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ABSTRACT

The Extension system throughout the United States is a unique network of educational processes based on collective research of the land-grant university system. Extension serves as the outreach arm of the land-grant university system and brings the research and education of the university to the people of the state.

County Extension administrators (commonly known as county chairs) are continuously working with a diverse and complex set of personalities and backgrounds among the staff of the local county Extension office. As the Ohio State University Extension system continues to undergo tremendous changes, the satisfaction and productivity of its clientele also faces similar challenges. County chairs must apply a continuous and dedicated effort to be emotionally, mentally and physically prepared to meet the needs and demands of staff members. Therefore, the competency and sensitivity of county chairs has become increasingly important for successful Extension leadership and work.

The researcher investigated the relationship between the level of emotional intelligence of county chairs and the job satisfaction of county Extension staff. The descriptive-correlational study utilized a census of Ohio State University Extension county chairs and a random sample of county Extension staff throughout the
State of Ohio. Data were collected utilizing Bar-On’s Emotional Intelligence Quotient instrument (county chairs) and Warner’s job satisfaction instrument (county employees).

The study examined the relationships between emotional intelligence of county chairs, job satisfaction of county staff and demographics of: appointment, main program area, location, length of employment with Extension, gender, race/ethnicity and previous management experience. Stepwise linear regression analysis was used to measure the proportion of variance in county staff’s job satisfaction that could be explained by emotional intelligence (county chairs) and demographic characteristics.

The findings suggested there is not a significant relationship between emotional intelligence of county chairs and the job satisfaction of county staff. Gender and level of highest education completed had low relationships to job satisfaction. Appointment, main program area, race/ethnicity and previous management experience did not effect the level of job satisfaction.

Based on the findings, the researcher concluded that the level of job satisfaction of Ohio State University Extension county staff is not influenced by the level of emotional intelligence of county chairs. Some correlations existed between job satisfaction and the selected demographic characteristics.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

This chapter addresses the background, statement of the problem, significance of the problem, purpose and objectives of the study, and definition of terms. It also identifies the limitations and basic assumptions of the study.

Background of the Problem

The Extension system throughout the United States is a unique network of educational processes based on the collective research of the land-grant university system. Extension serves as the outreach arm of the land-grant university system and brings the research and education of the university to the people of the state. Since 1914, Extension has been the catalyst for change and problem solving for individuals, families and groups from all facets of living, including the rural areas to the most populated metropolitan centers of this country (Rasmussen, 1989).

Leadership of the Extension organization necessitates effective and efficient management, particularly with the increased demand for human, material and economic resources between Extension and other non-mandated agencies at county, state and national levels. The importance of the manager’s job to secure resources available to
support and maintain operations (programming) is inevitable and cannot be evaded (Drucker, 1977). In county Extension offices, the management position is called the county chair.

Extension county chairs provide leadership to foster harmonious relationships and effective performance among colleagues and members of their unit’s program and support staff (Buford, Bedeian and Lindner, 1995). While following the organization’s mission, vision and values, Ohio State University Extension administrators implement leadership and managerial skills at one of three administrative levels. The state, or top management, level includes the Director and Department Chair. The middle level of management includes Assistant Directors for each program area, District Directors (also known as Associate Chairs) and Department Chairs within the Colleges of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences; Human Ecology; and Veterinary Medicine. The largest numbers of managers assume leadership/management roles on the county, or first line, level. These individuals carry the title of county chair and operate in a solo or shared leadership capacity in each county throughout the state. Except in the counties where the state’s three largest urban areas are located (Cincinnati, Cleveland and Columbus), the latter group is responsible for administrative and economic responsibilities in addition to programmatic responsibilities. In Ohio, county chairs also carry the appointment title of Extension agent.

Extension professionals are trained and skilled in a subject matter area where they can research and teach various topics to clientele using a variety of teaching delivery methods and technology. People generally assume that an Extension agent can also immediately undertake the roles and responsibilities of an Extension county chair.
County Extension administrative output and productivity seems to vary greatly, even with a number of years of Extension experience and tenure. Extension county chairs are expected to demonstrate the diverse knowledge, skills and abilities to adequately tackle the varied personnel issues and concerns capsulated in the chair’s job description and operations assignments.

County chairs currently in the system may not possess any previous management experience or course/degree work in management techniques. Budget constraints and political pressures from the three sources of Extension funding (i.e., county, state and federal) place additional time constraints on the educational opportunities for Extension staff to expand their management and leadership knowledge base (Meyers and Pigg, 1990). Their cognitive skills in management may stem from program leadership responsibilities (i.e., 4-H professional leading the county 4-H program), membership in community organizations and/or past participation in leadership roles. The complimentary side to cognitive management is the social/emotional management known as emotional intelligence. The use of emotional intelligence competencies have not been introduced or supported toward county chairs in Ohio, but the current state of change and restructuring may be the optimum time to enhance Extension county chairs’ abilities to work with their staff. The organization may need to make this change to support the needs and interests of current staff and the clientele they serve (Eddy, 1989).

In the Ohio Extension system, the state is divided into four Extension districts. Each district is comprised of a District Director that provides overall administrative leadership to Extension agents with direct supervision given by the county chair(s). County agents, who once reported to a support team of the District Director, District
Specialist and county chair for program guidance and performance appraisal, now report
to the county chair. This re-structuring has created the need for increased leadership and
managerial training for the county chair to help them perform with fairness, confidence
and integrity. The county chair is expected to maintain a variety of competencies to
remain a viable leader. They must make use of personal and professional skills to sustain
leadership in times of the chaos and frustration that is likely to arise from the progressing
changes in Ohio’s Extension system structure.

Goleman (1998) defined emotional intelligence as being constructed of two kinds
of competencies. First, threshold competencies, including intellect and expertise, are
those competencies people need to get the job done. Second, distinguishing
competencies, also often referred to as the emotional competencies, including persuasion
and influence, are the competencies that set the star performers apart from average
performers. The question could be asked whether thinking or feeling or acting comes
first. Emotional intelligence by humans requires the use of the entire brain (including
emotions) as people make wise decisions and choices about what they say or do.

Elias (1997) described emotional intelligence as the ability to understand and express
emotions to meet the requirements of the day-to-day living, learning, and relating to
others. A study of more than 2,000 supervisors, middle managers and executives at 12
different organizations by Boyatzis (1982) found that of the 16 abilities that distinguished
stars from average performers, all but two were emotional competencies. This study and
other research exist to support that emotional competencies play a far larger role in
superior job performance than do cognitive abilities and technical expertise. Therefore,
county chairs should study emotional intelligence to provide stability and direction that
inspires commitment to the organization, motivation for others to accomplish workplace
goals and give impact to decisions, questions, dreams and concerns of Extension
employees. These personal and people skills are crucial ingredients to effective
organizational leadership. Emotional intelligence is part and parcel of who and what
Extension county chairs are and help to “incorporate the message of the emotions in a
balance way so that they support our reasoning” (Feldman, 1999).

Statement of the Problem

Extension county chairs are continuously working with a diverse and complex set
of personalities and backgrounds among the staff of the local county Extension office.
These administrators must be able to develop and apply their emotional and social skills
to effectively influence constructive endeavors in their staff members (Feldman, 1999).
Goleman (1998) indicated that successful organizations are led by leaders with a desire to
make an organization more than just a workplace. Administrators can use the set of
social-emotional skills to enable their intellect to turn into action and accomplishments.
Leaders using high levels of emotional intelligence help communication become more
effective, increase cooperative group work, resolve conflicts thoughtfully and
nonviolently and bring a reflective, learning-to-learn approach to all domains of life
(Elias, Arnold & Steiger Hussey, 2003).

The organization’s success depends on molding the talents and energies of this
diverse set of staff and collaborating their efforts into a team or unified Extension
programming effort (Sturgeon, 1994). Amidst the ongoing and unpredictable change for
the organization are a set of individuals who have a variety of individual needs and
Successful Extension county chairs understand that the key to successful local operations is a unified staff that functions effectively and efficiently together in the daily operations of the Extension office.

The ability of county chairs to be emotionally, mentally and physically prepared to meet the needs and demands of staff members requires a continuous and dedicated effort. This effort can be costly in terms of time and personnel management that can be in competition with other job interests and responsibilities. For example, the county chair generally has his or her own individual programming job responsibilities (i.e., teaching, research and service). Then, as they become county chairs in Ohio, they also assume leadership for office operations, personnel issues, budget and financial documentation and management, promotion and marketing of the total Extension program, mentoring of new and experienced staff, role modeling and conflict management or resolution between staff members. If the county chair is not prepared to meet these demands on a continuous cycle and at various levels in a moment’s notice for change, the county chair may be faced with varying degrees of scrutiny and loss of productivity and team effort from staff members.

Although county chairs with high levels of either or both cognitive and emotional intelligence skills can greatly benefit the local operations, high levels of these skills alone do not guarantee success. The leadership and management skills are only a part of the many critical ingredients that would enable the Extension county chair to meet the individual goals of the staff members as well as the goals of high productivity in the local operating unit. For these leaders to be successful, they must keep their professional and personal abilities and the ability to work and stimulate productivity in others in alignment.
with one another. External forces (i.e., changes in the local, state, and/or national economy affecting budgets, family issues, changing needs for Extension programs in the community) can also affect the county chair’s level of impact and effectiveness. The management skills alone will not move a county chair from a good to a star performer and leader with staff.

County chairs must consider how to improve their personal and professional abilities as a leader and manager in local operations. After assessing the level of emotional intelligence and cognitive management ability, the county chair must develop goals for improved job performance and productivity. These goals should clearly designate the desired results of the local office and how the county chair’s own personal leadership and training (learned skills) can make the difference in the staff’s success. County chairs need to assess the current mix of the staff members as a whole and assert leadership where necessary to achieve the appropriate balance and mix of productivity to optimize the organization’s human capabilities (Bolman and Deal, 1991; Morrison, 1992). By using such a process, the county chair can be more valuable in satisfying the needs for security, satisfaction and recognition of the staff members (Yates, 1990). One strategy that state Extension administrators can use to improve and/or expand leadership and managerial skills involves assessing the level of emotional intelligence of county chairs. This strategy would be most useful to validate the predictor tests of administrators to the total job performance of staff members. The level of emotional intelligence may be included in the leadership evaluation of county chairs if the level of emotional intelligence of county Extension administrators is representative of the behaviors expected for job performance of staff members.
Significance of the Problem

Competent and sensitive county chairs are becoming increasingly important for successful Extension work. Modern management of Extension staff is shifting emphasis from the traditional individual leader to one of aligning people around a shared objective. Feldman (1999) referred to today’s administrative leader as one who influences others to work cooperatively, constructively, and with mutual trust to confront and resolve difficulties and difference. These same leaders must possess the skills to “sense how their employees feel about their work situation and to intervene effectively when those employees begin to feel discouraged or dissatisfied” (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000, p. 4). The county chair can no longer survive as the sole decision-maker in the local unit. To be satisfied, co-workers are desiring to share more in the decision making process for their day-to-day operations and future interests.

The power the county chair assumes is derived from the formal position assigned and the relationship between people, or the personal power, as given to the leader by the people. The relationship between the county chair and staff members relies upon the emotional competencies of this administrator. These competencies may include variables such as self-management, self-presentation, empathy and personal sensitivity (Fox & Spector, 2000).

Many researchers have concluded that if employees are happy with their work, they tend to work harder and more efficiently (Buford and Bedeian, 1988; Katzel and Thompson, 1990; Winslow, 1990; Watanabe, 1991). Researchers have also suggested that management styles focused on employees’ needs and interests are more effective than those centered on making a profit or only on high productivity (Katzel & Thompson,
To keep employees motivated and satisfied with work, county chairs must meet their needs, especially as the times and structure of Extension are moving through a transitional change.

For Ohio State University Extension, many changes are currently taking place in the structure and operation of the system. The roles and responsibilities of the state employee development support unit have been re-assigned to a smaller number of people because of budget limitations and retirements. The impact will be less time available to handle individual and staff needs in the counties. The leadership and managerial responsibilities of the county chair are also changing. County chairs must now assume the responsibility for performance appraisal of Extension agents, a duty once assumed by the Extension agent’s support team. The latter is significant because many county chairs do not possess the training and/or background necessary to assume this responsibility. The level of emotional intelligence for county chairs has not been assessed. It is assumed that a high level of emotional intelligence plays a major role in the success of the county chair. Further study into the emotional intelligence levels of county chairs and the job satisfaction of their staff will help to determine the significance for including emotional intelligence as a part of the training, preparation and development of the county chair, plus the potential for success during difficult economic conditions and re-structuring. Where lower levels of emotional intelligence exist among county chairs, the behaviors that demonstrate a pattern of weakness or strength can be built upon by state Extension administrative and leadership development specialists to increase leadership toward maximum efficiency and effectiveness for individuals in these leadership roles.
Research Questions

This study will investigate whether the job satisfaction of county Extension staff is dependent upon the level of emotional intelligence of county chairs.

**Question:** Will an increase in the level of emotional intelligence increase the job satisfaction of county Extension staff?

Additional analyses will be studied to assess the variance in job satisfaction explained by selected characteristics: appointment, main program area, location, length of employment with Extension, level of highest education completed, gender, race/ethnicity and previous management experience.

**Question:** Will a change in one or more selected professional or personal variables (i.e., appointment, years worked in Extension, main program area, highest level of education completed, previous management training, location, gender, race/ethnicity) increase the job satisfaction of county Extension staff?

**Purpose and Objectives of the Study**

The primary objective was to determine if a correlation existed between the level of emotional intelligence of county chairs and the job satisfaction of county Extension employees. At least one Extension county chair is located in each of Ohio’s 88 counties (some of the counties split county chair assignments) and carries responsibility for program staff (i.e., Extension agents and program assistants) and support staff. The researcher planned to use the findings of the study as the basis for suggesting and recommending leadership development and training materials for county chairs and ways to improve relationships in the local Extension units. Listed below were the specific objectives of the study:
1. To describe the professional and personal characteristics of county chairs and county staff members.

2. To describe the emotional intelligence levels of current county chairs.

3. To describe the level of job satisfaction of county Extension employees.

4. To examine the relationship between the level of emotional competence of the county chair and the level of job satisfaction of county Extension employees.

Definition of Terms

Terms used in the study that were thought to be unfamiliar to the reader were defined and listed in alphabetical order as follows:

Administrator: In county Extension operations, this individual is commonly called the county chair and assumes the responsibility for budget/financial concerns, personnel, county operations, marketing and promotion of the overall county programming, and legislative contacts on the county, state and national levels.

Alexithymia: Person known to have difficulty empathizing with others and less skilled at modulating other’s emotional states (Goleman, 1995; Lane and Schwartz, 1987).

County Chair: Extension agent with administrative duties for personnel, budget, marketing and securing resources to support local/county Extension operations.

District Director: Administrative leader for an Extension district.

Emotional Intelligence: Emotional judgment and action toward others by a county chair in order to adapt to, react to and/or predict environmental demands and pressures.

Extension Agent: County professionals with programming responsibility for one or more of the four program areas of Extension. The minimum degree requirement is a master’s degree.
Goal: Extension agents set a priority (via implementation of an Extension program, event and/or service) that will alleviate a need and reduce a drive for clientele served by the Extension agent (Speigel, 1989).

Job Satisfaction: County employees feel complete fulfillment of a need or want and the attainment of a desired end in the workplace. Pleasure is derived from able work being accomplished and recognized (Gove and Webster, 1969). Employees needs and expectations are satisfied and/or met to the fullest extent (Flexner and Hank, 1987).

Need: Individuals (employees and/or clientele) express a lack of something useful or desired, or the gap between what is and what should be (Boyle, 1981; Baker, 1987). It is an objective deficiency of an individual, created whenever there is a psychological or physiological imbalance (Boyle, 1981; Baker, 1987; Spiegel, 1989).

Program Area: The four subject matter areas for Extension programming are: 1) 4-H youth development, 2) agriculture/natural resources, 3) family and consumer sciences and 4) community development. Extension program staff are expected to have general knowledge in one or more of these subject matter areas.

Program Assistant: Extension employee who provides program support to an Extension agent in the development and operation of a program area.

Program Staff: Extension employees with titles of Extension agent or Program Assistant.

Strengths: Things that are done well that bring satisfaction and pleasure. Things learned easily and that help you feel energized and satisfied (Goleman, 1997). Strengths
of Extension agents would include the area where agents are most knowledgeable and/or most competent in teaching and research.

**Success:** end-product of that which one strives to achieve and accomplish (Bar-On, 2002)

**Support Staff:** Extension employees with clerical, bookkeeping, filing and other duties generally associated with secretarial work.

**Limitations of the Study**

1. In measuring the emotional intelligence level of county chairs, only one emotional intelligence inventory was selected. This emotional intelligence inventory was selected based on the literature and from the professional expertise of the facilitators already trained for implementing this particular inventory. Consequently, only those factors named in this inventory were used for comparison to employees’ job satisfaction.

2. Only county chairs currently working in one of Ohio’s counties participated in the study. Generalizations were, therefore, confined to that group and not to county administrators in other states.

3. Only OSU Extension county employees were surveyed in the study; therefore, results may only be applied to county staff in Ohio and not generalized to other district or state Extension professionals, or to county Extension personnel in other states.

4. Since the research questionnaire was self-reporting, no verification of responses was possible.

5. Attitudinal scales were used by the researcher to measure emotional intelligence in the study; therefore, a formal job performance appraisal was not conducted. Opinions
and perceptions of county chairs may change with time and as organizational structure and individual responsibilities and positions change.

6. Attitudinal scales were used by the researcher to measure job satisfaction of county employees; therefore, a formal job performance appraisal was not conducted. Levels of job satisfaction may change with time and as organizational structure and individual positions change.

7. The research study for human subjects approved by the Office of Responsible Research Practices limited the study to be on a volunteer basis; therefore, participants could chose not to participate in the study. Even though the data provided by county staff was associated with the individual county chair in the reporting process (as per the research agreement), concern for impact toward performance appraisal and follow-up may have deterred some county chairs from participating in the study. County staff information from counties where a county chair did not participate in the study was not used in the relationship analysis process. County chairs and county staff that choose not to participate in the study had a direct affect on the number of valid responses that was available for use in the study.

Basic Assumptions of the Study

The researcher assumed the county chairs taking the emotional intelligence inventory understood the questions and responded honestly. It was also assumed that these administrators understood the importance of using emotional intelligence levels in developing meaningful and effective administrator training curriculum and resources and thereby shared their actual, personal characteristics, reactions and emotions. The
perceptions of the respondents were assumed to be valid indicators of the concepts being measured. It was also assumed that all respondents would answer questions truthfully and honestly.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter reviews and summarizes the literature on the development of emotional intelligence, the core concepts associated with emotional intelligence levels, and job satisfaction. On the basis of what is currently known about emotional intelligence from various authors, a conceptual framework for identifying the factors related to job performance and satisfaction of employees related to the emotional intelligence level of county chairs concludes this chapter. The concepts and correlation identified by the literature form the basis for the study.

Emotional Intelligence Defined

Research and anecdotal observations indicate that, in addition to the kinds of knowledge, cognitive skills, and abilities traditionally associated with high performance, success also involves the effective management of the administrator’s emotions (Buford, 2001). The emotional competencies of an administrator have been grouped under a relatively new construct known as emotional intelligence. Wechsler’s (1940) definition of intelligence, as representative of the total personality, is the root of contemporary definitions of emotional intelligence: “the aggregate or global capacity of the individual to act purposefully, to think rationally, and to deal effectively with his or her environment” (p. 444). Gardner (1983) expanded the definition to include the concept of
intrapersonal intelligence (identification of self emotions) and interpersonal intelligence (understanding others’ emotions and intentions). Sternberg (1996, 1988) described practical intelligence as a combination of technical expertise and socialized experience. Fox and Spector (2000) further defined practical intelligence as the short-range and long-range goals implemented to solve problems important to emotions, needs, plans, well-being and survival. Based on real-life examples keeping emotions under control, Mayer, Salovey and Caruso (2000) defined emotional intelligence as “the ability to perceive and express emotion, assimilate emotion in thought, understand and reason with emotion, and regulate emotion in self and others” (p. 396).

The term emotional intelligence was first used by Peter Salovey of Yale University and Jack Mayer of the University of New Hampshire while researching factors important to functioning well in society (Salovey and Mayer, 1990). Their belief was that emotional intelligence was composed of: 1) verbal and non-verbal expression, 2) identification and appraisal of emotions within self and others and 3) use of emotions to strive toward action. Salovey, Mayer, Goldman, Turvey and Palfai (1995) felt individuals who could connect thoughts to feelings could better understand meaning from various situations. Later in 1997, Mayer and Salovey included the potential for intellectual and emotional growth as components in their revised model. The new model included the four categories of: 1) perception, appraisal, and expression of emotion; 2) emotional facilitation of thinking; 3) understanding, analyzing and implementing emotional knowledge; and 4) reflective regulation of emotions to potential emotional and intellectual growth. Ciarrochi, Forgas and Mayer’s (2001) research indicated that
emotional intelligence was established to solve the conflict between what one feels and what one thinks (head versus the heart) or the relationship between reason and emotion.

Research suggested that people’s behavior was best understood in terms of its adaptability and functionality (Gardner, 1983; Goleman, 1994; Saarni, 1999). Understanding one’s emotions can offer sensible meaning to how an individual approaches problem solving, plus helps develop the process by which an individual thinks through as a part of their decision making. Emotions give impact to one’s decisions, questions, dreams and concerns. They are “part and parcel of who and what we are” (Feldman, 1999, p. 10). When an individual can effectively manage their emotions, the individual becomes better equipped to determine the most effective course of action to resolve problems (Weisinger, 1998). Individuals who demonstrate emotional intelligence in leadership roles are sensitive to the needs of their co-workers, respond to their needs based on the situation at hand and are generally highly adaptable to the needs and interests of their co-workers. Feldman (1999) believed leaders using emotional intelligence “provide the direction and stability that inspires the commitment and motivation crucial to organizational success” (p. 7). The crucial ingredients to effective leadership are the personal or people skills encompassed within the individual leader. Emotional intelligence helps to balance and support the administrator’s reasoning. Understanding emotional intelligence expands the mechanisms that allow individuals to flourish in their lives, jobs, with families and as citizens of communities (Cherniss and Goleman, 2001).

Attention to the value and impact of emotional intelligence has grown considerably since the early 1990’s in primary, secondary and post-secondary institutions
(Geery, 1998; Mayer & Salovey, 1997), human service agencies (Artz, 1994), business schools (Griffith, 1999) and corporations and organizations (Abraham, 1999; Goleman, 2000; Massey, 1999). With the popularity of this construct in explaining relationships between people, validity data has also been collected (Davies, Stankov & Roberts, 1998; Geery, 1998; Schutte, Malouff, Hall, Haggerty, Cooper, Golden and Dornheim, 1997). While Goleman noted in his book that emotional intelligence became twice as important as IQ and other technical skills, there still needs to be attention given to whether emotional intelligence is a good predictor of success in life and if it might truly predict social sensitivity, persistence and well-being (Davies, Stankov & Roberts, 1998). While previous research has found linkages between self-report instruments and on-the-job satisfaction and, sometimes, performance (Ciarrochi, Forgas & Mayer, 2001), the question still exists why emotional intelligence is important to leadership and management in organizations.

People’s adaptive efforts are creative and imaginative, by transforming their surroundings and the meanings they attach to them (Cantor & Norem, 1989; Mischel, Shoda & Rodriquez, 1989; Showers & Cantor, 1985). Bar-on (1997) suggested that emotional intelligence is “an array of non-cognitive capabilities, competencies and skills that influence one’s ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures” (p. 14) and can be combined with other important determinants (i.e., cognitive intellectual capacity) to accurately predict competence and success.

Selected Theories of Emotional Intelligence

Emotional intelligence theories explain the competencies of individuals, including those in leadership and management roles, and how their emotional interpretation of
situations can lead to the reformation of problems in need of a solution. Leaders and managers assume to understand that effective problem solving and organizational leadership goes beyond the cognitive understanding of situations toward the relationships between people. This section will describe theories developed by Goleman, Feldman and Weisinger.

**Goleman’s theory of emotional intelligence**

Goleman (1997) suggested that effective leaders carry high levels of emotional intelligence. His emotional intelligence theory is one of the most popular and widely known in the field. According to Goleman, emotional intelligence is based on a five-step process. The first step is self-awareness that consists of the individual’s ability to recognize a feeling as they occur in real-life situations. With this self-awareness, the individual has more clarity about his or her feelings and thoughts that enable the individual to make better choices for their staff and the entire organization. The three parts of the brain (i.e., instinct, emotions and logic) work together like advisors for the brain and provide assistance in making decisions.

The second part of Goleman’s theory is the management and self-regulation of emotions. Once individuals are aware of their emotions, they are able to cope with strong feelings so as not to be overwhelmed and potentially be paralyzed by them. Individuals can find the causes for strong reactions like anger, revenge, fear, sorrow or exhaustion and learn to understand why these behaviors come to the forefront of their thoughts. Some reasons for these emotions are someone got in your way, previous childhood experience, compromised values and/or beliefs, offensive words or actions toward you and/or a previously upsetting experience.
The third part of the theory is self-motivation and performance. It is at this point the individual becomes goal-oriented and able to channel emotions toward desired outcomes. Empathy and perspective taking by the individual comes next. Here the individual is able to recognize emotions in others and to understand others’ point of view. This is a critical step as it puts the individual’s understanding of their co-workers into perspective. The final part of Goleman’s theory is the social skills. These skills give the individual the ability to handle a range of social relationships. Social skills help the individual understand why he or she does things and serves as the fuel that powers his or her actions.

Mayer and Salovey’s Theory of Emotional Intelligence

Mayer and Salovey (1997) stated emotional intelligence is a set of abilities that account for how people’s emotional perception and understanding vary in accuracy. Within this model, the researchers described emotional intelligence as the ability to perceive and express emotion, assimilate emotion into thought, understand and reason with emotion, and regulate emotion in the self and others.

The perception and expression of emotion is completed by identifying and expressing emotions as feelings and thoughts. Emotions are also identified and expressed by other means such as through other people, artwork and language. As emotions prioritize thinking, emotions can lead emotion in thought. These thoughts can assist a person’s judgment and memory. Emotions can also be understood and labeled to enhance one’s ability to understand relationships associated with shifts in emotion.
Finally, people can reflectively regulate emotions by staying open to feelings and monitoring or regulating emotions reflectively to promote emotional and intellectual growth.

**Feldman’s Theory of Emotionally Intelligent Leadership**

Feldman (1999) used emotional intelligence to describe the concept of leadership. “Leadership is about a person having the power to influence others” (p. 2). This researcher divided the leader’s power into the assigned, formal position power and the power that arises out of the relationship between people. The latter is the key factor in effective leadership because it focuses on the leader’s personal power rather than position power. Feldman suggested that cognitive reasoning (IQ) and emotional intelligence (EI) are distinct from each other, but also reinforce each other. Emotions are involved in decision making to “successfully navigate life and work” (p. 3).

Effective leaders use their emotional and social skills to influence certain behaviors in others and to create stability from chaos. Emotions play a major role in the decisions, questions and instructions that bounce back and forth between the leader and the people in the workplace. The concept of being emotionally intelligent is particularly important during the changing and economically challenged times faced today by private, non-profit and government sectors. Feldman believed that emotionally intelligent leadership is needed in organizations of all sizes and types today more than ever. As employees face new challenges because of the impact of budget constraints, technology, globalization, new organizational structures (i.e., flattening and de-centralizing) and job re-assignments, leaders must react with the type of leadership that brings employees together as a team.
Feldman suggested that emotions of leaders can be balanced to support the leader’s reasoning in decision-making. To facilitate the process, Feldman divided emotionally intelligent leadership skills into core skills and higher-order skills. The core skills lead to effective individual contributions while the combination of core skills and higher-order skills become effective leadership. The latter builds leaders who are sensitive to the needs of others and adapt their responses to various situations as change arises.

The core skills interact on a regular basis and allow leaders to respond to the ongoing demands of the workplace. First, leaders must be able to identify and understand their emotions, plus know what causes them. By knowing one’s feelings, the leader can evaluate a situation more clearly and make clearer decisions. Second, when a leader is able to maintain self-control, the leader can stay calm amidst the chaos of the situation. With self-control, leaders can role model a calm reaction and others will follow their direction.

The third core skill is reading others and being able to relate to others’ experiences. When this takes place, leadership impact can be magnified. The fourth core skill is perceiving accurately. When a leader can tap into his or her emotional intelligence, the leader is able to assess situations objectively and make more effective decisions. The final core skill is communicating with flexibility. With an understanding of the one’s emotions and others’ emotions, the leader can communicate in a way that matches verbal and non-verbal communication.

The core skills are basic to the emotionally intelligent leader, but other skills are needed to make the leader more effective. These skills are known as the higher-order
skills. First, leaders must take responsibility and be accountable for their actions. Second, leaders must generate a variety of choices that can be flexible toward different acts or situations. Third, emotionally intelligent leaders must embrace a vision that others can work toward and aspire to for direction and clarity. Fourth, leaders must have the courage to find the best possible choice for each situation whether a popular or tough decision. Finally, leaders must demonstrate resolve to create self-determination, self-esteem and a sense of personal effectiveness.

Weisinger’s Theory of Emotional Intelligence

Emotional intelligence can be used to assist leaders and managers with problem-solving situations. Weisinger (1998) suggested that to “effectively manage your emotions, you need to develop good problem-solving skills, the goal being to determine the most effective course of action to take to resolve the problem” (p. 49). Leaders must identify and define the problem situation in terms of what is relevant to the situation. The perception may be re-framed for a fresh look at the problem and alternative solutions generated by brainstorming. Once different options are explored, the best strategies to solve the problem can be identified with an evaluation of the results to follow.

Weisinger’s stages, labeled from setback to comeback, are predictable and are outlined in seven steps. In Stage 1, leaders experience disbelief, which is the shock of learning the situation exists to the onset of emotions. The level of emotional intelligence will vary as the individual experiences negative feelings without being overwhelmed by them. In Stage 2, individuals experience anger and come to grips with the reality of the situation, or learn to manage their emotions. While anger cues the individual that something is wrong, it also leads to a new arrangement that can be tolerated and accepted
by the individual and the organization. Stage 3 finds the individual yearning to turn back
time (to the way it was before), but taking productive action to make needed changes.
Stage 4 is the depression stage whereby hurdles over bad feelings and change are
resolved by the new action and the readiness to move forward.

Stage 5 is the acceptance stage and confidence builds as the past situation is
exhausted and enthusiasm builds for the new choice. Stage 6 involves hope and the
optimism that returns from new meaning and action. Finally Stage 7 is the positive
activity where the organization and/or the individual are back on course with the energy
and readiness to put the new course into action.

Measuring Emotional Intelligence

Basic emotional intelligence is known by age six and continues to shift during
the adolescent years (Bar-On, 2002). While emotional intelligence is stored in the brain,
it interacts with the total person (i.e., mental, physical, emotional and behavioral) and
causes reaction to various situations. Emotional intelligence involves the emotional
needs, drives, and true values of a person and guides all overt behavior. The value of
measuring emotional intelligence in leaders, managers and/or administrators is to
determine which areas of emotional intelligence are sound, which need improvement and
those that are compatible with others (Simmons and Simmons, 1997). Emotional
intelligence can be used to determine success on the job based on the relationships
between people. To benefit from emotional intelligence, leaders must understand their
own emotions, be able to relate to others and know how to apply the knowledge of
emotional intelligence in the workplace.
As the interest in emotional intelligence has risen in the past two decades so has the number of instruments dedicated to the measurement of emotional intelligence. Researchers have taken the basic principles of emotional intelligence and developed instruments in an attempt to measure emotional intelligence competencies. These instruments are used to determine success in the major tasks of life (Simmons and Simmons, 1997) by measuring a number of success factors related to the emotional or social side of leadership roles.

Simmons and Simmons Facets of Character

While Salovey and Mayer (1990) coined the values and basic introduction to emotional intelligence, this term has been exchanged for the concept of character by Simmons and Simmons (1997). The success factors that are measured by emotional intelligence inventories, or the term character, have been redefined by these researchers. Their research suggested the Simmons Personal Survey is a highly valid and reliable way to measure the 13 major facets of character. These facets are emotional energy, stress, optimism, self-esteem, commitment to work, attention to detail, desire for change, courage, self-direction, assertiveness, tolerance, consideration for others and sociability.

Low scores on the Simmons Personal Survey indicate a low amount of energy invested in that particular area of emotional intelligence. Individuals receiving high scores are highly driven and motivated in a specific area. In many cases, people do not really know their character because feedback from others may have drawn them to the wrong conclusions. The scores can assist an individual in personal growth and help them get along better with co-workers.
Information about character is useful in going beyond the blind spots of what is known about the self and others. The survey provides more insight to personal development, improvement in relationships, ability to help others, opportunities for change and career guidance. Results can be helpful in hiring the best individual for a particular job assignment, reducing turnover and promoting individuals to positions of best advantage for the individual and the organization.

The Simmons Personal Survey consists of two parts with sets of 360 adjectives each that look at how others feel about the individual (Part I) and how the individual feels about himself or herself (Part II). The survey uses a proven interviewing technique to balance how an individual feels about himself or herself and others’ perception of the individual. Using the 720 responses, the survey divides individual computer measurements and cross-comparisons into 13 scales that measure the subject’s behavior in certain areas. Validity is ensured by five checks that assure results are valid by random answering, secrecy, excessive confusion, unrealistic self-concepts, and the intensive case study method. The average test-retest reliability has a correlation of .74, considered a high degree of correlation. Survey results by clients have proven to be 95 – 100 percent accurate.

**Salovey and Mayer Trait-Meta Mood Scale**

A paper and pencil test, named the Trait-Meta Mood Scales, was developed by Salovey and Mayer (1997) to measure attention to emotion, emotional clarity and emotional repair. These tests carried adequate reliability and validity, plus proved to be a successful predictor of ruminative thinking while controlling for levels of depression and trait neuroticism (Salovey et al., 1995)
Schutte Self-Report Measure

A self-report measure of emotional intelligence was developed by Schutte et al. (1997) based on the original research by Salovey and Mayer Model (1997). Using factor analysis and a 33 item measure, higher scores were determined to be associated with greater clarity of feelings, greater attention to feelings, more mood repair, greater optimism, decreased ratings of alexithymia, less pessimism and depression and less impulsivity. Important components of the emotional intelligence construct were excluded from the study (i.e., nonverbal expression) that questioned the study’s convergent validity. The study also revealed limited support for emotional intelligence as a predictor of cognitive abilities.

Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale

The objective measure of emotional intelligence is assessed by using the Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scales (MEIS) developed by Mayer, Caruso and Salovey (1999). Group consensus ratings in this scale measure three hierarchical branches of emotional intelligence (Ciarrochi, Forgas, & Mayer, 2000). By identifying emotion in faces, stories, designs and music affective perception and appraisal of emotion are measured. The ability to assimilate affect into mental life and the understanding and reasoning about emotions comprise the second and third branches, respectively. The MEIS samples a wide range of behaviors, has generally reliable subscales and exhibits strength when compared to other measures (Mayer and Salovey, 1995).

Toronto Alexithymia Scale

A scale, called the Toronto Alexithymia Scale, was developed to identify feelings, distinguish between feelings and emotional arousal and review the difficulties
associated with describing feelings to other people (Bagby, Taylor and Parker, 1994). People who have difficulty identifying the emotions of others, plus their own emotions, are described as having alexithymia. These individuals are generally not successful in empathizing with other people and have fewer skills to deal with the emotional states of others (Goleman, 1995; Lane and Schwartz, 1987).

**Bar-On’s Emotional Quotient Inventory**

The Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) by Bar-On (1997) was developed to answer two challenging questions: 1) Why do some people experience greater levels of psychological well being than others? and 2) Why are some individuals more able to succeed in life than others? Bar-On believed there was little information available concerning optimal functioning and successful living. His research was an extension of previous research from Wechsler (1940) and Mayer and Salovey (Mayer and Salovey, 1995 and Mayer and Geher, 1996). Bar-On used a logical clustering of variables and underlying factors to address an individual’s success and well being. Bar-On used a five-point response set that ranges from “Not True of Me” to “Often True of Me”. The EQ-i uses 133 brief items to reflect a conceptualization of emotional intelligence as a group of behaviors and traits predictive of success. Bar-On found the traits most predictive of success included assertiveness, emotional self-awareness, empathy, flexibility, happiness, impulse control, independence, interpersonal functioning, optimism, problem solving, reality testing, self-actualization, self-regard, stress tolerance and social responsibility.

Scores from the EQ-i are transformed into a Total EQ score, five EQ composite scales (Interpersonal, Intrapersonal, Adaptability, Stress management and
General Mood) and 15 EQ subscales. The predictors of success were categorized into the composite scales. For example, emotional self-awareness, assertiveness, self-regard, self-actualization and independence comprise are components of the intrapersonal composite scale. Empathy, interpersonal relationship and social responsibility make up the subscale measures of the interpersonal composite scale. Adaptation is comprised of problem solving, reality testing and flexibility. Stress Management includes stress tolerance and impulse control. Finally, happiness and optimism fall under the general mood composite scale. The EQ-i is quite popular among businesses and organizations (Buford, 2001).

Core Components of Emotional Intelligence

General intelligence is the combination of cognitive intelligence and emotional intelligence. IQ measures cognitive intelligence. Emotional intelligence is a measure of well being and is measured by an emotional quotient (EQ). Bar-On (2002) defined emotional intelligence as “an array of non-cognitive capabilities, competencies, and skills that influence one’s ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures” (p. 14). Intelligence “describes the aggregate of abilities, skills and abilities” as a mass of knowledge used to cope with life effectively (Wechsler, 1940, p. 15). Emotional refers to a type of intelligence that is distinctively different from cognitive intelligence. Through the interactive position between people, behavior can be predicted using a variety of components important in dealing with personal factors and environmental situations (Bem and Allen, 1974). Salovey, Mayer and Caruso (2002) stated emotional intelligence involves the ability to process emotion-laden information competently. This information is used to guide cognitive activities like problem solving and to focus energy on required behaviors. Literature indicated that people who are
feeling happy are more like to do things they desire, do what is socially responsible, do what needs to be done, meets their goals, think more clearly and enjoy their accomplishments (Isen, 2002).

Because Bar-On’s EQ-i is an integral part of the study at hand, the EQ-i’s theoretical construction is described with considerable detail. The EQ-i was developed by logical clustering of variables and underlying factors thought to contribute to individual success and well-being. Bar-On’s (2000a) measure of emotional intelligence included an array of emotional and social knowledge and abilities: 1) the ability to be aware of, to understand, and to express oneself, 2) the ability to be aware of, to understand, and to relate to others, 3) the ability to deal with strong emotions and control one’s impulses, and 4) the ability to adapt to change and to solve problems of a personal or social manner. The five domains of Bar-On’s model are interpersonal skills, intrapersonal skills, adaptability, stress management, and general mood (Bar-On, 1997a). As in Table 2.1, the emotional skills (multifactorial components) that lead to an individual’s potential for performance through emotional intelligence include: 1) self-regard, 2) emotional self-awareness, 3) assertiveness, 4) independence, 5) self-actualization, 6) empathy, 7) social responsibility, 8) interpersonal relationship, 9) reality testing, 10) flexibility, 11) problem solving, 12) stress tolerance, 13) impulse control, 14) optimism and 15) happiness. The EQ-i composite scales and sub-scale components are grouped together in Table 2.1 and followed by individual description of each sub-scale component.
**Table 2.1: Emotional Intelligence Inventory (EQ-i) Composite Scales and Sub-scales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ-i Composite Scale</th>
<th>Sub-scales Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>* Empathy, Social Responsibility, Interpersonal Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal</td>
<td>* Self-regard, Emotional Self-awareness, Assertiveness, Independence, Self-actualization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Management</td>
<td>* Stress Tolerance, Impulse Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>* Reality Testing, Flexibility, Problem Solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Mood</td>
<td>* Happiness, Optimism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Self-Regard** - When an individual basically views themselves as good, likes the way he or she is and feels fulfilled and satisfied, the individual is considered to have self-regard, or the ability to respect and accept oneself as basically good. Individuals with self-regard have general feelings of security, self-assuredness, inner strength, self-confidence and self-esteem (Bar-On, 2002). The individual trusts himself (and others), believes in his or her self-worth and carries the competence to get a task completed (Drury, 1984). Leaders who can enhance employees’ feelings of self-confidence and make them feel good about their work, enable those employees to perform optimally in their jobs (Snyder and Lopez, 2002).

**Emotional Self-Awareness** - When a person can identify, differentiate between and understand their feelings, the individual is emotionally self-aware. Emotions are perceived when a person registers and attends to feelings encountered or
resulting from an event or encounter with others. Emotions can be witnessed in others by facial expressions, voice tone or cultural artifacts (Salovey, et al., 2002). Individuals who cannot recognize their feelings are alexithymic.

**Assertiveness** - Openly expressing feelings, beliefs and thoughts is descriptive of a person with assertiveness. Assertive people are neither aggressive nor abusive, but are able to stand up for their rights in a nondestructive manner and not allow others to take advantage of them (Bar-On, 2002). Shaw (1979) stated assertive people use only the amount of information or influence (i.e., facts, opinions and feelings) that is needed to achieve a goal. They tend to stand up for their rights, but in a way that also helps other people stand up for theirs. Assertive people do not ignore conflict, but strive to construct a mutually acceptable compromise. They also deal with the situation in a way that is fair to both parties. Through self-disclosure, assertive individuals are portrayed as honest and clear, but reserve respect for others through authentic communication. Assertive behavior involves knowing individuals’ needs and wants, making this clear to others and working in a self-directed way to get needs met while showing respect for others (Adams, 1989). People who exhibit assertiveness feel what they have to share is as important and valuable as any other person and carry the confidence that enables them to state their beliefs, values, opinions, etc. openly (Gillen, 1992). Assertive people can emotionally detach themselves from criticism and focus on real issues. They can be open about their feelings and see others’ viewpoints. Not jumping to conclusions, but letting others know the consequence of their behavior is common. A person acting in an assertive way makes clear, non-apologetic statements about expectations and feelings, follows through on issues, listens to others’ views respectfully, negotiates, and criticizes in a descriptive
rather than a judgmental way. The assertive person’s body language, words and voice characteristics are shared in a way to be taken seriously, but without humiliating others (Drury, 1984). Assertiveness is not about putting personal goals above organizational goals.

**Independence** - Independent people are able to think through and make their own decisions. Independence involves accepting the responsibility of using one’s own judgment (Locke, 2002). While they may consult with others for additional information, they are self-reliant and carry the inner strength and desire to meet expectations placed in their environment. Bar-On (2002) stated that independent people are free of emotional dependency and are self-controlled in one’s thinking and actions.

**Self-Actualization** - When an individual moves toward the maximum development of one’s abilities, capacities and/or talents, the individual is moving to the state of self-actualization. Maslow (1970) determined successful people who were able to meet most of their needs at all levels were experiencing self-actualization. Individuals at this stage are involved with peak experiences that include life experiences with greater richness, completeness, wholeness, unity and understanding (Adams, 1989). The self-development of the individual (opportunity to grow and expand through continued learning and experiences) to achieve the full and complete use of one’s potential is self-actualization, or self-fulfillment, in process (Hanlon, 1968). Self-satisfaction and the motivation to continue with personal interests is associated with a person realizing one’s potential capacities and doing his or her best to improve themselves (Bar-On, 2002).

**Empathy** - Tuning in and being sensitive to what, how and why people feel the way they do describes a person with empathy. Empathetic people can appreciate and
understand others’ feelings (Bar-On, 2002) and, as a result, show interest in and concern for others. In developing empathy, a positive attitude or feeling toward an individual, event or situation is made (Davis, Yeager & Foster, 2001). Gillen (1992) described empathy as “letting someone else know that you can and do appreciate their positions while taking care not to come across as patronizing or condescending” (p. 83). Empathy involves active listening to identify the needs and feelings of others and facilitating a resolution to the other’s problem, if possible (Adams, 1989).

**Social Responsibility** - Individuals who do things for and with others carry some degree of social responsibility. Bar-On (2002) defined social responsibility as “the ability to demonstrate oneself as a cooperative, contributing, and constructive member of one’s social group” (p. 16). Socially responsible people work toward the benefit of others (rather than just the self) by accepting others, acting in agreement with one’s conscience and adhering to the rules of the social environment.

**Interpersonal Relationship** - Individuals who are partaking in a rewarding and enjoyable social interchange are experiencing an interpersonal relationship. Sharing and giving affection and warmth in a friendly manner while making individuals feeling at ease and satisfied are representative of interpersonal relationships (Bar-On, 2002). To be effective, each person in a relationship must make a commitment not to use his or her power in finding a solution to a conflict (Adams, 1989). This solution involves both parties sitting down and finding alternatives that can satisfy the needs of both individuals. Resistance must be heard through listening and non-threatening ways.

**Reality Testing** - Reality testing involves tuning in to the immediate situation, keeping the situation in perspective, and experiencing things the way they really are
rather than daydreaming or fantasizing about them. It consists of the correspondence between what is experienced and what objectively exists (Bar-On, 2002). The ability to clearly examine a situation and focusing on a way to cope with the situation is a true reality test.

**Flexibility** – Adapting to unfamiliar or unpredictable circumstances and reacting to change is the ability of flexibility. Bar-On (2002) stated “the ability to adjust to one’s emotions, thoughts and behavior to changing situations and conditions” (p. 17) best describes flexibility. Individuals who are flexible are open to different ideas and practices. People are happiest when they are able to adapt to new systems of work and interaction when the old systems are no longer functional. Flexibility involves building upon what can be changed and accepting what cannot. It serves as a crucial part to interpersonal relationships and the impact resulting from change in an organization (McGinnis, 1990). Flexibility transforms into increases in actual creativity and more successful problem solving (Isen, 2002).

**Problem Solving** - Problem solving is the ability to recognize, define, develop effective solutions and make decisions to solve problem situations. Bar-On (2002) associated problem solvers as individuals who are conscientious, disciplined, methodical and systematic in the perseverance of eliminating problems. In problem solving, judging and criticizing is avoided, active listening is employed and the experience, when successful, is viewed as a truly creative and free-feeling expression of ideas and potential solutions (Adams, 1989). In problem solving, people can become intellectually
stimulated by being encouraged to think for themselves, challenged to make assumptions about the way they work and to think about old problems in new ways (Snyder and Lopez, 2002).

**Stress Tolerance** - Individuals who cope with stress are able to maintain focus and control feelings and emotions. These individuals can face crises and problems by maintaining control, calmly facing adversities and not feeling helpless, falling apart, or unable to seize the situation. Individuals who can keep stress under control carry a set of suitable responses to stressful situations (Bar-On, 2002). Assertive thinking can help to reduce stress (Gillen, 1992).

**Impulse Control** - When an individual can control one’s aggressive impulses and irresponsible behavior, he or she possesses impulse control. Maintaining self-control and keeping unpredictable behavior is characteristic of people with impulse control (Webster, 1976). When individuals interact, spontaneous or rash impulses would be controlled and replaced with behavior imitating reasonable and patient means (Webster and Jackson, 1997). Bar-On (2002) stated impulse control is the ability to control one’s emotions and resist or delay an impulse, drive, or temptation to act.

**Optimism** - Carrying a positive attitude in the face of adversity is key to the definition of optimism. Optimistic people carry a positive attitude in daily living and avoid pessimism, which is common to depression. “Optimists are cheerful even when they can’t be happy (McGinnis, 1990, p. 91). Optimists believe defeat is just a temporary setback brought about without fault and believed to be the result of circumstances, bad luck or other people. The key to optimism is how people feel when they fail by using the power of non-negative thinking (Seligman, 1991). The optimist can speak to one’s self
about setbacks from a more encouraging view and increase the control over thinking about adversity. Optimists can find benefit in learning how to change. Optimists look for the obstacles that prevent productive work and do not anticipate failure within even the toughest situations (Drury, 1984). Optimists have a way of bringing out the best in other people by breaking down the process into manageable segments (McGinnis, 1990). They can accept what cannot be changed because they can put the past behind them and accept the world as it is. Like positive thinking, optimism is a process and a behavior used to get somewhere through enhancing life or helping to achieve goals. It is seeing new realities before they happen and discerning new possibilities and answers (Briley, 1986). Optimism is looking at the brighter side while also maintaining a positive attitude (Bar-On, 2002).

**Happiness** - Individuals who are self-satisfied, content and enjoy life are the epitome of happiness. People who are happy feel good about their life, work and leisure life, plus enjoy opportunities to have fun. Happiness is an indicator of one’s overall emotional intelligence and is witnessed by cheerfulness and enthusiasm. The outward behavior of being cheerful and enthusiastic regulates an individual’s behavior, plus influences the inward feelings of happiness (McGinnis, 1990). People experiencing happiness in their lives feel satisfied, plus enjoy oneself and others to have fun (Bar-On, 2002).

“The well-functioning, successful, and emotionally healthy individual is the one who possesses a sufficient degree of emotional intelligence” (Bar-On, 2002, p. 18), including the fifteen conceptual components of emotional intelligence just presented.
These individuals would possess an average or above average EQ-i score in these areas. Emotionally capable people can succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures of the workplace or organization. Therefore, emotional intelligence relates to the potential for success in a variety of people-focused situations in organizational leadership.

**Emotional Intelligence and Organizational Leadership**

The operation and structure of organizations has changed considerably in the past two decades. Downsizing, technological expansion and various regulations continue to change rapidly (Luthans, 1998). The workplace has had to become more responsive to individual needs, community demographics, and additional demands by clientele. New emphasis has been placed on effective teamwork, responsive leadership, diversity, conflict resolution, stress management and strong customer-orientation skills (Bassi, 1996; Hudson, 1999). The latter relates to many of the interpersonal and intrapersonal sensitivities known to be a part of the emotional intelligence framework (Bar-On, 1997; Weisinger, 1998). Open dialogue and communication by employees is an essential part of organizational growth and change (Massey, 1999). Encouraging agreements among participants with diverse viewpoints, managing diverse change processes, addressing employee gender and cultural differences, balancing power and bringing forth continuity in the midst of constant change tap into a variety of emotions (Griffith, 1999). The role of emotions in the workplace is a growing area of attention (Grandey, 2000).

Research studies have communicated a conceptual or theoretical link between emotional intelligence and organizational behavior. (Abraham, 1999; Massey, 1999; Sosik & Megerian, 1999). These studies hypothesized that administrators with higher...
levels of emotional intelligence will be more successful in problem solving and managing conflict, coping with items that may become stressors in the workplace, interacting with political factors in the workplace and with increased interpersonal skill (Buford, 2001). The American Society for Training and Development sponsored a study in 1997 to study benchmark practices among major corporations. The study found that four out of five companies provided training in hiring and employee development on emotional competencies (Bassi, 1996). A national survey focusing on what employers are looking for in entry level workers found that the most desirable skills in employees were the ability to learn on the job, listening and oral communication, adaptability and resilience when facing obstacles, interpersonal effectiveness and leadership potential (Goleman, 1998). Emotional intelligence has also been connected to the transformational institution (Munaker, 1997), effective writing skills (Holbrook, 1998), leadership style and organization impact (Goleman, 2000), constructive thinking (Epstein, 1998) and accomplishing life goals and general life satisfaction (Martinez-Pons, 1997).

Empirical research related to emotional intelligence research has been associated with personality traits (Costa and McCrae, 1990) and coping patterns (Endler and Parker, 1994). Davies, Stankov & Roberts (1998) criticized the emotional intelligence construct because it reflected already defined and researched personality traits. Cattell (1987) and Horn (1988) suggested emotional intelligence is simply a secondary component to social intelligence. Little research information is available concerning the relationship between emotional intelligence and psychosocial development.
Management and Leadership in Extension

Contemporary organizations encourage high performance through effective utilization of human and material resources (Schermerhorn, 1999). The quality of leader and manager choices and development has a long-term effect on the organization, plus the performance appraisal methods used for the organization’s leadership (Gatewood and Field, 1994). It has been hypothesized that various aspects of emotional intelligence may be critical to developing leader skills (Sosik and Megerian, 1999). Cooper and Sawaf (1997) outlined a training model of emotional intelligence that related to specific skills and behavioral tendencies to emotional intelligence components: emotional literacy (identification of one’s emotions and how emotions function), emotional fitness (flexibility and durability), emotional depth (potential for growth) and emotional alchemy (utilizing emotions toward new and creative approaches).

Subordinates who view supervisors as supportive and considerate of their needs, plus where supervisors provide directions and guidance to employees, a positive leadership behavior results between the subordinates’ performance ratings and supervisor leadership behavior (Evans, 1970). Extension management and leadership has undergone extensive study with the results being that all levels of Extension, like other organizations, need managers. While specific responsibilities assigned to Extension managers continue to change with different geographic locations, resource allocations and re-structuring processes, several main focus areas of Extension managers still remain valid and of high priority. Mees (1963) raised four basic concerns in relation to management positions in Extension organizations. The concerns related to analyzing
competencies required for a managerial position within Extension, identifying
management material, roles managers fill in Extension and the training needed to
effectively manage Extension personnel and programs.

While a number of definitions about management exist, certain definitions help to
clarify the management and leadership for Extension managers. Buford, Bedeian and
Lindner (1995) stated managers need to be skilled individuals that can effectively achieve
the desired results from the efficient use of human and economic resources necessary to
accomplish the desired goals of the Extension system. Kreitner (1989) believed
managers must work with and through others in the system to achieve organizational
objectives in a changing environment. By knowing one’s subordinates well, setting
realistic standards, being considerate and emphasizing skills, not rules, good results are
achieved on the part of the supervisor. Managers can also work with and through
individuals or groups to accomplish organizational goals (Hersey and Blanchard, 1982).

A Texas Agricultural Extension Service study in 1996-1997 was designed to
identify outstanding characteristics of Extension educators and to compare the identified
core competencies of Extension workers with that of emotional intelligence
competencies. The majority of the Extension core competencies were related to
that emotional intelligence was a better predictor of job success than traditional measures
because six of the seven traits for entry-level workers were non-academic. Also, because
emotional intelligence skills can be learned through competency curriculum
development, including emotional intelligence in skill training for supervisors is practical
and advisable (Ayers and Stone, 1999).
JOB SATISFACTION

As a construct, job satisfaction is extremely complex with no single conceptual model completely and accurately describing the construct (Hagedorn, 2000). Job satisfaction has been defined as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (Locke, 1976, p. 1300). Vroom (1964) defined job satisfaction as the attitude an individual carries about work roles and the corresponding relationship to worker motivation. Variables that influence job satisfaction include promotional opportunities, positions that provide high pay, considerate and participative supervision, opportunities to interact with peers, a variety of duties and a high degree of control over work methods and pace.

Job satisfaction refers to a dedicated evaluation of the job as a whole, but also refers to components such as financial rewards, resources to get the job completed, interest, challenge, use of valued skills, variety, occupational prestige, autonomy, relations to co-workers and supervisors, involvement in decision making, and comfort factors such as hours, physical surroundings and travel time. The essence of job satisfaction is the fit of congruence of the worker and the job (Mortimer, 1979). Job satisfaction is concerned with the attitudes people have about work rather than efforts to fill a need, or the past tense involving outcomes already experienced. Comparatively, motivation suggests the present tense where individuals strive toward an outcome. While different in context, satisfaction and motivation are related and both are used to evaluation of employees. Motivation has been defined as a crucial issue that influences activities of individuals in organizations, which results in job satisfaction (Padde, 1993).
Numerous studies have been completed over the years in an attempt to classify, determine and/or predict job satisfaction (Locke, 1976). The studies can be grouped into two approaches: content and process (Buford and Bedeian, 1988). Herzberg (1959), Vroom (1964), Maslow (1970), Locke (1976) and McGinnis (1985) have studied what motivates individuals to behave in a certain way and strive toward a particular behavior. Herzberg’s (1959) study distinguished two factors that influenced job satisfaction. Intrinsic factors, or motivators, (i.e., interest in the job, achievement, work and recognition) lead to job satisfaction while extrinsic factors, or hygienes, (i.e., policy and administration, an individual’s relationships with peers and supervisors, working conditions, job security and pay) lead to job dissatisfaction. The theory was based on satisfaction whereby employees are motivated from within and are not self-motivated (Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman, 1959).

A national study of male workers found that job satisfaction was most likely related to ego-related factors such as interest, variety, responsibility and competence (Gurin, Veroff & Feld, 1960). Kohn and Schooler’s (1973) study of American workers suggested job satisfaction is closely tied to closeness of supervision, routinization of work and substantive complexity. The significance of autonomy and job scope (Shepard, 1973; Stone, 1976) and opportunities to use one’s ideas and skills, learn new things, and set one’s own pace of work are additional items leading to job satisfaction (Tannenbaum, Kavic, Rosner, Vianello, & Wieser, 1974). Other studies have focused on degree of formalization, centralization and complexity, decision-making and styles of supervisory personnel in managing conflict (Newman, 1975; Seashore and Taber, 1975; Locke, 1976). Individual differences in worker characteristics have been found to not be of
crucial importance in generating job satisfaction and dissatisfaction; therefore, the same work features generally contribute to the satisfaction of all workers in the same way with the level of importance the basic variance (Voydanoff, 1978). With work characteristics not of considerable importance, job satisfaction changes have been found to be related to workers’ subjective reactions to their jobs and noted improvements in efforts to enrich and/or enlarge jobs, increased economic benefits and security or enhanced working conditions and relationships (Mortimer, 1979). O’Toole (1973) found workers responding to self-fulfillment in their work through meaningful, enriching, growth-inducing work.

Motivation toward job satisfaction involves the attraction to a job for a variety of reasons before the job is taken. After assuming the position, individuals must be encouraged to put forth enough interest and energy to result in an acceptable effort. Finally, human resources must be developed and maintained to bring about success to the organization (Vroom, 1983). Studies by McGinnis (1985) supported that motivation and job satisfaction by subordinates in relation to supervisors can be enhanced with these suggestions: 1) expect the best from people you lead; 2) establish high, yet realistic, standards for excellence; 3) create an environment where failure is not fatal; 4) recognize and applaud achievement; 5) appeal sparingly to the competitive urge; 6) place a premium on collaboration; and 7) take steps to keep your own motivation high.

The Hierarchy of Needs developed by Maslow (1970) provided a basic foundation for understanding individuals’ needs and desires. The theory was established with the premise that certain needs must be met before proceeding to higher levels of desires. Basic needs such as food, clothing and shelter must be met for survival. More
complex desires included safety, belonging and love, self-esteem and status and self-actualization. Gruneberg (1979) used Maslow’s theory to provide some evidence of job satisfaction of workers. Individuals employed in lower level-type occupations were more likely to be motivated by pay and security. After basic needs were met, higher level-type occupations were more interested in fulfilling higher order needs.

McClelland (1973) developed the Achievement Theory that suggested achievers have three basic qualities: 1) they like situations in which they take personal responsibility for finding solutions to problems, 2) they have a tendency to set moderate achievement goals and to take calculated risks and 3) they want concrete feedback about how well they are doing. Achievement varies per the individual. Therefore, managers can structure work situations to fully use the talents of high need for achievement individuals.

The Goal Setting Theory operates under the premise that a person’s goals and intentions regulate a person’s behavior. Research studies by Locke (1976) suggested that setting specific goals results in higher productivity. Managers can further enhance employee productivity by providing feedback on goal attainment.

Each of the motivational theories provide suggestions for measuring job satisfaction, but conflict in any of the theories arises when some factors may serve as job satisfaction factors for some and not others. The local administrator has an important role in creating, monitoring and maintaining the expectancies and reward structures that lead to job satisfaction. Administrators need to provide clear goals for subordinates while also being aware and making adequate use of organizational goals, philosophies and
rewards. Administrators must use a contingency approach that is flexible, multifaceted and based on astute diagnosis of the situation (Kast & Rosenzweig, 1985).

**Job Satisfaction in Extension**

Today’s Extension organization is experiencing fundamental structure and organizational change. County chairs constantly battle with demands from clientele, stakeholders, funders and subordinates. These demands include delivering faster and more prominent educational services within a lower budget. The result is increased pressure, turmoil, conflict, ambiguity and change for the local Extension unit. While once “concerned with doing things right rather than doing the right things” (Licke, 1987, p. 1), Extension administrators, at all levels, must “shift their focus from command and control to creating a culture of productivity – one which challenges, rather than reinforces, established practices” (Padde, 1993, p. 43).

Age, years of experience, gender, types of agents, job title of personnel, job commitment, education level, salary, urban and rural agents, organizational justice, decision making, work area changes and attendance have been the focus of numerous job satisfaction studies conducted nationally within the Cooperative Extension system (Schmiesing, 2002; Miller, 1997; Boltes, Lippke and Gregory, 1995; Bowen, Radhakrishna and Keyser, 1994; Riggs and Beus, 1993; Mallilo, 1990; Keffer, 1976). Tenure in the organization, gender and highest level of formal education was suggested by Leventhal, Karuza and Fry (1980) as related to organizational performance. Gender has been investigated to have a relationship to commitment and satisfaction to stay with a job (Sweeney & McFarlin, 1997). Additional education, including previous management training, has been studied with some relationship to work performance and satisfaction.
An individual’s position has been studied in relation to organizational issues and found to have little significance to satisfaction within Extension staff (Schmiesing, 2002). No study was found that focused on emotional intelligence levels of administrators related to job satisfaction.

Miller (1997) conducted a study involving the level of job satisfaction and organizational commitment of OSU Extension county agents. The results of the study indicated no difference between males’ and females’ level of job satisfaction, a slight correlation between job title and job satisfaction, a low relationship between job satisfaction and age and a positive, low relationship between years of work. The study supported positive job satisfaction for county Extension agents in Ohio. The study did not include a review of job satisfaction for other county employees.

A study conducted by West Virginia University Extension found that job satisfaction increased the longer an individual was employed by Extension. Younger employees (age 23-33 years) and more tenured employees (age 46-50 years) carried a higher level of job satisfaction than those in the 34-45 year and over 51 year groups. No relationship was found between gender and current level of job satisfaction of Extension faculty (Nestor and Leary, 2000).

Summary

The construct of emotional intelligence has developed from the search for a set of measurable tendencies and capabilities that may serve as a valid predictor of academic, occupational and life success (Fox and Spector, 2000). Emotional intelligence serves as a navigational guide to direct organizations on where they are now and where to go in the future. Emotions are not stable (like IQ) and continue to be developed throughout life.
People cannot leave emotions at home. Therefore, identifying and understanding others’ emotions is an inevitable task for leaders in the workplace. Feldman (1999) suggested that emotions “inform all our actions, our dreams, and our concerns” (p. 10). We cannot work without them so the work needs to deal with them in a productive fashion. Emotions are not always good or bad. A range of possibilities exists for emotional reaction to different situations. When people disregard an emotion or get caught up in the moment of the emotion, performance of the leader and/or the worker can be affected. Feldman stated that emotionally intelligent people are informed by emotions not ruled by them.

The social skills enhanced by understanding of emotional intelligence help people feel more relaxed and peaceful. Others can understand the individual better and be more likely to consider their ideas and feelings (Goleman, 1997). The Extension county chair is a role model for others. With the strong social skills of the county chair, interpersonal communications improves for everyone on the staff. The county chair listens to the feelings and facts of various situations, stays open to new ideas, uses flexibility in problem solving and imagines the future by feeling what life will be like in moving people toward the desired state. Through self-disclosure a leader can clearly tell others what they think, feel and want. This back-and-forth exchange helps people to acknowledge ownership of statements (makes valid) and show how conclusions are reached. People can react to each other and understand how decisions are made. Through dynamic listening, leaders get under the emotional subtext to understand the facts, plus understand the feelings of others. While individuals in a workplace may outwardly
present opinions and feelings about a situation, the underlying facts may provide additional information critical to the decision making process (Weisinger, 1998).

Communication can move vulnerable thoughts and feelings into productive personal relationships. As a result, office operations can focus on productivity in a way that increases effectiveness and efficiency rather than personnel issues that lead to conflict situations among staff members. All staff members can focus on positives and build on their personal and professional strengths.

The whole brain is used in choices about programming, team productivity and overall office operations (Goleman, 1997). When the entire brain is used (including emotions), decisions tend to be wiser and better. The county chair’s work becomes more rewarding, better performance results and self-esteem is enhanced. Individuals are less likely to say and do things that may be regretted. There is also generally less stress in life and less stress for others in the workplace and more positive outcomes are achieved (Weisinger, 1998).

As staff members become more satisfied with their work, they also become more effective members of the group and view their environment as more than just a workplace (Goleman, 1997). Extension office units are generally small in size and require staff to work in close proximity. The emotional impact of this structure compels the leader to respond to the staff and the staff to respond to the leader on a regular basis for effective and efficient office output. When each individual’s talents and wisdom are understood, the county chair can make use of these talents, knowledge and expertise more fully. Glassman (1978) reported that individuals who gain a higher desire for achievement will be more apt to want their talents and wisdom used in problem solving. They will want to
develop the social relationship with the administrator and desire more response or opinion on their performance and set higher, more realistic goals for their role in the workplace. The benefits will include staff being enthusiastic and excited about work, involved because they want to be, willing to take on big challenges, act upbeat and positive, encourage others, work hard on their own and show customers that they really matter. The ability to communicate and relate well to others is fostered by actively involving the learner’s senses (i.e., seeing, touching, feeling) in a lifelike experience. Teamwork is supported and people learn to treat each other with respect and dignity. In the current times of budget and structure transitioning, staff feeling a part of the organization and their work valued will keep Extension staff connected to their workplace (Goleman, 1997).

Positive perceptions of Extension and job satisfaction may be related to the current level of emotional intelligence of county chairs. County Extension employees, regardless of program area, are actively engaged in the local functioning and outreach of the county Extension program. Regardless of county staff position, employees are also concerned with and/or effected by: 1) competence on the job; 2) size of staff; 3) salary and economic benefits; 4) job security; 5) county budget support; 6) enhancement of work conditions; 7) variety and challenge of work assignments; 8) evaluation procedure and level of feedback; 9) interest in job/job commitment; 10) adequate resources; 11) level of responsibility; and 12) decision making opportunities. Other conditions outside of the control of the county chair may be involved with these areas.
Conceptual Schema

Upon completion of the review of literature, the variables of gender, educational degree attainment, years of tenure, program area and previous administrative experience and/or management training were identified as factors that affect the emotional intelligence level of county chairs in personnel and administrative roles. This researcher formulated the conceptual schema (Figure 3.1) to depict the relationship between these select variables and an individual’s level of emotional intelligence. As depicted in Figure 3.1 on page 55, the level of job satisfaction of county staff was conceptualized as being dependent upon the level of emotional intelligence of county chairs and subsequently, selected personal and professional characteristics of county chairs.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the research methodology used in the study. Aspects addressed in this chapter are research design, subject selection, instrumentation, data collection and data analysis.

Research Design

The study was descriptive-correlational in nature and was designed to determine the relationships between the level of emotional intelligence of Extension county chairs in Ohio and the job satisfaction of county employees (program and support staff). Data were examined to determine the nature and strength of the relationship between variables. The researcher utilized the Emotional Intelligence Inventory (Bar-On, 2002) and a mailed questionnaire to collect data to accomplish the study objectives. Permission was secured from Ohio State University Extension administration. The Emotional Intelligence Inventory (EQ-i) was administered by trained and certified professionals via the Internet with permission granted for use of the County Chair EQ-i scores by the author. The job satisfaction survey was approved for human subjects by The Institutional Review Board at The Ohio State University (Protocol Number 2003B0235).
The conceptual schema used in this study was formulated upon the theoretical understanding of emotional intelligence and the various components related to job satisfaction. The review of literature provided the framework for this understanding.

The independent variable in this study was the emotional intelligence scores (EQ-i) of Extension county chairs. The dependent variable in this study was the level (scores) of job satisfaction of Extension county staff. The research questions from Chapter 1 asked whether the dependent variable will be affected by the emotional intelligence level of county chairs and the intervening variables of gender, tenure, educational degree, program area and previous administrative experience or management training. Variables not analyzed in this study include competence on the job, staff size, salary and economic benefits, job security, county budget support, enhancement of work conditions, variety and challenge of work assignments, evaluation procedure and level of feedback, interest in job/job commitment, adequate resources, level of responsibility, decision making opportunities, rural/urban location, and position prestige. The descriptive model for the conceptual schema for this research study appears in Figure 3.1.
Figure 3.1: Conceptual schema of potential relationship between selected personal and professional variables and the correlation of the emotional intelligence level of county chairs and the level of job satisfaction of county staff.
**Subject Selection**

Ohio State University Extension county chairs and county program and support staff were selected for this descriptive-correlational research. The population of county chairs and county employees was obtained from the OSU Extension personnel database. The county chairs included in the study were those with personnel responsibilities in the state as of May 14, 2003. The total number of county chairs in the state was 98, with 87 of those carrying personnel responsibilities on the county level. The total number of county program and support staff (not including county chairs) was 777 as of May 14, 2003. The number used in the study (Krejcie and Morgan, 1970) was 251. A random sample of county staff was selected based on a random number table and numbers assigned to an alphabetical listing of county staff. Individuals who were full or part-time personnel in district or regional offices, other than from a county office, were eliminated from the list. An effort was made to eliminate cross-county duplications and assure the list was accurate and current.

**Instrumentation**

The researcher used two different instruments in this study. One instrument was used to determine the level of emotional intelligence in county chairs. The second instrument was a job satisfaction index to collect data from county staff. A questionnaire was also given to both groups to acquire information about eight demographic variables.

**Emotional Intelligence**

The self-reporting Bar-On EQ-i was used to provide a comprehensive measure and assessment of the level of emotional intelligence for county chairs in the Ohio Extension system. The EQ-i is comprised of 133 brief items in a five-point response set.
(ranging from “Not True of Me” to “True of Me”) and combines existing observations, theories, methodological strategies, research findings and multi-factorial comprehensive scores (Bar-On, 2002). The EQ-i assessment provides four validity scale scores, a total emotional quotient (EQ) score, five composite scores and 15 EQ subscale scores.

**Reliability of Emotional Intelligence Inventory:**

Internal reliability indicates the extent to which individual differences in test scores are attributable to true differences in the characteristics under consideration in the study (Anastasi, 1988). The internal consistency, or consistency of the content of the individual scale being examined, is believed to be the best estimate of the test’s true reliability (Guilford & Fruchter, 1978). Bar-On’s (2002) internal consistency coefficients for the EQ-i sub-scales were based on seven population samples. The internal consistency coefficients for the EQ-i subscales were based on the average Cronbach alpha coefficients (set high for all subscales) ranging from a “low” of .69 (social responsibility) to a high of .86 (self-regard), with an overall average consistency of .76. The EQ-i results indicated very good reliability. The temporal stability of the EQ-i was a function of the reliability of the respondent and also the test’s stability over time. The results from seven population samples showed very good reliability (Guilford and Fruchter, 1978). From tests with two groups of South African subjects, the average retest reliability coefficients after one month (testing interval) was .85 and .75 after four months.

**Validity of Emotional Intelligence Inventory:**

Validity evaluates how successful an instrument is in assessing what it was designed to measure (i.e., emotional intelligence and its factorial components). Bar-On
(2002) has conducted nine validity studies on the EQ-i instrument: content, face, factor, construct, convergent, divergent, criterion-group, discriminant, and predictive validity. Face validity was addressed by conducting interviews of 39 subjects early in the EQ-i development, plus the feedback from approximately 3,000 individuals who have completed the inventory during the final stages of the EQ-i development. A factor analysis test was used to justify the theoretical and empirical extent of the inventory, or how well the proposed factors would “hold up and hang together” (Bar-On, 2002, p. 90). Factor loadings represented the correlation of each item in the inventory (loadings of .40 and higher across and within factors). The orthogonal rotation denoted the factorial validity of the item and served as a basis for construct validity based on the item’s ability to measure whatever is common to a group of items (Anastasi, 1982). A factor analysis process examined the logical cluster of the major factors and found the chosen factor structure in line with research available on emotional intelligence. The content validity of the EQ-i was examined by the statistical item analysis which is sensitive to item wording (Jackson, 1971). Poorly related items to definitions and being understood by the respondents were weeded out of the inventory. The EQ-i structure is interpretable, theoretically sound and empirically acceptable based on the delicate balance between theory and empirical research results. The inventory’s subscales scores were correlated with the various scale scores of other measures (i.e., external criterion scales) to measure construct validity. Ten tests (Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, 16PF, Cattell, Eber & Tatsouka, 1970; Minnesota Multiple Personality Inventory, MMPI-2, Butcher, Dahlstrom, Graham, Tellengen & Kaemmer, 1989; ETPQ, Eysenck Personality Questionnaire, EPQ, Eysenck, H.J. & Eysenck, S.B.G. 1975; Personality Assessment Inventory, PAI,
Morey, 1991; Symptom Check List-Ninety. SCL-90, Derogatis, 1973; Personality Orientation Inventory, POI, Shostrom, 1964, 1974; Short Acculturation Scale, SAS, Marin, Sabogal, Marin, Otero-Sabogal & Perez-Stable, 1987; Beck Depression Inventory Depression Scale, BDI, Beck & Steer, 1987; Zung Self-Rating Depression Scale, SDS, Zung, 1965; Kirkcaldy Quality of Life, KqoL, Kirkcaldy, 1995a) were administered with the EQ-I in six countries (Argentina, Canada, Germany, Israel, South Africa and the United States) from 1985-1997. The construct validity showed a close match between the expected theoretical subscale structure and the empirical subscale (factor analysis). The structure of the EQ-i was found to be easily interpretable, theoretically sound and empirically acceptable (Bar-On, 2002).

Job Satisfaction

The researcher utilized a job satisfaction index to collect data from county Extension staff. The index was developed by Brayfield-Rothe (1951) and then modified by Warner (1973). The original Brayfield-Rothe index was modified through feedback from a field test, resulting in four items that reflected low scores on a correlated split-half correlation being eliminated. The revised index was a 14-item version.

Validity – Job Satisfaction Survey

The validity of the job satisfaction index was reviewed via a pilot test of 18 Extension staff members representing program and support staff across Ohio (Schmiesing, 2002). The review was used to determine if the directions were applicable for use with OSU Extension personnel and determine the content and face validity of the questionnaire (Schmiesing, 2002). Modifications to the instrument were made based on the appropriate modifications suggested by the reviewers.
Reliability – Job Satisfaction Survey

Reliability indicates the extent to which individual differences in test scores are attributable to true differences in the characteristics under consideration in the study (Anastasi, 1988). The job satisfaction instrument was modified from a job satisfaction index developed by Brayfield-Rothe (1951) and modified by Warner (1973). The revised 14-item index resulted in a reliability of .89 (Bowen, 1980). The instrument was used in a field test with Ohio Extension Agents’ Association members (including county staff). From this audience, the Cronbach Alpha was calculated by Schmiesing (2002) for the job satisfaction in the instrument and resulted in internal reliability of .90.

Personal and Professional Characteristics

The personal and professional characteristics used in this study included gender, race/ethnicity, appointment, main program area, location of Extension district, length of employment with Extension, level of highest education completed and previous management experience. Through adulthood, peoples’ emotional intelligence levels do not change significantly, but can change with conscious efforts to change; therefore, age was not included as a characteristic in the study.

**Gender** was measured as either: a) male; or b) female. The level of measurement for this characteristic was assumed to be nominal.

**Race/Ethnicity** was measured as either: a) Black, not of Hispanic origin; b) American Indian or Alaskan native; c) Asian or Pacific Islander; d) Hispanic; e) Mixed; or f) White, not of Hispanic origin. The level of measurement for this
characteristic was assumed to be nominal during data collection. For correlational data analysis this characteristic was collapsed into the dichotomous categories of white and all other categories.

**Extension Appointment** was measured as either: a) Extension Agent; b) Program Assistant; c) Support Staff; or d) other. The level of measurement for Extension appointment was assumed to be nominal and for correlational data analysis was collapsed into the dichotomous categories of program staff (Extension agent and program assistant) and support staff.

**Main Program Area** was measured as either: a) Agriculture & Natural Resources; b) Family and Consumer Sciences; c) Community Development; d) 4-H Youth Development; and e) not appointed to a specific program area. The level of measurement for main program area during data collection was assumed to be nominal. For correlational data analysis the main program area was collapsed into program focused and not appointed to a specific program focus categories.

**Location** was measured as either: a) East District; b) North District; c) South District; or d) West District. The level of measurement was assumed to be nominal.

**Length of Employment with Extension** (all locations) was measured as either: a) less than 5 years; b) 5 – 14 years; c) 15 – 24 years; or d) over 25 years. The level of measurement was assumed to be ratio. However, for correlational data analysis this characteristic was collapsed into the dichotomous categories of 14 years or less and 15 years or more.

**Level of Highest Education Completed** measured to be either: a) Doctorate Degree; b) Masters Degree; c) Bachelor Degree; d) Associate or 2-year degree; e) High
school diploma; or f) other. The level of measurement for this characteristic was assumed to be ordinal during data collection. However, for correlational data analysis this characteristic was collapsed into dichotomous categories of advanced degrees (Doctorate and Master’s) and Bachelor’s Degree or less with the level of measurement assumed to be ordinal.

**Previous Management Training** was measured by either: a) yes or b) no. The level of measurement was assumed to be nominal.

**Data Collection**

**Emotional Intelligence**

A colleague of the researcher and trained facilitator of the emotional intelligence instrument, Dr. Garee W. Earnest, Program Leader, OSU Leadership Center, sent an e-mail invitation on November 5, 2003 to all county chairs in Ohio with personnel responsibilities to complete the emotional intelligence instrument on-line. The e-mail’s introductory note (Appendix A) was co-signed by the researcher, Dr. Earnest, and Dr. Keith Smith, Director, OSU Extension. Participants were encouraged to complete the EQ-i (Bar-On, 2002) by November 12, 2003. Each instrument (sample overview in Appendix B) contained an identification number to assist in follow-up with non-respondents. The data was collected by Dr. Earnest and shared with the researcher as group data.

The first e-mail invitation resulted in a 23 percent response (20 individuals) of the OSU Extension agents with personnel responsibility in the census. Those who had not responded by November 19, 2003, received an additional follow-up e-mail (Appendix C) from Dr. Earnest with directions on how to connect to the Internet emotional
intelligence instrument. The second e-mail resulted in an additional 21 percent response (18 individuals) by OSU county chairs included in the census. A third and fourth reminder to non-responders resulted in an additional 16 percent (14 individuals) response. The researcher established December 19, 2003 as the final deadline for accepting data for the analysis. The final county chair response rate was 61 percent (52 individuals).

**Job Satisfaction**

Data was collected by the researcher according to the mailed survey procedure outlined by Dillman (1978). The job satisfaction survey (Appendix D) was mailed to 251 subjects on November 10, 2003 with a cover letter (Appendix E) signed by the researcher, Dr. Garee W. Earnest and Dr. Keith Smith, Director of OSU Extension. A stamped, self-addressed envelope was also included. Participants were encouraged to respond by November 19, 2003. Each survey contained an identification number to assist in follow-up with non-respondents.

The first mailing resulted in a 68% response (172 staff) of the county OSU Extension staff members. Those who had not responded by November 17, 2003 received a reminder e-mail follow-up (Appendix F) from the researcher and a second copy of the instrument upon request and a requested response date of November 26, 2003. The reminder e-mail resulted in an additional 9 percent response (22 staff) by county OSU Extension staff members. A second e-mail reminder resulted in an additional 11 percent response (28 staff). The researcher established December 19, 2003 as the final deadline for accepting data for analysis. The final study response rate was 86 percent and included 222 county staff.
Data Analysis

The data from both data collection methods (EQ-i and job satisfaction survey) were coded, entered and analyzed using the SPSS statistical computer program. (Norusis, 2002). Measures of association were used to determine the linear relationship between job satisfaction (county staff), emotional intelligence (county chairs) and selected individual characteristics. After entering all data, the researcher randomly selected 25 percent of the returned surveys to check for accuracy in data input. An accuracy rate of 100 percent was calculated.

Job satisfaction data from county staff and the EQ-i scores of county chairs, were merged by matching the corresponding job satisfaction scores of county staff to the county chair EQ-i scores. Job satisfaction scores from county staff whose county chairs did not respond to the study were eliminated from the correlation section of the analysis. The resulting number of county staff’s job satisfaction scores reviewed in this section of correlational analysis was 130.

The use of an inferential statistic for a census study is a proper statistical procedure if based upon the assumption that the findings will only be used to describe the respondents in the study and that this population is a sample of time and not of individuals. No hypothesis testing should be conducted and no inferences should be made to the population or to any other similar population. (L.W. Miller, personal communication, May 22, 2004). Therefore, the inferential statistic of stepwise linear regression was chosen by this researcher as part of this study.

Stepwise linear regression analysis was used to determine the best predictor(s) of the dependent variable – job satisfaction of county Extension staff. Stepwise multiple
regression is described by McCaslin (1991) as “most appropriately used when a) the research goal is primarily predictive rather than explanatory, and b) the researcher has a relatively high number of potential independent variables and little theory or logic to guide the order in which the independent variables are entered into the equation” (p. 13).

The dependent variable for this study’s regression model was the total job satisfaction score for Extension county staff. Individual responses were transformed into a summated score for each person and for the respondents as a group. The independent and extraneous variables entered into the regression model included: emotional intelligence scores, including the total EQ-i and the five composite scales of the EQ-i, gender, race/ethnicity, appointment, main program area, location (by district), length of employment with Extension (all locations), level of highest education completed and previous management training. The total $R^2$ was computed to determine the amount of variance accounted for by the linear combination of the independent and extraneous variables.

The researcher calculated the descriptive statistics to meet study objectives. Davis’ (1971) conventions were used to describe measures of association (Table 3.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.70 or higher</td>
<td>Very Strong Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50 to .69</td>
<td>Substantial Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30 to .49</td>
<td>Moderate Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10 to .29</td>
<td>Low Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.01 to .09</td>
<td>Negligible Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Conventions Used to Describe Measures of Association
CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to explore and describe the relationship between the job satisfaction of county staff and the level of emotional intelligence of Extension county chairs in Ohio. This chapter encompasses the presentation of the findings for the study. Frequencies and descriptive statistics were computed for the predictor variables. Regression models were used to determine the proportion of variance in the county chairs’ emotional intelligence scores and job satisfaction of county staff as explained by gender, race/ethnicity, appointment, main program area, location, length of employment with Extension, level of highest education completed and previous management training. A description of the respondents (county chairs and county staff), measures of association and findings from the regression model analyses are presented in this chapter. The findings are organized according to the objectives of the study.

Objective 1: To describe the professional and personal characteristics of OSU Extension county chairs and county staff

A profile of the 52 responding county chairs and 222 county staff who participated in the study are summarized in Table 4.1 and Table 4.2. This profile was devised to offer necessary data to interpret the findings of the study. These
characteristics include: gender, race/ethnicity, appointment, main program area, location, length of employment with Extension, level of highest education completed, and previous management training.

Gender and Race/Ethnicity

As shown in Table 4.1, 44 percent of the Extension county chairs were female and 56 percent were male. Respondents were 98 percent white and two percent mixed. As shown in Table 4.1, 80 percent of the Extension county staff were female and 19 percent were male. Respondents were 94 percent white, two percent black, one half percent Asian or Pacific Islander, one half percent Hispanic, and two percent mixed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>County Chairs</th>
<th>County Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian/Alaskan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Personal Characteristics of OSU Extension County Chairs and County Staff

Highest Education Completed

Table 4.2 shows data on the county chair respondents’ highest academic degree completed. A majority (90%) attained a master’s degree. Two percent held a bachelor’s degree and nearly eight percent of the respondents reported their highest degree as a doctoral degree.
Table 4.2 shows data on the county staff respondents’ highest academic degree completed. A majority (44%) held a master’s degree. Twenty-five percent received a high school diploma, 15% held a bachelor’s degree, 11% held an associate’s degree, 2% had a level of education not listed and 2% of the respondents reported their highest degree as a doctoral degree.

**Main Program Area**

County chair respondents indicated their primary program area of responsibility with the largest percentage (33%) being agriculture/natural resources. Twenty-nine percent of the respondents were 4-H youth development, 27% family and consumer sciences, 6% community development, and 6% not appointed to a specific program area.

County staff respondents indicated a primary program area of responsibility (Table 4.2) with the largest percentage (34%) being family and consumer sciences. Twenty-nine percent of the respondents were 4-H youth development, 19% agriculture/natural resources, 15% not appointed to a specific area and 3% community development.

**Previous Management Training**

As shown in Table 4.2, 41 county chair respondents (79%) had some previous management training. Twenty-one percent had no previous management training. As shown in Table 4.2, 92 county staff respondents (41%) had some previous management training while fifty-seven percent had no previous management training.

**Appointment**

Table 4.2 shows data on the county chair respondents’ appointment within Extension. All of the respondents were county Extension agents. Table 4.2 shows data
on the county staff respondents’ appointment within Extension. A majority (43%) of the respondents were county Extension agents. Twenty-six percent worked as program assistants, 28% support staff and 3% had other appointment titles.

Location

The OSU Extension district of employment for county chairs is shown in Table 4.2. Thirty-three percent of the respondents worked in the South, 27% in the West, 21% in the North, and 19% in the East district. The OSU Extension district of employment for county staff is shown in Table 4.2. Twenty-six percent of the respondents work in the East, 25% in the North, 25% in the South, and 24% in the West District. No district was significantly weak or strong in participation. Therefore, impact from the district locations was not used as a major factor in this study.

Length of Employment with Extension

Table 4.2 shows data on the county chair respondents’ years of experience working with Extension. A significant number of county chairs (39%) worked with Extension 5-14 years. Thirty-three percent were employed 15-24 years, 21% worked for over 25 years and 8% had worked less than five years in Extension.

Table 4.2 shows data on the county staff respondents’ years of experience working with Extension. Thirty-seven percent of the respondents worked 5-14 years with Extension, 26% worked less than five years, 24% worked 15-24 years and 13% worked more than 25 years.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>County Chairs</th>
<th>County Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr./Nat. Res.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCS.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Dev.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H/Youth</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specific</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext. Agent</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prog. Ass’t.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East District</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North District</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South District</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West District</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Worked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 5 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 14 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 24 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Professional Characteristic of OSU Extension County Chairs and County Staff
Objective 2: To describe the emotional intelligence levels of current county chairs.

OSU County Chairs Level of Emotional Intelligence

The self-reported emotional intelligence scores of county chairs are reported in Table 4.3 by a total emotional intelligence inventory score and five composite scale scores that included competencies in intrapersonal skills, interpersonal skills, stress management, adaptability and general mood. The scores represent a portion of the county chairs in Ohio since the opportunity to participate in the EQ-i was completely voluntary and not all county chairs chose to participate in the census study. Respondents had diverse levels of total emotional intelligence. For the 52 county chair completing the EQ-i, total EQ-i scores ranged from 75 to 118. The distribution of scores had a mean of 100 (standard deviation = 12), a median of 100 and a mode of 96. The highest individual composite scale score mean was stress management having a mean score of 102 and a standard deviation of 11 and a range of scores from 73-119. The next highest composite scale scores were intrapersonal and adaptability at 101 (sd 13 and 11, respectively). The range of scores for the intrapersonal scale was from 73-119, while the range of scores for adaptability was from 77-120. The other composite scale mean scores were interpersonal (97, sd 13) and general mood (100, sd 11). The range of scores for the interpersonal composite scale was from 61-122 and the general mood scale scores ranged from 77-119.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ-i Scores</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total EQ-I</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75-118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>73-119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61-122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Management</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>103(a)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73-119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>90(a)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>77-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Mood</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>92(a)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>77-119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a: More than one mode; smallest mode reported

Table 4.3: Emotional Intelligence Scores and Ranges of Scores of OSU Extension County Chair

Scores for the Bar-On EQ-i (2002) will generally fall (99.9% of the time) between 55 and 145 (+/- 3 standard deviations from the mean). Extreme scores on the EQ-i are generally uncommon and most respondents achieve EQ scores near 100. Points are assigned through a complex scoring system based on the responses, mathematical transformation of raw scores, gender and normative sample data. Scores for each composite scale and sub-scale (one of 15 items) have the same mean (100) and standard deviation (15). Generally, high EQ-i scores indicate skills measured as being strong, well developed and functioning effectively. On the contrary, low scores suggest a deficiency may exist in a particular area and a need to improve particular competencies and skills to adhere to environmental demands. Scores are evaluated by how far they fall from up to one standard deviation (15 points) from the mean.

EQ-i scores can be interpreted from using Table 4.4, which provides interpretive guidelines for Bar-On’s EQ-i scale scores (Bar-On, 2002). Individuals with average or above scores are generally expected to possess the competencies of emotional intelligence to a greater degree for each of the inventory’s five factors. The total
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EQ-i score gives a snapshot of emotional well being, or general indication, of how emotionally intelligent the respondent is and how successful the individual is in coping with environmental demands. The total EQ-i score provides general information about the respondent because it covers a broad range of skills and competencies. Greater emphasis is placed on the five composite scores because a high total EQ-i score can hide a low score on one or more of the underlying subscales. High EQ-i scores describe individuals who feel good about themselves, are in touch with their feelings, feel fairly successful in realizing their potential, understand the way others feel (and respond accordingly), are realistic, assertive and successful in problem solving, are happy and carry a positive outlook on life.

OSU Extension county chairs generally have strong emotional intelligence capacity. Nearly 81 percent of the responding county chairs have a total EQ-i score in the average or above level (average score 90 or above). The strongest EQ-i composite scale score was in adaptability (84.6% average or above emotional capacity). Other composite scores percentages where county chairs scored at the average or above level of emotional capacity were: intrapersonal (80.8%); interpersonal (73.1%); stress management (82.7%); and general mood (82.7%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Score</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>OSU Extension County Chair Scores (% of Total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guideline</td>
<td>Total EQ-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130+</td>
<td>Markedly High</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-129</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110-119</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-109</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 70</td>
<td>Markedly Low</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Interpretive Guidelines and EQ-i Scores for OSU Extension County Chairs
Objective 3: To describe the level of job satisfaction of county Extension staff.

Total Satisfaction of County Extension Staff

Table 4.7 portrays OSU county Extension staff’s overall perceptions of job satisfaction. For the 222 county staff members completing the job satisfaction instrument, individual scores ranged from 1.50 to 4.36. The distribution of individual scores had an overall mean of 2.79 (sd .27), a median of 2.79 and a mode of 2.79. With 3.00 being a neutral score of job satisfaction, county staff were slightly negative in their level of job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scale 1 = Strongly Disagree       5 = Strongly Agree

Table 4.5: Perceptions of Job Satisfaction of OSU County Extension Staff

Relationships Between Job Satisfaction and Selected Characteristics of County Extension Staff

The overall relationship between selected characteristics with the dependent variable, job satisfaction, was assessed using the Kendall’s tau-b and Pearson’s R correlation coefficient measures of association. The Kendall’s tau-b and Pearson’s R correlations are shown in Table 4.6. These measures of association identified four characteristics with a significant relationship to job satisfaction at the .05 alpha level: highest level of education completed, appointment, previous management training and main program area. The characteristic with the highest level of correlation was highest level of education completed. Although the highest correlation, the relationship between the dependent variable and highest level of education completed was still considered to
be a low association with a .23 correlation. Other relationships identified with low
correlations were appointment (.18), previous management training (.16) and main
program area (.15). The correlations between the dependent variable and years in
Extension (.05), gender (.10), and race/ethnicity (-.08) were identified as negligible
associations.

### Table 4.6: Summary Data of Intercorrelations between Selected Characteristics and Job Satisfaction of County Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>$X^1$</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$X^3$</th>
<th>$X^4$</th>
<th>$X^5$</th>
<th>$X^6$</th>
<th>$X^7$</th>
<th>$X^8$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction ($X^1$)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment ($X^2$)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Extension ($X^3$)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Education ($X^4$)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ($X^5$)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity ($X^6$)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Training ($X^7$)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Program Area ($X^8$)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: Coefficients reported as Kendall’s tau-b and Pearson’s R correlations

$x^1$: 1 = Program staff, 0 = Support staff
$x^2$: 1 = Less than 14 years, 0 = 15 or more years
$x^3$: 1 = Advanced degrees, 0 = Bachelor’s or less
$x^4$: 1 = Male, 0 = Female
$x^5$: 1 = All other than white, 0 = White
$x^6$: 1 = Previous training, 0 = No previous training
$x^7$: 1 = Agriculture/Natural Resources, 0 = Families, Communities and Youth

*p < .05

Table 4.6: Summary Data of Intercorrelations between Selected Characteristics and Job Satisfaction of County Staff

### Stepwise Multiple Regression Model for County Extension Staff

Stepwise multiple regression analyses were performed to determine the
proportion of variance in job satisfaction that was explained by the linear combination of
selected characteristics for county Extension staff. The residuals were found to equal
zero and normally distributed; thus, assuring the assumptions of multiple linear
regression were met. The normal probability plots showed that errors were independent.
Scatter plots indicated that the residuals were not correlated with the independent
variables and had a constant variance. As none of the characteristics (variables) were substantially correlated (r > .80) with other variables, multicollinearity was not a problem.

Since all assumptions for multiple regression were met, stepwise multiple linear regression was performed to determine the best predictor of the dependent variable – job satisfaction. The regression model was run with the selected characteristics in the study, including appointment, main program area, length of employment, level of highest education completed, gender, race/ethnicity and previous management training. The regression model in Table 4.7 depicts the one characteristic that entered into the regression model for job satisfaction. The model indicated that 4.8 percent of the variance in job satisfaction could be explained by highest level of education completed. The other characteristics did not enter the model nor contribute a significant increment of $R^2$. The partial regression coefficient ($b$), or .118, indicated the expected change in the dependent variable associated with a one unit change in highest level of education completed when all other variables are held constant. Since highest level of education completed was the only variable to enter the regression equation, it is the only characteristic to explain a change in variance for job satisfaction for county Extension staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2_{\text{Change}}$</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Level Education</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>3.253</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error = .036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted $R^2 = .043$ for model: $F = 10.584$

Table 4.7: Regression of Job Satisfaction with Selected Variables for County Extension Staff – Stepwise Entry (n = 212)
Objective 4: To examine the relationship between the level of emotional competence of county chairs and the level of job satisfaction of county Extension employees.

Relationships Between Dependent Variable, EQ-i and Selected Characteristics

The EQ-i composite scale scores were used rather than the total EQ-i score in the investigation of relationships between emotional intelligence levels of county chairs and the job satisfaction of county Extension staff. The total EQ-i score gives general information on the county chairs’ emotional well being while the composite scale scores provide a deeper level of information concerning emotional capacity for each respondent. The overall relationships between EQ-i composite scales and selected characteristics were assessed using the Kendal’s tau-b and Pearson’s R correlation coefficients measures of association. The Kendall’s tau-b and Pearson’s R correlations are shown in Table 4.8. The Kendall’s tau-b and Pearson’s R measures of association identified five characteristics with a significant relationship to job satisfaction at the .05 alpha level: appointment, main program area, highest level of education completed, gender and previous management training. The characteristic with the highest level of correlation was level of education completed (.241). This characteristic held the highest level of correlation, but was still a low correlation explaining the relationship between the dependent variable, job satisfaction and highest level of education completed. Other relationships with low intercorrelations to job satisfaction, included: appointment (.198); main program area (.150); gender (.186); and previous management training (.165). The correlations between the dependent variable and race/ethnicity (-.081), years with Extension (.013) and the five composite scales of the EQ-i resulted in negligible
Stepwise Multiple Regression Model

Stepwise multiple regression analysis was performed to determine the proportion of variance in job satisfaction of county staff that was explained by the linear combination of the EQ-i five composite scale scores of county chairs. The residuals were found to equal zero and normally distributed; thus, assuring the assumptions of multiple linear regression were met. The normal probability plots shows that errors were independent. Scatter plots indicated that the residuals were not correlated with the independent variables and had a constant variance. As none of the independent variables were substantially correlated (r > .80) with other dependent variables, multicollinearity was not a problem.

Since all assumptions for multiple regression were met, stepwise multiple linear regression was performed to determine the best predictor of the dependent variable – job satisfaction. Since the job satisfaction scores had to be matched with county chair EQ-i scores to run the regression model, in cases where the county chair did not participate in the study, those county staff scores were eliminated. Therefore, the n for the multiple regression model was lower due to the unavailability of information from certain county chairs matched to county staff data.

The five EQ-i composite scale scores were run in a regression model with job satisfaction. The multiple regression analyses showed no relationship to job satisfaction and thus, no explanation of the variance related to job satisfaction. The regression model
in Table 4.9 depicts the one characteristic that entered into the regression model for job satisfaction. The model indicated that 5.8 percent of the variance in job satisfaction could be explained by gender. The other characteristics did not enter the model nor contribute a significant increment of $R^2$. The partial regression coefficient (b), or .168, indicated the expected change in the dependent variable associated with a one unit change in gender when all other variables were held constant. Since gender was the only variable to enter the regression equation, it was the only characteristic to explain a change in variance for job satisfaction. The mean value of the dichotomous variable coded 1 (male) was .168 points higher than the mean value of the variable coded 0 (female); therefore, whatever part of the variance was explained by females, the variance explained by males was .168 points higher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2_{\text{Change}}$</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. Error = .061  
Adjusted $R^2 = .05$  
For model: $F = 7.561$

Table 4.9: Regression of Job Satisfaction with EQ-i and Selected Variables – Stepwise Entry  (n = 124)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>x^1</th>
<th>x^2</th>
<th>x^3</th>
<th>x^4</th>
<th>x^5</th>
<th>x^6</th>
<th>x^7</th>
<th>x^8</th>
<th>x^9</th>
<th>x^{10}</th>
<th>x^{11}</th>
<th>x^{12}</th>
<th>x^{13}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satis</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.198*</td>
<td>.150*</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.241*</td>
<td>.186*</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.165*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x^1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intraper a</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interper a</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x^3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Mgt b</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>.655</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x^4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapt b</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x^5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Mood b</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.181</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x^6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appoint b</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x^7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program b</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x^8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Ext b</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.249</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x^9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education b</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x^{10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender b</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x^{11})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethn b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x^{12})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Train b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x^{13})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Coefficients reported as Kendall’s Tau-b and Pearson’s R Correlations  
a: Pearson’s R  b: Kendall’s tau-b  
\(x^1\): 1 = Program staff, 0 = Support staff  
\(x^2\): 1 = Less than 14 years, 0 = 15 or more years  
\(x^3\): 1 = Male, 0 = Female  
\(x^4\): 1 = Previous training, 0 = No previous training  
\(x^5\): 1 = Agriculture/Natural Resources, 0 = Families, Communities and Youth  
\(x^6\): 1 = Advanced degrees, 0 = Bachelor’s or less  
\(x^7\): 1 = All other than white, 0 = White  
\(x^8\): 1 = Previous training, 0 = No previous training  
\* p<.05

Table 4.8: Summary Data of Intercorrelations between Selected Variables, EQ-i Composite Scale Scores and Job Satisfaction
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The outreach arm of The Ohio State University, OSU Extension, has been serving the citizens of Ohio since the early 1900’s. A variety of educational programs have been provided in the areas of 4-H youth development, agriculture/natural resources, family and consumer sciences and community development. With the changing economic times, Extension has experienced budget constraints on the county, state and federal levels that have resulted in downsizing (reduction in force), restructuring and uncertainty in future endeavors. Loss of state staff and dollars toward management personnel have complicated the changes in Extension and compelled state Extension administration to re-assign additional supervisory responsibilities to county chairs. Maintaining current staff and critical programs remains a priority, but extreme fiscal constraints, pay equity and salary adjustments, employee workloads and balancing work/family issues and individual professional support are becoming more complex and challenging.

The varied and challenging changes underway with OSU Extension have a direct impact on the leadership of county chairs and the productivity of all Extension
employees. As these changes progress, the level of job satisfaction of county staff becomes increasingly important and challenging. County chairs must deal with budgetary cutbacks that affect personnel and operations, plus maintain an acceptable level of program output to and for clientele. As traditional program areas change to a more interdisciplinary approach, different management policies and procedures and reporting mechanisms must be learned and maintained. Changes in staff and program output, plus reduction in programming dollars, are creating the need for additional community and university partnerships with the potential for additional legal implications. OSU Extension is in the midst of cost recovery and generating program funds. Additional administrative responsibilities of county chairs are likely to create challenges in balancing management and operations, personnel and delivery of quality educational programs. County staff, regardless of title or responsibility, are faced with the challenge to do more (or at least the same output) with less resources.

Various studies have been completed on the current level of satisfaction of Extension employees (Boltes, Lippke & Gregory, 1995; Bowen, Radhakrishna & Keyser, 1994; Keffer, 1976; Mallilo, 1990; Miller, 1997; Nestor & Leary, 2000; Riggs & Beus, 1993). However, no studies have been conducted that investigated the relationship between the level of emotional intelligence of county chairs and the levels of job satisfaction of county staff.

The purpose of this study was to investigate factors affecting county staff members’ level of job satisfaction. This study was also conducted to examine the
relationships that existed between the level of emotional intelligence of county chairs and
the job satisfaction of county Extension staff.

Specific objectives were:

1. To describe the professional and personal characteristics of county chairs and
   county staff members.
2. To describe the emotional intelligence levels of current county chairs, including
   examination of the relationship between selected characteristics and the chairs’
   emotional intelligence scores.
3. To describe the level of job satisfaction of county Extension employees.
4. To examine the relationship between the level of emotional competence of the
   county chairs and the level of job satisfaction of county Extension employees.

Study Design

This was a descriptive-correlational study that utilized a web-based emotional
intelligence inventory and a mailed questionnaire to collect data about the study
objectives. The emotional intelligence inventory (EQ-i) was developed by Bar-On
(2002) and the job satisfaction instrument was developed by Warner (1973). The EQ-i is
categorized into five composite scales: interpersonal (interpersonal skills and
functioning), intrapersonal (inner self), stress management, adaptability and general
mood. These five composite scales encompass the 15 sub-scales of the overall inventory
as shown in Table 2.1. The job satisfaction instrument consisted of a 14-question survey.
The EQ-i was taken by county chairs in a web-based process. The job satisfaction survey
was mailed to a random sample of county Extension staff. Finally, the researcher
collected selected personal (gender, race/ethnicity) and professional (highest degree earned, main program area, district, years of employment with Extension, previous management training, Extension position) data on each respondent.

A census of OSU Extension county chairs with personnel responsibilities was used for this research. County chairs were given the option to participate in the study as per the requirements set forth by the Institutional Review Board of The Ohio State University. All county chairs had the position of Extension agent. All county chairs, but three, also had one or more of the following in their job title: Agriculture and Natural Resources; Family and Consumer Sciences; Community Development; or 4-H Youth Development. All individuals in the study were located in a county office. Responses were received from 52 county chairs, or 61% of the total census of county chairs employed with personnel responsibilities with OSU Extension.

A random sample of county staff was used for this research. The majority of county staff had the position of Extension agent, program assistant, or support staff. Only individuals housed in county offices were used in this study. Of the total number of county Extension staff in OSU Extension, 251 individuals were chosen at random to participate in the study.

Measures of association were utilized to determine the linear relationships between job satisfaction of county staff, the emotional intelligence levels of county chairs and selected personal and professional characteristics. Stepwise linear regression analysis was used to measure the proportion of variance in the county staff’s job satisfaction that could be explained by the level of emotional intelligence of county chairs.
and by the characteristics of appointment, main program area, length of employment in Extension, level of highest education, gender, race/ethnicity and previous management training.

Findings

This section will discuss the findings from Chapter 4 summarized by the following areas: a) characteristics of both populations (county chairs and county staff); b) perceptions regarding job satisfaction, including relationships between selected characteristics and job satisfaction; c) perceptions regarding emotional intelligence; and d) relationships between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction.

Characteristics of the Both Populations

The personal demographic variables of gender and race/ethnicity for both populations (county chairs and county staff) were investigated in this study. Of the 52 OSU Extension county chairs responding, 44% were female and 56% were male. The largest majority of respondents (98%) were white, not of Hispanic origin. Of the 222 county staff respondents, the majority (80%) were female and 19 percent were male. The largest majority of the respondents (94%) were white, not of Hispanic origin.

The researcher has observed the organization to be almost evenly divided in terms of male and female Extension county chairs. All county chair respondents served in the position of Extension agent. There were significantly more county staff respondents who were female (80%). County staff included individuals from the Extension agent, program assistant and support staff positions.
OSU county chairs responding to this study indicated they had worked a varied amount of time with Extension. The study findings indicated that more than one-third (39%) of the county chairs worked for Extension 5-14 years. Twenty percent of the county chairs have worked more than 25 years and one-third (33%) worked 15–24 years. Additionally, just less than ten percent (8%) have been an Extension employee for less than five years. These findings indicated that nearly one half (47%) of the county chairs in Ohio have less than 14 years work experience in Extension. Nearly two-thirds (63%) of the county staff respondents have worked for Extension less than 14 years.

Respondents for county chairs and county staff were relatively evenly distributed over the four Extension districts in Ohio. With county chairs and county staff having the option to participate in this study, response rates were dependent on the individual’s interest and time available for participation in the study. No district was significantly weak or strong in participation. Therefore, impact from the district locations was not used as a major factor in this study.

Over three fourths of the county chair respondents (79%) had participated in some level of previous management training. Only 41 percent of the county staff respondents had previously participated in some level of management training. The county chairs were more likely to have management training.

Perceptions Regarding Job Satisfaction of County Staff

The mean job satisfaction score for all respondents was 2.79 (sd .27) on a five-point scale for the population sample of OSU Extension county staff. Perceptions regarding the level of job satisfaction of Extension county staff indicated that four of the
selected characteristics were significantly correlated with job satisfaction at the .05 alpha level and included highest education completed, appointment, gender, previous management training and main program area. The highest level of education completed had a low association (.23) with job satisfaction. Other relationships identified with a low correlation to job satisfaction were appointment (.18), previous management training (.16) and main program area (.15). The correlations between the dependent variable and years in Extension (.05), gender (.10), and race/ethnicity (-.08) were identified as negligible associations.

Stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to determine that only one characteristic entered the model for significance. The variable, highest degree completed, accounted for 4.8 percent of the variance in job satisfaction of county staff.

Perceptions Regarding Emotional Intelligence

The mean total emotional intelligence score for OSU Extension county chairs was 100. This is an average score according to Bar-On (2002) and indicates adequate emotional capacity. The five composite scale score means that are a part of the development (not a summated score) of the total EQ-i score were intrapersonal (101), interpersonal (97), stress management (102), adaptability (101) and general mood (100).

The scores for total EQ-i and the five composite scales are based on an average score for each category of 100. Sixty-six percent of all respondents generally fall within in one standard deviation (15 points) of the average score, or a score between 85 and 115 (Bar-On, 2002). Approximately 75 percent (49 county chairs) of OSU Extension county chairs fell within this range. The composite scores have the following percentage of
county chairs within one standard deviation of the average mean score for EQ-i: intrapersonal skills (73.0%); interpersonal skills (75.0%); stress management (84.5%); adaptability (83.7%); and general mood (80.8%).

The interpretive guidelines for the EQ-i indicate that a standard score of 90-109 portrays individuals with average emotional intelligence, or adequate emotional capacity. Individuals with a score of 110-119 have a high level of emotional intelligence with well-developed emotional capacity. Scores above 120 indicate very high to markedly high emotional intelligence levels with extremely to atypically well-developed emotional capacity, respectively. For OSU Extension county chairs, 80.8 percent have average or higher total emotional intelligence scores. The percentage of county chairs with composite scale scores interpreted as average, high, very high or markedly high emotional intelligence scores include: intrapersonal (80.8%); interpersonal (73.1%); stress management (82.7%); adaptability (84.6 %); and general mood (82.7%). The percentage of county chairs with composite scale scores interpreted as low, very low or markedly low include: intrapersonal; (19.2%); interpersonal (26.9%); stress management (17.3%); adaptability (15.4%); and general mood (17.3%). The most significant range of scores was in the interpersonal intelligence composite scale score with scores ranging from 61 to 122. In the interpersonal composite scale, 5.8% of the county chair respondents scored in the very markedly low level.

Relationships between Emotional Intelligence and Job Satisfaction

The association between the emotional intelligence level of county chairs and the job satisfaction of county Extension staff indicated no significant correlation between the
dependent (job satisfaction) and independent (emotional intelligence) variables. A
correlational analysis (using Pearson’s Product-Moment and Kendall’s tau-b correlations)
between job satisfaction, total EQ-i and the five composite scores of the EQ-i showed no
significant relationships and carried negligible negative scores between the variables.
The same correlation values existed as with job satisfaction and the selected personal and
professional variables. Stepwise multiple regression analysis comparing the dependent
variable (job satisfaction), independent variable (emotional intelligence, including the
five composite scale scores) and selected characteristics was used to determine that only
one characteristic entered the model for significance. The variable, gender, accounted for
5.8 percent of the variance in job satisfaction of county staff.

Conclusions

Based upon the review of literature and the findings related to the research
objectives, the following conclusions, applicable to the populations of this study, were
reached:

1. Of the county chairs responding to this study, a large percentage of the county chairs
had an average or higher than average total and composite scales score of emotional
intelligence.

2. No association existed between the level of emotional intelligence of county chairs
and the level of job satisfaction of county Extension staff.
3. Only four of the county staff’s characteristics explored in this study had any degree of significance to job satisfaction. Of those four characteristics (appointment, highest level of education completed, previous management training and main program area) only low associations were observed.

4. The area needing the most training for county chairs and their level of emotional intelligence is in interpersonal skills.

5. OSU Extension county chairs responding to the EQ-i, on the average as a group, scored higher than previous respondents from other studies (Bar-On, 2002).

6. The level of job satisfaction of county staff has dropped significantly (from 4.13 to 2.79) since a study conducted two years ago with similar staff (Schmiesing, 2002).

**Implications**

As described in the various studies throughout Chapter 2 (Goleman, 1997; Feldman, 1999; Weisinger, 1998), emotional intelligence has been associated with people’s emotions and subsequent behavior. When looking at emotional intelligence scores for OSU Extension county chairs, the majority of the scores indicated county chairs have an adequate or higher level of emotional intelligence. This supports the findings by Endler and Parker (1994) where administrators need coping patterns and strategies to be effective leaders. Administrators with higher levels of emotional intelligence will be more successful in problem solving and managing conflict, coping with items that may become stressors in the workplace, interacting with political factors in the workplace and with increased interpersonal skill (Buford, 2001). Research findings by Goleman (2000) and Munaker (1997) offered that leaders with higher
emotional intelligence scores have greater organizational impact and are connected to the transformational institution, respectively. Evans’ (1970) belief that subordinates who view supervisors as supportive, considerate of needs, and providers of direction, will create a positive leadership behavior between the subordinates’ performance ratings and supervisor leadership behavior.

The study by Ayers and Stone (1999) indicated that most of the Extension core competencies of Extension educators were related to emotional intelligence. The researchers found that emotional intelligence was a better predictor of job success and that competency curriculum development, including emotional intelligence in skill training for supervisors, is practical and advisable.

The collective competency of emotional intelligence has been found to be a significant factor in the productivity of teams where emotional intelligence has boosted team performance (Welch, 2003). Individual competencies build on individual emotional intelligence skills such as inclusiveness, adaptability, assertiveness, empathy and influence. These competencies are not enough on their own as each member of the team has to commit to build the team output. For emotional intelligence to act as a determinant of organizational effectiveness, teams need to figure out what will make the team function most efficiently and effectively and how people can be influenced at the right level (Urch Druskat & Wolff, 2001). Emotional intelligence is not a static skill, but rather the way a team does business. The team that brings feelings into the open can see how emotions are affecting their performance. The team can develop their emotional intelligence skills and use them jointly to be more effective in dealing with organizational
challenges, including the major organizational structure, downsizing, and financial constraints now eminent before OSU Extension. The total team involved with understanding emotional intelligence can be proactive as the drivers of the change rather than just asking what is happening to the organization.

The value of measuring emotional intelligence of leaders and managers is to determine which areas of emotional intelligence are sound, which need improvement and those that are compatible with others (Simmons and Simmons, 1997). This study provided an opportunity for all county chairs to be exposed to an assessment of emotional intelligence and, for those with interest, an opportunity to work with a trained facilitator in understanding his or her individual emotional intelligence scores (not included with the study of this researcher). By understanding his or her own individual emotions, the county chair is better able to relate to others and how to apply the knowledge of emotional intelligence. Current emphasis on emotional intelligence has been supported because Extension core competencies were comparable to emotional intelligence competencies. Much like a natural fit, emotional intelligence and Extension competencies should gain interest as Extension organizations realize the importance that emphasis on emotional intelligence (i.e., programming, staff development, administrative training) can have to building Extension’s workforce in the future (Ayers & Stone, 1999).

The value of county chairs knowing their EQ-i scores is to help these individuals identify areas of relative strength in their current environment. Administrators can utilize the information to assist in tasks associated with human resources, organizational development and general office unit operations. The average mean near 100 (and/or
included within 15 points of this mean score) for most of the composite scores of the EQ-i indicated that county chairs have an average ability and typical healthy functioning within their responsibilities within OSU Extension. Previous research with the EQ-i process indicates that approximately two-thirds of respondents are expected to receive a total EQ-i score between 85 and 115. Additionally, Table 4.5 offers basic interpretations of the EQ-i scoring process.

For those OSU Extension county chairs responding to the EQ-i, approximately 80.8 percent of county chairs were considered to have adequate or well-developed emotional intelligence skills. The areas of greatest strength for OSU Extension county chairs was in stress management and adaptability. These are two areas that Extension staff must have strengths in to survive in their roles in programming and with clientele. The weakest area was in interpersonal skills where three county chairs scored in the markedly low level of emotional capacity. Individuals with such low scores could experience a variety of challenges in working with their co-workers. The researcher suggests that the competencies evaluated by the EQ-i, or the people management skills, are a strong element in the job function of county chairs.

The composite scale scores of intrapersonal, interpersonal, stress management, adaptability and general mood give a general indication of coping abilities and present functions of county chairs. Strengths and weaknesses can be identified in the five composite scale areas. Strengths can be enhanced and weaker areas can be focused upon for improvement by additional training and performance appraisal.
The intrapersonal EQ-i scale assesses the inner self. The subscales of the intrapersonal scale include self-regard, emotional self-awareness, assertiveness, independence and self-actualization. Nearly 81 percent of the county chairs in this study have average or higher emotional capacity with interpersonal skills.

The interpersonal EQ-i scale assesses an individual’s interpersonal skills and functioning in his or her environment. The subscales of this composite scale include empathy, social responsibility and interpersonal relationship. High scores in this composite scale would indicate a person has strong social skills and interacts and relates well to others. Extension employees have regular contact with clientele, other professionals and office staff. Of all composite scales, this scale had the widest range of scores, from 61 (markedly low) to 122 (very high) and the highest percentage of county chairs needing improvement in this area of emotional capacity. While these low scores existed within this respondent group, the overall percentage of county chairs with average or above emotional interpersonal capacity was still 72 percent of the total respondents.

The stress management scale assesses an individual’s ability to manage stress within environmental demands. This composite scale includes stress tolerance and impulse control subscales. High scores within this composite scale indicate individuals are able to withstand stress without losing control. A high number of county chairs responding to this study (nearly 83%) carry average or higher stress management competencies.

The adaptability scale assesses how successfully an individual can cope with environmental demands by effectively dealing with problem solving. This composite
scale consists of reality testing, flexibility and problem solving. High scores within this scale indicate a person can generally possess good ways of dealing with everyday difficulties. Nearly 85 percent (44 of 52 respondents) of the responding county chairs were at the average or higher level of emotional capacity in adaptability. The large number of respondents with high scores in this composite scale offer a substantial contribution to OSU Extension because of their flexibility, effectiveness in understanding problematic situations and realism. The researcher suggests this is an area of strength for county chairs with the current changes placed upon Extension staff in regards to budgets, reduction in staff force, organizational restructuring and day-to-day frustrations from county staff trying to make adjustments in the midst of change.

The general mood scale assesses the ability for an individual to enjoy life and carry the feeling of contentment. This composite scale consists of the happiness and optimism factors. High scores for this composite scale indicate that a person enjoys life and is generally cheerful, positive and hopeful. The researcher suggests that a positive attitude and an influential motivation component about the current changes facing Extension in Ohio are essential to creating and maintaining a positive atmosphere in the workplace. Nearly 83 percent of the county chair respondents carried a composite scale score indicating an adequate or higher level of emotional capacity in general mood.

Mayer and Salovey’s (1997) definition of emotional intelligence indicates to some degree that emotional intelligence may predict success at dealing with situations that require some combination of identifying, assimilating, understanding and managing one’s emotions and those of others (i.e., a group setting). Napier and Gershenfeld (1993) found
that group settings have often been said to examine and evaluate a person’s ability to work with others. Group members tend to feel strongly about belonging to the group (membership), role and status relative to other group members, group’s level of cohesiveness, and the group’s effectiveness. Individuals who can tap into these emotions are likely to also have the capability to build and maintain the group’s positive (or negative) emotions, such as team spirit. Frequent interpersonal interaction allows the individual to be more effective at reading the group’s emotional climate, impact the group’s sense of cohesiveness and facilitate the group’s overall effectiveness (Graves, 1999). Emotional relationships between group members left undiscovered do not change; however, increased awareness permits change in emotional relationships (Bergner, 2003). The emotional state of the inherent climate is caused by one’s interpretation of reality (Lazarus, 1991).

The self-report measures of the EQ-i may assume adequate reliability and validity with other self-report measures (Bar-On, 1997), but the usefulness of self-report measures may be limited. Many measures have limitations because competencies are not observable or measurable. Systematic testing and evaluation of theories require the use of empirical indicants designed to represent the concepts of emotional intelligence (Greer, 1969). The Bar-On EQ-i attempts to satisfy the need for empirically developed, multifactorial, and theoretical tests of emotional intelligence (Bar-On, 1988).

The research question that emotional intelligence of county chairs would have an impact on the job satisfaction of county staff was not supported with the findings in this study. Other factors may have more direct impact on job satisfaction than the ones used
in this study. OSU Extension was in the midst of a large amount of change during this study’s timeline and other factors than the emotional intelligence levels of county chairs may have affected job satisfaction of county Extension staff. This researcher supports Feldman’s (1999) belief that as employees face new challenges because of budget constraints, technology, globalization, new organizational structures and job re-assignments, leaders must react with the type of leadership that brings employees together as a team. By a leader understanding their emotions, the leader can better evaluate a situation more clearly and make clearer decisions. Control in the midst of conflict is critical to success of the leader, too. The ability to take a fresh look at problems, explore different options and strategies and develop alternative solutions is indicative of an emotionally intelligent leader (Weisinger, 1998). With the skills that strong emotional intelligence competencies can provide, leaders can make better choices for their staff and the entire organization (Goleman, 1997). The administrative leaders responsible for Extension county chairs and staff can find acceptable and positive attributes for the exposure to emotional intelligence implementation of training supporting the construct.

Job satisfaction is an extremely complex construct with no single conceptual model completely and accurately describing the construct (Hagedorn, 2000). This study substantiated this trend by not identifying a substantial association with emotional intelligence or selected characteristics for the respondents in this study.

The study conducted by Miller (1997) involving the level of job satisfaction and organizational commitment of OSU Extension county agents indicated no difference
between males’ and females’ level of job satisfaction, a slight correlation between job
title and job satisfaction, and a low relationship between job satisfaction and years of
work. This study did not support the results of Miller as only a low association was
found between job satisfaction and highest level of education achieved. The researcher
suggests that higher levels of education may be associated with job satisfaction because
employees may be better trained to handle job responsibilities and feel rewards of doing
work successfully at a higher level of expectation.

The study by Nestor and Leary (2000) was not supported by this study. In the
stepwise multiple regression model, including the EQ-i scores for county chairs, gender
carried the only association to job satisfaction for Extension staff. Nestor and Leary
found no relationship between gender and the current level of job satisfaction.

All staff members are expected to carry out individual programming
responsibilities and county leadership roles regardless of years of experience in
Extension. Staff members with lower years of tenure have to balance less experience in
Extension with these program and leadership responsibilities. The county chair position
carries a high level of responsibility, yet all but three chairs in Ohio also carry program
responsibility. The significant number of county chairs with less than 14 years of work
with Extension may have an impact on the satisfaction level of county chairs (potential
for future study). Mentoring and/or collaboration with longer tenured employees would
assist new county chairs in understanding past and current leadership roles in Extension.
The opportunity to serve as a co-chair (more than one county chair per county) may have
some impact as county chair responsibilities could be split and allow individual
Extension agents to manage partial county chair and program responsibilities in teaching, research and service. Program responsibilities and the responsibilities associated with the county chair position are becoming a major time consuming experience for individual Extension agents to manage, especially considering the minimal financial reward attached to the county chair role. Pressure beyond the ability of a county chair to adequately accomplish program and county chair responsibilities may be a reason why some individuals have left positions with Extension.

The study’s findings indicated that Extension employees are well educated beyond the high school level. Seventy-two percent of county staff have an associate or higher advanced degree, including two percent with doctoral degrees, 44 percent with master’s degrees, 15 percent with bachelor’s degrees and 11 percent with an associate or two-year degree. Support from Extension administration to seek additional degree work and/or professional training for all positions would also support the higher level of educational advancement. Since OSU Extension is by definition and function an educational organization, the higher level of educational attainment is appropriate for a majority of its employees.

A low, significant correlation existed between county staff’s previous management training and the dependent variable, the construct of job satisfaction. The findings do not provide strong evidence that participation in management training has a major impact on a county staff member’s job satisfaction.

There was a low, significant relationship between county staff members’ years of employment with Extension and their level of job satisfaction. Individuals with less time
in Extension likely have frustrations with getting acquainted with the needs of the community, adhering to a continually growing number of Extension and university policies and adjustment to new employment. Newer employees may not feel a sense of job security due to the current budget concerns within Extension.

Schmiesing (2002) conducted a study of OSU Extension staff and found that county agents had a rather high level of job satisfaction with a mean of 4.13 (sd .64). Vroom (1964) suggested that individuals’ job satisfaction was directly related to the extent their jobs provided them with rewarding outcomes (i.e., consideration from supervisor, interaction with co-workers, control over pace of work and opportunity to influence decision that will directly influence them). This study did not support Schmiesing’s study as the level of job satisfaction was much lower at 2.79 (sd .27). The changes in organizational re-structuring during the time the data was collected from county staff may have influenced these results. Reductions in workforce (job security) and county budgets may have been influential factors.

The value for and the personal interest of county Extension staff to obtain additional education knowledge and experience explained a portion of the variance in job satisfaction of county staff. County staff that attained a higher level of education were more apt to have a higher level of job satisfaction. The support for additional education in Extension by OSU Extension’s foundation philosophy (and current administration) and the individual staff member’s personal interest in attaining additional education may have accounted for the correlation between highest level of education completed and job satisfaction.
Recommendations

The review of literature, the findings of this study, and the resulting conclusions and implications have led this researcher to several recommendations. Following are these recommendations:

Recommendations for OSU Extension Based on the Literature Review

1. It is recommended that the state OSU Extension administration incorporate training and update sessions on emotional intelligence into in-service programs and management curriculum for county chairs and county staff. Specific attention should be given to developing strengths in interpersonal skills.

2. County chairs should have their emotional intelligence scores evaluated periodically throughout their administrative tenure to determine if a person’s scores are malleable and change over time. Improvement plans should be established, implemented and supported for each individual county chair. The qualitative aspect of emotional intelligence (i.e., personal feedback from county chairs by case study analysis, individual interviews and/or direct observation) should also be investigated for implementation.

3. To assess the understanding and reaction of incorporating emotional intelligence into the workplace structure, a web-based survey could be utilized as a method to involve all county staff in providing input to this operational change. Staff could express questions about areas of less understanding and provide suggestions for potential training and use in the workplace.
4. County Extension staff should be encouraged to operate as a proactive team where a safe environment for exploring, embracing and relying on emotions can be utilized for empowerment of all staff members and administrators.

5. The county Extension office should operate as a team in understanding and incorporating emotionally intelligent attitudes in the workplace. It is recommended that OSU Extension administration develop a set plan for evaluation of the cognitive and emotional intelligence competencies of county chairs. The information should be shared with chairs to improve their skills and abilities to lead and work with county staff.

6. State Extension personnel staff considering individuals as potential candidates for county chair positions should evaluate the competencies needed to become successful county chairs before positions are filled. New hires should be introduced to the construct of emotional intelligence and its viability to the success of the workplace.

7. It is recommended that OSU Extension administrators support emotional intelligence analysis for all staff as a required job enhancement responsibility. Individuals that make strong efforts in improving their emotional intelligence and success in office leadership should be praised from supervisors and rewarded appropriately within the Extension structure.

**Recommendations for OSU Extension Based on the Results of this Study**

1. Extension employees should be encouraged and supported to dedicate more time for participation in various types of personal or professional development
learning experiences, including enhancement of emotional intelligence skills.

2. It is recommended that OSU Extension administration regularly review and strive to understand the current levels of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction among staff and focus efforts to support Extension staff through the current period of change and transition.

Recommendations for Further Study

1. This study should be replicated using other variables that might effect job satisfaction other than those used in this study.

2. A new study should be introduced to investigate the correlation between the emotional intelligence levels of county chairs and their own level of job satisfaction. The willingness of respondents to receive personal feedback could be eliminated if seen as a barrier to participation in the study.

3. Conduct a follow-up with county chairs that did not participate in this study to determine whether their participation (i.e., EQ-i scores, matching with county staff information) would have made a difference in the results of this study, plus the overall perspectives on emotional intelligence of county chairs throughout the state. In addition, use the follow-up study to determine if the characteristics of those chairs not participating in the study would have made a difference in the results of this study.

4. Alternative testing mediums could be utilized to measure emotional intelligence for comparison to the results of this study, including study of how
supervisors of county chairs perceive the competencies and abilities of the county chair and how staff members perceive the competencies and capabilities of the county chair.

5. A new study should be implemented to evaluate whether other responsibilities that county chairs assume within their work assignments affect the EQ-i scores of county chairs.

Final Review

While cognitive ability is important in thinking through problems and dealing with management, emotional intelligence is a person’s emotional needs, drives and true values that guide all overt behavior. A person may have a good formal education for a job, have years of experience in a job, be truly interested in the job and still fail because his or her emotional intelligence did not fit the job. Emotional intelligence largely determines a person’s success in any given job (Simmons and Simmons, 1997). Factors such as technical skills, specific knowledge, mental abilities, physical fitness, physical appearance, interest in a particular type of work, aspirations and career goals and life circumstances should always be evaluated in employee success, but emotional intelligence is also critical in predicting relational and job success.

Emotional intelligence has been found to be either static or changeable. While some people behave and perform very consistently, others may alter the way they deal with emotions depending on the situation. For most people, the basic emotional
intelligence level is apparent by age six and continues to shift during adolescence. Through adulthood, peoples’ emotional intelligence levels do not change significantly, but can improve with conscious efforts to change.

Research in emotional intelligence indicates that emotional intelligence has real life impact. Emotional intelligence competencies are valuable tools in understanding, supporting and maintaining the highest level of productivity of staff members. The findings of this study can be used to assist Extension administrators and program staff coordinators and county chairs in guiding county staff to be successful in their work assignments and work environment. Professional development opportunities for county chairs need to focus on personal enhancement and leadership during the challenging and changing times of the current economy.

While this study does not indicate a direct relationship between the emotional intelligence level of county chairs and the job satisfaction of county staff, there may be other factors that altered the results of this study, including voluntary response by the census group (county chairs). OSU Extension administrators should be encouraged to help county chairs utilize skills and competencies of emotional intelligence in Extension program and operations decision making and policy formation.

County chairs can enhance their level of emotional intelligence; therefore, specialized training and learning opportunities are needed. With county chairs’ increased responsibility in personnel matters (due to downsizing and re-structuring), the benefits of higher emotional intelligence scores could be utilized.
October 15, 2003

Dear ___________________,

We would like you to participate in an applied research project that is currently underway at The Ohio State University. We believe this research will be beneficial to the Extension staff within Ohio State University Extension and to the Extension profession nationally as well. This research will provide insight into current program and support staff perceptions of the level of job satisfaction of staff and the level of emotional intelligence of administrators (county chairs) in local county units.

We recognize that your time is extremely valuable, yet the potential findings will benefit the leadership development of county chairs. We are asking you to voluntarily spend approximately 45 minutes during the next week to complete the emotional intelligence instrument by going to the following web site: http://www.mhs.com/eqi/. Your user group is: 134963OSUECC and your password is: cceqi. Dr. Garee W. Earnest, Associate Professor, The Ohio State University, will follow up with non-respondents. The data collected by Dr. Earnest will be stored as a group database. Only the group data will be provided to the researcher (Judy Villard) from Dr. Earnest. No individual data will be shared. The researcher and administration will not have access to the respondent’s individual responses. Also, there will be no matching between the responses from county chairs and county staff.

When completing the emotional intelligence instrument, please answer each item. If you have questions concerning the instrument, please contact Dr. Earnest at (614) 247-5034 (W). Please complete the emotional intelligence instrument and return it by electronic mail by October 31, 2003. Thanks for your cooperation. We hope you will be able to take the time to complete the enclosed questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Keith L. Smith    Garee Earnest    Judith A. Villard
Associate Vice President for Program Director    Extension Agent
Agricultural Administration Leadership Center    4-H Youth Development
Director. OSU Extension Ohio State University and Chair
Ohio State University Ohio State University

APPENDIX B
Examples of EQ-i Areas of Study
Bar-On (2002)

Emotional Self-Awareness
• Expression of feelings
• Being in touch with emotions

Assertiveness
• Expression of anger to others
• Standing up for one’s rights

Self-Regard
• Feeling good about one’s self
• Individual’s good and bad points

Self-Actualization
• Life is meaningful
• Knowing what a person is good at

Independence
• Reliance on ideas from others
• Making own decisions

Empathy
• Understanding others
• Sensitive to others’ feelings

Interpersonal Relationship
• Sharing inner feelings
• Sharing intimate thoughts with others

Social Responsibility
• Taking advantage of others
• Caring about other people.

Problem Solving
• Problem solving approach
• Solutions to problems

Reality Testing
• Keeping things in perspective
• Awareness of environment
Flexibility
- Changing my opinion
- Making adjustments

Stress Tolerance
- Handling stress
- Dealing with unpleasant things

Impulse Control
- Consequences of impulsiveness
- Controlling my anger

Happiness
- Satisfaction with my life.
- Ability to enjoy life

Optimism
- Motivation when things get difficult.
- Handling upsetting problems
Subject: Reminder: Emotional Intelligence Research

November 19, 2003

Dear County Chair,

On November 5, we asked you to complete the Emotional Intelligence instrument and return the demographic survey below. We recognize that your time is extremely valuable, yet the potential findings will benefit the leadership development of county chairs. We are asking you to voluntarily spend approximately 45 minutes during the next week to complete the emotional intelligence instrument (EQ-i) by going to the following web site: http://www.mhs.com/eqi/. Your user group is: 134963OSUECC and your password is: cceqi. Please complete the EQ instrument and return the survey by November 26.

The data collected by Dr. Earnest will be stored as a group database. Only the group data will be provided to the researcher from Dr. Earnest. No individual data will be shared. The researcher (Villard) will not have access to the respondent's individual responses. Also, there will be no matching between the responses from County Chairs and county staff. Dr. Earnest or Rose Fisher Merkowitz will schedule a personal feedback session of your individual emotional intelligence data with you upon your request. Both of these individuals are certified facilitators of the emotional intelligence instrument. The researcher or Extension administration will not have access to your individual information. When completing the emotional intelligence instrument, please answer each item.

Second, please complete the demographic survey below this message by clicking "reply" to this e-mail and marking an "X" next to the item that best describes you.

If you have questions concerning the instrument, please contact Judy Villard at (419) 747-8755 (W) or Dr. Earnest at (614) 292-3114 (W). Please complete the survey by November 12, 2003. Thanks for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Keith L. Smith  Garee W. Earnest  Judith A. Villard
Associate Vice President for Program Leader Extension Agent
Agricultural Administration Leadership Center 4-H Youth Development
Director. OSU Extension Ohio State University and Chair
Ohio State University

Date: Tue, 02 Dec 2003 07:49:17 -0500
From: "Earnest, Garee" <earnest.1@osu.edu>
Subject: 2nd Reminder: Emotional Intelligence Research  
December 2, 2003

Dear County Chair,

On November 5 and again on November 19, we asked you to complete the Emotional Intelligence instrument and return the demographic survey below. We recognize that your time is extremely valuable, yet the potential findings will benefit the leadership development of county chairs. Using Internet Explorer (not Netscape), please take approximately 45 minutes during the next week to complete the emotional intelligence instrument (EQ-i) by going to the following web site: <http://www.mhs.com/eqi/>. Your user group is: 134963OSUECC and your password is: cceqi Please complete the EQ instrument and return the survey by December 10.

The data collected by Dr. Earnest will be stored as a group database. Only the group data will be provided to the researcher from Dr. Earnest. No individual data will be shared. The researcher (Villard) will not have access to the respondent's individual responses. Also, there will be no matching between the responses from County Chairs and county staff. Dr. Earnest or Rose Fisher Merkowitz will schedule a personal feedback session of your individual emotional intelligence data with you upon your request. Both of these individuals are certified facilitators of the emotional intelligence instrument. The researcher or Extension administration will not have access to your individual information. When completing the emotional intelligence instrument, please answer each item.

Second, please complete the demographic survey below this message by clicking "reply" to this e-mail and marking an "X" next to the item that best describes you.

If you have questions concerning the instrument, please contact Judy Villard at (419) 747-8755 (W) or Dr. Earnest at (614) 247-5034 (W). Please complete the survey by December 10, 2003. Thanks for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Keith L. Smith  
Associate Vice President for Agricultural Administration  
Director. OSU Extension  
Ohio State University

Garee W. Earnest  
Program Leader  
Leadership Center  
Ohio State University

Judith A. Villard  
Extension Agent  
4-H Youth Development and Chair  
Ohio State Univ.
APPENDIX D
**DIRECTIONS:** Please circle the response following the statement that best describes how you feel about your job. The following scale will apply:
1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.

**EXAMPLE:**  I like to ride a bike                       1     2     3     4     5

The respondent indicated that they strongly agree with this statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My job is interesting enough to keep me from getting bored.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It seems that my friends are more interested in their jobs than I am.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider my job rather unpleasant.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am often bored with my job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel fairly satisfied with my job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time I have to force myself to go to work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I definitely dislike my work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I am happier in my work than most other people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most days I am enthusiastic about my work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each day of work seems like it will never end.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like my job better than most personnel in this organization.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job is pretty interesting.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find real enjoyment in my work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am disappointed that I took this job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Please turn document over and complete other side *
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Please complete each of the following items by circling the item that best describes you.

1. **Appointment** (Circle one)
   a. Extension Agent
   b. Program Assistant
   c. Support Staff
   d. Other: ______________________________

2. **Main Program Area** (Circle one)
   a. Agriculture & Natural Resources
   b. Family and Consumer Sciences
   c. Community Development
   d. 4-H Youth Development
   e. Not appointed to a specific program area

3. **Location** (Circle the one that best describes your office location)
   a. East District   c. South District
   b. North District   d. West District

4. **Length of employment with Extension – all locations** (Circle one)
   a. Less than 5 years
   b. 5 – 14 years
   c. 15 – 24 years
   d. Over 25 years

5. **Level of highest education completed** (Circle one)
   a. Doctorate degree
   b. Masters degree
   c. Bachelor degree
   d. Associate or 2-year degree
   e. High school diploma
   f. Other: ______________________________

6. **Gender** (Circle one)
   a. Male
   b. Female

7. **Race/ethnicity** (Circle one)
   a. Black, not of Hispanic origin
   b. American Indian or Alaskan native
   c. Asian or Pacific Islander
   d. Hispanic
   e. Mixed
   f. White, not of Hispanic origin

8. **Have you had previous management training?**
   a. Yes  (describe briefly ______________________________)
   b. No
APPENDIX E
November 3, 2003

Dear County Extension Staff Member:

We would like you to participate in an applied research project that is currently underway at The Ohio State University. We believe this research will be beneficial to the Extension staff within Ohio State University Extension and to the Extension profession nationally as well. This research will provide insight into current program and support staff perceptions of the level of job satisfaction and the level of emotional intelligence of administrators in local county units.

We recognize that your time is extremely valuable, yet the potential findings will benefit you as a staff member and the leadership development of county chairs. We are asking you to spend approximately ten minutes during the next week to complete the enclosed questionnaire. The code number on the instrument will be used to follow up with non-respondents only. Please be assured that your responses will be held in the strictest confidence. The only data to be reported will be group data. No individual data will be shared. As you complete the questionnaire, please answer each item. You have questions concerning the survey, please contact Judy Villard at (419) 747-8755 (W) or (419) 589-5582 (H).

Please complete the short questionnaire and return it (only) in the envelope provided by November 19, 2003. Thanks for your cooperation. I hope you will take the time to complete the enclosed questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Keith L. Smith  Garee W. Earnest  Judith A. Villard  
Associate Vice President  Program Director  Extension Agent  
Agricultural Administration and Leadership Center  Ohio State University  
Director, OSU Extension  Leadership Center  4-H Youth Development 
Ohio State University  Ohio State University  and Chair 
Ohio State University  Ohio State University
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APPENDIX F
November 19, 2003

Dear Extension Employee:

In the November 10 county mail packet, we asked you to complete a job satisfaction instrument and demographic survey. We recognize that your time is extremely valuable, yet the potential findings will benefit the Extension organization, specifically with county staff. We are asking you to voluntarily spend approximately 5-10 minutes during the next week to complete the job satisfaction instrument and return it in the envelope provided with your mailing. If you cannot locate the instrument, please contact Judy Villard (villard.1@osu.edu or 419-747-8755) and another instrument will be sent to you. Please return the instrument/survey by November 26.

The data collected through this research project will be stored as a group database. No individual data will be shared. The researcher (Villard) will destroy the codes used for respondent's individual responses once all data is collected. Also, there will be no matching reported between counties and county staff. Extension administration will not have access to your individual information. When completing the job satisfaction instrument and demographic survey, please answer each item.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Keith L. Smith, Associate Vice President for Agricultural Administration and Director, OSU Extension, Ohio State University

Garee W. Earnest, Program Leader, Leadership Center, Ohio State University

Judith A. Villard, Extension Agent, 4-H Youth Development and Chair, Ohio State University
E-mail:

December 4, 2003

Dear Extension Colleague:

On November 17 and again on November 20, we asked you to complete a job satisfaction instrument and return the document in the addressed envelope in the instrument mailing. We recognize that your time is extremely valuable, yet the potential findings will benefit the Extension program in the future. Please take approximately 5 minutes during the next few days to complete the job satisfaction instrument.

Thank you for your time.

Judy Villard
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