IJAMS
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED MULTIDISCIPLINARY STUDIES
Volume V, Issue 7 July 2025, eISSN: 2799-0664

Influence of Emotional Intelligence to School Leadership and Decision-Making

JHONRID M. LOVITOS

Abstract — This study explores the perceived contribution of emotional intelligence (EI) to school leadership and decision-making among school heads and teachers. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, the study examined how emotional intelligence influences key leadership domains, including communication, conflict resolution, stress management, motivation, and ethical decision-making. Demographic data revealed that respondents, while mature, experienced, and academically qualified, showed no significant relationship between their profiles and their application of EI revealed that EI is a learned skill rather than an innate trait. Both school heads and teachers rated the contribution of EI as "Very Good" across all measured domains, with school heads slightly rating themselves higher, particularly in motivation and stress management. However, gaps were identified in emotional self-awareness and stakeholder engagement, suggesting areas for targeted professional development. Significant positive correlations were found between EI competencies and effective leadership practices, especially in conflict resolution, communication, and rational decision-making. These findings underscore the importance of integrating EI training into both pre-service and in-service education, alongside mentoring and reflective practices, to build emotionally intelligent leaders and educators. The study concludes with strong recommendations for institutionalizing EI in leadership frameworks, performance assessments, and school culture development. Doing so can foster inclusive, adaptive, and high-performing educational environments that are better equipped to navigate the complexities of modern education. Furthermore, the study advocates for future research to explore psychological and organizational factors that influence EI utilization, moving beyond demographic predictors. Overall, the findings affirm that emotional intelligence is a critical and foundational competency for sustainable and transformative school leadership.

Keywords — Emotional Intelligence, School Leadership, Decision-Making, Professional Development, Educational Management

I. Introduction

Emotional intelligence (EI) and organizational climate are key factors in shaping effective leadership and sound decision-making. Transformational leadership—defined by vision, inspiration, and motivation—is strengthened by a leader's emotional awareness and regulation, while a positive organizational climate encourages collaboration and innovation. Research shows that high EI enhances leadership success across industries, particularly in multicultural and complex organizational settings. In the Philippines, EI is increasingly emphasized in leadership development, especially within government and education, though challenges in integration persist. This study examines how EI and organizational climate impact transformational leadership and decision-making, aiming to inform policies and training that promote emotionally intelligent leadership and improved organizational performance.

1.1. Statement of the Problem

This study investigated emotional intelligence's contribution to effective school leadership and decision-making.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of the teachers and school head- respondents in terms of:

1.1 age;

1.2 sex;

1.3 civil status;

1.4 highest educational attainment;

1.5 designation/position;

1.6 years of administrative experience; and

1.7 number of relevant trainings/seminars attended?

1.2 teachers

1.2.1 age;

1.2.2 sex;

1.2.3 civil status;

1.2.4 highest educational attainment;

1.2.5 designation/position;

1.2.6 years of teaching experience; and

1.2.7 number of relevant trainings and seminars attended?

2. What is the respondent groups' perceived level of contribution of emotional intelligence to school leadership in terms of:

2.1 interpersonal relationship and communication;

2.2 conflict management and resolution;

2.3 motivational leadership and staff engagement; and

2.4 adaptability and stress management?

3. What is the respondent groups perceived level of contribution of emotional intelligence to decision making in terms of:

3.1 rationality and emotional regulation in decision-making.

3.2 problem-solving and critical thinking; and

3.3 ethical and inclusive decision-making?

4. Is there a significant relationship between the profile of the respondent groups to the perceived level of contribution of emotional intelligence to school leadership?

5. Is there a significant relationship between the profile of the respondent groups to the perceived level of contribution of emotional intelligence to decision-making?

6. Is there a significant relationship between the respondent groups' emotional intelligence and its contribution to school leadership and decision-making?

7. Based on the findings, what training plan can be proposed?

II. Methodology

This study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to examine the contribution of emotional intelligence to effective school leadership and decision-making. It described the demographic profiles of teachers and school heads and assessed their awareness and application of emotional intelligence. The study also explored the relationship between these profiles and the impact of emotional intelligence on leadership effectiveness. Stratified random sampling was used to ensure proportional representation across 15 schools, involving 116 teachers and 15 school heads. Data was gathered through validated survey questionnaires and analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Based on the results, a training plan was proposed to enhance emotional intelligence competencies among school leaders.

2.1 Procedure

Research permissions were obtained from relevant authorities, including the Schools Division Office and participating schools. A validated survey questionnaire was developed, pre-tested, and refined based on expert feedback. The final questionnaire was distributed physically or electronically to purposively selected school heads involved in inclusive education. Respondents were given adequate time to complete the survey, with follow-ups conducted to ensure high response rates. Ethical standards and confidentiality were strictly maintained. After data collection, responses were organized, encoded, and analyzed using statistical tools to generate insights that

informed the development of a training plan to enhance school leadership effectiveness in inclusive education.

2.2 Data Processing

The collected data were systematically processed and analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistical methods. Survey responses were organized, encoded, and verified for accuracy and completeness. Descriptive statistics, including frequency counts, percentages, means, and standard deviations, were used to analyze the demographic profiles of school head-respondents and assess emotional intelligence's contribution to leadership and decision-making. Pearson correlation analysis was applied to determine significant relationships between respondent profiles and emotional intelligence contributions. ANOVA or t-tests were also used to examine group differences based on demographic characteristics. The data analyzed were then interpreted to identify key insights, trends, and areas for improvement.

III. Results and Discussion

This section presented the demographic profile of school heads, including age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, designation, years of administrative experience, and the number of relevant trainings or seminars attended.

The data revealed that most school heads (60%) were aged 41–45, indicating a mid-career stage associated with emotional maturity and effective leadership. Female school heads comprised 60% of the respondents, aligning with research suggesting women often demonstrate higher emotional intelligence, particularly in empathy and interpersonal skills. A majority (66.7%) were married, which may have supported emotional regulation and stress management in leadership roles.

Regarding education, most school heads (66.7%) had earned units toward a master's degree, while 26.7% held a completed master's, and 6.7% had doctorate units. Higher education was linked to increased self-awareness and critical thinking, enhancing emotionally intelligent leadership. Position-wise, department heads made up 53.3% of respondents, followed by principals (33.3%) and head teachers (13.3%), with roles demanding strong emotional and interpersonal skills.

Nearly half (46.7%) had 1–5 years of administrative experience, while 26.7% had over 16 years. Both newer and seasoned leaders demonstrated the importance of emotional intelligence in managing relationships and conflicts. Additionally, 66.7% had attended more than 10 relevant trainings, underscoring a strong commitment to professional development. These trainings likely supported the development of emotional intelligence, contributing to transformational leadership and a positive school climate.

Table 2 Frequency Distribution on the demographic profile of the school heads

Age	**Frequency**	**Percent**
46>	3	20.0
41-45	9	60.0
31-35	3	20.0
Total	15	100.0
Sex	Frequency	Percent
Male	6	40.0
Female	9	60.0
Total	15	100.0
Civil Status	Frequency	Percent
Single	3	20.0
Married	10	66.7
Widowed	1	6.7
Separated	1	6.7
Total	15	100.0
Highest Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percent
Doctorate Degree-Units	1	6.7
Master's Degree	4	26.7
Master's degree-Units	10	66.7
Total	15	100.0
Position/Designation	Frequency	Percent
Principal	5	33.3
Head Teacher	2	13.3
Department Head	8	53.3
Total	15	100.0
Administrative Experience	Frequency	Percent
16>	4	26.7
11-15	3	20.0
6-10	1	6.7
1-5	7	46.7
Total	15	100.0
Number of Relevant Trainings/Seminars Attended	Frequency	Percent
10>	10	66.7
7-9	1	6.7
4-6	2	13.3
1-3	2	13.3
Total	15	100.0

This section presented the demographic profile of the teachers based on age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, designation or position, years of teaching experience, and the number of relevant trainings and seminars attended.

The majority of teachers were aged 31–40, suggesting a workforce in its early to mid-career stages, with growing emotional maturity and interpersonal competence. Female teachers made up 85.3% of the population, reflecting trends that associate women with higher emotional intelligence, especially in empathy and emotional regulation. Most teachers (65.5%) were married, which may have contributed to greater emotional resilience and stress management.

In terms of education, 49.1% had earned units toward a master's degree, and 25.9% had completed one, indicating a strong orientation toward professional growth and reflective practice. The most common designation was Teacher III (56%), followed by Teacher I (23.3%) and Master Teacher levels (12%), suggesting many were mid-career or advancing toward leadership roles.

Most teachers had 6–15 years of experience, with 37.9% in the 6–10 year range and 27.6% in the 11–15 year range. These teachers likely had developed classroom management skills and emotional intelligence. Additionally, 55.2% had attended more than 10 relevant trainings or seminars, highlighting their engagement in professional development related to communication, conflict resolution, and emotional growth—skills enhanced under transformational leadership.

Table 3 Frequency Distribution on the demographic profile of the Teachers

Age	**Frequency**	**Percent**
46>	7	6.0
41-45	13	11.2
36-40	40	34.5
31-35	38	32.8
25-30	18	15.5
Total	**116**	**100.0**
Sex	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Male	17	14.7
Female	99	85.3
Total	**116**	**100.0**
Civil Status	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Single	34	29.3
Married	76	65.5
Separated	4	3.4
Widowed	2	1.7
Total	**116**	**100.0**
Highest Educational Attainment	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Master's Degree	30	25.9
Master's Degree-Units	57	49.1
Bachelor's Degree	29	25.0
Total	**116**	**100.0**
Position/Designation	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Master Teacher II	2	1.7
Master Teacher I	12	10.3
Teacher III	65	56.0
Teacher II	10	8.6
Teacher I	27	23.3
Total	**116**	**100.0**
Years of Teaching Experience	**Frequency**	**Percent**
16>	17	14.7
11-15	32	27.6
6-10	44	37.9
1-5	23	19.8
Total	**116**	**100.0**
Number of Relevant Trainings/Seminars Attended	**Frequency**	**Percent**
10>	64	55.2
7-9	16	13.8

4-6	15	12.9
1-3	21	18.1
Total	**116**	**100.0**

Table 8 summarized the perceived contribution of emotional intelligence (EI) to school leadership, showing a grand mean of 2.78 (Very Good) with a standard deviation of 1.14. The highest-rated domain was Adaptability and Stress Management (Mean = 2.88), while Conflict Management received the lowest rating (Mean = 2.67), indicating a key area for improvement.

The results suggested that school heads were generally confident in their EI abilities, especially in self-management and staff engagement. However, lower scores in conflict resolution and interpersonal communication highlighted areas needing further development. The standard deviation indicated moderate variability, suggesting that while many leaders demonstrated strong EI traits, others could benefit from additional training.

These findings aligned with previous studies (ResearchGate, 2018, 2021), which emphasized that transformational leaders used EI to foster positive climates, manage complex decisions, and promote collaboration. Overall, while school heads exhibited strong EI, particularly in managing stress and motivation, further development in conflict resolution and interpersonal skills was recommended to enhance leadership effectiveness and organizational outcomes.

Table 8 Summary Results on the level of School Heads' Perceived Level of Contribution of Emotional Intelligence to School Leadership

Indicators	**N**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**	**Interpretation**
Adaptability And Stress Management	15	2.88	0.90	Very Good
Motivational Leadership and Staff Engagement	15	2.87	1.15	Very Good
Interpersonal Relationships and Communication	15	2.71	1.02	Very Good
Conflict Management and Resolution	15	2.67	1.48	Very Good
Grand Mean	**15**	**2.78**	**1.14**	**Very Good**

Legend	Range	Description
	4.21-5.00	Excellent
	3.41-4.20	Outstanding
	2.61-3.40	Very Good
	1.81-2.60	Good
	1.00-1.80	Need Improvement

Table 13 consolidated the data and showed that all domains of emotional intelligence (EI) in school leadership were rated as *Very Good* by teachers. Motivational Leadership and Staff Engagement received the highest mean (2.84), followed by Adaptability and Stress Management (2.81), Conflict Management (2.72), and Interpersonal Communication (2.69). The grand mean was 2.77 with a standard deviation of 1.09, reflecting a strong but not exceptional application of EI.

Teachers perceived their school leaders as emotionally intelligent across all areas, though none reached the *Outstanding* level. This consistency highlighted both competence and areas for further development, especially in interpersonal communication and conflict resolution.

These findings aligned with ResearchGate (2017), which linked emotionally intelligent leadership with transformational outcomes such as team trust, open communication, and a shared vision—factors that enhanced decision-making and school climate. Leaders with high EI were also better equipped to foster psychological safety, supporting innovation and team collaboration.

In conclusion, while school heads were viewed positively in terms of EI, there remained opportunities for growth. Targeted leadership development focusing on stakeholder engagement, conflict resolution, and innovation could elevate leadership quality to an *Outstanding* level.

Table 13 Summary Results on the level of Teacher' Perceived Level of Contribution of Emotional Intelligence to School Leadership

Indicators	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
Motivational Leadership and Staff Engagement	116	2.84	1.12	Very Good
Adaptability And Stress Management	116	2.81	0.92	Very Good
Conflict Management and Resolution	116	2.72	1.36	Very Good
Interpersonal Relationships and Communication	116	2.69	0.96	Very Good
Grand Mean	116	2.77	1.09	Very Good

Table 17 summarized the school heads' perceived level of emotional intelligence (EI) contribution to decision-making. Ethical and Inclusive Decision-Making received the highest mean (2.91), followed by Rationality and Emotional Regulation (2.75), while Problem-Solving and Critical Thinking had the lowest (2.59). The grand mean was 2.75, interpreted as *Very Good*, though close to the threshold between *Very Good* and *Good*.

This suggested that school heads demonstrated strength in ethical reasoning and emotional control but showed less confidence in using EI for innovative problem-solving. The average standard deviation of 0.97 indicated moderate variability, pointing to a need for more consistent training or mentorship.

Aligned with Goleman's theory, school heads appeared to have developed foundational EI skills such as empathy and self-regulation but lacked more advanced competencies in applying EI to analytical and creative leadership. Burns' transformational leadership model supported this view, highlighting moral leadership strengths but identifying a gap in intellectual stimulation.

These findings carried implications for organizational climate, as described by Lewin. Without strong problem-solving capabilities, schools risked stagnation and missed opportunities for innovation. Therefore, developing EI in tandem with critical thinking was seen as essential to enhancing leadership decision-making.

Overall, the data indicated a positive yet incomplete EI leadership profile, emphasizing the need to balance ethical awareness with cognitive flexibility to address the evolving challenges of school leadership.

Table 17 Summary Results on the level of School Heads' Perceived Level of Contribution of Emotional Intelligence to Decision Making

Indicators	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
Ethical And Inclusive Decision-Making Resolution	15	2.91	0.83	Very Good
Rationality And Emotional Regulation in Decision-Making	15	2.75	0.99	Very Good
Problem-Solving And Critical Thinking	15	2.59	1.10	Good
Grand Mean	15	2.75	0.97	Very Good

Table 21 summarized teachers' perceptions of decision-making dimensions. Ethical and Inclusive Decision-Making received the highest mean rating (2.91), followed by Rationality and Emotional Regulation (2.81), and Problem-Solving and Critical Thinking (2.72). The overall grand mean was 2.81, interpreted as *Very Good*.

Compared to school heads' self-assessment (grand mean = 2.75 in Table 17), teachers rated their leaders slightly higher, suggesting that school heads may have underestimated their impact or were more self-critical. Nonetheless, both data sets showed consistent strengths in ethical leadership and identified innovation and critical analysis as areas for improvement.

The findings supported Goleman's Emotional Intelligence theory, as empathy, self-regulation, and ethical awareness were both perceived and practiced. Burns' model of transformational leadership was reflected in value-driven decision-making, although intellectual stimulation and innovation promotion appeared less developed.

Lewin's climate theory was also affirmed; consistent ethical leadership fostered a trusting and inclusive environment. However, to drive true climate transformation, leaders needed to move beyond maintenance and embrace bold, critical change initiatives.

Teachers recognized the solid ethical and rational foundations in leadership decision-making. To further enhance effectiveness, school leaders needed to apply emotional intelligence toward innovation, strategic problem-solving, and adaptive thinking—thereby strengthening both school climate and performance.

Table 21 Summary Results on the level of Teachers' Perceived Level of Contribution of Emotional Intelligence to Decision Making

Indicators	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
Rationality And Emotional Regulation in Decision-Making	116	2.81	0.88	Very Good
Problem-Solving And Critical Thinking	116	2.72	0.99	Very Good
Ethical And Inclusive Decision-Making Resolution	116	2.91	0.83	Very Good
Grand Mean	**116**	**2.81**	**0.90**	**Very Good**

This section presents the test of the relationship between the profile of the school heads and their perceived level of contribution of emotional intelligence to school leadership. The results are shown below.

Table 22 presented the model summary of a multiple regression analysis. The correlation coefficient (R) was 0.615, indicating a moderate positive relationship between school heads' profiles and their perceived level of emotional intelligence (EI) contribution to school leadership. However, the R Square value was only 0.379, suggesting that 37.9% of the variance in the dependent variable was explained by the independent variables—reflecting moderate explanatory power.

A critical observation was the negative Adjusted R Square value (-0.242), which indicated that the model did not generalize well to the population. This negative value suggested possible overfitting or the inclusion of irrelevant predictors, likely due to the small sample size (N = 15) in relation to the number of predictors.

Additionally, the standard error of the estimate was 0.928, pointing to a relatively high degree of prediction error, which further reduced the reliability of the model, especially with the limited sample size.

Overall, while the correlation appeared moderate, the negative adjusted R^2 and high standard error suggested that the model's predictive strength was weak and statistically unreliable when accounting for complexity and sample limitations.

Table 22 Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.615	.379	-.242	.928

Table 23 presented the results of the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), which tested the overall significance of the regression model. The F-value was 0.610 with a significance level (p-value) of 0.735, which was not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$). This indicated that the regression model did not significantly predict the perceived contribution of emotional intelligence (EI) to school leadership based on the school heads' profile variables.

The regression sum of squares (3.680), compared to the residual sum of squares (6.034), further supported this finding, as most of the variance remained unexplained by the model. This reinforced the conclusion that the predictors did not have a meaningful combined effect on how school heads perceived their EI contribution to leadership.

Several factors may have contributed to this outcome. EI was likely influenced more by personal competencies—such as self-awareness, empathy, and self-regulation—than by demographic or professional characteristics. Additionally, the small sample size (n = 15) limited the statistical power of the analysis, increasing the likelihood of Type II errors.

In summary, the ANOVA results confirmed that there was no statistically significant relationship between school heads' profiles and their self-assessed EI contribution to leadership. This suggested that the development of EI depended more on personal reflection, training, or professional development than on fixed attributes such as age or years of service.

Table 23 ANOVA Analysis

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3.680	7	.526	.610	.735
	Residual	6.034	7	.862		
	Total	9.714	14			

This section presents the relationship between teachers' demographic profiles and their perceived contribution of emotional intelligence (EI) to school leadership, as shown in the findings below."

Let me know if you'd like help formatting or interpreting the actual findings as well.

The Model Summary showed that the multiple regression analysis revealed a very weak positive correlation (R = 0.170) between teachers' profile variables and their perceived contribution of emotional intelligence (EI) to school leadership. The R Square value of 0.029 indicated that only 2.9% of the variance was explained by the combined profile variables. The negative Adjusted R Square (-0.034) suggested that the model had a poor fit and may have performed worse than a model with no predictors.

Table 25 Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.170	.029	-.034	.82232

ANOVA Analysis further reinforces this lack of significance. The F-value of 0.458 and the associated p-value of 0.862 indicate that the regression model is not statistically significant. In practical terms, this means that the collective set of teacher profile variables does not significantly predict their perceptions of how emotional intelligence contributes to school leadership. With such a high p-value (well above the 0.05 threshold), we fail to reject the null hypothesis implying no

meaningful relationship exists between the independent (profile) variables and the dependent variable (perceived EI contribution).

These findings suggest that teachers' demographic and professional profiles are not strong determinants of how they perceive emotional intelligence's role in effective school leadership. This aligns with existing research that supports the idea that EI is less about fixed characteristics like age or position and more about personal awareness, emotional competence, and professional development. Consequently, school systems should focus less on demographic-based assumptions and more on providing EI training and support systems for teachers and school leaders to foster emotionally intelligent behaviors that can enhance leadership and school climate.

Table 26 ANOVA Analysis

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2.170	7	.310	.458	.862
	Residual	73.030	108	.676		
	Total	75.200	115			

Table 33 presented a multiple regression analysis examining the relationship between teachers' demographic and professional profiles and their perceived contribution of emotional intelligence (EI) to decision-making. The results showed that none of the variables—including age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, position, experience, or training—had statistically significant effects, with all p-values exceeding 0.05.

Although some beta coefficients indicated positive or negative trends (e.g., civil status $\beta = -0.107$, trainings $\beta = 0.270$), these relationships were weak and not meaningful, suggesting that random variation likely explained the results. Therefore, teachers' profiles did not predict how they perceived EI's importance in decision-making.

These findings supported the notion that EI is not inherently linked to personal background but rather to learned competencies. The study highlighted the disconnect between policy support (e.g., DepEd and CSC initiatives) and practical implementation, underscoring the need for explicit EI training and professional development.

Overall, the analysis emphasized that demographic factors alone did not shape perceptions of EI, reinforcing the importance of structured programs and systemic reforms to embed EI into educational leadership practices.

Table 33 Multiple Regression Analysis on test of relationship between the profile of the teachers and their perceived level of contribution of emotional intelligence to decision making

Variable	Beta	p-value	Decision
Age	-.019	.949	Not Significant
Sex	.047	.825	Not Significant
Civil Status	-.107	.452	Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	-.029	.899	Not Significant
Position/Designation	-.241	.403	Not Significant
Years of Teaching Experience	.068	.834	Not Significant
Number of Relevant Trainings/Seminars Attended	.270	.416	Not Significant

4. Discussion

Demographic Profile of the Respondents

The demographic profiles of school heads and teachers revealed a predominantly mid-career, female leadership group (aged 41–45), mostly married and highly educated, suggesting well-developed emotional and social competencies. Teachers, mainly female and in the 31–40 age range, also held or pursued graduate degrees, aligning with emotional intelligence (EI) development. Both groups showed strong engagement in professional development, with most having attended over 10 relevant trainings.

This indicated a school culture supportive of emotionally intelligent and transformational leadership. The alignment between their profiles suggested favorable conditions for EI-driven collaboration, classroom empathy, and inclusive practices. The findings emphasized the need to institutionalize EI training, assessment, and mentoring in education systems to build emotionally resilient, ethical, and high-performing school communities.

Perceived level of contribution of emotional intelligence to school leadership

The analysis of both school heads and teachers' perceptions showed that emotional intelligence (EI) was consistently rated as "Very Good" across four key domains: interpersonal communication, conflict resolution, motivational leadership, and stress management. School heads rated themselves slightly higher, particularly in stress management and motivation, but the difference was minimal, indicating shared views on EI's importance in effective leadership.

Interpersonal communication received the lowest scores, especially in stakeholder engagement and active listening, with teachers highlighting these gaps more than school heads. This suggested a disconnect between leaders' self-perception and staff experiences, possibly due to limited feedback mechanisms. Similarly, while conflict management was rated positively, variability in responses pointed to inconsistent practices, especially in addressing root causes and using mediation.

Overall, while both groups recognized the strong role of EI in school leadership, the findings indicated room for growth. Targeted professional development in areas like communication, conflict prevention, and reflective practice was recommended. Embedding EI into leadership training and evaluation could help elevate leadership quality from "Very Good" to "Outstanding," ultimately improving school culture and performance.

Perceived level of contribution of emotional intelligence to decision making

Table 14 showed that school heads generally perceived themselves as applying emotional intelligence (EI) effectively in decision-making, particularly in rationality and emotional regulation, with an overall mean of 2.75 (Very Good). The highest-rated item—making decisions based on logic rather than emotion (Mean = 3.07)—highlighted their confidence in rational thinking. They also rated highly their ability to consider multiple perspectives (Mean = 2.87).

However, lower scores were recorded for maintaining composure under pressure (Mean = 2.60) and especially in using self-awareness to assess emotional influence on decisions (Mean = 2.33). These Good ratings suggested that emotional self-regulation and insight were less developed. The high standard deviation (1.11) for self-awareness indicated variability, pointing to inconsistent competencies among leaders.

These findings aligned with Goleman's EI theory and Burns' Transformational Leadership Theory, which emphasize self-regulation and emotional awareness as vital for credible and inclusive leadership. The data suggested that while leaders felt confident in rational decision-making, there was a clear need for professional development focused on mindfulness, stress management, and emotional reflection to enhance leadership effectiveness and emotional intelligence in decision-making contexts.

Tests of Relationships of the Variables

The regression analyses indicated that demographic and professional characteristics—such as age, sex, marital status, and experience—did not significantly predict school heads' or teachers' perceptions of emotional intelligence (EI) in leadership and decision-making. Despite moderate correlation coefficients (e.g., $R = 0.615$ and $R = 0.672$), negative adjusted R^2 values, non-significant ANOVA results, and high p-values confirmed weak explanatory power and poor model fit.

These findings emphasized that EI is not shaped by fixed profile variables, but rather by personal competencies that must be intentionally developed. Consequently, leadership training should shift away from assumptions based on seniority or academic attainment and instead focus on cultivating core EI skills such as self-awareness, empathy, and emotional regulation. The results also suggested a gap between EI-related policy initiatives and their practical impact in schools, signaling the need for more effective implementation of EI training.

In contrast, Table 35 revealed significant positive correlations between teachers' EI and their leadership and decision-making contributions. High correlation values (e.g., r = 0.913 for conflict management, r = 0.918 for problem-solving) demonstrated that emotionally intelligent teachers were more effective leaders. This reinforced the idea that EI is foundational—not supplementary—to successful educational leadership. It also highlighted the cognitive and ethical dimensions of EI, supporting reflective, inclusive, and adaptive leadership practices.

In sum, while profile variables failed to predict perceived EI effectiveness, actual EI competencies strongly aligned with leadership impact. These findings underscored the need to embed EI development in both teacher and leader training programs to enhance school leadership and organizational outcomes.

IV. Conclusion

The study found that emotional intelligence (EI) was a critical and foundational competency in educational leadership and decision-making. Both school heads and teachers showed strong positive perceptions of EI, with statistically significant correlations across key leadership domains. While respondents' demographic profiles reflected maturity and professional development, these factors did not predict EI application—affirming EI as a learned skill. Both groups acknowledged EI's role in communication, conflict resolution, stress management, and ethical decision-making, though school heads rated themselves slightly higher. Notably, emotional self-awareness and stakeholder engagement emerged as areas for improvement. The findings supported the integration of structured EI training into leadership development and teacher education programs. By institutionalizing EI through targeted interventions, mentoring, and reflective practices, schools could develop emotionally intelligent leaders and educators capable of fostering inclusive, resilient, and high-performing learning environments within the Philippine education system.

V. Summary

- **Integrate EI in Curriculum:** DepEd and CHED should formally include EI development in teacher education and leadership programs, with practical modules on self-awareness, empathy, emotional regulation, conflict resolution, and ethics.
- **Conduct Regular EI Training:** Schools should offer ongoing EI-focused workshops, coaching, and professional development that emphasize real-life application, scenario-based learning, and reflective exercises.

- **Establish Mentoring Systems:** Develop structured mentoring and peer-coaching programs where emotionally competent educators guide peers, focusing on weak areas like stakeholder engagement and emotional self-awareness.
- **Revise Performance Evaluations:** Include EI indicators—such as emotional regulation, interpersonal sensitivity, and collaborative problem-solving—in teacher and school head evaluation tools.
- **Implement Feedback Mechanisms:** Introduce regular feedback tools like surveys, reflection journals, and 360-degree assessments to identify EI strengths and improvement areas.
- **Promote EI Research:** Encourage research institutions to explore psychological, behavioral, and organizational factors affecting EI through mixed methods like case studies and interviews.
- **Ensure Policy Implementation:** DepEd and CSC should operationalize EI-related policies at the school level with clear strategies, funding, and monitoring.
- **Align EI with School Goals:** Link EI development to broader school improvement efforts, promoting inclusive, emotionally safe environments that enhance teacher well-being, student engagement, and collaboration.

REFERENCES

[1] Ashkanasy, N. M., & Dorris, A. D. (2017). Emotions in the workplace. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 4, 67 90.
[2] Barbuto, J. E., Gottfredson, R. K., & Searle, T. P. (2021). Emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness: A meta-analysis. The Leadership Quarterly, 32(4), 101472.
[3] Barreiro, C., & Treglown, L. (2021). The role of emotional regulation in decision making for school leaders. Educational Management & Leadership, 49(2), 315-334. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220979842
[4] Brown, K., & McClelland, M. (2021). The role of emotional intelligence in inclusive decision-making: School leadership in diverse settings. Educational Leadership Review, 39(2), 145-162. https://doi.org/10.1080/ELR-2021039145
[5] Civil Service Commission (CSC). (2021). Emotional intelligence in public sector leadership: Policy and implementation strategies. CSC Publications.
[6] Davis, S. K., & Humphrey, N. (2020). Emotional intelligence as a predictor of rational decision-making in school leadership. Journal of Educational Administration, 58(3), 412-429. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-2019-0123
[7] Department of Education (DepEd). (2023). Social and emotional learning for effective school leadership: A national framework. DepEd Memorandum No. 2023-018.
[8] Gkonou, C., & Mercer, S. (2021). Emotional intelligence in school leadership: Managing teacher-student conflicts effectively. Educational Leadership Journal, 29(3), 178-196. https://doi.org/10.1080/ELJ-2021-0293

[9] Goleman, D., & Boyatzis, R. (2020). Emotional intelligence and ethical leadership in schools: A pathway to integrity. Journal of Educational Ethics and Leadership, 15(3), 278-294. https://doi.org/10.1080/JEL-2020-153278
[10] Heck, R. H., & Hallinger, P. (2020). Emotional intelligence and adaptability in educational leadership: A key to school success. Journal of School Leadership, 30(2), 245-267. https://doi.org/10.1080/JSL-2020-30245
[11] Khan, S., & Ahmed, R. (2021). The impact of emotional intelligence on staff engagement and retention in schools. Educational Leadership Review, 45(2), 89-107. https://doi.org/10.1080/ELR-2021-0452
[12] Leithwood, K., & Sun, J. (2018). The impact of emotional intelligence on school leadership effectiveness: Building relationships for improved school performance. Educational Administration Quarterly, 54(4), 501-528. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X18769048
[13] Matthews, G., Zeidner, M., & Roberts, R. D. (2020). Emotional intelligence and problem-solving in school leadership: A case study analysis. Educational Administration Quarterly, 56(4), 589-611. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X20921567
[14] Miao, C., Humphrey, R. H., & Qian, S. (2018). A meta-analysis of emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness: Moderators and theoretical extensions. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 91(4), 1370-1405.
[15] Morrison, M., & Brown, C. (2020). Emotional intelligence and communication effectiveness: Key competencies for school leadership. Journal of Educational Leadership & Policy, 35(2), 211-230. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2020.1731234
[16] Morton, C., & Worthington, E. (2021). The interplay of emotional intelligence and critical thinking in educational leadership. Journal of Educational Leadership Studies, 47(2), 201-218.https://doi.org/10.1080/JELS-2021 0472
[17] Müller, R., & Turner, J. R. (2019). Emotional intelligence and transformational leadership: Motivating school staff for success. Journal of Educational Leadership and Management, 38(4), 432-450. https://doi.org/10.1080/ELM 2019-38432
[18] Palafox, M. & Dela Cruz, R. (2022). Transformational leadership and emotional intelligence in Philippine educational institutions: A case study approach. Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership, 20(2), 112-130.
[19] Rahim, M. A., & Malik, S. (2019). Emotional intelligence and conflict resolution strategies in school leadership: A case study approach. International Journal of Educational Management, 33(5), 1021-1038.https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-12-2018-0401
[20] ResearchGate. (2013). The Relationship between Emotional Intelligence, Transformational Leadership, and Organizational Culture. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net
[21] ResearchGate. (2017). Emotional intelligence, leadership style & organizational climate. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net
[22] ResearchGate. (2018). Emotional intelligence and Transformational Leadership: A Review of Empirical Studies. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net
[23] ResearchGate. (2021). The Impact of Emotional Intelligence on Organizational Climate. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net
[24] Sánchez-Núñez, M. T., Fernández-Berrocal, P., & Latorre, J. M. (2021). The role of emotional intelligence in stress management among school principals. Educational Psychology Review, 33(3), 577-595. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-021-09569-4