

## **Emotional Intelligence and Work Stress Among Teachers at the Senior High School Department in a University**

**Mario Ramil R. Pepito, PhD.**

Dean, College of Hotel and Restaurant Management, University of Cebu-Main Campus  
ORCID:0000-0001-7716-5776 | pepitomarioramil68@gmail.com

**Earl Dave V. Rocha, PhD.**

Professor, College of Hotel and Restaurant Management, University of Cebu-Main Campus  
ORCID: 0000-0002-7286-1673 | earluc@gmail.com

**Victoria S. Amadora, PhD.**

Professor, College of Hotel and Restaurant Management, University of Cebu-Main Campus  
ORCID: 0009-0005-1576-6599 | victoria\_amadora@hotmail.com

**Glenn R. Andrin, EdD., PhD.**

Adjunct Professor, La Consolacion College-Bacolod  
ORCID:0000-0002-3008-5661 | drandringlenn@gmail.com

**Flornel Joy A. Macahine, LPT**

Academic Coordinator, Joji Ilagan Stockbridge School

**DOI:** 10.5281/zenodo.16742172

**LINK:** <https://risejournals.org/index.php/imjrise/article/view/1375>

### **Abstract**

This study examined the relationship between emotional intelligence (EI) and work stress among 37 Senior High School teachers at the University of Cebu-Maritime Education Training Center (SY 2022-2023). Using validated instruments (Emotional Competence Profiler, Occupational Roles Questionnaire), quantitative analysis assessed EI across seven dimensions and work stress across six domains. Results indicated "Very Good" overall EI levels among teachers, with Interpersonal Relations scoring highest. Work stress was moderate overall, though Role Overload emerged as the most significant stressor. Demographic factors (age, sex, civil status, education, experience, employment status) significantly correlated with both EI and stress levels. However, no significant correlation was found between overall EI and work stress. Significant variance existed across EI and stress dimensions. The findings suggest demographic variables influence stress more than EI in this context, highlighting the need for targeted administrative support.

**Keywords:** Emotional Intelligence, Work Stress, Teachers, Senior High School, Role Overload, Demographic Factors, UC-METC.

### **Introduction**

Emotional Intelligence (EI), defined as the ability to perceive, understand, assimilate, and manage emotions, has significant impacts on both individual and organizational outcomes. Research demonstrates that higher EI predicts better job performance, contributes to leadership effectiveness and career success, correlates with improved physical, mental, and psychosomatic health, and influences levels of occupational stress. Consequently, organizations across various industries are increasingly implementing EI development programs. The rationale is the belief that enhancing EI leads to individual benefits like reduced stress and improved well-being, while also improving overall organizational functioning, including management performance.

Teaching is widely recognized as a highly stressful occupation, often experiencing disproportionately high stress levels compared to other professions. This chronic stress negatively impacts teachers' health, job satisfaction, absenteeism rates, and retention. Researchers emphasize that teaching involves significant "emotional labor," requiring teachers to manage their emotions and expressions to meet organizational expectations ("display rules"). This frequent clash between required and genuine emotions creates confusion, stress, and emotional masking. Given the high levels of stress and its detrimental economic and health consequences, interventions aimed at supporting teacher well-being and reducing stress are critically needed.

Teachers at the University of Cebu-Maritime Education Training Center (UC-METC) Senior High School Department face particularly high stress and burnout risk due to multiple, complex, and changing demands. Key stressors include intensified workloads from policy changes and Department of Education requirements, large class sizes, lack of resources and support, heightened accountability pressures (like Integrated Quality Management Systems),

expanded roles under the K-12 curriculum (including managing diverse learners with challenges), concerns over salary and status, and diminished self-esteem stemming from their transfer from the College department. The purpose of the specific research mentioned was to evaluate the EI levels and occupational stress experienced by these senior high school teachers at UC-METC, particularly focusing on the impact of their sudden transfer from their previous teaching context.

### **Theoretical Background**

School-based management is conceptually rooted in Ludwig von Bertalanffy's General System. The concept of EI, recognizing the crucial role of emotions in intellectual functioning and behavior, gained prominence through Salovey and Mayer's (1990) foundational work. They defined EI as encompassing four hierarchical abilities: perceiving, using, understanding, and managing emotions to foster growth. This "ability model" conceptualizes EI as a distinct intelligence involving mental processing of emotional information. An alternative perspective, the "mixed model" (e.g., Bar-On), views EI as a blend of emotion-related competencies and personality traits. These models led to different measurement approaches: performance-based ability tests (like the MSCEIT, designed to assess actual emotional abilities with more or less correct answers) and self-report trait measures (like the Bar-On EQ-i and SUEIT, assessing beliefs about one's emotional abilities). Research suggests EI correlates with positive outcomes like better health, stress management, job performance, and leadership effectiveness, with females often scoring higher and links observed to personality traits like agreeableness and openness.

High levels of EI act as a significant buffer against occupational stress, moderating the relationship between stressors and negative outcomes like burnout and poor health. Individuals with high EI demonstrate greater resilience, coping effectiveness, and report lower stress levels. Consequently, EI is strongly linked to favorable workplace outcomes, including higher job satisfaction, increased organizational commitment, better job performance, lower absenteeism, and enhanced teamwork. Research indicates EI correlates positively with job satisfaction (both internal aspects like responsibility and external aspects like pay) and organizational commitment, sometimes mediated through job satisfaction. Recognizing these benefits, organizations increasingly seek to promote EI, viewing it as a key factor for employee well-being, performance, and success not fully explained by IQ or personality alone.

Teaching is identified as a highly stressful profession due to factors like workload, discipline issues, lack of resources, and complex roles, leading to consequences like low job satisfaction and high attrition. Research demonstrates that EI plays a critical buffering role for teachers, mitigating occupational stress and its negative impacts on psychological and physical health, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Crucially, studies (e.g., Slaski & Cartwright, 2002; Gardner, 2005; Nelis et al., 2009) provide evidence that EI is developable through targeted training programs. These interventions have been shown to successfully increase EI levels, reduce stress experiences and its negative outcomes (like burnout and health issues), and improve overall teacher well-being. Therefore, developing teachers' EI is presented as a valuable strategy to enhance their resilience, job satisfaction, commitment, and health, ultimately benefiting both educators and their schools.

### **THE PROBLEM**

This study investigated the relationship between emotional intelligence (EI) and work stress among Senior High School teachers at a university during the 2022-2023 school year, with the findings intended to inform recommendations. Specifically, it aimed to answer the following questions: 1) What is the demographic profile of respondents regarding age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, years of service, and employment status? 2) What is the level of respondents' Emotional Intelligence across the dimensions of emotional literacy, self-esteem/self-regard, self-management, self-motivation, change resilience, interpersonal relations, and integration of heart and head? 3) What is the level of respondents' work stress concerning role overload, role insufficiency, role ambiguity, role boundary, responsibility, and physical environment? 4) Is there a significant relationship between respondents' demographic profile and their a) EI or b) work stress? 5) Is there a significant correlation between the overall level of EI and work stress? 6) Are there significant variances in the different dimensions of EI and work stress? 7) What recommendations can be formulated based on the findings? The study tested three null hypotheses at the 0.05 significance level: Ho1 (no significant relationship between demographic profile and EI or work stress), Ho2 (no significant correlation between overall EI and work stress), and Ho3 (no significant variances among the different dimensions of EI and work stress).

### **Methodology**

This study employed a quantitative research design utilizing structured questionnaires to numerically measure social phenomena and statistically analyze variable relationships (Babbie & Mouton, 2002). The investigation was conducted at the University of Cebu – Maritime Education and Training Center (UC-METC) in Cebu City, focusing specifically on its Senior High School Department. A census sampling approach included all 37 faculty members of this department during the 2022-2023 academic year.

Three validated instruments were administered: 1) A demographic questionnaire capturing participant profiles (age, sex, civil status, education, years of service, employment status); 2) The Emotional Competence Profiler (ECP) measuring seven EI dimensions (Emotional Literacy, Self-Esteem, Self-Management, Self-Motivation, Change Resilience, Interpersonal Relations, and Integration of Head and Heart) through 46 items using a 7-point Likert scale (Wolmarans, 2001), where higher scores indicated greater EI competence; and 3) The Occupational Roles Questionnaire (ORQ; Osipow, 1998) assessing work stress across six domains (Role Overload, Role Insufficiency, Role Ambiguity, Role Boundary, Responsibility, Physical Environment). Formal permission was obtained from the Graduate School Dean prior to data collection, with questionnaires distributed and retrieved within a 5-day period following coordination with department leadership.

**Table 2.**  
**Respondents' Profile**  
**(n = 35)**

| AGE                               | <i>f</i> | Percentage |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------------|
| 20-29                             | 20       | 57.14%     |
| 30-39                             | 9        | 25.71%     |
| 40-49                             | 3        | 8.57%      |
| 50-60                             | 3        | 8.57%      |
| SEX                               | <i>f</i> | Percentage |
| Female                            | 13       | 37.14%     |
| Male                              | 22       | 62.86%     |
| CIVIL STATUS                      | <i>f</i> | Percentage |
| Married                           | 12       | 34.29%     |
| Single                            | 23       | 65.71%     |
| HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT    | <i>f</i> | Percentage |
| BS degree                         | 17       | 48.57%     |
| BS with MA/MS/MBA/MA/MST units    | 8        | 22.86%     |
| MA/MS/MBA/MST with Doctoral units | 1        | 2.86%      |
| Masters degree                    | 9        | 25.71%     |
| YEARS IN TEACHING                 | <i>f</i> | Percentage |
| 11 – 15 years                     | 2        | 5.71%      |
| 15 – 20 years                     | 1        | 2.86%      |
| 6 – 10 years                      | 12       | 34.29%     |
| Below 5 years                     | 20       | 57.14%     |
| EMPLOYEE STATUS                   | <i>f</i> | Percentage |
| Probationary                      | 25       | 71.43%     |
| Tenured                           | 10       | 28.57%     |

Data analysis involved descriptive statistics to characterize profiles, EI levels, and stress dimensions, supplemented by inferential analyses: chi-square tests examined relationships between demographic profiles and EI/stress variables ( $H_{01}$ ), Pearson's correlation assessed EI-stress associations ( $H_{02}$ ), and ANOVA compared variances across EI/stress dimensions ( $H_{03}$ ), with all hypotheses tested at  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

### Presentation and Analysis of Findings

**On Profile.** This term refers to the age, gender, civil status, highest educational attainment, and employment status among the respondents. The table below shows the data gathered on this aspect.

It can be seen in table 2, on age distribution, that 20 or 51.14% of the respondents belong to the 20 – 29 years old age bracket; 9 or 25.71% belong to the 30- 39 years old age bracket while 3 or 8.57% belong to the 40 – 49 age bracket and another 3 belong to the 50 – 60 age bracket.

I  
As for sex, 22 or 62.86% of the respondents are male while 13 or 37.14% are female. As for civil status 23 or 65.71% are single and the rest are married. As for their highest educational attainment, 17 or 48.57% of the respondents are BS degree holders; 8 or 22.86% have BS with MA/MS/MBA/MST units; 1 or 2.86% have Doctoral units while 9 or 25.72% are Masters degree holders

As for years in teaching, 20 or 57.14% 5 have less than 5 years teaching experience; 12 or 34.29% have been teaching for 6 – 10 years; 2 or 5.71% have 11-15 years teaching experience while only 1 or 2.86% have been teaching for more than 15 years. As for employee status, 25 or 71.43% are probationary while the rest are tenured.

**On Emotional Literacy.** This refers to the ability to understand one's emotions, the ability to listen to others and empathise with their emotions, and the ability to express emotions productively. To be emotionally literate

is to be able to handle emotions in a way that improves one's personal power and improves the quality of life around oneself. Table 3 shows the data gathered on this aspect.

Table 3 shows a composite mean of 3.72 with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence. Looking further, it can be observed that statement Is aware of and understands his/her feelings garnered 3.87 mean with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence; Cares about others got 3.80 mean; Listens attentively to what people say captured a mean of 3.74 with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence; Chooses the right time to deal with emotional issues garnered 3.71 mean with an interpretation of Very Good Level of emotional intelligence; Facilitates repairing of relationships/emotional damage got a mean of 3.69 with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence while Interprets other people's emotions correctly obtained a mean of 3.53 with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence. Gardner's (1983) concept makes reference to the fact that people have the ability to know and understand their emotions as well as other individuals' emotions and intentions, which is believed to guide one's behaviour. This was further developed by research done by Gardner and Hatch (1989), where they developed the idea of multiple intelligences, which were distinctly different from that of IQ (Dulewicz and Higgs, 2000).

**Table 3.**  
**Level of Emotional Intelligence in the Context of Emotional Literacy**

| Indicators                                                  | Weighted Mean | Interpretation                                          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Is aware of and understands his/her feelings.            | 3.87          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| 2. Cares about others.                                      | 3.80          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| 3. Listens attentively to what people say.                  | 3.74          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| 4. Facilitates repairing of relationships/emotional damage. | 3.69          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| 5. Interprets other people's emotions correctly.            | 3.53          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| 6. Chooses the right time to deal with emotional issues.    | 3.71          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| <b>Composite Mean</b>                                       | <b>3.72</b>   | <b><i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i></b> |

**On Self-Esteem.** This reflects the person's overall emotional evaluation of his or her own worth. It is a judgment of oneself as well as an attitude toward the self. Table 4 shows the data gathered on this aspect.

**Table 4.**  
**Level of Emotional Intelligence in the Context of Self-Esteem/Self-Regard**

| Indicators                                                             | Weighted Mean | Interpretation                                          |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Publicly admits mistakes.                                           | 3.19          | <i>Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>             |
| 2. Is able to laugh at him/herself.                                    | 3.00          | <i>Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>             |
| 3. Is willing to take on challenges.                                   | 3.79          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| 4. Takes responsibility for his/her own thoughts, feelings and actions | 3.91          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| 5. Tells the truth even at his/her own expense.                        | 3.79          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| 6. Acts according to his/her own values .. "Walk the Talk".            | 3.79          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| <b>Composite Mean</b>                                                  | <b>3.58</b>   | <b><i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i></b> |

A composite mean of 3.58 was obtained in table 4 with an interpretation of with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence. Looking further, Takes responsibility for his/her own thoughts, feelings and actions got the highest mean of 3.91 with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence; Is willing to take on challenges, Tells the truth even at his/her own expense and Acts according to hi/her values "walk the talk" captured a mean of 3.79 with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence; Publicly admits mistakes got 3.19 mean while Is able to laugh at himself/herself has the lowest mean of 3.00 with an interpretation of Good Level of Emotional Intelligence

This finding is in consonance to the research done by Schutte, Malouff, Hall, Haggerty, Cooper, Golden and Dornheim (1998) which shows that emotional intelligence is associated with affective outcomes such as greater

optimism, less depression and less impulsivity. Emotional intelligence has been found to be positively linked to task mastery and life satisfaction and negatively linked to symptoms of depression (Martinez-Pons, 1997).

Table 5.  
Level of Emotional Intelligence in the Context of Self-Management

| Indicators                                                       | Weighted Mean | Interpretation                                   |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Responds calmly to explosive events and people.               | 3.47          | Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence        |
| 2. Controls his/her own emotions.                                | 3.67          | Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence        |
| 3. Has a calming effect on others.                               | 3.77          | Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence        |
| 4. Manages stressful situations calmly.                          | 3.59          | Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence        |
| 5. Balances different aspects of wellness. (body, mind and soul) | 3.69          | Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence        |
| 6. Asserts his/her rights in a constructive manner.              | 3.83          | Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence        |
| <b>Composite Mean</b>                                            | <b>3.67</b>   | <b>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</b> |

**On Self-Management.** This refers to methods, skills, and strategies by which individuals can effectively direct their own activities toward the achievement of objectives, and includes goal setting, decision making, focusing, planning, scheduling, time management, task tracking, self-evaluation, self-intervention, self-development, etc.. Table 5 shows the data gathered on this aspect.

A composite mean of 3.67 with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence was obtained in the table above. It can be noted that statement Asserts his/her rights in a constructive manner captured a high mean of 3.83 with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence Has a calming effect on others got a mean of 3.77 with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence; Controls his/her own emotions follows with a mean of 3.67 and an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence; Manages stressful situations calmly captured a mean of 3.59 with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence while Responds calmly to explosive events and people obtained a low mean of 3.47 with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence.

Emotional management or self-regulation is the second of Goleman's core competencies, and this enables the individual to manage his own internal states, impulses and controls. Self-regulation also involves self-monitoring, which allows the individual to adjust his behaviour according to external, situational factors. The element of self-regulation includes aspects such as trustworthiness; self-control; conscientiousness; adaptability and innovation (Goleman, 1995).

**On Self-Motivation.** This refers to the ability to do what needs to be done, without influence from other people or situations. Table 6 shows the data gathered on this aspect.

Table 6.  
Level of Emotional Intelligence in the Context of Self-Motivation

| Indicators                                             | Weighted Mean | Interpretation                                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Remains focused on vision and goals.                | 3.88          | Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence        |
| 2. Remains committed to a cause in spite of obstacles. | 3.74          | Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence        |
| 3. Follows through on what he/she starts.              | 3.67          | Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence        |
| 4. Regards challenges as opportunities.                | 3.75          | Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence        |
| 5. Sees the brighter side of things.                   | 3.95          | Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence        |
| 6. Creates a positive mood.                            | 3.92          | Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence        |
| <b>Composite Mean</b>                                  | <b>3.82</b>   | <b>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</b> |

Table 6 shows a composite mean of 3.82 was obtained with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence. Further look reflects that Sees the brighter side of things got a high mean of 3.95 with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence; Creates a positive mood follows with a mean of 3.92 with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence; Remains focused on vision and foals captured a mean of 3.88 with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence; Regards challenges as opportunities got 3.75 mean with Remains committed to a c an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence; while Remains committed to a cause in spites of obstacles got the lowest mean of 3.74 with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence

The third core competency that Goleman includes in his theory of emotional intelligence is that of self-motivation. Self-motivation involves the control of emotional tendencies that facilitate reaching one's goals (Goleman, 1995). There are several key elements that assist in self-motivation: achievement drive; commitment; initiative and optimism. Optimism in itself is believed to be a key pillar in self regulation and has been thought to be a key determinate of motivation and performance outcomes (Rozell, et al., 2002).

On Self-Resilience. This refers to the ability to recover from setbacks. Table 7 shows the data gathered on this aspect.

As can be seen in table 7, a composite mean of 3.82 was obtained with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence. Looking in detail reveals that statement Is open to new ideas ranked 1<sup>st</sup> with a mean of 3.94 with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence, Values diversity and understands the impact of change on people got a mean of 3.88 with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence; Accepts criticism and learns from it got 3.82 mean with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence, Adapts to changing circumstances got the lowest mean of 3.77 with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence

**Table 7.**  
**Level of Emotional Intelligence in the Context of Change Resilience**

| Indicators                                                                 | Weighted Mean | Interpretation                                          |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Is willing to change his/her view point in the face of new information. | 3.61          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| 2. Advocates the imperative for change and innovation.                     | 3.84          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| 3. Values diversity.                                                       | 3.88          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| 4. Adapts to changing circumstances.                                       | 3.77          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| 5. Understands the impact of change on people.                             | 3.88          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| 6. Is open to new ideas.                                                   | 3.94          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| 7. Accepts criticism and learns from it.                                   | 3.83          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| <b>Composite Mean</b>                                                      | <b>3.82</b>   | <b><i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i></b> |

It is also believed that emotional intelligence allows the person other ways of being and behaving as compared to those emphasized by traditional ideas of intelligence. It is thus possible for the person to develop these alternative ways of being in order to become more effective and efficient in both day-to-day living and in the workplace (Van Jaarsveld, 2003).

**On Interpersonal Relations.** This term refers to the strong, deep, or close association/acquaintance between two or more people that may range in duration from brief to enduring. This association may be based on inference, love, solidarity, regular business interactions, or some other type of social commitment. Table 8 shows the data gathered on this aspect.

**Table 8.**  
**Level of Emotional Intelligence in the Context of Interpersonal Relations**

| Indicators                                               | Weighted Mean | Interpretation                                          |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Co-operates effectively with others to achieve goals. | 3.94          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| 2. Maintains long-term trusting relationships.           | 3.94          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| 3. Builds trust.                                         | 3.87          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| 4. Takes interest in other people's development.         | 3.70          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| 5. Builds team spirit.                                   | 3.90          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| 6. Acknowledges the contribution of others.              | 3.95          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| 7. Expresses positive expectations of others.            | 3.83          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| 8. Stimulates enthusiasm and commitment.                 | 3.92          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| 9. Welcomes other people's inputs.                       | 3.95          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| <b>Composite Mean</b>                                    | <b>3.89</b>   | <b><i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i></b> |

Table 8 shows a composite mean of 3.89 with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence. Acknowledges the contribution of others got the highest mean of 3.95 with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence ; Co-operates effectively with others and Maintains long-term trusting relationships got a mean 3.94 with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence; Stimulates enthusiasm and commitment obtained a mean of 3.92 with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence; Builds team spirit captured a mean of 3.90 with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence; Expresses

positive expressions of others culled a mean of 3.83 with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence while Takes interest in other people's development garnered the lowest mean of 3.70 with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence.

According to Klausner (1997) an individual's emotional intelligence can be seen to dictate interpersonal relationships. Despite this, many managers in the workplace would rather steer away from dealing with emotional issues. Research by Cooper (1997) shows that emotions that are properly managed can, and do, have successful outcomes. Carefully managed emotions can drive trust, loyalty and commitment as well as increase productivity, innovation and accomplishment in the individual, team and organizational sphere (Cooper, 1997).

**On Integration of the Head and Heart.** This term refers to the ability to harmonize logic with compassion in dealing with adversity in life and in the workplace. Table 9 shows the data gathered on this dimension.

Table 9.

Level of Emotional Intelligence in the Context of Integration of Heart and Head

| Indicators                                             | Weighted Mean | Interpretation                                          |
|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Considers facts and feelings when making decisions. | 3.77          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| 2. Turns life crises into opportunities for growth.    | 3.74          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| 3. Identifies underlying emotional causes of conflict. | 3.64          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| 4. Is eager to learn.                                  | 4.00          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| 5. Facilitates effective problem solving.              | 3.86          | <i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i>        |
| <b>Composite Mean</b>                                  | <b>3.80</b>   | <b><i>Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence</i></b> |

As can be seen in table 9, a composite mean of 3.80 was obtained with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence. Looking closer the table would reveal that the statement Is eager to learn topped with a 4.00 mean and an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence; Facilitates effective problem solving follows with a mean of 3.86 and an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence; Considers facts and feelings when making decisions captured a mean of 3.77 with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence; Turns life crisis into opportunities for growth garnered a mean of 3.74 while Identifies underlying causes for conflict obtained the lowest mean of 3.64 with an interpretation of Very Good Level of Emotional Intelligence.

Several authors (Cooper and Sawaf, 1997; Salovey and Sluyter, 1997; Goleman, 1998) suggest that emotional intelligence is essential for effective leadership. It is believed that even if one has the best training in the world, as well as a "high intelligence" level, without emotional intelligence, the person would still not make a good leader. It should however be noted that although intelligence quotient (IQ) and emotional intelligence are two separate constructs, they do work in combination.

**On Role Overload.** Measures the extent to which job demands exceed resources (personal and workplace) and the extent to which the individual is able to accomplish workloads. Table 10 shows the data gathered on this aspect.

Table 10.

Level of Work Stress among the Respondents in the Context of Work Overload

| Indicators                                                                       | Weighted Mean | Interpretation                 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. At work I am expected to do too many different tasks in too little time.      | 3.43          | <i>High Work Stress</i>        |
| 2. I feel that my job responsibilities are increasing.                           | 3.65          | <i>High Work Stress</i>        |
| 3. I am expected to perform tasks on my job for which I have never been trained. | 3.09          | <i>Moderate Work Stress</i>    |
| 4. I have to take work home with me.                                             | 4.06          | <i>High Work Stress</i>        |
| 5. I have the resources I need to get my job done.                               | 2.29          | <i>Low Work Stress</i>         |
| 6. I am good at my job.                                                          | 4.26          | <i>Very High Work Stress</i>   |
| 7. I work under tight time deadlines.                                            | 3.94          | <i>High Work Stress</i>        |
| 8. I wish that I had more help to deal with the demands placed upon me at work.  | 3.60          | <i>High Work Stress</i>        |
| 9. My job requires me to work in several equally important areas at once.        | 3.57          | <i>High Work Stress</i>        |
| 10. I am expected to do more work than is reasonable.                            | 3.44          | <i>High Work Stress</i>        |
| <b>Composite Mean</b>                                                            | <b>3.53</b>   | <b><i>High Work Stress</i></b> |

A composite mean of 3.53 was generated in table 10 with an interpretation of High Work Stress. Looking further, the table reveals that I am good at my job got the highest mean of 4.26 with an interpretation of Very High Work Stress; I have to take work home with me follows with a mean of 4.06 and an interpretation of High Work Stress; I work under tight time deadlines copped a mean of 3.94 with an interpretation of High Work Stress; I feel that my job responsibilities are increasing garnered a mean of 3.65 with an interpretation of High Work Stress; I wish that I had more help to deal with the demands placed upon me at work got a mean of 3.60 with an interpretation of High Work Stress; My job requires me to work in several equally important areas at once culled a mean of 3.57 with an interpretation of High Work Stress; I am expected to do more work than is reasonable got a mean of 3.44 with an interpretation of High Work Stress; At work I am expected to do too many different tasks in too little time with a mean of 3.43 with an interpretation of High Work Stress; I am expected to perform tasks on my job for which I have never been trained captured a mean of 3.09 with an interpretation of Moderate Work Stress while I have the resources I need to get my job done copped the lowest mean of 2.29 with an interpretation of Low Work Stress.

**On Role Insufficiency.** Measures the extent to which the individual's training, education, skills and experience are appropriate to job requirements. Table 11 shows the data gathered on this aspect.

**Table 11.**  
**Level of Work Stress among the Respondents in the Context of Role Insufficiency**

| Indicators                                                              | Weighted Mean | Interpretation         |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 1. My career is progressing about as I hoped it would.                  | 3.91          | High Work Stress       |
| 2. My job fits my skills and interests.                                 | 1.57          | Very Low Work Stress   |
| 3. I am bored with my job.                                              | 1.57          | Very Low Work Stress   |
| 4. I feel I have enough responsibility on my job.                       | 2.26          | Low Work Stress        |
| 5. My talents are being used on my job.                                 | 2.03          | Low Work Stress        |
| 6. My job has a good fortune.                                           | 2.29          | Low Work Stress        |
| 7. I am able to satisfy my needs for success and recognition in my job. | 2.14          | Low Work Stress        |
| 8. I feel overqualified for my job                                      | 2.34          | Low Work Stress        |
| 9. I learn new skills in my work.                                       | 1.91          | Low Work Stress        |
| 10. I have to perform tasks that are beneath my ability.                | 3.54          | High Work Stress       |
| <b>Composite Mean</b>                                                   | <b>2.36</b>   | <b>Low Work Stress</b> |

Table 11 shows a composite mean of 2.36 and an interpretation of Low Work Stress. A detailed look reveals that My career is progressing about as I hoped it would copped a high mean of 3.91 with an interpretation of High Work Stress; I have to perform tasks that are beneath my ability follows with a mean of 3.54 and with an interpretation of High Work Stress; I feel overqualified for my job got a mean of 2.34; My job has a good fortune captured a mean of 2.29 with an interpretation of Low Work Stress; I feel I have enough responsibility on my job got a mean of 2.26 with an interpretation of Low Work Stress; I am able to satisfy my needs for success and recognition in my job obtained a mean of 2.14 with an interpretation of Low Work Stress; My talents are being used on my job got a mean of 2.03 with an interpretation of Low Work Stress; I learn new skills in my work got a mean of 1.91 with an interpretation of Low Work Stress; while My job fits my skills and interests and I am bored with my job garnered a mean of 1.57 with an interpretation of Very Low Work Stress.

**On Role Ambiguity.** Measures the extent to which priorities, expectations, and evaluation criteria are clear to individual. Table 12 shows the data gathered on this aspect.

It can be seen that a composite mean of 2.20 was obtained with an interpretation of Low Work Stress. A detailed look would reveal that My Supervisor provides me with useful feedback about my performance captured a mean of 2.97 with an interpretation of Moderate Work Stress; I am uncertain about what I am suppose to accomplish in my work got a mean of 2.91 with an interpretation of Moderate Work Stress; My supervisor asks for one thing, but really wants another copped a mean 2.89 with an interpretation of Moderate Work Stress; It is clear to me what I have to do to get ahead captured a mean of 2.34 with an interpretation of Low Work Stress; I know where to begin a new project when it is assigned to me obtained a mean of 2.11 with an interpretation of Low Work Stress; I know the basis on which I am evaluated got a mean of 1.89 with an interpretation of Low Work Stress; When faced with several tasks, I know which should be done first culled a mean of 1.97 with an interpretation of Low Work Stress; The priorities of my job are clear to me got a mean of 1.50 with an interpretation of Very Low Work Stress; while I understand what is acceptable personal behavior on my job (e.g. dress, interpersonal relations, etc.) copped a mean of 1.49 with an interpretation of Very Low Work Stress.

**Table 12.**  
**Level of Work Stress among the Respondents in the Context of Role Ambiguity**

| Indicators                                                                                                 | Weighted Mean | Interpretation                |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. My supervisor provides me with useful feedback about my performance.                                    | 2.97          | <i>Moderate Work Stress</i>   |
| 2. It is clear to me what I have to do to get ahead.                                                       | 2.34          | <i>Low Work Stress</i>        |
| 3. I am uncertain about what I am supposed to accomplish in my work.                                       | 2.91          | <i>Moderate Work Stress</i>   |
| 4. When faced with several tasks, I know which should be done first.                                       | 1.97          | <i>Low Work Stress</i>        |
| 5. I know where to begin a new project when it is assigned to me.                                          | 2.11          | <i>Low Work Stress</i>        |
| 6. My supervisor asks for one thing, but really wants another.                                             | 2.89          | <i>Moderate Work Stress</i>   |
| 7. I understand what is acceptable personal behavior on my job (e.g. dress, interpersonal relations, etc.) | 1.49          | <i>Very Low Work Stress</i>   |
| 8. The priorities of my job are clear to me.                                                               | 1.50          | <i>Very Low Work Stress</i>   |
| 9. I have a clear understanding of how my boss wants me to spend my time.                                  | 1.97          | <i>Low Work Stress</i>        |
| 10. I know the basis on which I am evaluated.                                                              | 1.89          | <i>Low Work Stress</i>        |
| <b>Composite Mean</b>                                                                                      | <b>2.20</b>   | <b><i>Low Work Stress</i></b> |

**On Role Boundary.** Measures the extent to which the individual is experiencing conflicting role demands and loyalties in the work setting. Table 13 shows the data gathered on this aspect.

**Table 13.**  
**Level of Work Stress among the Respondents in the Context of Role Boundary**

| Indicators                                                                                        | Weighted Mean | Interpretation                     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. I feel conflict between what my employer expects me to do and what I think is right or proper. | 2.50          | <i>Low Work Stress</i>             |
| 2. I feel caught between fractions at work.                                                       | 2.45          | <i>Low Work Stress</i>             |
| 3. I have more than one person telling me what to do.                                             | 2.55          | <i>Low Work Stress</i>             |
| 4. I know where I fit in my organization.                                                         | 3.88          | <i>High Work Stress</i>            |
| 5. I feel good about the work I do.                                                               | 1.74          | <i>Very Low Work Stress</i>        |
| 6. My supervisors have conflicting ideas about what I should be doing.                            | 2.82          | <i>Moderate Work Stress</i>        |
| 7. My supervisors have conflicting ideas about how I should doing.                                | 2.79          | <i>Moderate Work Stress</i>        |
| 8. It is clear who really runs things where I work.                                               | 2.42          | <i>Low Work Stress</i>             |
| 9. I have divided loyalties on my job.                                                            | 3.03          | <i>Moderate Work Stress</i>        |
| 10. I frequently disagree with individuals from other work units or departments.                  | 1.94          | <i>Low Work Stress</i>             |
| <b>Composite Mean</b>                                                                             | <b>2.61</b>   | <b><i>Moderate Work Stress</i></b> |

Table 13 shows a composite mean of 2.61 interpretation of Moderate Work Stress. Looking further, it can be noticed that I have divided loyalties on my job captured a mean of 3.03 with an interpretation of Moderate Work Stress; My supervisors have conflicting ideas about what I should be doing got a mean of 2.82 with an interpretation of Moderate Work Stress; My supervisors have conflicting ideas about how I should be doing copped a mean of 2.79 with an interpretation of Moderate Work Stress; I have more than one person telling me what to do obtained a mean of 2.55 with an interpretation of Low Work Stress; I feel conflict between what my employer expects me to do and what I think is right or proper culled a mean of 2.50 with an interpretation of Low Work Stress; I feel caught between fractions at work garnered a mean of 2.45 with an interpretation of Low Work Stress; It is clear who really runs things where I work got a mean of 2.42 with an interpretation of Low Work Stress; I frequently disagree with individuals from other work units or departments copped a mean of 1.94 with an interpretation of Low Work Stress; while I feel food about the work I do captured the lowest mean of 1.74 with an interpretation of Very Low Work Stress.

**On Responsibility.** Measures the extent to which the individual is given responsibility over a task related to his/ her job function. Table 14 shows the data gathered on this aspect.

**Table 14.**  
**Level of Work Stress among the Respondents in the Context of Responsibility**

| Indicators                                                                               | Weighted Mean | Interpretation              |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. I deal with more people during the day than I prefer.                                 | 3.48          | High Work Stress            |
| 2. I spend time concerned with the problems others at work bring to me.                  | 2.82          | Moderate Work Stress        |
| 3. I am responsible for the welfare of subordinates.                                     | 3.50          | High Work Stress            |
| 4. People on-the-job look to me for leadership                                           | 2.74          | Moderate Work Stress        |
| 5. I have on-the-job responsibility for the activities of others.                        | 3.12          | Moderate Work Stress        |
| 6. I worry about whether the people who work for/ with me will get things done properly. | 2.68          | Moderate Work Stress        |
| 7. My job requires me to make important decisions.                                       | 4.00          | High Work Stress            |
| 8. If I make a mistake in my work, the consequences for others can be pretty bad.        | 2.79          | Moderate Work Stress        |
| 9. I worry about meeting my job responsibilities.                                        | 2.76          | Moderate Work Stress        |
| 10. I like the people I work with                                                        | 4.35          | Very High Work Stress       |
| <b>Composite Mean</b>                                                                    | <b>3.22</b>   | <b>Moderate Work Stress</b> |

Table 14 shows a composite mean of 3.22 with an interpretation of Moderate Work Stress. Looking further, I like the people I work with garnered the highest mean of 4.35 with an interpretation of Very High Work Stress; My job requires me to make important decisions culled a mean of 4.00 with an interpretation of High Work Stress; I deal with more people during the day than I prefer follows with a mean of 3.48 with an interpretation of High Work Stress; I am responsible for the welfare of subordinates topped a mean of 3.50 with an interpretation of High Work Stress; I have on-the-job responsibilities for the activity of others captured a mean of 3.12 with an interpretation of Moderate Work Stress; I spend time concerned with the problems of others at work brought me a mean of 2.82 with an interpretation of Moderate Work Stress; People on-the-job look at me for leadership garnered a mean of 2.74 with an interpretation of Moderate Work Stress; I worry about the people who work for/with me will get things done properly got a mean of 2.68 with an interpretation of Moderate Work Stress; while I worry about meeting my job responsibilities captured a 2.76 with an interpretation of Moderate Work Stress.

**On Physical Environment.** Measures the extent to which the individual is exposed to high levels of environmental toxins or extreme physical conditions. Table 15 shows the data gathered on this aspect.

**Table 15.**  
**Level of Work Stress among the Respondents in the Context of Physical Environment**

| Indicators                                           | Weighted Mean | Interpretation              |
|------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. On my job I am exposed to high levels of noise.   | 3.38          | Moderate Work Stress        |
| 2. On my job I am exposed to high levels of wetness. | 2.65          | Moderate Work Stress        |
| 3. On my job I am exposed to high levels of dust.    | 2.65          | Moderate Work Stress        |
| 4. On my job I am exposed to temperatures extremes.  | 3.65          | High Work Stress            |
| 5. On my job I am exposed to bright light.           | 3.06          | Moderate Work Stress        |
| 6. My job is physically dangerous.                   | 1.88          | Low Work Stress             |
| 7. I have an erratic work schedule.                  | 2.50          | Low Work Stress             |
| 8. I work all by myself                              | 2.74          | Moderate Work Stress        |
| 9. On my job I am exposed to unpleasant odor.        | 2.65          | Moderate Work Stress        |
| 10. On my job I am exposed to poisonous substances.  | 1.79          | Very Low Work Stress        |
| <b>Composite Mean</b>                                | <b>2.69</b>   | <b>Moderate Work Stress</b> |

A composite mean of 2.69 was generated with an interpretation of Moderate Work Stress. A closer look reveals that On my job, I am exposed to extreme temperatures captured the highest mean of 3.65 with an interpretation of High Work Stress; On my job, I am exposed to high levels of noise follows with a mean of 3.38 and

with an interpretation of Moderate Work Stress; I work all by myself copped a mean of 2.74 with an interpretation of Moderate Work Stress; On my job, I am exposed to high level of wetness, On my job, I am exposed to high level of dust and On my job, I am exposed to unpleasant odor got a mean of 2.65 with an interpretation of Moderate Work Stress; I have an erratic work schedule and My job is physically dangerous copped a mean of 2.50 and 1.88 respectively and both interpreted as Low Work Stress while On my job, I am exposed to poisonous substances garnered the lowest mean of 1.79 with an interpretation of Very Low Work Stress.

#### Significant Degree of Relationship between Respondents' Profile and Emotional Intelligence.

Using Chi-Square Test of Independence, the relationship between respondents' profile and their emotional intelligence was tested at **0.05** significance level. Table 16 shows that **age** ( $\chi^2 = 207$ ), **sex** ( $\chi^2 = 209$ ), **civil status** ( $\chi^2 = 199$ ), **highest educational attainment** ( $\chi^2 = 247.40$ ), **number of years working** ( $\chi^2 = 236.80$ ) and **employment status** ( $\chi^2 = 200.00$ ) have **significant relationship** with the **emotional intelligence**; hence, the **rejection of the null hypothesis**. It can therefore be said that the teachers' profile has a direct relationship with their level of emotional intelligence.

Table 16.

Test of Relationship between the Profile of the Respondents' Profile and Emotional Intelligence

| Emotional Intelligence and...  | Comp. Chi-square value | df | crit. value | p-Value | Sig. Level | Result      | Ho       |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|----|-------------|---------|------------|-------------|----------|
| Age                            | 207.00                 | 8  | 15.507      | 0.00    | 0.05       | Significant | Rejected |
| Sex                            | 209.00                 | 4  | 9.488       | 0.00    | 0.05       | Significant | Rejected |
| Civil Status                   | 199.00                 | 4  | 9.488       | 0.00    | 0.05       | Significant | Rejected |
| Highest Educational Attainment | 247.40                 | 8  | 15.507      | 0.00    | 0.05       | Significant | Rejected |
| Number of Years Working        | 236.80                 | 8  | 15.507      | 0.00    | 0.05       | Significant | Rejected |
| Employment Status              | 200.40                 | 4  | 9.488       | 0.00    | 0.05       | Significant | Rejected |

Ho: There is no significant relationship between the respondents' profile and emotional intelligence.

#### Significant Degree of Relationship between Respondents' Profile and Work Stress

Using Chi-Square Test of Independence, the relationship between respondents' profile and their work stress was tested at **0.05** significance level. Table 17 shows that **age** ( $\chi^2 = 248.20$ ), **sex** ( $\chi^2 = 212.30$ ), **civil status** ( $\chi^2 = 218.20$ ), **highest educational attainment** ( $\chi^2 = 230.50$ ), **number of years working** ( $\chi^2 = 233.40$ ) and **employment status** ( $\chi^2 = 235.50$ ) have **significant relationship** with **work stress**; hence, the **rejection of the null hypothesis**. It can then be concluded from this study that being married and age among other demographic profile included in this paper have a significant relationship with their level of work stress.

#### Significant Degree of Correlation between the Level of Emotional Intelligence and Work Stress among the Respondents

The Pearson's Correlation Coefficient was used to test the significance relationship between the level of emotional intelligence and work stress. In Table 18, the correlation r-value is **0.2758**, this implies a positive and weak relationship between the two variables. Furthermore, the test revealed that at **0.05** significance level, the relationship between the emotional intelligence and work stress is **not significant** (**r-value = 0.2758**, **df = 33**, **p-value = 0.1088**); hence, the **acceptance of the null hypothesis**. As revealed by the data, The respondents' level of emotional intelligence doesn't have a significant correlation to their work stress since stress level was only noted to be moderate in general.

Table 17.

Test of Relationship between the Profile of the Respondents' Profile and Work Stress

| Work Stress and...             | Comp. Chi-square value | df | crit. value | p-Value | Sig. Level | Result      | Ho       |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|----|-------------|---------|------------|-------------|----------|
| Age                            | 248.20                 | 16 | 26.296      | 0.00    | 0.05       | Significant | Rejected |
| Sex                            | 212.30                 | 8  | 15.507      | 0.00    | 0.05       | Significant | Rejected |
| Civil Status                   | 218.20                 | 8  | 15.507      | 0.00    | 0.05       | Significant | Rejected |
| Highest Educational Attainment | 230.50                 | 16 | 26.296      | 0.00    | 0.05       | Significant | Rejected |
| Number of Years Working        | 233.40                 | 16 | 26.296      | 0.00    | 0.05       | Significant | Rejected |
| Employment Status              | 235.50                 | 8  | 15.507      | 0.00    | 0.05       | Significant | Rejected |

Ho: There is no significant relationship between the respondents' profile and work stress.

Table 18.

**Test of Correlation Between the Level of Emotional Intelligence  
and Work Stress Among the Respondents**

| computed<br>r-value | Sig.<br>Level | df | critical<br>r-value | p-value | Result               | H <sub>0</sub> |
|---------------------|---------------|----|---------------------|---------|----------------------|----------------|
| 0.2758              | 0.05          | 33 | 0.3040              | 0.1088  | <i>Insignificant</i> | <i>Accept</i>  |

H<sub>0</sub>: There is no significant correlation between the level of emotional intelligence and work stress among the respondents.

**Descriptive Statistics**

| Variables              | Mean   | Std.<br>Deviation | N  |
|------------------------|--------|-------------------|----|
| Emotional Intelligence | 4.0745 | 0.32388           | 35 |
| Work Stress            | 2.7181 | 0.40595           | 35 |

To further explore the relationship between the emotional intelligence and work stress, a Regression Analysis was performed.

**Regression Analysis Model Summary**

| Model                                  | R     | R<br>Square | Adjusted<br>R<br>Square | Std.<br>Error of<br>the<br>Estimate |
|----------------------------------------|-------|-------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Emotional Intelligence vs. Work Stress | 0.276 | 0.076       | 0.048                   | 0.39667                             |

The Regression Analysis result shows an **R<sup>2</sup>** value of **0.076** which can be explained that the independent variable, **Emotional Intelligence**, of the respondents can only predict an accuracy of **7.6%** of the **Work Stress**. **Therefore, this explains the positive but weak correlation between these variables.**

**Significant Degree of Variances on the Different Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence**

An Analysis of Variance was conducted to compare the 7 dimensions of emotional intelligence. The means and variances are presented in the Descriptive Statistics Summary. The analysis revealed that at 0.05 significance level the 7 dimensions are **significantly different** from one another (**F = 4.7 , between df = 6, within df = 238, p-value = 0.000**); thus, the **rejection of the null hypothesis**. For this study, it was found out that a significant degree of variance existed among the 9 dimension of emotional intelligence. A closer look would show that interpersonal relation gained the highest mean score while self-esteem as well as management copped the lowest mean respectively.

Table 19.

**Analysis of Variance on the 7 Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence**

| ANOVA Summary          |                   |     |                |     |                |             |               |                    |               |
|------------------------|-------------------|-----|----------------|-----|----------------|-------------|---------------|--------------------|---------------|
| Source of<br>Variation | Sum of<br>Squares | df  | Mean<br>Square | F   | crit.<br>Value | p-<br>value | Sig.<br>Level | Result             | Ho            |
| Between Groups         | 4.975             | 6   | 0.829          | 4.7 | 2.137          | 0.000       | 0.05          | <i>Significant</i> | <i>Reject</i> |
| Within Groups          | 42.022            | 238 | 0.177          |     |                |             |               |                    |               |
| Total                  | 46.997            | 244 |                |     |                |             |               |                    |               |

H<sub>0</sub>: There is no significant degree of variance on the 7 dimensions of emotional intelligence.

| Tukey Post Hoc Analysis |                |                       |            |         |               |
|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|------------|---------|---------------|
| Dimensions (I)          | Dimensions (J) | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | p-value | Result        |
| A                       | B              | 0.14686               | 0.100      | 0.767   | Insignificant |
|                         | C              | 0.142                 | 0.100      | 0.794   | Insignificant |
|                         | D              | -0.11029              | 0.100      | 0.928   | Insignificant |
|                         | E              | -0.17057              | 0.100      | 0.618   | Insignificant |
|                         | F              | -0.23686              | 0.100      | 0.221   | Insignificant |
|                         | G              | -0.15543              | 0.100      | 0.716   | Insignificant |
| B                       | A              | -0.14686              | 0.100      | 0.767   | Insignificant |
|                         | C              | -0.00486              | 0.100      | 1.000   | Insignificant |
|                         | D              | -0.25714              | 0.100      | 0.143   | Insignificant |
|                         | E              | -.31743*              | 0.100      | 0.029   | Significant   |
|                         | F              | -.38371*              | 0.100      | 0.003   | Significant   |
|                         | G              | -.30229*              | 0.100      | 0.045   | Significant   |
| C                       | A              | -0.142                | 0.100      | 0.794   | Insignificant |
|                         | B              | 0.00486               | 0.100      | 1.000   | Insignificant |
|                         | D              | -0.25229              | 0.100      | 0.160   | Insignificant |
|                         | E              | -.31257*              | 0.100      | 0.034   | Significant   |
|                         | F              | -.37886*              | 0.100      | 0.004   | Significant   |
|                         | G              | -0.29743              | 0.100      | 0.052   | Insignificant |
| D                       | A              | 0.11029               | 0.100      | 0.928   | Insignificant |
|                         | B              | 0.25714               | 0.100      | 0.143   | Insignificant |
|                         | C              | 0.25229               | 0.100      | 0.160   | Insignificant |
|                         | E              | -0.06029              | 0.100      | 0.997   | Insignificant |
|                         | F              | -0.12657              | 0.100      | 0.869   | Insignificant |
|                         | G              | -0.04514              | 0.100      | 0.999   | Insignificant |
| E                       | A              | 0.17057               | 0.100      | 0.618   | Insignificant |
|                         | B              | .31743*               | 0.100      | 0.029   | Significant   |
|                         | C              | .31257*               | 0.100      | 0.034   | Significant   |
|                         | D              | 0.06029               | 0.100      | 0.997   | Insignificant |
|                         | F              | -0.06629              | 0.100      | 0.995   | Insignificant |
|                         | G              | 0.01514               | 0.100      | 1.000   | Insignificant |
| F                       | A              | 0.23686               | 0.100      | 0.221   | Insignificant |
|                         | B              | .38371*               | 0.100      | 0.003   | Significant   |
|                         | C              | .37886*               | 0.100      | 0.004   | Significant   |
|                         | D              | 0.12657               | 0.100      | 0.869   | Insignificant |
|                         | E              | 0.06629               | 0.100      | 0.995   | Insignificant |
|                         | G              | 0.08143               | 0.100      | 0.984   | Insignificant |
| G                       | A              | 0.15543               | 0.100      | 0.716   | Insignificant |
|                         | B              | .30229*               | 0.100      | 0.045   | Significant   |
|                         | C              | 0.29743               | 0.100      | 0.052   | Insignificant |
|                         | D              | 0.04514               | 0.100      | 0.999   | Insignificant |
|                         | E              | -0.01514              | 0.100      | 1.000   | Insignificant |
|                         | F              | -0.08143              | 0.100      | 0.984   | Insignificant |

To further examine which of these dimensions are significantly different, a Tukey post-hoc analysis was performed. The post-hoc test revealed that there is **significant degree of variances** on the 7 dimensions as shown in the following table.

#### Significant Degree of Variances on the Different Dimensions of Work Stress

An Analysis of Variance was conducted to compare the 6 dimensions of work stress. The means and variances are presented in the Descriptive Statistics Summary. The analysis revealed that at 0.05 significance level the 6 dimensions are **significantly different** from one another (**F = 19.7**, **between df = 5 within df = 204**, **p-value = 0.000**); thus, the **rejection of the null hypothesis**. A closer look would show of an existence of a variances among the 6 dimensions of Work stress which revealed that Role overload gained the highest mean score.

Table 20.  
Analysis of Variance on the 6 Dimensions of Work Stress

| ANOVA Summary       |                |     |             |      |             |         |            |             |        |
|---------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|-------------|---------|------------|-------------|--------|
| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F    | crit. Value | p-value | Sig. Level | Result      | Ho     |
| Between Groups      | 43.56          | 5   | 8.712       | 19.7 | 2.258       | 0.000   | 0.05       | Significant | Reject |
| Within Groups       | 90.111         | 204 | 0.442       |      |             |         |            |             |        |
| Total               | 133.671        | 209 |             |      |             |         |            |             |        |

Ho: There is no significant degree of variance on the 6 dimensions of work stress.

### Descriptive Statistics

| Dimensions               | N  | Mean | Variance |
|--------------------------|----|------|----------|
| A - Role Overload        | 35 | 3.51 | 0.42     |
| B - Role Insufficiency   | 35 | 2.36 | 0.17     |
| C - Role Ambiguity       | 35 | 2.19 | 0.21     |
| D - Role Boundary        | 35 | 2.52 | 0.54     |
| E - Responsibility       | 35 | 3.11 | 0.59     |
| F - Physical Environment | 35 | 2.62 | 0.72     |

### Tukey Post-Hoc Analysis

| Dimensions (I) | Dimensions (J) | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig.  | Result        |
|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|------------|-------|---------------|
| A              | B              | 1.15429*              | 0.15887    | 0     | Significant   |
|                | C              | 1.32000*              | 0.15887    | 0     | Significant   |
|                | D              | .99429*               | 0.15887    | 0     | Significant   |
|                | E              | 0.39714               | 0.15887    | 0.129 | Insignificant |
|                | F              | .89429*               | 0.15887    | 0     | Significant   |
| B              | A              | -1.15429*             | 0.15887    | 0     | Significant   |
|                | C              | 0.16571               | 0.15887    | 0.903 | Insignificant |
|                | D              | -0.16                 | 0.15887    | 0.915 | Insignificant |
|                | E              | -.75714*              | 0.15887    | 0     | Significant   |
|                | F              | -0.26                 | 0.15887    | 0.575 | Insignificant |
| C              | A              | -1.32000*             | 0.15887    | 0     | Significant   |
|                | B              | -0.16571              | 0.15887    | 0.903 | Insignificant |
|                | D              | -0.32571              | 0.15887    | 0.318 | Insignificant |
|                | E              | -.92286*              | 0.15887    | 0     | Significant   |
|                | F              | -0.42571              | 0.15887    | 0.084 | Insignificant |
| D              | A              | -.99429*              | 0.15887    | 0     | Significant   |
|                | B              | 0.16                  | 0.15887    | 0.915 | Insignificant |
|                | C              | 0.32571               | 0.15887    | 0.318 | Insignificant |
|                | E              | -.59714*              | 0.15887    | 0.003 | Significant   |
|                | F              | -0.1                  | 0.15887    | 0.989 | Insignificant |
| E              | A              | -0.39714              | 0.15887    | 0.129 | Insignificant |
|                | B              | .75714*               | 0.15887    | 0     | Significant   |
|                | C              | .92286*               | 0.15887    | 0     | Significant   |
|                | D              | .59714*               | 0.15887    | 0.003 | Significant   |
|                | F              | .49714*               | 0.15887    | 0.024 | Significant   |
| F              | A              | -.89429*              | 0.15887    | 0     | Significant   |
|                | B              | 0.26                  | 0.15887    | 0.575 | Insignificant |
|                | C              | 0.42571               | 0.15887    | 0.084 | Insignificant |
|                | D              | 0.1                   | 0.15887    | 0.989 | Insignificant |
|                | E              | -.49714*              | 0.15887    | 0.024 | Significant   |

Furthermore, the following shows the results of the different dimensions of work stress are significantly different.  
**Significant Degree of Difference on the Level of Emotional Intelligence between the Tenured and Probationary Teachers**

A t-test of two independent samples was conducted to test the significant degree of difference on the emotional intelligence between the tenured and probationary teachers. As shown in Table 21, at **0.05 significance level** the test result revealed that there is **no significant difference on the emotional intelligence of the tenured and probationary teachers ( $t = 0.3$ ,  $df = 24.45$ ,  $p\text{-value} = 0.767$ )**. Thus, the null hypothesis was **accepted**. The result showed that when it comes to the level of emotional intelligence, the employment status of where tenured or probationary doesn't have a significant bearing.

| Group Statistics       |                   |    |        |                |          |                 |
|------------------------|-------------------|----|--------|----------------|----------|-----------------|
| Test Variable          | Employment Status | N  | Mean   | Std. Deviation | Variance | Std. Error Mean |
| Emotional Intelligence | Probationary      | 25 | 5.0835 | 0.3555         | 0.1264   | 0.0711          |
|                        | Tenured           | 10 | 5.0522 | 0.2417         | 0.0584   | 0.0764          |

### Significant Degree of Difference on the Level of Work Stress between the Tenured and Probationary Teachers

Table 21.  
Test of Significant Difference on the Level of Emotional Intelligence  
Between the Tenured and Probationary Teachers

| Independent Samples Test |                               |         |                              |       |             |                      |                 |        |                 |                       |                                                          |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|-------|-------------|----------------------|-----------------|--------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Test Variable            | Levene's Test for Equality of |         | t-test for Equality of Means |       |             |                      |                 |        |                 |                       |                                                          |
|                          | F                             | p-value | t                            | df    | crit. Value | p-value (two-tailed) | Result          | Ho     | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference (Lower, Upper) |
| Emotional Intelligence   | 1.7                           | 0.2     | 0.3                          | 24.45 | 2.06        | 0.767                | Insignificant t | Accept | 0.0313          | 0.10439               | -0.184 2.4654                                            |

Ho: There is no significant difference on the level of emotional intelligence between the tenured and probationary teachers.

Furthermore, the same t-test was performed to determine the significant degree of difference on the work stress between the tenured and probationary teachers. As shown in Table 22, at **0.05 significance level** the test result revealed that there is **no significant difference on the work stress of the tenured and probationary teachers ( $t = -0.5$ ,  $df = 12.3$ ,  $p\text{-value} = 0.626$ )**. Thus, the null hypothesis was **accepted**. It as found out that in this study that the work stress between the tenured and probationary teachers does not significantly differ from each other wherein the tenured teachers' level of work stress compared to the probationary teachers at the Senior high school of UC-METC are at the same level. This might be perhaps due to the fact that the tenured teachers and the probationary teachers have spent the same length of employment at the UC-METC. The only difference would be the employment status wherein the probationary remained to be so because of the school requirement of a Master's degree to attain tenureship in teaching.

Table 22.  
Test of Significant Difference on the Level of Work Stress  
Between the Tenured and Probationary Teachers

| Independent Samples Test |                                         |         |                              |      |             |                      |               |        |                 |                       |                                                          |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|------|-------------|----------------------|---------------|--------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Test Variable            | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances |         | t-test for Equality of Means |      |             |                      |               |        |                 |                       |                                                          |
|                          | F                                       | p-value | t                            | df   | crit. Value | p-value (two-tailed) | Result        | Ho     | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference (Lower, Upper) |
| Work Stress              | 0.21                                    | 0.65    | -0.5                         | 12.3 | 2.18        | 0.626                | Insignificant | Accept | -0.09133        | 0.18264               | -0.488 0.30556                                           |

Ho: There is no significant difference on the level of Work Stress between the tenured and probationary teachers.

## Findings

The study yielded comprehensive results across demographic profiles, emotional intelligence dimensions, and work stress levels. Regarding participant profiles, the majority (51.14%,  $n=20$ ) were aged 20-29 years, with decreasing representation in older cohorts: 30-39 years (25.71%,  $n=9$ ), 40-49 years (8.57%,  $n=3$ ), and 50-60 years (8.57%,  $n=3$ ). Gender distribution showed male predominance (62.86%,  $n=22$ ) over female respondents (37.14%,  $n=13$ ). Most participants were single (65.71%,  $n=23$ ), and educational backgrounds varied: Bachelor's degree holders (48.57%,  $n=17$ ), those with graduate units (22.86%,  $n=8$ ), Master's degree holders (25.72%,  $n=9$ ), and one doctoral candidate (2.86%). Teaching experience was predominantly limited to under 5 years (57.14%,  $n=20$ ), with 34.29% ( $n=12$ ) reporting 6-10 years, and minimal representation beyond 11 years. Employment status revealed probationary positions constituted 71.43% ( $n=25$ ) of the faculty.

Emotional intelligence assessments demonstrated consistently strong performance across all dimensions. Emotional literacy registered a composite mean of 3.72 ("Very Good"), while self-esteem scored 3.58 ("Very Good"). Self-management competencies yielded a mean of 3.67 ("Very Good"), and self-motivation achieved the highest dimension score at 3.82 ("Very Good").

## Conclusions

This chapter presents the empirical results of the study, contextualized by descriptive statistics and reliability analyses. Analysis revealed significant relationships between teachers' demographic profiles (age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, years of experience, and employment status) and their levels of emotional intelligence (EI), leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. Similarly, significant relationships were found between the same demographic variables and work stress levels, also resulting in null hypothesis rejection; notably, marital status and age emerged as key factors linked to stress.

However, no significant relationship was observed between respondents' emotional intelligence and their work stress levels, supporting the acceptance of the null hypothesis, which aligns with the generally moderate stress levels reported. Further analysis using ANOVA showed significant differences among the seven dimensions of emotional intelligence (rejecting the null hypothesis), with interpersonal relations scoring the highest mean and self-esteem and self-management recording the lowest. Similarly, ANOVA revealed significant differences among the six dimensions of work stress (null hypothesis rejected), with role overload exhibiting the highest mean score. Independent samples  $t$ -tests indicated no significant difference in emotional intelligence levels between tenured and probationary teachers, accepting the null hypothesis and suggesting employment status does not significantly influence EI.

Likewise, no significant difference was found in work stress levels between the two groups, also accepting the null hypothesis. This comparable stress level is potentially attributable to similar lengths of service at UC-METC, with the distinction in employment status primarily stemming from the institutional requirement of a Master's degree for tenure.

## Recommendations

Based on the study's findings, the following recommendations are proposed. Administrators and teachers should collaborate to develop and implement strategies aimed at mitigating prevalent occupational stress within the workplace. Specifically, the UC-METC HRD Director should proactively monitor and address instances of excessive workload, particularly role overload identified as the highest stressor, among Senior High School faculty to prevent burnout. Furthermore, administrators should establish supportive mechanisms to help teachers manage stress associated with sudden workload shifts or reassignments. Finally, the adoption and implementation of the proposed Stress Management Plan (detailed on the following page) is strongly recommended to address these concerns systematically.

## References

- Ackerman, C. P., Scheepers, J. M., Lessing, B. C., & Dannhauser, Z. (2000). [Article title]. *Journal of Industrial Psychology*, \*26\*(2), 58-65.
- Adam, C., Cavendish, W., & Mistry, P. (1992). Adjusting privatisation. Heinemann.
- Amos, T. L., Ristow, A., & Ristow, L. (2004). *Human resource management* (2nd ed.). Juta and Co Ltd.
- Armstrong, M., & Baron, A. (1998). *Performance management: The new realities*. IPD.
- Arnold, K. A., Barling, J., & Kelloway, E. K. (2001). Transformational leadership or the iron cage: What predicts trust, commitment and team efficacy? *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, \*22\*(7), 315-320.
- Aundry, I. (1995). Love and profit: Finding the balance. *Quality Process*, \*29\*(1), 47-49.
- Avolio, B. (1996). Leadership: Most critical issue in business today. *Human Resource Management Yearbook*, 10-14.

- Avolio, B. J., Waldman, D. A., & Yammarino, F. J. (1991). Leading in the 1990s: The four I's of transformational leadership. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, \*15\*(1), 1–8.
- Babbie, E., & Mouton, J. (2001). *The practice of social research*. Oxford University Press.
- Bagshaw, M. (2000). Emotional intelligence: Training people to be affective so they can be effective. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, \*32\*(2), 61–65.
- Baird, L. (1986). *Managing performance*. John Wiley.
- Barling, J., Salter, F., & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Transformational leadership and emotional intelligence: An exploratory study. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, \*21\*(3), 157–161.
- Bar-On, R. (1996). The Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i): A test of emotional intelligence. Multi-Health Systems.
- Bar-On, R. (1997). Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory technical manual. Multi-Health Systems.
- Bar-On, R. (2000). Emotional and social intelligence. In R. Bar-On & J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence* (pp. 363–388). Jossey-Bass.
- Barry, J. M. (1997). Performance management: A case study. *Journal of Environmental Health*, \*60\*(4), 12–38.
- Bartlett, C. A., & Ghoshal, S. (1995). Changing the role of top management: Beyond systems to people. *Harvard Business Review*, \*73\*(3), 132–142.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (3rd ed.). Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1994). Transformational leadership critical for South Africa. *Human Resource Management*, \*2\*, 10–13.
- Bass, B. M. (1997). Concepts of leadership. In R. P. Vecchio (Ed.), *Leadership: Understanding the dynamics of power and influence in organizations* (pp. 3–23). University of Notre Dame Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990a). Developing transformational leadership: 1992 and beyond. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, \*14\*(5), 21–27.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990b). *Transformational leadership development: Manual for the MLQ*. Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Sage Publications.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1997). *Full range leadership development: Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Mind Garden.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2000). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Mind Garden.
- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., & Goodheim, L. (1987). Biography and the assessment of transformational leadership at a world-class level. *Journal of Management*, \*13\*(2), 7–19.
- Baxter, J. (2004, November–December). [Personal communication on statistics]. Statistics Department, Rhodes University.
- Behling, O., & McFillen, J. (1996). A syncretical model of charismatic/transformational leadership. *Group and Organization Management*, \*21\*(2), 120–160.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategy for taking charge*. Harper & Row.
- Bernard, L. L. (1926). *Introduction to social psychology*. Holt.
- Bless, C., & Higson-Smith, C. (2000). *Fundamentals of social research methods: An African perspective* (3rd ed.). Juta Education.
- Booth, W. C. (1995). *The craft of research*. University of Chicago Press.
- Botha, J. (2001). The relationship between leadership, internal quality, and customer satisfaction levels of dealerships in a South African motor vehicle organisation [Master's thesis, Rhodes University].
- Brand, C., Heyl, G., & Maritz, D. (2000). Leadership. In M. Meyer & E. Botha (Eds.), *Organisational development and transformation in South Africa* (pp. 123–144). Butterworths.
- Brewster, C., Carey, L., Dowling, P., Grobler, P., Holland, P., & Wärnich, S. (2003). *Contemporary issues in human resource management*. Clyson Printers.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.
- Bycio, P., Hackett, R. D., & Allen, J. (1995). Further assessment of Bass's (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, \*80\*(4), 468–478.
- Byrkit, D. R. (1987). *Statistics today: A comprehensive introduction*. Cummings.
- Cacioppe, R. (1997). Leadership moment by moment. *Leadership and Organisational Development Journal*, \*18\*(7), 335–345.
- Campbell, J., McCloy, R., Oppler, S., & Sager, C. (1993). *The theory of performance*. Jossey-Bass.
- Carkhuff, R. R. (1988). *Empowering the creative leader in the new age of capitalism*. Human Resource Development Press.
- Carlton, G. (1993). *Leadership: The human race* (2nd ed.). Juta & Co.
- Carrell, M. R., Elbert, N. F., Hatfield, R. D., Grobler, P. A., Marx, M., & van der Schyf, S. (1998). *Human resource management in South Africa*. Prentice-Hall.
- Charlton, G. (2000). *Human habits of highly effective organisations*. Van Schaik.
- Cherrington, D. J. (1994). *Organisational behavior*. Allyn & Bacon.

- Coakes, S. J., & Steed, L. G. (1997). SPSS: Analysis without anguish: Version 6.1. John Wiley & Sons.
- Coetzee, M. (2005). \*Organisational report: 360-Degree Emotional Competency Profiler results\*. University of South Africa.
- Collis, D. J., & Montgomery, C. A. (1995). Competing on resources. *Harvard Business Review*, \*73\*(4), 118–128.
- Cooper, R. K. (1997). Applying emotional intelligence in the workplace. *Training and Development*, \*51\*(12), 31–38.
- Cooper, R. K., & Sawaf, A. (1997). *Executive EQ: Emotional intelligence in leadership and organisations*. Putnam.
- Corvellec, H. (1995). *Stories of achievement: Narrative features of organisational performance*. Lund University Press.
- Cullen, K., Gillmor, L., & Holmes, A. (2005). *Collins dictionary and thesaurus*. HarperCollins.
- Cummings, L. L., & Schwab, D. P. (1973). *Performance in organisations: Determinants and appraisal*. Scott, Foresman.
- Damasio, A. (1994). *Descartes' error: Emotion, reason and the human brain*. Putnam.
- De Vellis, R. F. (1991). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. Sage.
- Dimma, W. A. (1989). Leadership. *Business Quarterly*, \*23\*(2), 20–41.
- Downing, S. J. (1997). Learning the plot: Emotional momentum in search of dramatic logic. *Management Learning*, \*28\*(1), 27–44.
- Dulewicz, V., & Higgs, M. (2000). Emotional intelligence: A review and evaluation study. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, \*15\*(4), 341–372.
- Fiedler, F. E., & House, R. J. (1988). Leadership theory and research: A report of progress. *International Review of Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, \*19\*(88), 73–91.
- Foot, M., & Hook, C. (1999). *Introducing human resources management*. Longman.
- Gardner, L., & Stough, C. (2002). Examining the relationship between leadership and emotional intelligence in senior level managers. *Leadership and Organisation Development Journal*, \*23\*(2), 68–78.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind*. Bantam.
- Gardner, H., & Hatch, T. (1989). Multiple intelligences go to school. *Educational Researcher*, \*18\*(8), 8–14.
- George, J. M. (2000). Emotions and leadership: The role of emotional intelligence. *Human Relations*, \*53\*(12), 1027–1041.
- Gerber, P. D., Nel, P. S., & van Dyk, P. S. (1996). *Human resource management*. International Thompson.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. Bantam.
- Goleman, D. (1996). *Emotional intelligence*. Bloomsbury.
- Goleman, D. (1997). *Beyond IQ: Developing the leadership competencies of emotional intelligence*. Bloomsbury.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. Bantam.
- Grobler, P. A., Wörnich, S., Carrell, M. R., Elbert, N. F., & Hatfield, R. D. (2002). *Human resource management in South Africa*. Thompson Learning.
- Hall, J. (1996). *The competence connection: A blueprint for excellence*. Woodstead Press.
- Harrison, R. (1997). Why your firm needs emotional intelligence. *People Management*, \*3\*(1), 41.
- Hater, J. J., & Bass, B. M. (1988). Superiors' evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, \*20\*(1), 695–702.
- Hayward, B. A., Davidson, A. J., Pascoe, J. B., Tasker, M. L., Amos, T. L., & Pearse, N. J. (2003, June 25–27). The relationship between leadership and employee performance in a South African pharmaceutical company [Conference presentation]. Society for Industrial and Organisational Psychology 6th Annual Conference, Johannesburg, South Africa.
- Hellriegel, D., Jackson, S. E., Slocum, J. W., Staude, G., Amos, T., Klopfer, H. B., Louw, L., & Oosthuizen, T. (2004). *Management (2nd South African ed.)*. Oxford University Press.
- Hellriegel, D., Jackson, S. E., & Slocum, J. W. (1999). *Management*. South-Western College.
- Hellriegel, D., & Slocum, J. (1996). *Management (7th ed.)*. South-Western College.
- Hendry, C. (1995). *Human resource management: A strategic approach to employment*. Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1988). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources (5th ed.)*. Prentice-Hall.
- Holloway, J., Francis, G., & Hinton, M. (1999). A vehicle for change? A case study of performance improvement in the "new" public sector. *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*, \*12\*(4), 351–365.
- Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated business performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, \*78\*(1), 891–902.
- Hughes, R., Ginnett, A., & Curphy, G. (1994). *Leadership: Enhancing the lessons of experiences*. Free Press.
- Hussey, J., & Hussey, R. (1997). *Business research: A practical guide for undergraduate and postgraduate studies*. Macmillan.
- Johnson, M. (1995). *Managing in the next millennium*. Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Jones, G. R., & George, J. M. (2000). *Essentials of managing organisational behavior*. Prentice-Hall.
- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). *The balanced scorecard*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Keller, G., & Warrack, B. (1999). *Statistics for management and economics (4th ed.)*. Brooks-Cole.
- Kelley, R., & Caplan, J. (1993). How Bell Labs creates star performers. *Harvard Business Review*, \*3\*(2), 100–103.

- Kent, A., & Chelladurai, P. (2001). Perceived transformational leadership, organizational commitment, and citizenship behavior: A case study in intercollegiate athletics. *The Journal of Sport Management*, \*15\*, 135–159.
- Kilbourne, C. E. (1935). The elements of leadership. *Coast Artillery Journal*, \*11\*(1), 437–439.
- Klausner, H. (1997, July 5). Review of Raising your Emotional Intelligence by Jeanne Segal. <http://www.emotionalintelligence.org>
- Kotter, J. P. (1988). *The leadership factor*. Free Press.
- Lagomarsino, R., & Cardona, P. (2003). Relationships among leadership, organizational commitment and OCB in Uruguayan health institutions [Unpublished report]. IESE Business School, University of Navarra.
- Langley, A. (2000). Emotional intelligence: A new evaluation for management development? *Career Development International*, \*5\*(3), 177–183.
- Leedy, P. D. (1993). *Practical research planning and design*. Prentice-Hall.
- Lowe, K. B., & Kroeck, K. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership Quarterly*, \*7\*(3), 385–426.
- Maritz, D. (1995). Leadership and mobilising potential. *Human Resource Management*, \*10\*(1), 8–16.
- Martinez, M. N. (1997). The smarts that count. *HR Magazine*, \*42\*(11), 72–78.
- Martinez-Pons, M. (1997). The relation of emotional intelligence with selected areas of personal functioning. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, \*17\*, 313.
- Maude, B. (1978). *Leadership in management*. Business Books.
- Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D., & Salovey, P. (1998). Competing models of emotional intelligence. In R. J. Steinberg (Ed.), *Handbook of human intelligence* (2nd ed., pp. 396–420). Cambridge University Press.
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development, emotional literacy, and emotional intelligence* (pp. 3–31). Basic Books.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. (2000). Emotional intelligence meets traditional standards for an intelligence. *Intelligence*, \*27\*(4), 267–298.
- Mester, C., Visser, D., & Roodt, G. (2003). Leadership style and its relation to employee attitudes and behaviour. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, \*29\*(2), 72–80.
- Meyer, M., & Botha, E. (2000). *Organisation development and transformation in South Africa*. Butterworths.
- Mullins, L. (1999). *Management and organisational behaviour*. Pitman.
- Munroe, M. (1993). *Becoming leaders: Everyone can do it*. Pneuma Life.
- Neely, A., Gregory, M., & Platts, K. (1995). Performance measurement system design. *International Journal of Operational and Production Management*, \*15\*(4), 80–116.
- Neter, J., Wasserman, W., & Whitmore, G. A. (1993). *Applied statistics* (4th ed.). Allyn & Bacon.
- Norton, D. P. (1999). *The balanced scorecard: Participant's workbook*. Institute for International Research.
- Nwankwo, S., & Richards, D. C. (2001). Privatization: The myth of free market orthodoxy in sub-Saharan Africa. *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*, \*14\*(2), 165–179.
- Otley, D. T. (1999). Performance management: A framework for management control systems research. *Management Accounting Research*, \*10\*(2), 363–382.
- Palmer, P. N., & Jansen, C. A. (2004, September 17–29). Emotional intelligence as an important attribute of transformational leadership [Conference presentation]. Southern African Institute of Management Scientist Annual Conference, Cape Town, South Africa.
- Palmer, P. N., Jansen, C. A., & Coetzee, M. (2005). Perceptions of South African managers' emotional intelligence: A preliminary investigation. University of South Africa.
- Palmer, B., Walls, M., Burgess, Z., & Stough, C. (2001). Emotional intelligence and effective leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, \*22\*(20), 1–7.
- Parasuraman, A. (1986). *Marketing research*. Addison-Wesley.
- Paulus, P. B., Seta, C. E., & Baron, R. A. (1996). *Effective human relations: A guide to people at work* (3rd ed.). Prentice-Hall.
- [Personal communication]. (2004, April–December). Southern Region Human Resource Manager, The Parastatal.
- Piasecka, A. (2000). Not 'leadership' but 'leaderism'. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, \*32\*(7), 253–256.
- Porter, L. W., Lawler, E. E., III, & Hackman, J. R. (1987). *Behaviour in organisations*. McGraw-Hill.
- Pruijn, G. H. J., & Boucher, R. L. (1994). The relationship of transactional and transformational leadership to the organisational effectiveness of the Dutch National Sports Organisations. *European Journal of Sports Management*, \*1\*, 72–87.
- Quy, N. H. (1999). Emotional capability, emotional intelligence, and radical change. *Academy of Management Journal*, \*24\*, 325–345.
- Ristow, A. (1998). Transformational leadership and organisational effectiveness in the administration of cricket in South Africa [Master's thesis, Rhodes University].
- Ristow, A., Amos, T., & Staude, G. (1999). Transformational leadership and organisational effectiveness in the administration of cricket in South Africa. *South African Journal of Business Management*, \*30\*(1), 1–5.
- Robbins, S. P. (1996). *Organisational behavior: Concepts, controversies, applications*. Prentice-Hall.
- Robbins, S. P. (2001). *Organisational behavior* (9th ed.). Prentice-Hall.
- Rozell, E. J., Pettijohn, C. E., & Parker, R. S. (2002). An empirical evaluation of emotional intelligence. *The Journal of Management Development*, \*21\*(4), 272–289.

- Rutter, G. (1995). Leadership: Directing people for their genuine long-term good. *Human Resource Management*, \*10\*(2), 27–28.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, \*9\*, 185–211.
- Salovey, P., & Sluyter, D. J. (1997). Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications. Basic Books.
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D. J., Cooper, J. T., Golden, C. J., & Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, \*25\*, 167–177.
- Sekaran, U. (1992). *Research methods for business: A skills building approach* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Sekaran, U. (2000). *Research methods for business* (3rd ed.). Hermitage.
- Senior, B. (1997). *Organisational change*. Pitman.
- Shriberg, A., Lloyd, C., Shriberg, D. L., & Williamson, M. L. (1997). *Practicing leadership: Principles and applications*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Sosik, J. J., & Megerian, L. E. (1999). Understanding leader emotional intelligence and performance: The role of self-other agreements on transformational leadership perceptions. *Group and Organisational Management*, \*24\*(2), 367–390.
- Stein, S. J., & Book, H. E. (2000). *The EQ edge: EQ and your success*. Stoddart.
- Steiner, C. (1997). *Achieving emotional literacy*. Bloomsbury.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. Free Press.
- Stuart, A., & Pauquet, A. (2001). Emotional intelligence as a determinant of leadership potential. *Journal of Industrial Psychology*, \*27\*(3), 30–34.
- Swanepoel, B., Erasmus, B., Van Wyk, M., & Schenk, H. (2000). *South African human resource management: Theory and practice*. Juta and Co. Ltd.
- Temple, B. (2002). Avoid downsizing disasters: Empower your employees. *San Diego Business Journal*, \*23\*(5), 22–45.
- Terre Blanche, M., & Durrheim, K. (1999). *Research in practice: Applied methods for the social sciences*. University of Cape Town Press.
- Theron, D., & Roodt, G. (2001). An evaluation of the 360° project management competency assessment questionnaire. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, \*27\*(2), 51–56.
- Thorndike, E. L. (1920). A constant error in psychological ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, \*4\*, 25–29.
- Tichy, N. M., & Devanna, M. A. (1986). *The transformational leader*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Turner, N., & Barling, J. (2000). *Moral reasoning and transformational leadership: An exploratory study* [Thesis]. Queen's University School of Business.
- Van Jaarsveld, P. (2003). *The heart of a winner*. Paarl Print.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. Wiley.
- Wall, B., Solum, R. S., & Sobol, M. R. (1992). *The visionary leader*. Prima.
- Whetten, D. A., & Cameron, K. S. (1998). *Developing management skills* (4th ed.). Addison-Wesley.
- Wolmarans, I. S. (1998). Emotions give you the edge. *People Dynamics*, 23–25.
- Wolmarans, I. S., & Martins, N. (2001). \*The 360-Degree Emotional Competency Profiler\*. Organisational Diagnostics and Learning Link International.
- Yammarino, F. J., & Bass, B. M. (1990). Transformational leadership and multiple levels of analysis. *Human Relations*, \*43\*(10), 975–995.
- Yovovich, B. G. (1996). Knowledge workers managers' style. *Advertising Age's Business Marketing*, \*8\*(1), 44.
- Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organisations*. Prentice-Hall.