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Abstract
The aim of the research is to examine the relationship between the levels of emotional intelligence and decision-making strategies of gifted students. A relational model was used in this study. 141 gifted students in Gaziantep BİLSEM in 2016-2017 academic year and between the age of 14-16 years were participated in the study. The data were obtained from the "Emotional Intelligence Scale" and the "Decision Making Strategies Scale". In the analysis of the data, Pearson Correlation test and hierarchical regression analysis were used. There was a positive relationship between decision making strategies and emotional intelligence. As stress management and adaptability increases in individuals, it seems that Hypervigilance (panic decision-making strategy) scores decrease and Vigilance (careful decision-making strategy) scores increase. There was no significant relationship between self-esteem and emotional intelligence in making decisions. It is thought that other factors could be effective in the decision-making strategies of gifted students.
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Introduction

It is known that today, as the functioning of education and training is minded, the expectations of the society and the attainment of the aims of the education depend on the effectiveness and proper use of human resources. In recent years, using human resources plays crucial roles in the development and progress of the societies. Today's contemporary societies embark on an effort to give special importance and education to gifted students (Koçak and İçmenoğlu, 2012). Since gifted students have a higher level of cognitive levels than peers, it is important for them to be trained by experts in the fields (Tortop, 2012). In order to give importance to the education and training of the gifted individuals and to determine the planning of studies that clearly demonstrate the characteristics and potentials of these individuals is one of the needs of our age.

According to the definition of American National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC), gifted individual is the one who demonstrates outstanding level of aptitude or competence in one or more domains (National Association for Gifted Children, 2010). According to the widely accepted definition of giftedness, the relation of three basic characteristics constitutes giftedness. These are; “motivation”, “creativity”, and “senior talent”. The most important component of being a gifted individual is creativity (Renzulli, 1986; Özbay, 2013). Davaslıgil (2004) defines the gifted children as the Individuals who are superior to their peers with mental, creative leadership skills and who are academically successful at higher levels and who also need a special education program to further functionalize their present abilities.

As the most important role in the development of societies is thought to be played by the education system, to be able to make a positive contribution for the future of the societies the most important tasks of the education system should be to diagnose the gifted children and discover them during their education process and ensure that they are in the most appropriate education programs.

It has been put forth that gifted individuals are not always successful in their academic, business and private lives in society. We all meet with people who are successful at school but unhappy in life, unsuccessful in academic tests, but with good common sense and creativity at the same time have good social relationships (Yeşilyaprak, 2001). The concept of emotional intelligence is undergoing the same journey of being proved and questioned in different cultural settings as its applications is becoming more widespread in the context of social psychology and organizational behavior (Bhattacharya and Sengupta, 2007).

Emotional intelligence has become a matter of importance and dispute. The reason for these discussions is that it is important for the people to have high emotional intelligence along with high IQ levels so that they can achieve success and happiness in their lives. Individuals with high levels of emotional intelligence are
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those who communicate seamlessly with their families and environments, reach success through simpler ways, more productive and more successful in their business life. Emotional intelligence is a concept that enables individuals to understand, manage, empathize, and at the same time helps develop the feelings of motivation and self-esteem. Therefore today emotional intelligence being able to be improved attaches great importance (Doğan and Demiral, 2007).

It has been understood that the level of intelligence throughout their lives is not sufficient to achieve their success, but the emotional intelligence that carries personal characteristics such as managing empathy and empathizing, good mood, patience is also important. Although it is known that emotional intelligence, defined as the ability to recognize and manage the feelings of individuals, is as important as intelligence for the success, it has been observed that individuals with higher levels of emotional intelligence can better use their abilities and capacities in their lives (Yeşilyaprak, 2001; Yüksel, 2006).

Emotional intelligence level; Along with genetic traits, is related to later acquired life experiences and later learnings. Additionally, emotional abilities can be learned and improved at all ages. It is known that intelligence is a hard-to-change variable, while contrarily emotional intelligence can be improved more easily (Singh, 2012). While IQ is not a type of intelligence that develops much after 13-19 years of age, emotional intelligence can be developed throughout the lifetime (Yeşilyapra, 2001). The emotional intelligence levels of the people are affected by socio-demographic characteristics, gender, income status and parental education levels (Tambağ, 2014). It is very important for families to actively participate in the education of gifted students during this influencing process (Tortop, 2016). Taking all these factors into consideration, it is considered appropriate to include changes, studies and activities in both normal and gifted individuals' family, school, and social environment that improve their emotional intelligence.

Gifted individuals' desire to deal with one thing constantly, their unspecific goals, their social coercive attitudes (late decision making or decision changing), their willingness to succeed, and pressures on the process of the high career expectations (for ego satisfaction) should also be considered (Özbay and Palancı, 2011).

Decision-making involves many cognitive processes such as information search and processing (e.g. to establish the details of options that are available), problem-solving (finding a novel or creative solution to a decision dilemma), judgement (evaluating the options and the credibility of the source of information), learning (e.g. realizing that commitments are binding and cannot easily be broken), and memory (recalling relevant information about how to handle similar decision problems) (Mann, 1985).

Life constantly confronts the individuals with decision-making situations in which they must choose among various options. Decision-making is not only specific to a situation but can also be considered as a developmental process. In this
process, the individual must make decisions for the near and far future. Decisions about the far future of the individual are determined by the instant decisions in his life. The instant decisions made by the individual about himself/herself and environment vary as his/her knowledge and experience increase (Ersever, 1996).

Decision-making ability is closely related to the characteristics of people and their level of socialization. The decision is to choose the most appropriate one from different situations according to the circumstances and conditions of the individual in order to draw a conclusion. Decision-making is directly related to the choice and consists of our cognitive and behavioral efforts. The process of making very different decisions cause more problems and difficulties for the individual (Deniz, 2004). The decision-making process may be influenced by individual differences. (Parker and Fischhoff, 2005). The abilities of gifted children, whose thinking styles, reactions, interests can also be different than their peers (Ersoy and Deniz, 2016).

All this information suggests that gifted individuals’ decision-making processes and selection skills may differ from individuals with normal intelligence levels.

Decision making and problem solving stages are similar. Gömleksiz and Kan (2007) states that these stages cover common features. İşmen (2001) revealed that problem-solving skills increase as emotional intelligence improves. The similarity of these stages suggests that problem-solving skills will have an impact on decision-making processes. It is also believed that emotional intelligence is influential on problem-solving skill of individuals that they face throughout the lifetime, on making plans concerning the future and therefore on their decision-making process.

The individual faces with problems at every moment of life. It is a must to survive by solving these problems with his/her intelligence and talents. Individual lives together with decision-making situation in order to solve his/her problems. The nature of the decisions that he/she makes during his/her life can vary according to the individual's developmental stage, the circumstances he/she needs to decide, and the characteristics of the options (Taşgit, 2012).

As the statements above are evaluated, evaluation of the emotional intelligence level and decision making process of gifted students are important in terms of the training and intervention approaches planned to be presented to them. Meanwhile, no research has been found on this particular research group which evaluates emotional intelligence and decision-making processes of gifted students on relevant literature. The aim of this study was to determine at what level and what kind of relationship is there between the levels of emotional intelligence and decision-making skills of the gifted students in the secondary school 9th, 10th and 11th grades. This study also examined the impact of gender and class levels on decision-making strategies in addition to emotional intelligence.
Methodology

Research Model
Since it is trying to determine if there is the relationship between emotional intelligence level and decision making strategies in gifted students, so correlational research design has been employed in this study. In this study, emotional intelligence as an independent variable and decision strategies as a dependent variable were used in hierarchical regression analysis.

Participants
Population of this study consists of 141 students aged between 14-16, grades 9th, 10th, 11th from Gaziantep Science and Art Center in 2016-2017 academic year. Of these, 79 are male students and 62 are female students.

Data Collection Instruments
To reach the objectives of the research, necessary data were collected from Melbourne Decision Making Scale (MDMQ), which was developed by Mann (1997), and adapted into Turkish, tested for validity and reliability by Deniz (2004), and Bar-On emotional quotient inventory has also been used which was developed by Bar-On and Parker and adapted into Turkish by Köksal (2007).

Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory: Youth version
Application age range of Bar-On emotional quotient inventory: Youth version, which was developed by Bar-On and Parker, is 7-18. The questionnaire includes 60 items. It was adapted into Turkish by Köksal (2007). It is a 4-point Likert-style questionnaire and includes five substantive models and 15 subscales. Cronbach's alpha coefficient for reliability has been calculated as α .91. When the internal consistency values of the questionnaire were examined, it was calculated as .80 for interpersonal, .62 for intrapersonal, .68 for stress management, .85 for compliance, .85 for general mood, and .63 for positive effect (Köksal, 2007). The content validity of the Bar-On emotional quotient inventory: Youth version was tested with expert opinion and necessary arrangements were made accordingly (Köksal, 2007). The characteristics of those who score higher on the lower steps of the scale can be expressed as (Köksal, 2007):

*Intrapersonal:* The individual recognizes his/ her feelings and can express his / her feelings and needs. This subscale includes 6 items. *Interpersonal:* The individual has a good interpersonal relationship. He listens to others and understands their feelings. This subscale includes 12 items. *Adaptability:* The individual has an understanding of flexible thinking and a realistic mind and is successful in adapting to various situations. He/she is successful in finding positive solutions to problems. This subscale includes 10 items. *Stress Management:* The individual is quite calm and can work well even under stress. Instinctive behaviors are rarely observed. They do not experience emotional outbursts even when they are under stress. This subscale
includes 12 items. **General Mood:** The individual is in an optimistic attitude. They always like to look on the optimistic side of life and happy to be a part of it. This subscale includes 14 items. **Positive Impression:** Individuals with high scores want to look very positive. This subscale includes 6 items. **Total EQ:** The individual is successful and happy in dealing with daily problems. **Inconsistency Index:** The high scores of the subscales mean that the individual filling out the questionnaire did not perceive the explanations or gave random responses.

**Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire (MDMQ)**

Melbourne Decision Making Scale, which was developed by Mann (1997), and adapted into Turkish, tested for validity and reliability by Deniz (2004). Three-point Likert scale has been used in the study. Validity and reliability of the scale were tested with data collected from 154 students (Deniz, 2004). The scale consists of two parts. In the first part, it is aimed to measure decision making self-esteem. Self-esteem consists of 6 items. While three items have been scored regularly, the other three items have been reverse-coded. The answers coded as the followings: “Correct” is 2, “Sometimes Correct” is 1, and “Not Correct” is 0. Highest score could be 12 points. High score refers to high self-esteem in decision making. Second part of the scale consists of 22 items and measure decision making styles. There are four sub-factors. These are:

**Vigilance:** The individual’s searching for the relevant information before making the decision and making a choice after evaluating the alternatives carefully. This sub-scale consists of six items. **Buck-passing:** The individual’s not taking the responsibility of decision making and trying to evade decision making by leaving the responsibility of decisions to someone else. This sub-scale consists of six items. **Procrastination:** The individual’s postponing and procrastinating the decisions. This sub-scale consists of five items. **Hypervigilance:** The individual’s making decisions hastily. This sub-scale consists of five items.

Deniz (2004), Reliability of the questionnaire has been calculated via test-retest and internal consistency. After applying two times to 56 students every three weeks, reliability coefficients, achieved from subscales via test-retest method, found between .68-.87.

According to item analysis results of internal consistency (Deniz, 2004), total item correlation of the 26 out of 28 items in the questionnaire is above .33; and the other two items’ total item correlation is .26 and .27. Internal consistency coefficients of the questionnaire, which was applied to 154 students, are; Self-esteem .72, Vigilance .80, Buck-passing .78, Procrastination .65, and Hypervigilance .71

Deniz (2004) achieved the validity of the questionnaire via content validity and similar scale validity; for the content validity, he asked for the expert’s opinion.
Data Analysis
After checking the assumptions of parametric tests, the data, derived from the results, has been analyzed by Pearson Correlation test and hierarchical regression analysis in SPSS 20.0 statistics software.

Results
As seen on Table 1, the relationship between the sub-scales of Emotional Intelligence and Decision Making Questionnaire has been calculated via Pearson Correlation Coefficient.
Table 1.
Correlation Table Related To the Sub-Scales of Emotional Intelligence and Decision Making Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vigilance (1)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buck-passing (2)</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procrastination (3)</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypervigilance (4)</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem in decision making (5)</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal (6)</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal (7)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress management (8)</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability (9)</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Mood (10)</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As table 1 is examined, making decisions carefully has a moderate positive relationship with self-esteem in decision making (r = .31, p < .01), and weak linear positive relationship with stress management (r = .25, p < .01), adaptability (r = .28, p < .01), interpersonal (r = .21, p < .05) sub-scales. Buck-passing has a moderate positive relationship with hypervigilance (r = .54, p < .01), a moderate negative relationship with self-esteem in decision making (r = -.41, p < .01), and weak negative linear relationship with stress management (r = -.20, p < .05), adaptability (r = -.19, p < .05), and general mood (r = -.19, p < .05). Procrastination has a moderate positive relationship with buck-passing (r = .61, p < .01), and hypervigilance (r = .61, p < .01). Procrastination has also a moderate negative relationship with self-esteem in decision making (r = -.38, p < .01). A weak negative linear relationship has been observed between decision making level and stress management (r = -.18, p < .05). Hypervigilance has a moderate negative relationship with self-esteem in decision-making (r = .40, p < .01), and weak negative linear relationship with stress management (r = -.19, p < .05) and adaptability (r = -.18, p < .05). Self-esteem in decision making has weak linear positive relationship with stress management (r = .22, p < .05), adaptability (r = .21, p < .05), and general mood (r = .29, p < .01). Interpersonal, one of the sub-scales of the emotional intelligence, has a weak negative linear relationship with stress management (r = -.17, p < .05), and moderate positive relationship with adaptability (r = .43, p < .01) and general mood (r = .47, p < .01). Additionally, general mood has a weak linear relationship with intrapersonal, one of the subscales of emotional intelligence (r = .27, p < .01), and moderate positive relationship with adaptability (r = .49, p < .01).

The results of the hierarchical regression analysis of the sub-scales of decision-making strategies are given in Table 2. In the first block gender and class variables, and in the second block emotional intelligence scores have been entered into the analysis. Gender and class variables have been converted into dummy variables to involve in the regression model. Gender and class variables together explain 4% of the variance associated with vigilance. There is no meaningful relationship between vigilance and gender and class variables. So, gender and class are not meaningful predictor variables of decision making strategies. As second block, sub-scales of emotional intelligence have been entered into the analysis. Checking the gender and class variables, emotional intelligence level appear to contribute 21% to the previously explained variance in the vigilance variable. Thus the total variance increased to 26%. There is a meaningful positive relationship between vigilance and emotional intelligence. Stress management and adaptability from emotional intelligence levels can be said to increase as individuals increase in their ability of vigilance.
Table 2.
Hierarchical Regression Analysis Results Related to the Prediction of Decision Making Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SHB</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² top</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vigilance</td>
<td>1. Demographic</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>2.32*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>4.12**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UY</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>3.21**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buck-passing</td>
<td>1. Demographic</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.79</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-2.86**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UY</td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Demographic</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.06**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procrastination</td>
<td></td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-2.30*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UY</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>-.86</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Demographic</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypervigilance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the first block, gender and class variables have been entered into the hierarchical regression analysis done with the buck-passing. These two variables together explain 1% of the variance associated with buck-passing. There is no meaningful relationship between buck-passing and gender and class variables. Hence, gender and class are not significant predictors of decision making strategies. As second block, sub-scales of emotional intelligence have been entered into the analysis. Checking the gender and class variables, emotional intelligence levels appear to contribute 12% to the previously explained variance in the buck-passing variable. Thus the total variance increased to 13% there is a meaningful positive relationship between buck-passing and emotional intelligence. Buck-passing can be said to decrease as individuals increase in their ability of stress management.

Hierarchical regression analysis results of procrastination has been shown in Table 2. In the first block, gender and class variables have been entered into the analysis. These two variables together explain 6% of the variance associated with procrastination there is a meaningful positive relationship between procrastination and gender and class variables. Class variable is a meaningful predictor while gender is not. As second block, sub-scales of emotional intelligence have been entered into the analysis. Checking the gender and class variables, emotional intelligence levels appear to contribute 9% to the previously explained variance in the procrastination variable. Thus the total variance increased to 14%. There is a meaningful positive relationship between procrastination and emotional intelligence. Procrastination can be said to decrease as individuals increase in their ability of stress management.
Hierarchical regression analysis results of hypervigilance has been shown in Table 2. In the first block, gender and class variables have been entered into the analysis. These two variables together explain 6% of the variance associated with hypervigilance; thus there is no meaningful relationship between hypervigilance and gender and class variables. Hence, gender and class are not significant predictors of decision making strategies. As second block, subscales of emotional intelligence have been entered into the analysis. Checking the gender and class variables, emotional intelligence levels appear to contribute 9% to the previously explained variance in the hypervigilance variable. Thus the total variance increased to 11%. There is a meaningful positive relationship between hypervigilance and emotional intelligence. Hypervigilance can be said to decrease as individuals increase in their ability of stress management and adaptability.

Hierarchical regression analysis results of self-esteem in decision making has been shown in Table 2. In the first block, gender and class variables have been entered into the analysis. These two variables together explain 11% of the variance associated with self-esteem in decision making; thus there is a meaningful positive relationship between self-esteem and gender and class variables. Hence, gender and class are significant predictors of decision making strategies. As second block, subscales of emotional intelligence have been entered into the analysis. Checking the gender and class variables, emotional intelligence levels appear to contribute 2% to the previously explained variance in the self-esteem variable. Thus the total variance increased to 13%. There is no meaningful relationship between self-esteem and emotional intelligence.

**Discussion**

As a result of this study, having no relationship between vigilance of gifted students and gender and class suggests that gifted individuals are not affected by the class and age in their decision making process. Ersoy and Deniz (2016) have found that taking total decision-making scores into account, decision-making skills are higher in girls than boys in a study on gifted children.

Avşaroğlu ve Üre (2007) stated that self-esteem, decision making, and stress management strategies did not differ in terms of gender in a study they examined in terms of self-esteem and other variables. Köksal and Gazioğlu (2007) found no significant difference in terms of gender in impulsive decision making, dependent decision making, and unstable decision making in a study they did on normal intelligence level adolescents. However, they also stated that it was higher in girls than boys. It is thought that the logical decision making sub-scale resembles the vigilance sub-scale in this study.
In our study, having a positive relationship between only procrastination and gender and class might suggest that the gender variable is not related to the decision-making variable.

This study puts forth that there is a partial relationship between gifted children's emotional intelligence levels and their decision making strategies. In terms of decision-making strategies, it is understood that emotional intelligence is related to vigilance. Similar to our study, Avşaroğlu and Deniz (2014) found a positive relationship between students' emotional intelligence abilities and vigilance in a study they conducted on normal intelligence level university students. Having a relationship between vigilance and interpersonal, stress management and adaptability from emotional intelligence levels shows that those with interpersonal emotional intelligence manage social stress better and ones with higher levels of adaptability make more careful decisions. It's statistically significant that Emotional intelligence, which is a social intelligence type from the point of the nature and process of decision making, has a positive relationship with vigilance. Köksal and Gazioglu (2007) also found a meaningful positive relationship between logical decision making and emotional intelligence. It can be argued that logical decision making is thought to coincide with vigilance and both studies show that vigilance have a relationship with emotional intelligence.

Emotional intelligence can be defined as an individual's perception of his / her own and others' emotions correctly, making a choice among emotions, adapting the information obtained in his/her behaviors, and using in thought processes. Emotional intelligence is that individuals have to be competent in their interpersonal relationships and have significant skills to find solutions to their problems (Acar, 2002). When emotional intelligence is thought to be capable of recognizing and controlling the emotions of the individual, the individual with a high emotional intelligence score is predicted to be able to cope with this process more effectively and better by focusing on the problem or the situation that needs to be decided more carefully.

In their study Sahin and Guler (2009) stated that individuals, who have higher level of emotional intelligence than their peers, understand their own and others' emotional situations, are more compatible for difficult situations, and can better solve their problems.

This study reveals that buck-passing has a meaningful positive relationship with emotional intelligence. Köksal and Gazioglu (2007) found a reverse meaningful relationship between undecided decision-making and emotional intelligence in a study on normal intelligence level adolescents. We think that Köksal and Gazioglu's (2007) undecided decision-making subscale coincides with buck-passing subscale used in this study in terms of definition. In our study, having procrastination and hypervigilance a positive relationship with emotional intelligence suggests that all
decision-making strategies have meaningful positive relationships with emotional intelligence. This situation suggests that the relationship between the levels of emotional intelligence of the gifted individuals and their decision making strategies may be related to other parameters. In a study conducted on prospective teachers, Yılmaz and Altınok (2010) found that there is a meaningful positive relationship between all subscales of emotional intelligence scale and self-esteem in decision making. Avşaroğlu and Deniz (2014) also found a meaningful positive relationship between emotional intelligence and self-esteem in decision-making.

The lack of a meaningful relationship between self-esteem and emotional intelligence in our study can be explained by the fact that gifted individuals prefer to be problem-solution oriented in their decision-making process and to use academic and cognitive skills more in this process.

As a result of our study, the greater the stress management and adaptability of the gifted individual, the more attention is paid to the decision-making process. It can be said that an individual who has a good adaptation to stress management and difficult circumstances will be able to solve ideas easily by producing ideas, putting out the options and making choices in decision making process. Moreover, as stress management increases in individuals, the decrease in buck-passing reveals that gifted people prefer to make decisions on their own responsibility when they decide.

There are also other studies (Deniz ve Yılmaz, 2006; Güzey, 2001) indicate that coping with stress and stress management features affect the decision-making strategies of individuals.

According to our study results, it can be stated that, with the increase in stress management and adaptability among individuals, hypervigilance and procrastination is decreasing. Starting from this point of view, it is expected that individuals with high stress management and compliance will be able to make decisions in a calm and controlled manner without giving any panic in the decision-making process.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research
Accurate identification of gifted individuals will enable them to better understand their personal characteristics and to make appropriate decisions in a way that they can be successful throughout their life. These individuals can be developed and educated in decision-making strategies. In this way, vocational guidance can be made regarding decision-making strategies. Suitable occupations can also be identified for gifted individuals with high stress management and adaptability skills.

It is important to follow their emotional intelligence levels, provide them with emotional intelligence developments, and include activities to improve their emotional intelligence in school curricula. Parents, teachers, school administrators and students should be informed about emotional intelligence and how to develop
It may be advisable to conduct researches into the factors that may contribute to the development of emotional intelligence.

The relationship between decision-making strategies and emotional intelligence of gifted individuals can be examined using different scales. In the following studies; relationships between peers, self-efficacy beliefs, anxiety and empathy, uncertainty intolerance, and emotional intelligence and decision-making strategies can be examined. In addition, variables such as the general academic achievements of these individuals, number of siblings, socio-cultural, economic and marital status of their families may be included in further studies.

This study was conducted only on secondary school students. The study group can be expanded by including the primary school level in the study. The sample group can be increased by including gifted individuals in the nearby cities as well. Future studies may include normal intelligence level students to determine the differences between their decision-making strategies and those of the gifted ones.
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