



The Effect of Managers' Emotional Intelligence Level on Their Autocratic Management Style*

Murat ÖZTURAN¹ & Türker TUĞSAL²

Keywords

Emotional Intelligence, Autocratic Management Style, Self Actualization, Impulse Control.

Article History

Received
24 Feb, 2019
Accepted
24 Mar, 2019

Abstract

The object of the research is investigating whether manager's emotional intelligence level has an effect on their autocratic management style. The research has been done in IT sector and 368 managers have attended to the study. The data of the research is analysed by SPSS 20.0 package programme, by using multiple regression analysis. According to the findings, the self actualization dimension of Emotional Intelligence has a significant effect on autocratic management style. It is determined that there is a negative relationship between them ($p < .05$). Also it is determined that the impulse control dimension of Emotional Intelligence has a significant effect on autocratic management style and there is a positive relationship between two terms ($p < .01$).

Yöneticilerin Duygusal Zekâ Düzeylerinin Otokratik Yönetim Tarzları Üzerindeki Etkisi*

Anahtar Kelimeler

Duygusal Zekâ, Otokratik Yönetim Tarzı, Kendini Gerçekleştirme, Dürtü Kontrolü.

Makale Geçmişi

Alınan Tarih
24 Şubat 2019
Kabul Tarihi
24 Mart 2019

Özet

Araştırmanın amacı, yöneticilerin duygusal zekâ düzeylerinin otokratik yönetim tarzı üzerinde bir etkisi olup olmadığını araştırmaktır. Araştırma bilişim sektöründe yapılmış olup 368 yönetici araştırmaya katılmıştır. Araştırmanın verileri, çoklu regresyon analizi kullanılarak SPSS 20.0 paket programı ile analiz edilmiştir. Bulgulara göre, Duygusal zekânın kendini gerçekleştirme boyutunun otokratik yönetim tarzı üzerinde anlamlı bir etkisi vardır. Aralarında olumsuz bir ilişki olduğu belirlenmiştir ($p < .05$). Ayrıca Duygusal zekânın dürtü kontrolü boyutunun otokratik yönetim tarzı üzerinde anlamlı bir etkisi olduğu ve iki değişken arasında pozitif bir ilişki olduğu belirlenmiştir ($p < .01$).

* Derived from doctoral dissertation

¹ Corresponding Author. ORCID: 0000-0003-0759-2320, Dr., İstanbul Ticaret Odası, murat.ozturan@ito.org.tr

² ORCID: 0000-0002-7585-4989, Dr., Beykent Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, t.turker@gmail.com

1. Introduction

In today's business World, for the success of organizations, how decisions makers in the top management manage their own emotions and others' feelings is a highly important factor to form interpersonal relations and it is accepted as an item of the emotional intelligence. In the modern World where the human factor is acknowledged as the most significant source of business, one of the most vital factors is the type of the management behaviours that managers show towards employees.

It is thought that if the managers show autocratic behaviours towards the employees, the productivity, performance, job satisfaction, organizational confidence and loyalty of the persons may be affected negatively. Therefore, these people may have the potential to affect the other employees negatively (Güney, 2011:11). This research has been carried out in order to investigate whether the Emotional Intelligence levels of the managers have any effect on Autocratic Management Style.

2. Theoretical Frame and the Review of the Literature

When the historical background of the Emotional Intelligence concept is examined, it could be dated to 2000 years ago by the phrase "All learning has an emotional base." attributed to Plato. There are many studies that have been carried out by philosophers, sociologists, educators and scientists from Ancient Greek to these days (Yaylacı, 2006). John Mayer and Peter Salovey who studied in the field of psychology made a study in 1990 and they described Emotional Intelligence as understanding the emotions of one's own and the emotions of others and using these datum in order to make plans and take decisions rather than social skills such as being together with people (Costadopoulos, Pham, and Prasad, 2016). The emotional Intelligence considers emotions as a beneficial source in order to so as to understand and explore the environment and therefore brings emotion and intelligence spheres together (Salovey and Grewal, 2005).

Autocratic management can be described with over-monitoring, obedience of the subordinates and strict managers who want decisions to be made only by themselves (Balta and Petecel, 2016). In Autocratic management, managers at the top of management make decisions only by themselves and expect their decisions to be completely presented, accepted and carried out. Autocratic management style is hierarchically structured from the top to the bottom. In autocratic management organizations where the management is designed hierarchically, decisions are taken by the top management and dictated without getting the opinion of the lower management (Taylor, 2017).

Managers generally adopt autocratic style as they think being strict and cruel in market conditions is effective. However, this kind of communication established by a manager who has an autocratic style of management with his subordinates does not increase his authority level. How the top managers comply with ethical standards and rules of etiquette in their communication with the subordinates is highly important in terms of the management application (Valieva, Orazbaieva and Shaiheslyamova, 2016).

3. Methodology and Research Model

A quantitative research method is used to investigate whether the levels of emotional intelligence of first, middle and top level managers in the IT sector have effect on the autocratic management style. Due to the fact that time and cost are limited, simple random sampling method is used in the research (Tuğsal, 2018). Hierarchical regression analysis is performed to analyze the data. The research model is structured to state the effects of managers' emotional intelligence levels on the autocratic management styles.

The sample of the research consists of 362 participants who are the first, middle and top level managers working in the IT sector in Istanbul. Frequency and percentage distributions of managers which involved in the survey are indicated in Table 1.

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage Distributions

Variable	Level	N	%
Gender	Female	82	22,65
	Male	280	77,35
Age	20-29	36	9,94
	30-39	159	43,92
	40-49	129	35,64
	50-59	36	9,94
	60 and above	2	0,55
Marital Status	Single	79	21,82
	Married	258	71,27
	Divorced	25	6,91
Education	High School	7	1,93
	Vocational School	19	5,25
	Graduate	181	50
	Post-Graduate	137	37,85
	Doctoral	18	4,97
Position in the Recent Company	First Level Manager	85	23,48
	Middle Level Manager	131	36,19
	Top Level Manager	146	40,33
Seniority of Managing	1-5 years	142	39,23
	6-10 years	94	25,97
	11-20 years	99	27,35
	21 -30 years	22	6,08
	31 years and above	5	1,38
Managing in the Recent Company	1-5 years	255	70,44
	6-10 years	61	16,85
	11-20 years	40	11,05
	21 -30 years	4	1,1
Size of the Company	31 years and above	2	0,55
	Small (less than 50 employees)	121	33,43
	Medium (50-249 employees)	106	29,28
	Large (250 and more employees)	135	37,29

Yetişkin katılımcıların 5'i erkek 5'i kadın, 5'i 50-55 yaş, 5'i 60-70 yaş arasında, 8 yetişkin orta, 2 yetişkin ise üst sosyo-ekonomik seviyede ve katılımcıların 9'unun çocukluğu köyde ve bir katılımcının ise şehirde geçmiştir.

3.1. Measurement Tools Used in the Research

Turkish version of "Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory" which was developed by Reuven Bar-On and was adapted to Turkish by Acar (2002) is used in the research. The second scale The Manager Behavior Survey (WBS) which was developed by Kurt and Terzi (2005) is used to determine the management styles of the managers. The WBS questionnaire consists of 29 items and including 3 sub-dimensions managerial behaviors which are "autocratic, democratic-participant and laissez faire" types. Autocratic type sub-scale has been used in this research.

Survey data are examined before the analysis. Missing values are checked and missing data isn't found. After the re-encoding process, the data set is prepared for analysis. First of all, reliability analyzes of the scales are performed.

Since there is not any observation/data to be removed from the dataset, all 362 observations in the sample are used in the analysis.

Table 2. Reliability Statistics of the Emotional Intelligence Scale

Cronbach's Alpha	Item
.903	88

Table 3. Scale Statistics of the Emotional Intelligence Scale

Mean	Variance	Standard Deviation
278.86	649.229	25.48

Mean value of the Emotional Intelligence is 278.86, variance is 649.229, and standard deviation is 25.48.

Table 4. Reliability Statistics of the Autocratic Manager Behavior Survey

Cronbach's Alpha	Item
.839	6

Table 5. Scale Statistics of the Autocratic Manager Behavior Survey

Mean	Variance	Standard Deviation
11.41	22.087	4.700

Mean value of the Autocratic Manager Behavior Survey is 11.41, variance is 22.087 and standard deviation is 4.700.

3.2. Factor Structures and Explanatory Factor Analysis of Scales

Due to the fact that confirmatory factor analysis in scales can not be explained by single factor, explanatory factor analysis is performed.

When factor analysis is performed, if there are factors constituting only one item, these items should be removed and factor analysis should be done again. (Durmuş, Yurtkoru and Çinko, 2013:84). In this context, in the emotional intelligence scale, 8, 14, 44, 45, 56, 59, 64, 71 items are removed and the analysis is done again. Emotional Intelligence concept consists of 11 sub-dimensions. These sub-dimensions are; independence, self-regard, happiness, problem solving, reality-

testing, flexibility, interpersonal relationship, impulse control, empathy, assertiveness and self-actualization.

Table 6. Statistics Results of Emotional Intelligence Scale

Statistics Results	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8	F9	F10	F11
Eigen Values	21.6	7.06	2.57	2.45	2.30	1.76	1.63	1.53	1.42	1.35	1.33
Cumulat. Variance (%)	25.4	33.7	36.7	39.6	42.3	44.4	46.3	48.1	49.8	51.4	52.9
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Sample Adequacy	.926										
Bartlett Sph. Test	3570										
p	.000										
Cronbach's Alpha	.959										

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin sample adequacy is calculated .926. The result of the Bartlett sphericity test, which tests the validity of the model, is 3570 and is significant at $p < .001$. The first factor in the model, Self Actualization, explains 25.424% of the total variance; besides, cumulative variance explained by 11 factors in total is 52.996%.

Due to the fact that confirmatory factor analysis in scale can not be explained by single factor, explanatory factor analysis is performed for Manager Behavior Survey. 1, 2, 3, 10 items are removed and the analysis is carried out again.

Table 7. Statistics Results of Manager Behavior Survey

Statistics Results	Factor 1
Eigen Values	2.573
Cumulative Variance (%)	18.716
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Sample Adequacy	.899
Bartlett Sphericity Test	171
p	.000
Cronbach's Alpha	.811

As a result of the factor analysis, it is calculated that the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin sampling adequacy value is .899. The result of the Bartlett sphericity test is 171 and the model is significant at $p < 0.001$ level. Autocratic management style dimension predicts the model 18.716%.

3.3. Analysis and Findings

Data collected for the study are evaluated by hierarchical regression analysis with SPSS 20.0 software. The effects of Emotional Intelligence's "independence, self-regard, happiness, problem solving, reality-testing, flexibility, interpersonal relationship, impulse control, empathy, assertiveness and self-actualization" dimensions on the autocratic manager behavior is analyzed.

In the research model, the effects of managers' emotional intelligence levels on autocratic management styles are being investigated.

In the research model, the dimensions of emotional intelligence; independence, self-regard, happiness, problem solving, reality-testing, flexibility, interpersonal relationship, impulse control, empathy, assertiveness and self-actualization are the

independent variables; and Autocratic Management Style is dependent variable. The linkage between them has been investigated.

Table 8. Model Summary Table of the Effects on Autocratic Management Style

Step	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Change Statistics			Durbin-Watson Value
				R ² Change	F Change	p	
1	.244	.059	.03	.059	2.011	.027	1.985

Variables as predictors in the analysis are; independence, self-regard, happiness, problem solving, reality-testing, flexibility, interpersonal relationship, impulse control, empathy, assertiveness and self-actualization. The first step explains the model by 5.9% variance (p <.05).

Table 9. ANOVA Statistics Table of the Effects on Autocratic Management Style

Step	Sum of Squares	Square of Means	F	p
1	21.464	1.951	2.011	.027

F value in the ANOVA table of the model is statistically significant at p <.05 level. At first step, the estimation power is statistically significant (F362-11 = 2.011).

Table 10. Coefficients Table of the Effects on Autocratic Management Style

Step	Independent Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	p
		B	St. Error	Beta		
	Constant (Autocratic)	-1.88	.052		0	1
	EQ_ Self-Actualization	-.13	.052	-.13	-2.509	.013
	EQ_ Assertiveness	.023	.052	.023	.449	.653
	EQ_ Empathy	.079	.052	.079	1.529	.127
	EQ_ Impulse Control	.157	.052	.157	3.021	.003
	EQ_ Interpersonal Relationship	-.046	.052	-.046	-.894	.372
	EQ_ Flexibility	-.064	.052	-.064	-1.241	.215
	EQ_ Reality-Testing	-.049	.052	-.049	-.944	.346
	EQ_ Problem-Solving	-.035	.052	-.035	-.669	.504
	EQ_ Happiness	-.032	.052	-.032	-.609	.543
	EQ_ Self-Regard	.005	.052	.005	.103	.918
	EQ_ Independence	.017	.052	.017	.319	.75

The regression equation of the model in the first step in the direction of statistical calculations is expressed as follows:

$$\text{Autocratic} = -1.88 + [(-.13 \times \text{Self-Actualization}) + (.157 \times \text{Impulse Control})]$$

As the findings are evaluated, the factors of Emotional Intelligence which have statistically significant effect on the Autocratic Management Style are:

It is determined that the dimension of Self-Actualization of Emotional Intelligence has statistically significant (p <.05) effect on the autocratic management styles of the managers. Hypothesis is accepted. Therefore; when Self- Actualization increases by 1 unit, the Autocratic Management level might reduce by .13 units. In this direction, there is a negative relationship between the dimension of Self-Actualization of Emotional Intelligence and Autocratic Management Style.

The Impulse Control dimension of emotional intelligence has statistically significant effect ($p < .01$) on the Autocratic Management Styles of the managers. Hypothesis is accepted. When the Impulse Control is increased by 1 unit, the Autocratic Management level may increase by .157 units. In this framework there is a positive relationship between the Impulse Control dimension of Emotional Intelligence and the Autocratic Management Style.

No other variables of emotional intelligence are found to be statistically significant on the dimension of the Autocratic Management Style.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

There is a negative relationship between the self-actualization dimension of the Emotional Intelligence and Autocratic Management Style. It is highly possible that persons who have actualized themselves and have reached the top of their purposes, make an effort for others to reach the same level as themselves, integrate them to the process of decision making and value their opinions and thoughts. For this reason, it would not be a surprise that this kind of managers do not adopt autocratic management style and as a matter of fact they make contribution to the self-improvement, labour productivity and motivation of the employees by establishing a better communication with them and perform “reinforcement” studies by integrating the employees to the process of decision making.

On the other hand, another factor for the managers to actualize themselves is to make contribution to the self-actualization process of the other employees. From this point of view, autocratic management style which does not make contribution to a healthy communication between the employee and the manager will not serve for this purpose. When evaluated from the sectoral point of view, one of the sectors where human-based added value is highest is the information sector. Especially, when it is thought that in the software part of the sector creativity, entrepreneurship and inventiveness are necessary, it is clear that the managers who have actualized themselves adopt democratic-participative management style. In this respect, it is considered that the negative relationship between self-actualization and autocratic management style in research findings is convenient for both the literature and the sectoral reality.

There is a positive relationship between Impulse Control dimension of the Emotional Intelligence and Autocratic Management Style. Impulse Control is defined as the ability of an individual to control the emotions effectively and positively. Actually, impulse control is the ability to resist or delay an impulse, a tempting situation or an action. In the event that the dimension of impulse control increases, it is considered that the reason for the findings of increasing in the autocratic management style is that the managers who want to keep the duties and obligations fully in order so as to maintain the continuity of the business may adopt a strict management style instead of acting emotionally at the moment when quick and strategic decisions are necessary to be made. Nevertheless, it is also considered that this situation may happen especially under contingency circumstances..

References

- Acar, F. (2002). Duygusal Zekâ ve Liderlik. *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, S. 12, 53-68.
- Balta, A. & Petecel, A. (2016). Subordinates Leadership, Styles of Leadership. *Journal of Criminal Investigations*, 10.1, 107-109
- Costadopoulos, N., Pham, L. & Prasad C. (2016). *Wireless sensing for emotional intelligence* International Conference on Electronics, Information, and Communications (ICEIC) 1 - 5, IEEE Conference Publications.
- Durmuş, B., Yurtkoru, S. & Çinko, M. (2013). *Sosyal Bilimlerde SPSS'le Veri Analizi*. Beta Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Güney, S. (2011). *Örgütsel Davranış*. Nobel Yayın Dağıtım. İstanbul.
- Kurt, T. & Terzi, A. R. (2005). İlköğretim Okulu Müdürlerinin Yöneticilik Davranışlarının Öğretmenlerin Örgütsel Bağlılığına Etkisi. *Milli Eğitim Üç Aylık Eğitim ve Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. Y.33, S. 166.
- Salovey, P. & Grewal D. (2005). The Science of Emotional Intelligence. *American Psychological Society*, Vol. 14, 6, 281-285.
- Taylor, A. (2017). Perspectives on the University as a Business: the Corporate Management Structure, Neoliberalism and Higher Education. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 1, 108-135.
- Tuğsal, T. (2018). *İş-Yaşam Dengesi, Sosyal Destek ve Sosyo-Demografik Faktörlerin Tükenmişlik Üzerindeki Etkisi*. Cinius Yayınları: İstanbul.
- Valieva, A., O., A. & Shaiheslyamova, K. (2016). The Image of a Manager in Market Conditions. *IEJME – Mathematics Education*, 2016, Vol. 11, No. 7, 1971-1985.
- Yaylacı, Ö. G. (2006). *Kariyer Yaşamında Duygusal Zekâ ve İletişim Yeteneği*. Hayat Yayıncılık, İstanbul.



Strategic Research Academy ©

© Copyright of Journal of Current Researches on Social Science is the property of Strategic Research Academy and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.