The Influence of Emotional Intelligence in the Choice of Conflict Resolution Strategy

Fleura Shkëmbi*, Valbona Treska

Department of Psychological Studies, Mediterranean University of Albania, Albania. *Corresponding Author's Email: fleura.shkembi@umsh.edu.al

Abstract

The purpose of this article is to examine the need for Emotional Intelligence (EI) in conflict resolution and the workplace. Based on the review of emotional intelligence models, we aimed to comprehend the ability to resolve the effect of conflict and the process of regulation and processing of conflicts. Data was collected from 280 university employees through the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-I 2.0) and the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument (TKI). The results showed that the categories most frequently used by the participants were 'Accommodation', 'Avoidance', and 'Compromise'. Women are among those who have used this kind of conflict resolution the most. Additional results revealed significantly higher EI levels in females, a positive relationship between emotional intelligence and social intelligence, positive emotional intelligence in the Social Sciences Department, and the significant impact of emotional intelligence on conflict resolution styles. The present article reported the impact of emotional intelligence on conflict resolution models, including the role of administrative staff in the Albanian context.

Keywords: Emotional intelligence, Conflict resolution, Employee, Management style, Wellbeing.

Introduction

Studies have revealed that those who possess higher emotional intelligence levels tend to attain greater professional success (1, 2), reduced job insecurities (3, 4), more effective leadership (5-7), and improved team management and organizational performance (8, 9). People who have higher emotional intelligence can better handle stressors (10, 11) and have more effective coping skills than those with lower EI (12). This study aims to analyze how emotional intelligence relates to conflict resolution among Albanian university workers.

Emotional Intelligence and Conflict Resolution

According to scholars (13), the intellect originates from the Latin "intellectuals" ("intus" = inner and "legere" = to study), which means "*to study the inner."* It is typically associated with understanding and the ability to think, comprehend, and form a mental image of reality. The notion of emotional intelligence (EI) was initially proposed in 1990 when scholars published their first scientific paper on the subject (14). In this paper, they characterized EI as social intelligence distinct from general cognitive abilities. Effectively managing emotions requires the recognition and regulation of emotions in oneself and others, as well as the application of cognitive skills. In a later series, the authors expanded their model and defined EI as "*a person's ability to better understand, analyze, and express his emotions; the ability to receive and/or create emotions that stimulate thinking; the ability to understand emotions and the cognition of emotions; and the ability to regulate emotions promotes emotional and intellectual growth*" (15). Both saw EI as part of human intelligence. Another author (16) defined EI within the context of human psychology as a combination of abilities, skills, and unconscious abilities that influence an individual's capacity to cope effectively with environmental demands and pressures. He proposed a model of non-cognitive intelligence that includes five extensive areas of abilities or competencies in personality and specific abilities that seem to contribute to success. These, in their revised model*, include interpersonal skills, decision-making, stress management, self-perception, and expression.* When arguing the concept of EI as "*the ability to recognize our feelings and those of others to motivate ourselves and to manage emotions well in ourselves and our relationships,"* scholars questioned the classical

concepts related to success, ability, and talent since, in his opinion, excessive importance had been given to the Intelligence Quotient (IQ) as a unique indicator to classify people as intelligent or not intelligent and thus predict their future (17). EI is considered a potential capacity that determines the learning of practical skills regarding five aspects: *self-awareness, motivation, self-control, empathy, and relationships with others*. Therefore, the author proposed a new model in terms of performance theory since, as he suggested, it has a specific application in work and organizational structure, especially in terms of the ability to predict any type of work. These models include *abilities, personalities, and characteristics,* and they combine motivation, states of consciousness, social functions, and the ability to understand and manage emotions together. Researchers use the mixed model of EI more than other models, which is shown to be the most popular and acceptable model (18-20). An occurrence that has now been broadly addressed via clinical literature is conflict management and psychological well-being (21, 22).

Conflicts are neither effective nor negative. They truly exist and arise in all areas. Therefore, knowing how they may usually be present is an essential factor to face. Conflict resolution styles are the behavioral patterns that individuals use when facing a conflict (23, 24).

Individuals with a high level of EI work to maintain interpersonal relationships, while those with lower levels of EI tend to report greater use of negative conflict behaviors that can affect their interpersonal relationships. Research has traditionally differentiated between two dimensions of interpersonal conflict resolution styles: *concern for oneself and concern for others* (25, 26).

The interaction of these two dimensions results in five different conflict resolution styles: *collaborative, competitive, compromised, avoidant, and accommodating.* According to research, emotionally intelligent people can adopt various conflict resolution styles (27). Studies (28) also revealed that people who manage their emotions well are more likely to use an introspective and less accepting or receptive style than those who do not manage their emotions well. People with higher EI levels are more likely to engage in more collaborative conflict resolution styles.

Researchers (29) found in the Chinese population that the higher the EI in the supervisor-supervised relationship, the more the integrative/collaborative style and the committed style when coping with conflicts. Yet others (30) describe several skills that promote constructive conflict resolution*: observation*, referring to the ability to put oneself in the other person's shoes and try to understand their feelings and preferences (*emotional empathy*); *communication skills*, both about expressing ideas clearly and respectfully and listening with attention and interest to the interlocutor (*active listening); creative thinking*, to be able to propose the right solution; *critical thinking*, involving self-criticism of self-deprecation and unreliable sources of information (e.g., rumors); and *emotional skills*, which allow us to recognize negative emotions (especially anger) and control them. About this last skill, it is very important to note that conflict creates an emotional state, but people's emotions can be the basis of conflict. Therefore, the correct management of emotions acts as a barrier to conflict, and for those who have already been created, this is the major factor in the resolution. Scholars also argued that aggressive behavior that often accompanies conflict leads to feelings of anger (31). It is an emotion associated with an unfulfilled desire that results from frustration. Therefore, a significant number of conflicts could be avoided if people developed some emotional skills. EI sets the necessary standards for effective conflict management. Intelligent people consider their feelings and those of others, distinguish between them, and use that information to guide their thinking and behavior. Researchers have studied conflict in different organizations (32). In a study of EI and social interaction, authors (33) found that people with high EI show greater empathy, greater self-control in social situations, interpersonal relationships, greater relationships with partners, etc. This result can be considered important since it shows that EI can be seen as a desirable quality that leads to social knowledge. The authors' study supports other significant findings, which revealed that people with high EI may be more effective than their peers and, therefore, may be better at motivating people to achieve goals, objectives, and organizational tasks (34). In the job-related field, through the ability to

interact and communicate effectively with others, the employees will have a sense of acceptance and comfort in reaching agreement among their supervisors and be more effective in their task accomplishment. Data showed that the integrative style of conflict resolution ("collaboration") was predicted by the "*problem-solving" and "social responsibility*" subscales. *'Problem-solving"* subscale was also predictive for the *'Compromised' and 'Avoidance'* conflict management styles; "Social *Responsibility"* was true for the type of "Accommodator" conflict resolution style, and the *'Impulse Control' and 'Self-Esteem'* subscales were predictors of the dominant style ('*Competitiv*e'). Recently, studies (35) confirmed that various studies associate the ability to resolve conflicts with a better self-image and a higher degree of qualities that make people more able to control emotions. The results are consistent with various research (36, 37).

Method

Purpose
This paper aims to study the dynamic interaction of emotional intelligence (EI) and conflict resolution in the workplace and how sociodemographic and workplace factors influence Emotional Intelligence and vice versa.

Sample
The sample of the present work was composed of 280 administrative employees from the major Departments of the University of Tirana. Male participation is relatively high (n = 150) or 53% while women (n = 130) or 46%. Most of the participants were from Tirana (54%) while other cities in Albania represent different weights such as Durres (15%), Elbasan (12%), Vlora (11%), Korça (5 %), and Shkodra (3%). 86% of the participants had completed at least a master's degree and had more than 5 years of working experience in administration; 9% of the participants had less than 5 years of work with a bachelor's degree and the remaining 5% held a Doctoral Degree and more than 3 years of working experience. Most participants belong to the "*Faculty of Social Sciences*" (45%), followed by the "*Faculty of Economics and Finance*" (25%), the "*Faculty of Law*" (18%), the "*Faculty of Medical Sciences*" (10%) and the "*Faculty of Arts and Humanities*" (2%). A detailed view of this data collection can be found in the following Table.

Measures
Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i 2.0)
EQ-i is used to determine how a person's EI can affect people and the workplace. It is one of the most widely used EI measures in literature and one of the most respected and popular EI assessment tools in the world (38). The EQ-i is a self-assessment tool available in several languages, but not yet standardized in Albanian. Afore, the authors of the present work used an adapted version of the tool based on the reliability of the tool in the current sample. The author has developed many versions for use with different people and different situations (39).

In the present study, we used the EQ-i 2.0 version as it is the most complete version of the original EQ-i. In general, the development of EQ-i 2.0 followed much of the same process as EQ-i: defining the goals of change (what needs to change and why); designing changes to subscales, and creating new ones based on the latest EI research and practice using the EQ-i model; build and test applications; and conduct a normative analysis and post-analysis of the data to improve and validate the instrument (objective analysis, analysis, and verification). EQ-i 2.0 focuses on emotional and social behaviors that are competent about performance and success in life and work. The tool consists of 5 scales and 15 subscales. EQ-i 2.0 consists of 133 items and its responses are measured on a scale of 5- Likert scores range from 1 (never/rarely) to 5 (always/almost always). The test requires about 30 minutes to be administered without interruption. The total raw score is converted to a standard score of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. To evaluate the reliability of EQ-i 2.0 in the current sample, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was calculated.

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of the sample

		No. of participants	% of participants
Gender	Female	130	46
	Male	150	53
Location	Tirana	151	54
	Durres	42	15
	Elbasan	34	12
	Vlora	31	11
	Korça	14	5
	Shkodra	8	3
Education	Bachelor	240	86
	Master	25	9
	Doctorate	15	5
Working experience	up to 3 years	25	9
	3-6 years	15	5
	6-10 years	240	86
Hierarchical rank	D.1 (Head of dpt.)	28	10
	D.2 (Specialists)	182	65
	D.3(Admin. assist.)	70	25
Faculty	Social Sciences	126	45
	Economics and Finance	70	25
	Law	50	18
	Medical Sciences	28	10
	Arts and Humanities	6	2

Source: Authors elaboration on own data

The alpha coefficient of the total score was high (α= 0.91). The score between the scales is also high, especially for "*social interaction*" and "*decision making*" at α= 0.87, "*self-expression*" at α=.821 and "*stress management*" and "*self-awareness*" at α= .91. Alpha coefficients obtained for the subscales were very high and consistent, varying between α=.90 and α= .92. To study the validity of the EQ-i 2-0- and a sample of participants, factor analysis was performed.

Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument (TKI)

TKI has been helping to understand how different types of conflict management modes affect interpersonal relationships for more than 40 years (40). These authors proposed a questionnaire that makes it possible to establish people's preference for using some form of conflict resolution styles in different situations of daily life. The TKI is a forced instrument that consists of 30-word types, namely 60 sentences, of which 25 are repeated; in which the parts

corresponding to item 7 are checked for each type. Each pair sets up a situation of conflict and refers to the judgment and concerns of people. The person must choose from each pair the statement that best describes what he or she considers to be their behavior during the conflict. Based on the interaction of the variables of assertiveness and cooperation, the authors identified five types of conflict management strategies: accommodation, avoidance, competitive, collaborative, and compromised. To evaluate the reliability of the TKI, the McDonald Omega ratio was calculated, which for the present sample was equal to ω= 0.63. To consider the reliability value acceptable thanks to the Omega ratio, it must be between ω= 0.70 and ω = 0.90 although scholars suggest that in some cases, scores starting from ω= 9.65 may be acceptable (41). Therefore, according to this index, the reliability of TKI for the present sample is acceptable.

Data administration

For the collection of information in the current study, an official letter of introduction was sent to the Human Resources Department of the University of Tirana; where we obtained permission to contact the participants among the selected 280 administrative staff. The participants were informed about the consent process, the aim, the objective, and the importance of the study. The administration time of the questionnaire for each participant varies between 15 and 20 minutes.

Results

Table 2 shows the results of the descriptive analysis of the dimensions of EI, specifying the global index (total EI), scales, and sub-scales to identify the scores of EI and meet the research objective. The total EI of the sample was 100.0,

with a standard deviation of 14.98. This score is right in the middle of the average range (90–110 points); therefore, the score for this group is of the standard level, adjusted to the average found during the process of creating the standard for the test. In this regard, it must be considered that excessive attention to personal emotions may not be adaptive and may even not be helpful to the research scores.

Among the different scales for calculating total EI, the "self-perception scale" has the highest score (M = 102.04; SD = 13.52), while the "interpersonal scale" has the lowest score (M = 98.89; SD = 13.87). Regarding the subscales, "Interpersonal Relations" (M = 103.05; SD = 13.76) has the highest score, while the lowest score concerns the subscale "Independence" of the Scale of Self-Expression (M = 96.67; SD = 14.89).

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics, Means, and Standard Deviations of EI

EI	N	Mean		SD	
EI total	280	100,00		14,98	
Self-perception scale	280	102,04		13,52	
- Self-esteem	280	-	100,056	-	14.01
- Self-realization	280	-	101,00	-	14,98
- Emotional self-awareness	280	-	97,876	-	15,06
Self-expression scale	280	98,90		14,765	
- Emotional expression	280	-	97,879	-	15,09
- Assertiveness	280	-	99,01	-	15,01
- Independence	280	-	96,67	-	14,89
Interpersonal Scale	280	98,89		13,87	
- Interpersonal relations	280	-	103,05	-	13,76
- Empathy	280	-	96,87	-	14,61
- Social Responsibility	280	-	104,982	-	13,54
Decision-making Scale	280	101,001		14,08	
- Problem resolution	280	-	100,25	-	13,87
- Reality testing	280	-	99,42	-	13,61
- Impulse control	280	-	103,56	-	14,08
Stress-management scale	280	99,87		13,987	
- Flexibility	280	-	100,65	-	13,01
- Tolerance to stress	280	-	97,83	-	14,60
- Optimism	280	-	103,002	-	14,08

Source: Authors elaboration on own data

Regarding "stress management," it seems that for the current sample, the "optimism" subscale has the highest score (M = 103,002; SD = 14.08), while "stress tolerance" has the lowest score (M =

97.83; SD = 14.60). This means that for the present study participants, being "optimistic" is a repeated coping mechanism and that they also have a high degree of flexibility (accommodation).

However, the group exhibits poor stress tolerance, which in turn can make them more vulnerable or depressed under demanding conditions. There is no significant difference between the scores of the different EI values (the closest to 10) or between the number of participants, with a standard deviation between 15 and 20% of the mean.

Table 3 shows details of conflict management styles as the "total EI" of EQ-i. The participants are divided into three groups (EI high, moderate, and low) according to the score of distribution: between the high and medium EI groups, there are no great differences, with different scores based on high and low EI. The highest EI score is for a "compromising type" (M = 56.07; SD = 29.89). The lowest score was for "accommodation type" (M = 44.08; SD = 29.76). It means that people with high EI scores tend to find solutions that will try to make everyone happy, but they do not put the needs of others before their own. In the medium-score EI style, the highest score is in the "avoidance style" (M = 51,09; SD = 25,25), and the lowest score is in the "collaborative style" (M = 43,65; SD = 29,87). It means that a moderate EI person tends to avoid conflict completely, but when they must take sides, they do not like to please everyone. In the low EI score profile, the highest scores are reached in the "competitive style" (M = 56,76; SD = 30,65), while the lowest scores regard the "accommodation style" (M = 32,04; SD = 25,36). This means that low-EI people fail to value others' perspectives while also putting their own needs before others.

To meet the purpose of studying the relationship between demographics (variables of gender and hierarchy) and EI and conflict management styles, t-tests were performed for the two independent variables. The other remaining variables, education level, and working experience, are not the aim of the present study.

The following table 4 shows the results of these analyses, considering gender as the comparison variable. Significant differences were found for females in the 'Self-Expression' and 'Interpersonal' subscales, as well as the 'Emotional Self-Awareness', 'Emotional Expression', and 'Empathy' subscales. There is no significant difference in terms of conflict management between both genders.

Table 3: Descriptive statistics means, and standard dev. of conflict management styles according to the total EI

EI	Conflict management style	N	Mean	Std
Total EI High	Accommodation	280	44,08	29,76
	Avoidance		46,65	27,06
	Collaborative		49,08	30,01
	Competitive		50,89	26,87
	Compromising		56,07	29,89
Total EI Moderate	Accommodation	280	47,98	27,54
	Avoidance		51,09	25,25
	Collaborative		43,65	29,87
	Competitive		48,87	27,39
	Compromised		43,98	28,65
Total EI Low	Accommodation	280	32,04	25,36
	Avoidance		52,09	28,03
	Collaborative		36,98	26,42
	Competitive		56,76	30,65
	Compromised		48,98	31,02

Source: Authors elaboration on own data

Table 4: t-test for difference in means by gender (male vs. female)

	Mean male	Mean female	SD	t value	p-value
EI total	100.00	98.09	1.675	-1.10	.45
Self-perception scale	98.89	100.04	1.765	-1.345	.36
Self-expression scale	96.87	98.96	1.78	-2.5	.46
Interpersonal Scale	98.05	103.76	1.68	1.54	.20
Decision-making Scale	102.89	99.87	1.57	1.68	.25
Stress-management scale	99.067	99.01	1.56	1.34	.35
Self-esteem	106.89	105.98	2.01	1.40	.48
Self -realization	98.94	99.02	2.67	-.40	.56
Emotional self-awareness	93.78	97.89	2.87	1.35	.74
Emotional expression	95.06	99.00	2.99	.80	.60
Assertiveness	100.00	99.02	2.67	1.30	.86
Independence	99.00	96.45	2.88	.75	.80
Interpersonal relations	101.45	99.00	2.80	1.01	.65
Empathy	98.88	100.03	2.60	2.34	.46
Social Responsibility	103.001	101.56	2.60	.50	.78
Problem resolution	99.67	100.15	2.97	.30	.95
Reality testing	96.78	98.87	2.65	.25	.85
Impulse control	100.21	100.07	3.00	1.34	.36
Flexibility	95.62	99.00	2.88	.67	.40
Tolerance to stress	99.01	100.54	2.78	.76	.50
Optimism	100.00	101.56	2.98	1.055	.68
Accommodation	51.03	48.96	4.87	.20	.96
Avoidance	58.25	55.01	4.981	.86	.67
Collaboration	45.68	41.00	4.28	.65	.89
Competitive	51.02	49.66	5.00	.35	.94
Compromised	50.89	59.20	5.01	.26	.98

Table 5 shows that there is a significant difference both in the total EI score and in the number of scales and subscales in favor of the participants working in the "Social Sciences" department. It also shows that participants in this department use *'accommodation' and 'compromising'* styles more than other forms of conflict resolution compared to their colleagues in other sectors. It means that Social Sciences department employees are very tolerant when putting other needs before their own, and they try to find a solution that generally pleases all parties. They are flexible and have good stress-management skills.

The Table 6 introduces the Pearson correlations between study variables EI and conflict resolution styles. As it can be deduced, a positive relationship between the EI total and accommodation conflict resolution style (r_w =.567), a positive relationship with competitive conflict resolution style (r_w =.874), and a strong and positive relationship between the EI total and compromised conflict resolution style (r_w = 1.034) were found. These results are in line with our t-test and descriptive analysis.

To fully understand the impact of EI on conflict resolution style, we performed a linear regression. Referring to the correlation variables in the Model Summary, a value of 0.4 is considered significant. Starting from the analysis of the sociodemographic characteristics and the total score on the five EI scales, Table 7 shows the coefficients that result from the regression of each variable on each EI scale in an individual method. The present R=.701, which reveals a good variability and R_{square}=.698 reveals that there is enough influence between the EI and the Conflict Resolution Styles.

Table 5: t-test for difference in means by discipline of work (social sciences, economics, and other departments)

	Mean other depts.	Mean Social Sciences	Mean Economics & Finance	SD	t value	p-value
EI total	99.01	105.67	101.59	1.92	2.98	.35
Self-perception scale	99.88	104.35	100.02	1.99	2.80	.45
Self-expression scale	97.06	99.89	89.98	2.01	3.00	.67
Interpersonal Scale	99.00	98.78	92.54	2.006	1.99	.47
Decision-making Scale	99.139	97.87	95.09	1.87	1.95	.30
Stress-management scale	96.38	102.45	100.87	2.05	2.87	.66
Self-esteem	105.54	110.04	99.92	2	-3.25	.15
Self -realization	100.65	104.06	100.97	1.89	2.85	.42
Emotional self-awareness	98.15	100.45	99.56	1.56	1.86	.45
Emotional expression	99.01	99.05	98.87	1.65	2.00	.35
Assertiveness	96.89	97.07	99.00	1.54	2.03	.38
Independence	96.45	100.45	98.88	1.35	2.00	.46
Interpersonal relations	99.00	100.44	99.98	1.54	2.34	.44
Empathy	100.56	100.18	100.25	1.45	2.00	.47
Social Responsibility	102.54	99.76	98.09	1.54	2.45	.46
Problem resolution	97.88	96.05	99.00	1.55	2.056	.37
Reality testing	99.94	103.03	100.76	1.78	2.75	.48
Impulse control	101.94	100.55	99.98	1.65	2.56	.49
Flexibility	96.07	99.76	87.09	.87	1.09	.56
Tolerance to stress	99.76	103.05	102.98	1.98	2.01	.47
Optimism	96.54	99.99	100.76	1.56	2.00	.57
Accommodation	54.06	42.00	44.89	2.01	3.65	.55
Avoidance	55.87	51.01	45.79	1.98	2.05	.49
Collaborative	42.09	38.99	40.19	1.78	3.01	.54
Competitive	47.81	58.09	56.76	1.54	2.09	.47
Compromised	58.25	62.15	60.15	.98	2.65	.56

Source: Authors elaboration on own data

Table 6: Pearson Correlations of EI and Conflict Resolution Styles

	(1) Accommodation	(2) Avoidance	(3) Collaborative	(4) Competitive	(5) Compromised
EI total	.567	.467	.169**	.874	1.034**
N	280	280	280	280	280

**p<0.01; *Source:* Authors elaboration on own data

Table 7: Multiple Regression of EI and Conflict Resolution Styles

		Variables Entered /Removed	Variables Removed	
Model 1	Variables Entered Conflict Resolution Styles			Method Enter
	a. Dependent Variable EI			
	b. All requested variables entered			

			Model Summary		
Model		R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. error in the estimate
1		.701ᵃ	.698	.592	.754
	a. Predictors: (Constant), Conflict Resolution Styles				

Source: Author's elaboration on own data

Table 8: Logistic regression of sociodemographic and employment variables on conflict resolution

	(1) Accommodation	(2) Avoidance	(3) Collaboration	(4) Competitive	(5) Compromised
Female	3.765 (2.98)	3.187(2.987)	1.097(2.897)	2.987 (1.987)	2.456 (3.564)
Social Sciences	8.078*** (4.019)	3.807 (2.5674)	3.056(2.987)	11.925***(2.876)	3.452 (-4.056)

Standard errors are in parentheses *** p<0.001; *Source:* Author´s elaboration on own´s data

Table 9: Logistic regression of sociodemographic and work variables on total EI and scales

	(1) EI total	(2) Self-perception scale	(3) Self-expression scale	(4) Interpersonal Scale	(5) Decision-making Scale	(6) Stress-management scale
Female	1.8000 (1.678)	2.00065 (1.702)	3.087** (1.679)	3.987** (1.7658)	2.067 (1,654)	.546 (1.456)
Social Sciences	5.439** (1.765)	5.122*** (1.860)	5.1774** (1.987)	2.987 (1.708)	3.564** (1.978)	4.031*** (1.907)

Standard errors are in parentheses *** p<0.001, ** p<0.01; *Source:* Author´s elaboration on own data

Regarding the sociodemographic factor and choice of conflict management model, tables 8 and 9 summarize the results of the regression of both variables. Both the Kaiser criterion and the Scree-test highlighted the presence of two main dimensions (EI and Conflict resolution styles) which generated almost 76% of the total variability. As can be revealed by the above tables, gender does not influence the choice of conflict resolution style. Regression analysis confirmed that the female administrative employees of the "*Social Sciences* " Department used the *Avoidance and Compromised style and the Stress Management* style type more than the other styles.

Discussion and Conclusions

As the aim of this paper, we propose to know what the level of EI among the administrative employees at the University of Tirana is. Regarding the choice of conflict resolution model, there is no reference to determine whether the values obtained in the sample are "good" or not since people use different types depending on the time, although some are easier to apply than others. The most frequently used categories by the participants were "accommodation," "avoidance," and "compromised" styles, and the results of the current paper are in line with those of other research (42, 43). Regarding gender, the results show that the 'Self-Expression' and 'Interpersonal' subscales, as well as the 'Emotional Self-Awareness', 'Emotional Expression', and 'Empathy' subscales, Results also show that women with high EI scores tend to find solutions that will try to make everyone happy (the avoidance style with the highest score; M = 51,09; SD = 25,25), but they do not put the needs of others before their own (the collaborative style with the lowest score; M = 43,65; SD = 29,87).

Various studies supported the differences in gender and support for women in terms of emotional intelligence elements (empathy, expression, and interpersonal relations) (44, 45). Regarding the department, the Social Sciences department is the variable where we find the strongest results. There is a big difference both in the total score of EI and on many scales (four out of five) and subscales (twelve out of fifteen), always in favor of the employees working in the field of "Social Sciences." The people who work in this department are responsible for providing psychosocial help, internal staff services, laboratory assistance, managing human resources, IT services, accounting, budgeting, etc. This is related to the influence of culture at the global level in the organization mentioned by research (46). The same result is consistent with what was reported by other researchers, who found significant differences in the use of departments and sectors and supported the literature on the mediating role of cultural norms in the resolution of conflicts (47). In the present paper, cultural characteristics were addressed in the sociodemographic factor, and our results did not reveal any significant differences, although further research may be needed to explore these dynamics. Regarding the impact of EI on conflict management style, our results found a significant relationship between EI and the compromised conflict management style (r_w = 1.034), a positive relationship between the EI total and the accommodation conflict resolution style (r_w =.567), and a positive relationship with the competitive conflict resolution style (r_w = .874).The results obtained show that EI provides a significant and positive relationship with three types of conflict resolution ("accommodation," "competition," and "compromising"). It is important to state that, although the variance described is large, all the regression coefficients show the impact that EI variables have on conflict resolution styles and the expected outcomes that will precede events in many significant situations. Regarding the relationship between EI and conflict type, the results show that EI is closely related to the type of approval and support of others. In quality of the part of EI, we find that the "Interpersonal relations" and "Stress Management" subscales have a very good ratio and are very important in reporting the use of the EI. Keeping a balanced (accommodation and compromised) relationship at work and having healthy coping mechanisms (competitiveness) are also related to general well-being as they increase being assertive, better adapted, being motivated, having a positive tolerance to anxiety, better affect management, and creating positive teamwork.

Abbreviations

Emotional Intelligence (EI)
Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-I 2.0)
Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument (TKI)
Intelligence Quotient (IQ)

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Ethics statement

Based on the approval of the Ethics Body at the Order of the Psychologist of Albania and the Rectorate of the University of Tirana, prot. No. 120, issued on 01/10/2023, authors started collecting data on the subjects in the study. The protection of the confidentiality and anonymity of the subjects was carried out according to the ethical criteria of the Data Protection Law no.9887, amended in 2014 by the Republic of Albania, and the European Act on Protection of Privacy and Personal Data regarding data treatment for research purposes.

References

1. Sony M, Mekoth N. The relationship between emotional intelligence, frontline employee adaptability, job satisfaction, and job performance. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services. 2016 May; 30:20–32.
2. Côté S, Miners CTH. Emotional Intelligence, Cognitive Intelligence, and Job Performance. Administrative Science Quarterly. 2006 Mar;51(1):1–28.
3. Sy T, Tram S, O'Hara LA. Relation of employee and manager emotional intelligence to job satisfaction and performance. Journal of Vocational Behavior [Internet]. 2006 Jun;68(3):461–73. Available from: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0001879105001260
4. Dulewicz V, Higgs M. Can emotional intelligence be measured and developed? Leadership & Organization Development Journal. 1999 Sep;20(5):242–53.
5. Mairaj A, Siddiqui DA. Conflict Resolution Strategies and Workplace Frustration and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Moderating Role of Emotional Intelligence. Human Resource Research. 2020 Aug 19;4(1):233.
6. O'Boyle EH, Humphrey RH, Pollack JM, Hawver TH, Story PA. The Relation between Emotional Intelligence and Job performance: a meta-analysis. Journal of Organizational Behavior. 2011 Jun 29;32(5):788–818.
7. Jordan PJ, Troth AC. Emotional Intelligence and Conflict Resolution: Implications for Human Resource Development. Advances in Developing Human Resources [Internet]. 2002 Feb;4(1):62–79. Available from: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1523422302004001005
8. Edelman P, van Knippenberg D. Emotional intelligence, Management of Subordinate's emotions, and Leadership Effectiveness. Leadership & Organization Development Journal. 2018 Jul 2;39(5):592–607. Available from: . https://doi.org/10.1108/lodj-04-2018-0154
9. Bratton VK, Dodd NG, Brown FW. The Impact of Emotional Intelligence on Accuracy of Self-awareness and Leadership Performance. Leadership & Organization Development Journal. 2011 Mar 8;32(2):127–49. Available from : https://doi.org/10.1108/01437731111112971
10. Melita Prati L, Douglas C, Ferris GR, Ammeter AP, Buckley MR. Emotional Intelligence, Leadership Effectiveness, and Team Outcomes. The International Journal of Organizational Analysis . 2003 Jan;11(1):21–40. Available from: https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/eb028961/full/html
11. Higgs M, Rowland D. Does It Need Emotional Intelligence to Lead Change? Journal of General Management. 2002 Mar;27(3):62–76.
12. Hwang S, Feltz DL, Lee JD. Emotional Intelligence in coaching: Mediation Effect of Coaching Efficacy on the Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Leadership Style. International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology. 2013 Sep;11(3):292–306.
13. Jordan PJ, Troth AC. Managing Emotions during Team Problem Solving: Emotional Intelligence and Conflict Resolution. Human Performance 2004 Apr;17(2):195–218.
14. Dirican AH, Erdil O. The Influence of ability-based Emotional Intelligence on Discretionary Workplace Behaviors. Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment. 2019 Dec 23;30(3):369–82. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2019.1687388
15. Zeidner M, Matthews G, Roberts RD. Emotional Intelligence in the Workplace: A Critical Review.

Applied Psychology. 2004 Jul;53(3):371–99. Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2004.00176.x

16. Bar-On R, Brown JM, Kirkcaldy BD, Thomé EP. Emotional Expression and Implications for Occupational stress; an Application of the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i). Personality and Individual Differences. 2000 Jun;28(6):1107–18.

17. Guilford JP. The Structure of intellect. Psychological Bulletin. 1956;53(4):267–93.

18. Salovey P, Mayer JD. Emotional Intelligence. Imagination, Cognition and Personality. 1990 Mar;9(3):185–211.

19. Mayer JD, Salovey P. What Is Emotional intelligence? In: Emotional Development and Emotional Intelligence: Implications for Educators. Basic Books; 1997. p. 3–31.

20. Bar-On R. Emotional Intelligence: An Integral Part of Positive Psychology. South African Journal of Psychology. 2010 Mar;40(1):54–62.

21. Goleman D. Working with Emotional Intelligence. New York: Bantam Books; 1998.

22. Wen J, Huang S (Sam), Hou P. Emotional intelligence, Emotional labor, Perceived Organizational support, and Job satisfaction: a Moderated Mediation Model. International Journal of Hospitality Management. 2019 Aug;81(1):120–30.

23. Olderbak S, Semmler M, Doebler P. Four-Branch Model of Ability Emotional Intelligence with Fluid and Crystallized Intelligence: A Meta-Analysis of Relations. Emotion Review. 2018 Nov 22;11(2):166–83.

24. Mayer JD, Salovey P, Caruso DR. Emotional intelligence: Theory, findings, and Implications. Psychological Inquiry. 2004 Jul;15(3):197–215.

25. Т.В. Корнилова, Chigrinova IA. Personal values, Moral development, and Emotional Intelligence in the Regulation of Choice in Situations That Involve Interpersonal Interactions. Psychology Journal of the Higher School of Economics. 2014 Jan 1;11(4):56–74.

26. Desivilya HS, Somech A, Lidgoster H. Innovation and Conflict Management in Work Teams: the Effects of Team Identification and Task and Relationship Conflict. Negotiation and Conflict Management Research. 2010 Feb;3(1):28–48.

27. Lim J, Huan, Yazdanifard R, 142 J, Lim R, Yazdanifard. The Difference of Conflict Management Styles and Conflict Resolution in Workplace. Business & Entrepreneurship Journal. 2012;1(1):2241–312.

28. Shih H, Susanto E. Conflict Management styles, Emotional intelligence, and Job Performance in Public Organizations. International Journal of Conflict Management. 2010 Apr 27;21(2):147–68.

29. Afzalur Rahim M, Psenicka C, Polychroniou P, Zhao J, Yu C, Anita Chan K, et al. A Model of Emotional Intelligence and Conflict Management Strategies: A study in seven countries. The International Journal of Organizational Analysis. 2002 Apr;10(4):302–26.

30. Grace JS, Harris RJ. Conflict Resolution Styles and Their Relation to Conflict type, Individual differences, and Formative Influences. Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society. 1990 Aug;28(2):144–6.

31. Salovey P, Grewal D. The Science of Emotional Intelligence. Current Directions in Psychological Science. 2005 Dec;14(6):281–5.

32. Yin J, Jia M, Ma Z, Liao G. Team Leader's Conflict Management Styles and Innovation Performance in Entrepreneurial Teams. International Journal of Conflict Management. 2020 Apr 1;31(3):373–92.

33. Cavus Kasik N, Kumcagiz H. The Effects of the Conflict Resolution and Peer Mediation Training Program on self-esteem and Conflict Resolution Skills. International Journal of Academic Research. 2014 Jan 30;6(1):179–86.

34. Halperin E, Tagar MR. Emotions in conflicts: Understanding Emotional Processes Sheds Light on the Nature and Potential Resolution of Intractable Conflicts. Current Opinion in Psychology. 2017 Oct;17:94–8.

35. Morrison J. The Relationship between Emotional Intelligence Competencies and Preferred conflict-handling Styles. Journal of Nursing Management. 2008 Nov;16(8):974–83.

36. Schutte NS, Malouff JM, Bobik C, Coston TD, Greeson C, Jedlicka C, et al. Emotional Intelligence and Interpersonal Relations. The Journal of social psychology. 2001;141(4):523–36. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11577850

37. Mayers JD, Salovey P, Caruso DR. Models of Emotional Intelligence. In: Cambridge University Press eBooks. 2000. p. 369–420.

38. Zeidner M, Matthews G, Roberts RD. The Emotional Intelligence, Health, and Well-Being Nexus: What Have We Learned and What Have We Missed? Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being. 2011 Nov 28;4(1):1–30.

39. Cronbach LJ. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika [Internet]. 1951 Sep 1;16(3):297–334. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02310555

40. Kilmann RH, Thomas KW. Developing a Forced-Choice Measure of Conflict-Handling Behavior: the "Mode" instrument. Educational and Psychological Measurement. 1977 Jul 1;37(2):309–25.

41. Katz MH. Multivariable analysis [Internet]. 2011. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511974175

42. Thory K. A Gendered analysis of emotional intelligence in the workplace. Human Resource Development Review. 2013 May 10;12(2):221–44. Available from:

43. Prati LM, Douglas C, Ferris GR, Ammeter AP, Buckley Mr. Emotional intelligence, leadership effectiveness, and team outcomes. International Journal of Organizational Analysis [Internet]. 2003 Jan 1;11(1):21–40. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1108/eb028961

44. Goleman D. An EI-based Theory of Performance. In: The Emotionally Intelligent Workplace. Jossey-Bass; 2001. p. 27–45.

45. Cabello R, Sorrel MA, Fernández-Pinto I, Extremera N, Fernández-Berrocal P. Age and gender differences in ability emotional intelligence in adults: A cross-sectional study. Developmental Psychology [Internet]. 2016 Sep 1;52(9):1486–92.

Available   from:
https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000191

46. Gunkel M, Schlaegel C, Engle RL. Culture's influence on emotional intelligence: an Empirical study of nine countries. Journal of International Management. 2014 Jun 1;20(2):256–74. Available from:
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intman.2013.10.002

47. Bono EJ, Barron LG. Leaders as emotional managers, across cultures. In: Research companion to emotion in organizations. Edward Elgar. 2008. p. 489–511.