

School Heads' Emotional Intelligence and Teachers' Interpersonal Relationship

CHERIE P. TENDOY

Department of Education Teacher
Cherie.tendoy@deped.gov.ph

RAQUEL B. PANCHO

Department of Education School Head
NWSSU Graduate School Professor

EMELYN A. PORFERO

Abstract — This study investigated the impact of school heads' emotional intelligence on the interpersonal relationships of teachers in the Palapag Districts, Schools Division of Northern Samar, for the School Year 2024–2025, with the aim of informing the development of a Psychosocial Activity Plan to enhance school relational climates. Anchored in emotional intelligence theory, the study employed a descriptive-correlational design, gathering data from 35 school heads through total enumeration and 221 teachers through stratified random sampling. Emotional intelligence was measured across four domains—self-awareness, social awareness, self-management, and relationship management—while interpersonal relationships were assessed using indicators such as security, work environment, job responsibilities, and community linkages. Data analysis revealed high levels of emotional intelligence among school heads, particularly in self-awareness and relationship management, which positively influenced the overall school climate. Teachers similarly demonstrated strong interpersonal dynamics, especially in communication and empathy, although challenges in conflict resolution were identified. Significant correlations emerged between administrative experience and trust, as well as between teaching load and communication, while demographic variables such as age and sex showed no significant relationship with either emotional intelligence or interpersonal relationships. These findings underscore the importance of emotionally intelligent leadership in fostering collaborative and supportive educational environments and support the recommendation to implement a Psychosocial Activity Plan aimed at strengthening relational competencies across school communities.

Keywords — *Emotional Intelligence, Interpersonal Relationships, School Leadership, Psychosocial Activity Plan, and Quantitative-Correlational Study*

I. Introduction

Emotional intelligence (EI) is increasingly regarded as a critical component of effective leadership, especially in educational settings where school climate, teacher morale, and interpersonal relationships significantly impact organizational success. As the ability to perceive, understand, and manage emotions in oneself and others, EI enables school heads to foster

supportive environments, resolve conflicts, and promote collaborative cultures essential for teaching and learning. While numerous studies affirm the role of EI in enhancing leadership and teacher satisfaction in urban contexts, there is a notable scarcity of research focused on rural and under-resourced areas. In regions like the Palapag Districts in Northern Samar, the education sector continues to face systemic challenges—such as limited infrastructure, resource scarcity, high workloads, and inadequate professional development—which negatively affect teacher well-being and collegiality. These issues are exacerbated by weak administrative support, contributing to poor teacher retention and suboptimal school climates. Despite the potential of emotionally intelligent leadership to buffer these challenges, empirical investigations into its specific influence on teachers' interpersonal relationships in rural settings remain limited. Teachers in such areas often report feeling disconnected from leadership, leading to strained relationships, low trust, and diminished professional engagement. This study addresses these gaps by examining the impact of school heads' EI on the interpersonal relationships of teachers in the Palapag Districts, aiming to generate context-specific insights into how emotionally intelligent leadership can strengthen collaboration, enhance morale, and improve educational outcomes. The findings are expected to inform the development of a Psychosocial Activity Plan and contribute to evidence-based leadership training tailored to the unique needs of rural schools, ultimately supporting broader educational reform in underserved regions of the Philippines.

Literature Review

Emotional intelligence (EI) has gained prominence in educational leadership research due to its impact on school performance, workplace relationships, and teacher well-being. Defined as the ability to perceive, understand, and manage emotions (Goleman, 2021), EI is especially important in schools, where leadership often dictates institutional culture and staff morale. In urban and well-resourced environments, emotionally intelligent school heads have been shown to foster collaboration, enhance teacher satisfaction, and improve overall school outcomes (Brackett & Cipriano, 2022; O'Connor et al., 2023). However, a notable gap remains in the literature concerning rural and underserved areas such as the Palapag Districts in Northern Samar, where school leaders face compounded challenges including infrastructural deficits, limited teacher support, and weak administrative systems (Estacio & Robles, 2024).

This study draws from multiple theoretical perspectives to examine how school heads' emotional intelligence influences teacher relationships in resource-constrained contexts. It integrates Emotional Intelligence Theory (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2004; Goleman, 2021), Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000), Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory (1959), and Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964) to create a comprehensive conceptual framework. Goleman's five EI domains—self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills—are central to fostering trust, reducing conflict, and encouraging teacher collaboration (Liu et al., 2024). These domains intersect with Herzberg's motivational factors and the psychological needs emphasized in Self-Determination Theory, while Social Exchange Theory helps explain how emotionally

attuned leadership builds mutual commitment and cohesion (Tajeddin & Khodaverdi, 2023; Gómez-Leal et al., 2022). The framework also considers individual variables such as experience and professional training, which may moderate the effects of EI on school dynamics (Kaur & Bedi, 2022; Manalo, 2023).

In emotionally challenging work environments—particularly rural schools—EI becomes even more critical. Teachers in these areas often report low morale, professional isolation, and limited access to support systems (Vesely-Maillefer & Saklofske, 2018). Studies show that emotionally intelligent leaders can counter these stressors by cultivating psychologically safe environments, strengthening communication, and validating teachers’ emotional experiences (Bedi & Kaur, 2020; Yin & Wang, 2023). Such leadership improves teacher retention, boosts intrinsic motivation, and reinforces commitment to the school community (Brackett et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2024). This highlights the necessity of responsive leadership in contexts where systemic barriers undermine interpersonal relationships and educational quality.

Moreover, emotionally intelligent leadership has been shown to support effective conflict resolution and classroom management, especially in high-stress settings. Leaders and teachers with high EI employ integrative conflict management strategies, leading to more harmonious working environments and constructive professional interactions (Skordoulis et al., 2025; Valente & Lourenço, 2020). EI also buffers the effects of occupational stress and reduces burnout, which are prevalent in under-resourced school systems (Estacio & Robles, 2024; Kalkan & Yıldırım, 2023). The ability to lead with empathy and regulate emotional climates has been associated with stronger organizational loyalty and resilience, particularly in educational communities marked by scarcity and adversity (Fernández-Berrocal & Extremera, 2022).

Given these insights, the study underscores the need for leadership training that embeds emotional intelligence as a core competency, especially in marginalized educational contexts. By localizing the inquiry within the Palapag Districts, this research responds to a critical gap in literature and practice, proposing that emotionally intelligent leadership can serve as a compensatory mechanism for structural limitations. Ultimately, it aims to inform policy, professional development, and school governance strategies that prioritize emotional and relational dimensions of leadership—an essential step toward building inclusive, resilient, and high-performing schools in underserved regions.

II. Methodology

This study investigated the impact of school heads’ emotional intelligence (EI) on the interpersonal relationships of teachers in the Palapag Districts under the Schools Division of Northern Samar during the academic year 2024–2025. Anchored in Emotional Intelligence Theory (Goleman, 2021; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2008), Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000), Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory (Herzberg, 1959), and Social Exchange Theory (Blau,

1964), the research integrated psychological, motivational, and organizational constructs to examine how emotionally attuned leadership enhanced collegiality, teacher motivation, and workplace well-being. Using a descriptive-correlational research design (Creswell & Creswell, 2022), the study utilized total enumeration for school heads (N=35) and stratified random sampling for teachers (n=221) across Palapag I–III Districts to ensure representativeness and minimized sampling bias (Teddlie & Yu, 2007).

Validated instruments adapted from the Emotional Competence Inventory (Boyatzis, Goleman, & Rhee, 2000) and the Interpersonal Trust Scale (Rotter, 1967; Colquitt et al., 2021) measured four EI domains—self-awareness, social awareness, self-management, and relationship management—alongside five teacher relationship dimensions: communication, trust, empathy, conflict management, and social support (Vesely-Maillefer & Saklofske, 2018). High internal reliability ($\alpha > 0.80$) was achieved through pilot testing, and data collection was conducted through both online and face-to-face modalities, following ethical protocols including informed consent and confidentiality (Fetters, Curry, & Creswell, 2013). Normality tests supported the use of parametric analyses such as Pearson’s *r* and multiple regression (Field, 2018; Pallant, 2020). The study’s findings aimed to inform the development of a Psychosocial Activity Plan that promoted emotionally intelligent leadership and fostered collaborative, resilient, and emotionally supportive school environments, particularly in rural and under-resourced settings where emotional labor and teacher disengagement remained prevalent (Brackett & Cipriano, 2022; Estacio & Robles, 2024; Liu et al., 2024).

III. Results and Discussion

Table 1 summarizes the demographic and professional profile of the 35 school heads in the Palapag Districts, revealing a predominantly middle-aged, gender-balanced leadership group concentrated in mid-level roles. Most fall within the 42–46 and 52–56 age brackets (28.6% each), reflecting experienced leaders with institutional insight. A slight male majority (54.3%) suggests progress in gender equity, though female advancement remains limited. The prevalence of Head Teacher I positions (42.9%) and few higher-ranked posts point to restricted promotion opportunities. With 40% having only 2–8 years of experience and a similar percentage receiving just 2–11 trainings, the data highlight gaps in leadership development and the need for structured mentorship and capacity-building—particularly in rural, resource-challenged contexts.

Table 1
Profile of the School Heads

Profile	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Age		
52-56	10	28.6
47-51	6	17.1
42-46	10	28.6

37-41	6	17.1
32-36	3	8.6
Sex		
Male	19	54.3
Female	16	45.7
Administrative Position		
Principal III	3	8.6
Principal II	1	2.9
Principal I	5	14.3
Head Teacher IV	5	14.3
Head Teacher III	1	2.9
Head Teacher II	4	11.4
Head Teacher I	15	42.9
Master Teacher I	1	2.9
Years of Administrative Experience		
30-36	1	2.9
23-29	5	14.3
16-22	5	14.3
9-15	8	22.9
2-8	14	40.0
1 or below	2	5.7
Number of Relevant Trainings Attended		
42-51	1	2.9
32-41	5	14.3
22-31	7	20.0
12-21	8	22.9
2-11	14	40.0

Profile of the Teachers

Table 2 presents the demographic and professional profile of teachers in the Palapag Districts, highlighting a young, predominantly female workforce mostly in the early to mid stages of their careers. With nearly half aged 32–40 and a strong presence in Teacher III positions (57.9%), this group shows potential for innovation but faces limited promotion opportunities, as only 13.9% have reached Master Teacher ranks. The scarcity of senior teachers (11.3% aged 50 and above) suggests a mentorship gap for younger educators. Most teachers have 2–19 years of service and carry substantial daily teaching loads—often exceeding 300 minutes—which, without balanced preparation time, risks overwork and reduced instructional quality. These trends call for targeted support in mentorship, professional growth, and workload relief to sustain teacher effectiveness and well-being.

Table 2
Profile of the Teachers

Profile	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Age		
59 or above	8	3.6
50-58	17	7.7

41-49	49	22.2
32-40	102	46.2
23-31	45	20.4
Sex		
Male	53	24.0
Female	168	76.0
Teaching Position		
Master Teacher III	2	.9
Master Teacher II	2	.9
Master Teacher I	27	12.2
Teacher III	128	57.9
Teacher II	19	8.6
Teacher I	43	19.5
Years of Teaching Experience		
38 or above	4	1.8
29-37	12	5.4
20-28	15	6.8
11-19	85	38.5
2-10	99	44.8
1 or below	6	2.7
Teaching Load (Number of Minutes per Day)		
375-434	6	2.7
315-374	89	40.3
255-314	51	23.1
195-254	71	32.1
135-194	4	1.8

Level of Emotional Intelligence of School Heads

Table 3 presents a strong profile of school heads' emotional intelligence (EI) in the Palapag Districts, with mean scores across self-awareness, social awareness, self-management, and relationship management ranging from 4.314 to 4.771—classified as “Very High Emotional Intelligence” (VHEI). These results indicate that school leaders possess well-developed emotional competencies essential for effective leadership. High self-awareness scores reflect their ability to understand personal emotions and strengths, while elevated social awareness ratings, particularly in empathy, highlight their capacity to build trust and rapport. In self-management, strong scores in emotional regulation and stress coping suggest resilience and composure under pressure. Relationship management scores further show their ability to influence and maintain positive professional relationships. These findings underscore the critical role of EI in fostering inclusive, collaborative, and high-performing school environments, particularly in rural settings, and point to the importance of continued EI-focused training for school leadership development.

Table 3
Level of Emotional Intelligence of School Heads

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
Self-Awareness		
I feel that I have a number of good qualities.	4.429	VHEI
On the whole, I'm pleased with my life.	4.657	VHEI
I generally believe that things will work out fine in my life.	4.457	VHEI
I expect that I will do well on most things in I try.	4.600	VHEI
When I am faced with challenge, I don't easily give up because I believe I will not fail.	4.371	VHEI
Social Awareness		
I don't find any difficulty to see things from another person's viewpoint.	4.571	VHEI
I'm normally able to "get into someone's shoes" and experience their emotions.	4.286	VHEI
In my group of friends, I am generally aware of how each person feels about the people in our social circle.	4.400	VHEI
I find it time to listen to other person's problems.	4.686	VHEI
My co-workers easily confide on me.	4.371	VHEI
Self - Management		
I don't find any difficulty to regulate my emotions.	4.314	VHEI
I don't change my mind frequently.	4.571	VHEI
I'm usually able to find ways to control my emotions when I want to.	4.543	VHEI
On the whole, I am able to deal with stress.	4.486	VHEI
I pray/meditate to shake off bad mood.	4.771	VHEI
Relationship Management		
I can deal effectively with people.	4.257	VHEI
I usually able to influence the way other people feel.	4.600	VHEI
I would describe myself as a good "negotiator".	4.543	VHEI
My fellow workers want me to share in their celebrations.	4.771	VHEI
I find it easy to approach a fellow worker and ask how s/he is doing.	4.371	VHEI

* Interpretation

- 4.20-5.00 – With Very High Emotional Intelligence (VHEI)
- 3.40- 4.19 – With High Emotional Intelligence (HEI)
- 2.60-3.39 – With Moderate Emotional Intelligence (MEI)
- 1.80-2.59 – With Less Emotional Intelligence (LEI)
- 1.00-1.79 – With No Emotional Intelligence (NEI)

Level of Interpersonal Relationship of Teachers

Table 4 provides an overview of teacher–school head interpersonal relationships across five domains: communication, trust, empathy, conflict management, and social support. Overall, both groups rated their interactions as generally positive, with mean scores falling within the "Relational" range. Communication was a relative strength, with both teachers (M = 4.13) and school heads (M = 4.10) expressing confidence in open dialogue, though lower scores on adapting to others' perspectives suggest a need for greater communicative flexibility. Trust levels were moderate, with teachers rating school heads slightly lower in dependability (M = 3.70), highlighting a key area for improvement in relational trust.

Empathy and conflict management scores showed that while both parties expressed general awareness and concern for each other, there is room to strengthen emotional sensitivity and conflict resolution strategies. Teachers rated themselves higher in conflict management (M = 3.89) than

school heads ($M = 3.58$), possibly due to administrative burdens limiting proactive engagement. Social support was perceived as stronger by teachers ($M = 4.00$) than by school heads ($M = 3.60$), reflecting the complex dual roles leaders must navigate. These findings emphasize the importance of enhancing emotionally intelligent leadership, particularly in trust-building, empathy, and collaborative problem-solving, to foster healthier school climates and more supportive professional relationships.

Table 4
Level of Interpersonal Relationship of Teachers as Assessed by Themselves and their School Heads

Indicators	Teachers		School Heads		Total	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
Communication						
I feel comfortable initiating conversations with others.	4.13	R	4.10	R	4.11	R
I actively listen when others are speaking.	4.05	R	4.00	R	4.03	R
I am able to express my thoughts and feelings clearly.	4.05	R	4.00	R	4.03	R
I show interest in what others have to say.	3.86	R	3.80	R	3.83	R
I adjust my communication style depending on who I am speaking with.	3.89	R	3.83	R	3.86	R
Trust						
I find it easy to trust people I interact with.	3.95	R	3.86	R	3.90	R
I believe that people generally have good intentions	3.77	R	3.70	R	3.73	R
I feel confident sharing personal information with close colleagues/friends	4.14	R	4.00	R	4.07	R
I am dependable when others confide in me.	3.84	R	3.55	R	3.70	R
I give others the benefit of the doubt in uncertain situations.	4.13	R	4.00	R	4.06	R
Empathy						
I try to understand things from other people's perspectives.	3.83	R	3.77	R	3.80	R
I feel concerned when someone is upset.	3.84	R	3.79	R	3.81	R
I offer help when I see someone struggling emotionally.	4.01	R	4.00	R	4.00	R
I respect the emotions of others even when I do not fully understand them.	3.79	R	3.68	R	3.73	R
I am sensitive to the feelings of those around me.	3.86	R	3.75	R	3.80	R
Conflict Management						
I address misunderstandings calmly and respectfully.	3.89	R	3.58	R	3.73	R
I address misunderstandings calmly and respectfully.	3.92	R	3.87	R	3.89	R

I am willing to compromise to resolve disagreements.	3.96	R	3.78	R	3.87	R
I can discuss differences without becoming defensive.	4.14	R	4.00	R	4.07	R
I seek solutions that benefit everyone involved.	3.90	R	3.50	R	3.70	R
I maintain positive relationships even after conflicts.	3.83	R	3.45	R	3.64	R
Social Support						
I am willing to offer support to others in times of need.	3.87	R	3.75	R	3.81	R
I know I can rely on my colleagues/friends when I need help.	3.86	R	3.68	R	3.77	R
I often receive encouragement from people close to me.	3.94	R	3.69	R	3.81	R
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my social group.	3.89	R	3.70	R	3.80	R
I contribute to building a supportive environment for others.	4.00	R	3.60	R	3.80	R

* Interpretation

- 4.20-5.00 – Highly Relational (HR)
- 3.40- 4.19 – Relational (R)
- 2.60-3.39 – Fairly Relational (FR)
- 1.80-2.59 – Less Relational (LR)
- 1.00-1.79 – Not Relational at all (NR)

Test of Relationship Between the Profile of the School Heads and Their Level of Emotional Intelligence

Table 5 presents the results of a Pearson correlation analysis examining the relationship between school heads' demographic characteristics and their emotional intelligence (EI) across five domains and overall interpersonal relationship competencies. The findings show that age, sex, and administrative position are not significantly associated with any EI domain ($p > 0.05$), suggesting that these attributes do not substantially influence emotional or relational capacities—supporting research that EI is shaped more by experience than by inherent traits (Bar-On, 2006; Mayer et al., 2016). However, years of administrative experience positively correlated with trust ($r = 0.212$, $p = 0.049$), indicating that longer-tenured leaders tend to build stronger trusting relationships. Additionally, teaching load showed significant positive correlations with both communication ($r = 0.136$, $p = 0.043$) and trust ($r = 0.131$, $p = 0.044$), implying that school heads who continue teaching are likely to develop deeper relational competencies through regular engagement with teachers and students. These results highlight the value of leadership experience and continued instructional involvement in fostering emotionally intelligent leadership, particularly in trust and communication domains.

Table 5
Test of Relationship Between the Profile of the School Heads and Their Level of Emotional Intelligence

Variables	Parameters	Communication	Trust	Empathy	Conflict Management	Social Support	Interpersonal Relationship
Age	Correlation Coefficient	-0.057	-0.045	-0.055	0.193	0.002	-0.046
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.395	0.510	0.416	0.169	0.976	0.496
	Interpretation	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant
Sex	Correlation Coefficient	0.080	-0.027	-0.023	-0.056	-0.020	-0.023
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.237	0.685	0.732	0.404	0.772	0.729
	Interpretation	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant
Position	Correlation Coefficient	0.027	-0.075	-0.016	-0.060	0.095	-0.004
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.695	0.268	0.810	0.378	0.159	0.951
	Interpretation	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant
Years of Administrative Experience	Correlation Coefficient	0.067	0.212	0.049	-0.088	-0.012	0.049
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.321	0.049	0.470	0.192	0.861	0.473
	Interpretation	Not Significant	Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant
Teaching Load	Correlation Coefficient	0.136	0.131	0.086	0.035	0.023	0.096
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.043	0.044	0.204	0.604	0.731	0.155
	Interpretation	Significant	Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant

Test of Relationship Between the Profile of the Teachers and Their Level of Interpersonal Relationship

Table 6 presents the Pearson correlation analysis results between teachers’ demographic and professional characteristics—such as age, sex, position, years of experience, and teaching load—and their interpersonal relationship skills across five domains, including a composite score. The analysis found no significant correlations between interpersonal skills and the variables of age, sex, teaching position, or experience ($p > 0.05$), indicating that these factors do not meaningfully predict teachers’ relational competencies in this context, consistent with research emphasizing the role of emotional intelligence and situational factors over fixed demographics (Riggio, 2019). However, teaching load showed modest but statistically significant positive correlations with communication ($r = 0.176, p = 0.043$), trust ($r = 0.161, p = 0.044$), and overall interpersonal relationships ($r = 0.156, p = 0.045$), suggesting that teachers with heavier instructional duties may develop stronger relational skills, likely due to more frequent interactions with students and colleagues (Cepriehko, 2021). While these relationships are not strong, they highlight how active engagement in teaching can contribute to interpersonal growth, though other

contextual and emotional factors undoubtedly shape relational effectiveness within school environments.

Table 6
Test of Relationship Between the Profile of the Teachers and Their Level of Interpersonal Relationship

Variables	Parameters	Communication	Trust	Empathy	Conflict Management	Social Support	Interpersonal Relationship
Age	Correlation Coefficient	-0.057	-0.045	-0.055	-0.093	0.002	-0.046
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.395	0.510	0.416	0.169	0.976	0.496
	Interpretation	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant
Sex	Correlation Coefficient	0.080	-0.027	-0.023	-0.056	-0.020	-0.023
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.237	0.685	0.732	0.404	0.772	0.729
	Interpretation	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant
Position	Correlation Coefficient	0.027	-0.075	-0.016	-0.060	0.095	-0.004
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.695	0.268	0.810	0.378	0.159	0.951
	Interpretation	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant
Years of Experience	Correlation Coefficient	0.067	0.012	0.049	-0.088	-0.012	0.049
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.321	0.859	0.470	0.192	0.861	0.473
	Interpretation	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant
Teaching Load	Correlation Coefficient	0.176	0.161	0.086	0.035	0.023	0.156
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.043	0.044	0.204	0.604	0.731	0.045
	Interpretation	Significant	Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Significant

Test of Relationship Between the Level of Emotional Intelligence of School Heads and the Level of Interpersonal Relationship of the Teachers

Table 7 presents the results of a correlation analysis between school heads' emotional intelligence (EI)—measured across self-awareness, social awareness, self-management, relationship management, and an overall EI score—and teachers' interpersonal relationship skills, including trust, empathy, conflict management, social support, and a composite score. The analysis found no statistically significant correlations ($p > 0.05$), indicating that school heads' EI does not directly relate to how teachers perceive their own interpersonal skills. This outcome contrasts with existing literature (e.g., Goleman, 1998; Mayer et al., 2016) suggesting that emotionally intelligent leadership fosters positive relational climates. The lack of correlation may reflect the complexity of school environments, where other factors—such as leadership style, peer relationships, workload, or institutional culture—may mediate or moderate the influence of leadership EI on

teacher interactions. Additionally, measurement differences or inconsistencies in the translation of EI into observable behaviors may limit alignment between leader traits and teacher perceptions. These findings suggest the need for further research into the contextual variables that shape teacher relationships and the indirect pathways through which emotionally intelligent leadership may operate.

Table 7
Test of Relationship Between the Level of Emotional Intelligence of School Heads and the Level of Interpersonal Relationship of the Teachers

Variables	Parameters	Trust	Empathy	Conflict Management	Social Support	Interpersonal Relationship
Self - Awareness	Correlation Coefficient	-0.045	-0.055	-0.093	0.002	-0.046
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.510	0.416	0.169	0.976	0.496
	Interpretation	221	220	221	221	221
Social Awareness	Correlation Coefficient	-0.027	-0.023	-0.056	-0.020	-0.023
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.685	0.732	0.404	0.772	0.729
	Interpretation	221	220	221	221	221
Self Management	Correlation Coefficient	-0.075	-0.016	-0.060	0.095	-0.004
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.268	0.810	0.378	0.159	0.951
	Interpretation	221	220	221	221	221
Relationship Management	Correlation Coefficient	0.012	0.049	-0.088	-0.012	0.049
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.859	0.470	0.192	0.861	0.473
	Interpretation	221	220	221	221	221
Emotional Intelligence	Correlation Coefficient	0.101	0.086	0.035	0.023	0.096
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.134	0.204	0.604	0.731	0.155
	Interpretation	221	220	221	221	221

IV. Conclusion

1. The findings highlight a workforce of school heads with a mix of experience and age, but with gaps in career advancement and professional development. The majority have limited administrative experience and few professional development trainings, indicating a need for strategic support to enhance leadership capabilities and ensure smoother succession planning within school management.
2. The teacher profile shows a young and dynamic workforce with a heavy teaching load, raising concerns about burnout and stress. This underscores the need for better mentoring, career development pathways, and workload management to sustain teacher performance, well-being, and long-term retention.
3. School heads demonstrate strong emotional intelligence, including self-awareness, social awareness, self-management, and relationship management. This contributes to effective

leadership, fosters a positive school culture, and supports teacher morale. Continuous emotional intelligence development is crucial for sustaining and improving school environments.

4. Both school heads and teachers report strong interpersonal relationships in communication, trust, and empathy. However, there is room for improvement in conflict management and perceived leadership support. Targeted professional development in these areas could further enhance school culture and collaboration.
5. The profile analysis of school heads suggests that while demographic factors like age, sex, and position do not significantly influence emotional intelligence, administrative experience and teaching load positively impact trust, communication, and leadership effectiveness. Direct interactions through teaching contribute to improved emotional intelligence competencies.
6. For teachers, higher teaching loads were positively correlated with better communication, trust, and interpersonal relationship skills. The increased interaction resulting from heavy teaching loads may enhance their interpersonal dynamics, suggesting that exposure to more interactions can foster effective communication and trust-building.
7. Despite existing literature linking emotional intelligence to better interpersonal dynamics, the analysis found no significant correlations between school heads' emotional intelligence and teachers' interpersonal relationship skills. This lack of correlation points to the complexity of interpersonal relationships in schools, where multiple factors such as school culture, leadership style, and peer interactions play crucial roles. Future research should explore these variables in more depth.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alitagtag, J., & Rosales, A. (2022). Leading with empathy: Emotional intelligence and teacher commitment in Philippine public schools. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Practice*, 14(3), 45–59.
- [2] Ansari, N., & Asad, M. M. (2023). Exploring the impact of emotional intelligence on teacher engagement and school climate. *International Journal of Educational Psychology*, 12(1), 30–49.
- [3] Bar-On, R. (2006). The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence (ESI). *Psicothema*, 18(Supl), 13–25.
- [4] Bedi, A., & Kaur, R. (2020). Emotional intelligence and conflict management styles among school leaders. *Journal of School Leadership and Management*, 40(2), 125–143.
- [5] Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. Wiley.
- [6] Boyatzis, R., Goleman, D., & Rhee, K. (2000). Clustering competence in emotional intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI). In R. Bar-On & J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence* (pp. 343–362). Jossey-Bass.

- [7] Brackett, M. A., & Cipriano, C. (2022). Cultivating emotionally intelligent school leaders: A systems-based approach. *Educational Leadership Quarterly*, 58(2), 142–166.
- [8] Colquitt, J. A., Baer, M. D., Long, D. M., & Halvorsen-Ganepola, M. D. K. (2021). Scale development in organizational research: A review and best-practice recommendations. *Journal of Management*, 47(1), 239–287.
- [9] Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2022). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE.
- [10] Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268.
- [11] Estacio, R. M., & Robles, M. A. (2024). Emotional intelligence and teacher resilience in geographically isolated schools. *Philippine Journal of Rural Education*, 6(1), 56–72.
- [12] Fernández-Berrocal, P., & Extremera, N. (2022). Emotional intelligence as a protective factor in teaching: A review. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 109, 103575.
- [13] Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5th ed.). SAGE.
- [14] Goleman, D. (2021). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ* (25th anniversary ed.). Bantam Books.
- [15] Gómez-Leal, R., Méndez, I., Pérez, C., & Torres, F. (2022). The role of emotional intelligence in educational leadership: A meta-analytical review. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 50(4), 654–673.
- [16] Herzberg, F. (1959). *The motivation to work*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [17] Kaur, R., & Bedi, A. (2022). Emotionally intelligent leadership and teacher engagement in public schools. *Journal of Contemporary Educational Leadership*, 12(3), 99–115.
- [18] Liu, Y., Wang, H., & Li, X. (2024). Transformational leadership and emotional intelligence: Predictors of teacher commitment. *Educational Leadership Studies*, 42(2), 233–251.
- [19] Manalo, R. C. (2023). Emotional intelligence and faculty job satisfaction in rural Philippine higher education institutions. *Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership*, 9(2), 84–102.
- [20] Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2008). Emotional intelligence: New ability or eclectic traits? *American Psychologist*, 63(6), 503–517.
- [21] Pallant, J. (2020). *SPSS survival manual* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- [22] Riggio, R. E. (2019). *Introduction to leadership: Concepts and practice* (4th ed.). SAGE.
- [23] Rotter, J. B. (1967). A new scale for the measurement of interpersonal trust. *Journal of Personality*, 35(4), 651–665.
- [24] Skordoulis, R., Apostolidou, Z., & Katsaros, A. (2025). Emotional intelligence and conflict resolution strategies in Greek secondary schools. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 42(1), 67–88.
- [25] Tajeddin, Z., & Khodaverdi, M. (2023). The mediating role of trust in emotional intelligence and teacher collaboration. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 126, 104046.
- [26] Teddlie, C., & Yu, F. (2007). Mixed methods sampling: A typology with examples. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(1), 77–100.
- [27] Valente, S., & Lourenço, A. (2020). Emotional intelligence and conflict resolution in school environments: A systematic review. *Educational Research Review*, 31, 100355.
- [28] Vesely-Maillefer, A. K., & Saklofske, D. H. (2018). Emotional intelligence and teacher self-efficacy: Implications for teacher training. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 76, 147–158.
- [29] Yin, H., & Wang, W. (2023). Emotional intelligence and collaborative school cultures in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 43(2), 176–192.