

THE ROLE OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE IN
POLITICAL CANDIDATE IMAGE

by

Copyright 2007
Erin E. Blocher
B.A., University of Kansas

Submitted to the Department of
Communication Studies and the Faculty of
the Graduate School of the University
of Kansas in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Dr. Mary Banwart, Committee Chairperson

Dr. Amy Schmisser, Committee Member

Dr. Jay Childers, Committee Member

Date Defended: _____

The Thesis Committee for Erin E. Blocher certifies that this is the approved version of the following thesis:

THE ROLE OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE IN
POLITICAL CANDIDATE IMAGE

Dr. Mary Banwart, Committee Chairperson

Date Approved: _____

ABSTRACT

Erin E. Blocher, Master of Arts
Department of Communication Studies, April 2007
University of Kansas

This study sought to apply the interpersonal construct of emotional intelligence to political candidate image, and specifically to test the influence of a candidate's perceived emotional intelligence on overall image scores, vote choice, candidate competence, and the voter's emotional intelligence. A pretest and posttest design was used to study participant reactions to the paid political advertising of two male candidates running against each other for an open congressional seat.

Participant perceptions of candidate emotional intelligence did prove to be significant in their correlation with overall image scores, prediction of vote choice, and relationship to perceptions of candidate competence. Several factors relating to voters' perceptions of their own emotional intelligence also correlated with their overall perception of a candidate's emotional intelligence. These findings suggest that emotional intelligence is a concept that can be used to assess voter perception and vote choice, and even voters' perceptions of themselves. Several implications for candidates, campaigns, and voter identification emerge from the findings.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere thanks and appreciation to those who were instrumental in the completion of this thesis. A debt of gratitude goes to my advisor, Dr. Mary Banwart. I appreciate her willingness to engage an unconventional topic and to allow me to explore how other communication disciplines cross over into political communication. Her tireless commitment to quality feedback and her encouragement, guidance, and mentorship made the research process a valuable and enriching experience. Dr. Banwart is a true scholar and a role model.

I would also like to extend a hearty thank you to the members of my committee, Dr. Amy Schmisser and Dr. Jay Childers. Their knowledge, critiques, and enthusiasm were invaluable to the project.

I would like to offer a special thank you to my family, friends, and graduate student colleagues. I will always be grateful for the love of learning and the respect for education instilled in me by my parents, Rebecca Blocher and Kim Blocher. The love and support of my parents and step-parent, Jane Blocher, have been an immeasurable resource. A warm thank you also goes to Tim Burger for his love and support.

I am also grateful for the legacy of education and teaching in my family, and especially the inspiration of several female pioneers: Elizabeth Jane McKittrick, B.A. Mathematics and Chemistry, University of Kansas (1912), M.S. Home Economics, Kansas State University (1922), Professor of Home Economics, University of Wyoming (1922-1951); Josephine Alderson McKittrick Trowbridge, B.A. English,

Fort Hays State College (1963), M.A. English, University of Kansas (1973); Kathleen Blocher, B.S. Human Ecology, West Virginia Wesleyan College (1942), M.A. Home Economics, Columbia University (1946); D. Caroline Trowbridge, B.A. William Allen White School of Journalism, University of Kansas (1979); and Rebecca Blocher, B.S. Language Arts Education, University of Kansas (1971), M.S. Gifted and Talented Education, University of Kansas (1996); and also my father, William Kim Blocher, B.S. Mathematics, University of Kansas (1971), Instructor, United States Air Force Academy (1986-1993).

Thank you for blazing the trail.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE.....	1
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	4
Emotional Intelligence and the Leader.....	4
The Intersections of Politics and Emotional Intelligence.....	7
Image and Interpersonal Dimensions.....	13
Emotional Intelligence as Image Construct.....	18
III. METHOD.....	20
Participants.....	20
Procedures.....	21
Instrument.....	22
Data Analysis.....	26
IV. RESULTS.....	28
V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS.....	31
Limitations of the Study.....	39
Conclusions.....	40
REFERENCES.....	42

APPENDICIES

A. Survey Instrument.....49

B. Informed Consent Statement60

C. List of Tables.....61

CHAPER ONE

Introduction and Rationale

Over the last decade emotional intelligence has become a buzz phrase for corporate America. As an entire industry has emerged around workplace dynamics and positive leadership, emotional intelligence has received a great deal of attention in the private sphere. This study argues that the construct of emotional intelligence may have an important application to the dynamics of the *political* realm, as well. In the modern context, leadership and organization permeate campaigns and elections: 1) The candidate operates in a campaign organization; 2) the candidate functions as the symbolic leader of that organization and staff; and 3) on a larger scale, the candidate is judged by their constituency for their perceived interpersonal and leadership abilities as a public office seeker.

When seeking office, this third issue of candidate image has become a dominant force in vote choice (Hacker, 1995, 2004), and scholars have begun to acknowledge the role that interpersonal elements such as empathy (Trent, Short-Thompson, Mongeau, Nusz, & Trent, 2001), extroversion (Hellweg, 1979), and interpersonal communication abilities (Stephen, Harrison, Husson, & Albert, 2004) play in creating candidate image. Although repeatedly found to be important, the discussion of interpersonal criteria in political image has been scattered and lacks consistency in how it is identified and analyzed. The cohesive dimensions of emotional intelligence offer one potential construct with which to study voter perceptions of candidate image at the interpersonal level, and ultimately to study how

interpersonal perception impacts vote choice. Emotional intelligence can be perceived through communication styles, both verbal and non-verbal, and serves as an observable and predominantly behavioral construct. Emotional intelligence offers an opportunity for political communication scholars to analyze beyond the traditional image descriptors, and to operationalize the behavioral components of image that can be directly observed and perceived through communication acts, such as speeches, debates, and campaign advertisements.

The purpose of this study is to explore whether emotional intelligence is in fact a construct used by voters when analyzing a candidate's public image and when deciding for whom to cast their vote. The following review of literature will establish a foundation for the application of emotional intelligence to candidate image. First, an overview of the development of emotional intelligence is given, followed by a discussion of the contributions emotional intelligence has made to the study of leadership. Second, research that intersects emotional intelligence with politics is addressed, including two areas of political image research which run parallel to the construct of emotional intelligence—the study of candidate emotionality and the study of political executive leadership. Third, an overview of the study of candidate image is given and the interpersonal elements already addressed by image scholars are discussed. Lastly, the opportunities presented by applying emotional intelligence to candidate image are explored. A discussion of the method used to gather data is provided next, including participants, procedures, instruments, and data analysis,

followed by the results of the statistical analyses; and finally a discussion of those results and their implications is provided.

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

Emotional Intelligence and the Leader

Salovey and Mayer (1990) first defined emotional intelligence as a comprehensive theoretical framework. Their framework represented the interwoven concepts they believed were disparately spread across the psychology literature on emotion and on social intelligence. The authors defined emotional intelligence as “the ability to monitor one’s own and other’s feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and actions” (Salovey and Mayer, 1990, p.189). The authors’ framework focused on the practical use and recognition of emotional states to “solve problems and regulate behavior” (p.189).

The authors argued:

. . . there is a set of conceptually related mental processes involving emotional information. The mental processes include: a) appraising and expressing emotions in the self and others, b) regulating emotion in the self and others, and c) using emotions in adaptive ways. (pp. 190-191)

Goleman (1995, 1998, 2002) in turn popularized the concept of emotional intelligence after stumbling upon the little known Salovey and Mayer (1990) construct. In addition to his own writings, Goleman partnered with scholars to refine the model and categorize emotional intelligence into a set of measurable competencies assessed by the Emotional Competency Inventory (Boyatzis, Goleman, and Rhee, 2000). Boyatzis, Goleman, and Rhee (2000) organized the emotional

intelligence competencies around four clusters: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and social skills. Self-awareness addresses the knowing of one's own internal states and resources; self-management relates to managing one's own internal states and impulses; social awareness deals with the awareness of other's feelings and needs; lastly, social skills refer to the ability to produce a desired response in others (Byrne, Smither, Reiley, & Dominick, 2005).

Although critics have maligned the emotional intelligence framework as too broad or as unmeasurable (see Ashkanasy & Daus, 2005), the subject has provided important perspectives for studying and understanding emotion and leadership within the organization. George (2002) theorized that emotional intelligence contributes to leader effectiveness in several areas: developing collective objectives; instilling the importance of work in others; generating confidence, enthusiasm, cooperation, and trust; encouraging flexibility in change; and lastly, establishing and maintaining organizational identity. To find a link with well established leadership constructs, Barling, Slater, and Kelloway (2000) tested the relationship between managers' emotional intelligence level and their transformational or transactional leadership style. The researchers found a connection between high emotional intelligence and the use of three elements of transformational leadership: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, and individualized consideration. Although the sample was small ($n = 60$), the researchers offered the following argument as to the relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership:

First, leaders who know and can manage their own emotions, and who display self control and delay of gratification, could serve as role models for their followers, thereby enhancing followers' trust in and respect for their leaders. This would be consistent with the essence of idealized influence. Second, with its emphasis on understanding others' emotions, leaders high in emotional intelligence would be ideally placed to realize the extent to which followers' expectations could be raised, a hallmark of inspirational motivation. Third, a major component of individualized consideration is the ability to understand followers' needs and interact accordingly. With its emphasis on empathy and the ability to manage relationships positively, leaders manifesting emotional intelligence would be likely to manifest individualized consideration. (pp.157)

Linking leadership to self-awareness, Sosik and Megerian (1999) studied the relationship between emotional intelligence, social self-awareness, and private self-awareness. They found that those rating high in self awareness had high rankings from their subordinates in transformational leadership, in a purpose in life test, personal efficacy, interpersonal control, and social self-confidence. The authors reasoned that self-awareness is an underlying X factor for many of the elements of emotional intelligence, and that emotional intelligence in turn correlates to perceived leadership abilities. Similarly and more recently, Keer, Garvin, Heaton, and Boyle (2005) found supervisors' emotional intelligence scores correlated positively with employees' ratings of supervisors' effectiveness. Particularly strong positive

correlations were found between the employee ratings of managers and the managers' scores on the ability to perceive emotions, understand emotions, and reason with emotional knowledge.

As emotional intelligence has continued to be more closely tied to leadership, we might expect that the construct of emotional intelligence could be applied to better understand the type of leadership image cultivated by those seeking political office. It is likely that the effectiveness, idealized influence, inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, and self-awareness linked to emotional intelligence in the business realm are also present in the leadership voters expect to see, and in turn vote for, in the political realm. To explore this possible connection it is important to begin with a description of three clear areas where politics and the interpersonal nature of emotional intelligence intersect. The review of literature will then discuss current research on emotional intelligence in political organizations, two tracks of political image research which parallel the emotional intelligence construct, and lastly, offer a rationale for examining the effect that perceived emotional intelligence has on candidate image.

The Intersections of Politics and Emotional Intelligence

Modern political campaigns are organizational, and candidates are cast as leaders in three practical ways: 1) campaigns themselves are an organization with staff, hierarchy, and mission; 2) politicians act as the symbolic leader of their campaign organization and their staff; and 3) for their broader audience, candidates enact the leadership traits expected in a public servant seeking a high level office (for

a discussion of the organizational nature of political campaigns see Denton & Woodward, 1998; Salmore & Salmore, 1985). Scholars have recently studied emotional intelligence as it relates to the organizational element of campaigns and the supervisory role a candidate or elected official plays within their political organization (Barbuto & Burbach, 2006). However, emotional intelligence has not specifically been applied to the third element described above—a candidate’s *public* leadership image. As defined by Salovey and Mayer (1990), the construct of emotional intelligence has two interdependent elements, as opposed to similar emotion-based constructs (for a comparison of multiple emotion-based constructs and measures, see Conte, 2005). Emotional intelligence requires one be able to assess the emotional climate they find in the outside world, and regulate their own emotional states and reactions to respond appropriately to that exterior climate. The ability to simultaneously assess the circumstances and react appropriately seems central to the public image candidates cultivate with their constant response to, and interplay with, their outside audience, the voters at large. However, scholars have not yet looked to emotional intelligence—and the two pronged emotional skills it addresses—as a factor in how candidates cultivate their public image as they pursue a leadership position.

Several constructs that parallel emotional intelligence have been studied in regard to candidate image, chiefly the construct of “emotionality” and the notion of executive leadership. This section will outline one past study of emotional intelligence in political organizations and then review the two lines of research on

candidate image that most closely parallel the study of emotional intelligence and candidate image proposed in this study.

As indicated, Barbuto and Burbach (2006) recently applied emotional intelligence to the first two characteristics of politicians listed above—that the elected official exists within an organizational structure and that the elected official is a boss. Their study examined the relationship between four dimensions of transformational leadership (inspirational motivation, idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration) and five aspects of emotional intelligence (empathetic response, mood regulation, interpersonal skills, internal motivation, and self-awareness). The authors compared the self-rated emotional intelligence and transformational leadership scores of 80 elected officials to the rater perception scores of 3-4 staffers for each politician. Several elements of transformational leadership style did correspond to emotional intelligence, both in the self-rated results and in the rater results. A significant relationship also emerged between the staffers' ratings of the elected officials and the leaders' empathetic responses to perceptions of intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration. Leaders' interpersonal skills were also positively related to self-reported and rater-reported individualized consideration, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence; however, stronger correlations were found between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership in leaders' self-reports. With this study, Barbuto and Burbach (2006) called attention to the role of emotional intelligence in the organizational and supervisory aspects of political life.

Despite Barbuto and Burbach's (2006) interesting conclusions, an application of emotional intelligence to politics beyond the organizational frame is missing. The role of emotional intelligence in candidate *image* has not yet been addressed by scholars. However, two concepts which parallel emotional intelligence have been applied to image. First among these is the concept of "candidate emotionality" (Stroud, Glaser, & Salovey, 2005), or the act of showing emotion and its effect on candidate image. These analyses were either grounded in a "psychoanalytic approach, obtaining data from case studies of important political leaders" (Glaser & Salovey, 1998; Marcus, 2000) or focused on candidate emotions as a personality trait (Stroud et al., 2005, p.27). Stroud et al. (2005) found that in the absence of partisanship cues, a candidate's emotional expressiveness did have an influence on voters' candidate preference. Their experiment relied on an actor portraying a political speech with a range of emotions and then without emotion. When the candidate was not labeled Democrat or Republican, and party association was neutral, the more emotive candidate was preferred. In these types of experiments, Stroud et al. (2005), Glaser and Salovey (1998), and Marcus (2000), introduced the idea of emotion to candidate image and vote choice, but from the standpoint of personal affect and expression as opposed to an interpersonal or relational outlook.

A second important track of political image scholarship which parallels the concept of emotional intelligence has been on executive leadership in politics. Seligman (1950) argued well over 50 years ago that the 20th Century saw a rise in the role leadership played in politics, especially as the power of the executive office grew

and the mass media evolved in the last century. Edinger's (1975) comparative view of political leadership particularly noted the inherent link between the construct of leadership and hierarchy, politics, political actors, and political action.

Not surprisingly, much of the study of leadership in politics has centered on the office of the presidency, resulting in important contributions to both the study of politics and the study of leadership. Perhaps the most recognized example is that of Burns' (1978) theoretical construct of transformational and transactional leadership as developed from his analysis of politics and the presidency. Hargrove (1998) offers yet another representation of this focus in his analysis of the *President as Leader*, analyzing the important role leadership plays in the image of the president and the presidency, and the leadership image Americans have come to expect from executive officials.

Even rhetorical scholars have tried to deconstruct the elements of executive leadership when analyzing the president's political speech, and their conclusions also hint at the elements of emotional intelligence. Thurow (1996) chronicles how the portrayal of presidential character has evolved as the American presidency has matured. Thurow discusses the president's words and deeds as his main means of persuading the American people:

Especially when the matter discussed may be uncertain and doubtful, hearers will be inclined to rely upon the confidence they have in the speaker, which in turn depends upon their perception of his character. If they perceive him to be prudent, virtuous, and to have good will toward them, they will be likely to be

convinced. Conversely, if they think him foolish, vicious, or concerned only with his own interests, they will be difficult to persuade even if the speech seems to contain irrefutable logic. (1996, pp.15-16)

Elements of emotional intelligence appear to even be present in the rhetorician's tool kit, especially when it comes to the original Aristotelian concept of ethos and credibility. Tied up in presidential power and executive leadership are undoubtedly ideas about managing emotion, empathy, and social understanding.

Scholars have studied voter perceptions of candidates' emotional affect and voter perceptions of candidates' executive leadership abilities, but the essence of emotional intelligence (defined by self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and social skills), although related to leadership and to emotional affect, is its own conceptually unique construct. This study seeks to examine if emotional intelligence, as a unique construct, has an effect on candidate image, beyond the act of simply performing emotion and beyond the leadership skills which scholars have previously studied. Do the dimensions of self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and social skills contribute to the "it factor" voters seek in their elected officials in the same way general leadership abilities and emotional affect have proven to contribute? To evaluate the usefulness of emotional intelligence as another dimension of candidate image, it is important to examine which elements of emotional intelligence fit into existing models of candidate image, and which elements of emotional intelligence have been ignored thus far by the image literature.

Image and Interpersonal Dimensions

Nimmo and Savage (1976) discuss the role of image in campaign politics, calling special attention to the role that voter perceptions play in an ever increasingly mediated world. The authors attest to the bottom line of candidate image, which is that “voters respond to candidates on the basis of the images they have of them and hence, candidate images are a significant short-term force in elections” (Nimmo and Savage, 1976, p. 39). Hellweg (2004) offers a comprehensive account of the decades of research from the latter half of the 20th century that demonstrate candidate image is a predictor of electoral outcomes and voting behavior. Natchez and Bupp (1968) found that the simplicity of images, compared with the cognitive complexity of issues, made images more salient to voters in campaigns from 1952 to 1964. In his study of the 1976 presidential campaign, Roberts (1981) argued voters first assessed the likability of a candidate before making issue judgments. Similarly, Marshall (1983) determined that image formation was especially important in the early stages of a campaign. As Kaid and Chanslor (2004) discuss, forms of contemporary campaign communication, such as televised candidate advertising, have become a powerful vehicle for disseminating elements of candidate image and in forming candidate image.

With the importance of candidate image to vote choice confirmed, scholars have asked *what* factors create candidate image. Kaid (2004) has demonstrated the value in using a semantic differential scale to measure the components of image with bipolar adjective sets. Other adjective scales, similar to Kaid’s, have been used by

researchers such as Trent, Mongeau, Trent, Kendall, and Cushing (1993), who offer the first in an important series of studies examining the consistency with which the public and media evaluate candidate image in presidential elections. Trent et al. (1993) found that between the 1988 and 1992 election, a stable set of image-related criteria were used to evaluate presidential candidates. Each presidential cycle they tested the following dimensions: experience in office, being an energetic and aggressive leader, faithful to spouse, forceful public speaker, moral character, talks about nation's problems, honest, younger than sixty, and male. The candidate's honesty and an ability to talk about the problems facing the country were consistently most important, while the candidate's gender (male) and age (young) were rated the least important.

Despite the fact that the same criteria were consistently rated important for the public across the elections, there were differences in which of the criteria took precedence based on political circumstances. Trent, Trent, Mongeau, and Short-Thompson (1997) again found the same characteristics desirable for a political candidate, despite the voter's age, gender, party, and media connection when viewing the 1988, 1992, and 1996 elections. Changes in candidate, economic conditions, and demographics did cause changes in the degree of criteria importance, but not in the direction of trending toward general importance. Findings from the 2000 study (Trent, Short-Thompson, Mongeau, Nusz, & Trent, 2001) repeated earlier results. However, in 2000 the variation of difference between the several characteristics was greater than in the past, with a stronger than usual push for honesty, faithfulness to

spouse, and moral integrity, which Trent et al. (2001) attributed to the Clinton era scandals.

The consistency with which the image-related selection criteria have been identified by this series of studies does suggest the American public has an “ideal candidate” in mind. Trent, Short-Thompson, Mongeau, Metzler, and Trent (2005) continued the study with the 2004 election, drawing several conclusions about the consistency across time. First, they argued that the criteria of being honest and talking about the nation’s problems is considered to be the most valuable. Although moral values were also consistently highly rated, the authors determined that political party, age, and gender affected the degree of importance. Despite some differences over time, the consistency with which the public and the media value the criteria used by Trent et al. (1993, 1997, 2001, 2005) speaks to the power of certain variables in establishing candidate image. However, such research does not offer much insight as to how voters might project such variables into an interpersonal evaluation of the candidate or how exposure to the candidates’ communication might influence voters’ abilities to perceive the candidate as meeting, exceeding, or disappointing the ideal image.

In a similar vein, Hellweg (1979) identified several attributes of the ideal candidate in a study of the 1976 general election. Competence, character, sociability, composure, extroversion, and similarity to the voter in beliefs all emerged as important to voters. Hellweg differentiated the relationship between the candidate and the voter into two categories, 1) the task environment, where candidate

competence and character are “envisioned in relationship to the candidate’s potential position upon election to office;” and 2) the interpersonal environment, where composure, extroversion, and sociability in relation to the potential office are examined (p. 382). Hellweg’s study found that it is more important to a potential voter that a political candidate be high in “competence and character, rather than in composure, extroversion, or sociability” (p. 383).

However, what if the elements in Hellweg’s construct are not mutually exclusive? Emotional intelligence gives us a place where “competence” and “sociability” cross. Could it be that voters also see “extroversion” or “sociability” as attributes which convey job competence or leadership ability? Arguably, an additional lens for studying image is needed in order to appropriately evaluate the inextricable need for the interpersonal to do the work of the political. By doing so we can account for the intersection of what Hellweg’s model inherently separates.

Although the construct of emotional intelligence as a whole has not been studied in light of candidate image, researchers have explored what might be perceived as elements of emotional intelligence in a quest to study politics’ obvious social and interpersonal underpinnings. Trent et al. (2001) allude to some elements of emotional intelligence, especially empathy, in their explanation of why the criteria of “talks about nation’s problems” again and again proves important to Americans and why the importance of interpersonal criteria seems to be on the rise:

In 2000, the interpersonal characteristics (honesty, faithful to spouse, and moral integrity) were emphasized more (in ranking and rating by the media

and the public) than in our prior studies. The three characteristics were frequently discussed in news stories, and it can be argued that such characteristics are easier to discuss and quicker to assess than are complicated issue stances and policy positions. Moreover, the highly ranked characteristic, talks about nation's problems, can become a personal as opposed to professional attribute. For example a candidate who recognizes the problems of average Americans, even 'feels their pain' as Clinton reportedly had, is viewed as being in touch with the average person, empathetic, and understanding. A candidate who does not recognize and talk about the nation's problems might be seen as personally aloof or out of touch with the people. (pp. 2121-2122)

Another nod to the interpersonal in the image literature comes from the work of Stephen, Harrison, Husson, and Albert (2004). Their study analyzed candidates' interpersonal communication behavior and made comparisons over the 1984, 1988, and 1992 elections. The authors found that winning candidates are "text-book studies in optimal, non-defensive interpersonal communication behavior" with their communication being rated as more "self-contained, secure, relaxed, and interpersonally functional" (p.185). Losers on the other hand were perceived as more "overbearing, tense, contentious, histrionic, and serious" (p. 185). The authors also found a consistent relationship between the more positive interpersonal communication perceptions and vote choice over the three elections, even including the interesting case of George H.W. Bush who was once a winning candidate and

once a losing candidate in the study. Furthermore, McCroskey, Jensen, and Todd (1972) (as cited in Hellweg, 2004) found sociability and extroversion to be two important variables in candidate credibility. Others such as Parry-Giles and Parry-Giles (1996) have studied the rising use of the talk show venue as an opportunity for candidates to engage in a more interpersonal setting.

Emotional Intelligence as Image Construct

This review highlights the importance of image to political communication, especially in understanding how voters select political candidates and make vote choices. While the image studies highlighted in this review recognize the importance of the interpersonal in candidate image, there is little research focusing on a well developed construct for understanding a) voter perceptions of a candidate's interpersonal dimensions, and b) the effects of such perceptions on traditional understandings of image and vote choice.

As discussed previously, researchers have tested candidate emotionality as a dimension affecting image and have established the importance of executive leadership in candidate image. Further, several dimensions discussed in the ideal candidate image literature, such as empathy, extroversion, sociability, self-containment, and composure correspond to important constructs in the emotional intelligence model. These trends indicate that image researchers are testing several of the elements of emotional intelligence one by one, but have not looked to the construct of emotional intelligence as another dimension of candidate image which can be observed behaviorally. Boyatzis, Goleman, and Rhee's (2000) four emotional

competencies: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and social skills, seem to be recognized as important throughout the political image literature, but only in isolation.

Another connection between image and emotional intelligence may lie in researchers' focus on homophily when studying image. The research of both Hellweg (1979) and Trent et al. (1993, 1997, 2001, 2005) has focused on voters' preference for individuals they perceive to be most like themselves. Perhaps if one values the interpersonal dimensions of emotional intelligence in their own self-perception, it might also be a competency they seek in a public figure.

Therefore, this study argues that the cohesive dimensions of emotional intelligence offer a new and powerful tool to examine the interpersonal elements of candidate image. Based on the above review of literature, this study poses the following research questions to examine the role of emotional intelligence in voter perceptions:

RQ1: Do candidate image ratings become more positive as perceived emotional intelligence levels increase?

RQ2: Are perceptions of the candidates' emotional intelligence related to candidates' perceived competency?

RQ3: Do perceptions of the candidates' emotional intelligence influence vote choice?

RQ4: Does voter emotional intelligence correlate with perceptions of candidates' emotional intelligence?

CHAPTER THREE

Method

To answer these research questions data was collected in conjunction with a research team gathering data at two locations for multiple research projects. The following will address the methods and procedures used to gather the data relevant to this study.

Participants

The 152 participants responding to the questions reported in this study were undergraduates from both a large midwestern university and a regional southern university. The students earned points toward an introductory communications class for their participation in the research process. The mean age of the participants was 20.4 years old, with an age range from 18 to 34 years old. Gender representation was fairly even, with 50.7% of the respondents being male ($n = 77$) and 49.3% of the respondents being female ($n = 75$). The primary ethnic group surveyed in the study was Non-Hispanic White, with 84.2% ($n = 128$) of the participants marking this label. Additional ethnic responses included Asian or Pacific Islander 3.3% ($n = 5$), African-American 5.3% ($n = 8$), Spanish or Hispanic 3.9% ($n = 6$), multi-racial or mixed race 2% ($n = 3$), and those representing other ethnic groups 1.3% ($n = 2$). Of those surveyed, 77% ($n = 117$) reported they were registered to vote and 23% ($n = 35$) reported they were not registered to vote. Political party affiliation was fairly evenly distributed, 30.9% ($n = 47$) identified as Democratic, 40.1% ($n = 61$) identified as Republican, and 28.9% ($n = 44$) identified as either independent or unaffiliated.

Procedures

The data was collected by a combination of paper surveys and computerized surveys proctored by the principle researchers and by research assistants serving on the research team. The participants responded to a pretest survey and a posttest survey, similar to the pretest/posttest procedure used by Tedesco (2002) and other political communication scholars (Kaid and Tedesco, 2003; Kaid, 2002; Kaid, 1997). After the pre-test, participants were asked to carefully watch six political advertisements aired during the 2006 general election for an open congressional race, and then respond to the post-test. The candidates depicted in the ads were males representing the Republican party and Democratic party. The advertisements, created and published by each candidate's campaign organization, consisted of one positive or biographical advertisement, one advertisement meant to show contrast between the candidate and their opponent, and one advertisement attacking the candidate's opponent, for each of the two candidates. The candidates represented in this study were John Gard (Republican) and Steve Kagen (Democrat), running for an open congressional seat in Wisconsin's 8th Congressional District. This down ballot, low information race was chosen in order to minimize preconceived conceptions of the candidates and to control for previous exposure to the message, as well as to control for gender and incumbency.

Participants were exposed to paid political television advertising instead of other sources of political information such as print materials, candidate debates, or other public appearances. Political advertising was chosen as a medium because of

the important role television spots have in creating and enhancing image (Kaid, 1997). Experimental research has proven there is “convincing evidence for the influence of political spots, particularly on candidate image and voting behavior” (Kaid, 1997, p.1086). Furthermore, the content of political advertisements can vary, but the second most common content theme found by Joslyn (1980) in political advertising is content that focuses on candidate qualities. This makes political advertising rich with opportunities for voters to evaluate a quality such as emotional intelligence. As candidates, staff, and consultants make decisions about the message, issue content, and production elements of an advertisement, the candidate’s emotional intelligence—ability to assess the overall political context and respond appropriately—is conveyed to voters. Lastly, in a practical sense, opportunities for personal interaction with a candidate have declined in the modern political era, leaving candidates to interact with the voters primarily through mediated channels (Graber, 2002) and limiting the opportunities to express their emotional intelligence to a mediated environment. The modern political climate makes television advertising the most common and ubiquitous exposure voters have to a congressional level candidate. For these reasons political spot ads were chosen as the stimuli in this study.

Instrument

Candidate Emotional Intelligence

The scale used to measure the participants’ perceptions of the candidate’s emotional intelligence was adapted from Byrne, Smither, Reiley, and Dominick

(2005) and was used as an other-report measure. Emotional intelligence instruments are nascent and often criticized (for a thorough critique of emotional intelligence instruments, see Conte, 2005). The scale by Byrne et al. emerges from an effort to test several validity measures of the Emotional Competency Inventory, a commonly used instrument corresponding to the four dimensions of emotional intelligence outlined by Boyatzis, Goleman, and Rhee (2000). The instrument used by Byrne et al. was first developed by Boyatzis (2003) for coders to rate emotional intelligence behaviors on video tape. For this study, the Byrne et al. content analysis scheme was applied to a survey design, and several factors led to this choice. First, free and academically published scales on emotional intelligence are very limited. Those available from for-profit organizations require the researcher to sign legal documents giving the for-profit organization the rights to their subsequent data and findings. Second, the Byrne et al. (2005) instrument was designed for watching and evaluating the behaviors of others on a video screen. This aspect of the instrument translates especially well into the task of evaluating emotional intelligence in video spot ads, as the participants in this study were asked to do. Third, the Byrne et al. (2005) instrument transfers well to this study because the original content analysis instrument was situated on a 5 point Likert scale, identically to how it is reproduced in this study, lending the instrument to easy use in collecting survey data. Furthermore, Byrne et al. (2005) found a strong correlation and convergent validity between the instrument and the traditional (yet costly) Emotional Competency Inventory.

The Byrne et al. (2005) scale used in this study contained 14 behavioral (versus cognitive) description sets, and participant agreement with each description was measured on a 5 point Likert scale (see Appendix A for instrument). When used as a content analysis tool, Byrne et al. (2005) reported reliability (intraclass coefficient) of 0.77 for the instrument. Despite the instrument's shift from content analysis scheme to a representative scale in this study, reliability measurements remained high. For this current study, a Cronbach's alpha of .92 was achieved for the scale measuring the emotional intelligence of candidate John Gard, and a Cronbach's alpha of .87 was achieved for the scale measuring the emotional intelligence of candidate Steve Kagen. To obtain an overall candidate emotional intelligence score, each item was summated to produce a mean score for use in calculations.

Voter Emotional Intelligence

The participants' own emotional intelligence was recorded using a self-rater scale developed by Carson, Carson, and Birkenmeier (2000). The scale measures five factors of emotional intelligence, each listed here with Carson et al.'s (2000) original reliability scores for each factor: empathetic response dimension .87, mood regulation dimension .77, interpersonal skills dimension .82, internal motivation dimension .78, and self-awareness dimension .69. The scale developed from Carson et al.'s efforts to create an academically available, valid emotional intelligence scale. The researchers began with 269 items, eventually trimming those to 30 items which loaded cleanly onto five factors. For this study, 29 of those items, representing the five emotional intelligence factors are used. Carson et al.'s (2000) scale was also used in the study

cited earlier, by Barbuto and Burbach (2006), on the transformational leadership and emotional intelligence of elected officials, as a self-rater measurement.

When used to measure the emotional intelligence of the participants in this study, the self-rater emotional intelligence scale had an overall Cronbach's alpha of .90, and each factor achieved a Cronbach's alpha as follows: empathetic response .91 (n = 5 items), mood regulation .78 (n = 6 items), interpersonal skills .86 (n = 6 items), internal motivation .86 (n = 6 items), and self-awareness .76 (n = 6 items).

Participants' responses to the questions under each factor were summated to create an overall mean score for the participants on each factor.

Candidate Image

Candidate image was measured by the semantic differential scales developed and standardized by Kaid (2004, 1997) to measure candidate image. The twelve item scale includes the following bi-polar adjective dimensions: unqualified/qualified, unsophisticated/sophisticated, dishonest/honest, believable/unbelievable, unsuccessful/successful, attractive/unattractive, unfriendly/friendly, insincere/sincere, calm/excitable, aggressive/unaggressive, strong/weak, inactive/active. Previous studies have reported Cronbach's alpha levels ranging from .83 to .92 (Kaid, 2004). In this study a Cronbach's alpha of .78 was achieved for the image scale reporting Steve Kagen's image and a Cronbach's alpha of .79 was achieved for the image scale reporting John Gard's image. The semantic differential scales were summated to create a mean score for use in statistical equations, similar to the process used by

Tedesco (2002) in his application of the scales to the effects of televised political advertising on candidate image in a 2000 Senatorial race.

Candidate Competence

Candidate competence was measured by a single variable on a 5 point Likert scale, using the question “Please consider the candidate based only on the ads that you have just seen” and then “Please evaluate the candidate on competence.”

Data Analysis

Research Question 1

To assess the relationship between candidate image and a candidate’s perceived emotional intelligence, an overall mean image score for each candidate was calculated and an overall mean emotional intelligence score for each candidate was calculated. Pearsons r was tested to determine whether significant correlations exist.

Research Question 2

To assess if perceptions of the candidates’ emotional intelligence are related to candidates’ perceived competency, ratings of each candidate’s competency and each candidate’s mean emotional intelligence score were subjected to a bivariate linear regression analysis.

Research Question 3

To assess if perceptions of the candidates’ emotional intelligence influence vote choice, two independent samples t tests were conducted. The grouping variable represented the participant’s vote choice and the dependent variable represented the candidate’s emotional intelligence score.

Research Question 4

To assess if a voter's emotional intelligence correlates with perceptions of candidates' emotional intelligence, the Pearson's r correlation between the mean score for each voter emotional intelligence factor and the mean candidate emotional intelligence score was calculated.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results

In order to respond to the first research question—which asked if candidate image ratings become more positive as candidates’ perceived emotional intelligence levels increase—a mean image score and a mean emotional intelligence score were calculated for Steve Kagen and for John Gard. Pearson correlation coefficients were computed for each candidate’s image and perceived emotional intelligence scores. The correlation between Gard’s image score ($M = 4.81$) and emotional intelligence score ($M = 3.62$) was significant, $r(150) = .488$, $p < 0.01$. The correlation between Kagen’s image score ($M = 4.35$) and emotional intelligence score ($M = 3.37$) was also significant, $r(150) = .684$, $p < .001$.

In order to respond to the second research question—which asked if perceptions about candidates’ emotional intelligence are related to perceptions of candidate competency—bivariate linear regression was conducted. The candidates’ mean emotional intelligence score served as the independent variable and voters’ rating of each candidate’s competence was used as the dependent variable. The sample size for this research question regarding John Gard was slightly smaller ($n = 114$); due to a computer error some participant responses to the survey question measuring Gard’s candidate competence were not recorded. Kagen’s data remained consistent at 152 respondents.

The linear regression analysis conducted did show that the two variables are linearly related for each candidate (see Table 1), such that as each candidate’s

perceived emotional intelligence scores increase so do candidate competence scores. For John Gard, the 95% confidence interval for the slope .831 to 1.254 does not contain the value of zero, and therefore emotional intelligence is significantly related to competence. As voters perceive Gard to have higher emotional intelligence, they perceive him to have higher competency. Accuracy in predicting candidate competency was strong for John Gard. The correlation between emotional intelligence and competency was .68. Approximately 46% of the variance of competence was accounted for by its linear relationship with emotional intelligence.

For Steve Kagen, the 95% confidence interval for the slope .564 to 1.007 does not contain the value of zero, and therefore emotional intelligence is significantly related to competence. As voters perceive Kagen to have higher emotional intelligence, they perceive him to have higher competency. Accuracy in predicting candidate competency was strong for Steve Kagen. The correlation between emotional intelligence and competency was .50. Approximately 25% of the variance of competence was accounted for by its linear relationship with emotional intelligence.

In order to respond to the third research question—which asked if voter perception of candidates' emotional intelligence is related to vote choice—an independent samples *t* test was conducted. Of the 152 participants, 61% ($n = 93$) cast a vote for John Gard and 39% ($n = 59$) cast a vote for Steve Kagen. When the mean emotional intelligence scores were compared, participants ranked the candidate they voted for higher in emotional intelligence than they rated the candidate for which they

did not cast a vote. Those voting for John Gard rated John Gard's emotional intelligence ($M = 3.88, SD = .53$) significantly higher than Steve Kagen's emotional intelligence ($M = 3.16, SD = .53$), $t(106.9) = 6.764, p < .001$. Those who voted for Steve Kagen rated Steve Kagen's emotional intelligence ($M = 3.70, SD = .41$) significantly higher than John Gard's emotional intelligence ($M = 3.20, SD = .64$), $t(143.3) = -7.085, p < .001$. The eta square index for Kagen indicated that 14% of the variance in vote choice was related to perceptions of emotional intelligence. The eta square index for Gard indicated that 13% of the variance in vote choice was related to perceptions of emotional intelligence.

In order to respond to the fourth research question—which asked if participant emotional intelligence correlates with perceptions of candidates' emotional intelligence—a mean score was calculated for participants' responses to each of the five emotional intelligence factors on the self-emotional intelligence scale. Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated using the candidate's overall emotional intelligence score and each of the five factors of the self-emotional intelligence scale.

Significant correlations (see Table 2) were found between Gard's emotional intelligence and respondent's mean interpersonal skills score ($r = .20$) and mean internal motivation score ($r = .16$). Significant correlations were found between Kagen's emotional intelligence and respondent's mean empathetic response score ($r = .20$) and mean interpersonal skills score ($r = .17$).

CHAPTER FIVE

Discussion and Conclusions

This study sought to apply the interpersonal construct of emotional intelligence to candidate image, and to test the significance of emotional intelligence on overall image scores, vote choice, candidate competence, and the voter's emotional intelligence. Participant perceptions of candidate emotional intelligence did prove to be significant in their correlation with overall image scores, prediction of vote choice, and relationship to perceptions of candidate competence. Several factors relating to voters' perceptions of their own emotional intelligence also correlated with their overall perception of a candidate's emotional intelligence. These findings suggest that emotional intelligence is a concept that can be used to assess voter perception and vote choice, and even voter's perceptions of themselves. Several implications for candidates, campaigns, and voter identification emerge from the findings.

The first research question posed in this study asked if there was a correlation between candidate image ratings and candidates' perceived emotional intelligence. The results indicated that voter perceptions about candidate image and voter perceptions about candidate emotional intelligence were positively correlated. As voters' perceptions of a candidate's level of emotional intelligence increased, voters' perceptions of a candidate's positive image also increased. These findings clearly suggest that the dimensions of emotional intelligence tested here, such as recognizing one's emotions and their effects on others, flexibility with change, striving for a sense

of excellence, a focus on proactivity and action, leading with a sense of mission, bringing disagreements and grievances into the open, and fostering collaboration are significant to candidate image.

The suggestion that image and emotional intelligence are related supports the periodic reference to elements of emotional intelligence in past image literature (Trent et al., 2001; Hellweg, 1979). The four dimensions of emotional intelligence used in this study encompass many of the image descriptors used in past research on image and interpersonal topics such as empathy, extroversion, sociability, self-containment, and composure. However, these findings, beyond just corresponding to past dimensions, studied in isolation, serve to strengthen the validity of using emotional intelligence as a singular concept to gauge voter perceptions. Emotional intelligence, when taken as a holistic concept, is relevant to voter perceptions about political image.

An explanation for this link may lie in the leadership expectations inherent in political office. The public leadership skills voters expect to see in a candidate may well manifest themselves behaviorally, in many cases, as emotional intelligence. The connection between positive leadership and emotional intelligence has been shown in the business context, and this study indicates that a relationship exists between emotional intelligence and public leadership as well.

The second research question inquired whether perceptions about candidate emotional intelligence were related to perceptions of candidate competency. The results demonstrated that a predictive linear relationship exists between perceptions of

candidate emotional intelligence and perceptions of candidate competence. This relationship suggests that voters' perceptions about a candidate's competence can be explained by their perceptions about a candidate's emotional intelligence. This conclusion supports the argument presented earlier that the social intelligence involved in emotional intelligence is inherent to political work and political life. Perhaps a candidate who appears emotionally competent, and behaves in line with the emotional intelligence competencies, is also perceived as politically competent.

It is notable that John Gard was the top vote getter in the study, and his r^2 value suggested a strong predictive relationship between emotional intelligence and competence. For Steve Kagen, the candidate with fewer votes, the results suggest a moderate predictive relationship between emotional intelligence and competence. In this study, when voters preferred a candidate and indicated that candidate as their vote choice, the predictive relationship between perceiving emotional intelligence and perceiving competence was higher. These results indicate that further research is needed to determine whether high candidate emotional intelligence and competence ultimately predict vote choice. However, if future connections are found, interesting implications arise for candidates' need to turn their attention not only to their perceived emotional intelligence, but also, simultaneously, to illustrating their competence, in order to ensure vote choice.

Kagen's case suggests that when emotional intelligence is lower and the candidate is less preferred by voters, other variables may play a greater role in predicting competence ratings. What variables might account for the other 75% of

variance found in Kagen's competence ratings? As shown here, emotional intelligence certainly offers part of the explanation, but this study also raises the question of what other variables might affect perceptions of competence, especially when a candidate is not preferred. We know that emotional intelligence is a predictive variable for a winning candidate, but what other factors help to explain the data further for a losing candidate? Further research on this topic and answers to these questions might offer ways for a candidate to confront and address variables that affect competence when the candidate is not preferred and lagging in the polls.

The third research question asked if voter perceptions of candidate emotional intelligence are related to vote choice, and the results confirm that participants were more likely to vote for the candidate they ranked highest in emotional intelligence. It is also worth noting that Gard's supporters perceived his emotional intelligence to be higher than Kagen's supporters perceived Kagen's emotional intelligence. Specifically, Gard's voters rated John Gard's emotional intelligence higher ($M = 3.88$) than Kagen's voters rated Steve Kagen's emotional intelligence ($M = 3.70$); and Gard, who achieved the highest mean emotional intelligence score, was the highest vote getter with 61% of the overall vote.

The power of perceived emotional intelligence to affect vote choice is certainly suggested by these results. Vote preference is a complex choice affected by several factors. These results indicate that scholars may be able to add voters' perceptions about emotional intelligence to such concepts as rational choice and party cues (Blais, 2000; Menefee-Libey, 2000), which have previously been used to explain

vote choice. Certainly, emotional intelligence offers another concept to use to unpack the complex decision making process involved in vote choice.

The final research question sought to identify the relationship between participant emotional intelligence and perceived candidate emotional intelligence. Several factors regarding participant emotional intelligence were significantly related to participants' perceptions of candidate emotional intelligence, however, the correlations differed by candidate. As participants' self-perceptions about two factors of emotional intelligence increased—interpersonal skills and empathetic response—so did their perceptions of Steve Kagen's emotional intelligence. As participants' self-perceptions increased regarding the factors interpersonal skills and internal motivation, their perceptions of Gard's emotional intelligence also increased.

Interestingly, emotional intelligence ratings for each candidate were significantly correlated on participant interpersonal skills, but also correlated to a second and different factor of participant emotional intelligence. These findings raise the question of why differences in the significance of the factors might occur. One might argue it requires a degree of emotional intelligence to perceive emotional intelligence in others. Perhaps the messages and images the candidates chose to highlight in their advertisements account for the differences in which dimensions voters scored high in, when rating a candidate as having higher emotional intelligence.

Gard's advertisements showed him speaking directly into the camera, addressing the audience directly. A possible link might exist between this direct

communication style and being given a high emotional intelligence score by those who themselves scored high in interpersonal skills. Also, Gard's advertisements highlighted the theme of hard work and the belief that good, hard working people deserve good jobs. Gard was pictured outdoors at a road construction site, and the listener heard personal testimony from a union member. Along these same lines of middle class virtue and honest work, Gard attacked Kagen with the announcer proclaiming that, in contrast to Kagen, Gard is not a millionaire and has given any public pay raises he earned back to the people. Clearly, these themes might resonate with those voters inclined to rate themselves high in internal motivation. Despite not knowing the direct cause, it is interesting to note that the voter emotional intelligence factors that correlated to a higher Gard emotional intelligence score were linked thematically to the content of his advertisement.

The same observation can be made for Kagen's advertisements. A higher perceived emotional intelligence score for Kagen was correlated with voters' emotional intelligence scores in empathetic response and interpersonal skills. Kagen was pictured speaking with and interacting with constituents, staff, and his medical patients in the advertisements. He was engaged in physical action while walking with others, talking to voters, and actively listening to those in the camera shot with him. He was pictured shaking hands with others and wearing a white doctor's coat. The issues addressed include the rising cost of health care, a burden which Kagen said must be made more affordable. Also addressed were the issues of creating jobs, securing the borders, and reigning in the national debt. It is clear that Kagen had a

“you-focused” message. He appeared sympathetic to the problems of his constituents and the problems of the nation. It is not surprising that these themes might resonate with voters who rate themselves high in empathetic response. Kagen’s constant interaction with those in the ad might also account for his higher emotional intelligence scores from those rating themselves higher in interpersonal skills.

Both Kagen and Gard were given higher perceived emotional intelligence scores by voters who rated themselves high in interpersonal skills, and both candidates demonstrated interpersonal skills in their advertisements, although in different ways. Gard was more interactive in speaking directly to the viewer. Kagen demonstrated interpersonal skills by interacting with individuals around him in the ad who represented constituents, patients, and staff. In either case, this study does point to the significance of voters, rating themselves high in the dimension of interpersonal skill, perceiving to a greater extent a candidate as high in emotional intelligence. Further research is needed to answer the question of why these correlations exist, but this study does suggest that a significant link is present between rating high in the factors of emotional intelligence and perceiving emotional intelligence in a public figure, such as a political candidate.

The findings of this study— which suggest the real role emotional intelligence, both on the part of the voter and the candidate, can play in political perceptions— may have several behavioral and tactical implications for candidates and campaigns. In regard to the correlation between how voters perceive a candidate’s emotional intelligence and perceived candidate image, perceived

candidate competence, and candidate vote choice, candidates might want to make emotional intelligence a dimension that they intentionally cultivate in advertisements, personal interactions, and perhaps other public interactions beyond advertisements. Further research would be needed to identify the same dynamic at play for the role of emotional intelligence in public appearances, debates, and even print advertising, but this study suggests that emotional intelligence might prove to be a dimension for campaigns to add to the list of important image tools.

The relationship between voters' perceptions of candidates' emotional intelligence and the voters' perceptions of their own emotional intelligence might suggest, with further research, a new tool for voter profiling. If candidate image correlates with perceptions of higher candidate emotional intelligence, and rating a candidate higher in emotional intelligence is correlated with one's own higher rating on certain emotional intelligence dimensions, then the emotional intelligence of the voter may give us a tool to further understand voter behavior. A candidate might want to be mindful of the relationship between voters' emotional intelligence and perceptions of the candidate's own emotional intelligence when communicating with groups that have a high emotional intelligence potential, such as teachers, social workers, those in the helping professions, and those in the humanities and the arts. Although future research would be needed to substantiate these generalizations, this study certainly opens the door to asking such questions.

Limitations of the Study

Obviously, the use of a younger sample, experimental conditions, and the use of emotional intelligence inventories that continue to be perfected, all present limitations to the study. Middle aged or older voters might have more complex voting schemas, derived from the more complex financial situations, family burdens, and health care interests that come with age. With these life conditions, susceptibility to emotional intelligence or image perceptions might give way to a heavier concern over issues and policy. More past experience with the political process and elections might cause older voters to react differently than younger voters, who might be voting for the first time in a general or midterm election. In addition, the experimental design used in this study cannot mimic the exposure a voter would have to multiple campaign messages in the real world. The experiment also does not account for media messages and the overall political climate that affect the real world voter.

Emotional intelligence represents a new field of study, and several perspectives on the construct often compete. Debate has existed over the nature of the construct. Argument has emerged not only over how to break down the components of emotional intelligence, but also over what the nature of those components are, if defined as either inherent abilities or learned competencies. A movement to strengthen the validity of emotional intelligence measurements is in action, and the scales represented in this study emerge from those efforts. As suggested, several of the potential implications listed here require further research and study. Several questions present themselves that can be answered with further work

within this data set, and several questions have been presented here which will require other experimental designs.

Conclusions

However, these results do show an interesting and important link between emotional intelligence and political candidate image, vote choice, and the voter's own emotional intelligence. The major implication from these findings for political communication is the promise that perceptions about emotional intelligence hold for unpacking the behavioral aspects of image. In past studies, scholars have focused on image in terms of descriptive labels, but the construct of emotional intelligence offers a way to measure perceptions about the behaviors that create an image of leadership, empathy, or sociability. Emotional intelligence allows us to look beyond descriptors to behavior.

The study also offers implications for emotional intelligence as a construct. Previously taken as an interpersonal construct, this study stretches emotional intelligence beyond one-to-one contact or interactions. The strong reliability of the scales when used to perceive emotional intelligence across a mass medium such as advertising suggests that emotional intelligence need not be limited to person-to-person studies. This study suggests that emotional intelligence can be used to measure how one perceives a public figure and their public persona, stretching the study of emotional intelligence beyond actual interpersonal interaction. Further study may find an application for those outside of politics who rely on mass media to create their public image: public relations officials, corporate executives, emergency

managers, and even Hollywood celebrities. The implications for perceptions about emotional intelligence to affect public image are intriguing for the political realm and beyond.

REFERENCES

- Ashkanasy, N.M. & Daus, C.D. (2005). Rumors of the death of emotional intelligence in organizational behavior are vastly exaggerated. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 441-452.
- Barbuto, J.E. & Burbach, M.E. (2006). The emotional intelligence of transformational leaders: A field study of elected officials. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 146(1), 51-65.
- Barling, J., Slater, F., & Kelloway, K.E. (2000). Transformational leadership and emotional intelligence: An exploratory study. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, 21, 156-161.
- Blais, A. (2000). *To vote or not to vote?: The merits and limits of rational choice theory*. Pittsburgh, P.A.: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Boyatzis, R.E., Goleman, D. & Rhee, K. (2000). Clustering competence in emotional intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Competence Inventory. In R. Baron & J.D.A. (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence* (pp. 343-362). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Boyatzis, R.E. (2003). *Thematic coding- ECI competencies: Code Book for use with videotape and audio recordings*. Cited in Byrne, J.C., Smither, J.W., Reilly, R.R., & Dominick, P.G. (2005, April). *An examination of the discriminate, convergent, and criterion-related validity of the Emotional Competence Inventory*. Poster session presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, a Division of the American

Psychological Association, Los Angeles, CA.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper Colophon.

Byrne, J.C., Smither, J.W., Reilly, R.R., & Dominick, P.G. (2005, April). *An examination of the discriminate, convergent, and criterion-related validity of the Emotional Competence Inventory*. Poster session presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, a Division of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, CA.

Carson, K.D., Carson, P.P., and Birkenmeier, B.J. (2000). Measuring emotional intelligence: Development and validation of an instrument. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 2, 32-44.

Conte, J.M. (2005). A review and critique of emotional intelligence measures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 433-440.

Denton, E.D. & Woodward, G.C. (1998). *Political communication in America*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Edinger, L.J. (1975). The comparative analysis of political leadership. *Comparative Politics*, 7, 253-269.

George, J.M. (2000). Emotions and leadership: the role of emotional intelligence. *Human Relations*, 53, 1027-55.

Glaser, J. & Salovey, P. (1998). Affect in electoral politics. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2, 156-172.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. New York: Bantam.

- 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.
- Graber, D.A. (2002). *Mass media & American politics*. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.
- Hacker, K.L. (Ed.). (1995). *Candidate images in presidential elections*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Hacker, K.L. (Ed.). (2004). *Presidential candidate images*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Hargrove, E.C. (1998). *The president as leader: Appealing to the better angels of our nature*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press.
- Hellweg, S.A. (1979). An examination of voter conceptualization of the ideal political candidate. *The Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 44, 373-385.
- Hellweg, S.A. (2004). Campaigns and Candidate Images in American Presidential Elections. In, K.L. Hacker (Ed.), *Presidential candidate images* (pp. 21-47). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Joslyn, R.A. (1980). The content of political spot ads. *Journalism Quarterly*, 57, 92-98.
- Kaid, L.L. (1997). Effects of the television spots on images of Dole and Clinton. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40, 1085-1094.
- Kaid, L.L. (2002) Political advertisements and information seeking: Comparing

- exposure via traditional and internet channels. *Journal of Advertising*, 31, 27-35.
- Kaid, L.L. (2004). Measuring Candidate Images with Semantic Differentials. In K.L. Hacker (Ed.), *Presidential candidate images* (pp. 131-134). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Kaid, L.L. & Chanslor, M. (2004). The Effects of Political Advertising on Candidate Images. In K.L. Hacker (Ed.), *Presidential candidate images* (pp. 133-150). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Kaid, L.L. & Tedesco, J.C. (2003). Style and effects of the Bush and Gore spots. In L.L. Kaid, J.C. Tedesco, D.G. Bystrom, & M.S. McKinney (Eds.), *The Millennium Election: Communication in the 2000 Campaign*, (pp. 5-16). New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Keer, R., Garvin, J., Heaton, N., & Boyle, E. (2005). Emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 27, 265-279.
- Marcus, G.E. (2000). Emotion in politics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 3, 221-250.
- Marshall, T.R. (1983). Evaluating Presidential Nominees: Opinion polls, issues, and personalities. *Western Political Quarterly*, 3, 61-83.
- Menefee-Libey, D. (2000). *The triumph of campaign-centered politics*. New York: Chatham House Publishers.
- Natchez, P.B. & Bupp, I.C. (1968). Candidates, issues, and voters. *Public Policy*, 17,

409-437.

Nimmo, D. & Savage, R.L. (1976). *Candidates and their images: Concepts, methods, and findings*. Palisades, CA: Goodyear Publishing Company.

Perry-Giles, T. & Perry-Giles, S.J. (1996). Political scopophilia, presidential campaigning, and the intimacy of American politics. *Communication Studies*, 47, 191-205.

Roberts, C. (1981). From primary to the presidency: A panel study of images and issues in the 1976 election. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 45, 60-70.

Salmore, S.A. & Salmore, B.G. (1985). *Candidates, parties, and campaigns*. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly.

Salovey, P. & Mayer, J.D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, 9, 185-211.

Seligman, L.G. (1950). The study of political leadership. *The American Political Science Review*, 44, 904-915.

Sosik, J.J. & Megerian, L.E. (1999). Understanding leader emotional intelligence and performance: The role of self-other agreement on transformational leadership perceptions. *Group & Organizational Management*, 24, 367-390.

Stephen, T., Harrison, T.M., Husson, W., & Albert, D. (2004). Interpersonal communication styles of political candidates: Predicting winning and losing candidates in three U.S. Presidential Elections. In K.L. Hacker (Ed.), *Presidential candidate images* (pp. 177-196). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield

Publishers, Inc.

- Stroud, L.R., Glaser, J., & Salovey, P. (2005). The effects of partisanship and candidate emotionality on voter preference. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality, 25*(1), 24-44.
- Tedesco, J.C. (2002). Televised political advertising effects: Evaluating responses during the 2000 Robb-Allen senatorial election. *Journal of Advertising, 31*, 37-48.
- Thurow, G.E. (1996). Dimensions of presidential character. In M.J. Medhurst, (Ed.), *Beyond the rhetorical presidency* (pp. 15-39). College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press.
- Trent, J.S., Mongeau, P.A., Trent, J.D., Kendall, K.E., & Cushing, R.B. (1993). The ideal candidate: A study of the desired attributes of the public and the media across two presidential campaigns. *American Behavioral Scientist, 37*, 225-239.
- Trent, J.S., Short-Thompson, C., Mongeau, P.A., Metzler, M.S., & Trent, J.D., (2005). The idealized presidential candidate: A vision over time. *American Behavior Scientist, 49*, 130-156.
- Trent, J.S., Short-Thompson, C., Mongeau, P.A., Nusz, A.K., & Trent, J.D. (2001). Image, media bias, and voter characteristics: The ideal candidate from 1988-2000. *American Behavioral Scientist, 44*, 2101-2124.
- Trent, J.S., Trent, J.D., Mongeau, P.A., & Short-Thompson, C. (1997). The ideal candidate revisited: A study of the desired attributes of the public and the

media across three presidential campaigns. *American Behavioral Scientist*,
40, 1001-1019.

APPENDIX A: SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Survey ID Number (below, place the *first 2 letters of your last name*, and *last 4 digits of your student ID #*):

_____ _____ _____ _____
(*first 2 letters of last name*) (*last 4 digits of your student ID #*)

Please mark one:

_____ male _____ female

Age _____

Which of the following best represents your ethnic background (*circle one*):

(1) Asian or Pacific Islander (2) Non-Hispanic White (Caucasian) (3) African-American

(4) Spanish or Hispanic origin (5) Multi-racial or mixed race (6) Native American

(7) Other (*name*): _____

Are you registered to vote? (*circle one*)

(1) YES

(2) NO

When thinking about politics and government, do you consider yourself to be (*please circle*):

very
conservative

somewhat
conservative

moderate

somewhat
liberal

very
liberal

Which of the following best represents your political party affiliation? Check **ONLY ONE** of the following:

(1) _____ Democrat (2) _____ Republican (3) _____ Independent/Unaffiliated

(4) _____ Other (*name*): _____

Please answer the following questions about how you perceive the following traits in yourself. If there is an answer you are unsure of, answer with your first “gut level” reaction.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
a. I am keenly aware of the feelings of other people	5	4	3	2	1
b. I am gifted at sensing what others around me are feeling	5	4	3	2	1
c. I pick up the subtle signals of feelings from another person	5	4	3	2	1
d. I have good insight into how others are feeling	5	4	3	2	1
e. I am astute at reading others’ reactions and feelings	5	4	3	2	1
f. My emotions are often out of control*	5	4	3	2	1
g. I can often shrug off a foul mood and go on with my day	5	4	3	2	1
h. I feel negative emotions more strongly than other people*	5	4	3	2	1
i. I can regulate my moods so that they don’t overwhelm me	5	4	3	2	1
j. I have emotional battles inside me that interfere with my thoughts*	5	4	3	2	1
k. My feelings are so intense that I often feel overwhelmed*	5	4	3	2	1
l. I have good people skills	5	4	3	2	1
m. People seem to avoid interacting with me*	5	4	3	2	1
n. I am good at interpersonal relationships	5	4	3	2	1
o. Socially, I could be described as awkward*	5	4	3	2	1
p. I have good social skills	5	4	3	2	1
q. I could be described as a good team player	5	4	3	2	1
r. I have the will to accomplish my goals	5	4	3	2	1
s. I am almost always enthusiastic about pursuing my goals	5	4	3	2	1
t. I relentlessly pursue any personal or work-related goals I set	5	4	3	2	1

u. I have too little motivation to try hard enough to do well*	5	4	3	2	1
v. I consistently pursue any personal or work-related goals I set	5	4	3	2	1
w. I consistently pursue important goals	5	4	3	2	1
x. I am what others call a “self-starter”	5	4	3	2	1
y. I am always aware of my moods	5	4	3	2	1
z. I have good insight into what makes me tick	5	4	3	2	1
aa. I have difficulty describing my feelings to others	5	4	3	2	1
bb. I can’t put my feelings into words*	5	4	3	2	1
cc. Other people have to point out that I’m in a nasty mood before I realize it myself*	5	4	3	2	1
dd. Sometimes I’m in a foul mood and don’t even know it*	5	4	3	2	1

STOP HERE

CLOSE YOUR SURVEY AND RELAX FOR A MOMENT.

THE GROUP FACILIATOR WILL GIVE YOU INSTRUCTIONS FOR CONTINUING

**DO NOT PROCEED WITH THIS SURVEY
UNTIL AFTER THE PROGRAM HAS ENDED**

Next, please evaluate the candidates on each of the scales below. For example, if you think the candidate is **very pleasant** you would check the **UNPLEASANT-PLEASANT** scale as follows:

UNPLEASANT: _____:_____X_____PLEASANT

On the other hand, if you think a candidate is **very unpleasant**, you would rate them as follows:

UNPLEASANT: X_____PLEASANT

If you think the candidate is somewhere between the two extremes, check the space that best represents your reaction on the scale. If you feel you have **no reaction** to a particular candidate on **any one scale** or if you're **unfamiliar with the candidate**, check the middle space on the scale (as illustrated) to indicate your neutrality.

: _____:_____X_____:

John Gard

UNQUALIFIED: _____:_____QUALIFIED

UNSOPHISTICATED: _____:_____SOPHISTICATED

DISHONEST: _____:_____HONEST

BELIEVABLE: _____:_____UNBELIEVABLE*

UNSUCCESSFUL: _____:_____SUCCESSFUL

ATTRACTIVE: _____:_____UNATTRACTIVE*

UNFRIENDLY: _____:_____FRIENDLY

INSINCERE: _____:_____SINCERE

CALM: _____:_____EXCITABLE*

AGGRESSIVE: _____:_____UNAGGRESSIVE*

STRONG: _____:_____WEAK*

INACTIVE: _____:_____ACTIVE

Which is more descriptive of John Gard?

Liberal: _____:_____Conservative

Democrat: _____:_____Republican

Answer the following questions regarding your perception of John Gard. In some cases you may not be able to directly know the answer, but do your best to answer based on the overall impression you gained from the candidate by watching their ads. If there is an answer you are unsure of, answer with your first “gut level” reaction.

<u>For John Gard</u>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Candidate recognizes their emotions and the effects of their emotions (expresses feelings willingly)	5	4	3	2	1
Candidate has an accurate self assessment (appears to know their own strengths and weaknesses)	5	4	3	2	1
Candidate has a strong sense of self-worth (shows they are confident in their abilities and capabilities)	5	4	3	2	1
Candidate takes responsibility for their own performance (offers a sense that they are concerned with accuracy and being conscientious)	5	4	3	2	1
Candidate is flexible in responding to change (might change ideas or perceptions based on new information)	5	4	3	2	1
Candidate is striving to improve or meet a standard of excellence (sets challenging goals and wants to improve the status quo, appears to understand the costs and benefits involved)	5	4	3	2	1
Candidate appears proactive (focused on action and opportunities)	5	4	3	2	1
Candidate is concerned with understanding others (senses others feelings, perspectives, and concerns)	5	4	3	2	1
Candidate appears to accurately read the social and political currents (accurately assess relationships both personally and globally)	5	4	3	2	1
Candidate leads with a sense of mission, vision, and a clear set of standards (inspires others to action)	5	4	3	2	1

Candidate appears skilled at influence and persuasion (uses factual arguments, capable of gaining the buy-in of influential entities)	5	4	3	2	1
Candidate sends convincing messages (has an appropriate concern for the effect of tone of voice, visual cues, and the audience's emotional reaction)	5	4	3	2	1
Candidate brings disagreements and grievances into the open (works toward a common understanding, focuses on issues or actions in a conflict rather than the person)	5	4	3	2	1
Candidate appears to foster collaboration (expresses respect for others, values and seeks others' input, has a desire to cooperate toward shared goals)	5	4	3	2	1

Please evaluate Steven Kagen on the scales below:

Steven Kagen

- UNQUALIFIED: ____:____:____:____:____:____:____:QUALIFIED
- UNSOPHISTICATED: ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: SOPHISTICATED
- DISHONEST: ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: HONEST
- BELIEVABLE: ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: UNBELIEVABLE
- UNSUCCESSFUL: ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: SUCCESSFUL
- ATTRACTIVE: ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: UNATTRACTIVE
- UNFRIENDLY: ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: FRIENDLY
- INSINCERE: ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: SINCERE
- CALM: ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: EXCITABLE
- AGGRESSIVE: ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: UNAGGRESSIVE
- STRONG: ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: WEAK
- INACTIVE: ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: ACTIVE

Which is more descriptive of Steven Kagen?

- Liberal: ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Conservative
- Democrat: ____:____:____:____:____:____:____: Republican

Answer the following questions regarding your perception of Steven Kagen. In some cases you may not be able to directly know the answer, but do your best to answer based on the overall impression you gained from the candidate by watching their ads. If there is an answer you are unsure of, answer with your first “gut level” reaction.

<u>For Steven Kagen</u>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Candidate recognizes their emotions and the effects of their emotions (expresses feelings willingly)	5	4	3	2	1
Candidate has an accurate self assessment (appears to know their own strengths and weaknesses)	5	4	3	2	1
Candidate has a strong sense of self-worth (shows they are confident in their abilities and capabilities)	5	4	3	2	1
Candidate takes responsibility for their own performance (offers a sense that they are concerned with accuracy and being conscientious)	5	4	3	2	1
Candidate is flexible in responding to change (might change ideas or perceptions based on new information)	5	4	3	2	1
Candidate is striving to improve or meet a standard of excellence (sets challenging goals and wants to improve the status quo, appears to understand the costs and benefits involved)	5	4	3	2	1
Candidate appears proactive (focused on action and opportunities)	5	4	3	2	1
Candidate is concerned with understanding others (senses others feelings, perspectives, and concerns)	5	4	3	2	1
Candidate appears to accurately read the social and political currents (accurately assess relationships both personally and globally)	5	4	3	2	1
Candidate leads with a sense of mission, vision, and a clear set of standards (inspires others to action)	5	4	3	2	1

Candidate appears skilled at influence and persuasion (uses factual arguments, capable of gaining the buy-in of influential entities)	5	4	3	2	1
Candidate sends convincing messages (has an appropriate concern for the effect of tone of voice, visual cues, and the audience's emotional reaction)	5	4	3	2	1
Candidate brings disagreements and grievances into the open (works toward a common understanding, focuses on issues or actions in a conflict rather than the person)	5	4	3	2	1
Candidate appears to foster collaboration (expresses respect for others, values and seeks others' input, has a desire to cooperate toward shared goals)	5	4	3	2	1

Please consider the candidate **John Gard** again. *Based only on the ads* that you have just seen, please evaluate John Gard on the following:

John Gard

- a. working with health care issues Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- b. is a charismatic leader Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- c. has a vision for the future of the state Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- d. could resolve education funding issues Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- e. effectiveness with monetary policy Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- f. making tough decisions Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- g. able to handle a crisis Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- h. is a strong leader Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- i. responsiveness to constituents Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- j. ability to compromise with other party Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- k. honesty Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- l. emotional stability Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- m. will use logical decision making Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- n. compassion Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- o. decisiveness Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- p. competence Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak

Please consider the candidate **Steven Kagen** again. *Based only on the ads* that you have just seen, please evaluate Steven Kagen on the following:

Steven Kagen

- a. working with health care issues Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- b. is a charismatic leader Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- c. has a vision for the future of the state Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- d. could resolve education funding issues Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- e. effectiveness with monetary policy Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- f. making tough decisions Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- g. able to handle a crisis Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- h. is a strong leader Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- i. responsiveness to constituents Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- j. ability to compromise with other party Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- k. honesty Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- l. emotional stability Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- m. will use logical decision making Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- n. compassion Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- o. decisiveness Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak
- p. competence Strong 5:____:____:____:____:____:1 Weak

If the election for this race were held today, based on what you have seen for whom would you vote?

John Gard _____

Steven Kagen _____

APENDIX B: INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Information Statement – Agreement to Participate Research Conducted at the University of Kansas – Lawrence Campus

Sponsor: Department of Communication Studies
Principal Investigator: Mary Banwart, Ph.D.

This form represents the subject's informed consent to participate voluntarily in a research project on political communication. Subjects will view communication messages and respond to questions via an online survey. The research will require from 15 minutes to 1 hour of time. You must be 18 years of age or older to participate.

The Department of Communication Studies at the University of Kansas supports the practice of protection for human subjects participating in research. You may refuse to participate in this study. The following information is provided for you to decide whether you wish to participate in the present study. You should be aware that even if you agree to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time; however, completion of the survey is required in order to receive participation points. If you do withdraw from this study, it will not affect your relationship with this unit, the services it may provide to you, or the University of Kansas.

This research involves no risk to subjects. Benefits of the study may involve new information regarding those who participate in our political system.

All records and data related to this research shall be confidential, and subjects or their responses will not be identified by name.

For any additional information on this research or your rights as a subject, you may contact Mary Banwart, Department of Communication Studies, 864-5681. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact the Human Subjects Committee-Lawrence Campus.

PARTICIPATION CERTIFICATION:

Completion of this survey indicates that you are a willing participant, at least 18 years old, and have read this Information Statement. You have had the opportunity to ask, and have received answers to, any questions you had regarding the study and the use and disclosure of information about me for the study. If you have any additional questions about your rights as a research participant, you may call (785) 864-7429 or write the Human Subjects Committee Lawrence Campus (HSCL), University of Kansas, 2385 Irving Hill Road, Lawrence, Kansas 66045-7563, email dhann@ku.edu.

APPENDIX C: DATA TABLES

Table 1: Bivariate Linear Regression, Candidate EI and Competence

Candidate	<i>r</i>	<u>R square</u>	<u>F</u>	<i>p</i>
John Gard	.68	.41	95.28	.001
Steve Kagen	.50	.25	48.98	.001

Note: Competence scores were rated on a scale of 1 = weak, 5 = strong. Sample size for John Gard = 114, sample size for Steve Kagen = 152.

Table 2: Correlations Between Candidate EI and Self EI Factors

Candidate	<u>Self EI Factors</u>				
	<u>Empathetic Response</u>	<u>Mood Regulation</u>	<u>Interpersonal Skills</u>	<u>Internal Motivation</u>	<u>Self Awareness</u>
John Gard EI	-.02	.06	.20*	.16*	-.01
Steve Kagen EI	.20*	.03	.17*	.04	.12

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level