Emotional Intelligence and Job Performance of Public Elementary School Principals and Teachers in San Antonio, Nueva Ecija

Faye Marie S. Ilano

San Antonio District, Division of Nueva Ecija, Philippines

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100900836

Received: 07 October 2026; Accepted: 12 October 2026; Published: 24 October 2026

ABSTRACT

Quality principals and teachers are valuable assets within the field of education. Their emotional intelligence (EI) plays an important role in managing emotions, building relationships, and working towards the goals of the school. This study aimed to determine the emotional intelligence of public elementary school principals and teachers and examine its relationship with their profiles and job performance in the District of San Antonio, Nueva Ecija, during School Year 2019–2020. A descriptive correlational research design was employed. The respondents were 19 principals and 184 teachers from 19 public elementary schools. The Emotional and Social Competency Inventory was used to assess 12 competencies across self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management. Job performance was described using the principals' Office Performance Commitment and Review Form and the teachers' Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form ratings. Frequency, percentage, weighted mean, and Pearson correlation were used to analyze the data. The principals obtained an overall EI weighted mean of 4.46, interpreted as very high, while the teachers obtained 4.18, interpreted as high. Teamwork received the highest rating in both groups. Eighteen principals had outstanding performance ratings, while 142 teachers had very satisfactory ratings. Teachers' age and years in service were positively correlated with EI, with $r = .157$, $p = .033$ and $r = .216$, $p = .003$, respectively. No significant relationship was found between principals' profile variables and EI. EI was not significantly correlated with principals' performance ratings ($r = .120$, $p = .623$) or teachers' performance ratings ($r = -.072$, $p = .329$). The findings identify areas for continued professional development while showing that high EI ratings were not significantly associated with the performance ratings used in this study.

Keywords: emotional intelligence, job performance, school principals, elementary teachers, professional development

INTRODUCTION

Quality principals and teachers are valuable assets within the field of education. They take the leading role in educating young minds and developing a knowledge-based community. The standards set for principals and teachers play a significant role in schools' performance. Among these standards is that of their emotional intelligence (EI). It is one of the necessary factors in enhancing job performance as it is vital in the effectiveness and success of principals and their teachers.

Goleman (1995) brought the construct of EI to wider attention and emphasized the importance of understanding and managing emotions. In education, principals and teachers take a leading role in developing young minds, making decisions, and maintaining relationships with members of the school community.

Enhancing one's EI is very important, particularly at the workplace, as workplaces are usually relational environments. A school's success is greatly affected by its personnel's emotional intelligence, and it could rise or fall due to emotional management or misdirection. Thus, through EI, people have the power to understand, manage, and judge emotions. Principals and teachers take a more significant role in making

choices throughout the school year as they work for the school. Once EI is improved, they can recognize people's feelings and examine their perspectives, making it easier to resolve conflicts within the organization.

Principals and their teachers' EI play a vital role in terms of management and teaching. Furthermore, managing feelings expressed appropriately and effectively enables people to work together smoothly towards achieving an organization's goal. Emotional intelligence skills may lead to a change in the way schools hire, train, and improve their employees' work.

This study sought to determine the extent of emotional intelligence and its relationship with the performance ratings of principals and teachers in the District of San Antonio, Nueva Ecija. Its results may serve as documentation for districts when proposing professional development in emotional intelligence and identifying competencies that need continued support.

THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The study is anchored on Goleman's theory of emotional intelligence (1998). In his definition, EI is "the capability for recognizing our feelings, and of other people, managing our emotions in a relationship, and motivating ourselves." He targeted the influence of EI on a personality's skilled performance. Goleman's model of EI introduced five primary EI constructs and 25 competencies. Over the years, As Goleman and Boyatzis (1996) teamed up to develop these competencies, it turned into Emotional Competency Inventory (ECI) developed into Emotional and social competency inventory (ESCI), which made the four clusters that focused on self-awareness, self-management, relationship management, and social awareness with its 12 competencies. They believe that focusing on different specific competencies can guide people in exploring and developing their EI.

The four domains embody 12 competencies and consist of personal competency and social competency. The primary domain, self-awareness, means having a deep understanding of one's emotions, strengths, weaknesses, wants, and drives. Self-awareness is the foundation that the remaining domain depends on. Being self-aware is the ability to understand our own emotions and how it affects our wellbeing. Self-management, the second domain, builds on self-awareness, the more open people tend to be with their own emotions, the more adept they will be reading their feelings. It includes a propensity for reflection and thoughtfulness, comfort with ambiguity, changes, and integrity – a capability to say no to impulsive urges (Goleman, 1998). The third domain, social awareness, is defined as the ability to sympathize with others and things. Social awareness may be a necessary ingredient in leadership. One who is socially aware can envision subtleties in visual communication and listen to emotional messages behind people's words. The last domain, relationship management, is described as friendliness with a purpose: moving individuals in the right direction. Relationship management incorporates persuasion, conflict management, collaboration, and handling people's emotions; it permits leaders to place their emotional intelligence to work. (Goleman et al., 2002).

RELATED LITERATURE

Salovey and Mayer (1997) proposed the first EI model, which consists of emotional intelligence, imagination, cognition, and personality; this theoretical model motivated EI's first ability-based tests. Furthermore, they described social intelligence as the ability for constructive thinking that is adaptive to an environment. Moreover, they see EI as a subset of social intelligence and constructed their seminal definition of EI as the ability to oversee one's own and other people's feelings and emotions and determine and apply this information to lead one's thought and conduct. EI principles have been grounded in the field, whether it regards emotional and social intelligence among teachers and school leaders (Akomolafe & Olatomide, 2013; Bedessem-Chandler, 2014; Berkovich & Eyal, 2017; Grobler, 2014; Juma, 2013; Pierce, 2014; Sun & Leithwood, 2015; Taliadorou & Pashiardis, 2015).

An EI-based theory of performance was created by Goleman (1995), which contains a set of guidelines of competencies that are associated with leadership towards success. He claims one's EI can grasp and manage

one's emotions and feelings, producing influential, persuasive leaders. He created five EI domains that embody self-awareness, managing emotions, motivating oneself, empathy, and social skills. The five domains represent 25 competencies and consist of personal competency and social competency. Self-awareness is the ability to acknowledge and perceive one's moods and emotions and recognize how it affects one's behavior and performance. While on the other hand, managing emotions is the ability to control one's feelings, making sound decisions. Another competency is social skills, and it is the power to take care of sensible relationships and build a good network. Motivating oneself is the ability to face challenges and be optimistic about guiding one's emotions into achieving one's goals. Another competence is empathy; it is derived from the Greek word empatheia, which means feeling into a term used by theoreticians to explain the power to understand another person's subjective expertise (Goleman, 1998). Later on, Goleman, Boyatzis, and Hay group (2011) developed the emotional and social competency inventory. It consists of 12 measured competencies separated into four clusters Self Awareness, Self-Management, Social Awareness, and Relationship Management.

Emotions are temporary, vehement, and generally used at work. Although emotions could seem trivial for an organization, it has consequences for obtaining the job done. A leader's mild anxiety may indicate that one thing wants much attention and careful thought, or sometimes a risky situation and an excessive amount of optimism will cause ignoring dangers. Feeling good improves a person's mental efficiency, makes one better understand information, uses decision rules in complex judgments, and helps one become more flexible in their thinking (Goleman, Boyatzis & McKee 2002).

The 21st-century educational system is stressful as it is. Therefore the EI of a person might rise or fall depending upon how an individual manages it. Researches over the years suggest that EI is essential in a wide range of settings, including education, business, and accounts and that EI is related to achievement, productivity, leadership, personal health, and job performance (Hopkins, O'Neil & Williams, 2007; Maamari & Shouweiry, 2016; Rahman & Ferdausy 2014). Moreover, another study found a connection between EI related to an individual's job performance, motivation, decision making, successful management, and leadership (Assanova & McGuire, 2009). Another study reported that teachers with high overall teaching stress had lower job satisfaction (Klassen and Chiu, 2010). Furthermore, investigators from various research fields have highlighted the importance of understanding EI as a significant basis for personal performance, relationships, and generating competencies that are important "in almost any job" (Cherniss, 2000). Thus, individuals with higher EI were more likely to exhibit higher performance in their organizations, as study shows (Dokhtar et al., 2014; Mohamad & Jais, 2016; Rangarajan & Jayamala, 2014; Shamsuddin & Rahman, 2014; Vratskikh et al., 2016). Moreover, teachers can only be effective in their work if they are in the right environment and experiencing job satisfaction to encourage motivation, commitment, and quality work (Akomolafe & Adebayo, 2012; Akomolafe & Olatomide, 2013). It is found that employees with high EI tend to use their emotions to socialize in their workplace, leading to better job performance (Dhany & Sharma, 2015). EI is seen as an effective way of increasing employees' job performance and job satisfaction. EI ensures effective job performance of individuals (Goleman, 2006)

The selection of personnel for valid performance rating and the correction of deficiencies in individuals' job behavior in service depended upon rating procedures. In the Department of Education, most evaluations are done through performance ratings. In 2015, the Department of Education (DepEd) issued Guidelines on the Establishment and Implementation of the Results-based Performance Management System (RPMS) under DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015, known to follow the Civil Service Commission Memorandum Circular No. 06, s. 2012.

Teachers and principals identify their job performance through a tool called Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS). This tool is utilized to ensure that the personnel upholds efficient, timely, and quality performance. Every school year, teachers and principals work towards achieving the objectives as required by the RPMS. In the process, documents regarding their performance for the year are needed to show that they complied with the guidelines (DepEd issued Order No. 2, s. 2015). This was signed into policy by Secretary Maria Leonor Briones of the Department of Education through DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017. The Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) have been developed and nationally validated to validate teacher's quality on the field (DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017). This helps teachers and

principals to assess their performance throughout the year. The RPMS is an organization-wide process of ensuring that employees work towards achieving the DepEd vision, mission, values, and strategic priorities. It manages, monitors, and measures performance and identifies the human resource and organizational development needs inside the department (DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017). It is an essential tool in every organization, especially in education. It is a basis to determine the employee's strengths and weaknesses that need to be developed to have a general idea of their role within the organization's structure.

Furthermore, a study suggested a relationship between leadership and EI and regarded EI as an essential element for any leader (Yusof, Kadir, Mahfar, 2014). Therefore, they can make their position more effective and efficient as they have the power and responsibility of making decisions in the organization (Sonnentag & Volmer, 2010). To reduce the distress associated with transformation and positively affect change, school leaders must recognize various emotions and needs of stakeholders and respond in a manner suited to the situation (Nelson & Low, 2011). This ability is often not developed, although it is a critical skill that is necessary due to a lack of training and programs that may help manage emotions. Managing one's feelings is a challenging task for both the principals and teachers, for they also need to deal with the stakeholder's emotions.

The study of EI has brought to the forefront the role of non-cognitive skills in the workplace. It has highlighted the importance of emotions and emotional competencies in performance in many occupations and professions, including teaching (Dolev & Leshem, 2017). The role of a school principal and its teachers is more complicated than ever. As it involves the interaction with the faculty, the EI of school leaders is essential for understanding how principals affect student achievement. A study suggests that EI is a vital influence on career and leadership success (Nelson and Low, 2011). Moreover, Goleman et al. (2014) found that high levels of EI create a climate in which information sharing, trust, healthy risk-taking, and learning flourish.

Principals' and teachers' EI affects how they work and socialize with their stakeholders. High EI helps people achieve work goals, improve their work-life balance, encourage others, and be ready to work well with people. School principals are responsible for ensuring teachers are well trained in developing and delivering rigorous instruction to engage students and ultimately promote high student achievement levels. Principals need to be self-aware to determine their strengths and cultivate them towards their effectiveness in the organization. Great principals should know who they are, what they do, and how others perceive them (Whitaker 2012). In an organization like the educational setting, the person with the most power is the emotional sender who sets everyone's emotional tone (Goleman, 2011). When people share common values and objectives, they are more likely to excel in achieving a common goal than when people work individually. People who are sensitive to their emotions and the impact of their feelings on others will be more active leaders (Northouse 2016).

A person with a high EI level can empower people to take advantage of the available opportunities, especially their personal development, to achieve the same goals. EI also helps with selecting personnel for valid performance ratings, and the correction of deficiencies in the job behavior of individuals in service is dependent upon rating procedures. Without EI, a person can be analytical, smart, and have the best training, but he still will not make a great leader (Goleman, 2014). In education, performance tools are utilized to know if the personnel is upholding its performance rating. The national adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) is a performance tool to observe teachers and rate them based on their annual performance (DepEd Order 42 s.2017).

Furthermore, researches have been tested for links between EI, affect at work, and job satisfaction among 523 educators in Greece (Kafetsios and Zampetakis, 2008). The results showed that EI is a significant predictor of work affectivity and job satisfaction in educational settings. Results also indicated that positive and negative affect at work substantially mediates EI's relationship and job satisfaction, positively affecting a more substantial influence (Kafetsios and Zampetakis, 2008). Among the four EI dimensions used, emotion and emotion regulation were significant predictors of affect at work, whereas perceiving others' feelings was uniquely associated with job satisfaction. Such job satisfaction may likely translate into better job performance as it helps them understand their students in a better way.

EI's ability model suggests EI skills can be taught and that individuals can learn and improve their competence in each of the four branches of EI. Emotional competencies are not innate abilities. However, it is a learned capability that has worked on and might be developed to attain outstanding performance. Goleman's analysis points out that leaders' EI affects their effectiveness and success (Goleman,1999). Many researchers have been investigating how emotions affect people's behaviors. EI's concept emerged within the professional and academic domains of psychology in the 1990s (Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso 2004; Prentice, 2013). EI involves abilities that can be categorized as self-awareness, empathy, managing emotions, self-motivation, and handling relationships with others (Goleman 1995). Bar-On (1997) identified five interactive EI dimensions, including adaptability, intrapersonal skills, stress management, interpersonal skills, and general mood. He describes EI as a way of adapting to the external environment. Recent research in education also emphasizes the importance of adaptability among teachers, particularly when navigating unfamiliar professional, cultural, and educational environments (Bautista & De Castro, 2025). Goleman (1998) stressed that more and more companies see that encouraging EI skills is vital to any organization's management philosophy. Another study claimed that a significant EI function area is in the educational field (Seema, 2012).

EI is important because it influences what people do (Madhar, 2010). With all these, teachers' and principals' EI play a vital role in classroom management. One thing is sure: EI increases with age as a person matures. However, some people still need training to enhance their EI. Unfortunately, too many training programs that intend to build leadership skills- including EI - are a waste of time and money. The problem is simple: they focus on the wrong part of the brain (Goleman, 1998). In an organization, training is essential, primarily when it focuses on developing the organization's members. Training helps the members boost their job satisfaction and job morale, improving their performance rating. Well-trained principals and teachers show both quantity and quality in their performance. Research stated that EI is primarily used within organizations to determine a person's skills, personality, and leadership ability appropriate to a specific position (Joseph & Newman, 2010).

Nelson and Low (2011) built upon the work of Salovey and Mayer, and Goleman. Their model of EI is an education and skill-based approach to EI. Their framework is based on the belief that emotionally intelligent people can think constructively, behave wisely, and develop these skills to enhance their personal, academic, and career excellence. The Goleman et al. (2002) model is similar to the EI model developed by Mayer and Salovey (1990) in that it utilizes the model but also assigns characteristics or traits into a compound conception, or mixed model of EI (Mayer et al., 2000).

Emotionally intelligent individuals have some competencies and skills which help in their daily and social life. Emotional-social intelligence is a complex set of interrelated emotional and social competencies, the skill to influence one's ability to recognize, understand and manage emotions to relate with others, to adapt to change, and solve problems to cope with the daily challenges and pressure (Bar-On, 2006).

Research Objectives and Scope

The researcher aimed to describe the profiles, emotional intelligence, and performance ratings of principals and teachers; determine whether their profile variables were significantly related to EI; and examine whether EI was significantly related to their performance ratings.

The study focused on 19 principals and 184 teachers from public elementary schools in the District of San Antonio, Division of Nueva Ecija, during School Year 2019–2020. The findings may help principals and teachers assess their emotional competencies and identify areas for professional development.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design and Setting

The descriptive correlational method was employed to determine the EI of principals and teachers in the District of San Antonio and examine its relationship with their performance ratings. This design examined

the direction and magnitude of relationships among variables without an active intervention by the researcher. The study was conducted in 19 public elementary schools in the District of San Antonio, Division of Nueva Ecija, during School Year 2019–2020.

Respondents and Sampling Procedure

The respondents were 19 principals and 184 teachers. Principals had served in their role for at least one year, while participating teachers had taught for at least one year in a school with a participating principal. The two participant groups were recruited through convenience sampling. Respondents voluntarily provided their RPMS ratings.

The study included a teacher population of 342 and used Slovin's formula, $n = N / (1 + Ne^2)$, with a 5% margin of error to estimate a target sample of approximately 184 teachers. The use of this formula for the target sample size did not make the actual convenience sampling procedure random. Consequently, population representativeness cannot be assumed.

Research Instruments

The Emotional and Social Competency Inventory (ESCI) was the primary instrument. Developed by Richard Boyatzis, Daniel Goleman, and Korn Ferry Hay Group, it assesses 12 emotional and social competencies across four domains (Korn Ferry, 2017).

The study used self-assessment and colleague ratings through the online survey platform. The teachers' Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) and the principals' Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF) were used to describe job performance under the RPMS (Department of Education, 2015).

Raters assessed how consistently respondents demonstrated the behaviors described by the survey items. The response options were 5 = consistently, 4 = often, 3 = sometimes, 2 = rarely, 1 = never, and 0 = don't know. The study used the following weighted-mean interpretation bands: 4.20–5.00, very high; 3.40–4.19, high; 2.60–3.39, average; 1.80–2.59, low; and 1.00–1.79, very low.

Data Gathering Procedure and Confidentiality

Permission from the Schools Division Superintendent, District Supervisors, and School Heads of the elementary schools in the District of San Antonio was sought before the administration of the instruments.

During data collection, the purpose, significance, and objectives of the study were relayed to the respondents. The researcher administered the questionnaires through the Korn Ferry online survey platform to teachers and principals in the 19 schools. Participants provided colleague email addresses for the 360-degree ESCI assessment.

They were assured that their information would be used solely for the study and that their identities would remain confidential. In some instances, return visits were made to clarify items that needed further explanation. After data collection, the gathered information was organized and tabulated to answer the research objectives.

Statistical Treatment

Microsoft Excel and the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences were used to analyze the gathered data. Frequency and percentage described the respondents' profiles and performance ratings. Weighted mean described their emotional intelligence competencies. Pearson r was used to examine the relationships between profile variables and EI, and between performance ratings and EI. The reported tests used two-tailed significance levels of .05 and .01.

RESULTS

Profiles of the Respondents

Tables 1 and 2 present the profiles of the principal-respondents and teacher-respondents. The largest principal age group was 50–59 years old, with 9 respondents or 47.4%. Eleven principals or 57.9% were female, and 9 or 47.4% had a master's degree. Among the teachers, the largest age group was 40–49 years old, with 61 respondents or 33.2%. Most teachers were female, and 99 or 53.8% had served for 1–10 years.

Table 1: Profile of the principal-respondents

Variable	Category	n	Percentage
Age	below 40 years old	1	5.3
Age	40 - 49 years old	7	36.8
Age	50 - 59 years old	9	47.4
Age	60 years old above	2	10.5
Sex	Male	8	42.1
Sex	Female	11	57.9
Highest Educational Attainment	With Units in Master's Degree	5	26.3
Highest Educational Attainment	Master's Degree	9	47.4
Highest Educational Attainment	Doctorate Degree	5	26.3
Years in Service	19-Oct	4	21.1
Years in Service	20 - 29	7	36.8
Years in Service	30 - 39	8	42.1
Length of Service as School Head in the Present School	2 years	12	63.2
Length of Service as School Head in the Present School	3 years	3	15.8
Length of Service as School Head in the Present School	4 years	2	10.5
Length of Service as School Head in the Present School	5 years above	2	10.5
Length of Service as School Head	1 - 5 years	2	10.5
Length of Service as School Head	6 - 10 years	2	10.5
Length of Service as School Head	11 - 15 years	6	31.6
Length of Service as School Head	16 - 20 years	5	26.3
Length of Service as School Head	21 - 25 years	4	21.1

Note: n = 19 principals.

Table 2: Profile of the teacher-respondents

Variable	Category	n	Percentage
Age	29 years old below	37	20.1
Age	30 - 39 years old	59	32.1
Age	40 - 49 years old	61	33.2
Age	50 - 59 years old	26	14.1
Age	60 years old above	1	0.5

Sex	Male	25	13.6
Sex	Female	159	86.4
Highest Educational Attainment	Bachelor's Degree	62	33.7
Highest Educational Attainment	With Units in Master's Degree	66	35.9
Highest Educational Attainment	Master's Degree	52	28.3
Highest Educational Attainment	With Units in Doctorate Degree	1	0.5
Highest Educational Attainment	Doctorate Degree	3	1.6
Years in Service	1 - 10 years	99	53.8
Years in Service	11 - 20 years	56	30.4
Years in Service	21 - 30 years	24	13
Years in Service	31 years above	5	2.7

Note: n = 184 teachers. Percentages may not total 100 because of rounding.

Emotional Intelligence of Principals and Teachers

Table 3 shows the respondents' overall EI rating classifications. Sixteen principals or 84.2% had very high ratings, while 3 or 15.8% had high ratings. Among teachers, 91 or 49.5% had very high ratings, 87 or 47.3% had high ratings, and 6 or 3.3% had average ratings. The very high category contained the largest group of teachers, although it did not constitute a majority.

Table 3: Distribution of overall emotional intelligence ratings

EI classification	Principals, n (%)	Teachers, n (%)
Very high	16 (84.2)	91 (49.5)
High	3 (15.8)	87 (47.3)
Average	0 (0.0)	6 (3.3)
Total	19 (100)	184 (100)

Table 4 presents the EI competency means. Teamwork obtained the highest weighted mean in both groups: 4.61 for principals and 4.36 for teachers. Emotional self-awareness received the lowest principal rating at 4.31, while emotional self-control received the lowest teacher rating at 4.05. Overall, principals obtained a mean of 4.46, interpreted as very high, and teachers obtained 4.18, interpreted as high.

Table 4: Emotional intelligence competency ratings

Competency	Principals	Teachers
Achievement Orientation	4.56 (Very high)	4.35 (Very high)
Adaptability	4.33 (Very high)	4.08 (High)
Conflict Management	4.39 (Very high)	4.08 (High)
Coach and Mentor	4.54 (Very high)	4.18 (High)
Empathy	4.47 (Very high)	4.25 (Very high)
Emotional Self-Awareness	4.31 (Very high)	4.11 (High)
Emotional Self-Control	4.32 (Very high)	4.05 (High)
Inspirational Leadership	4.45 (Very high)	4.09 (High)
Influence	4.41 (Very high)	4.10 (High)

Competency	Principals	Teachers
Organizational Awareness	4.51 (Very high)	4.25 (Very high)
Positive Outlook	4.58 (Very high)	4.32 (Very high)
Teamwork	4.61 (Very high)	4.36 (Very high)
Average Weighted Mean	4.46 (Very high)	4.18 (High)

Performance Ratings

Table 5 presents the performance ratings. Eighteen principals or 94.7% had outstanding OPCRF ratings, while 1 or 5.3% had a very satisfactory rating. Among the teachers, 40 or 21.7% had outstanding IPCRF ratings, 142 or 77.2% had very satisfactory ratings, and 2 or 1.1% had satisfactory ratings.

Table 5: Performance ratings of principals and teachers

Performance classification	Principals, n (%)	Teachers, n (%)
Outstanding	18 (94.7)	40 (21.7)
Very satisfactory	1 (5.3)	142 (77.2)
Satisfactory	0 (0.0)	2 (1.1)
Total	19 (100)	184 (100)

Relationships between profile variables and emotional intelligence

Table 6 shows that none of the principal profile variables had a statistically significant relationship with EI. The p-values ranged from .215 to .728. The reported findings therefore did not provide sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis for these relationships.

Table 6: Relationships between principals' profiles and emotional intelligence

Profile variable	Pearson r	p-value	n
Age	-.298	.215	19
Sex	-.195	.424	19
Highest Educational Attainment	-.086	.728	19
Years in Service	-.275	.255	19
Years as Principal	-.278	.249	19
Years as Principal in the Present School	.086	.727	19

Table 7 shows positive correlations between teachers' age and EI ($r = .157$, $p = .033$) and between years in service and EI ($r = .216$, $p = .003$). These associations were statistically significant but small in magnitude. Sex and highest educational attainment were not significantly correlated with EI, with p-values of .208 and .326, respectively.

Table 7: Relationships between teachers' profiles and emotional intelligence

Profile variable	Pearson r	p-value	n
Age	.157	.033	184
Sex	-.093	.208	184
Highest Educational Attainment	.073	.326	184
Length in Service	.216	.003	184

Relationships between emotional intelligence and performance ratings

Table 8 shows that EI was not significantly related to principals' OPCRF ratings ($r = .120$, $p = .623$) or teachers' IPCRF ratings ($r = -.072$, $p = .329$). The null hypotheses were not rejected. These findings indicate

that the study did not detect a statistically significant linear association between EI and the performance ratings used; they do not establish that EI has no role in job performance.

Table 8: Relationships between emotional intelligence and performance ratings

Respondents and performance measure	Pearson r	p-value	n
Principals, OPCRF	.120	.623	19
Teachers, IPCRF	−.072	.329	184

DISCUSSION

Emotional Competencies and Professional Development

Principals and teachers obtained high or very high EI ratings, with teamwork emerging as a strength in both groups. Managing feelings appropriately and effectively enables members of the school community to work together towards shared goals. The findings provide a basis for recognizing existing strengths while identifying competencies that may benefit from continued development.

Although all principal competency means were very high, emotional self-awareness and emotional self-control received comparatively lower ratings. Among teachers, emotional self-control, adaptability, conflict management, and inspirational leadership were among the lower-rated competencies. These findings may guide the selection of training topics without treating lower relative scores as evidence of poor performance.

Teachers' age and years in service were positively correlated with EI. These findings suggest an association between experience and emotional competencies within this sample. However, the correlations were small, and the design cannot establish that age or experience causes EI to improve. Principals' profile variables did not show statistically significant associations with EI.

Emotional Intelligence and Formal Performance Ratings

The absence of significant correlations between EI and OPCRF or IPCRF ratings differs from the broader emphasis on emotional competencies in workplace performance described by Goleman (1998). Formal appraisal scores and emotional competencies may reflect different aspects of professional practice. The findings should therefore be interpreted in relation to the measures and respondents included in the study.

Almost all principals had outstanding performance ratings, and most teachers had very satisfactory ratings. This concentration of scores may have limited the variation available for detecting associations. The small principal sample also limits the precision of conclusions for that group. These are possible explanations rather than findings tested by the study.

Proposed Emotional Intelligence Development Plan

Based on the findings, the researcher proposed an Emotional Intelligence Plan for Principals and Teachers. The plan aims to increase awareness of feelings, emotions, and thoughts; develop constructive responses during challenging situations; improve relationships; and strengthen emotional self-control, adaptability, empathy, and conflict management. The proposal was not implemented or evaluated as part of the reported study.

For principals, the proposed activities include peer interviews and mindfulness exercises for self-awareness; listening and assertiveness activities; social and emotional learning sessions focused on self-control; an empathy training series; and an active listening game for conflict management. For teachers, the plan includes similar self-awareness, empathy, and conflict management activities, together with sharing best practices and activities for managing change and improving adaptability.

The original proposal identified the public schools district supervisor, school heads, guidance coordinators, and LAC/In-Service Training chairpersons as persons responsible for implementation and monitoring. A

total proposed budget of Php 24,000 was allocated from school MOOE funds. The activity schedules in the source proposal included dates in 2022; implementation would require an updated schedule and approval. Performance ratings were proposed as monitoring indicators, but the study did not establish that the training would improve these ratings.

LIMITATIONS

The study was limited to one district and School Year 2019–2020. Convenience sampling limits generalization beyond the respondents. The correlational design cannot establish causation, and the limited variation in performance ratings may have affected the observed relationships. Pearson correlations involving coded categorical profile variables also require cautious interpretation because the coding and measurement assumptions were not fully documented.

The source manuscript did not report sample-specific reliability estimates, the precise method used to combine self-assessment and colleague ratings, the handling of "don't know" responses, or the number of completed colleague assessments per respondent. It also did not specify a formal ethics review or approval identifier. The proposed development plan should be assessed separately before claims are made about its effectiveness.

CONCLUSION

The principal-respondents had very high emotional intelligence, with an overall weighted mean of 4.46, while the teacher-respondents had high emotional intelligence, with an overall weighted mean of 4.18. Teamwork received the highest rating in both groups. Emotional self-awareness received the lowest principal rating, while emotional self-control received the lowest teacher rating.

Almost all principals had outstanding OPCRF ratings, and most teachers had very satisfactory IPCRF ratings. No significant relationship was found between principals' profile variables and EI. Teachers' age and years in service had small positive correlations with EI, while sex and highest educational attainment did not have significant relationships with EI. EI was not significantly correlated with either principals' or teachers' performance ratings.

RECOMMENDATIONS

School districts should establish professional development opportunities to assess and develop principals' and teachers' EI. Training may build on teamwork as a strength while providing opportunities to improve emotional self-awareness, emotional self-control, adaptability, empathy, and conflict management. Improving these competencies requires time, practice, and continued support.

Future researchers may conduct the study across additional districts and use a larger principal sample. Other performance indicators may also be considered alongside OPCRF and IPCRF ratings. Further studies should document instrument reliability, rater selection, score aggregation, and the treatment of missing or "don't know" responses. The proposed development plan should be implemented and evaluated before drawing conclusions about its effects on EI or job performance.

REFERENCES

1. Akomolafe, M., & Adebayo, M. (2012). Assessment of emotional intelligence among secondary school students in Ibadan Metropolis, Oyo State, Nigeria. Ife Psychologia, 20(1), 214- 228. Retrieved from https://www.ifepsychologia.org/
2. Akomolafe, M., & Olatomide, O. (2013). Job Satisfaction and Emotional Intelligence as Predictors of Organizational Commitment of Secondary School Teachers. Ife Psychologia. Retrieved from https://www.ifepsychologia.org/
3. Assanova, M., & McGuire, M. (2009). Applicability analysis of the emotional intelligence theory. Indiana University. Retrieved from

http://indiana.edu/~spea/pubs/undergrad-honors/honors_vol.3_no.1.pdf
4. Bar-On, R. (2006). The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence (ESI). Psicothema
5. Bar-On, R. (1997) Development of the BarOn EQ-i: A measure of emotional and social intelligence the 105th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association in Chicago.
6. Bautista, N. A. V. (2026). Status of the implementation of the Philippines' DepEd Computerization Program in Santa Rosa North District. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Applied Science, 11(8), 4275–4319. https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2026.1308000273
7. Bautista, N. A. V., & De Castro, L. B. (2025). Exploring the adaptability of foreign special education teachers working with students with special needs in Columbia South Carolina. International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research, 6(11), 5827–5864. https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.06.11.36
8. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2013). Household data annual averages. Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat11.pdfhttp://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat11.pdfBureau of Labor Statistics. (2014). Occupational outlook handbook: Kindergarten and elementary school teachers. Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/ooh/education-training-and-library/kindergarten-and-elementary-school-teachers.htm
9. Bedessem-Chandler, T. (2014). Teachers' perceptions of principal Leadership are based on the 21 responsibilities of a school leader as defined by Marzano, Waters, and Mcnulty (2005) (Dissertation). Retrieved from Edgewood College, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. (3613803)
10. Berkovich, I., & Eyal, O. (2017). The mediating role of principals' transformational leadership behaviors in promoting teachers' emotional wellness at work: A study in Israeli primary schools. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 45(2), 316-335. doi:10.1177/1741143215617947
11. Boyatzis, R. E., & Goleman, D. (1996, 1999, 2002, 2007,2011). Emotional Competency Inventory (now the Emotional and Social Competency Inventory). Boston, MA: The Hay Group.
12. Boyatzis, R., Goleman, D., & McKee, A. (2014). Primal leadership: The hidden driver of great performance. Harvard Business Review OnPoint.
13. Cherniss, C. (2000). Emotional intelligence: What it is and why it matters. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, New Orleans. LA. Retrieved January 20, 2020, from http://www.eiconsortium.org/research/ what_is_ emotional_ intelligence.htm.
14. Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative.
15. Department of Education (2015). DepEd issued Order No. 2, s. 2015 — "Guidelines on the Establishment and Implementation of the Results-based Performance Management System (RPMS) in the Department of Education" following Civil Service Commission
16. Department of Education (2007). DepEd Order no. 42, s. 2007 also known as the Revised Guidelines on Selection, Promotion, and Designation of School heads
17. Department of Education (1999). DepEd Order no. 7, s. 1999 states the policies on Selection/Appointment and Transfer/Reassignment of DECS Regional Officials.
18. Dokhtar, L. S. G., Talebi, M., Sabouri, S., Deloi, M. T., and Khaki, S. N. T. (2014). The Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Job Performance in Employees of Mashad University of Medical Sciences. Future of Medical Education Journal 4 and3.
19. Dolev N., Leshem S. (2017) "Developing emotional intelligence competence among teachers, volume 21."
20. Dulewicz, C., Young, M., & Dulewicz, V. (2005). The relevance of emotional intelligence for leadership performance. Journal of General Management.
21. Goleman, D. (1995). Emotional Intelligence. New York: Bantam Books.
22. Goleman, D. (1998). Working with emotional intelligence. New York: Bantam Books
23. Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). Primal Leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence.
24. Goleman, D. (2006). Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ (10th Anniversary Edition). New York: Bantam Books
25. Goleman, D. (2006). Emotional intelligence. Bantam.

26. Goleman, D. (2011). Leadership: The power of emotional intelligence. Northhampton, MA: More Than Sound LLC.
27. Goleman, D. (2014). What makes a leader: Why emotional intelligence matters. Florence, MA: More Than Sound LLC.
28. Grobler, B. (2014). Teachers' perceptions of the utilization of emotional competence by their school leaders in Gauteng, South Africa. Educational Management Administration & Leadership. doi:10.1177/1741143213513184
29. Joseph, D.L. & Newman, D.A. (2010). Emotional intelligence an integrative meta-analysis and cascading model. Journal of Applied Psychology, 95(1), 54-78.
30. Juma, D. (2013). The relationship between emotional intelligence of principals and the overall organizational climate of public elementary schools (Dissertation). Retrieved from Grand Canyon University, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
31. Kafetsios, K., & Zampetakis, L. A. (2008). Emotional intelligence and job satisfaction: Testing the mediatory role of positive and negative affect at work. Personality and Individual Differences, 44(3), 710-720
32. Maamari, B.E. and Shouweiry, M. (2016) 'Position, gender, emotional intelligence and job performance,' Int. J. Work Organisation and Emotion, Vol. 7, No. 4, pp.299–315.
33. Madhar, M. (2010). Emotional Intelligence of Teachers and Effective Class Room Management. Retrieved January 15, 2020, fromhttp://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1666122
34. Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2000). Models of emotional intelligence. In R. Bar-On & J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), The handbook of emotional intelligence. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
35. Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R.(2008). Emotional intelligence: New ability or eclectic traits?. American psychologist.
36. Mayer, J., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. (2004). Emotional Intelligence: Theory, findings, and implications. Psychological Inquiry.
37. Mohamad, Mafuzah and Jais, Juraifa (2015). Emotional Intelligence and Job Performance: A Study Among Malaysian Teachers. Procedia Economics and Finance 35: 674-682.
38. Nelson, D. B., & Low, G. R. (2011). Emotional intelligence (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Prentice-Hall.
39. Northouse, P. G. (2016). Leadership theory and practice (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
40. Pashiardis, P., & Kyriakides, L. (2010). The influence of school leadership styles and culture on students' achievement in Cyprus primary schools. Journal of Educational Administration, 48(2), 218-240. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231011027860
41. Pierce, S. (2014). Examining The Relationship Between Collective Teacher Efficacy And The Emotional Intelligence Of Elementary School Principals. Journal of School Leadership. Retrieved from http://rowman.com/Page/Journals.
42. Prentice C. (2013)Emotional labor and its consequences: The moderating effect of emotional intelligence Individual Sources, Dynamics, and Expressions of Emotion, p. 187 – 201
43. Rahman, Md & Ferdausy, Shameema. (2014). Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Job Performance Mediated by Transformational Leadership. 10.14456/ndj.2014.1.
44. Schoo, A. (2008). Leaders and their teams: learning to improve performance with emotional intelligence and using choice theory. International Journal of Reality Therapy, Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
45. Seema. (2012). Emotional Intelligence in Classroom. Retrieved February 10, 2020, from http://universallyconstructed.pbworks.com/w/file/fetch/70676575/Emotional%20Intelligence%20in%20Classroom.pdf
46. Shamsuddin, Noorazzila and Rahman, Ramlee Abdul (2014). The Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Job Performance of Call Centre Agents.Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences 129: 75-81
47. Sonnentag, S., Volmer, J., & Spychala, A. (2008). Job Performance. The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Behavior. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849200448
48. Spiro, J. D. (2013). Effective principals in action. Phi Delta Kappan, 94(8). https://doi.org./10.1177/003172171309400807
49. Sun, J., & Leithwood, K. (2015). Leadership Effects on Student Learning Mediated by Teacher Emotions. Societies, 5, 566-582. doi:10.3390/soc5030566

50. Taliadorou, N., & Pashiardis, P. (2015). Examining the role of emotional intelligence and political skill to educational Leadership and their effects on teachers' job satisfaction. Journal of Educational Administration, 53(5), 642-666. doi:10.1108/JEA-02-2014-0025
51. Vratskikh, I., Masa'deh, R., Al-Lozi, M., and Maqableh, M. 2016. The Impact of Emotional Intelligence on Job Performance via the Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction. International Journal of Business and Management 11(2): 69-91.
52. Whitaker, T. (2012). What great principals do differently. New York, NY: Eye on Education
53. Wiley, J. W. (2010).The impact of effective Leadership on employee engagement. Employment Relations Today.
54. Zafer Ünal & Aslihan Ünal. (2012). The impact of years of teaching experience on the classroom management approaches of elementary school teachers. International Journal of Instruction, 5(2), e-ISSN: 1308-1470 ● www.e-iji.net p-ISSN: 1694-609X