and conducing daily life events, discussion continues around its actual definition and measurement (Morehouse, 2007). There have been numerous definitions of what constitutes EI and different models describing EI dimensions. All of these definitions and models reference EI as thoughts and feelings behind people actions which guide their response patterns in different situations (Diggins, 2004). In other
words, EI can be regarded as an attempt to comprehend the relationship between thinking and emotion (Maree & Finestone, 2007). Mayer & Salovey defined EI as the subset of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one's own and others feelings and emotion to guide one's thinking and actions (Chruscieł, 2006; Bar-On et al., 2000) view EI as a non cognitive intelligence which is defined as an array of emotional, personal, and social abilities and skills that influence an individual's ability to cope effectively with environmental demands and pressures.

Goleman (1995, 1998) has argued about the importance of emotional intelligence in everyday life of organizations work. He acknowledges that EI has its roots in classic management theory (Leban & Zulauf, 2004) and provides a useful definition of EI construction which is about (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2000):

- Knowing what you are feeling and being able to handle those feelings without having them swamp you,
- Being able to motivate yourself to get jobs done, being creative and perform at your peak, and
- Sensing what others are feeling, and handling relationships effectively.

Based on the above construction, two models of EI have emerged. First, the ability model that describes EI as "abilities that involve perceiving and reasoning abstractly with information that emerges from feeling". Second, the mixed model that defines emotional intelligence as "ability with social behaviors, traits and competencies" (Mandell & Pherwani, 2003). The ability model of EI is largely upheld by Mayer and Salovey; while, the mixed model is espoused by Goleman (1995, 1998) and Bar-On (1997). There are slight differences in these models and EI remains a fashionable current research topic and debate (Morehouse, 2007). In our study, we measure EI with respect to Goleman model. In his model, five dimensions for EI are identified (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2000):

- **Self awareness**: Knowing own feeling and being in touch with them.
- **Emotional management**: Not reflecting on own feelings, being able to express feelings (not passive).
- **Self motivation**: Do not use impulse in pursuing goals, do not give up in face of set backs.
- **Empathy**: Sense what others are feeling and feel rapport with them.
- **Relationship**: persuading others to work to common goal and helping others to learn promoting social harmony.

Regarding to different definitions of EI, this concept refers to a feeling or thought beyond all individual activities that affects their reactions to different situations. Therefore, those who are in high levels of EI are able to recognize their own and others' feelings and reactions in different situations; also, are able to direct these reactions in a right way.

### 2.2. Decision Making

The study of decision making processes is not a new topic. It has been evolving with contributions from a number of disciplines for over 300 years (Olivera, 2007). Decisions are the core transactions of organizations (Harrison & Pelletier, 2000) and may include three aspects (Olivera, 2007):

1. There may be more than one possible courses of action.
2. Decision makers can form expectations concerning future events that are often described in terms of probabilities as degree of confidence.
3. Consequences associated with possible outcomes can be assessed in terms of reflecting personal values and current goals.
As with leadership decision making has been studied from multiple perspectives (Tatum et al., 2003), decision making by individuals within an organizational and social context has become an increasing complex part of leadership (McKena & Martin-Smith, 2005). Over the years, there has been much debate on how to accurately describe decision making processes in general beyond an implicit agreement that decisions are made through some sort of chaotic processes (Fulop et al., 2006).

Decision making is about deliberately choosing an option from two or more options in a proactive manner, under conditions of uncertainty, in order to reach a specific goal, objective or outcome with the least amount of risk (Cervone, 2005). Managers, sometimes, see decision making as their central job because they must constantly choose what to be done, who is to do it, when, where and occasionally even how it will be done (Weinz & Koontz, 1993). Harrison & Pelletier (2000) agree with Herbert A. Simon (1960) who in his classic work on the science of management decision making treats it as a process synonymous with the whole process of management. Harris (1998) considers it as the study of identifying and choosing alternatives based on the values and preferences of decision makers (Fulop et al., 2006). We can say that managers face with situations (opportunities or threats) that have to make decisions in doing all their activities; therefore, decision making is of great importance in all managerial activities and organizational processes.

Decision theories have embodied several prevalent concepts and models which exert significant influence over almost all the biological, cognitive, and social sciences (Olivera, 2007). There are different factors affecting the ways in which decision makers concern with decision situations. Based on Tatum et al. (2003) there is no universally accepted classification of decision making style. Hunt et al (1989), considered decision making style as closely related to the term cognitive style. Cognitive style in decision making often refers to individual "thinking practices" central to the understanding of decision processes (Thuholm, 2004). Scott and Bruce (1995), described decision making styles as the learned, habitual response patterns exhibited by an individual when confronted with a decision situation. With more attention to individual differences in decision making style Scott and Bruce (1995) consider five decision making styles as the General Decision Making Style (G.D.M.S) (Spicer & Sadler-Smith, 2005) that we measured these five styles among the managers in our study:

**Rational decision making style**
Harren (1979) explained that individuals engaging in rational decision making anticipate the need to make a decision and prefer for it by seeking relevant information about themselves and their environment. Such individual"s primary approach to information gathering and processing is systematic and oriented toward both internal and external sources (Singh & GreenHous, 2004). In rational decision making style, decision makers analyze a number of possible alternatives from different scenarios before selecting a choice. These scenarios are weighted by probabilities and decision makers can determine the expected scenarios for each alternative. The final choice would be the one presenting the best – expected scenario and with highest probability of outcome (Olivera, 2007). In other words, decision makers in this style follow a consistent and familiar process to select and implement a course of action.

**Intuitive decision making style**
The literature looks at the intuition from many perspectives. Since the 1950s it has been known that organization of maternal in the brain provides neural respecters and prefers pathways for storing new information (Patton, 2003). The role of intuition in decision making can be conceptualized as a two step process in which (implicit) knowledge is first marked with a positive or negative valence depending on the outcome of previous decisions and then is used to shape further (explicit) decision making by means of the somatic maker (the
emotional valence) associated with the knowledge (Bierman, 2005). Patton (2003) identified three sources of intuition that decision makers truth them when they are trying to cope with uncertain and unpredictable decision making situations due to rapid and complex changes in environment:

1. **Innate response**: The instinct that bring subconscious but usually still appropriate reactions to situations. It is not learned but inborn.
2. **General experience**: The learning that occurs in the normal process of aging and of accumulating experience.
3. **Focused learning**: The learning that stems from deliberate effects to develop habits and achieve intuitive reactions.

**Dependent decision making**
It refers to reliance upon the direction and support of others (Spicer & Sadler-Smith, 2005). Decision makers in this style always search for advice and guidance from others before making important decisions (Thunholm, 2004).

**Spontaneous decision making**
It means impulsive and prone to making "snap" or "spur" of the moment (Spicer & Sadler-Smith, 2005). This style characterized by a feeling of immediacy and desire to come through the decision making process as quickly as possible (Thunholm, 2004).

**Avoidant decision making style**
It means avoiding or postponing making decisions (Spicer & Sadler-Smith, 2005). In this style, decision maker attempts to avoid or postpone making decisions (Thunholm, 2004).

### 2.3. EI and decision making style

Management scholars and development practitioners have evidenced marked interest in understanding emotions in the workplace for more than a decade (Groves et al., 2008). Knowing that EI is tied to successful leadership, skills of emotionally intelligent people like flexibility, conflict management, persuasion, and social reasoning become increasingly important with advancing level in leadership hierarchy (Mandell & Pherwani, 2003). Therefore, EI as an important personal trait has an inevitable role in doing all managerial activities in appropriate ways; especially, in changing environments that relying on cognitive intelligent is not effective enough to make suitable decisions and cope with unknowns for different managers.

Whilst, decision making has been the subject of long–standing conceptual concern, despite some theoretical work, there has been little consideration of the impact of individual differences between decision making approaches to as style of decision making (Spicer & Sadler-Smith, 2005). There are different individual characteristics that can influence decision making style of managers; such as, individual value systems (Connor & Becker, 2003), self regulation habits (Thunholm, 2004), and emotional intelligence (EI) as an important personal factor that its effect on decision making styles of managers is studied in this research.

Ashkanasy et al. (2002) presents both the narrow interpretation limiting emotional intelligence to the distinct abilities of perception, identification, understanding, and management of emotions, to the broader interpretation which would include empathy, time management, decision making, and team working (Chrusciel, 2006). Therefore, in today's organizations that face with complex and changing internal and external environments, decision makers should have various skills and abilities to make decisions in order to deal
with these extreme situations. This usually requires managers to evaluate their current skills and develop more creative approaches. According to Diggins (2004), the best managers need to possess EI to make decisions based on a combination of self management, relationship skills, and awareness of their behavior's effects on others in the organization. He argued that EI plays a greater role than "traditional intelligence" in determining leaders and organizations' success and concluded that EI helps people to:

- Be more aware of their interpersonal style.
- Recognize and manage the impact of emotions on their thoughts and behavior.
- Understanding how well they manage relationships and how to improve.

EI with its unique elements is of great importance in managerial decision making activity. Self-motivation helps managers in better understanding of their own feelings when they are confronted with a threat or opportunity that demands their decision or reaction. Self-controlling as another important factor of EI helps managers to control their internal feelings and reactions such as; fear or negative excitement in decision making situations. Self-motivating as the third element of EI increases managers’ desire to respond to the problems in an active way instead of passive ways. Empathy as another important elements of EI help managers to understand others feelings and needs and make decisions because all decision makers make decisions that is implemented by their employees. Finally, social communication or relationship makes managers able to connect with their employees. In this way, managers can make suitable decisions and also facilitate their implementations. Therefore, managers who are high in EI are expected to understand and analyze decision making situations in better ways comparing those who are in lower level of EI.

### 2.4 Training EI for managers

Emotional intelligence training is very demanding on management level of organizations. There are limits to how much individuals can improve their EI. However studies have suggested that people can quite effectively increase their emotional intelligence. People develop their emotional intelligence in a sequential manner. They begin by developing their self-awareness through recognizing their own thoughts and feelings towards people and situations. Once they build this self-understanding, they move towards understanding other people, groups and subtleties at play in the organization, and use this information to induce effective and desirable responses in others (Diggins, Cliona, 2004). Since emotional intelligence is an important factor in management success, many organizations try to design special training programs with the focus on introducing EI dimensions to their managers and encourage them to learn about new techniques of developing their EI skill.

The process of improving emotional intelligence in work places with the special focus on management level can be summarized in different steps as following (Cherniss, Cary, 2000):

**Step one: Readiness for change**
1. Evaluation of organization’s needs.
2. Evaluation of individual’s strengths and weaknesses and making them aware of the result of their evaluation.
3. Trainees readiness
4. Clear goal setting and making connection between learning goals and personal values.
5. Self-directed learning.
6. Help trainees to gain positive beliefs about learning.

**Step two: learning**
1. Making connection between trainer and trainee.
2. Using actual and valuable models.
3. Reliance on empirical models.
4. Providing situations for the practice of skills and giving feedbacks.
5. Paying attention to the point saying that mistakes does not necessarily mean failure.

Step three : encourage, maintenance and evaluation of change
1. Providing social supports
2. Creation of an encouraging environment

3. Methodology

In this section, we provide the methodology for operationalizing the variables and factors, acquiring the data, and determining the reliability of factor grouping. The data used in this study are consisted of responses of managers in Iranian oil industry to the questionnaire. At the targeting viewpoint, this research is developmental-applicable ones, but from implementation view it is descriptive and analytical. Population of survey is defined by the entire Iranian managers and experts in oil industry and masters. Sampling method was judgmental and based on available sample of experts. Sample size was 70 in which all of the people have enough knowledge (22-28 years of experience). 58 percent of respondents have bachelor education, 38 percent have master, and 4 percent have higher degrees. In this respect, we use two questionnaires include emotional intelligence (EI) and managerial decision making styles. In EI assessment of sample size we used standard questionnaire include 33 questions, while Scott & Bruce(1995) questionnaire in managerial decision making style is considered (25 questions) (Spicer & Sadler-Smith, 2005). Questions were answered using a five-point Likert-type scale (e.g. 1=not at all important, 2=not important, 3=not thinking about it, 4=important, 5=extremely important). To customize the questionnaire, we asked for suggestions from high skilled related managers during their participation in workshops. The draft questionnaire was handed out during two workshops. Accordingly, from 70 distributed questionnaires, 55 of them are returned (the response rate was 78%). K-S test shows that the data distribution is normal. Measures of each category were found to be reliable with the Alpha Cronbach 0.028 for all questions. This is mean of all variables Cranach’s Coefficient Alpha.

To validate the framework presented in the preceding section, a linear SEM approaches used to validate the causal relationships between the different latent constructs of emotional intelligence and managerial decision making styles. The significance of the overall models is determined by the chi-square value, the corresponding degrees of freedom and the associated p-value. The individual linkages between any two variables are tested using the critical ratio, which is an observation on a random variable that has an approximate standard normal distribution. Thus, using a significance level of 0.05 any critical ratio that exceeds 1.96 in magnitude would be significant. All the same, the critical ratio misinterpreted as if there were a significant link or not.

The latent variables in each of the model are measured by the manifest or indicator variables used in the research instrument. One limitation of the model was that multivariate normality was assumed. However, we did conduct tests for testing the univariate normality by plotting normal probability plots and several variables conformed to have a normal distribution. Therefore; SEM technique is suited for our research purposes. In inference statistical analysis, basic hypotheses are defined. These hypotheses are defined for determining relationships between EI factors and managerial decision making styles as follows:

$H_0$: There is a significant relationship between emotional intelligence (EI) coefficient and managerial decision making styles.
H1: There is not a significant relationship between emotional intelligence (EI) coefficient and managerial decision making styles.

4. Results

According to literature review, a generic conceptual model of emotional intelligence (EI) and managerial decision making styles is developed. The conceptual model is shown based on above steps in figure (1).

Equations are made by emotional intelligence (EI) that is functions of self-awareness (SEL), self-motivating (MOT), self-managing (MAN), empathy (EMP), handling relationship (HAN), and its relationship to managerial decision making styles (DM) includes rational decision making (RAT), intuitive decision making (INT), dependent decision making (DEP), spontaneous decision making (SPO), and avoidant decision making (AVO).

The structure of hypothetical model about interactions of EI elements is supported by chi-square statistics. The GFI (goodness of fit index) for this model is 0.89. These global goodness of fit statistic suggesting acceptable fit of the data with the model. The path coefficient estimated were statistically significant with t-value, indicating that the variables were completely linked to the model (t-value of 1.96 or higher at level of 0.05 is significant). The structural equation is demonstrated and also path coefficients, the t-values and p-values of the model are shown as follows:

**Figure (1): EI & managerial decision making styles model**

- RAT = 0.88*LS, Errorvar. = 2.38, \( R^2 = 0.25 \)
  
  \[
  \begin{align*}
  \text{SEL} & \quad 0.26 \\
  \text{MOT} & \quad 1.25 \\
  \text{MAN} & \quad 0.87 \\
  \text{EMP} & \quad 1.54 \\
  \text{HAN} & \quad 35.51 \\
  \text{EI} & \quad 0.05 \\
  \text{LS} & \quad 0.05 \\
  \text{RAT} & \quad 2.08 \\
  \text{INT} & \quad 0.36*LS, \ Errorvar. = 11.11, \ R^2 = 0.012 \\
  \text{DEP} & \quad 2.56 \\
  \text{SPO} & \quad 5.45 \\
  \text{AVO} & \quad 2.45 \\
  \end{align*}
  \]

- INT = -0.36*LS, Errorvar. = 11.11, \( R^2 = 0.012 \)

\[
\begin{align*}
(0.24) & \quad (0.60) \\
3.60 & \quad 3.94 \\
(0.51) & \quad (1.57) \\
-0.70 & \quad 7.05
\end{align*}
\]
DEP = 1.13*LS, Errorvar. = 2.88, R² = 0.31
    (0.28)              (0.86)
    3.97              3.36
SPO = 1.24*LS, Errorvar. = 8.45, R² = 0.15
    (0.67)              (2.14)
    1.86              3.95
AVO = 1.47*LS, Errorvar. = 2.25, R² = 0.49
    (0.29)              (1.05)
    5.00              2.15
SEL = 0.74*EI, Errorvar. = 0.96, R² = 0.37
    (0.14)              (0.29)
    5.35              3.29
MOT = - 0.050*EI, Errorvar. = 1.35, R² = 0.0018
    (0.17)              (0.18)
    -0.29             7.30
MAN = 0.69*EI, Errorvar. = 0.87, R² = 0.35
    (0.12)              (0.25)
    5.84              3.54
EMP = 1.74*EI, Errorvar. = 1.14, R² = 0.73
    (0.21)              (0.92)
    8.32              1.24
HAN = 1.83*EI, Errorvar. = 16.51, R² = 0.17
    (0.78)              (3.93)
    2.35              4.20

Structural Equations

LS = - 0.062*EI, Errorvar. = 1.00, R² = 0.0038
    (0.24)
    -0.25

5. Discussion and Implications

As indicated by the statistics above, the overall convergence of the SEM model was significant. The chi-square values and associated p-value are highly acceptable indicating good fit for the model. However, both GFI and AGFI are measures that represent overall degree of fit (squared residuals from prediction compared to the actual data) are on the low side. For both of these, higher values would indicate better fit but no absolute threshold levels have been established for GFI. This might be expected given the sample size, which makes estimation of maximum likelihood parameters not significant.

Thus, given the limitation of a small sample size we accept the validity of the model. Of course, the structural model does require a multivariate normality assumption of the variables included in the model. We tried to test the univariate normality by plotting the normal probability plots and the corresponding univariate distributions and more than 60 percent of the variables conformed to univariate normal distributions. However, the multivariate normality had to be assumed and this did become a limitation of the model. Figure 2 gives the finalized model with the associated statistics as presented above. From the statistics presented above, the evidence suggests that emotional intelligence has important effect on managerial decision making style whilst it might be expected that the motivating oneself leads to EI, the
critical ratio for this link (1.78), is lower than the required 1.96. For this reason, we acknowledge that there is still not enough evidence to establish the significance of this link. However, the handling relationship and empathy leads to significant values for EI accordingly. In other side of model and among five kinds of decision making styles, intuitional style has negative and poor correlation to EI in certain company. In addition, Avoidance has strong correlation to emotional intelligence.

6. Conclusion and final remarks

This research provides a number of contributions to the theoretical debate; that is, "Relationship between Emotional Intelligence (EI) and Management Decision Making Styles". The first contribution considers the managerial decision making not in sections but in its entirety. Moreover, we consider the relationship between emotional intelligence (EI) related factors and managerial DM ones. The second contribution establishes that the emotional intelligence does lead to wide variety styles of managerial DM. The third contribution is that, opposed to much of the available literature on emotional intelligence, this research has a theoretical basis and an empirical analysis where the model converged statistically with acceptable chi-square and p-values. The most important contribution of this research points to the effects of emotional intelligence on different managerial dimensions such as managers decision making style. Therefore we can consider emotional intelligence as a critical subject to be considered in management training programs. With regards to the influence of emotional intelligence in shaping managers decision making style, it is obvious that emotional intelligence should be considered as a training course for managers in order to improve their abilities to adapt their decision making style with the situation they are working in. Future research should empirically test the relationships suggested in this paper in different companies to enable comparative studies. A large sample would also allow detailed cross-sectoral comparisons, which are not possible in the context of this study.
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