

2020-02

# Emotional Intelligence Influences on Consumers Consumer Behavior

Anastasiadis, Lazaros

Research Institute for Entrepreneurship Development (RIED): Neapolis University, Pafos

---

<http://hdl.handle.net/11728/11527>

*Downloaded from HEPHAESTUS Repository, Neapolis University institutional repository*

# **Emotional Intelligence Influences on Consumers Consumer Behavior**

**Lazaros Anastasiadis**

Aristotle University of Macedonia, Greece

For Marketing Customer Emotional Intelligence (EI) influences are significant aspects for consumer behavior. In addition the impact of EI on decision making is noteworthy. The main objective is to recognise patterns among EI and consumers' loyalty, commitment and satisfaction. EI is measure with respect to TEIQue-SF instrument. Well-being Self-control, Emotionality, Sociability and General Items of EI subscales are related to TEIQue-SF instrument. These subscales were measured by 30 items, rated on a seven-point Likert format, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). To test the research questions and hypotheses, a survey will be conducted using Greek customers of Greek e-shops. The results showed that EI is a Prediction of Consumer Decision Making of a major importance.

## **1 Introduction**

This paper will explore the impact of Emotional Intelligence on customer behaviour in respect of customers' intentions towards E-Service Quality, Perceived Value, Perceived Value Purchase and Loyalty Intentions, with the view to provide information and feedback to marketing scientists. More concretely the current study' intentions is to evaluate of TEIQue-SF' instrument dimensions on E-Service Quality, Perceived Value, Purchase and Loyalty Intentions, Overall Perceived Quality and Satisfaction.

## **2 Theoretical Framework**

*Emotional Intelligence:* Goleman (1995) defined Emotional Intelligence as the capacity to distinguish, be aware of, comprehend and regulator our own emotions and sentiment as well as other people sentiment in order to inspire ourselves and manage feelings very well concerning ourselves and our interactions.

Cooper and Orioli (2005) conceptualized Emotional Intelligence as the capacity that a person possess in order to feel, to perceive, to react, to power emotions.

Petrides and Furnham (2001) distinguish between Ability Emotional Intelligence (EI) from Trait Emotional Intelligence (TEI), which are two separate perspectives of EI.

Ability Emotional Intelligence (EI) is considered as a set of cognitive-emotional abilities situated in range backgrounds of individuals intelligence (Petrides, 2011).

On the other hand Trait Emotional Intelligence (TEI) is considered as a set of emotional dispositions and self-perceptions situated at the lower sections of standing five personality hierarchies (Petrides, 2011, Petrides & Fernham, 2001).

*Perceived value:* Perceived value is conceptualized as an expectation and a desire and it is strongly related with consumer and customer satisfaction (Patterson et al., 1997; Sweeney et al., 1999; Parasuraman, et al., 1988, Zeithalm, 1988). According to Ilieska (2013) perceived value is a measure of quality to price paid (Masouras and Papademetriou, 2018).

*Purchase intention:* Purchase intention or Repurchase intention is conceptualized as one's judgment to purchase a product or use a service all over again related to the same service provider or in the procedure of a repurchase (Hellier et al., 2003; Zeithalm et al., 1996).

*Customer Satisfaction:* According to Ilieska (2013) Customer Satisfaction is conceptualized as the customers' feeling of pleasure and desire or disappointment and discontent resulting from the gap between a customer' expectation related to products/services and actual service perceived performance. Customer Satisfaction according to Servqual Model is consider as the Gap between Service expectation and the actual service received (Ilieska, 2013; Anastasiadis, et al. 2016; Anastasiadis, & Christoforidis, 2019; Anastasiadou & Zirinolou, 2014, 2015; Papadaki & Anastasiadou, 2019, Anastasiadou & Papadaki, 2019). Customer satisfaction is the key objective of every organization (Anastasiadou, 2014; Anastasiadou, 2015; Anastasiadou, 2016; Anastasiadou et al., 2016a; Anastasiadou et al., 2016b). SERVQUAL model of Parasuraman, Zeithaml & Berry (1988) is a mean of measuring the quality of services provided through the assessment of expectations and citizen satisfaction with services (Anastasiadou & Anastasiadis, 2019). Its function lies in the gap that usually exists between customer expectations and customer satisfaction for the service concerned with the five dimensions of quality: reliability, assurance, tangible assets, personalization and responsiveness (Anastasiadou, 2015, Anastasiadou et al., 2016a, Anastasiadou et al., 2016b, Taraza & Anastasiadou, 2019b). Still, Taraza & Anastasiadou, (2019a, 2019b) and Anastasiadou (2018c, 2018d, 2018d) believe that achieving quality control is an end in itself and everyone is expected to work together to improve overall quality.

*Overall Service Quality:* Customer Overall Service Quality is conceptualized as the customers' value evaluation (Nambiar et al., 2019; Mavris et al, 2019; Taraza & Anastasiadou, 2019a, 2019b, 2019c). Anastasiadou (2018a, 2018b) and Anastasiadou & Taraza (2019b, 2019c, 2019d, 2019e) links quality to the difference between perceived and perceived quality of services or products and recommends the application of Gap Analysis in determining its elements. According to Taraza & Anastasiadou (2019a, 2019b, 2019c) and Anastasiadou & Taraza (2018c, 2018d, 2018e) the most important parameters of overall quality are related to the evaluation, vision, mission, processes and leadership of the organization related to services.

### 3 Research Methodology

#### 3.1. Sampling and Sample

For the study purpose a sample of 25 out of 125 shops was selected using simple sampling methodology (Table 1).

The sample comprises of 111 respondents, of whom 70 (63.1%) were men and 41 (36.9%) were women. With respect to the respondents' age, 57 (51.4%) were from 18 to 24 years old; 27 (24.3%) from 25-34; 13 (11.7%) were from 35 to 44 years old; and 14 (12.6%) were from 45 to 54 years old.

With respect to their marital status, 86 (77.5%) were single; 22 (19.8%) were married and 3 (2.7%) were separated or divorced.

As for the respondents' education, one (0.9%) answered that he has completed elementary education, 54 (48.6%) secondary, 40 (36%) tertiary and, finally, 16 (14.4%) hold a post-graduate or doctoral title.

69 of the 111 respondents (62.2%) stated that their income is less than €10.000; 30 (27%) from €10.000 to €24.999; 7 (6.3%) from €25.000 to €49.999; 1 (0.9%) from €50.000 to €74.999 and, finally, 4 (3.6%) did not respond to this question (Table 1).

Table 1: Final Sample Demographics

| Demographic data | Category | Frequency (N=111) | Relevant frequency (%) |
|------------------|----------|-------------------|------------------------|
| Sex              | Male     | 70                | 63.1                   |
|                  | Female   | 40                | 36.9                   |

|               |                                     |          |      |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|----------|------|
| Age           | 18-24                               | 57       | 51.4 |
|               | 25-34                               | 27       | 24.3 |
|               | 35-44                               | 13       | 11.7 |
|               | 45-54                               | 14       | 12.6 |
| Family status | Single                              | 86       | 77.5 |
|               | Married                             | 22       | 19.8 |
|               | Divorced/Separated                  | 3        | 2.7  |
| Education     | Elementary education                | 1        | .9   |
|               | Secondary education                 | 54       | 48.6 |
|               | Tertiary education                  | 40       | 36.0 |
|               | Postgraduate studies /<br>Doctorate | 16       | 14.4 |
|               | Income                              | <€10.000 | 69   |
|               | €10.000-€24.999                     | 30       | 27.0 |
|               | €25.000-€49.999                     | 7        | 6.3  |
|               | €50.000-€74.999                     | 1        | .9   |
|               | Did not respond                     | 4        | 3.6  |

### 3.2. Research questions

The present study will examine the following research questions:

RQ1: Conceptual construct TEIQue-SF is a five-dimensional instrument

RQ2: Emotional Intelligence Traits has an effect on Conceptual construct named E-Service Quality

RQ3: Emotional Intelligence Traits has an effect on Conceptual construct named Perceived Value

RQ4: Emotional Intelligence Traits has an effect on Conceptual construct named Purchase Intentions

RQ5: Emotional Intelligence Traits has an effect on Conceptual construct named Loyalty Intentions

RQ6: Emotional Intelligence Traits has an effect on Conceptual construct named Overall Perceived Quality

RQ7: Emotional Intelligence Traits has an effect on Conceptual construct named Satisfaction

RQ78: Conceptual constructs named Perceived Value, Purchase Intentions, Loyalty Intentions, Overall Perceived Quality and Satisfaction are related.

### *3.3 Research Hypotheses*

The present study will examine the following hypotheses:

Ho<sub>1</sub>: Factors Well-being, Self-control, Emotionality, Sociability and General Items of EI contribute to the conceptual construct TEIQue-SF

Ho<sub>2</sub>: Well-being factor of EI is highly correlated with Perceived Value

Ho<sub>3</sub>: Well-being factor of EI is highly correlated with Purchase Intentions

Ho<sub>4</sub>: Well-being factor of EI is highly correlated with Loyalty Intentions

Ho<sub>5</sub>: Well-being factor of EI is highly correlated with Overall Perceived Quality

Ho<sub>6</sub>: Well-being factor of EI is highly correlated with Satisfaction

Ho<sub>7</sub>: Self-control factor of EI is highly correlated with Perceived Value

Ho<sub>8</sub>: Self-control factor of EI is highly correlated with Purchase Intentions

Ho<sub>9</sub>: Self-control factor of EI is highly correlated with Loyalty Intentions

Ho<sub>10</sub>: Self-control factor of EI is highly correlated with Overall Perceived Quality

Ho<sub>11</sub>: Self-control factor of EI is highly correlated with Satisfaction

Ho<sub>12</sub>: Emotionality factor of EI is highly correlated with Perceived Value

Ho<sub>13</sub>: Emotionality factor of EI is highly correlated with Purchase Intentions

Ho<sub>14</sub>: Emotionality factor of EI is highly correlated with Loyalty Intentions

Ho<sub>15</sub>: Emotionality factor of EI is highly correlated with Overall Perceived Quality

Ho<sub>16</sub>: Emotionality factor of EI is highly correlated with Satisfaction

Ho<sub>17</sub>: Sociability factor of EI is highly correlated with Perceived Value

Ho<sub>18</sub>: Sociability factor of EI is highly correlated with Purchase Intentions

Ho<sub>19</sub>: Sociability factor of EI is highly correlated with Loyalty Intentions

Ho<sub>20</sub>: Sociability factor of EI is highly correlated with Overall Perceived Quality

Ho<sub>21</sub>: Sociability factor of EI is highly correlated with Satisfaction

Ho<sub>22</sub>: General Items factor of EI is highly correlated with Perceived Value

Ho<sub>23</sub>: General Items factor of EI is highly correlated with Purchase Intentions

Ho<sub>24</sub>: General Items factor of EI is highly correlated with Loyalty Intentions

Ho<sub>25</sub>: General Items factor of EI is highly correlated with Overall Perceived Quality

Ho<sub>26</sub>: General Items factor of EI is highly correlated with Satisfaction

Ho<sub>27</sub>: Perceived Value is highly correlated with Purchase Intentions

- Ho<sub>28</sub>: Perceived Value is highly correlated with Loyalty Intentions
- Ho<sub>29</sub>: Perceived Value is highly correlated with Overall Perceived Quality
- Ho<sub>30</sub>: Perceived Value is highly correlated with Satisfaction
- Ho<sub>31</sub>: Purchase Intentions is highly correlated with Loyalty Intentions
- Ho<sub>32</sub>: Purchase Intentions is highly correlated with Overall Perceived Quality
- Ho<sub>33</sub>: Purchase Intentions is highly correlated with Satisfaction
- Ho<sub>34</sub>: Loyalty Intentions is highly correlated with Overall Perceived Quality
- Ho<sub>35</sub>: Loyalty Intentions is highly correlated with Satisfaction
- Ho<sub>36</sub>: Overall Perceived Quality is highly correlated with Satisfaction

### *3.4. Instruments*

#### *3.4.1 TEIQue-SF*

Emotional Intelligence will be evaluated by “Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire” [Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire-Short Form (TEIQue-SF)], (Stamatopoulou, Galanis, & Prezerakos, 2016). This tool consists of 30 items referring to five different attitude sub-scales, as follows:

- Well-being (e.g. W\_being3: On the whole, I have a shining perspective on most things) (6 items).
- Self-control (e.g. S\_cont1: I usually find it difficult to regulate my emotions). (6 items).
- Emotionality (e.g. Emot8: I find it difficult to bond well even with those close to me\*) (8 items).
- Sociability (e.g. Soci6: I don’t seem to have any power at all over other people’s feelings\*) (6 items).
- General items of EI (e.g. G\_Item4: Generally, I’m able to adapt to new environments) (4 Items) (All items with \* were reversed).

#### *3.4.2 Perceived Value*

Perceived Value was measured by four items (PER<sub>i</sub>) (Parasuraman et al.,2005). Customers rated on each item using a ten-step scale of 1 (poor) to 10 (excellent) (e.g. PER4: The overall value you get from this site for your money and effort) (4 items).

#### *3.4.3 Purchase Intentions*

Finally, two items of a seven-step Likert scale constitute conceptual construct *Purchase Intentions* (ITB<sub>i</sub>) (ITB1: If I proceed with the purchase of some product in the coming 30 days) (2 items).

#### *3.4.4 Loyalty Intentions*

Loyalty Intentions was measured using five items (LOY<sub>i</sub>) (Parasuraman et al.,2005). Customers rated their likelihood of engaging in each behavior on a five-point Likert format, ranging from 1 (very unlikely) to 5 (very likely) (e.g. LOY2: Recommend it to someone who seeks your advice) (5 items).

#### *3.4.5 Overall Quality*

The assessment of the overall quality of the e-shop's services was evaluated using a five -point Likert scale, which investigates the extent by which the overall view of the respondent on the services is very positive (GPO) (e.g. I am positively dispositioned towards the services offered by the e-shop).

#### *3.4.6 Satisfaction*

The assessment of the customer's degree of satisfaction is evaluated based on another five-point Likert scale statement, investigating the extent by which the respondent is satisfied from the purchasing experience he had with the organization/ e-shop (CSF) (e.g. I am satisfied from my purchasing experience with the organization/ e-shop).

### **4. Results**

*Results of Principal Component Analysis:* Both the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) coefficient, equal to 0.767 and deemed very satisfactory as it exceeds the accepted value criterion (0.60), as well as Bartlett's Test of Sphericity ( $\chi^2=1868.224$ ,  $df=435$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) have shown that the application of Factor Analysis on the Principal Components is acceptable.

The table that follows presents the results of principal components analysis, with varimax rotation, for all of the statements on the TEIQue-SF Instrument, from which it follows that the criterion of the eigenvalue or characteristic root (eigenvalue > 1), is verified for five components (Table 2).



The first component, Self-control with an eigenvalue of 6.976, interprets 23.198% of the total dispersion of the data, a percentage considered satisfactory (Hair, 2005, Anastasiadou, 2018e), and includes, in order, statements S\_Cont3, S\_Cont6, S\_Cont4, S\_Cont2, S\_Cont1 and S\_Cont5 and indeed with very high loads, 0.690, 0.690, 0.681, 0.665, 0.605 and 0.573 correspondingly. The eigenvalue or characteristic root criterion (eigenvalue>1) verifies that the six items, S\_Cont3, S\_Cont6, S\_Cont4, S\_Cont2, S\_Cont1 and S\_Cont5, represent the same conceptual construct. The values of the Common Variance (Communalities) for statements S\_Cont3, S\_Cont6, S\_Cont4, S\_Cont2, S\_Cont1 and S\_Cont5 assume the values 0.537, 0.498, 0.493, 0.529, 0.474 and 0.409, respectively, and exceed the value criterion (0.40), posed as the verification limit for the satisfactory quality of the statements for factor Self-control (Table 2).

The second factor, General items of EI, while with an eigenvalue of 3.369, it interprets 13.190% of the total dispersion of data. The eigenvalue criterion (eigenvalue>1) verifies that the four items G\_Item2, G\_Item1, G\_Item3 and G\_Item4 represent the same conceptual construct. The values of the Common Variance (Communalities) of statements G\_Item2, G\_Item1, G\_Item3 and G\_Item4 assume the values 0.831, 0.834, 0.778 and 0.688 respectively and exceed the value criterion (0,40), posed as the limit for the verification of the satisfactory quality of items for conceptual construct General items of EI. Included in order under this factor, which interprets 13.190% of the total inertia, are statements G\_Item2, G\_Item1, G\_Item3 and G\_Item4 and indeed with very high loading, 0.907, 0.904, 0.867 and 0.804 correspondingly (Table 2).

The third factor, Well-being, while with an eigenvalue of 2.912, it interprets 11.930% of the total dispersion of the data. The eigenvalue or characteristic root criterion (eigenvalue>1) verifies that the six items, W\_bein3, W\_bein4, W\_bein6, W\_bein2, W\_bein5 and W\_bein1, represent the same conceptual construct. The values of Common Variance (Communalities) for items W\_bein3, W\_bein4, W\_bein6, W\_bein2, W\_bein5 and W\_bein1 assume the values 0.560, 0.611, 0.445, 0.557, 0.432 and 0.507 respectively, and exceed the value criterion, 0.40, posed as the verification limit for the satisfactory quality of the statements for conceptual construct Well-being. Included in order in this factor that interprets 11.930% of the total inertia, are statements W\_bein3, W\_bein4, W\_bein6, W\_bein2, W\_bein5 and W\_bein1 and indeed with very high loadings, 0.735, 0.636, 0.567, 0.563, 0.497 and 0.481 respectively (Table 2).

The fourth component, Emotionality with an eigenvalue of 2.012, interprets 9.910% of the total inertia of the data, and includes, in order, statements Emot7, Emot6, Emot5,

Emot3, Emot8 Emot2, Emot4 and Emot1 and indeed with very high loadings, 0.924, 0.905, 0.830, 0.728, 0.725, 0.721, 0.520 and 0.468 correspondingly. The eigenvalue or characteristic root criterion (eigenvalue > 1) verifies that the eight items, Emot7, Emot6, Emot5, Emot3, Emot8 Emot2, Emot4 and Emot1, represent the same conceptual construct. The values of the Common Variance (Communalities) for statements Emot7, Emot6, Emot5, Emot3, Emot8 Emot2, Emot4 and Emot1 assume the values 0.867, 0.839, 0.722, 0.547, 0.659, 0.533, 0.410 and 0.401, respectively, and exceed the value criterion (0.40), posed as the verification limit for the satisfactory quality of the statements for conceptual construct Emotionality (Table 2).

The fifth component, Sociability with an eigenvalue of 1.848, interprets 8.824% of the total inertia of the data, and includes, in order, statements Soci1, Soci2, Soci3, Soci4, Soci6 and Soci5, and indeed with very high loadings, 0.587, 0.527, 0.497, 0.497, 0.465, 0.440 and 0.403 correspondingly. The eigenvalue or characteristic root criterion (eigenvalue > 1) verifies that the six items, Soci1, Soci2, Soci3, Soci4, Soci6 and Soci5, represent the same conceptual construct. The values of the Common Variance (Communalities) for statements 1 Soci1, Soci2, Soci3, Soci4, Soci6 and Soci5 assume the values 0.629, 0.674, 0.631, 0.574, 0.488 and 0.469 respectively, and exceed the value criterion (0.40), posed as the verification limit for the satisfactory quality of the statements for conceptual Sociability (Table 2).

Table 2 presents reliability indexes, Cronbach's  $\alpha$  (alpha), composite reliability (CR) and AVE for each conceptual construct. Specifically, the composite reliability scores for Self-control, General items of EI, Well-being, Emotionality and Sociability constructs equal to 0.816, 0.927, 0.754, 0.905 and 0.651 respectively.

Cronbach's  $\alpha$  is equal to 0.871 for TEIQue-SF, for Self-control, General items of EI, Well-being, Emotionality and Sociability constructs equal to 0.773, 0.914, 0.756, 0.654 and 0.798 respectively. The composite reliability (CR) values range from 0.651 to 0.927 and Cronbach's  $\alpha$  estimates range from 0.654 to 0.914, indicating the reasonable reliability and internal consistency of the measures (Formel and Larcker 1981; Nunnally 1978).

Average variances extracted (AVE's) equal to 0.525, 0.760, 0.554, 0.553, and 0.540 for Self-control, General items of EI, Well-being, Emotionality and Sociability constructs respectively. The average variances extracted were all above the recommended 0.5 level (Hair et al. 1995, 2005), which implies that more than one-half of the variances observed in the items were accounted for by their hypothesized conceptual constructs.

Cronbach's  $\alpha$ , composite reliability (CR) and Average variances extracted (AVE's), indicate TEIQue-SF' reliability.

Besides, all of the factors loadings are over 0.4 large and significant, and the items of all the structures load on one factor with eigenvalue over 1 indicating convergent validity (Wixon & Watson, 2001, Kim, 2008).

The communalities for all 30 items were greater than 0.40, indicating their quality. The cumulative percentage of variance explained by each conceptual construct was greater than 67% (67.051%). AVEs' for Self-control, General items of EI, Well-being, Emotionality and Sociability are over 0.50 indicating convergent validity.

Table 2: Table of Eigenvalues, % of variance, Loadings, Communalities, Cronbach's  $\alpha$ , CR and AVE

| Construct                  | Eigenvalues | % of variance | Loadings | Communalities | Cronbach's alpha | CR   | AVE  |
|----------------------------|-------------|---------------|----------|---------------|------------------|------|------|
| <b>TEIQue-SF</b>           |             |               |          |               | <b>.871</b>      |      |      |
| <b>SELF-CONTROL</b>        | 6.976       | 23.198        |          |               | .773             | .816 | .525 |
| S_Cont3                    |             |               | .690     | .537          |                  |      |      |
| S_Cont6                    |             |               | .690     | .498          |                  |      |      |
| S_Cont4                    |             |               | .681     | .493          |                  |      |      |
| S_Cont2                    |             |               | .665     | .529          |                  |      |      |
| S_Cont1                    |             |               | .605     | .474          |                  |      |      |
| S_Cont5                    |             |               | .573     | .409          |                  |      |      |
| <b>GENERAL ITEMS OF EI</b> | 3.369       | 13.190        |          |               | .914             | .927 | .760 |
| G_Item2                    |             |               | .907     | .831          |                  |      |      |
| G_Item1                    |             |               | .905     | .834          |                  |      |      |
| G_Item3                    |             |               | .867     | .778          |                  |      |      |
| G_Item4                    |             |               | .804     | .688          |                  |      |      |
| <b>WELL-BEING</b>          | 2.912       | 11.930        |          |               | .756             | .754 | .554 |
| W_bein3                    |             |               | .735     | .560          |                  |      |      |
| W_bein4                    |             |               | .636     | .611          |                  |      |      |
| W_bein6                    |             |               | .567     | .445          |                  |      |      |
| W_bein2                    |             |               | .563     | .557          |                  |      |      |
| W_bein5                    |             |               | .497     | .432          |                  |      |      |
| W_bein1                    |             |               | .481     | .507          |                  |      |      |
| <b>EMOTIONALITY</b>        | 2.012       | 9.910         |          |               | .654             | .905 | .553 |

|  |       |       |          |      |      |           |
|--|-------|-------|----------|------|------|-----------|
| Emot7  |       |       | .924     | .867 |      |           |
| Emot6  |       |       | .905     | .839 |      |           |
| Emot5  |       |       | .830     | .722 |      |           |
| Emot3  |       |       | .728     | .547 |      |           |
| Emot8  |       |       | .725     | .659 |      |           |
| Emot2  |       |       | .721     | .533 |      |           |
| Emot4  |       |       | .520     | .410 |      |           |
| Emot1  |       |       | .468     | .401 |      |           |
| <b>SOCIABILITY</b>                               | 1.848 | 8.824 |          |      | .798 | .651 .540 |
| Soci1  |       |       | .587     | .629 |      |           |
| Soci2  |       |       | .527     | .674 |      |           |
| Soci3  |       |       | .497     | .631 |      |           |
| Soci4  |       |       | .465     | .574 |      |           |
| Soci6  |       |       | .440     | .488 |      |           |
| Soci5  |       |       | .403     | .469 |      |           |
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy  |       |       | .767     |      |      |           |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity Approx. Chi-Square |       |       | 1868.224 |      |      |           |
| df   |       |       | 435      |      |      |           |
| Sig.   |       |       | 0.000    |      |      |           |

The results showed that the Well-being factor of EI is correlated with Perceived Value ( $r=0.309^{**}$ ,  $p<0.01$ ), with Loyalty Intentions ( $r=0.263^{**}$ ,  $p<0.01$ ), with Overall Quality and ( $r=0.189^*$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) and Satisfaction ( $r=0.309^{**}$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). Thus the null hypotheses Ho<sub>2</sub>, Ho<sub>4</sub>, Ho<sub>5</sub> and Ho<sub>6</sub> are accepted. On the contrary the null hypothesis Ho<sub>3</sub> is rejected. The results showed that the Self-control factor of EI is correlated with Loyalty Intentions ( $r=0.358^{**}$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). Thus the null hypothesis Ho<sub>9</sub> is accepted. On the contrary the null hypotheses Ho<sub>7</sub>, Ho<sub>8</sub>, Ho<sub>10</sub> and Ho<sub>11</sub> are rejected (Table2).

The results showed that the Emotionality factor of EI is correlated with Perceived Value ( $r=0.269^{**}$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) and with Loyalty Intentions ( $r=0.580^{**}$ ,  $p<0.01$ ).

Thus the null hypotheses Ho<sub>12</sub> and Ho<sub>14</sub> are accepted. On the contrary the null hypotheses Ho<sub>13</sub> and Ho<sub>15</sub> and Ho<sub>16</sub> are rejected (Table 2).

The results showed that the Sociability factor of EI is positively correlated with Perceived Value ( $r=0.303^{**}$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) and with Satisfaction ( $r=0.200^*$ ,  $p<0.05$ ). Thus the null hypotheses Ho<sub>17</sub> and Ho<sub>21</sub> are accepted. On the contrary the null hypotheses Ho<sub>18</sub>, Ho<sub>19</sub> and Ho<sub>20</sub> are rejected (Table 2).



|      |             |   |        |       |        |       |        |
|------|-------------|---|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|
| G_It | Pearson     | 1 | ,839** | -,021 | ,126   | -,064 | ,070   |
| m    | Correlation |   |        |       |        |       |        |
| PER  | Pearson     |   | 1      | ,133  | ,253** | -,050 | ,010   |
|      | Correlation |   |        |       |        |       |        |
| ITB  | Pearson     |   |        | 1     | ,025   | -,010 | ,140   |
|      | Correlation |   |        |       |        |       |        |
| LOY  | Pearson     |   |        |       | 1      | -,039 | ,063   |
|      | Correlation |   |        |       |        |       |        |
| GPO  | Pearson     |   |        |       |        | 1     | ,528** |
|      | Correlation |   |        |       |        |       |        |
| CSF  | Pearson     |   |        |       |        |       | 1      |
|      | Correlation |   |        |       |        |       |        |

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The following Table, 4, presents the results of the Hypotheses Testing.

Table 4: Hypotheses Testing

| Hypothesis       | Proposed relationships   | p-value          | Hypothesis Supported |
|------------------|--|------------------|----------------------|
| Ho <sub>1</sub>  | FWell-being, Self-control, Emotionality, Sociability and General Items of EI contribute to TEIQue-SF | -                | <b>accepted</b>      |
| Ho <sub>2</sub>  | Well-being Perceived Value   | <b>p&lt;0.01</b> | <b>accepted</b>      |
| Ho <sub>3</sub>  | Well-being-Purchase Intentions   | p>0.05           | rejected             |
| Ho <sub>4</sub>  | Well-being-Loyalty Intentions  | <b>p&lt;0.01</b> | <b>accepted</b>      |
| Ho <sub>5</sub>  | Well-being-Overall Perceived Quality   | <b>P&lt;0.05</b> | <b>accepted</b>      |
| Ho <sub>6</sub>  | Well-being-Satisfaction  | <b>p&lt;0.01</b> | <b>accepted</b>      |
| Ho <sub>7</sub>  | Self-control-Perceived Value   | p>0.05           | rejected             |
| Ho <sub>8</sub>  | Self-control factor-Purchase Intentions  | p>0.05           | rejected             |
| Ho <sub>9</sub>  | Self-control-Loyalty Intentions  | <b>p&lt;0.01</b> | <b>accepted</b>      |
| Ho <sub>10</sub> | Self-control-Overall Perceived Quality   | p>0.05           | rejected             |
| Ho <sub>11</sub> | Self-control-Satisfaction  | p>0.05           | rejected             |
| Ho <sub>12</sub> | Emotionality factor-Perceived Value  | <b>p&lt;0.01</b> | <b>accepted</b>      |
| Ho <sub>13</sub> | Emotionality-Purchase Intentions   | p>0.05           | rejected             |
| Ho <sub>14</sub> | Emotionality-Loyalty Intentions  | <b>p&lt;0.01</b> | <b>accepted</b>      |
| Ho <sub>15</sub> | Emotionality-Overall Perceived Quality   | p>0.05           | rejected             |
| Ho <sub>16</sub> | Emotionality-Satisfaction  | p>0.05           | rejected             |
| Ho <sub>17</sub> | Sociability-Perceived Value  | <b>p&lt;0.01</b> | <b>accepted</b>      |
| Ho <sub>18</sub> | Sociability-Purchase Intentions  | p>0.05           | rejected             |
| Ho <sub>19</sub> | Sociability-Loyalty Intentions   | p>0.05           | rejected             |

|      |   |                  |                 |
|------|---|------------------|-----------------|
| Ho20 | Sociability-Overall Perceived Quality         | p>0.05           | rejected        |
| Ho21 | Sociability-Satisfaction                      | <b>p&lt;0.01</b> | <b>accepted</b> |
| Ho22 | General Items-Perceived Value                 | <b>p&lt;0.05</b> | <b>accepted</b> |
| Ho23 | General Items-Purchase Intentions             | p>0.05           | rejected        |
| Ho24 | General Items-Loyalty Intentions              | p>0.05           | rejected        |
| Ho25 | General Items-Overall Perceived Quality       | p>0.05           | rejected        |
| Ho26 | General Items -Satisfaction                   | p>0.05           | rejected        |
| Ho27 | Perceived-Value-Purchase Intentions           | p>0.05           | rejected        |
| Ho28 | Perceived-Value-Loyalty Intentions            | <b>p&lt;0.01</b> | <b>accepted</b> |
| Ho29 | Perceived-Value-Overall Perceived Quality     | p>0.05           | rejected        |
| Ho30 | Perceived Value-Satisfaction                  | p>0.05           | rejected        |
| Ho31 | Purchase Intentions-Loyalty Intentions        | p>0.05           | rejected        |
| Ho32 | Purchase Intentions-Overall Perceived Quality | p>0.05           | rejected        |
| Ho33 | Purchase Intentions-Satisfaction              | p>0.05           | rejected        |
| Ho34 | Loyalty Intentions-Overall Perceived Quality  | p>0.05           | rejected        |
| Ho35 | Loyalty Intentions-Satisfaction               | p>0.05           | rejected        |
| Ho36 | Overall Perceived Quality -Satisfaction       | <b>p&lt;0.01</b> | <b>accepted</b> |

## 5. Conclusions

Emotional intelligence affects all aspects of human behavior. It can also affect consumer behavior, shopping habits, shopping intentions, and loyalty intentions, beliefs about product / service quality and satisfaction. The purpose of this study was to evaluate this effect. Emotional intelligence is recorded under the conceptual constructs of Well-being, Self-control, Emotionality, Sociability, General items of EI assessed by “Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire” [Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire-Short Form (TEIQue-SF)], (Stamatopoulou, Galanis, & Prezerakos, 2016). The data analysis confirmed its reliability and validity.

A survey of 111 consumers showed that the highest correlation between EI conceptual constructs and constructs Perceived Value, Purchase Intentions, Loyalty Intentions, Overall Quality and Satisfaction is between General items of EI and Perceived Value. Next is the correlation between Emotionality and Loyalty Intentions. The correlation between Self-control and Loyalty Intentions is followed.

It is noteworthy that the conceptual construct of Well-being has a statistically significant correlation with the conceptual constructs of Perceived Value, Loyalty Intentions, Overall Quality and Satisfaction.

The conceptual construction of Emotionality, in addition to its relationship with Loyalty Intentions, is also significantly related to the conceptual construction of Perceived Value

The conceptual construct of Sociability is significantly correlated with the conceptual constructs of Perceived Value and Satisfaction

Also, it is worth noting that the conceptual construct of Purchase Intentions has no statistically significant correlation with the conceptual constructs of Emotional Intelligence.

## References

Anastasiadis, L., Anastasiadou, S. Iakovidis, G. (2016). *Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award (MBNQA) dimensions in Greek Tertiary Education System*. 8<sup>th</sup> International Conference 'The Economies of Balkan and Eastern Europe Countries in the changed world', EBEEC 2016, Split, Croatia. KnowledgeE Publishing-the Economies of Balkan and Eastern Europe Countries in the Changed World (EBEEC) | pages 436-455.

Anastasiadis, L. & Christoforidis, C. (2019). Evaluating citizens' actual perceptions and expectations and assessing e-Service Quality Gap in Public Sector related to e-Government Services, *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovative Competitiveness – IJEIC*, Vol. 1 – Iss. 1. <http://hephaestus.nup.ac.cy/bitstream/handle/11728/11395/Paper5.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>.

Anastasiadou, S., Papadaki, Z. (2019). Consumers' perceptions toward E-Service Quality, Perceived Value, Purchase and Loyalty Intentions. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovative Competitiveness – IJEIC*, Vol 1, Issue 1, <https://hephaestus.nup.ac.cy/bitstream/handle/11728/11391/paper1.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>.

Anastasiadou S., Anastasiadis L. (2019b). *Quality Assurance in Education in the Light of the Effectiveness of Transformational School Leadership*. In: Sykianakis N., Polychronidou P., Karasavvoglou A. (eds) *Economic and Financial Challenges for Eastern Europe*. Springer Proceedings in Business and Economics. Springer, Cham, pp. 323-344. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-12169-3\\_21](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-12169-3_21).

Anastasiadou, S., Taraza, E. (2019c). *Total Quality Management: Implementation of the Six Sigma Methodology for Improving Quality in Higher Education*. ICERI2019,



the 12th annual International Conference of Education, Research and Innovation, Seville (Spain), pp. 9533-9537.

Anastasiadou S. Taraza, E. (2019d). *Pre-service teachers' perceptions toward leadership regarding the MBVQA Model*. 11th annual International Conference on Education and New Learning Technologies Palma de Mallorca, Spain, EDULEARN 19. pp. 533-543.

Anastasiadou S. Taraza, E. (2019e). *The structure and paths of Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award (MBNQA) dimensions applied in Greek Tertiary educational systems dimensions in Greek Tertiary Education System*. 11th annual International Conference on Education and New Learning Technologies Palma de Mallorca, Spain, EDULEARN 19, pp. 455-463.

Anastasiadou, S., Papadaki, Z. (2019). *Consumers' perceptions toward E-Service Quality, Perceived Value, Purchase and Loyalty Intentions*. Proceeding of the ICME 2018- 1st International Conference on Marketing and Entrepreneurship. Cyprus. <http://hephaestus.nup.ac.cy/handle/11728/11313>.

Anastasiadou, S. (2018a). *Gap analysis between perceived and expected of service quality in Greek Tertiary Education*. Proceedings of EDULEARN18: 10th annual International Conference on Education and New Learning Technologies Palma de Mallorca, Spain, pp. 8373-8382. doi:10.21125/edulearn.2018.1951.

Anastasiadou, S. (2018b). Evaluating Perception, Expectation of Students/Pre-service Teachers and Service Quality Gap in Greek Tertiary Education. *KnE Social Sciences | The Economies of the Balkan and the Eastern European Countries in the changing World (EBEEC 2018) | pages: 294–308*.

Anastasiadou, Sofia. (2018c). *Leadership according to EFQM Model in Tertiary education: The case of Greek Universities*. Proceedings of 10<sup>th</sup> International Conference The Economies of the Balkan and the Eastern European Countries in the changing world, EBEEC 2018, Warsaw, Poland, pp. 20-24.

Anastasiadou, Sofia. (2018d). *Total quality management in Greek Tertiary Educational System The case of Greek Universities*. Proceedings of 10<sup>th</sup> International Conference EBEEC 2018 - The Economies of the Balkan and the Eastern European Countries in the changing world, Warsaw, Poland, pp. 59-64.

Anastasiadou, Sofia. (2018e) Comparison of multivariate methods in group/cluster identification. Dissertation thesis of the degree of MSc. in Research Methodology in

Biomedicine, Biostatistics and Clinical Bioinformatics, Faculty of Medicine, University of Thessaly.

Anastasiadou, S. (2016a). Ishikawa' approach in Greek secondary education system evaluation in respect of quality assurance. Παρουσιάστηκε στο 8<sup>th</sup> International Conference 'The Economies of Balkan and Eastern Europe Countries in the changed world', EBEEC 2016, Split, Croatia και είναι Under publication σε περιοδικό του συνεδρίου, under publication.

Anastasiadou, S. (2016b). *Greek Tertiary Education System evaluation in respect of quality assurance dimensions according to Malcolm Baldrige Performance Excellence Model*. 8<sup>th</sup> International Conference 'The Economies of Balkan and Eastern Europe Countries in the changed world', EBEEC 2016, Split, Croatia n: Karasavvoglou A., Goić S., Polychronidou P., Delias P. (eds) *Economy, Finance and Business in Southeastern and Central Europe*. Springer Proceedings in Business and Economics. Springer, Cham, pp. 811-825.

Anastasiadou, S., Fotiadis, T., Anastasiadis, L, Iakovidis, G, Fotiadou, X., Tiliakou, C. (2016c). Estimate and analysis of vocational training school (IEK) students' satisfaction regarding the quality of studies provided by these schools, *Scientific Bulletin – Economic Sciences*, Vol. 15, Issue 2, 48-45.

Anastasiadou, S.D, Fotiadou, X.G, Anastasiadis, L. (2016d). Estimation of Vocational Training School (IEK) students' contentment in relation to quality of their studies. *New Trends and Issues Proceedings on Humanities & Social Sciences*, [On line].10, pp 09-18. Available from: [www.prosoc](http://www.prosoc).

Anastasiadou, S.D, Florou, G.S Fotiadou, X.G, Anastasiadis, L. (2016e). Evaluation of the satisfaction of preservice educators of Primary Education from their work and faithfulness to their work. *New Trends and Issues Proceedings on Humanitiw and Social Sciences*. [On line].10, pp35-41. Available from: [www.prosoc.eu](http://www.prosoc.eu).

Anastasiadou, S. (2016). *Greek Tertiary Education System evaluation in respect of quality assurance dimensions according to Malcolm Baldrige Performance Excellence Model*. 8<sup>th</sup> International Conference 'The Economies of Balkan and Eastern Europe Countries in the changed world', EBEEC 2016, Split, Croatia n: Karasavvoglou A., Goić S., Polychronidou P., Delias P. (eds) *Economy, Finance and Business in Southeastern and Central Europe*. Springer Proceedings in Business and Economics. Springer, Cham, pp. 811-825.

- Anastasiadou S., Zirinoglou P. (2015). EFQM dimensions in Greek Primary Education System. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, vol 33, pp. 411 – 431.
- Anastasiadou S., (2015). The Roadmaps of Total Quality Management in the Greek education system according to Deming, Juran, and Crosby in light of the EFQM model. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, vol 33, pp. 562-572.
- Anastasiadou S., (2014). Students' attitudes toward Effective Leadership in Education *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, ELSEVIER, vol. 143, pp. 941 – 946.
- Anastasiadou S., Zirinolou, P., (2014). Reliability testing of EFQM scale: The case of Greek secondary teachers *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* Volume 143, pp. 990–994.
- Hair, J., Anderson, R., Tatham, R. and Black, W., 1995. *Multivariate Data Analysis With Raedings*, p.373. USA: Prentice-Hall International, Inc.
- Hair, F. J., Black C. W., Badin, N. J., Anderson, E. R., Tatham, R. L., 2005. *Multivariate Data Analysis*. New Jersey, Pearson Education Inc.
- Anastasiadou S., (2014). A structural equation model describes factors affecting Greek students' consumer behavior. *Procedia Economics and Finance. Volume 9, Pages 402–406*.
- Hellier, P.K., Geursen, G.M., Carr, R.A. and Rickard, J.A., 2003. Customer repurchase intention: A general structural equation model. *European journal of marketing*, 37(11/12), pp.1762-1800.
- Ilieska, K. (2013). Customer Satisfaction Index- as a Base for Strategic Marketing Management, *TEI Journal*, 2(4), pp. 327-331.
- Kaiser, H, F. (1960). The application of electronic computers to factors analysis. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 20, 141-151.
- Kim, D.J., Ferrin, D.L. and Rao, H.R., (2008). A trust-based consumer decision-making model in electronic commerce: The role of trust, perceived risk, and their antecedents. *Decision support systems*, 44(2), pp.544-564.
- Masouras, A., & Papademetriou, C. (2018). Digital consumer behaviour in Cyprus: from uses and gratifications theory to 4c's online shopping approach.
- Mavris, E., Anastasiadou, S., Florou, G, Efthymios Valkanos, E., Anastasiadis, L. (2019). Data Evelopment Analysis (DEA): An application of DEA regarding Greek tertiary education. *Journal of Business Paradigms*, vol 4. No 1. pp. 78-99.

- Papadaki Z.E., Anastsasiadou S.D. (2019b). *Evaluating Perception, Expectation of Consumers, and Service Quality Gap in Greek Banking in a Period of Financial Crisis and Capital Controls*. In: Sykianakis N., Polychronidou P., Karasavvoglou A. (eds) *Economic and Financial Challenges for Eastern Europe*. Springer Proceedings in Business and Economics. Springer, Cham, pp. 67-80. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-12169-3\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-12169-3_5).
- Papalazaridis, G., Hatzithomas L., Fotiadis, T., Anastasiadou, S. (2018). *The effect of shopping styles on online shopping benefits and risks*. In 2018 Global Marketing Conference at Tokyo, Global Marketing Conference at Tokyo Proceedings: pp. 341-354.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A., Malhotra, A. 2005. E-S-Dual. A Multiple-Item Scale for Assessing Electronic Service Quality. *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 7, No X., pp. 1-21.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A. and Berry, L. L. 1988. Servqual: A multi-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), pp. 12-40.
- Patterson, P.G., Johnson, L.W. and Spreng, R.A. (1997). Modeling the determinants of customer satisfaction for business-to-business professional services. *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 25, pp. 4-17.
- Petrides, K. V. (2011). Ability and trait emotional intelligence. In Chamorro –Premuzic, A. Furnham, & S. Von Strumm (Eds.). *The Bloccjwell-Wiley Handbook of Individual Differences* (pp. 656-678). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2001). Trait emotional intelligence: Psychometric investigation with reference to established trait taxonomies. *European Journal of Personality*, 15, 425-448.
- Stamatopoulou, M., Galanis, P. & Prezerakos, P. (2016). Psychometric properties of the Greek translation of the trait emotional intelligence questionnaire-short form (TEIQUE-SF). *Personality & Individual Differences*, 95:80-84.
- Sweeney, J.C., Soutar, G.N. and Johnson, L.W. (1999). The role of perceived risk in the quality-value relationship: a study in a retail environment. *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 75 No. 1, pp. 77-105.
- Taraza, E. Anastasiadou S. (2019a). *Assessing quality in Greek tertiary education: the case of school of pedagogical and technological education (ASPETE)*. Proceedings of

13th annual International Technology, Education and Development Conference (INTED2019), Valencia, Spain, pp. 2364-2374.

Taraza, E. Anastasiadou S. (2019b). *EFQM Excellence Model in Vocational Lyceum: Reliability and Validity of EFQM Instrument*. Proceedings of 13th annual International Technology, Education and Development Conference (INTED2019), Valencia, Spain, pp. 2273-2285.

Taraza, E., Anastasiadou, S. (2019c). Evaluation of Total Quality Management (TQM) in Greek Higher education Using advanced statistical methodologies. ICERI2019, the *12th annual International Conference of Education, Research and Innovation* will be held in Seville (Spain), pp. 9450-9460.

Wixon B. H & Watson H. J. (2001). An empirical investigation of the factors affecting data warehousing. *MIS Quarterly* 25(1), pp 17-41.

Zeithaml, V.A., 1988. Consumer perceptions of price, quality, and value: a means-end model and synthesis of evidence. *The Journal of marketing*, pp.2-22.

Zeithaml, V.A., Berry, L.L. and Parasuraman, A., 1996. The behavioral consequences of service quality. *The Journal of Marketing*, pp.31-46.