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Emotional intelligence is a crucial and key ingredient of great leadership and can be seen as a transformational part of leadership that can bring unparalleled leader, member, and organizational success. While a plethora of research and data exists on emotional intelligence, deficiencies in evidence exist to understand the relevance in school district leadership. A particularly vulnerable group of leadership is the Superintendents in school districts with an enrollment of less than 3,000 students. This is because the Superintendent is still very hands on the everyday management of staff and faculty but also has many challenges that are different than other sizes of schools that require a high degree of E.I. to meet those challenges (Moore, 2009). School Districts in Nebraska have a variety of challenges based on socioeconomic, geographic location, budget cuts, student needs, a pandemic, and the availability of resources.

Therefore, the purpose of this quantitative study will be to explore the distribution of emotional intelligence in leadership for public school Superintendents in Nebraska in school districts with 3,000 or less students using the Emotional Competence Inventory. The decision to use Superintendents in districts of less than 3,000 students is to ensure the leadership expectations are similar.

Contemporary findings suggest that EI can be learned or trained. Since Sadri (2012) suggests that leaders high in EI can recognize, appraise, predict and manage
emotions in a way that enables them to work with and motivate team members. It supports Sadri (2012) who suggests that practitioners interested and involved in developing leaders not attempt to improve all five EI competencies in the same training program, but rather consider developing one or more of the competencies identified here as integrating with past research in leadership development (self-awareness, self-regulation, empathy and social skills) as stand-alone competencies and provide training to participants who lack the requisite skills on an as-needed basis.
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Chapter 1: Statement of the Problem

Introduction

Emotional intelligence is a crucial and key ingredient of great leadership and can be seen as a transformational part of leadership that can bring unparalleled leader, member, and organizational success. The leadership of a school Superintendent can be parallel to a CEO or any leader of a complex organization that counts on the performance of people as its major statistic for success (Sadri, 2012). While a plethora of research and data exists on emotional intelligence, deficiencies in evidence exist to understand the relevance in school district leadership. A school Superintendent’s leadership must be examined in the same empirical manner done for leaders across other professions. Emotional Intelligence has shown the influence of leaders in the corporate world, military, professional sports, and more. However, there is a startling lack of educational research exists in the realm of Superintendent leadership and emotional intelligence.

A particularly vulnerable group of leadership is the Superintendents in school districts with an enrollment of less than 3,000 students. This is because the Superintendent is still very hands on the everyday management of staff and faculty but also has many challenges that are different than other sizes of schools that require a high degree of E.I. in order to meet those challenges (Moore, 2009). Emotional intelligence is defined as the ability to recognize, manage, and understand our own emotions as well as recognize, understand, and influence the emotions of others (Bradberry & Greaves, 2009). Emotions can drive behavior, decision-making, and impact people positively and negatively. School Districts in Nebraska have a variety of challenges based on socioeconomic, geographic location, budget cuts, student needs, a pandemic, and the
availability of resources. With the evolving and increasing role of the School Superintendent and the need to effectively engage all stakeholders, emotional intelligence may play a role in the success of a School District under their leadership.

Emotional Intelligence is not a static indicator of an individual’s personality and can be actively developed (Webb, 2005). An example can be found by examining the leadership of Pete Carroll, which uncovers many valuable examples of successfully applying Emotional Intelligence skills and tools to leadership in sports and business. After struggling as an NFL coach with the New York Jets in 1994 and the New England Patriots from 1997-99, he began to make fine adjustments to his leadership style with a focus on emotional self-awareness, accurate self-assessment, trustworthiness, and communication. Beginning with his tenure as the Head Coach at USC in 2001, he demonstrated that staying with his strengths and making only small micro-initiatives in his leadership he was creating macro impact on his coaching staff, players, and team success. This is a model of emotional intelligence in action. Pete Carroll has demonstrated strengths and competencies across all four cluster of Emotional Intelligence (Nadler & Segalove, 2007).

In a 2016 interview “Master the Mental Game” with Dr. Michael Gervais, a psychologist who has focused his career on the central question “Is there a common thread connection how the greatest performers in the world use their minds to purse the boundaries of human potential?”, Coach Carroll talked about his continued belief that leading an organization requires the astute ability to be a master of emotional intelligence. Carroll began to elaborate on what has transpired with the NFL’s Seattle Seahawks since his arrival in 2010. “In order to perform at a high level it starts with
love, truly caring about the people so deep that you will do everything you can to help them be the best they can be,” Carroll started. Leaders who are culturally grounded in the person can create an environment where others are reflective about who they are, how they can be valued, and be passionate about others. If you don’t know who you are how can you help those around be who they want to be? Carroll went on to explain, “You have to know how you did it and recreate it. It becomes what others see, feel, and communicate.”

Coach Carroll talked about both winning and losing a Superbowl, but what didn’t happen in the organization after a loss was blame, discontent, or erosion of the team. “Beliefs and values that guide your life will also show what is important in your world. Our players knew they were what was valued because of three things that were lived. First, practicing EI as much as any other skill with the focus on master of self. Second, as coaches, listen and be present in the moment. Last, spend a majority of the time investing in others to make them better. The overall focus was not to be as concerned about developing each person’s own position, mentality, philosophy, and approach. The focus is to be centered in what’s really the truth to others. “The main goal is trying to help the guys understand who they are and what they’re capable of,” he said (Wisdom 2.0, 2016). While exploring the connection between emotional intelligence and leadership it is widely recognized that connecting with people requires emotional intelligence.

John C. Maxwell (2020) defines successful leaders as those who relentlessly ask questions and have an incurable desire to pick the brains of the people they meet. He goes on to link the questions asked and answered to be the process of building a
relationship. Before one can establish communication, one must establish a commonality, commonality connects people, and effective communication prompts people to think. It’s coupled with emotional intelligence because what you ask matters and so does how you ask it. Relationships are important to every area of life. They help define who one is and what one can become. Most people can trace their success to pivotal relationships.

Emotional Intelligence can be divided into four fundamental aspects recognized as the Emotional Competence Inventory: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management (Goleman, 1998). The goal of the research is to better understand which of the four fundamental aspects of Emotional Intelligence are evident in Superintendent leadership decisions. From a leadership perspective it makes sense to fully understand how to manage behavior, navigate social complexities, and make personal decisions that achieve positive results (Bradberry & Greaves, 2005).
The EQ-I 2.0 Model of Emotional Intelligence developed by Bar-On is the definitive construct of emotional intelligence (Bar-On, 1997). Although the terms EI (Emotional Intelligence) and EQ (Emotional Quotient) are often easily confused, the main difference is that EI is what emotional intelligence is, and your EQ is how much EI you have. EI is the term used to describe the construct of emotional intelligence. While this may seem like a small and perhaps irrelevant detail, it is worth noting what is used for measurement. The EQ-I model is divided up to give broad areas, or composite scales of emotional intelligence. The EQ-i Model supports the belief of Goleman (2005) who notes that self-awareness is not an attention that gets carried away by emotions, overreacting and amplifying what is perceived. It is a neutral mode that maintains self-reflectiveness even amidst turbulent emotions.

Educational leaders, more than ever before, are riddled with enormous challenges and potential conflicts given today’s diverse and rapidly changing world. It is arguable that the ability to understand and relate to others has become as important as knowledge and experience (Greenockle, 2010). When District leaders become more aware of their personal competence and social competence, they possess the ability to strengthen their Emotional Intelligence and develop a critical factor that sets star performers apart from the rest of the pack (About Emotional Intelligence, 2019).

Great leaders move us. They ignite our passion and inspire the best in us. When trying to explain why they are so effective, followers often speak of strategy, vision, or powerful ideas. However, through research, can it be determined to what extent great leadership works through the emotions (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2003).

**Purpose Statement**
Therefore, the purpose of this quantitative study will be to explore the distribution of emotional intelligence in leadership for public school Superintendents in Nebraska in school districts with 3,000 or less students using the Emotional Competence Inventory. The decision to use Superintendents in districts of less than 3,000 students is to ensure the leadership expectations are similar. Districts larger than 3,000 students may have a division of duties that would make the roles and expectations of the Superintendent dramatically different than the rest of the subjects. The intent is to analyze data acquired from the online data collecting instrument Emotify that will measure different components of emotional intelligence. Emotify is a web-based interactive measure of emotional intelligence, perception, and understanding developed by Revelian. Emotify will be used to gather a baseline of scale scores based on the response to different virtual situations requiring emotion intelligence for the group of subjects in the study.

**Research Questions**

The general research question is centered on the relevance of Emotional Intelligence, the distribution of EI in Superintendent leadership and the correlation to longevity as a Superintendent? Given the goal, the following research questions will be addressed:

#1 – How are a Superintendent’s responses to virtual situations categorized in the Emotional Competence Inventory.

#2 – What aspects of the Emotional Competence Inventory categories are more prevalent in specific Superintendent demographic groups?

#3 – How strong is the relationship between the Emotional Competence Inventory categories and longevity as a Superintendent?
Operational Definitions

**Emotional Intelligence (EI)** - The ability to recognize, manage, and understand our own emotions as well as recognize, understand, and influence the emotions of others through self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management (Bradberry & Greaves, 2009; Bressert, 2018; Goleman, 1998). EI will be measure by Emotify, a research instrument founded by the company Revelian that measures two key aspects of emotional intelligence: emotional perception and emotional understanding.

**Superintendent** – Chief executive officer of a public school district (Martens, 2012).

**Self-Awareness** – Includes emotional awareness, accurate self-assessment, and self-confidence (Bradberry & Greaves, 2009).

**Self-Management** – Includes self-control, trustworthiness, conscientiousness, adaptability, and innovation (Bradberry & Greaves, 2009).

**Social Awareness** – Includes understanding others, developing others, service orientation, leveraging diversity, and political awareness (Bradberry & Greaves, 2009).

**Relationship Management** – Includes influence, communication, conflict management, change catalyst, building bonds, collaboration, and team capabilities (Bradberry & Greaves, 2009).

**Emotional Quotient (EQ)** – Is the measure of how much emotional intelligence you have (Bar-On, 1997).

**Mayer–Salovey–Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT)** - A measure of the ability of emotional intelligence as created by John D. Mayer, David R. Caruso, & Peter Salovey (1997).

Framework
Educational leadership continues to change and evolve. The demands in districts of every size require unique personal skills to engage stakeholders in a team effort to move school districts forward with increased student opportunities and higher student achievement as the ultimate outcome. Superintendent leadership is unique to make an immediate impact on those outcomes. It raises the question, why do some Superintendents succeed when others don’t? Each Superintendent in Nebraska has the same fundamental skills associated with the position and graduate programs are very similar in their design and expectations. Goleman’s (1995) hypothesis is that the absence of emotional intelligence is related to career derailment.

Improving self-awareness takes serious thoughtfulness and courage to explore reactions to people and events at work and how it tends to influence future decisions (Greenockle, 2010). An example is what are your typical thoughts and resulting behaviors just before you walk into a crowded faculty or community meeting you are leading? The ability to use awareness of one’s emotions to stay flexible and to positively direct behaviors leads to success in leadership (Weisinger, 1998).

Theory suggests tailoring of leadership styles to accommodate an individual leader’s personality, interests, experiences and emotional concern. Thus, leadership is all about bringing people together; it is a “collaborative experience of teaching and learning” where a leader can reveal all sides of truth (Goleman et al., 2003). This is supported through a Gallup study that defined four domains for leadership strength, with three directly related to the Emotional Competence Inventory. Leaders who are innately good at influencing are always selling the team’s ideas inside and outside the organization. Relationship builders are the glue that holds a team together, bringing people together
whether it is by keeping distractions at bay or keeping the collective energy high. They possess the ability to transform a group of individuals into a team capable of carrying out complex projects and goals. Lastly, it was identified that strategic thinkers can keep people focused on what they could be, constantly pulling a team and its members into the future. They continually absorb and analyze information and help the team make better decisions (Secrets of Successful Leaders, 2009).

Who possess emotional intelligence and where did they attain it? Can it be taught or acquired? Despite resounding results with successful leadership development programs that incorporate the principles of emotional intelligence in their training, skepticism still abounds (Doe & Raymond, 2015).

Dana Joseph (2015) and colleagues point out that “recent empirical reviews have claimed a surprisingly strong relationship between job performance and self-reported emotional intelligence (also commonly called trait EI or mixed EI by the academics), suggesting self-reported/mixed EI is one of the best-known predictors of job performance. Results further suggest mixed EI can robustly predict job performance beyond cognitive ability.

Mayer and Salovey proposed the original framework of emotional intelligence, according to Zysberg and Raz (2014). It was defined as:

1. Identifying emotions in the self and others.

2. Integrating emotions into thought processes.

3. Effectively processing complex emotions.

4. Regulating one’s own emotions and the emotions of others.
Many studies have since shown that EI may, in fact, predict and account for a broad range of human behaviors, among them mental and physical health, life-satisfaction (self-reported) and well-being, positive social interactions, academic achievements, and work performance (Zysberg & Raz, 2014).

The prior research suggests that identifying the distribution of emotional intelligence in leadership can be a predictor of job performance. Coupled with a growing shortage of Superintendents in Nebraska, the ability to correlate certain types of emotional intelligence to longevity will provide insight to develop and retain successful school leadership in Nebraska.

For the study, Emotify by Revelian will be used to gather EI data from a virtual response scenario. Additional information will be gathered from digital questions for demographic data prior to the scenario responses.

**Delimitations for the Study**

The study was delimited to public school Superintendents in the state of Nebraska in districts of 3,000 or less students who were currently engaged in the position as full-time, part-time, or interim basis during the 2022-2023 academic school year. Study findings were limited to Superintendents who have completed all the self-assessment instruments during the collection window.

**Significance of the Study**

Emotional Intelligence, as noted in the introduction with Pete Carroll, can be practiced and improved over time and perhaps with training. The best example is changes were made on a micro level and how that improved his experience on a macro level.
The significance of the study is to compile, analyze, and determine how or if Emotional Intelligence is distributed among School Superintendents. The findings will assist current and prospective educational leaders, school boards, and educational administration preparation programs in better understanding prevalent types of emotional intelligence and how it will correlate to longevity as a Superintendent. Currently there is very limited research on emotional intelligence and school Superintendent leadership.
Chapter 2: Overview of Literature

Emotional intelligence is defined as the ability to recognize, manage, and understand our own emotions as well as recognize, understand, and influence the emotions of others (Bradberry & Greaves, 2009). Emotions can drive behavior, decision-making, and impact people positively and negatively. The lower, more primitive areas of the brain mediate an emotional response. The sections of the brain are called the limbic system and the hippocampus. These emotional parts of the brain influenced the way humans' higher, more advanced areas—called the neocortex—function. When you make complex decisions such as when you interact with people, solve problems, and so on, the lower parts of the brain are still active; they play a role in how effectively you carry out various tasks. Emotions affect your decisions and your reactions to events even seemingly insignificant ones and people. Having good emotional intelligence involves optimal functioning of your higher and lower brain functions (Stein, 2017).

The literature review is to establish relevance between emotional intelligence and effective and exceptional leadership. The foundational understanding of emotional intelligence will start with the history of the phrase and findings. The next section will establish the connection between leadership and emotional intelligence that will intertwine throughout the review. Following that introduction, an examination of the frameworks and constructs most notably associated with emotional intelligence will be broken down to best explain their purpose and use in the study. This includes Goleman’s Four Components of Emotional Intelligence, the Bar-On EQ-I Model, and the Mayer–Salovey–Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test called MSCEIT. Bird’s Impact Model best describes the need for emotional intelligence and where it lies in the overall leadership
skill set. The literature review concludes with ways to collect emotional intelligence data and how it is used to enhance leadership to be more impactful, transformational, and lead to positive change.

The literature review is to establish the relevance of a study of school superintendents and collecting data to determine the prevalence of emotional intelligence in those positions. It will also establish that the most effective mode of collection is through virtual response based or game-based assessment formats. This study examines the research behind using such a method combined with the researched based constructs in use.

**History of Emotional Intelligence**

Emotional intelligence is a crucial and key ingredient of great leadership. There are many key figures when it comes to emotional intelligence from Daniel Goleman’s work to the work of Travis Bradberry to Howard Gardner. Research is the key to learning more about emotional intelligence and how it impacts a person’s life.

Emotional intelligence is that ability you have that allows you to be smart about your feelings and emotions. Those who are emotionally intelligent are also smart when it comes to sensing the feelings and emotions of others. From Salovey and Mayer’s contribution to the work of Dr. David Walton, the field of emotional intelligence continues to both motivate and inspire many others to learn more.

In 1985, a man by the name of Wayne Leon Payne, a graduate student wrote a doctoral dissertation that happened to include the term “emotional intelligence.” This may very well be the first academic usage of the term emotional intelligence. Payne’s (1985) study was centered on how a person develops emotional intelligence by way of
education, by self, or through others. Payne’s study also coined the term emotional ignorance, of which is not found in any literature since. Emotional ignorance was believed to cause depression, addiction, illness, religious conflict, violence, and war. The study’s intent was to assist in developing emotional intelligence by raising important issues and questions about emotion; by providing a language and framework to examine and talk about the issues and questions raised; and by providing concepts, methods, and tools for developing emotional intelligence. Payne’s belief was that emotional intelligence involved a relation to fear, pain, and desire and how to relate to them in emotionally intelligent ways. Payne moved away from the study of emotional intelligence after he believed the mainstream view and purpose had changed under other studies and research.

In 1990, John Mayer and Peter Salovey, two American university professors, were doing research to develop ways to scientifically measure the difference between people’s abilities in and around their emotions. Mayer and Salovey soon discovered that some people seemed to be better than others when it came to identifying others’ feelings and solving problems involving emotional issues. They also seemed to be better at identifying their own feelings. Salovey and Mayer are credited with coining the term “emotional intelligence” in 1990 with a research paper titled “Emotional Intelligence”.

In terms of well-known research in emotional intelligence, Daniel Goleman is probably one of the most widely recognized. Goleman, a New York writer, and consultant began writing articles for Popular Psychology in the early 90s and then later wrote for the New York Times. John Mayer has been quoted as stating that Goleman broadened the definition of emotional intelligence to such an extent that it no longer had
any scientific meaning or utility. He was also quoted as saying that emotional intelligence was no longer a clear predictor of outcome.

Howard Gardner is a professor of cognition and education at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. He is also an adjunct professor at Harvard as well as senior director of the Harvard Project Zero. Gardner has authored over 30 books and is best known for his theory of multiple intelligences. The book, *Multiple Intelligences: New Horizons in Theory and Practice*, distills nearly 3 decades of research on multiple intelligences theory and practice.

Dr. Travis Bradberry is a world-renowned expert when it comes to emotional intelligence. Dr. Bradberry is the co-founder of TalentSmart and co-author of the book, “Emotional Intelligence 2.0“. TalentSmart is a consultancy that works with Fortune 500 companies providing emotional intelligence training as well as tests. The book “Emotional Intelligence 2.0” outlines TalentSmart’s step-by-step program for increasing your emotional intelligence. The book also includes an EQ test known as “The Emotional Intelligence Appraisal,” which helps pinpoint the strategies that can help increase your emotional intelligence while testing your EQ.

Dr. David Walton is a specialist in behavioral change. His book, “Emotional Intelligence: A Practical Guide” is a great example of a book that serves to cultivate emotional intelligence. The book goes into details to help you not only control your own emotions but to help you grasp and influence how others may feel. The book uses tools that can help develop mindfulness, strengthen willpower, cultivate a positive outlook, and even reduce conflict and improve relationships. As you explore the concepts in the book you will learn to be more assertive and increase your empathy.
While Mayor and Salovey may have started the trend in emotional intelligence research, Goleman’s work took off in a big way. His book, “Working with Emotional Intelligence,” published in 1998, widened the definition even more, stating that emotional intelligence consisted of 25 skills, abilities, and competencies. Since then, there have been many more definitions when it comes to emotional intelligence and many claims about what it is and how it works.

Goleman’s initial published research surmised that up to 67% of all competencies that were deemed essential for high performers were related to emotional intelligence or EQ. When it came to high performers the idea of EQ seemed to be a great advantage at the highest levels of leadership (Riopel et al., 2019).

**Emotional Intelligence and Leadership**

The literature supporting leadership as the most important factor related to organizational success or failure is burgeoning. To a large extent, this may explain why so much research focuses on factors influencing leadership effectiveness. A crucial aspect of leadership research is to determine why some individuals perform effectively in leadership roles while others demonstrate mediocre or low levels of effectiveness. Once measures of individual characteristics have been validated within a relevant context, they become useful sources of information for selecting, placing, and promoting people into leadership positions. The relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness seems to warrant organizational consideration of the possible inclusion of emotional intelligence, among other competencies, as a selection and promotion criterion for future leaders. Based on such predetermined criteria, valid measures of emotional intelligence could be included as part of the selection and promotion process, along with
other desirable individual attributes, such as verbal and numerical abilities, personality attributes, and specific managerial and leadership competencies required for effective leadership specifically within public sector institutions (Kotze & Venter, 2011).

A growing body of research is examining the association between emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness. A study conducted by Bar-On (2003) indicates that poor personal judgement in decision-making resulted from lower levels of emotional intelligence, even though the subjects were of average to above-average cognitive intelligence. While some researchers claim emotional intelligence, or certain dimensions thereof such as awareness or expression, is a necessity for leadership effectiveness (Kotze & Venter, 2011), others contest such claims as premature or unsupported by scientific research (Mayer & Cobb, 2000).

Research on leadership effectiveness focuses on efforts to explain factors affecting leadership in one way or another. While some researchers focus mainly on the leader’s individual traits, value system, morality, and authenticity (Avolio BJ and Gardner WL, 2005), others prefer to focus on leadership behaviors and styles, such as task versus people orientation (Kellett, Humphrey, & Sleeth, 2006), transformational, transactional, laissez-faire, or servant-leadership behavior and style (Benjamin & Flynn, 2006). Leadership effectiveness as a dependent variable has also been linked to a vast number of situational variables, including the role of culture, the attributes of followers, and followers’ perceptions (Bass & Avolio, 1995). Efforts to link leadership effectiveness to specific behavioral patterns such as punishment and reward, communication styles,
decision-making styles, distribution of power, and destructive behavior have also been undertaken (Atwater & Yammarino, 1997).

It appears that several of the competencies identified by Goleman are already the focus of current leadership development practices. Looking at the definitions provided and reviewing the activities identified by Conger. Conger’s (1992) categories integrate with Goleman’s competencies in the following ways: personal growth integrates with Goleman’s dimension of self-awareness (both focus on developing greater awareness of one’s internal states); feedback taps into self-regulation (feedback on leader behaviors leads to a greater recognition of abilities, preferences and resources and identifies next steps in managing resources); skill building approaches help with the development of social skills. Three of the four categories of leadership training and development currently employed by practitioners overlap in some manner with three of the five competencies identified by Goleman in his model of EI.

EI has been linked to numerous important organizational outcomes and is frequently studied as a correlate with performance (Boyatzis, Goleman, & HayGroup, 2001; Goleman, 1995; Goleman, 2001). Studies linking EI to improved organizational performance outcomes suggest that EI abilities contribute to team effectiveness, better decision making, stress tolerance, interpersonal facilitation, and overall performance (Cote, Lopes, Salovey, & Miners, 2010). Several authors (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2005; Ashkanasy & Tse, 2000; George, 2000) have also suggested that EI contributes to effective leadership. Ashkanasy and Daus (2005) found that leaders need to inspire and motivate their followers and as such, leaders therefore need to use and manage their
emotions intelligently to effectively communicate their vision. Such leaders must be in touch with their own feelings first, before recognizing and managing others’ emotions. Evidence that positive emotions can enhance sociability and elicit positive responses from others whereas unregulated negative emotions can drive others away is well documented (Cote et al., 2010). Many organizations are now incorporating some type of EI training in their leadership succession and development programs to help create better, more productive teams and team members to enhance organizational effectiveness (Goleman, 2001).

Healthy organizations are not about the one person who leads them, but they are about everyone who is in them (Maxwell, 2019). This perspective underscores that to develop a successful culture and environment a leader needs to make the effort to better understand others. How does the distribution of Emotional Intelligence impact a leader’s authenticity, integrity, and humility? Not all leaders are created equally, and each Superintendent is likely to employ different personal strengths evidenced by their leadership style and effectiveness.

When it comes to evaluating great leadership, the focus tends to be much more on things like interpersonal relationships, teamwork, and collaboration, both for good and bad leaders. All of these are either a part of, or directly related to, emotional intelligence.

Leadership is defined as the behavioral process of influencing individuals and groups toward set goals (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980). The role of the leader is a key component of organizational success. Role is not defined by a position on hierarchy chain of command or a specific title within the organization. In sport, business, and education multiple leaders can be identified as influencing organizational outcomes.
There is substantial support that leaders must be in a role to make key organizational decisions and have autonomy over the other components.

Great leaders are people of integrity and character, and an obvious indicator of great leaders is that they’re the same in private and public (Grev, 2013). Those who build relationships and develop trust have the best chance to succeed as organizational leaders, regardless of the size of the organization. When Warren Buffet was asked about his potential successor at Berkshire Hathaway, he listed trustworthiness as the top requirement (Gunnarson, 2015). The employees, clients, and public must trust a leader and their judgment. Building trust is no small matter when it comes to leading a company.

Leadership styles vary and the style is strongly related to commitment, which is found to be a key to other components of a successful organization (Lok & Crawford, 1999). Despite differing styles, influential and successful leaders are those who consistently demonstrate a willingness to serve others, always set the example, inspire others through action, focus on being your best, are positive, hold themselves and others accountable, get team buy-in to the vision, and build relationships (Grev, 2013).

Leadership in education, while fundamentally leading to different outcomes, mirrors the same qualities as leaders in business and sport. Successful leaders develop and build sustainability by how they approach and commit to human and material resources. Since the primary responsibility of educational leaders is to sustain learning, a focus on the long-term results over temporary gains supports the need for a strong leader to steer the remaining components within the organization (Hargreaves & Fink, 2003).
Different people are motivated differently, so a one size fits all approach to leadership doesn’t work. Being a leader isn’t easy. You can’t take a passive approach to leading (Donnelly, 2018). A successful organization needs the power of a committed leader, one who is committed to their employees, the organization, the community, and to achieving successful results (Horsager, 2012).

Not all leaders will naturally possess each necessary quality, but each can develop the skills necessary for their organization, set an example with your own energy and enthusiasm, and have passion for your organization and the desire to grow and care for it. As a leader, making decisions is probably one of the most important things that are done. When leaders think about making decisions the inclination is be rational and logical. It's about getting together all the facts you can, putting them into categories, such as pro versus con, then adding up one side of the ledger followed by the other. Then looking at which side of the ledger is bigger, and then go with it. By understanding the role of emotions in decision making and being more proactive about using your emotions to make decisions, a leader can learn to make better, more reasonable decisions (Stein, 2017).

Teamwork, collaboration, and relationships are all components of culture building, which parallels the importance of a leader’s emotional intelligence in developing and maintaining culture. Building a culture was tied directly to leadership and vision, components mentioned above. Culture transcends many of the other key components and can be impacted either positively or negatively by any one component being out of alignment with the others.
Lok and Crawford’s (1999) study did show leadership style was strongly related to culture of an organization. Additional interviews with other leaders who have a history of long-term success found that each team member’s character, personal relationships, trust, selflessness, and support are key to shaping culture.

The definition of a great culture is as unique as the leader of the organization. Bill Belichick believes so passionately that character shapes culture, he hired a character coach for the organization. Reyes (2018) interview of the Patriots Character Coach Jack Easterby explained that unfortunately, sometimes it (character) matters most when counted on the least and when it is evaluated the least, it matters the most. Many organizations fail because of lack of character. Character is more important than talent. Belichick (Mejia & Snyder, 2018) believes you need character, grit, and a positive attitude to be successful.

In education culture and climate are closely related. School leadership that guides their actions by what is best for all students usually has the trust of the staff. A leader that acknowledges the success of the whole school and individuals within the school will build and model a desired culture of unity (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2006). Unity and trust are both necessary components of a successful culture. The connection to culture in a school is that the leader is able to lead by example because of the work done to build relationships with all stakeholders of the organization.

Whether leading in business, sports, or education personal relationships shape culture. Nick Saban firmly believes that getting to know your team better and making each member feel like part of the team through building those relationships is key to culture (Grev, 2013). Bill Belichick also believes that developing positive personal
relationships leads to success, you listen and learn. Maxwell’s (2005) foxhole principle explains that a foxhole may include a business, a sports team, or a small group. Faithful and dependable friends will go to battle with you in the foxhole and through that relationship you create an investment of trust in the people for whom you would fight.

The individual characteristics of selflessness and trust are the mortar that holds the foundation of a successful culture together. Mike Matheny succinctly defined culture as needing certain values like grit, optimism, discipline, and selflessness to build a foundation for all winning programs (Donnelly, 2018). Any team that allows selfishness to permeate its structure will fail. Selfishness will spread negatively throughout the organization if it isn’t confronted and stopped. If a leader fails to root out selfishness, they only have themselves to blame when it spreads throughout the organization and keeps everyone involved from reaching their highest potential. Trust can accelerate or destroy any business, organization, or relationship. An environment of trust leads to greater innovation, morale, and productivity. Conversely, the trusted leader is followed (Horsager, 2012).

Culture is where you infuse people with the values, the attitudes, the work ethic, and the sense of responsibility to themselves. Belichick worked hard to get people who are a good fit, who he believes will have a good locker room presence and weed out the knuckleheads. A leader who is determined to change the culture can do it through hiring, rewards, and retention processes to bring about that change. It can be a very powerful tool to improve performance (Pazzanese, 2016).

Nick Saban (Burke, 2015) needs all members of his organization to do certain things to maintain the desired culture: have pride in your performance, don’t let past
failures affect you, don’t let future gains distract you, learn from your mistakes, do you best at everything you do, and expect difficulties and challenges – accept them and move on – being successful is hard. This supports that a culture where members are supported and invested in with time, energy, and resources leads to success. Leaders who focus on people, pursue perfection, develop trust, strive for excellence, and emphasize getting the process right seem to be the most successful over the long haul.

The specific characteristics and behaviors attributed to good leadership differ from one person to the next. Chances are that a good leader list includes the following:

- They understand me as a person
- They encourage me to do my best
- They trusted me
- They were supportive
- They were clear about expectations
- They dealt with difficult situations
- They weren’t afraid to address issues
- They were consistent in their behavior

These attributes, characteristics, and behaviors point to the importance of emotional intelligence in leadership (Bird, 2016).

Clear expectations are a result of having a vision. There is not one key vision that each successful organization must adopt, instead there is a definite need for a clearly communicated vision for the organization. A vision is built on trust and buy-in, which occurs when clarity, competency, and connection occur within the organization. People have confidence in those who stay fresh, relevant, and capable (Horsager, 2012).
Fletcher and Arnold’s (2011) study on Leadership and Management cited vision as the number one factor of successful performance.

Vision development, influences on vision, and sharing the vision is key in performance leadership (Fletcher & Arnold, 2011). Vision development differs by leader, yet nearly all leaders in business, education, and sport believe it should include a high-standard bed rocked by an attainable objective. Nick Saban’s vision includes taking steps other are not willing to try while Belichick’s clear vision is built upon a lot of bone-crushing work and long hours, including extensive analysis by him and the rest of this staff (Fanning, 2016; Pazzanese, 2016). While both leaders demonstrated a different process of vision development, in the end each developed a consistent pattern of organization vision.

The collective approach to visioning in education is often driven by a strategic plan or stakeholder feedback, a process slightly obtuse from business and sport. Although once a vision is developed, leaders play a substantial role in caring out the vision to achieve maximum learning in students. The vision is seen as the ideational core of the organization, and the ability to engage others in the buying into a realistic but challenging vision begins with the commitment and passion of the formal leader’s belief and his or her ability to communication with educational stakeholder to accomplish the preferred outcomes (Mombourquette, 2017).

Vision implementation requires the need for extraordinary effective communicator. In Saban’s perspective on vision implementation, also known as strategy, is that most organizations do a poor job. Visions are poorly crafted, even more poorly implemented, and little effort is invested into getting buy-in. The vision needs to be
something that you earnestly want to achieve, and you need to be willing to go all-in to
make it happen. Organizations that don’t invest in it (vision), hire and fire based on it, or
act in contradiction of it – won’t achieve it and nobody will believe that anyone really
wants it. Have a vision, create a process on how to achieve that vision, and have the
discipline to stick to the process (Grev, 2013).

Bird’s Model on EI and Leadership

Drew Bird (2016) made a strong connection between certain skills predicting the
success of leaders more than others. The research indicated five consistent factors:

1. The leader has a leave of self-assuredness without being arrogant or
   appearing over-confident.
2. The leader is able to understand and manage their emotional reactions to
   internal and external challenges.
3. The leader builds healthy, differentiated relationships with their team,
   peers, and their own management.
4. The leader confronts difficult situations in a proactive grounded manner
   accepting that, as a leader, they may have to make unpopular decisions.
5. They handle stress well, acting as a role model to their own team.

If a leader’s underlying emotional intelligence is not sufficiently developed or balanced,
they will struggle to implement the leadership skills they have learned.

Emotional Intelligence can be divided into four fundamental aspects recognized
as the Emotional Competence Inventory: self-awareness, self-management, social
awareness, and relationship management (Goleman, 1998). Reuven Bar-On defined
emotional intelligence as “an array of non-cognitive capabilities, competencies, and skills
that influence one's ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures,” which is best identified in a tool called the Emotional Competence Inventory (Stein, 2017). The significance of the research is to better understand which aspects of Emotional Intelligence are evident in Superintendent leadership decisions. From a leadership perspective Bradberry and Greaves (2005) believes it is necessary to fully understand how to manage behavior, navigate social complexities, and make personal decisions that achieve positive results.

Of the two schools of thought that accept the construct of emotional intelligence, the position with the greatest construct clarity is that which focuses on EI as an ability. This school of thought views emotional intelligence as a set of abilities directly related to emotions. These abilities are a natural part of every individual’s daily functioning. However, as is the case with other cognitive abilities, individuals with greater ability in the area of emotional intelligence should have enhanced functioning compared to those with lesser ability. The model encompassing this school of thought, generally referred to as an ability model, is most often conceptualized as having four subcomponents. The component labels used by Mayer, Caruso, and Salovey (2000) to describe these subcomponents are: Emotional perception, emotional facilitation of thought, emotional understanding, and emotional management.

Managing emotions in the self and in others is a critical component of leadership. According to Yukl (1994), as cited in Ashkanasy and Tse (2000), all leadership involves “mobilizing human resources toward the attainment of organizational goals”. Many researchers have stressed the importance of the proper use of emotions to successful leadership (Ashkanasy & Tse, 2000; Barling, Slater, & Kelloway, 2000; Pescosolido,
2002; Sosik & Megerian, 1999). These authors note that leaders use emotional tone to secure cooperation within groups, to motivate followers and to enhance communication. Furthermore, as Mayer et al. (2000) point out, leaders must be aware of their followers’ emotional reactions. Without such awareness, the leader will have difficulty knowing when, or if, his orders are followed. While the focus can be on the ability to regulate emotion, it is relevant to acknowledge two other dimensions of EI: the ability to perceive emotion and the ability to understand emotion (Joseph et al., 2010).

The ability to transform followers’ emotions in such a manner is clearly related to emotional intelligence. First, perception of emotions in the self and in others is necessary for a leader to recognize both the emotions associated with their own vision, and the emotions associated with their followers’ initial values and beliefs. Next, understanding of emotions and how they relate to each other, and to external sources, is key. The leader must understand how the emotions of their beliefs entail relate to the emotions their followers’ beliefs entail. Through this relationship, the leader can draw a logical connection between the two. Also, and of extreme importance, a leader must understand how emotions relate to physical gestures, speech patterns and other cultural information he shares with their followers. Finally, managing emotions in the self and others is necessary so that the leader can transfer their values to their followers. Thus, the basic components of emotional intelligence are all directly related to leadership (Webb, 2005).
Bird (2016) identifies a three-layer model to assist a leader in understanding their leadership. The *pancake model* refers to a drive up and down model that begins with your core values and beliefs, which drive your behavior in every aspect of your life on a day-to-day basis. The next level is your emotional intelligence and on top is your technical skills. Technical skills include the skills like leadership, communication, change management, conflict management, and project management. In this model your drive up builds you as a leader and your drive down is what defines your leadership. In this model, emotional intelligence is the transitional piece in both building a great leader and sustaining great leadership.

In Bird’s (2016) model, emotional intelligence refers to a set of emotional and social skills that collectively establish how well a person perceives themselves and how they express feelings, build, and maintain relationships with others, understand their environment and make decisions as they deal with stressful or difficult situations. There have been many attempts to quantify how much of an impact emotional intelligence has on the effectiveness of leadership. A 2002 meta-analysis by Multi-Health Systems concluded that 80% of leadership effectiveness involved emotional intelligence. That data certainly supports why Goleman (2005) called emotional intelligence the “sine qua non of leadership,” which means the ‘essence’ or most important thing.
Continuing to explore the connection between emotional intelligence and leadership it is recognized that connecting with people required emotional intelligence. John C. Maxwell (2020) defines successful leaders as those who relentlessly ask questions and have an incurable desire to pick the brains of the people they meet. He goes on to link the questions asked and answered to be the process of building a relationship. Before communication can be established, it requires the establishment of commonality, commonality connects people, and effective communication prompts people to think. It’s coupled with emotional intelligence because what you ask matters and so does how you ask it. Relationships are important to every area of life. They help define who people are and what they can become. Literature suggest most leaders can trace their success to pivotal relationships.

The emotionally effective leader is one who has a high emotional intelligence quotient. They can understand themselves, what they believe, and who they are as a leader. What is even more important is that they can understand and connect with others. They can empathize, understand, and communicate with the people around them, making them more effective as a leader, while also impacting the effectiveness of those they lead (Bird, 2016). A term most everyone is familiar with is IQ, or intelligent quotient. Intelligence is defined as the ability to acquire and apply knowledge and skills. Cognitive intelligence is measured through IQ tests. By breaking down cognitive intelligence in this way, it ensures there is a way to assess, measure, and potentially improve specific areas of cognitive intelligence. This discussion is valuable in demonstrating that to understand constructs like intelligence, it is useful to have
conceptual models that break down and identify the elements of that type of intelligence (Carroll, 1993).

**Bar-On EQ-I Model**

The EQ-I 2.0 Model of Emotional Intelligence developed by Bar-On is the definitive construct of emotional intelligence (Bar-On, 1997). Although the terms EI (Emotional Intelligence) and EQ (Emotional Quotient) are often easily confused, the main difference is that EI is what emotional intelligence is, and your EQ is how much EI you have. EI is the term used to describe the construct of emotional intelligence. While this may seem like a small and perhaps irrelevant detail, it is worth noting what is used for measurement. The EQ-I model is divided up to give broad areas, or composite scales of emotional intelligence. The five areas and their definition are:

![EQ-I Emotional Intelligence Construct](image)

*Figure 3 EQ-I Emotional Intelligence Construct, Bar-On (1997).*
• Self-Perception – which is concerned with the internal functions of how to see and understand ourselves.

• Self-Expression – which connects with the way to express thoughts and emotions in our daily lives.

• Interpersonal – which relates to how to manage and maintain relationships with other people, as well as the role in groups that are a part of the broader social context.

• Decision Making – which involves how to make decisions and interact with the world.

• Stress Management – which deals with how to understand, process, and react to difficult or stressful situations.

Balancing emotional intelligences requires understanding how each subscale is defined and how it plays into the next. The EQ-i Model supports the belief of Goleman (2005) who notes that self-awareness is not an attention that gets carried away by emotions, overreacting and amplifying what is perceived. It is a neutral mode that maintains self-reflectiveness even amidst turbulent emotions. In the words of John Mayer, self-awareness means being “aware of both actual mood and the thoughts about that mood.” (Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 2016). Each area of the model influences the other areas to create an overall healthy emotional intelligence and as the model is circular, there is no start or end point. This is the first scientifically proven emotional intelligence tool and an excellent resource for employee, leadership, and management development (Goleman, 1995).
The self-perception composite is made up of three subsets that include self-regard, self-actualization, and emotional self-awareness. Self-regard is the way to see ourselves as a whole person. It is the extent to which people respect themselves while understanding and accepting both strengths and weaknesses. In a leadership role it is important to have a certain level of confidence in your ability coupled with a well-developed sense of self-regard to develop and grow. Self-actualization refers to the extent to which a person sets and works towards meaningful goals. This subset shows a willingness to persistently try to improve oneself and engage in the pursuit of personally relevant and meaningful objectives. The negative of this in leadership is the potential to project personal ambition and goal-orientation onto other people or judge their level of goal setting negatively if it isn’t in line with personal standards of ambition. The final subset of self-perception is emotional self-awareness. Emotional self-awareness is defined as the ability and willingness to examine and understand our own emotional reactions. This subset is most useful when balanced. A leader with low levels tends to think through situations to better understand their reactions while a leader with high levels will take considerable time and energy to better understand their emotional reaction to a situation (Bird, 2016).

The self-expression composite is made up of the three subsets emotional expression, assertiveness, and independence. Emotional expression is the ability to communicate emotions accurately and clearly to another person. Under this subset, communicating includes the entire range of body language, facial expressions, tone, and the chosen words used. Those with high levels of emotional expression are said to wear their emotions on their sleeve. With low levels of emotional expression, the
communication pieces don’t often match up together, making it necessary for a quality leader to demonstrate high levels of this subset. Assertiveness is the second subset and is the ability to openly communicate thoughts, beliefs, and feelings. Assertiveness relates to how to assert ourselves in a socially acceptable and non-offensive way. Leaders must strike a balance between being appropriately assertive and sufficiently collaboratively in their day-to-day activities. Assertiveness should not be associated with strong, pushy, or arrogant personalities. The third subset is independence and relates to the ability to be self-directed and free from emotional dependency on others. Independent leaders can autonomously complete decision making, planning and other daily tasks. In the realm of emotional intelligence, it refers to an ability to work alone and manage emotional concerns and issues without disrupting others or needing excessive emotional support. An effective leader needs to be close enough on an interpersonal level to the people they lead, but far enough away that they can make tough decisions. Leaders with low levels of independence will tend to care too much about what other people think of their actions and may shy away from decisions that will impact people in the group (Bird, 2016).

The interpersonal composite is made up of interpersonal relationships, empathy, and social responsibility as its three subsets. Interpersonal relationships deal with the ability to establish and maintain meaningful relationships with other people. In detail, it is the extent to relying on others, how to manage compromise and how mutually satisfying are the relationships that encompass someone. It is strongly correlated to the keen ability as leaders to build trust and compassion with others. A behavior noticeable with this subset is a leader who places value on being able to connect with and work with other people while seeking to establish deep and trusting relationships. Empathy is the
ability to recognize, understand, and appreciate how others feel. Empathy is the ability to jump in the mudhole with someone and feel it with them, while sympathy can best be described as standing outside the mudhole and feeling for them. The two should not be used the same. Goleman said that empathy is the single most important emotional intelligence skill a leader can have. If a leader can’t empathize, they have no chance to have an understanding where the other person is coming from. Effective leaders can strike a balance between acknowledging and accommodating the needs of the individuals in their team with ensuring that the goals and objectives of the team are met. Social responsibility in the context of emotional intelligence is related to the willingness to be a part of social groups and recognize that it is being part of a larger whole in terms of community, country, and humanity. It means to act responsibly, being conscious of societal needs, and showing concerns for the community. Leaders use this approach to make small impactful changes in action to make a broader reach and impact to larger, meaningful causes (Bird, 2016).

The decision-making composite is made of three subsets tied to the hundreds of daily decisions made by leaders. Those are problem solving, reality testing, and impulse control. Under the context of emotional intelligence, problem solving refers to the ability to solve emotionally laden or emotionally challenging problems. This is in exception to the broader scope of problem solving that usually includes logistical or technical problems. The competency of this subset comes down to being able to manage the emotions involved with certain decisions, understanding who might be affected by these decisions, and considering what the consequences might be. When making difficult decisions about performance or termination if emotion is ignored, for all involved, it can
become an impediment to a balanced decision-making process. Leaders performing at a high level will tend to tackle problems head-on and analyze the issue or situation from a variety of angles. They will carefully consider the impact of their options. Reality testing is the ability to see things objectively and as they really are. Having a strong competency in this area includes being able to remove any biases, instead of fantasizing or catastrophizing about potential outcomes. Leaders with this strength go to great lengths to understand what is going on in a specific situation. An expected balance would be to never reach the paralysis-by-analysis inhibiting a leader’s decision-making capacity. Impulse control is a person’s ability to resist impulsive and tempting behaviors and decisions, especially when it comes to emotionally charged situations. When low, people have a difficult time refraining from doing or saying something inappropriate or making a snap judgement wrong decision. It is noticeable when a leader interrupts others during conversations, makes hasty decisions, or talks too much. A high level may result in talking oneself out of saying or doing something by leaving too much time for rationalization (Bird, 2016).

The stress management composite is made up of the three subsets flexibility, stress tolerance, and optimism. Flexibility is the ability to be open to new ideas or ways of doing things and to easily adapt beliefs because things are viewed from a different perspectives. This involves adapting emotions, thoughts, and behaviors to unfamiliar and unpredictable circumstances, especially those that might cause stress. Leaders with an optimal level of flexibility are able to adapt and thrive in unfamiliar situations, but never lose sight of their self and their own emotions, thoughts, and behaviors. Stress tolerance is the way to manage and deal with stressful situations. It is the ability to cope with the
situation and manage stress levels, as well as the way to express that stress. A key element includes the extent to which it is possible to positively influence situations. Leaders on extreme ends of this subset could find themselves either flustered and helpless with feelings of being unable to affect change or appear to be too laid back, unphased, or caring which could impact trust and empathy a leader has building with their team.

Optimism is how positively one views life in general through the lens of feeling hopeful and resilient in the face of challenges. It makes perfect sense to have this in the subset of the stress management composite, in stressful situation that is when leaders are required to summon their inner strength and optimism as the mechanism for working through it (Bird, 2016).

The EQ-I Model creates an understanding of emotional intelligence in three ways. First, by naming something you can start to work on it. The model provides a structure and platform for developing and improving your overall EQ through assessment and analysis of yourself. Second, by naming subsets you can also see where others demonstrate their emotional intelligence. Through observing and listening when others act and speak, you can see how they express their emotions and how you might interpret them. A third benefit of the model is that you can being to name your own behavior as you reflect on your day-to-day life. You can recognize how you are and start to understand how and why others see you as they do (Bird, 2016).

**MSCEIT Measurement of EI**

The Mayer–Salovey–Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2003) is a measure of the ability of emotional intelligence as articulated by Mayer et al. (1997). Through the lens of an argument-based approach to
validation, several resources examined the accumulated evidence relevant to the argument for the validity of the ability model of emotional intelligence. Mayer et al. (2016) believed that these principles succinctly represent how to think about emotional intelligence.

- Principle 1: Emotional Intelligence Is a Mental Ability – in regard to intelligence as the capacity to carry out abstract reasoning: to understand meanings, to grasp the similarities and differences between two concepts, to formulate powerful generalizations, and to understand when generalizations may not be appropriate because of context (Carroll, 1993; Gottfredson, 1997). Detterman (1982) added that intelligence can be regarded as a system of mental reactions to how people reason about emotions. It’s proposed that emotionally intelligent people (a) perceive emotions accurately, (b) use emotions to accurately facilitate thought, (c) understand emotions and emotional meanings, and (d) manage emotions in themselves and others (Mayer et al., 1997).

- Principle 2: Emotional Intelligence is Best Measured as an Ability - the foundation of thinking is that intelligences are best measured as abilities—by posing problems for people to solve and examining the resulting patterns of correct answers (Carroll, 1993; Mayer, Panter, & Caruso, 2012). Correct answers are those that authorities identify within the problem-solving area. The best answers to a question can be recognized by consulting reference works, convening a panel of experts, or (more controversially for certain classes of problems), by identifying a general consensus among the test-takers (Legree, Psotka, Tremble, & Bourne, 2005; Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, & Sitarenios, 2003;
Roberts, Schulze, & MacCann, 2008). Because people lack knowledge of what
good problem-solving actually entails, they estimate their abilities on other bases.
These include a mix of general self-confidence, self-esteem, misunderstandings of
what is involved in successful reasoning, and wishful thinking. These
nonintellectual features add construct-irrelevant variance to people’s self-
estimated abilities, rendering their judgments invalid as indices of their actual
abilities (Mayer et al., 2003).

- Principle 3: Intelligent Problem Solving Does Not Correspond Neatly to
  Intelligent Behavior – this entails the belief that there is a meaningful distinction
  between intelligence and behavior. A person’s behavior is an expression of that
  individual’s personality in a given social context (Mischel, 2009). An individual’s
  personality includes motives and emotions, social styles, self-awareness, and self-
  control, all of which contribute to consistencies in behavior, apart from
  intelligence. Although intelligences predict some long-term behavioral outcomes,
predicting any individual behavior is fraught with uncertainty because of the other
personality—and social—variables involved (Funder, 2001; Mischel, 2009).

- Principle 4: A Test’s Content—the Problem-Solving Area Involved—Must Be
  Clearly Specified as a Precondition for the Measurement of Human Mental
  Abilities - to measure emotional intelligence well, tests must sample from the
  necessary subject matter; the content of the test must cover the area of problem-
solving (Mayer et al., 2003). A test of verbal intelligence ought to sample from a
  wide range of verbal problems to assess a test-taker’s problem-solving ability.
  Once the test’s content is established, the test can be used to identify a person’s
mental abilities. People’s problem-solving abilities are reflected by the
correlational (or covariance) structure of the responses they make to the test
items.

- Principle 5: Valid Tests Have Well-Defined Subject Matter That Draws Out
  Relevant Human Mental Abilities - people exhibit their reasoning abilities as they
  solve problems within a given subject area. As such, a test’s validity depends both
  on the content it samples and the human mental abilities it elicits. From this
  perspective, test scores represent an interaction between a person’s mental
  abilities and the to-be-solved problems. As applied to emotional intelligence, it is
  necessary to describe accurately the emotional problem solving that people
  undertake and the abilities people employ to solve those problems—which are
two different matters (Mayer et al., 2003).

- Principle 6: Emotional Intelligence is a Broad Intelligence – the concept of broad
  intelligences emerges from a hierarchical view of intelligence often referred to as
  the Cattell–Horn–Carroll or “three-stratum model” (McGrew, 2009). In this
  model, general intelligence, or g, resides at the top of the hierarchy, and it is
  divided at the second stratum into a series of eight to 15 broad intelligences
  (Flanagan, McGrew, & Ortiz, 2000; McGrew, 2009). The model is based on
  factor-analytic explorations of how mental abilities correlate with one another.
  Such analyses suggest that human thinking can be fruitfully divided into areas
  such as fluid reasoning, comprehension-knowledge (similar to verbal
  intelligence), visual-spatial processing, working memory, long-term storage and
  retrieval, and speed of retrieval.
• Principle 7: Emotional Intelligence is a Member of the Class of Broad Intelligences Focused on Hot Information Processing - the broad intelligences, especially those defined by their subject matter, can be divided into hot and cool sets. Cool intelligences are those that deal with relatively impersonal knowledge such as verbal-propositional intelligence, math abilities, and visual-spatial intelligence. Hot intelligences as involving reasoning with information of significance to an individual, matters that may chill hearts or make blood boil. People use these hot intelligences to manage what matters most to them: their senses of social acceptance, identity coherence, and emotional well-being.

Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso build on MSCEIT by revisiting the 1997 four branch model of emotional intelligence and then proceed to renew it—as well as to clarify its range of usefulness in the context of the field’s current understanding of intelligences. More
specifically, (a) add more abilities to the model, (b) distinguish the four-branch model of problem-solving content from the structure of human abilities relevant to emotional intelligence, (c) relate emotional intelligence to closely allied broad intelligences, (d) examine the key characteristics of the problem-solving involved, and (e) more clearly distinguish between areas of problem-solving and areas of human mental abilities. At the same time, the problem-solving they address—about emotions, personality characteristics, and social processes—concerns systems at three different levels of complexity: emotions are relatively small psychological subsystems; personality exists at the level of the whole individual; social organizations involve groups of people. More formally, the phenomena being reasoned about occupy different levels along the biopsychosocial continuum, with emotions lowest and social systems highest (Sheldon, Cheng, & Hilpert, 2011). One matter that remains indeterminate is, therefore, whether all
three intelligences can be considered broad intelligences, or whether, alternatively, emotional intelligence (because it concerns the smallest system) is a specific ability within personal (or social) intelligence. For now, it seems reasonable to keep them separate until such a time as mathematical models indicate more about their relationships.

Twenty-five years after its introduction, a good deal of evidence has accumulated that emotional intelligence exists as a mental ability among the class of hot, broad intelligences. From an empirical standpoint, tasks on the Mayer–Salovey–Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) have been represented by between one and three factors (Legree et al., 2014; MacCann, Joseph, Newman, & Roberts, 2014). Those theorists who favor a three-factor model have argued for dropping Branch 2, Facilitating Thought Using Emotions—which describes how drawing on emotions can enhance cognition. Critics contend that confirmatory factor models of the MSCEIT fit branches 1,
3 and 4 of the models reasonably well, but not Branch 2 (Joseph et al., 2010). Ability measures of emotional intelligence are still evolving, and the factor structure of the area remains uncertain—although support exists for both one- and three-factor models (Legree et al., 2014; MacCann et al., 2014). Emotional intelligence could turn out to be a part of a larger personal or social intelligence. The studied concluded that emotional intelligence predicts important outcomes.

The valid measurement of a cognitive attribute such as emotional intelligence (EI) is in many ways a prerequisite for deep exploration of the nature and structure of this ability and the ways in which it connects with other cognitive and behavioral phenomena (Maul, 2012). Although Maul finds many aspects of the MSCEIT’s validity argument to be wanting, there is also much that has been learned and can be applied to future research on emotional intelligence and other psychological constructs. Interpretation of test results for the MSCEIT are proposed on the total test level, said to represent general emotional intelligence (or EIg), and four branch levels, said to represent the abilities to perceive, use, understand, and manage emotions.

**Construct of EI Assessments**

To adequately evaluate the validity of a measurement enterprise, it is necessary to first adequately specify what Kane (2006) refers to as the “network of inferences and assumptions leading from observed performances to the conclusions and decisions based on those performances”, also known as the interpretive argument. Kane further notes that “a failure to state the proposed interpretations and uses clearly and in some detail makes a fully adequate validation essentially impossible, because implicit inferences and
assumptions cannot be critically evaluated”. The primary recommendation is to consider an explanatory approach to the measurement of emotional intelligence. Such an approach would demand a sufficient background of literature and theory on what constitutes better or worse performance in emotional domains. It suggests role or game-based simulations may best assess emotional intelligence (Maul, 2012).

The Mayer Salovey Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test, MSCEIT and the EQ-I (Bar-On, 1997), are marketed as assessing EI, but they are based on different models and use different measurement methods. The MSCEIT was designed to assess Mayer et al. (1997) four-branch ability-based model of EI, and it is based on their previous measure, the Multi-Factor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS) (Mayer et al., 1997). The MSCEIT was designed to measure how well individuals perform emotion-related tasks (e.g., identifying emotions in faces and landscapes) and is composed of four scales: Emotional Management, Emotional Understanding, Emotional Facilitation, and Emotional Perception. Mayer et al. (2000) labeled the MSCEIT as an ability-based or performance-based measure, suggesting that there are correct and incorrect responses to items on this measure.

Conversely, the EQ-i (Bar-On, 1997) is a self-report inventory that consists of 133 items assessing 15 subscales that are classified under five main factors: Intrapersonal Functioning (i.e., emotional self-awareness, assertiveness, self-regard, self-actualization, and independence), Interpersonal Skills (i.e., empathy, interpersonal relationships, and social responsibility), Adaptability (i.e., problem solving, reality testing, and flexibility), General Mood (i.e., happiness and optimism), and Stress Management (i.e., stress
tolerance and impulse control). Because of its conceptual overlap with personality and mood, Mayer et al. (2000) classified this measure as a mixed model of EI.

Construct validity evidence for both the EQ-i and MSCEIT is lacking. Therefore, using these measures as criteria for each other is not sufficient to provide evidence of construct validity. However, if these two measures are assessing the same construct, scores on these measures should be highly correlated. Mayer et al. (2000) reported that scores on the EQ-i tended to be unrelated to scores on the MSCEIT, suggesting that these measures may be assessing different constructs. Little research has examined this question. Therefore, the first goal of the study was to explore the relationship between scores on these two measures of EI. It was expected that the scores on the MSCEIT scales would demonstrate low, but statistically significant, positive correlations with scores on the EQ-i scales (Livingstone & Day, 2005).

It has been suggested that EI predicts success at work and at home (e.g., Bar-On, 1997; Goleman, 1995; Mayer & Cobb, 2000). Mayer and Cobb (2000) argued that individuals who are aware of their emotions and can regulate their emotions are more likely to be successful in the workplace because they get along well with clients and coworkers. Bar-On (1997) also argued that high-EI individuals tend to be more satisfied at work and at home than low-EI individuals are. Despite these claims, the notion that EI predicts success at work and at home has been surrounded by a great deal of controversy (Barrett, Gross, Conner, & Benvenuto, 2001), and little research has examined this issue (Mayer & Cobb, 2000).

Mayer et al. (2000) concluded that if EI is to be considered a measure of intelligence, it should be moderately correlated with other intelligence measures. In the
present study, however, there was little evidence to support scores on either measure being associated with cognitive ability scores. Of the four MSCEIT scales, cognitive ability accounted for a statistically significant amount of variance only in Emotional Understanding, and even this amount of variance was small. Similar to past research, cognitive ability did not account for a statistically significant amount of variance in any of the EQ-i scales (Newsome, Day, & Cantano, 2000). Although the cognitive ability measure used in this study is a well-developed measure (Albert, 1998; Woycheshin, 1999), other more readily available measures should be used in research with both ability-based and mixed-model EI measures.

Livingstone and Day (2005) suggest that the MSCEIT and EQ-i are not assessing the same construct. Which measure is a better measure of EI is still a matter of debate. The construct of EI, as it was originally defined, referred to EI as an “ability” (Mayer et al., 1997). In contrast, more recent definitions of EI have become broader and have encompassed many personal attributes that appear to deviate from the traditional definition of intelligence (Bar-On, 1997; Goleman, 1995). It may make more intuitive sense for a construct labeled intelligence to be related to traditional intelligence measures. However, the constructs assessed by mixed-model measures should not be ignored because studies found some support for both models.

**Emotional Intelligence Training**

A Muyia and Kacirek (2009) study sought to determine if there was a difference in the EI scores of the participants prior to and after the training. The test of significance indicated that across the full sample, none of the pre or post mean differences were statistically significant \( p < .05 \), although the mean scores for stress management \( M = \)
104.72), general mood (M = 101.12), and total EQ-i (M = 103.72) slightly improved. Overall, these results demonstrated that there were no significant differences in the pretest and posttest scores of participants as measured by the total EQ scores and each of the five major components of EQ, namely, intrapersonal, interpersonal, stress management, adaptability, and general mood.

Dr. Golnaz Sadri (2012) suggests that leadership development programs may be enhanced through a better understanding of the concept of emotional intelligence and the inclusion of practices that aim to develop participants’ emotional intelligence. A clear process on how to proceed in terms of incorporating emotional intelligence into leadership development programs varies. Sadri (2012) suggests that leaders high in EI can recognize, appraise, predict and manage emotions in a way that enables them to work with and motivate team members. Prati, Douglas, Ferris, Ammeter, and Buckley (2003) propose that EI is “essential to effective team interaction and productivity” and that the “emotional intelligence of the team leader is important to the effective functioning of the team. The leader serves as a motivator toward collective action and facilitates supportive relationships among team members. The emotionally intelligent team leader also provides a transformational influence over the team.” Research evidence to date implies that higher levels of EI will lead to greater levels of effectiveness in a leadership role. The first leadership development to be paralleled in this section is that of Conger (1992) who suggested that there are essentially four approaches to leadership development: personal development, conceptual understanding, feedback, and skill building.

Sadri (2012) suggests that practitioners interested and involved in developing leaders not attempt to improve all five EI competencies in the same training program, but
rather consider developing one or more of the competencies identified here as integrating with past research in leadership development (self-awareness, self-regulation, empathy and social skills) as stand-alone competencies and provide training to participants who lack the requisite skills on an as-needed basis.

The encouraging thing is that EI can be learned by those who are willing to learn. Thus, those who are either in leadership roles or aspiring to such roles can intentionally and continuously work on improving levels of EI and, hence, leadership effectiveness. It may seem very surprising that almost all the leadership practices identified in these leadership exercises are related to EI and that almost none of them are related to IQ/knowledge/technical expertise. Those who are already in leadership roles may want to regularly seek feedback from their subordinates regarding their own effectiveness in their organizational roles. Given the importance of EI in building relationships and the importance of relationship building to leadership effectiveness, asking the right questions of subordinates may facilitate a leader in better understanding their relationships with their subordinates and how they can increase their own leadership effectiveness. There is support in the literature for the value of subordinates’ leadership assessments, and just the fact that a leader asks these questions tells subordinates that their feedback is valued (Zakariasen & Zakariasen, 2012).

Transformational Leadership Ties to Emotional Intelligence

Burns (1978) developed the original idea of transformational leadership and defined it as a process in which “leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of morality and motivation” Bass (1985) further refined this definition looking at the
theory as two distinct types of leadership processes: the first being transactional leadership and the second being transformational leadership. Although he defined these leadership processes as distinct, Bass recognized that the same leader might use both types of leadership at different times in different situations. It is transformational leaders however who influence followers by arousing strong emotions and identification with the leader (Yukl, 1998). Although transformational leaders are described to motivate followers to perform beyond expectations by intellectually stimulating and inspiring them to transcend their own self-interest for a higher collective purpose, transactional leaders use a negotiation process, where followers exchange efforts and services for rewards. A transformational leader activates follower motivation and increases follower commitment (Weinberger, 2009).

Hyejin Kim and Taesung Kim (2010) recognize the importance of influential leaders to tackle challenges, seize opportunities, and secure success. In the organizational context, research and practice alike have been in pursuit of the formula and programs for effective leadership. It has been referred to as responsive and responsible leadership. Petcu, Gheres, Obrad, and Suciu (2010) looked into the potential economic effect of leaders’ emotional intelligence (EI) and argued that leaders who underestimate EI are likely to fail due to their inability to move followers and satisfy customers. Matthews, Zeidner, and Roberts (2004) even maintain that EI seems to be more myth than science and that the proponents of EI stand on speculative scaffoldings, rather than on sufficient evidence. When it comes to scholarly work on the relationship between EI and leadership effectiveness, the results are mixed. For example, Barling et al. (2000) argued that important components of EI are positively associated with transformational leadership
(TL) behaviors; Antonakis and Ashkanasy NM and Dasborough MT (2009) found no significant evidence of EI’s contribution to TL behaviors; Harms and Crede (2010) added a variation that EI and TL have a marginal association.

Among the 20 studies chosen, 15 argue the significance of EI in relation to TL based on the correlational and predictive findings about the EI–TL relationship. Barling et al. (2000), drawing on data from 49 managers of a large pulp and paper organization via Bar-On’s self-report Emotional Intelligence Inventory found that EI is significantly related to three dimensions of TL: inspirational motivation, idealized influence, and individualized consideration. Among these, inspirational motivation had the most significant correlation with EI. (Kim & Kim, 2010) In looking at the correlation between EI and TL, Hackett and Hortman (2008) collected data from 46 assistant principals in elementary, middle, and high schools in a large school district of Georgia and used the ECI university edition (ECI-U) for EI and the MLQ for leadership styles. The results showed that EI levels were positively correlated with TL behaviors with two domains of the ECI-U (social awareness and relationship management) being most significantly correlated. Furthermore, 16 out of 21 EI subfactors of the ECI-U were found to be correlated with intellectual stimulation, and 13 subfactors were positively correlated with inspirational motivation. Hunt and Fitzgerald (2013) pointed out that the lack of a broadly accepted EI assessment tool is one of the reasons for the mixed results regarding the EI–TL relationship. To be specific, the discriminant validity issue is concerning for self-reporting instruments (e.g., EQ-i and ECI), because quantitative studies are often susceptible to common method bias, especially when the data set is gathered from the homogeneous source with similar assessment methods.
Emotional Intelligent Leaders and Organizational Change

Research by George (2000) and Humphrey (2002) has shown that leader–follower relationships are imbued with emotional content. In the context of change, as Szabla (2007) has demonstrated, the emotional levels in these relationships rise. Emotions in organizational settings have traditionally been seen as illogical and disruptive (Domagalski, 1999) and accordingly people, especially in organizational settings, have been discouraged from displaying them or even talking about them (Bolton, 2005; Diefendorff and Richard, 2003). The EI of the leader, as perceived by the follower, becomes a crucial element in the follower’s engagement with or resistance to the change. While much research has explored the relationship between follower EI and perceptions of others’ leadership ability, it has seldom addressed follower perceptions of leader EI. A study by Felfe and Schyns (2010) has shown the influence of perceptions of leader personality on followers and the study takes a similar line on perceived leader EI ability.

Smollan, Roy, Parry, and Ken (2011) support the view that EI is ability but note that ability and personality often work in tandem in influencing behavior. In practice followers may see little value in contemplating whether leader behavior reflects EI as ability or personality. What is of more concern to them is that their leaders express and regulate their own emotions appropriately and respond constructively to the followers’ emotions, including when change takes place.

Dasborough and Ashkanasy (2003) have produced a useful follower-centric model in which they reinforce the notion that leader–member relations have emotional content. They suggest that followers make positive attributions about leaders partly because of the genuine ways in which they can demonstrate transformational behaviors.
They propose that leaders with high EI can control their emotions and convey to followers the sincerity of their intentions and that followers with high EI pick up on these cues.

As Newcombe and Ashkanasy (2002) point out: a leader who feels negatively towards a member may unconsciously display negative emotion while expressing a positive message as a means of influencing the member through symbolic management. If the member can detect unconscious indicators of negative (felt) emotion, then it is likely that the leader’s influence attempt will be ineffective, resulting in a breakdown of trust, an essential ingredient of the leader-member relationship (Smollan et al., 2011).

Central to institutional or organizational change is leadership. Moore (2009) suggested that leaders equipped with the appropriate leadership behavior and skills will likely succeed in leading change. Emotional intelligence enables leaders to evaluate their and others behavior effectively and integrates both mental and emotional processes to adapt appropriate behaviors and manage situations. Emotional intelligence is the quality shared by effective leaders (Goleman, 2004). Three perspectives of the concept of emotional intelligence are identified: The ability model that focuses on the ability of the individual to process emotional information and use it appropriately within the social environment; the trait model focuses on behavioral dispositions and self-perceived abilities; and the mixed model describes the combination of mental abilities, dispositions, and traits (Mayer et al., 2000). For instance, the traits perspective focuses on emotion-related pre-dispositions; it involves the tendency to focus, especially under emotion-related situations, whereas the mental ability model is about the ability to apply the
knowledge of emotions in emotional situations (Nelis, Quoidbach, Mikolajczak, & Hansenne, 2009).

In any situation of change, a key determinant to the level of success is the degree to which the leader demonstrates the ability to communicate a need for the change to members of the organization. Emotionally intelligent leaders know and create an environment of open communication for those to be affected by the change to contribute by analyzing the present situation of the organization and to share in the future desired state of the organization (Issah & Zimmerman, 2016). Emotionally intelligent leaders can recognize the motives of members and act appropriately by providing the tools and needed support, which will motivate them to achieve excellence (Foltin & Keller, 2012). Leaders and team members accurate social perception allows individuals to gain considerable knowledge of other group members’ attitudes, goals, and interests, which should enable influence by identifying, understanding, and addressing members’ unstated needs and creating goals that might be accepted (Srivastava, 2013).

**Emotional Intelligence Influence on Social Awareness**

Goleman (2004) studies support that the social skill component of emotional intelligence is a culmination of the other components of emotional intelligence. For instance, empathetic individuals who are leaders know when to engage with emotions and when to engage with reason. Goleman (2001) asserts that socially skilled leaders are adapt at managing teams, a manifestation of self-awareness, self-regulation, and empathy combined. Emotionally intelligent leaders can employ their social skills in building and maintaining relationships (Goleman,
emotionally intelligent leaders can use their social skills to inspire and persuade this category of followers to adopt the proposed change and strive to contribute efficiently toward achieving the organizational goal (Srivastava, 2013). Similarly, emotionally intelligent leaders do not quit when they encounter irrational resistance but employ the emotional skills and what the organizational culture permits to overcome the resistance.

According to Momeni (2009), emotional intelligence is a mental ability that has influence on other abilities of managers, especially, their leadership abilities. According to Bennis (2009), a leader being self-aware is the foundation to developing emotional intelligence. Exceptional leaders can understand and support others if they know their strengths, weaknesses, emotions, and have the capacity for self-management (Jacobs, Kemp, & Mitchell, 2008). As stated by Moore (2009), leaders can use emotional information to build trust and secure cooperation, display empathy to employees, social awareness, develop collaboration, understand the loss that people experience during the change process, and display their skills in addressing issues and solving problems. Evidence suggests that a school leaders’ failure in restructure and redesign of a school district is a valuable indicator of the extent to which most leaders of schools are ill equipped to address emotional challenges and conflicts emanating from school reform (Moore, 2009). Emotionally intelligent leaders are equipped with the requisite skill to create a trusting environment.

Emotional intelligence is essential in leadership because leadership is an emotionally charged process both for the leader and the followers (George, 2000). For instance, teachers moved from working in isolation to working collaboratively, increased
accountability, implementation of monitoring systems, and distributing leadership can be a huge paradigm shift in most school environments. This environment can have a huge emotional toll on the teachers, the students, and principals. Therefore, for teachers and students to reach their full potential intellectually, collaboratively, and in social skills, the leaders must be emotionally competent (Moore, 2009).

Summary

Western societies found that emotional intelligence contributes significantly towards leadership success (Lone & Lone, 2010). As aforementioned, the basic tenet of emotional intelligence in an organizational setting is about understanding the feelings and emotions of the followers. The outstanding leaders strive for this so that it results in cordial relationships between the leaders and the followers (Ashkanasy & Tse, 2000). While analyzing the performance of leaders in 188 large Western companies, Goleman (1998) found that self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skill to be consistent characteristics of an effective leader. By investigating the association between emotional intelligence and leadership ability in other similar studies, Goleman (1995, 1998) established that emotional intelligence proved to be more commanding compared to technical skills and cognitive abilities for effective leadership.

In similar Western settings (George, 2000; Sosik & Megerian, 1999), it has been noted that emotionally intelligent individuals could be good organizational citizens and better overall performers. George (2000) maintained that such individuals can effectively utilize their emotions in their decision-making processes. George (2000) further claimed leaders that are high on emotional intelligence possess the aptitude to recognize pros and cons of emotions are capable of solving individual and organizational issues more
effectively. Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, and Sitarenios (2001) argued that the ability to capitalize on emotions helps a leader to encourage idea generation and decision-making besides motivation.

There has been substantial disagreement on how EI is measured, and which measures are best (Joseph et al., 2010; McEnrue and Groves, 2006; Van Rooy & Viswesvaran, 2004). Ashkanasy and Daus (2005), Joseph et al. (2010) and Joseph, Lin, Newman, and O'Boyle (2015) have argued that ability EI must be objectively measured through performance-based tests since self-reported measures of ability EI merely tap perceptions of ability. This perspective strongly supports the concept of using game-based or response-based scenario simulations for the measurement of EI or EQ.

Despite certain differences, it seems from the literature review that all mainstream emotional intelligence models manifest certain commonalities. First, all of these models have both an intrapersonal component as well as a social or interpersonal component (Bar-On, 2006; Goleman et al., 2003). Second, they all address the issue of being able to perceive and understand one’s own emotions (Bar-On, 2000; Mayer et al., 2000). Third, the emphasis in all models is placed on emotional self-management or regulating one’s emotions (Bar-On, 2006; Mayer et al., 2000). Fourth, most models of emotional intelligence also include a component related to empathy, or the ability to understand the feelings that others experience (Bar-On, 2000; Goleman et al., 2003; Mayer et al., 2000; Salovey & Mayer, 1990). The fifth basic component addressed by most conceptualizations of emotional intelligence is the ability to handle personal and interpersonal problems, and to cope with situational demands and changes (Bar-On, 2006; Goleman, 2004; Mayer et al., 2000). A sixth component common to most
descriptions of emotional intelligence is the ability to generate positive effects, and to be self-motivated (Bar-On, 2000).

Proponents of the ability model argue that the operations of concepts, relationship to intelligence, and the characteristics of development applied to the emotional domain are not accurate indicators of EI. (Humphrey, Curran, Morris, Farrell, & Woods, 2007)

Throughout the review it discussed the relationship between strong emotional intelligence skills and effective leadership. To best assess that symmetry in School Superintendents, research was used in the review that proposes a study that will assess emotional intelligence based on the scientifically determined and researched constructs of MSCEIT and Bar-on EQ-I. However, the assessment will be done through a virtual assessment of responses to situations. The research shows a lack of validity in using self-evaluation assessments, therefore, a virtual response based, or game-based assessment appears to be a format to achieve unbiased results of emotional intelligence strengths and weaknesses in subjects (Revelian, 2016).
Chapter 3: Methodology

Participants

Research was conducted using Superintendents of Nebraska K-12 public schools with an enrollment of less than 3,000 students. The questionnaire and Emotify instrument was sent electronically to 200 current Superintendents who met the criteria and had contact information available from the Nebraska Department of Education. This sub-group of Superintendents was chosen to provide data for this study because they represented similar organizations with similar desired outcomes of their leadership.

Nebraska was chosen as the sole state participating in the study due to the requirement to follow similar rules by the Department of Education. It also ensures that the Superintendent is the top administrative position hired in the District and is hired by the school board.

Instrumentation

A quantitative study was used in order to correlate the data collected and determine its distribution in Superintendent leadership. The self-assessment called Emotify from Revelian was used to capture the ability to perceive emotion and the ability to understand emotion. The total amount of time to complete was approximately 30 minutes. Subjects were asked to contribute additional demographic information that includes gender, educational background, number of years as a Superintendent, the number of years in their current District, and their professional plans in the next three years. This data was not used as a delimitating factor in the study. Subjects were able to take the assessments at one time or each section individually at their own pace.
Emotify, an emotional intelligence assessment by Revelian, is comprised of three separate assessments called matching faces, emotional ties, and self-management. This instrument required subjects to identify emotions displayed in everyday situations and predict the types of emotional consequences that may arise as a result of those situations. The assessments have been specifically developed to assess a subject’s ability to accurately perceive emotions and effectively understand the connections between emotions, and situations that lead to specific emotional reactions. Emotify used a device agnostic approach and natively displays in common browsers to conduct the assessment online to ensure that all subjects have a positive and frictionless testing experience. For this study, Emotify did provide data on three key aspects of emotional intelligence: emotional perception, emotional understanding, and emotional self.

Validation studies have demonstrated the strong psychometric properties of Emotify.

As part of two large-scale validation exercises, more than 3000 participants completed the three Emotify mini-games—Matching Faces, Emotional Ties, and Self-Management—and the Situational Test of Emotional Understanding (STEU). Adopting a cross-validation approach to modelling, scores for Matching Faces, Emotional Ties, and Emotify overall were found to strongly correlate with STEU performance: $r = .40 (.45)$, $ .54 (.61)$, $ .57 (.65)$ respectively. The second correlation presented here in brackets represents the corrected coefficient, accounting for the unreliability of the criterion (Revelian, 2016).

For each mini-game, the metrics that combine to produce both game and overall Emotify scores each contribute in statistically unique and significant ways to predict the
convergent measure (STEU). This indicates that scoring for each game is not only valid but has also been derived in a manner that takes account of the multiple aspects of emotional intelligence (Mayer et al., 2016).

On a scale of 0-100, participant results from the Emotify screener are defined on scale for composite and each individual screener. Emotify provides a scale for results with 0-25 being below average, 26-74 being average, 75-90 being above average, and any score above 90 is to be considered exceptional (Revelian, 2016).

**Questions and Justification**

Questions presented in the questionnaire were intended to gather demographic information of the subjects. Question A asked for gender with the choices of male, female, or other. Question B asked for education of the subject with the choices of master’s degree, Educational Specialist, Educational Doctorate, or other. Question C asked the subject to select a range of experience as a Superintendent with the choices 0 to 4, 5 to 8, 9 to 12, and more than 12. Question D asked the subject how long they have been the Superintendent in their currently employed district with the choices 0 to 4, 5 to 8, 9 to 12, and more than 12. Question E asked the subject to select from set choices regarding their three-year professional plan. Those selections for Question E were retire, remain in the current position, seek other Superintendent position, seek other school leadership, seek private sector position, or pursue becoming a college instructor. The questionnaire data was used to predict trends and cluster data results associated with the Emotify assessment.

Emotify (Revelian, 2016) did provide online, visual scenarios for the subject to respond with a choice A or choice B for each scenario. For the purpose of this study,
Emotify did provide the same scenarios for each subject of the study to ensure validity of the results. Each subject received an equal number of scenarios from the emotional ties, matching faces, and self-management modules to ensure the overall score was derived from a balance of situational scenarios. The justification for using Emotify was that it provided scenario-based responses, could be administered remotely, independently, online, and did provide an overall score and results rubric for data analysis.

**Role of the Researcher**

The study was conducted as an online quantitative study; therefore, the researcher’s role was limited to the selection of the instrumentation, analysis of data, and dissemination of the findings. The researcher has twenty years of public school administrative experience, including seven in the role of a Superintendent. The research did use a quantitative study administered by a third party to create a systematic way to gather data and avoid unnecessary bias with results and analysis.

**Procedures**

Participants were provided with all testing materials digitally. Participants initially received an e-mail invitation requesting participation that contained a link to the electronic, on-line questionnaire and information about the Emotify assessment.

Once the participant completed the questionnaire, Revelian automatically generated an e-mail message to those individuals, asking them to complete the Emotify assessment and provide them a code to access the assessment online. Emotify measured the participant’s ability to assess emotional perception and emotional understanding. Emotify generated a scoring report from the assessment that could be quantified with other results based on a rubric from Revelian.
Data Collection and Analysis by Research Question

Analysis was made of the data that is complete from each subject and if the self-perceptions of subjects matching their assessed emotional intelligence and the impact it had on their leadership outcomes including job satisfaction and their tenure in District.

The research was collected digitally using Emotify by Revelian that has been used in prior research, has been validated and grounded in study, and was adapted to this study. The findings will assist current and prospective educational leaders, school boards, and educational administration preparation programs in better understanding the impact and importance of emotional intelligence and what foundational components are most needed.

This enabled the analysis to answer the three research questions posed by the study. The culmination of this study provided a clear analysis of how a Superintendent emotions are distributed in the Emotional Competence Inventory. From the analysis it was determined what aspects of the four fundamental Emotional Competence Inventory categories are more prevalent in Superintendent leadership. Emotify scores were then analyzed based on a Superintendents ability to perceive and understand their emotions. Figure 2 shows the correlation between a subject’s overall score and emotional intelligence.

The analysis of results for each of the three research questions is, for question #1, how are a Superintendent’s responses to virtual situations categorized in the Emotional Competence Inventory? The results were analyzed using distribution (descriptive) statistics presented through a graphical analysis and distributive table. Using the four categories of the Emotional Competence Inventory (figure #1, pg. 4) results were
categorized under self-awareness, social awareness, and self-management by Superintendent response.

For question #2, what aspects of the Emotional Competence Inventory categories are more prevalent in specific Superintendent demographic groups? The results were analyzed using chi-squared test to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference between the recorded frequencies of responses in the four categories and specific Superintendent demographics. Results are shown using a contingency table.

For question #3, how strong is the relationship between the Emotional Competence Inventory categories and longevity as a Superintendent? The results were analyzed using a correlation coefficient to measure how strong is the relationship of the two variables. Data is presented in a table demonstrating results from the four categories and longevity tied to each Superintendent response. The results of each category of the Emotional Competence Inventory are shown as a scatterplot graph with the corresponding longevity data.
Chapter 4: Analysis of Data

This chapter contains the results of the quantitative study conducted to answer the research questions:

RQ1 – How are a Superintendent’s responses to virtual situations categorized in the Emotional Competence Inventory.

RQ2 – What aspects of the Emotional Competence Inventory categories are more prevalent in specific Superintendent demographic groups?

RQ3 – How strong is the relationship between the Emotional Competence Inventory categories and longevity as a Superintendent?

This chapter also includes data that the analysis conducted was consistent with quantitative methodology and how the analysis ties back to the research questions. Additionally, this chapter includes sample demographics, using tables to complement the summary. The process used to analyze results from the 63 individuals who completed the Emotify screener and questionnaire is described in detail in this chapter. At each level of analysis, constant comparison was used to distill the data further, until frequency and consistencies emerged from the data. Included in the chapter are tables and graphs used to present detailed data.

Data Collection

Two hundred and twenty-five invitations were electronically sent out to public school Superintendents in Nebraska with a school district enrollment of less than 3,000 students. The questionnaire was part I of a two-part data collection process used for
research. Part two included virtual responses from a screener called Emotify. Emotify is an ability-based measure of emotional intelligence, measuring a subject’s ability to accurately identify, understand, and manage emotions. Only those who completed both parts were used in the research. Sixty-three subjects completed the requirements during the data collection window.

**Questionnaire Data**

Sixty-three participants completed the full Emotify screener and questionnaire for this study. The minimum requires sought for participants in this study included currently serving as a Superintendent of a public school in Nebraska with a total enrollment of 3,000 students or less. The sixty-three participants had the following demographic make-up:

![Participant Demographics](image)

*Figure 6 Study participants demographics as responses to questions asked in the questionnaire.*

Participants were asked five demographic questions in the questionnaire; results are listed in figure 6 above. Gender included the choice of male, female, or other.
Highest degree earned options included masters degree (MA), education specialist (EDS), educational doctorate (EDD), or other not listed. Years as a Superintendent included four options, 0-4 years, 5-8 years, 9-12, or 12+ years. Years in current position included four options, 0-4 years, 5-8 years, 9-12 years, or 12+ years. The last question asked was for each participant to provide their plan for three years from this school year and the response options included to retire, remain in their current position, seek another Superintendent position, or other leadership. Other leadership included a non-Superintendent position in a public school, private sector leadership, or college instructor.

The participants in the study were predominantly male, 82% to 18%. No other choices other than male or female were selected. Two-thirds of the participants highest degree was an Education Specialist. This is the degree required to hold a Superintendent certificate in the State of Nebraska. Superintendents who choose to pursue a degree beyond their Educational Specialist would work towards either an Educational Doctorate and 27% of participants held that advanced degree. Years as a Superintendent was the most evenly split category of the participants with 22 have twelve or more years, 17 were in their first four years, and 15 were in years five to eight. Roughly 50% of the participants fell into years one through eight. Conversely to years as a Superintendent, years in the current position was heavily skewed toward years zero to four with 27 of the 63 participants, or 43% falling into this category. Eighteen participants, or 29%, have spent twelve or more years with the current school district. The last question asking each subject to choose their three-year plan overwhelming had remain in current district as the top response with two-thirds selecting that choice. The remaining choices of finding a
new Superintendent position (8), retire from education (7), and pursue other leadership roles (6) were split very evenly.

**Emotify Data**

Participants completed three different virtual situations that scored the responses in perceiving the emotions of others, understanding emotions of others, and managing your own emotions. The combination of these results created an overall percentile score for each subject and provided an explanation of that score.

In the first component of Emotify the candidate completed an assessment called matching faces, which measured their ability to quickly and accurately identify a broad range of emotions in facial expressions. Individuals who were able to accurately perceive emotions are more likely to identify a need to respond and adapt to people and situations as required.

On a scale of 0-100, participant general results from the Emotify scale are below.

Emotify provides a scale for results with 0-25 being below average, 26-74 being average, 75-90 being above average, and any score above 90 is to be considered exceptional. The low score was a 1 and the high score was a 99, this was the widest margin between high and low of the three categories. The median score was 43, the average was 45.68, and the standard deviation was 27.02. Based on the scale, 27% of the results for Perceiving Emotions fell in the below average category and 59% fell in the average portion of the scale. Of the 17 participants who fell in the below category, they are 15 male to 2
female, 16 of the 17 held their Educational Specialist or Doctorate degree, and all 8 of the participants who are looking for new Superintendent position fell in this group.

In the second component of Emotify the candidate completed an assessment called emotional ties, which assessed their ability to recognize emotions and demonstrate awareness of how different situations and events influence emotions. Individuals with a higher score on understanding of emotions are better able to predict future emotions based on current events and use this knowledge to inform their approach to people and situations.

Emotify provides a scale for results with 0-25 being below average, 26-74 being average, 75-90 being above average, and any score above 90 is to be considered exceptional. For Understanding Emotions the low score was 8 and the high score was a 99. The median score of 64 and the average of 61.16 were both were the highest of the three categories. Based on

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding Emotions</th>
<th>Emotify Scale</th>
<th>No. of Scores by Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-25 Below Average</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median = 64</td>
<td>26-74 Average</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STD = 25.84</td>
<td>75-90 Above Average</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average = 61.16</td>
<td>91+ Exceptional</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 8 Understanding Emotions results.*

the Emotify scale, this category was the strongest of the participants with 19% scoring exceptional and 19% scoring above average. Slightly more than 50% fell into the average category. Breaking down the twenty-four subjects that scored in the above average and exceptional range it showed 3 female and 21 males. The highest degree earned for the group was 13 with an Educational Specialist and 9 with an Educational Doctorate. Nine of Superintendents had twelve plus years as a Superintendent while
thirteen of the group were in their first eight years. The largest number of the 24 in this category, 42%, were in their first four years at a school district.

In the third component of Emotify the candidate completed an assessment called emotions in action, which measured their capacity to effectively manage emotions. Individuals with strong emotion management skills are better able to manage their own and others’ emotions to help achieve a desired outcome, and influence emotions in ways that are more likely to be helpful to a situation rather than harmful.

Emotify provides a scale for results with 0-25 being below average, 26-74 being average, 75-90 being above average, and any score above 90 is to be considered exceptional.

For managing emotions the low score was 11 and the high score was 97. The median score was 63, the average was 59.22, and the standard deviation was the closest of the three categories at 22.3. Based on the Emotify scale, managing emotions had the fewest subjects below average with three and the highest number in the average range with 40. A high number, 32%, of subjects still managed to score in the above average and exceptional range. A breakdown of the 20 subjects scoring the highest in this area it included 18 males and 2 females.

Eighteen in the group had an Educational Specialist or Doctorate. In comparison with Understanding Emotions there was nearly the same split with 14 of the 20 in years zero to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managing Emotions</th>
<th>Emotify Scale</th>
<th>No. of Scores by Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median = 63</td>
<td>0-25 Below Average</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STD = 22.30</td>
<td>26-74 Average</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average = 59.22</td>
<td>75-90 Above Average</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91+ Exceptional</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 9 Managing Emotion results.*
eight as a Superintendent and 6 having twelve or more years. Eight, or 40%, were in their first four years as a Superintendent in their current school district.

Each subject was given a comprehensive scale score based on their overall scoring in the three areas of perceiving, understanding, and managing emotions. This score scales an individual’s ability to use all three for a comprehensive ability to display emotional intelligence when interacting with others, working in teams, or making decisions.

Emotify uses the same scale for comprehensive results with 0-25 being below average, 26-74 being average, 75-90 being above average, and any score above 90 is to be considered exceptional. For comprehensive scores the lowest was a 20 and the highest was an 87. The median score was 59, the average was 57.71, and the standard deviation as 16.31.

Comprehensive results had only 3 subjects fall in the below average category and none fell in the exceptional range. Only one candidate score exception in two of the three individual areas, but they did not score well enough in the third area to reach a comprehensive score of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composite Scores</th>
<th>Emotify Scale</th>
<th>No. of Scores by Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median = 59</td>
<td>0-25 Below Average</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STD = 16.31</td>
<td>26-74 Average</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average = 57.71</td>
<td>75-90 Above Average</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91+ Exceptional</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 10 Composite Score results*

exceptional. Ten candidates score above average with a comprehensive score of 77 to 87.

Breaking down the data related to the ten subjects who score the highest comprehensive scores there were 9 males and 1 female. Nine of the ten had an Educational Specialist or Doctorate. Their
experience as a Superintendent was spread evenly throughout the years of experience breakdowns with 3 in years 0-4, 3 in years 5-8, and 3 with 12+ years. An equal spread also existed in the category of years in current district with 4 being in years 0-4, 3 in years 5-8, and 3 with 12+ years. Six of the ten plan to remain in their current district based on their response to the three-year plan question. These ten subjects averaged a score of 72 on perceiving emotions, 89 on understanding emotions, and 80 on managing emotions.

The remaining breakdown of data from Emotify is by gender. Fifty-two males and eleven females completed the questionnaire and Emotify screener. The raw data, listed in Figure 11, is very comparable between the two. Using median data, the females comprehensive score is 2.5 points above the males while the males comprehensive score is $\frac{1}{2}$ point below the combined group median. The three individual tests show nearly identical median scores except for managing emotions where the male’s median score was 8 points higher than that of the female participants. Each of the average scores were less than 3 points difference between the gender groups.

**Analysis of Statistical Findings**

Findings are presented for each research question guiding this study. These findings are presented in tabular form with narrative descriptions of findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Gender</th>
<th>Comprehensive Score</th>
<th>Perceiving Emotions Assessment</th>
<th>Understanding Emotions Assessment</th>
<th>Managing Emotions Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>11 Females</strong></td>
<td>61 Median</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.18 Average</td>
<td>48.27</td>
<td>62.09</td>
<td>56.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>52 Males</strong></td>
<td>58.5 Median</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.83 Average</td>
<td>45.13</td>
<td>60.96</td>
<td>59.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 11 Comparison data between male and female responses.*
How are a Superintendent’s responses to virtual situations categorized in the Emotional Competence Inventory.

Figure 12: Each response to the individual Emotify tests that correspond to the Emotional Competence Inventory. Series 2 responses can be categorized under Social Awareness. Series 3 responses can be categorized under Relationship Management. Series 4 responses can be categorized under Self-Management and Self Awareness.

Figure 12 is a scatter plot graph that shows each individual assessment score and how it was scored by subjects overall composite score. The X-Axis is the individual’s total percentile score with each colored dot representing an individual testing score. The Y-Axis is the 0 to 100 scale for scoring on the individual assessments in Emotify.

The frequency of dots at the bottom of the graph indicates lower scores than those at the top. The graph shows that results attached to Social Awareness (ECI) from the Emotify Test Perceiving Emotions (M=43) or Series 2 are lower than that of the others.
The graph also shows a higher frequency of results for Relationship Management (ECI) from the Emotify Test Understanding Emotions (M=64) or Series 3 with twelve marks scoring 90 or above. The average scores for each area show that Relationship Management (A=61.16) was a slightly stronger area than Self-Management/Self Awareness (ECI) from the Emotify Test Managing Emotions (A=59.22) or Series 4 and both were significantly stronger than Social Awareness (A=45.68). Of the 63 Superintendents in the study, 24 were above average or exceptional based on the Emotify scale for Relationship Management. Twenty were above average or exceptional based on the Emotify scale for Self-Management/Self Awareness. Only 9 Superintendents scored above average or exceptional for Social Awareness using the Emotify scale.

Based on the Emotional Competence Inventory shown in Figure 13, the Superintendents in the study showed the highest scores in Relationship Management and in the Self Awareness/ Self-Management areas. This would categorize the participant...
group as being “Social Regulators” meaning they showed strengths in self-control, adaptability, influence, developing and understanding others, and building bonds.

**What aspects of the Emotional Competence Inventory categories are more prevalent in specific Superintendent demographic groups?**

The questionnaire given to every subject required them to provide five pieces of demographic data that included gender (male, female, or other), Education by Degree (masters, specialist, doctorate, or other), their years as a Superintendent (0-4, 5-8, 9-12, 12+), their years in the current District as a Superintendent (04-, 5-8, 9-12, 12+), and their plan in the next three years (retire, remain in their current position, find a different Superintendent position, or choose other leadership opportunities).

Using the demographic data groupings and aligning them to the Emotional Competence Inventory, the trends for each generated by examining the frequency of a demographic group for each individual area of those Superintendents who scored above average or exceptional as shown in Figure 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Superintendents Above Average or Exceptional</th>
<th>Highest Percentage of Gender</th>
<th>Highest Percentage of Degree Earned</th>
<th>Highest Percentage of Years as Superintendent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Awareness</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>78% Male</td>
<td>78% Specialist</td>
<td>44% Years 0 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Management</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>88% Male</td>
<td>54% Specialist</td>
<td>38% Years 12+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Awareness &amp; Self-Management</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90% Male</td>
<td>50% Specialist</td>
<td>35% Years 5-8 &amp; 12+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 14 Highest demographic groups by percentage for each Emotional Competence Inventory category.*
In the sub-group of those scoring above average or exceptional on the Emotify Scale, consistently each area showed a high percentage of males with a specialist degree. In two of the three scored areas the Superintendents with 12 or more years of experience as a Superintendent were found to be the highest percentage of the Superintendents in the above average or exceptional scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Highest Degree Earned</th>
<th>Years as a Superintendent</th>
<th>Years as Supt. – Current Dist.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDS</td>
<td>EDS</td>
<td>EDS</td>
<td>EDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDD</td>
<td>EDD</td>
<td>EDD</td>
<td>EDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTH</td>
<td>OTH</td>
<td>OTH</td>
<td>OTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>12+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>12+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall scoring by Emotional Competence Inventory category for each demographic group is categorized in Figure 15 and is listed with the median score. The overall group median for each category is Social Awareness (M=43, SD=27.02), Relationship Management (M=64, SD=25.84), and Self Awareness/Self-Management (M=63, SD=22.3). In conducting chi-squared test for Social Awareness it returned a P value of 0.056912, therefore, there is marginal significance to the results of each sub-category. The chi-squared test for Relationship Management returned a P value of 0.66237, making the sub-group scores not significant in determining the prevalence of Relationship Management by sub-group. The chi-squared test of Self Awareness and Self-Management returned a P value of 0.02799, since the value is <.05 it was determined that the scores have significance to determine the prevalence by sub-group.

How strong is the relationship between the Emotional Competence Inventory categories and longevity as a Superintendent?
Based on comprehensive scores from the Emotify screener, the most disparity among scoring fell in the category of years as a Superintendent. Superintendents who are in years 5 to 8 had the highest average and median comprehensive scores as listed in Figure 16. To further validate the findings, over 75% of the exceptional scores in the individual categories of Social Awareness and Self Awareness/Self-Management were Superintendent’s from this category. For Relationship Management they had an equal percentage as the other groupings. With results being placed on the Emotional Competence Inventory, this group was found to be the most balanced of any other grouping.

The results of the Pearson Correlation Coefficient test on the relationship between years as a Superintendent (longevity) and the Emotional Competence Inventory shown in Figure 17 for each of the categories there is a correlation between the score and longevity as a Superintendent. In each of the independent tests comparing the median score for each assessment to the median score of each longevity group of Superintendents, the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Competence Inventory</th>
<th>Emotify Assessment</th>
<th>Years as a Superintendent</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL AWARENESS</td>
<td>Perceiving Emotions</td>
<td>43 27 55 43 53</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>Understanding Emotions</td>
<td>64 64 64 64 70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF AWARENESS &amp; SELF MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>Managing Emotions</td>
<td>63 53 74 55 61</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
results found $r > 0$ for each independent test indicating a strong relationship between years as a Superintendent and scoring above the median and higher than those with less longevity. The positive correlation indicated as longevity years increased so did the individual Emotify screener scores for the three individual tests.

**Summary**

Chapter 4 presented the quantitative data the investigated the differences between the categories of the Emotional Competence Inventory and the demographic sub-groups of Nebraska Superintendents in public schools of 3,000 or less students. Data collected from a questionnaire and Emotify provided data related to Superintendent demographic groups and their placement on the Emotional Competence Inventory.

The purpose of the study was to observe the distribution of Emotional Intelligence among Superintendents, determine which types of emotional intelligence were more prevalent, and determine if there was a correlation between Superintendent longevity and any of the Emotional Competence Inventory categories. The researcher did find statistically significant data to determine the prevalence of Relationship Management from the Emotional Competence Inventory (Understanding Emotions Test from Emotify) in Superintendents and a strong correlation between individual scores on the Emotify screener and career longevity for Superintendents.

In Chapter 5, the researcher draws conclusions from the data and identifies the implications of the study for school district leaders, boards of education, and those who would need to quantify these strengths for the selection of a Superintendent.
Chapter 5: Discussion & Implications

Chapter 5 provides a summary of the study and research findings. Conclusions were drawn about each of the three questions based on the data from Chapter 4. This chapter includes a summary of the findings, a discussion of the results, and recommendations for further research.

Summary of Findings

The purpose of this study was to find the distribution of emotional intelligence among Superintendents in Nebraska public school districts with an enrollment of less than 3,000. Within this study the first two research questions were to analyze, dissect, and find prevalence of specific research data to locate trends. The third research question was posed to find a correlation between a Superintendents emotional intelligence score and longevity as a Superintendent. The study provides statistical data for the reader to draw conclusions about the existence and strength of any correlation between Superintendent demographics and specific emotional intelligence strengths. Boards of education, as the hiring agent for school districts, could be influence by hiring decisions and potential screening practices based on the conclusions of this study.

Three research questions guided this study.

#1 – How are a Superintendent’s responses to virtual situations categorized in the Emotional Competence Inventory.

#2 – What aspects of the Emotional Competence Inventory categories are more prevalent in specific Superintendent demographic groups?

#3 – How strong is the relationship between the Emotional Competence Inventory categories and longevity as a Superintendent?
The population of this study included 63 of the possible 200 public school Superintendents serving Nebraska public school districts with an enrollment of 3,000 or less students. Each subject completed a pre-questionnaire of basic demographic data and then a three-part virtual response screener called Emotify. Emotify calculated a composite score based on the subject’s ability to perceive emotions of others, understand emotions of others, and manage their own emotions.

The findings from the study, based on statistical analysis, were as follows for each research question:

1. Based on the median scores of the three-part Emotify screener, Superintendents scores were much higher in the areas of understanding others’ emotions and managing their own emotions. Placed on the Emotional Competence Inventory, the area of Relationship Management had the highest number of above average and exceptional scores based on the Emotify scale using the Understanding Emotions test. Relationship Management had a median score of M=64 and Self Awareness/Management from the Emotify test using Managing Emotions had a median score of M=63.

2. Using a Chi-Squared Test, data was evaluated to determine in one of the Emotional Competence Inventory categories was more prevalent than others. Using data from each demographic sub-group and the median score for each individual assessment from Emotify it was determined that Self Awareness and Self-Management returned a P Value (P=0.02799), since the value is <.05 it was determined that the scores have significance to determine the prevalence by sub-group.
3. Using the Pearson Correlation Coefficient test, data was analyzed to determine if scores from the Emotify assessment, when placed on the Emotional Competence Inventory, had any relationship to longevity as a Superintendent. In each case the result was $r > 0$, with Relationship Management returning a perfect positive linear correlation between the two variables, ECI median score and years as a Superintendent.

**Discussion of Results**

The study data were able to provide results to resolve the research questions. The data analysis and findings of the study within the limitations and delimitations present the following conclusions:

1. The responses were tracked and categorized using the Emotional Competence Inventory. Based on the number of Superintendents scoring above average, exceptional, and the median score the areas of Relationship Management and Self Awareness/Management as most prevalent.

2. Based on the response data the Chi-Squared Test returned a very significant result with the ECI category Self Awareness and Self-Management by Superintendents.

3. Based on the Emotify screener and demographic data the Pearson Correlation Coefficient returned a value of $r > 0$ which determined a strong positive correlation between higher Emotify scores and Superintendent longevity in the profession.

The significance of the results and findings is that one of the most critical tasks completed by a school board is to hire the Superintendent. According to a study
conducted by Darron Arlt (2016) only 11% of Superintendents remain in one district for twelve or more years. The study also showed the average tenure for Nebraska Public School Superintendents to be at 5.3 years.

The current study does not infer that Superintendent’s with longevity have higher emotional intelligence, but in fact shows that many Superintendents in years 0 to 8 also scored well. What is decisive is that those with higher emotional intelligence scores were shown to have longevity as a Superintendent and were more likely to remain in their current district for a longer tenure.

Predicting longevity in the Superintendent profession is a key quantifier in the hiring process. While there are more variables that can be recognized that may impact longevity in a single school district, or tenure, the data for this study is consistent with contemporary findings. While using quantitative predictors, like test scores, the study showed that independent variables like EI and longevity are connected. Contemporary findings suggest that EI can be learned or trained. Since Sadri (2012) suggests that leaders high in EI can recognize, appraise, predict and manage emotions in a way that enables them to work with and motivate team members. It supports Sadri (2012) who suggests that practitioners interested and involved in developing leaders not attempt to improve all five EI competencies in the same training program, but rather consider developing one or more of the competencies identified here as integrating with past research in leadership development (self-awareness, self-regulation, empathy and social skills) as stand-alone competencies and provide training to participants who lack the requisite skills on an as-needed basis. The study data supports that Superintendents do not possess universal strengths in all EI components, supporting the findings above.
The encouraging thing is that EI can be learned by those who are willing to learn. Thus, those who are either in Superintendent roles or aspiring to such roles can intentionally and continuously work on improving levels of EI and leadership effectiveness.

George (2000) maintained that individuals with high emotional intelligence can effectively utilize their emotions in their decision-making processes. George (2000) further claimed leaders that are high on emotional intelligence possess the aptitude to recognize pros and cons of emotions that can solve individual and organizational issues more effectively. This statement would support the findings of this study that Relationship Management and Self Awareness/Management from the Emotional Competence Inventory can be key predictors.

Relationship Management had the highest mean score of current Superintendents in the study. As stated by Moore (2009), leaders can use emotional information to build trust and secure cooperation, display empathy to employees, social awareness, develop collaboration, understand the loss that people experience during the change process, and display their skills in addressing issues and solving problems. The study data contradicts some contemporary findings that suggest school leaders’ are ill equipped to address emotional challenges and conflicts emanating from school reform. Leaders with high EI in relationship management can control their emotions and convey to followers the sincerity of their intentions.

In Bird’s (2016) model, he viewed emotional intelligence as a set of emotional and social skills that collectively establish how to perceive ourselves and how to express feelings, build, and maintain relationships with others, understand the environment and
make decisions as to most effectively deal with stressful or difficult situations. This relatively newer finding supports the findings in the study where Superintendents were found to have self-awareness and self-management as most prevalent of the EI Competencies. The emotionally effective leader is one who has a high emotional intelligence quotient. They can understand themselves, what they believe, and who they are as a leader. This would support Goleman (2005), who called emotional intelligence the “sine qua non of leadership,” which means the ‘essence’ or most important thing.

School leadership is an absolute critical component to the success of a school district. The complexity of organizational leadership and the necessary skills for success remain vastly unstudied. The role of the Superintendent has evolved to one that relies heavily on the skills associated with emotional intelligence as much as a broad understanding of educational law, finance, and curriculum.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

The following recommendations for further research emerged from the results of the study. A mixed method study including qualitative surveys and interviews would add additional insight to the demographics and deeper understanding to the scores from the Emotify Screener. The study can be expanded beyond the state of Nebraska and public-school Superintendents using a similar quantitative approach. Additional research on emotional intelligence and school leadership has the potential to be impactful data for the selection, growth, and development of future leaders and those that hire them.
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Appendix

Appendix A: Demographic Questionnaire

This questionnaire is to be completed by the subject and connected to your results on part 2 from Emotify. No individual identifiers will be used.

Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>EdS</th>
<th>EdD</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years as Superintendent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-4</th>
<th>5-8</th>
<th>9-12</th>
<th>12+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years in Current District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-4</th>
<th>5-8</th>
<th>9-12</th>
<th>12+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How would you best categorize your next three-year career plan as a Superintendent? (Choose One)

  _____ Retire from Education
  _____ Remain in my current District
  _____ Look for a different Superintendent position
  _____ Seek other Educational Leadership options (Associate or Assistant Superintendent, Principal)
  _____ Seek a private sector position in leadership, manage
  _____ Seek a post-secondary college teaching position
Appendix B: Emotify Assessment

EMOTIFY

Predict interpersonal, team and leadership effectiveness

Emotify, a Revelian Emotional Intelligence Assessment, is one of the world’s few ability-based measures of emotional intelligence (EI). The development of Emotify has been guided by the ability-based model of EI first proposed by Mayer and Salovey (1997).

Emotify is comprised of two separate assessments: Matching Faces and Emotional Ties. Matching faces requires candidates to identify the emotion displayed on a person’s face, while Emotional Ties requires candidates to read a number of everyday situations and predict the types of emotional consequences that may arise as a result of these situations. These assessments have been specifically developed to assess a candidate’s ability to accurately perceive emotions and effectively understand the connections between emotions and situations that lead to specific emotional reactions.

Emotify uses a device-agnostic approach and natively displays in common browsers without the need to download any additional plugins or settings to ensure that all candidates have a positive and frictionless testing experience no matter the operating system, device type or size.

Assessment information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>ROLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two key aspects of emotional intelligence: emotional perception and emotional understanding.</td>
<td>Use for all roles, especially when interpersonal interaction is an important factor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DETAILS</th>
<th>DEVICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two separate ability-based mini-assessments. Approx. 20 minutes to complete both mini assessments.</td>
<td>Device-agnostic: take the test wherever you are on a digital device of your choosing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fast facts about emotional intelligence

- Higher Emotional Intelligence scores have been linked with better leadership skills, improved performance and stronger interpersonal and social skills.
- Candidates with below-average scores on Emotify were twice as likely to be involved in conflict at work or have a hard time coping with stressful events when compared with candidates with average or higher scores.
- 84% of candidates who completed Emotify said they would recommend that employers use the assessment in recruitment.

Candidate Feedback:

“Getting to understand others’ emotions in the workplace can really help to understand people.”

“I think it was a great exercise and will be an ideal test to help someone to understand peoples’ different emotions.”

It’s a unique experience compared to other tests, somewhat enjoyable even though it’s an assessment.

Unique and fun way to assess a candidate’s abilities.

It was clear and engaging!

The test was entertaining but still objective.

I liked the concept of the assessment, particularly judging peoples’ faces, it was nice to try something new.

I very much liked the concept behind these tests: It gives employers a better understanding of a candidates perception of emotions.”
SCORING AND REPORTING

The Emotify score is produced from two separate mini assessments: Emotional Ties and Matching Faces.

1. The candidate's overall score is compared to one or more comparison groups.

   ![Comparison Score Diagram]

2. The score is given a rating of Far Below Average to Far Above Average and a percentile, which shows how the candidate compares to others in the group.

Results indicate ability to perceive and understand emotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEOPLE WHO SCORE IN THE BOTTOM RANGE:</th>
<th>PEOPLE WHO SCORE IN THE MIDDLE RANGE:</th>
<th>PEOPLE WHO SCORE IN THE TOP RANGE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May have difficulty identifying emotions in people</td>
<td>Will usually identify the appropriate emotion in themselves and others</td>
<td>Are highly accurate in identifying different emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are most likely to misinterpret emotional situations and events</td>
<td>Generally interpret emotional situations and events correctly</td>
<td>Are highly skilled in interpreting emotional situations and events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are most likely to be unsure how emotions are influenced by different situations</td>
<td>Usually understand the connection between emotions and situations and how emotions change and evolve</td>
<td>Accurately understand how emotions change and evolve in different situations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BELOW AVERAGE (0-19%) | AVERAGE (20-79%) | ABOVE AVERAGE (80-100%)
### Appendix C: Raw Data Collection by Subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjec t #</th>
<th>Emotify Percentile</th>
<th>Rankin g</th>
<th>Perceivin g Emotions</th>
<th>Understandin g Emotions</th>
<th>Managin g Emotion s</th>
<th>Gende r</th>
<th>Educatio n</th>
<th>Yrs as Sup t</th>
<th>Curren t Distric t</th>
<th>3-Yr Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject #</td>
<td>Emotify Percentile</td>
<td>Ranking</td>
<td>Perceiving Emotions</td>
<td>Understand Emotions</td>
<td>Managing Emotions</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Yrs as Supt</td>
<td>Current District</td>
<td>3-Yr Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>