

SUPERINTENDENT EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AS A FACTOR IN BOND ELECTION OUTCOMES

Wesley D. Hickey, Ed.D.
University of Texas at Tyler

Financial difficulties, and the budget restrictions that emerge as a result, are a common topic in school finance (Austin, 2005). The Texas finance system is once again in the courts as a result of school districts suing the state for not providing for the “general diffusion of knowledge” required by the state’s constitution (Moses, 2004). In this environment, developing budgets that address the need of general operation of the district is difficult, and capital improvements may be neglected. The selling of bonds is one way that a district may obtain funds for use in capital projects. Through the approval of local voters in a bond election, a school district may be granted consent to sell bonds for construction and other capital improvements, as well as have the right to tax the local taxpayers at a rate that ensures annual bond payments (Koetter & Cannon, 1995).

Since bonds are important to the finances of local school districts, a greater understanding of the dynamics involved in voter approval may impact local strategies in bond elections. The purpose of this study is to analyze superintendent emotional intelligence as a factor associated with bond election outcomes. More specifically, these factors include not only school superintendent emotional intelligence, but also the emotional intelligence sub-domains of self-awareness, self-management, social awareness and relationship management. In addition, this study analyzes other elements considered important to bond election success, including minority population percentage, senior citizen population percent-

Superintendent Emotional Intelligence

age, school quality, financial impact of the bond, and school size.

The results of this research suggest there is not a statistically significant relationship between the independent variables of general emotional intelligence, self-management, social awareness, relationship management, financial impact of the bond, and school size with the dependent variable of 'yes' votes in bond elections. However, three independent variables suggest a significant relationship with the dependent variable. Scoring high in self-awareness on the emotional intelligence test and senior citizen population percentage negatively correlated with 'yes' vote percentage in bond elections. Minority population percentage positively correlated with 'yes' vote percentage. School quality was not statistically significant, but a trend toward significance was suggested.

Emotional intelligence and the district superintendent.

The work of Goleman (1995, 1998) impacted the cultures of business and education because it helped explain components associated with success in these environments. Goleman asserted that emotional intelligence, which incorporates both intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligence, provides the foundation to effective leadership. Intrapersonal intelligence focuses upon the personal knowledge and motivations of an individual, and it consists of the emotional intelligence components of self-awareness and self-management. Interpersonal intelligence is outwardly focused, and it consists of social awareness and relationship management (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002).

The superintendent is the chief executive officer of the school district, and as such, must exhibit competence and emotional control. Intrapersonal intelligence provides the self-knowledge and self-control necessary to lead a district effectively. Understanding one's self provides the foundation for personal and organizational stability (Goleman, 1995).

A school district superintendent, as formal leader of the organization, needs interpersonal competence to aid in the development of an effective team. As Hoyle, English, and Steffy (1998) state: "To truly lead, administrators must be more than technically competent in planning, budgeting, curriculum design, scheduling,

and facility renovation; they must be able to communicate with their constituencies, and they must have something worthwhile to say to them” (p. 37). Interpersonal competence provides the foundations for handling the technical skills in ways that garner support from others.

A superintendent’s duties within a school district are varied, but to be effective, they consistently require collaboration and teamwork. As a leader of the district, a superintendent routinely works through others to achieve objectives. Generally speaking, a superintendent’s duties include developing a vision for the district, governance, communicating with stakeholders, organizational management, instructional management, and personnel management (Hoyle et al., 1998).

A superintendent’s skills in handling these duties effectively and interpersonally may be analyzed more thoroughly during a bond election. Voters may spend more time focused on a superintendent’s actions during this time as concerns arise about submitting a vote that may increase property tax rates. If stakeholders focus more on the superintendency during bond elections, intrapersonal and interpersonal competence may be important to election outcomes.

Other bond election factors.

Data on bond elections suggests several factors that may influence bond election outcomes. These factors include senior citizen percentage rates (Button, 1992), minority percentage rates (Tedin, Matland, & Weiher, 2001), tax rate impact (Lode, 1999), school size, and school quality (Koetter & Cannon, 1995).

Senior citizen opposition to referenda that increase tax rates have been asserted in previous studies. These studies are often contradictory, with senior citizens being considered a difficult demographic in which to get bond election support (Dismuke, 1994; Speer, 1993), but often providing support depending upon the issues involved or knowledge of the impact of the election (Tedin et al., 2001). The uncertainty involved in senior citizen voting behavior make this demographic an important group within a bond election.

Superintendent Emotional Intelligence

Minority population voting was studied in previous Houston bond elections (Tedin et al., 2001). These studies suggested that African-American and Hispanic voters were disproportionately in favor of the bond election when compared with white voters. This trend was found to include senior citizens, although in all age groups trust was important (Tedin et al., 2001), a factor that may be influenced by the interpersonal intelligence of the superintendent.

Research suggests socio-economic factors may influence bond elections. Lode (1999) found that districts with a high percentage of families with low incomes had difficulty in passing bond elections. This suggests the tax impact may influence voter decisions negatively.

Public schools vary considerably in size. In Texas, the smallest schools may have 100 or fewer students, and the larger schools in excess of 100,000 (Texas Education Agency, 2002). The extreme ranges in the sizes of public schools in Texas suggest that this may be factor in bond elections.

School quality may be another important factor to bond election success. The recent failure of a district's bond election, amid concerns of the quality of the school, suggests a factor in voter support may be school quality (Benton, 2004). Furthermore, the perception of school quality may be related to administrative trust (Lodge & Booth, 2004), which may be increased through effective emotional intelligence.

Methodology

There are many factors in any social event, and bond elections are no exception. This research focused on several factors that have been suggested by previous literature as relevant in bond election outcomes. These include senior citizen population percentage, minority population percentage, school quality, and superintendent emotional intelligence, including the components of self awareness, self management, social awareness, and relationship management.

Survey design was used in gathering the information on emotional intelligence for this study. A survey was utilized to quantify the information regarding emotional intelligence in the su-

perintendent of districts who have held bond elections from June 1, 2002 through December 31, 2003. Initially, an Internet hyperlink to the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal was sent to superintendents who have held a bond election during this timeframe. The original number of the sample was 150, matching the number of bond elections held during the time period. There were 48 superintendents who had either retired or moved to another district, and these individuals were removed from the sample, leaving a sample of 102 superintendents who remained with the district where the bond election occurred.

Along with the survey on emotional intelligence, several other factors on bond elections were collected from archived sources, such as the Texas Education Snapshot 2002 (Texas Education Agency, 2002) and Census 2000 demographic profiles (United States Census, 2000). These factors included school size, minority population, senior citizen population, school quality, and financial impact.

Instrumentation.

The survey utilized to measure superintendent emotional intelligence was the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal, an instrument released after a two-year design and validation process (Bradbury & Greaves, 2003a). Validity of the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal was obtained through the design process in which 12,483 individuals were measured in regard to their emotional intelligence. This process gave a cross-section of diversity among several general job titles, including executives, senior executives, and chief executive officers (Bradbury & Greaves, 2003a), which parallel the roles of superintendents.

In developing the validity of the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal, the scores on this instrument were compared with job performance as measured on the last performance evaluation for 12,483 individuals. The validity indicated an R of .42 and R² of .176 with a significance of .000161. The self-rating explained 20% of the variance in performance (Bradbury & Greaves, 2003a).

Concurrent validity of the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal was obtained by its comparison to the MSCEIT, which has individ-

Superintendent Emotional Intelligence

uals perform certain tasks associated with emotional intelligence, such as rating facial expressions and determining the emotional tone of stories. The MSCEIT has been used to develop concurrent validity with other emotional intelligence tests, such as the Bar-On EQ-I. Previous studies have indicated a correlation between .10 and .30, and the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal, when correlated with the MSCEIT, had a correlation of .195, which is in the range of other tests on emotional intelligence (Bradbury & Greaves, 2003a).

Cronbach's alpha was used to determine reliability of the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal, which indicated a reliability from .85 to .91 in each component of emotional intelligence, which included self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management (Bradbury & Greaves, 2003a). The survey had 28 items analyzing the four factors of Goleman's (1995) emotional intelligence. There were six questions relating to self awareness, nine questions relating to self-management, five questions relating to social awareness, and eight questions relating to relationship management (Bradbury & Greaves, 2003b).

Along with the survey to measure a superintendent's emotional intelligence, archived data were collected on other factors determined by the literature to have an impact on bond elections, including minority population percentage, senior citizen percentage, school size, school quality, and financial impact.

Procedures.

The districts that held a bond election between June 1, 2002, and December 31, 2003, were downloaded from the Texas Bond Review Board website, and this information was used to determine which districts would receive the survey. A cover letter and hyperlink for the emotional intelligence survey were e-mailed to each district's superintendent, whose e-mail address was obtained from the Who's Who in Texas Public Schools 2002-2003 Directory (Texas Association of School Administrators, 2003). Each survey was coded to identify responding superintendents. The first attempt had 32 respondents. A second message with an appropriately coded hyperlink was sent one week after the first at-

tempt to districts that had not responded, resulting in an additional 22 respondents. Three days later, a third attempt was repeated through e-mail, and four more superintendents responded. Superintendents who had not responded through e-mail were sent a hard copy of the survey by fax. This effort increased the response rate by 14 respondents. Respondents by fax had their answers transcribed into an online version of the survey for scoring. There were a total of 72 respondents out of the 102 attempts, resulting in a 71% return rate.

The other variables were obtained from other sources. The independent variable of school size was obtained from the Texas Education Agency's Snapshot 2002 (Texas Education Agency, 2002), which lists information on all school districts in Texas according to the county in which the district resides. Minority population percentage was obtained from the Texas Education Agency's Snapshot 2002 (Texas Education Agency, 2002). The minority population percentage was determined by adding the African-American and Hispanic student populations in the appropriate columns. Senior citizen population was determined by using the data in the demographic profiles of the online version of the Census 2000 (United States Census, 2000). The community in which the school district resides was requested from the database to obtain demographics. The senior citizen population percentage was determined from the "over 65" line of the document.

School quality was determined by using data obtained from the Texas Education Agency's Snapshot 2002 (Texas Education Agency, 2002). School quality was defined by the school district's accountability rating, which was located in the "accountability ratings" column. The accountability ratings were one of four – low performing, academically acceptable, recognized, or exemplary. Each of these accountability ratings were given numerical categories, with low performing being 1, academically acceptable being 2, recognized being 3, and exemplary being 4.

Financial impact was determined by using data given in the Texas Education Agency's Snapshot 2002 (Texas Education Agency, 2002). The value given in "taxable value per pupil" was multiplied by the number in "total students," resulting in a total

Superintendent Emotional Intelligence

taxable value for the district. The total taxable value of the district was divided into the total value of the bond election as determined by the Texas Bond Review Board (2003). The resulting value gave a measure of the size of the bond as a percentage of the total taxable value.

The dependent variable, which was the percentage of “yes” votes in the bond election, was determined through a combination of phone calls, faxes, and e-mails to business managers and superintendents. Forty-two of the results were obtained through responses to a phone call query on election results; 17 of the results were attained by e-mail, and 13 of the results were acquired through phone calls to the districts. Superintendents provided this data in 53 districts, and business managers provided the data in 19 districts.

Data Analyses.

Models of bond election factors were developed to analyze combined effects and subtle combinations of effects. The models were labeled based upon the emotional intelligence, or emotional intelligence components, included in the model. In addition to emotional intelligence or its components, the models included the independent variables of school size, financial impact, minority population percentage, senior citizen population percentage, and school quality. Table 1 describes each model analyzed.

Table 1
Independent Variables Analyzed in the 5 Emotional Intelligence Models

Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
General EQ	Self-Awareness	Self-Motivation	Social Awareness	Relationship Management
School Size	School Size	School Size	School Size	School Size
Financial Impact	Financial Impact	Financial Impact	Financial Impact	Financial Impact
Minority %	Minority %	Minority %	Minority %	Minority %
Senior %	Senior %	Senior %	Senior %	Senior %
School Quality	School Quality	School Quality	School Quality	School Quality

To analyze the combined effects of these models, a multiple regression analysis was conducted. This provided an analysis that allowed for the separation of each independent variable from the other factors in order to determine its relationship to the outcome while still considering the other factors involved (George & Mallory, 2001). This is valuable for this study, so that the effect of superintendent emotional intelligence can be accounted for separately while considering other variables. The data were entered into the Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 10.0 software. In order to develop a predictive model of the independent variables, it is important to use data from variables that have a significant impact. As a result, multiple regression using backward entry of data was used. SPSS first determined which independent variable had the lower bivariate correlation with the dependent variable. The SPSS removed this independent variable, refigured the correlations, and continued the process until only significant variables remained (George & Mallory, 2001). The backward entry method was used to analyze each model and determine a predictive formula.

Collinearity is a potential problem in multiple regression research. Collinearity refers to the measured influence of multiple independent variables indicated in the correlation number. This does not change the overall theory of influence, “rather it is the inability of data to clearly distinguish the separate yet subtle effects of two independent variables” (Kahane, 2001, p. 114). Collinearity is the interaction effect of independent variables (Kahane, 2001). Collinearity was analyzed to determine influence among independent variables.

Collinearity is a concern in multiple regression because of the impact two or more of the independent variables share in impacting the dependent variable. Collinearity is determined through measuring the tolerance and variance inflation factor (VIF) of the statistics. Acceptable collinearity occurs when the tolerance approaches one, and the VIF is less than two (Miles & Shevlin, 2001).

Results

The focus of this study was the impact of superintendent emotional intelligence, and its components, on bond election outcomes. Peripheral to this data were other potentially important factors to bond elections, including minority population percentage, senior citizen population percentage, school quality, school size, and financial impact of the bond. Table two outlines the descriptive statistics of these data, including the dependent variable of 'yes' vote percentage.

Table 2

Variable Ranges, Mean, and Standard Deviation (SD) n=72

	Minimum	Minimum	Mean	SD
General Emotional Intelligence	72	94	82.97	5.010
Self-Awareness	72	94	83.33	4.399
Self-Management	62	95	82.17	8.174
Social Awareness	74	96	85.06	6.264
Relationship Management	65	100	80.79	7.103
School Size	121	56,059	7055.22	12319
Minority Population Percentage	3	99	33.65	24.237
Senior Citizen Percentage	2.8	25.9	12.974	5.378
Financial Impact	.1	16.3	3.826	3.0362
School Quality	2	4	2.76	.722
'Yes' Votes Percentage	19	99	66.67	15.270

Model 1

Model one, focusing upon general emotional intelligence, added independent variables of school size, minority population percentage, senior citizen population percentage, financial impact, and district accountability rating, which were analyzed through multiple regression using the enter method of inputting

Superintendent Emotional Intelligence

independent variables. As a result, all of the independent variables were considered in the analysis. This model suggests that the total correlation between all the independent variables and the dependent variable (R) is .402, indicating a reasonably strong linear relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable. R² is .162, which suggests that 16.2% of the ‘yes’ votes may be influenced by the independent variables measured. The adjusted R², which estimates the variance on the population as a whole, instead of the sample, measured .084, or 8.4% of the variance.

The correlation of each independent variable with the dependent variable, when taking each one into consideration, can be determined by the standardized coefficients. Table 3 indicates the standardized coefficients and significance.

Table 3
Standardized Coefficients for Model Summary Using General Emotional Intelligence, School Size, Minority Population, Senior Citizen Population, School Rating, and Financial Impact

	Beta	Significance (t)
Emotion	-.070	.557
Size	-.084	.520
Minority Population	.276	.045
Senior Citizen Population	-.274	.048
Financial Impact	.025	.848
Rating	.224	.076

The standardized coefficients suggest superintendent emotional intelligence has little relationship with the number of ‘yes’ votes in a bond election. Also, size and financial impact indicated little relationship. The factors of minority population, senior citizen population, and school rating all indicated a relationship with the dependent variable, with school rating showing a level of significance (.076) just outside our number for consideration of significance (.05). Minority population and senior citizen popula-

tion were both significant. The collinearity was acceptable for model one, with a tolerance range of .700 to .916, and a VIF range of 1.092 to 1.429.

The final analysis of the general emotional intelligence model was a multiple regression using the backward entry method. General emotional intelligence was excluded in the development of this model, which retained the independent variables of minority population, senior citizen population, and school rating. The predictive equation was as follows: Yes % = .166 (Minority population %) + 4.846 (School rating) - .630 (Senior citizen %) + 55.859.

Model 2

The second model, which included self-awareness along with the other independent variables, was analyzed through multiple regression using the enter method of inputting independent variables. Model two suggests that the total correlation between all the independent variables and the dependent variable (R) is .483, indicating a reasonably strong linear relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable. R² is .234, which suggests that 23.4% of the 'yes' votes may be influenced by the independent variables measured. The adjusted R², which estimates the variance on the population as a whole, instead of the sample, measured a .163, or 16.3% of the variance.

The correlation of each independent variable with the dependent variable when taking each one into consideration can be determined by the standardized coefficients. Table 4 indicates the standardized coefficients and significance.

Table 4

Standardized Coefficients for Model Summary Using Self-Awareness, School Size, Minority Population, Senior Citizen Population, School Rating, and Financial Impact

	Beta	Significance (t)
Self-Awareness	-.295	.013
Size	-.097	.441
Minority Population	.346	.010
Senior Citizen Population	-.228	.084
Financial Impact	-.024	.843
Rating	.207	.087

The standardized coefficients suggest a negative correlation for superintendent self-awareness and senior citizen population. A stronger positive correlation for minority population was indicated, with school rating having an even smaller correlation. There was minimal effect shown for school size and financial impact. The collinearity was acceptable for model one, with a tolerance range of .690 to .878, and a VIF range of 1.139 to 1.450.

The final analysis of the self-awareness model was a multiple regression using the backward entry method. Self-awareness was included in the final formula of the equation developed, which also retained the independent variables of minority population, and school rating. The predictive equation was as follows: $Yes \% = .236 (\text{Minority population \%}) + 5.211 (\text{School rating}) - 1.105 (\text{Self-Awareness}) + 136.375$.

Model 3

Model three, which included self-management with the other independent variables, was analyzed through multiple regression utilizing the enter method of inputting independent variables. As a result, all of the independent variables were considered in the analysis. This model suggested that the total correlation between all the independent variables and the dependent variable (R) is .418, indicating a reasonably strong linear relationship between

the independent variables and the dependent variable. R2 is .175, which suggests that 17.5% of the ‘yes’ votes may be influence by the independent variables measured. The adjusted R2, which estimates the variance on the population as a whole, instead of the sample, measured a .099, or 9.9% of the variance.

The correlation of each independent variable with the dependent variable when taking each one into consideration can be determined by the standardized coefficients. Table 5 indicates the standardized coefficients and significance of the self-management model.

Table 5
Standardized Coefficients for Model Summary Using Self-Management, School Size, Minority Population, Senior Citizen Population, School Rating, and Financial Impact

	Beta	Significance
Self-Management	-.136	.241
Size	-.085	.515
Minority Population	.273	.042
Senior Citizen Population	-.288	.037
Financial Impact	-.021	.869
Rating	.231	.066

The standardized coefficients suggest a negative correlation for superintendent self-management and senior citizen population. A stronger positive correlation for minority population and school rating was indicated. There was minimal effect shown for school size and financial impact. The collinearity was acceptable for model one, with a tolerance range of .735 to .957, and a VIF range of 1.045 to 1.442.

The final analysis of the self-management model was a multiple regression using the backward entry method. Self-management was excluded in the development of this model, which retained the independent variables of minority population, senior citizen population, and school rating. The predictive equation was

Superintendent Emotional Intelligence

as follows: Yes % = .166 (Minority population %) + 4.846 (School rating) - .630 (Senior citizen %) + 55.859.

Model 4

The fourth model, which used social awareness along with the other independent variables, was analyzed through multiple regression using the enter method. As a result, all of the independent variables were considered in the analysis. This model suggests that the total correlation between all the independent variables and the dependent variable (R) is .418, indicating a reasonably strong linear relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable. R² is .175, which suggests that 17.5% of the ‘yes’ votes may be influence by the independent variables measured. The adjusted R², which estimates the variance on the population as a whole, instead of the sample, measured a .099, or 9.9% of the variance.

The correlation of each independent variable with the dependent variable when taking each one into consideration can be determined by the standardized coefficients. Table 6 indicates the standardized coefficients and significance.

Table 6
Standardized Coefficients for Model Summary Using Social Awareness, School Size, Minority Population, Senior Citizen Population, School Rating, and Financial Impact

	Beta	Significance
Social Awareness	.138	.241
Size	-.085	.514
Minority Population	.225	.098
Senior Citizen Population	-.255	.062
Financial Impact	-.055	.671
Rating	.227	.071

The standardized coefficients suggest a positive correlation for superintendent social awareness and senior citizen population.

A stronger positive correlation for minority population and school rating was observed. There was minimal effect shown for school size and financial impact. The collinearity was acceptable for model one, with a tolerance range of .704 to .932, and a VIF range of 1.073 to 1.420.

The final analysis of the social awareness model was a multiple regression using the backward entry method. Social awareness was excluded in the development of this model, which retained the independent variables of minority population, senior citizen population, and school rating. The predictive equation was as follows: Yes % = .166 (Minority population %) + 4.846 (School rating) - .630 (Senior citizen %) + 55.859.

Model 5

The fifth model, which used relationship management along with the other independent variables, was analyzed through multiple regression using the enter method of inputting independent variables. As a result, all of the independent variables were considered in the analysis. This model suggests that the total correlation between all the independent variables and the dependent variable (R) is .397, indicating a linear relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable. R² is .158, which suggests that 15.8% of the 'yes' votes may be influence by the independent variables measured. The adjusted R², which estimates the variance on the population as a whole, instead of the sample, measured a .080, or 8% of the variance.

The correlation of each independent variable with the dependent variable when taking each one into consideration can be determined by the standardized coefficients. Table 7 indicates the standardized coefficients and significance of the relationship management model.

Table 7

Standardized Coefficients for Model Summary Using Relationship Management, School Size, Minority Population, Senior Citizen Population, School Rating, and Financial Impact

	Beta	Significance
Relationship Management	.017	.887
Size	.079	.546
Minority Population	.255	.063
Senior Citizen Population	-.263	.058
Financial Impact	-.035	.785
Rating	.231	.071

The standardized coefficients suggest little relationship between superintendent relationship management and ‘yes’ votes in a bond election. There is a negative correlation for senior citizen population. A positive correlation for minority population and school rating was indicated. There was minimal effect shown for school size and financial impact. The collinearity was acceptable for model one, with a tolerance range of .698 to .917, and a VIF range of 1.090 to 1.433.

The final analysis of the relationship management model was a multiple regression using the backward entry method. Relationship management was excluded in the development of this model, which retained the independent variables of minority population, senior citizen population, and school rating. The predictive equation was as follows: Yes % = .166 (Minority population %) + 4.846 (School rating) - .630 (Senior citizen %) + 55.859.

Discussion

If emotional intelligence is important for effectiveness in superintendent roles and responsibilities, then this impact should be felt district-wide. Koetter and Cannon (1995) suggest bond elections are decided before they are announced. Therefore, emotional intelligence may be important in developing the continued

support for school initiatives.

Political matters may be different, especially in regard to school bonds, which do not focus directly upon the superintendent. A superintendent would be expected to have a high score in emotional intelligence, as occurred in this study. The range for emotional intelligence was 72 to 94, with a mean of 82.97, which is considerably higher than the test mean of 75. Based upon this range, there was no significant impact on bond election outcomes. Emotional intelligence may be important to bond elections if the superintendent is below a threshold, but as long as he/she is above a critical level, the impact of general emotional intelligence does not appear to be significant.

However, scoring high on the self-awareness portion of the emotional intelligence test resulted in a statistically significant negative correlation. The survey questions related to self-awareness included topics associated with confidence in personal abilities, admission of shortcomings, understanding personal emotions, recognizing personal impacts upon others, realizing when others influence personal emotional states, and recognizing the personal role played in circumstances (Bradbury & Greaves, 2001). Although these measures would generally be considered a strong foundation for leadership, they may also be aspects of self-awareness that negatively impact bond elections. This self-awareness may project as weakness and provide the information needed for dissenters in bond elections to create further community concern.

Minority population percentage was statistically significant as a factor having a positive correlation on bond elections. Tedin et al. (2001) researched a bond election in Houston ISD, concluding that the minority demographic of African-American and Hispanic voted in favor of the bond election in disproportionate numbers. Tedin et al.'s (2001) research was supported by the data found in this study. The minority population, defined by the combined district percentage of African-American and Hispanic members, indicated a positive correlation with 'yes' votes.

Senior citizen population percentage was statistically significant as a negative correlation in bond elections. Senior citizen opposition to school bond elections is a common theme (Dismuke,

1994; Speer, 1993). This demographic often does not feel a sense of connection with the local school district due to having no children as a part of the schools; however, they pay taxes. Senior citizens, who may be on a fixed budget, begin to develop resistance about paying for part of an institution in which they have no active part.

Although the taxes on a homestead of senior citizens are frozen, many of these individuals either lack this understanding or do not believe it. As a result, senior citizens vote against bond elections. Since apathy is a big issue among potential voters, a large demographic who votes consistently against a potential raise in taxes has a consistently negative impact. This relationship was reflected in the negative correlation found in this study.

There was not a significant correlation between bond elections and school size. District sizes vary significantly throughout the state (Texas Education Agency, 2002), and each district has a unique culture, based in part on its size. While smaller districts often have a closer sense of community, they may also have feuds existing within them that hinder progress. Large districts are not able to have the same sense of community (Sergiovanni, 1996), but they have their own set of issues, both in favor and against school districts.

Koetter and Cannon (1995) suggest that school quality may be important to bond elections. Although there was a statistically significant relationship in school quality for self-awareness in the backward entry method of multiple regression, other statistical analysis models suggested no significance. There does appear to be a trend in support of a relationship with school quality and 'yes' votes.

School quality was measured by the ranking determined by the Texas Education Agencies accountability system (Texas Education Agency, 2002). These rankings have four categories: Exemplary, Recognized, Academically Acceptable, and Low-Performing. Interestingly, no low-performing schools held a bond election during the period studied.

These rankings were based upon quantitative measures on standardized tests, along with some data quality information.

Because these rankings were published, they were a source of information on the quality of the district for individuals who may not have direct connections to the school. The published designation of school quality may provide information about the school to demographics that are not directly associated with the school, thus providing data for supporting the district.

The financial impact of the bond proposal was not statistically significant in the outcome of the bond. This may be due to the various ways of addressing the repayment of a bond. Districts may increase the length of a bond to minimize the annual increase in taxes, or a district may choose to increase taxes more but over a shorter time. Depending on the district, the way in which the bond is handled may be more important than the overall financial impact.

Conclusion

The following is recommended based upon the results of the study:

1. A superintendent should not allow data showing a lack of relationship between bond elections and emotional intelligence to impact his/her daily building of relationships. A superintendent must be cognizant of this potential lack of impact, but also understand that the community perceptions of the district may be improved by strong emotional intelligence among district leaders. Although a correlation between superintendent emotional intelligence and bond election success was not found, positive feelings about a school are likely to increase community support for district initiatives.
2. African-American and Hispanic populations must be contacted about bond elections. Since any attempt at passing a bond election needs to focus on getting the supportive voters to vote, districts must get the message to minority voters about the need for a bond.
3. Senior citizens must feel as if they are a part of the schools. One reaction to senior citizens' impact would be to ignore this demographic because they are not likely to change their minds. However, this study shows that financial im

pact is not an overall factor, and may not be the biggest factor with senior citizens. Instead, the lack of connection may be the major factor. Districts that can create a connection with the senior citizen community may be able to get increased support. This connection may be created through volunteer programs and special privileges for senior citizens. In addition, providing an incentive in the bond that will impact senior citizens may help, such as the development of a community/school library.

4. Superintendents must be aware of the image they are reflecting to voters. Superintendents must realize that political events, such as bond elections, are won through the appearance of being something that the common man is not. Admitting to mistakes may not be a way to gather support for bond elections.
5. This study suggests districts should not allow the financial impact of the bond to be a source of concern for voters. Districts should focus less on the size of the bond and more on the way the bond is paid for and presented.
6. This study suggests districts should not be concerned with the size of their school as a factor in whether the bond election will be successful. Instead, leaders should focus upon the need they are seeking to meet.

Recommendations for Further Research

Several needs for further research have arisen from this study. These needs include the following:

1. Continue the study with new bond elections. The findings of this study were from districts that held bond election over a limited period of time. The study would be strengthened by increasing the sample by adding new districts as they hold bond elections in the future.
2. Develop a greater understanding of why minority voters vote as they do. A greater understanding of why minority populations vote in disproportionate numbers is outside the scope of this research, but future research in this area would increase comprehension of the reasons behind these

figures.

3. Develop a greater understanding of why senior citizen voters vote as they do. The findings of this study confirm other studies that senior citizens tend to vote against bond elections (Dismuke, 1994). Discovering the underlying cause for this would improve approaches to soliciting their support.
4. Continue the study with other independent variables. There are other potential factors in bond elections, such as socio-economic level of the district, age of facilities, and myriad of other factors which may increase understanding of bond elections if studied.
5. Develop a study designed to better understand superintendent emotional intelligence factors in bond elections that failed.

References

- Austin, L. (2005, January 3). School finance battle went to Capitol, court in 2004. *HoustonChronicle.com*. Retrieved January 5, 2005, from www.chron.com/cs/CDA/ssistory.mpl/metropolitan/2975253.
- Benton, J. (2004, August 23). Schools not worth saving, W-H told. *DallasNews.com*. Retrieved September 30, 2004, from www.dallasnews.com/cgi-bin/bi/gold_print.cgi.
- Bradbury, T., & Greaves, J. (2003a). Emotional intelligence appraisal: There is more than IQ. Technical Manual. www.talentsmart.com: TalentSmart, Inc.
- Bradbury, T., & Greaves, J. (2003b). Emotional intelligence appraisal: There is more than IQ, Me Edition. www.talentsmart.com: TalentSmart, Inc.

Superintendent Emotional Intelligence

- Button, J. W. (1992). A sign of generational conflict: The impact of Florida's aging voters on local school and tax referenda. *Social Science Quarterly*, 73(4), pp. 786-797.
- Dismuke, D. (1994, May). Are senior citizens public enemy #1 for educators? *Education Digest*, 59(9), pp. 11-14.
- George, D., & Mallory, P. (2001). *SPSS for windows step by step: A simple guide and reference 10.0 update*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Hoyle, J. R., English, F. W., & Steffy, B. E. (1998). *Skills for successful 21st century school leaders*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Kahane, L. H. (2001). *Regression basics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Koetter, B., & Cannon, T. (1995). *Going to the polls: A guide to successful school bond elections*. Austin, TX: Texas Association of School Boards.
- Lode, M. D. (1999). *Factors affecting the outcomes of school bond elections in Iowa*. Doctor of Education Dissertation: University of South Dakota.

- Lodge, B., & Booth, H. (2004, September 19).
Voters reject bond for W-H school improvements.
DallasNews.com. Retrieved September 30, 2004, from www.dallasnews.com/cgi-bin/be/gold-pring.cgi.
- Miles, J., & Shevlin, M. (2001). *Applying regression and correlation: A guide for students and researchers*. London: Sage Publications.
- Moses, G. (2004, November 30). Robin Hood Livies!
MALDEF declares victory. North Texas indy media center. Retrieved January 5, 2005, from www.ntimc.org/newswire.php?story_id=1549.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1996). *Leadership for the schoolhouse. How is it different? Why is it important?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Speer, T. L. (1993, September). Do Florida's seniors lack school spirit? *American Demographics*, 15(9), pp. 22-25.
- Tedin, K. L., Matland, R. E., & Weiher, G. R. (2001). Age, race, self-interest, and financing public schools through referenda. *The Journal of Politics*, 63(1), pp. 270-294.
- Texas Association of School Administrators. (2003). *Who's Who in Texas Public Schools: 2002-2003 Directory*.
- Texas Bond Review Board. (2003). Retrieved June 6, 2003, from <http://www.b.b.state.tx.us>.
- Texas Education Agency (2002). *Snapshot 2002: 2001-2002 school district profiles*. Texas Education Agency Division of Performance Reporting

Superintendent Emotional Intelligence

United States Census (2000). Highlights from the census 2000 demographic profiles. Retrieved November 12, 2003 from factfinder.census.gov