Summer 8-2012

The Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence of School Principals and Their Ability to Identify the Strengths or Talents of a Member of Their Leadership Team

Angela Luther Bare
University of Southern Mississippi

The University of Southern Mississippi

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE OF

SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AND THEIR ABILITY TO IDENTIFY THE STRENGTHS

OR TALENTS OF A MEMBER OF THEIR LEADERSHIP TEAM

by

Angela Luther Bare

Abstract of a Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate School
Of the University of Southern Mississippi
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

August 2012

ABSTRACT

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE OF

SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AND THEIR ABILITY TO IDENTIFY THE STRENGTHS

OR TALENTS OF A MEMBER OF THEIR LEADERSHIP TEAM

by Angela Luther Bare

August 2012

The role of high school administrators has become increasingly complex, as many school populations have reached the thousands. The responsibilities placed before school administrators, particularly principals' responsibilities, mirrors that of city management. School leaders are charged with the challenges of exhibiting expertise in the fields of educational leadership, instruction, facilities management all while developing and implementing a school mission with sincere purpose for the students and school community. Additionally, school administrators must be able to address the social-emotional needs of their staffs, students and school community. The purpose of this study was to illuminate effective leadership through an exploration of the relationship between emotional intelligence of school principals and their ability to identify the strengths or talents of a member of their leadership team.

There were a total of 52 participants in this study, which consisted of 26 principals and 26 assistant principals/assistant administrators from all three school levels: elementary, middle, and high. The administrative participants were pairs; each participating principal was randomly paired with an assistant principal/assistant administrator from their school. The principals completed the Bar-On EQ-i 125

Emotional Intelligence Quotient Inventory, a survey, and a rating form in which they scored their paired administrator from a scale of 1-10, with increments of .10 on each of the StrengthsFinder Profile themes. The assistant principal/assistant administrator completed the StrengthsFinder Profile, and reported their top five strength themes. In order to examine the relationship between emotional intelligence and the number of matched themes between the principal rating and the assistant principal/assistant administrator's results from the self-reporting StrengthsFinder Profile, correlation coefficients were calculated. Multiple regression techniques were used to explore the relationship between emotional intelligence scores, number of matched strengths, number of years the administrative pair had worked together and the total number of years the principal had served in the role of the principal.

The correlation analysis revealed that there was no relationship between a principals' emotional intelligence and their ability to identify the top five strengths of their assistant principal/assistant administrator. Findings from the study may be used to restructure professional development for principals in order to increase their effectiveness as leaders, particularly in the area of strengths based leadership.

The University of Southern Mississippi

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE OF

SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AND THEIR ABILITY TO IDENTIFY THE STRENGTHS

OR TALENTS OF A MEMBER OF THEIR LEADERSHIP TEAM

by

Angela Luther Bare

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate School
Of the University of Southern Mississippi
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Approved

Rose McNeese_____
Director

David E. Lee_____

Tammy Greer_____

Ronald Styron_____

Susan A. Siltanen_____
Dean of Graduate School

August 2012

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my family, and especially my children: Bliss, Brock and Bryce Caroline. I love you guys, way up past heaven. Ultimately, my children paid the largest sacrifice. Thank you Bliss, Brock and Bryce Caroline for being so very patient with me while I sat for hours at the dining table completing my assignments, and finally near the end writing the dissertation. It's been three long years and you guys have been my driving force. When obligations became demanding, I would look at you and know that you also were learning in this process as I saw the importance of planting those scholarly seeds! And to Cinderella (my mother!)…I hope you understand the impact you have had on me as a person. You have been an incredible role model, showing me all throughout my life how important it is to keep pushing forward and improving in everything I do.

To the Golden family: thank you for providing me with an incredible sense of peace. You have been amazing friends, and I will never be able to adequately express the gratitude I have for all of the time and energy you have put into my children. We are all so very lucky to have you in our lives. Charlece and David, you are so loved. As Mother of Teresa of Calcutta once stated, " Spread love everywhere you go: First of all in your own house... let no one ever come to you without leaving better and happier. Be the living expression of God's kindness; kindness in your face, kindness in your eyes, kindness in your smile, kindness in your warm greeting."

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writing of this dissertation has been one of the most significant academic challenges I have ever had to face. Without the support, patience and guidance of the following people, this study would never have come to full bloom. It is to them that I owe my deepest gratitude.

To Jan Fendig, my forever friend. Thank you for helping me process my thoughts, frustrations and enthusiasm from the beginning of this project to the very end. Your inspiration, insight and dedication to our friendship and my scholarly growth have been without fail. In the world of friendships, I consider you my soulmate.

To Catherine Mallanda, my friend and colleague. You were our fearless leader from the very beginning of the process, and without your organizational strengths and crazy smart math mind I would never have made it through the statistical analysis. You are true to the core, and I am proud to call you my friend.

To Paul Damico, President of Moe's Southwest Grill. Thank you for helping fund the StrengthsFinder Profile for the research.

To Dr. Larry Sparkman for his assistance in establishing access and execution of the Bar-On EQ-i 125 Emotional Intelligence assessment for the participating principals.

I would also like to express my deepest gratitude to Dr. Rose McNeese, chair of my committee and the other members: Dr. Tammy Greer, Dr. Ronald Styron and Dr. David Lee. Thank you for your excellent guidance throughout this process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTERS

        Introduction to the Study
        Background of the Problem
        Theoretical Foundation
        Problem Statement
        Statement of Purpose
        Research Questions
        Methodology
        Assumptions
        Delimitations
        Definition of Terms
        Summary and Organization of the Study

        Introduction
        Theoretical Framework
        Leadership and Leadership Teams
        Theories and Perspectives of Effective School Leadership
        Emotional Intelligence
        Emotional Intelligence and Leadership
        Strengths Based Leadership
        Summary

LIST OF TABLES

Table

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Introduction to the Study

The role of high school administrators has become increasingly complex (Fullan,

1998). With student enrollment in some high schools numbering in the thousands, the

roles of the principal and assistant principal mirror those of city management. In addition

to overseeing the student population in terms of academics and safety, school

administrators are responsible for managing the overall structure and scheduling of the

school, which includes athletic programs, fine arts programs and various clubs and

organizations within the school. Additionally, school administrators are considered

leaders in the quest for increasing academic achievement and implementing necessary

reform in education.   School administrators face the daunting challenge of improving

academic achievement for all children, in all types of environments. The purpose of this

study is to examine the relationship between effective leadership, emotional intelligence

of high school principals and their ability to identify the top five strengths or talents of a

member of their leadership team.

Background of the Problem

Many have argued that effective leadership skills require an understanding of

emotions and abilities associated with emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1998; Palmer,

Walls, Burgess, & Stough, 2001). Emotional intelligence (EQ) is defined by Goleman

(1998) as the capacity for recognizing our own feelings and those of others, for

motivating ourselves, and for managing emotions effectively in self and others. Bar-On

(1997a) defines emotional intelligence as "an array of non-cognitive capabilities,

competencies, and skills that influence one's ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures" (p.14). Dealing effectively with emotions can contribute to how effective leaders handle the needs of individuals, how they motivate others, and how they foster a sense of belonging in the workplace (Goleman, 1998). During the last two decades research has indicated that there is a relationship between emotional intelligence and job performance. Studies from Goleman (1998) indicate that for jobs of all kinds, emotional intelligence is a more important variable for outstanding performance than cognitive ability and technical skill combined, and the higher that individuals climb within an organization, the more important these qualities are for success in leadership positions. Emotional intelligence assessments developed by four prominent psychologists and researchers, Salovey, Mayer, Bar-On & Goleman, have opened the door for examining the research between emotional intelligence and job performance (Patti & Tobin, 2006). In the field of educational leadership, the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) has examined critical leadership behaviors of principals, and the cross analysis of all of these behaviors reveals many of the emotional intelligence competencies (Patti & Tobin, 2006). A meta-analysis of 69 emotional intelligence studies conducted by Van Rooy and Viswesvaran (2004) concluded that emotional intelligence could be considered a valuable predictor of job performance (Van Rooy & Viswesvaran, 2004). In addition, a study of 464 elementary through high school principals in Ontario, Canada, focusing on identifying key emotional and social competencies required by school administrators, confirmed that emotional intelligence was a significant predictor of successful school administration (Stone, Parker, & Wood, 2005).

Emotional intelligence can be nurtured, developed and augmented; it is not a trait that is either present or not (Weisinger, 1998). The corporate world has been tapping into emotional competence/awareness coaching for years. Many companies and organizations have referred to Bolman & Deal's Reframing Organizations theory when working with upper level management (Bolman & Deal, 2008). In *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice and Leadership*, Bolman and Deal used a case study approach to illustrate the effectiveness of making administration on leadership teams aware of the importance of having clear definitions of roles and relationships (Bolman & Deal, 2008). In another case study, Moore (2007) investigated the effects of emotional intelligence coaching and perceptions that educational administrators held. As expected, the data revealed that school administrators were faced with a variety of emotions with their job positions, and both the qualitative data and the quantitative data indicate that coaching administrators in the skills of emotional intelligence was beneficial (Moore, 2007). In the past, traditional graduate programs that prepared educators for their roles in leadership positions focused on curriculum development, finance, law and organizational theory. However, the work of Goleman (1998) in regard to increasing awareness of emotional intelligence, has spread across many facets of organizations. No longer are the high level corporate executives the only ones taking a close look at emotional competencies and the effect on leadership; school systems are increasingly examining emotional intelligence within school and system level leadership positions.

The push for accountability in the school setting has highlighted the need for effective school leadership. Research suggests that effective leadership is vital to the successful functioning of elementary, middle and high schools (Marzano, Waters &

McNulty, 2005). As school leadership teams take on increasing responsibilities, the

identification of strengths of individual team members plays a key role in establishing

effective leadership practices. Rath and Conchie (2008) support strengths based

leadership, noting that effective leaders surround themselves with the right people and

build on each person's strengths. Unfortunately, rarely are individuals recruited to

leadership teams because the strengths they exhibit make them a good compliment to

those of existing team members (Rath & Conchie, 2008).

<div align="center">Theoretical Foundations</div>

Effective Leadership

As leadership continues to be a focal point for school reform, empirical data

continue to support the positive correlation between emotional intelligence and effective

leadership (Moore, 2009). Effective leaders possess the ability to understand and

"manage moods and emotions in self and others" (George, 2000). Understanding the

emotional needs of others is critical, particularly for those in leadership positions. Many

U.S. schools, particularly at the high school level, have reached student population sizes

comparable to small universities or small towns. The increasing demands placed on

school administrators have proven to be very stressful, as their daily tasks have grown to

include more than what can be accomplished in a typical school day. School

administrators are viewed as the leadership team of the school. Much of what is known

about school leadership is based upon teachers' perceptions of leadership practices

(Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000).

The style with which a leader approaches interaction can either energize or have a

negative motivational effect on people (Goleman, 2006). Reeves (2006) discussed

relational leadership, and the positive impact that the development of trust and integrity has as the foundation of any enduring relationship. According to Kouzes and Posner (2002), leadership is "a relationship between those who aspire to lead and those who choose to follow" (p. 20).

Leadership Team Structure

School administrators are typically members of a leadership team. In education, leadership is a complex and demanding position. The creation of effective leadership teams is important to school success and student achievement. Administrative positions, however, are held by individuals who possess unique personal strengths and weaknesses. Furthermore, leadership teams at all school levels shift due to reassignments, retirement, promotions or other personal reasons. Research has been very clear: leadership has a direct effect on the organization of the school, school ethos, teacher efficacy, the morale of the staff and the teachers' attitude toward any change that may result from reform movements (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000). The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCBL, 2002) has placed increasing demands of accountability on the shoulders of leadership teams within the school, particularly principals. Reeves (2008) suggested that teachers must work closely with their principals as leaders, stating "A radical transformation toward leadership is not an option; it is a necessity" (p. 16). Increasingly, schools develop various types of leadership teams within the faculty. High schools typically have department chairs for each academic area, and they serve as leaders within that department. Well-trained, competent school-level leadership is necessary for student achievement. Awareness of self-weaknesses and strengths is vital for school leaders, particularly those in administrative positions. Leadership teams within schools typically

have specific assignments of leadership duties. Optimally, an alignment of individual strengths with job responsibilities should occur.

Emotional Intelligence

Emotional intelligence is the ability to understand and recognize one's emotions and the emotions of others, and the ability to use this awareness to manage one's behavior and relationships (Bradberry & Greaves, 2009). Emotional intelligence cannot be predicted based on a person's cognitive intelligence, or IQ; there is no known connection between IQ and EQ (Bradberry & Greaves, 2009). Emotional intelligence is an array of skills that can be learned through awareness and coaching. While some people are born with a naturally higher level of emotional intelligence than others, emotional intelligence can be developed.

Mayer and Salovey (1997) define emotional intelligence in terms of five domains: knowing one's emotions, managing emotions, motivating oneself, recognizing emotions in others, and handling relationships. This theory of emotional intelligence focuses on one's ability to cognitively manage emotions. Bradberry and Greaves (2009) identify four skills of emotional intelligence: self- awareness, self- management, social awareness, and relationship management. Self-awareness and self -management fall under a larger category of personal competencies, and social awareness and relationship management fall under a larger category of social competence.

Effective school leadership continues to be a focal point for increasing student achievement. A host of research strongly supports the theory that increasing levels of emotional intelligence improves leadership. Moore (2009) and other researchers, have

reported that school leaders with high emotional intelligence may be better at influencing, inspiring, intellectually stimulating and nurturing those around them.

Strengths Based Leadership

With the increased focus on accountability, school leaders face the challenge of demonstrating effective leadership. In Strengths Based Leadership, Rath and Conchie (2008) identify three keys to being a more effective leader: knowing one's strengths and investing in others' strengths, getting people with the right strengths on one's team, and understanding and meeting the four basic needs of those who look to one for leadership. In an effort to understand one's talents or strengths, the Gallup Organization has conducted over two million interviews throughout the last 30 years to examine what allowed leaders to excel in their leadership role, and from this research 34 talent *themes* were identified and the *StrengthsFinder Profile* was created (Buckingham & Clifton, 2001).

Research in school leadership has begun to consider the role emotions play in relations among various faculty members, particularly those of school leaders (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Bradberry & Greaves, 2009; Buckingham & Clifton, 2001; Goleman, 2006; Kouzes and Posner, 2002; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000; Marzano et al., 2005; Patti & Tobin, 2006; Rath & Conchie, 2008; Reeves, 2006). In order to meet job expectations with success, it has become necessary for school leaders to understand their own strengths and weaknesses, including both their perceptions and the perceptions of others. Furthermore, increased awareness of one's emotional intelligence and strategies for increasing emotional intelligence can guide school leaders toward greater efficacy in their positions. Emotional intelligence seems critical to success. Research suggests that

emotional intelligence accounts for 58% of performance in all types of jobs (Bradberry & Greaves, 2009). Furthermore, Bradberry and Greaves (2009) found that 90% of high performers are also high in emotional intelligence, while only 20% of low performers are high in emotional intelligence. Performance was initially a term coined in the business industry, however more and more the term, performance, is used school settings.

One of the most important competencies of emotional intelligence is empathy. Empathy is the ability to understand the perspectives and feelings of another person. Empirical work focused on the construct of empathy among educational leaders has offered some insight. Empathy provides the school leader with a social awareness needed to accomplish essential tasks in the school setting (Patti & Tobin, 2006). Empathy also enables school leaders to have a better understanding of diversity and how to navigate through the boundless intricacies of district politics and it assists with the many social interactions that school leaders face on a daily basis (Patti & Tobin, 2006).

Problem Statement

Much research exists on emotional intelligence and the impact it has on effective leadership practices. There is limited research, however, on the relationship between effective leadership, emotional intelligence, and job responsibilities assigned to school administrators within an administrative team.

Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this study is to illuminate effective leadership through an exploration of the relationship between emotional intelligence of school principals, and their ability to identify the top five strengths or talents of a member of their leadership team using the StrengthsFinder Profile. Although not an expressed purpose of this study,

it is expected that participation in the StrengthsFinder Profile will provide a language through which administrators can begin a new dialogue within their team.

Research Questions

This study will address the following research questions:

1. Do emotional intelligence levels of principals have an impact on their ability to identify the top five strengths of their assistant principals/assistant administrators?

2. Does the length of time a school principal and assistant principal/assistant administrator work together have an impact on a principal's ability to identify the strengths of the assistant principal/assistant administrator?

3. Does the length of time a school principal serves in the role of principal have an impact on a principal's ability to identify the strengths of an assistant principal/assistant administrator on their administrative team?

Methodology

This study will be implemented in a large school district, which has 111 schools and over 106,000 students, located in the southeastern part of the United States. Once permission is received from the district level representatives, the study will be carried out in the district's elementary, middle and high schools. All elementary schools have a principal and at least one assistant principal, all middle schools have a principal and two assistant principals/assistant administrators, and all high schools have a principal and at least four assistant principals/assistant administrators.

Procedure

Permission will be obtained from the school district to communicate with all school level administrators regarding their willingness to participate in the study. All principals who participate will be given the EQ-i (Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory) along with a survey for gathering additional demographic information. The survey will also include an opportunity for qualitative data to be gathered through open response questions. An assistant principal or assistant administrator from each school will be invited to participate in the study as well by completing the *StrengthsFinder Profile*, which is a self-reporting instrument that measures self-perception of strengths. Those individuals will be provided with *StrengthsFinders 2.0*, the most current edition which will contain an access code that will enable the completion of the StrengthsFinders Profile online. The assistant principals/assistant administrators will also be asked to complete a brief survey that will gather additional demographic information and an opportunity for qualitative data to be collected through open- response questions. The methodological approach of this study will consider both quantitative and qualitative data. Quantitative data from the emotional intelligence testing and the StrengthsFinder Profile will be examined. Qualitative data will be used from the open-ended survey questions.

Assumptions

The researcher assumes that the participants will respond honestly to the study survey, emotional intelligence test questions, and questions on the StrengthsFinder profile. It is likewise assumed that the assistant principals and assistant administrators at

each of the participating schools in the district will follow through with the directions and observations with the purpose intended.

<div align="center">Delimitations</div>

This study includes principals from a large school district in the southeastern United States, and one additional administrator (assistant principal/assistant administrator) from their leadership teams.

<div align="center">Definition of Terms</div>

For the purpose of this study, the following terms are defined:

Emotional Intelligence: Bar-On (1997) defined emotional intelligence as "an array of non-cognitive capabilities, competencies, and skills that influence one's ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures" (p.14).

EQ-i: The BarOn Emotional Quotient Inventory, developed by Reuven Bar-On is a self-report measure of emotionally and socially intelligent behavior that provides an estimate of emotional-social intelligence (Bar-On, 1997).

Leadership: Leadership is a relationship between those who aspire to lead and those who choose to follow. (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Leadership Team: A leadership team is the administrative team at each school consisting of the principal and all assistant principals and assistant administrators.

Positive Psychology: Positive Psychology is an emerging school of thought within psychology that focuses on optimal well- being rather than the treatment of pathology (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000).

Signature Themes: The five dominant themes identified by the StrengthsFinder Profile that highlights an individual's dominant pattern of thought, feeling or behavior are referred to as signature themes (Buckingham & Clifton, 2001).

Strengths: The ability to provide consistent, near-perfect performance in a given activity is considered a strength (Buckingham & Clifton, 2001).

StrengthsFinder Profile: The StrengthsFinder Profile is a web-based instrument containing 180 items, each listing a pair of self-descriptors. These self-descriptors are then grouped into thirty four themes, of which the top five are identified for each participant to highlight their strengths (Buckingham & Clifton, 2001).

Talents: Our naturally recurring patterns of thought, feeling, or behavior, that can be productively applied to create the greatest opportunity for success are considered talents (Clifton & Harter, 2003).

<p align="center">Summary and Organization of the Study</p>

This dissertation responds to the increasing challenges presented to leadership teams in schools by using the Bar-On EQ-i Emotional Quotient Inventory to assess emotional intelligence of principals and the StrengthsFinders Profile to identify strengths of assistant principals. This study establishes links among emotional intelligence, the identification of strengths of members of leadership teams, and effective school leadership.

The remainder of this dissertation will be separated into four chapters. Chapter II will present a literature review of the history and current work regarding leadership, effective school leadership, emotional intelligence and strengths-based leadership. Chapter III will discuss the methodology of the study including the sample,

instrumentation and limitations. Chapter IV will present the results of this study and related research findings. Chapter V will conclude the dissertation and analysis of the study findings, the theoretical implications, practical implications and a summary.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Commensurate with the purpose of this study, examining the relationship of effective school leadership, emotional intelligence and the identification of strengths in school administrators, the literature review included five areas of research: leadership and leadership teams, perspectives of effective school leadership, emotional intelligence, emotional intelligence and effective leadership, and strengths based leadership. In addition, the roles of assistant principals within the leadership team are examined.

Theoretical Framework

The demands on school leaders are increasingly comprehensive and complex. As school leaders and teachers face the daunting tasks of meeting accountability requirements, more and more school leaders recognize the benefit of nurturing and maintaining a connection with those on their leadership team. Leadership teams in schools have a broad range of responsibilities, including the development and implementation of the school's mission and beliefs, as well as the daily management responsibilities. Most importantly, school leaders must foster the implementation of appropriate, successful curriculum and instruction so that students can learn. When adding the caveat of demographic and academic challenges that face school leaders, the position of school administrators becomes more challenging. Enhancing the quality of educational programs for prospective administrators is one factor that may help break the cycle of poverty for those students (Maulding, Townsend, Leonard, Sparkman, Styron & Styron, 2010).

Research suggests that emotions play an important role in the thinking process that leads to decision making (Goleman, 1995).   There has been an increased empirical interest into the link between emotional intelligence and performance at work. Increasingly, in the quest to develop more effective school leaders, the field of educational leadership has begun to explore this knowledge regarding emotional intelligence (Patti & Tobin, 2006).   While empirical research leaves little doubt that IQ and other measures of cognitive ability are limited in their power to predict who will succeed in leadership positions, measures of emotional intelligence matter more as a predictor of superior performance (Goleman, 1998).

With an increase in research over the past fifteen years examining the relationship between emotional intelligence and job performance, there has been a natural trend to examine the role emotional intelligence has in relationships at work. In *Working with Emotional Intelligence,* Goleman (1998) concentrates on the building of relationships. School leaders and school leadership teams spend more time dealing with people issues than any other variable in their work environment, and the climate and culture is greatly influenced by how the school leaders model effective leadership (Benda & Wright, 2002; Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003). Building authentic relationships seems to be a key to success.

According to Fullan (2002), principals must be nimble and prepared to deal with the complexities encountered in educational leadership in order to succeed. The implication of the demand for speed, nimbleness and the ability to execute a plan for vision has led to a rise in the exploration of leadership teams. Covin and Kilmann (1991) reported in the 1990s that of 310 organizational efforts to improve effectiveness, the most

prevalent practice was team building. Dubin (2005) supports the acknowledgement of team building, particularly at the leadership level as leaders are continually pressed to do more with less, noting that "you would be hard-pressed to find a CEO who doesn't want to have a high performing team" (p. 47). Due to the pressures created by accountability measures in education, it is critical that principals in elementary, middle and high schools lead high performance administrative teams (Jewell, 2009). Additionally, many school districts are facing pressures once thought to be exclusive to business organizations; the downshift in the economy has heavily impacted the economic structure of public school systems and school systems are facing lay-offs and facility closings (Stover, 2009). Difficult economic conditions have caused schools to face the pressure of doing more with fewer resources. Meanwhile, schools must also move with a more agile stance while facing higher levels of accountability (Hosin, 2009; Jacobson, 2008).

While research indicates that there is a relationship between team structures and the success of an organization, there is limited research that has examined school administrative teams and the structure of the team. Higgins, Young, Weiner, and Wlodarczyk (2009) have provided recent data that indicates there is a relationship between educational team success and team structures. Holly (2009) further connects leadership effectiveness in schools to student success, producing data that indicates a link between leadership practices of urban principals, team effectiveness, and improved scores in standardized tests.

The use of leadership teams in school settings has been shown to have a positive impact (Gravois & Rosenfield, 2006). Furthermore, evidence suggests that positive results occur when school principals foster certain conditions such as available and

shared leadership (Mullen & Hutinger, 2008). There is literature that has specifically called for the inquiry regarding principals' leadership roles (Rafoth & Foriska, 2006). Rafoth and Foriska (2006) noted "Similarly, and independent of the principal's leadership characteristics or participation on the team, administrative supports are another legitimate area for inquiry" (p. 134).

When examining emotional intelligence in leadership roles, Northouse (2007) proposes that leaders are more effective when they know both themselves and their followers. Specifically, a more in-depth look at both the leader and team members provides insight in understanding mutual needs, predispositions, and emotional responses (Northouse, 2007). This knowledge of self and others, and the ability to work more effectively within a team using this knowledge, is the cornerstone to emotional intelligence (Daft, 2008). Great organizations, with strong leadership should not only acknowledge the differences among each employee but capitalize on the differences; strong leaders watch for clues to each employee's natural talents and then develop opportunities for the talents to be transformed into bona fide strengths (Buckingham & Clifton, 2001).

Leadership and Leadership Teams

The definition of leadership has been examined by a host of researchers in many arenas, including both the corporate and educational fields. Bensimon (1989) examined the definition of leadership, noting:

Recent traditions in leadership can be grouped into six major categories: trait theories, which attempt to identify specific personal characteristics that appear to contribute to a person's ability to assume and successfully function in positions of

leadership; power and influence theories, which consider leadership in terms of

the source and amount of power available to leaders and the manner in which

leaders exercise that power over followers through either unilateral or reciprocal

interactions; behavioral theories, which study leadership by examining patters of

activity, managerial roles, and behavior categories of leaders—that is, by

considering what it is that leaders actually do; contingency theories, which

emphasize the importance of situational factors, such as the nature of the task

performed by a group or the nature of the external environment to understand

effective leadership; cultural and symbolic theories, which study the influence of

leaders in maintaining or reinterpreting the system of shared beliefs and values

that give meaning to organizational life; and cognitive theories, which suggest

leadership is a social attribution that permits people to make sense of an

equivocal, fluid, and complex world. (p. 2)

According to Kouzes and Posner (2003), leadership is "a relationship between

those who aspire to lead and those who choose to follow" (p.20). In *The Leadership*

Challenge (2003), Kouzes and Posner identified "The Five Practices of Exemplary

Leadership", which include (a) Modeling the Way, (b) Inspiring a Shared Vision, (c)

Challenging the Process, (d) Enabling Others to Act, and (e) Encouraging the Heart

(Kouzes & Posner, 2003). A brief description of each practice is offered below:

1. *Model the Way*. Kouzes and Posner (2003) describe a form of leadership

    in which leaders model the way through the clarification of their personal

    values and consequently building and affirming shared values. Credibility

    is established as they stand firm behind their beliefs and values and

encourage others to express their own beliefs. Examples are set through
daily actions, and shared values are reinforced through the illustration of
stories and daily conversations.

2. *Inspire a Shared Vision*. Through the process of envisioning the future
   and encouraging others to share your vision, leaders inspire a shared
   vision (Kouzes & Posner, 2003). According to Kouzes and Posner (2003),
   leaders must know and understand the needs and interests of those they
   lead.

3. *Challenge the Process*. According to Kouzes and Posner (2003), leaders
   build confidence in their constituents, enabling them to manage changes
   when the process is challenged.   The process of accepting a challenge is a
   trait of a good leader; it is a learning process and much can be learned
   from the risks involved.

4. *Enable Others to Act*. Through the promotion of ownership and personal
   power, Kouzes & Posner (2003) suggest that teamwork, trust and
   empowerment provide people with the necessary foundation to maintain
   effective leadership and take risks. and

5. *Encourage the Heart*. Through the recognition of contributions and the
   celebration of values and victories, leaders encourage the heart (Kouzes &
   Posner, 2003). By offering encouragement and appreciation and
   maintaining a positive outlook, leaders develop a team spirit and
   encourage the heart.

Another perspective of leadership is defined by Bolman and Deal (2008) as "a subtle process of mutual influence fusing thought, feeling and action, procuring cooperative effort in the service of purposes embraced by both leader and led" (p. 345). In examining good leadership, Bolman and Deal (2008) recognize there are two widely accepted leadership propositions which offer divergent perspectives: one asserts that all good leaders must have the qualities of vision, strength and commitment, and the other holds that good leadership can be exhibited depending on the situation- what works in one setting may not work in another. In both perspectives, vision and focus are common threads. Bolman and Deal (2008) suggest that "effective leaders help articulate a vision, set standards for performance, and create focus and direction" (p. 345). While managers are concerned with keeping a good system running well, leadership is needed to foster purpose, passion and imagination and take an organization in a new direction when needed (Bolman & Deal, 1994). Bolman and Deal (1994) further state that when a school's social and cultural support is weak, leadership is even more critical in order to develop interpersonal relationships so that attitudes and beliefs can be changed. Examining an organization through four different vantage points or coherent perspectives, the work of Bolman and Deal (2008) is considered one of the most useful organizational typologies. The structural frame emphasizes formal roles and relationships, the human resource frame focuses on the needs of people, the political frame considers the conflict over scarce resources, and the symbolic frame views organizations as cultures with shared values (Bolman & Deal, 2008).

For decades, researchers have examined the personal attributes of effective leaders. The prevailing theory in the early 20th century was that great leaders were born,

not made and it was believed that effective leaders were naturally endowed with the attributes necessary to lead (Davis, 1998). With the advent of behaviorist thinking later in the century, the question of leadership as a cultivated skill set arose. McKee, Boyatzis and Johnston (2008) answer the historical nature-versus-nurture question: are people born to be good leaders, or do they develop leadership abilities over time? With yes being the answer to both, some characteristics of good leadership are traits with which we are probably born, while others learn and develop leadership skills when what they want to change matters deeply, and will affect them both personally and professionally (McKee, Boyatzis, & Johnston, 2008).

The Gallup Organization has been studying leadership teams for nearly four decades, and their research indicates that the following characteristics are common in strong, high-performing teams: (a) conflict doesn't destroy strong teams because strong teams focus on results, (b) strong teams prioritize what's best for the organization and then move forward, (c) members of strong teams are as committed to their personal lives as they are to their work, (d) strong teams embrace diversity, and (e) strong teams are magnets for talent (Buckingham & Clifton, 2001). Additionally, Buckingham & Clifton (2001) noted that the evidence suggested that the most successful teams have members who are highly engaged in their work and satisfied with their personal lives, and the most engaged teams look at individuals through the lens of their natural strengths.

Additionally, there is growing evidence that top performance can be achieved in teams under certain conditions (West, 1994), and those conditions include the following: (a) team members agree on the rules for dealing with each other, are able to communicate honestly, and respect each other and display loyalty, (b) team membership represents a

heterogeneity of talents, experiences, education and background, (c) the team has a vivid commitment to excellent output and an ethos for achievement, (d) all members take responsibility for the team's success, (e) the team sets itself clear, specific, and high goals for itself, (f) team members fit together on technical and personal level, (g) team members are able to profit from their individual strengths, and (h) the team is able to use the tool of team reflection to discuss what is good and should be sustained and what is bad should be improved.

Furthermore, recent evidence suggests that group decision-making can have a positive effect in motivation, and when some individuals within the group work harder the overall group performance is enhanced (Hertel, Kerr, & Messe, 2000). Douglas McGregor's *Theory X* was an early perspective regarding leadership and the roles members of an organization have in regard to decision making. McGregor, a management theorist, proposed *Theory X,* which focused on autocratic and transactional relationships (Herman, 2000). Under his *Theory X,* McGregor assumed that superiors made the decisions for all followers (Herman, 2000). The position of the superior, according to Herman (2000) trumped the intelligence and experience of the followers. As the workplace evolved, *Theory X* proved to be inadequate and a more democratic leadership style known as *Theory Y* developed (Herman, 2000).

<center>Theories and Perspectives of Effective School Leadership</center>

Numerous theories and perspectives of effective school leadership exist. Goleman, Boyatzis and McKee (2002) suggest that the most effective leaders act according to one or more leadership approaches and may alternate between them. While some of these leadership styles are more collaborative, others are hierarchical in nature.

The trend in school leadership has necessarily evolved into a more collaborative effort. The role of the school principal has become increasingly complex, with an increased amount of duties and expectations that may vary from system to system (Fullan, 1998). Taking on the duty as a school principal is a challenge as well as a choice, and is considered by many to be one of the most difficult leadership positions. More alarming to the challenges that face principals is the fact that over 50% of the administrators serving in schools in the United States are eligible for retirement (Gibbs, 2008). Educator's desires to lead and stay in leadership positions have become a position of challenge. Although more emphasis has been placed on site-based decision making and shared leadership throughout the school as opposed to the more traditional managerial leadership style, school leadership has not become easier and is not considered a desirable occupation (Zellner, Ward, McNamara, Gideon, Camacho, & Edgewood, 2002).

Teacher shortages have been acknowledged, yet there has been little recognition for the lack of qualified candidates applying for principal positions; the position has accumulated increased responsibilities and lacks the necessary incentives needed to attract high-quality candidates (Tirozzi, 2001). The shortage for qualified school leaders is evidenced in a 1998 survey completed by the Educational Research Service (ERS) for the National Association of Elementary School Principals and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (Educational Research Service, 2000). The complex role of the principal is best learned and developed under the guidance of experienced, successful principals who can serve as mentors, by "observing, doing, commenting, and questioning, rather than simply listening" (Walker & Stott, 1993).

Another model of educational leadership, WICS, encompasses wisdom, intelligence, and creativity synthesized (Sternberg, 2005). The WICS theory of educational leadership views leadership as a decision, rather than focusing on traits or skills that are described in most other leadership theories (Sternberg, 2005). The basic idea of the WICS theory is that one needs wisdom, intelligence and creativity all working together in order to become a highly effective leader. Examining educational leadership using the WICS model assumes effective leaders need creative skills and attitudes to generate powerful ideas, analytical intelligence to make a determination of whether or not they are good ideas, practical intelligence for the effective implementation of the ideas and having the ability to persuade others to accept and follow the ideas, and wisdom to confirm that the ideas are representative of a positive outcome for all the stakeholders (Sternberg, 2005).

In 1996, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) developed the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), which is now known as the ISSLC Standards for School Leaders with the intention of developing standards for improving the practice of school leadership, emphasizing the importance and responsibilities of effective school leaders (1996). The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium identified six professional standards for principals, one of which calls for the principal to be "an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth," (1996, p. 12). Although the ISLLC standards for building administrators have been widely used for guidelines in licensing and performance indicators, Waters and Grubb (2004) describe the

criticism of the ISLLC standards by some educators as lacking depth, breadth and research. In 2003, the Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) conducted a study of principal leadership, and their findings became the basis for the *Balanced Leadership Framework*, another leadership assessment instrument (Waters & Grubb, 2004). Supporters of the Balanced Leadership Framework claim that the ISLLC standards do not address the importance of school leaders having a clear understanding of the change process, proposing that the Balanced Leadership Framework provides additional insights into the knowledge and skills essential to effective school change leadership and noting the instrument's effectiveness in describing the administrator's leadership responsibilities in managing first-order and second-order change (Waters & Grubb, 2004).

Leadership in the school setting is a valid area of investigation as links between effective school leadership and student performance have been examined. McRel's Balanced Leadership Framework's foundation is a result of quantitative research that investigated the relationship between school leadership and student achievement, using two separate studies conducted between 2001 and 2004 representing a sample of 2,894 schools, 14,000 teachers, and 1.1 million students (Waters & Grubb, 2004). Key findings from McREL's meta- and factor-analysis included principal leadership is significantly correlated with student achievement, school leaders can have both a positive and negative impact on student achievement, and changes that impact stakeholders are both positively and negatively associated with others with regard to responsibilities (Waters & Grubb, 2004).

Examining behaviors that have an impact on student learning was a critical issue in a study that involved an extensive meta-analysis of the research on principal effectiveness from 1980 to 1995 (Hallinger & Heck, 1998). The results of the research indicated that principals indirectly affect student learning by influencing internal school processes (setting academic expectations, promoting a school vision/mission, supervising instruction and establishing academic learning time), and the student's learning is mostly affected by the principal's efforts to establish a vision for the school and goals related to the accomplishment of the vision (Hallinger & Heck, 1998).

Reithel and Finch (2007) theorize that a holistic approach, including the examination of natural leadership traits and skills, should be used when examining leadership. Through the process of identifying traits, skills, experience, training and environmental factors, effective leadership within organizations can be attained with long-term education programs (Reithel & Finch, 2007). Recent research regarding school leadership teams support this process, with results indicating that the behaviors and traits of principals impact followers (Giese, 2006; Jarnagin, 2004).

Another perspective of the changing roles of principals was articulated by DuFour (2002). He proposed that the role of the principal has undergone a shift in definition from instructional leader with a focus on teaching to leader of a professional community with a focus on learning (DuFour, 2002). The National Association of Elementary School Principals (National Association of Elementary School Principals [NAESP], 2001) echoed this perspective, and proposes six standards for what principals should know and do, and the process of putting student and adult learning at the center of their leadership and serving as the lead learner tops the list.

There is no set formula or defined pattern for developing an effective school leader, and interpretations of a school's achievement and outcomes that could serve as a template for measuring principal effectiveness vary widely depending on a host of variables (Davis, 1998). Furthermore, within each school a unique and complex relationship exists between the principal, other school administrators, teachers, students, parents and the community (Davis, 1998). As noted by Hallinger and Heck (1998), a school principal's ability to influence the outcomes from the organizational perspective is generally indirect and difficult to measure with precision. The principal's role has shifted from a hands-on focus on management and administration to a site-based shared leadership that incorporates the vision of the school that facilitates the teaching and learning process (Tirozzi, 2001). The development of a learning community within the school calls for a leadership that is focused on achieving the goals of the school's vision; exemplary school principals utilize the school's vision while developing goals and utilizing shared decision-making (Zellner, Ward, McNamara, Gideon, Camacho, & Edgewood, 2002).

Stedman (1987) defined effective schools as those having programs that positively impact student attitudes, self-esteem, social responsibility, higher-order thinking skills, and test performance. Levine and Lezotte's (1990) research identified characteristics of effective schools that are tangential to the actual teaching and learning process, and they included (a) schools with site-based management that practice teacher empowerment and allow teachers the latitude to solve site-based problems, (b) shared vision, mission, and goals to promote collegiality and to foster a sense of community, and (c) strong leadership at the school level.

Equating leadership with position relegates others to a passive role and often reinforces leaders to take on more responsibility than they can manage (Bolman & Deal, 2008). The responsibility of true effective school leadership should not be the responsibility of one single individual in the school setting; it should be the culmination of joint effort that involves all individuals from the state level down to the classroom teacher (Reese, 2004). Leadership does not come automatically with high positions; it is possible to be a leader without a formal title; regardless of responsibilities within an organization, having the power to show leadership is imperative (Sharma, 2010). School leaders have opportunities to encourage and train individuals in the school setting to assume leadership roles in a host of roles, such as academic department heads, school strategic team members, school council members, as well as many others.

The concept of shared leadership is reinforced by a 2003 study by the Center on Reinventing Public Education (CRPE) at the University of Washington found that the school principal does not have to be the standard-bearer in all areas of leadership (Reese, 2004). In the report, *Making Sense of Leading Schools*, (Reese, 2004) the results from the study were disclosed and proposed that schools need leadership in seven critical areas: instructional, cultural, managerial, human resources, strategic, external development and micro-political. The study emphasized that the principal's responsibility was to ensure that leadership occurred in all seven areas, yet the principal did not need to be the one providing the leadership.

Numerous studies have identified specific skills, values, characteristics and areas of knowledge and understanding that seem to distinguish principals of effective schools, and it is reasonable to assume that school administrative preparation programs prepare

individuals for these positions (National Association of Elementary School Principals, 2001). Creating and maintaining a warm and positive climate for learning and nurturing positive relationships with parents, faculty, students, community groups and school staff are important skills effective schools leaders should have. The quality of human relationships established and maintained by the principal has been identified as a key factor in student achievement (National Association of Elementary School Principals, 2001).   Andrews and Soder (1987) conducted a three-year study of principals and found a significant correlation between favorable perceptions of the quality of human relationships in the school by the teachers and increased growth in student achievement.

With the landscape of the school setting becoming more multi-faceted, sustaining high quality instruction in an everchanging, complex environment in the school setting places increased demands on the school principal, as the school leader (Gantner, Daresh, Dunlap, & Newsome, 2009). Principals are considered key figures in setting the tone of the school and leading the school in the direction of the established vision. Research has continued to examine the actions of the principal, or educational leaders as one of the most critical factors in the accomplishments of high quality school programs (Daresh, 1991).

In a study commissioned by the National Association of Headteachers in the UK to identify, examine and celebrate good principal practice, results indicated that the principals were effective because they had clear visions and values that were shared by all the stakeholders in the school. They communicated this vision, and empowered the staff by developing a school climate filled with collaboration and sought the support of

influential groups within the school community in an effort to ensure that they had a national strategic view of what is and what is to come (Day, Harris, & Hadfield, 2001).

McEwan (2003) identifies specific skills needed as school principals in *10 Traits of Highly Effective Principals: From Good To Great Performance*. Among the traits discussed, the number one priority of a principal's job is appropriate, productive, meaningful and helpful communication. Additionally, McEwan (2003) discussed the importance of principals having a facilitating trait, acknowledging that all of the skills and talents necessary to creating highly effective schools are most likely already present. Through the process of developing meaningful relationships effective principals reach out and access those skills and talents from different individuals in the school. According to McEwan (2003), highly effective principals know themselves, and they have identified their strengths, or behaviors and attitudes that seem easy and natural, and use them to complement traits that are less developed; additionally, successful principals know how to tap and develop the talents and strengths of those around them.

Lessons of school leadership come continuously, some silently and others through abrasive or devastating events such as Columbine. Despite the pressures associated with accountability, educational leaders must address the development of the social and emotional competencies of students through building environments of physical and emotional safety designed to support the communities of learners and stakeholders (Patti & Tobin, 2063). The National Council of Teacher Accreditation (NCATE), the governing body responsible for accreditation for the majority of schools of education, requires higher education programs to improve the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of aspiring school leaders (Patti & Tobin, 2003).

School leaders spend more time on average dealing with issues that involve individuals (people issues) than any other variable; the climate and culture of the school is very much influenced by how the school leader models effective leadership (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003). Critical leadership behaviors that principals must demonstrate have been examined for years by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), and a cross analysis of all of the behaviors reveal many of the emotional intelligence competencies (Waters, Marzano, & McNutly, 2003).

Research on educators' perceptions of effective school administration points to optimism as being an important characteristic to model (Stein & Book, 2000). Through modeling optimism, principals help create a climate that promotes persistence and hopefulness. Additionally, effective communication is the lifeblood of a caring school community; communication enables individuals to teach and learn, share ideas and solve conflicts.

Educational leadership and the ethical-decision making of school principals has been a topic of discussion for the past two decades, but on the contrary, the position of assistant principals has received modest scholarly discussion (Glanz, 2004; Rintoul and Goulais, 2010; Weller and Weller, 2002). The role of the assistant principal is one of the least researched and discussed topics in educational leadership, leaving it open to interpretation by principals and district personnel (Weller & Weller, 2002). Assistant principal responsibilities vary depending on the school level (elementary, middle or high), and expectations differ depending on the district in which the school is located. The ambiguity in the role of assistant principal provides opportunities for ineffective use

of the position, and assistant principals often rely on their ability to master and apply salient leadership knowledge and skills (Weller & Weller, 2002).

Often, newly appointed assistant principals have reported the role is not what they expected, and many report that they have not been adequately trained as well as they experience feelings of isolation (Armstrong, 2005; Thompson 2006). Many studies cite low job satisfaction associated with the position of assistant principal (Thompson, 2006). Additionally, many assistant principals have reported a disconnect in their school placements; they report that they are assigned to schools without consideration to the administrative leadership team with differing leadership styles (Armstrong, 2005).

A further consideration for assistant principals beyond the concerns that their roles are often poorly defined is the challenges they face on a daily basis with ethical decision making (Rintoul & Goulais, 2010). The assistant principal or assistant administrator position is an entry level position in school administration, and these administrators are often caught in a politically charged position, exhibiting loyalty to the principal (Marshall & Hooley, 2006).

<div align="center">Emotional Intelligence</div>

History of Emotional Intelligence

Emotional intelligence is not an entirely new concept and has become a hot buzzword in corporate America, yet it has limited chartered territory in educational leadership. In 1998, the Harvard Business Review published an article on emotional intelligence and it attracted a higher percentage of readers than any other article published in that periodical in the previous forty years (Cherniss, 2000). Emotional intelligence is based on an extensive history of research and theory in personality and

social psychology. Psychologists originally focused on the cognitive aspects of intelligence, yet non-cognitive aspects have experienced an increase in studies. In the late 1930s Robert Thorndike wrote about social intelligence. As early as 1940, Wechsler (Wechsler, 1958), referred to *non-intellective* elements of intelligence as having the capacity for the prediction of one's ability to succeed, and defined intelligence as "the aggregate or global capacity of the individual to act purposefully, to thing rationally, and to deal effectively with his environment" (p.7). Wechsler referred to *non-intellective* as well as *intellective* elements by which he mean affective, personal and social factors (Wechsler, 1940). As early as 1943, Wechsler was proposing that the non-intellective abilities are essential for predicting one's ability to succeed in life, writing:

> The main question is whether non-intellective, that is affective and cognitive abilities, are admissible as factors of general intelligence. (My contention) has been that such factors are not only admissible but necessary. I have tried to show that in addition to intellective there are also definite non-intellective factors that determine intelligent behavior. If the foregoing observations are correct, it follows that we cannot expect to measure total intelligence until our tests also include some measures of the non-intellective factors. (Wechsler, 1943, p. 103)

In 1983, Gardner (Cherniss, 2000) introduced his ideas regarding multiple intelligences. He *Proposed that 'intrapersonal* and *interpersonal* intelligences are as important as the type of intelligence typically measured by IQ and related tests" (Cherniss, 2000, p. 38). Reuven Bar-On was the first to use the abbreviation of EQ as a reference to aspects of this range of abilities in the 1980s, and in 1990 Peter Salovey and John Mayer published "their landmark conceptualization of what was described for the

first time as *emotional intelligence"* (Bar-On & Parker, 2000). Emotional intelligence is often interpreted as describing societal practices that integrate emotion and thought, and current research on the brain suggests that the cognitive and emotional systems of the brain are more closely integrated than originally believed (LeDoux, 1998). There is a history of research suggestion that emotional and social skills may actually improve cognitive function, as indicated in the famous marshmallow studies at Stanford University. The study involved four-year old children who were left alone in a room with a marshmallow, and they were told that they would receive an additional marshmallow if they waited for the researcher to return before eating. After ten years, the children in the study were examined and the results showed that the children who were able to resist the temptation had a total SAT score that was on average 210 points higher than those who were unable to wait (Shoda, Mischel, & Peake, 1990).

Currently, many researchers are exploring the relationship between emotional intelligence and specific aspects of organizational success that have not been previously explored in studies of IQ or personality traits; E.L. Thorndike's proposal that *social intelligences* existence is independent of academic intelligences has supported the research (Landy, 2005). There are numerous definitions and models of emotional intelligence. Two models of emotional intelligence will be examined: the *trait model* (Bar-On, 1997; Goleman, 1995) and the *ability-based model* (Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Salovey & Sluyter, 1997).

Goleman's (1995) theory of *emotional intelligence* was grounded specifically in work performance, contending that emotional intelligence plays a significant role in the prediction of success in the work place, especially among those in leadership positions.

Much of Goleman's research examines the effect emotional intelligence has on leaders in the business world, and a significant presence for considering emotional intelligence among leaders within businesses has been established (Bradberry & Greaves, 2004; Cherniss, 2004; Goleman, 1998).   In *Emotional Intelligence*, Goleman (1995) describes emotional intelligence as having five parts: knowing emotions, managing emotions, motivating oneself, recognizing emotions in others, and handling relationships. Throughout *Emotional Intelligence*, Goleman (1995) redefines emotional intelligence numerous times, with each definition including a different set of personality attributes. In *Working With Emotional Intelligence*, Goleman (1998) defines emotional intelligence as "the capacity for recognizing our own feelings and those of others, for motivating ourselves, and for managing emotions well in ourselves and in our relationships". In *Working With Emotional Intelligence*, Goleman (1998) redefines the Emotional Competence Framework, and includes two primary competencies: personal and social. Self-awareness, self-regulation and motivation are three dimensions within the personal competencies, and empathy and social skills are the two dimensions within the social competencies. Goleman (1998) breaks down the five dimensions of emotional intelligence into twenty-five different emotional competencies, which include: emotional awareness, accurate self-assessment, self-confidence, self-control, trustworthiness, conscientiousness, adaptability, innovation, achievement drive, commitment, initiative, optimism, understanding others, developing others, service orientation, leveraging diversity, political awareness, influence, communication, conflict management, leadership, change catalyst, building bonds, collaboration, and cooperation and team capabilities.

The theoretical framework used to describe emotional intelligence proposed by Goleman was defined within four domains: (a) self-awareness, (b) self-management, (c) social awareness, and (d) relationship management (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002), with each domain divided into a series of competencies. The self-awareness and self-management domains address an individual's personal competence. The social awareness and relationship management domains address an individual's social competence.

Self-awareness

In Goleman's model of emotional intelligence, self-awareness includes three personal competencies: (a) emotional self-awareness, (b) accurate self-assessment, and (c) self-confidence (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002). It is difficult to manage one's emotions, assess emotions in others accurately and manage relationships with others until an adequate understanding and knowing oneself is established. The ability to reflect honestly and understand one's emotions, strengths, challenges, motives, values, goals and dreams describes self-awareness. The importance of self-awareness has been explored in the venue of leadership (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002; Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Self-awareness provides the foundation for the remaining domains (self-management, social awareness, relationship management) to be built.   The ability to be conscious of personal limitations and identify personal strengths to achieve leadership goals are necessary competencies in effective leadership.

Self-management

According to Goleman (2002), six personal competencies are encompassed in self-management: (a) emotional self-control, (b) transparency, (c) adaptability, (d)

achievement, (e) initiative, and (f) optimism according to Goleman's model. Golman, Boyatzis, & McKee (2002) describe self-management as similar to an ongoing inner conversation; self-management "is the component of emotional intelligence that frees us from being a prisoner of our feelings. It's what allows the mental clarity and concentrated energy that leadership demands, and what keeps disruptive emotions from throwing us off track" (p. 46). Key elements included developing and establishing trust, integrity and personal capital. Managing one's emotions enables these key elements to exist, leading to healthy working relationships.

Social Awareness

Social awareness, being acutely aware of the emotions and needs of others, is comprised of three social competencies: (a) empathy, (b) organizational awareness, and (c) service. In regard to social awareness, Goleman (2002) noted, "By being attuned to how others feel in the moment, a leader can say and do what's appropriate-whether it be to calm fears, assuage anger, or join in good spirits. This attunement also lets a leader sense the shared values and priorities that can guide the group" (p. 49).

Relationship Management

The following social competencies are involved in relationship management: (a) inspirational leadership, (b) influence, (c) developing others, (d) change catalyst, (e) conflict management, (f) building bonds, and (g) teamwork and collaboration. The cultivation of relationships and the development and sharing of common visions toward reaching goals is relationship management. Additionally, Goleman (2002) wrote:

> All leaders need enough intellect to grasp the specifics of the tasks and challenges
> at hand. Of course, leaders gifted in the decisive clarity that analytic and

conceptual thinking allow certainly add value. We see intellect and clear thinking largely characteristics that get someone in the leadership door. Without those fundamental abilities, no entry is allowed. However, intellect alone will not make a leader; leaders execute a vision by motivating, guiding, inspiring, listening, persuading – and, most crucially, through creating resonance. The neural systems responsible for the intellect and for the emotions are separate, but they have intimately interwoven connections. (p. 26)

Goleman's research has brought attention to the importance of *internal characteristics* that may lead to organizational success without devaluing cognitive intelligence.

As one of the more prominent spokespersons for emotional intelligence, Goleman (1995, 1998) has brought popular attention to emotional intelligence, arguing that part of the roughly 80% of the variance among people in various forms of success that is not accounted for by IQ tests is constituted by emotional intelligence. Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2002) examined data from approximately 500 competency models from large companies such as IBM, Lucent, British Airways and PepsiCo and concluded that when star performers were matched against average performers in senior leadership positions, emotional intelligence competencies accounted for 85% of the differences in their profiles. Goleman has, however, been criticized for stretching the definition of emotional intelligence, and some have claimed that his definition of emotional intelligence attempts to capture almost everything but IQ (Sternberg & Hedlund, 2002).

Bar-On (1997a) defined emotional intelligence as "an array of non-cognitive capabilities, competencies, and skills that influence one's ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures" (p. 14). Similar to Goleman, Bar-On

(1997a) presents a definition of emotional intelligence that includes five areas of competence: intrapersonal skills, interpersonal skills, stress management, adaptability, and general mood. Bar-On interprets findings from the EQ-I, a self-report scale of emotional intelligence he developed. Intrapersonal EQ is further divided into emotional self-awareness, assertiveness, self-regard, self-actualization, and independence. Interpersonal EQ is further divided into empathy, interpersonal relationship and social responsibility. Adaptability EQ is divided into problem solving, reality testing and flexibility. Stress Management EQ divides into stress tolerance and impulse control, and General Mood IQ divides into happiness and optimism (Bar-On, 1997a).

Bar-On suggests that non-cognitive capabilities, such as intrapersonal skills, interpersonal skills, stress management, adaptability and general mood impact an individual's ability to cope with environmental demands. One's general mood, for example, is described to influence responses to situations presented. Bar-On has attempted to develop measures that encompass these non-cognitive abilities. *Trait models*, such as Goleman's (1995, 1998) emotional intelligence definition and Bar-On's model have faced frequent criticism, as they tend to share high correlation with personality measures. That is, it may be difficult to separate the cognitive abilities from the traits (Day, Newsome, & Catano, 2002).

The ability model defines emotional intelligence as a set of abilities (Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Salovey & Sluyter, 1997). Salovey and Mayer (1990) define the constructs of emotional intelligence as "the ability to perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotion; the ability to access and/or generate feelings when they facilitate thought; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; and the ability to regulate

emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth" (p. 10). Salovey and Mayer's (1997) theory centers around the concept of emotional intelligence as an actual intelligence defined as a group of *mental abilities*. Emotional intelligence, as a set of skills, enables the accurate recognition and expression of emotion in oneself and in others, the effective regulation of emotion in oneself and others, and the use of feelings to motivate, plan and achieve (Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Salovey & Sluyter, 1997). Salovey and Mayer (1990) argued that emotional intelligence should be distinguished from personal attributes and referred to as *ability*. Specifically, they suggested that emotional intelligence is the ability to recognize the meanings of emotional and the ability to use that knowledge to solve problems. Salovey's (1997) definition of emotional intelligence includes five domains: (a) knowing one's emotions, (b) managing emotions, (c) motivating oneself, (d) recognizing emotions in others, and (6) handling relationships.

<div align="center">Emotional Intelligence and Leadership</div>

The examination of the relationship between emotional intelligence and effective leadership dates back to the early 1900s. Under the direction of Hemphill (1959), in the 1940s the Ohio State Leadership Studies suggested that *consideration* is an important aspect of effective leadership, further stating that leaders who established *mutual trust, respect, and a certain warmth and rapport* with members of their group are more effective leaders (Fleishman & Harris, 1962). Knowing how and when to express emotion is integral in leadership. Barsade (1998) conducted an experiment at Yale University with a group of volunteers that assumed the roles of managers who had the task of allocating bonuses to their subordinates. A trained actor was planted in the group and took the lead in discussions. The actor displayed various emotions within separate

groups, including cheerful enthusiasm, relaxed warmth, depressed sluggishness and hostile irritability. The results of the study indicated that the actor's display of emotion had a large impact over the actions of the group's decision on the allocation of bonuses; the cheerful groups distributed the money more fairly and in a way that benefited the organization. In other words, the Barsade experiment supports the idea that sensitivity to emotional expressions can affect decision-making (Barsade, 998).

There is an overlap among the various definitions of emotional intelligence (Druskat, Sala, & Mount, 2006), and the definition depends largely on the theorist from which the definition is based (Caruso & Salovey, 2004). Large companies such as American Express, L'Oreal, and the U.S. Air Force report benefits from establishing emotional intelligence programs (Bradberry & Greaves, 2003).   The United States Air Force used Bar-On's EQ-I to select recruiters, whom they consider their front-line in human resource personnel, and found the recruiters with the higher emotional intelligence competencies of assertiveness, empathy, happiness and emotional self-awareness were much more successful by increasing their ability to predict successful recruiters by nearly three-fold (Cherniss, 2011). This immediate gain produced a savings of $3 million annually, which resulted in the Government Accounting Office submitting a report to Congress, and eventually led to a Secretary of Defense order to all branches of the armed forces to adopt the procedure in recruitment and selection (Cherniss, 1999). Additionally, a study of 130 executives found that the success in which people handle their own emotions had a determination on how much people in their immediate work environment preferred to deal with them (Walter V. Clarke Associates, 1997).

The impact of emotional intelligence in the workplace has been researched through numerous studies, and results indicate that emotional intelligence can be a contributing factor to the financial success of an organization (Cherniss, 2000). Bradberry and Greaves (2009) tested emotional intelligence alongside 33 other important work-place behaviors and the results indicated that it subsumes the majority of them, including time management, decision-making, and communication. Additionally, their findings indicated that emotional intelligence is the foundation for a host of critical skills which have an impact on most everything that is accomplished each day, accounting for 58% of performance in all types of jobs (Bradberry & Greaves, 2009). A culmination of Bradberry and Greaves (2009) studies indicated that 90% of high performers are also high in emotional intelligence, and individuals who develop their emotional intelligence tend to be successful particularly in leadership. Research by the Center for Creative Leadership has found that the primary causes of failure in executive leadership positions involve deficits in emotional competence, particularly difficulty in handling change, not being able to work well in a team, and poor interpersonal relations (Cherniss, 2011).

Goleman (2004) examines what distinguishes great leaders from merely good ones, and proposes that "emotional intelligence is the sine qua-non of leadership; without it, a person can have the best training in the world, and incisive, analytical mind, and an endless supply of smart ideas, but he still won't make a great leader" (p. 8). Moreover, Goleman's research indicated that the higher the position an individual holds within an organization, the more emotional intelligence capabilities play a role in his or her effectiveness. A comparison of top performers with average performers in senior

leadership positions indicated that 90% of the difference in their profiles was attributable to emotional intelligence factors rather than cognitive abilities (Goleman, 2004).

Another study (Brienza & Cavallo, 2011) on 358 managers within the Johnson & Johnson Consumer and Personal Care Group was conducted to determine if there were specific leadership competencies that distinguished high performs from average performers. The results showed that the highest performing managers have significantly more *emotional competence* than the remaining managers, yielding a strong inter-rater agreement among supervisors and peers in the competencies of self-confidence, achievement orientation, initiative, leadership, influence, and change catalyst (Brienza & Cavallo, 2011). The position that emotional competence differentiates successful leaders is supported in this study, as high performing managers at Johnson & Johnson Consumer and Personal Care Group were seen to possess significantly higher levels of self-awareness, self-management, and social skills which all fall under the emotional intelligence domain (Brienza & Cavallo, 2011).

Similar to research on the impact effective leadership has with student academic performance, studies examining the relationship of emotional intelligence of principals and student achievement have been conducted. A study in Mississippi Public Schools conducted by Maulding, Townsend, Leonard, Sparkman, Styron, and Styron (2010) included 261 participating principals. Their research indicated that emotional intelligence of the principals was not related to student achievement as designated by school performance level. Maulding et al. (2010) suggested the role of emotional intelligence in leadership is a two-fold concept, and when personal abilities and perceptions are combined, the perceptions of others may be affected.

Bradberry and Greaves (2009) reported that individuals can work to improve emotional intelligence, citing research at the business school at the University of Queensland in Australia where individuals who were low in emotional intelligence and job performance matched their colleagues who excelled in both solely by working to improve their emotional intelligence. The ability for improvement in emotional intelligence was evidenced in a longitudinal study conducted at the Weatherhead School of Management at Case Western Reserve University (Boyatzis, Cowan, & Kolb, 1995) where students participated in a required course on competence building. After assessing their emotional intelligence, students selected specific competencies for improvement and developed and implemented a plan for strengthening the targeted competencies. Assessments on these competencies were taken at the beginning of the program, at graduation and years later while employed. The research indicated that emotional competencies can be improved and sustained over a period of time with commitment and implementation of effective models (Cherniss & Goleman, 2001).

The theories set forth in *Primal Leadership: Realizing the Power of Emotional Intelligence,* Goleman, Boyatzis and McKee (2002) encouraged the process of utilizing advanced listening techniques as these essential skills impact effective leadership. *Primal Leadership* identified a five-step process for learning better leadership skills:

1. Step one is identifying one's ideal self, which involves uncovering and listening to one's core values and beliefs to develop a picture of the person one aspires to be.

2. Step two is identifying the real self, which involves discovering how one appears to others regardless of how one sees one's self. Comparing one's

ideal self to one's real self is a powerful tool because it helps identify

strengths and gaps.

3. Step three entails making a plan to build on strengths and reduce gaps.

4. Step four calls for deliberate experimentation to provide opportunities to

    practice new skills and to bring about change.

5. Step five, which should take place concurrently with steps one through four, is

    to develop trusting, encouraging relationships that can be used as a support

    mechanism during the learning process.

Emotional leadership is defines as understanding the impact made on others, and

then adjusting the approach accordingly (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2001). Research

shows that high levels of emotional intelligence creates climates in which information

sharing, trust, healthy risk-taking and learning flourish, and additional research indicates

that a leader's mood plays a key role in that dynamic (Goleman et al., 2001). *Primal

Peadership* drives a demand for execution; it requires leaders to determine, through

reflective analysis, how emotional leadership drives the moods and actions of an

organization and then, with equal discipline, adjust leadership behavior accordingly

(Goleman et al., 2001).

While there is still more to learn about the role emotional intelligence plays with

effective leadership in the school setting, research suggests a similarity between the

domains and competencies that comprise emotional intelligence (Golman et al., 2001)

and becoming an effective school leader in the twenty-first century in regard to

improving student achievement (Marazano et al., 2005). It is evident more research is

needed. As Boyatzis, Goleman, and Rhee (2000) stated,

The need for more research into the construction of personality and determinants and consequences of our behavior is more than a perpetual plea of scholars; it is an expression of our commitment to the benefits that accrue from our drive to satisfy our curiosity about being human. We seek to understand characteristics that predict better performance because we wish to be more effective. We seek to understand characteristics that predict more fulfilling lives because we see injustice and suffering and know that many of our lives are out of balance….More research is needed to understand how our emotions and capabilities affect our lives and work. (p. 359)

Strengths Based Leadership

The most effective leaders have the capacity to forever alter the course of your life (Rath & Conchie, 2008). After decades of the Gallup Organization conducting more than 20,000 in-depth interviews with senior leaders and studies including more than one million work teams, the findings identified that the keys to being a more effective leader as follows: (a) the most effective leaders are always investing in strengths, (b) the most effective leaders surround themselves with the right people and then maximize their team, and (c) the most effective leaders understand their followers' needs (Rath & Conchie, 2008). The research found that in the workplace, when leadership fails to focus on individuals' strengths, only nine percent of the employees are likely to be engaged; however, when an organization's leadership focuses on the strengths of employees, 73% are engaged.

According to Buckingham and Clifton (2001), great organizations must not only accommodate the fact that employees are all different, organizations should capitalize on

these differences, watching for clues to individual employee's natural talents so that the talents can be developed into strengths. The Gallup Organization has asked the "opportunity to do what I do best" question of more than 1.7 million employees in a variety of companies all over the world, and only 20% of employees feel that their strengths are in play every day (Buckingham & Clifton, 2001, p.12). The research further indicated that the higher an employee evolves toward a leadership position, the less likely there is a perception that opportunities in the workplace are available to exhibit individual strengths.

This discrepancy led the late leadership researcher and "Father of Strengths Psychology," Clifton (Buckingham & Clifton, 2001), to begin studying the unique strengths of leaders. Just before his death in 2003, Clifton was asked to share his greatest discovery after three decades of leadership research, and his response was the following:

A leader needs to know his strengths as a carpenter knows his tools, or a physician knows the instruments at her disposal. What great leaders have in common is that each truly knows his or her strengths—and can call on the right strength at the right time. This explains why there is no definitive list of characteristics that describes all leaders. (Buckingham & Clifton, 2001, p. 18)

Clifton and Harter (2003) noted that organizations are more than the sum of the individuals that create the whole, and the most basic yet important form of strengths investment lies with the individual. When more individuals within an organization have their talents identified, understood, and implemented in their assignments, the greater the potential for success. Through the application of positive psychology, or the study of individual strengths and virtues that enable individuals and communities to thrive, the

identification of individual talents can occur (Duckworth, Steen & Seligman, 2005).

Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000) proposed that the major psychological theories

need to evolve to become more focused on virtues rather than deficits. Seligman (1998,

1999) noted three domains that form an organizing framework for positive psychology:

positive personal and interpersonal traits, positive subjective experience, and positive

institutions and communities. The *strengths* approach to leadership relates to all three of

these domains, and specifically relates to the identification of positive personal and

interpersonal traits or talents (Clifton & Harter, 2003).

Talent identification and measurement provides an organizing framework around

positive psychological potential. That is, as individuals become aware of their talents

through the process of measurement and feedback, a strong position from which to view

potential is created and strengths are developed (Clifton & Harter, 2003). As both

organizations and individuals refine their talents with knowledge and skills, strengths are

developed. From the perspective of individuals, once dominant talents are refined with

knowledge and skills, they become strengths (Clifton & Harter, 2003). The Gallup

Organization has interviewed approximately two million individuals from various

backgrounds and professions, and discovered that individual talents provide the greatest

opportunity for success (Clifton & Harter, 2003). Talents, or naturally recurring patterns

of thought, feeling, or behavior are the basis for creating individual strengths (Clifton &

Harter, 2003).

Effective leaders surround themselves with individuals that have complementary

strengths, and for leadership teams to create sustained growth, the leader must continue

investing in each individual's strengths (Rath & Conchie, 2008). Seligman and

Czikszentmihalya (2000) have called have called for additional studies on strengths and

prevention as well as individual, societal and community factors that provide motivation.

A closer look at individual strengths provides insight as to the overall function of a team.

When examining the definition of human strengths, it is important to include the

possibility of transcending and improving given personal and societal circumstances

(Aspinwall & Staudinger, 2003). Efforts to identify and understand human strengths

have historically been based on the trait approach, focusing on the individual traits of

intelligence, optimism, self-efficacy, and ego resilience (Staudinger & Pasupathi, 2000).

However, more recent research indicates that findings give a different view of what

constitutes human strength. From the emerging view, human strengths may primarily lie

in the ability to apply as many different resources and skills as necessary to accomplish a

goal (Staudinger & Pasupathi, 2000).

Contextual dependencies should be considered when examining human strengths.

Many human strengths are *relational or collective*, depending on the context in which

they are examined (Aspinwall & Staudinger, 2003). Human strengths may be developed

in the process of evolving relationships with others, while other strengths may be

identified as part of a collective group. As humans, most are embedded in a web of

relationships with others in personal and professional contexts, and the development of a

psychology of human strengths is vital (Bercheid, 1998).

Cultural differences are another issue to consider when examining and measuring

human strengths. Strengths across different cultures undoubtedly differ. Miller and

Bersoff (1992) noted that Hindu Indians tend to focus more than Americans on the

importance of responsiveness to others' needs in discussing moral conflicts, whereas

Americans tend to view interpersonal responsiveness as a personal choice. The process of nurturing peace, human strengths, and pro-social behaviors between and within similar and different cultures may eventually involve a new philosophy of thinking, learning and existing that will accommodate the unforeseen demands of the 21st century (Aspinwall & Staudinger, 2003).

Summary

The study of leadership and team leadership dates back decades and the use of teams in educational leadership continues to be a need for examination (Jennings & Palmer, 2007). Emotional intelligence has been a hot topic for the past three decades, and ongoing research continues to examine the relationship between emotional intelligence and effective leadership. With ever-increasing demands placed on school leadership teams, identifying individual strengths of team members is proving to be a useful tool for meeting the demands of effective leadership. Chapter II presents a literature review of the history and current research regarding leadership, effective school leadership, emotional intelligence and strengths based leadership. Chapter III discusses the methodology of the study including the sample, instrumentation and limitations.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The intent of this study was to examine the relationship between effective leadership, emotional intelligence of school principals, and their ability to identify the top five strengths or talents of a member of their leadership team. As highlighted in the review of literature, the utilization of individual strengths and talents within leadership teams plays an instrumental role in the success of the school. With the increased demands on principals, leadership teams that include assistant principals and assistant administrators play a crucial role in the leadership endeavors of schools. Additionally, principals often are placed at schools that have an existing team of assistant principals or assistant administrators. These factors, combined with the importance of the principal role in relation to student achievement and motivation of the entire staff, make the identification of various strengths within the administrative team a top priority for schools.

This study builds a strong foundation for future work in the planning and development of individual school leadership teams. At each school, individual administrators are typically assigned specific tasks or projects that fall outside of the normal daily responsibilities. The EQ-i 125 (BarOn Emotional Quotient Inventory) was administered to principals in the elementary, middle and high school levels. The StrengthsFinder profile, developed by the Gallup Organization, will be the assessment used to identify the participating assistant principal or assistant administrator individual

strengths and talents. Additional demographic information from both the principals and the assistant principals and assistant administrators taking part in the study was collected.

Research Questions

The following research questions were used to this study:

1. Do EQ levels of principals relate to their ability to identify the top five strengths of their assistant principals/assistant administrators?

2. Does the length of time a school principal and assistant principal/assistant administrator work together have an impact on a principal's ability to identify the strengths of the assistant principal/assistant administrator?

3. Does the length of time a principal serves in the role of a principal have an impact on a principal's ability to identify the strengths of the assistant principal/assistant administrator?

All principals and one assistant principal or assistant administrator from each school within a large school district consisting of 16 high schools, 25 middle schools, and 69 elementary schools in the southeastern United States were invited to participate in this study.

Instrumentation

The EQ-I 125 (BarOn Emotional Quotient Inventory), developed by Reuven Bar-On is a self-report measure of emotionally and socially intelligent behavior that provides an estimate of emotional-social intelligence (Bar-On, 1997b). A web-based version of the EQ-i 125 was provided to the principals who participated in the study. The Clifton StrengthsFinder Profile, originally developed by the Gallup Organization in 1999, was utilized to identify the top five strengths or talents of the assistant principals/assistant

administrators participating in the study. The assistant principals/assistant administrators were given a copy of *StrengthsFinder 2.0*, which contained an access code to complete the StrengthsFinder profile. The book provides a reference for each of the strength/talent themes identified in the profile. Each principal participating in the study received a detailed document describing each of the strengths/themes in the StrengthsFinders profile. Each principal participating rated the assistant principal/assistant administrator who was randomly chosen to participate on each of the 34 themes, using a scale from 1 to 10, with increments of 0.5. The results of the emotional intelligence scores were correlated with the correct number of the top five strengths the principal identified from the results of the Clifton StrengthsFinder Profile completed by the assistant principal/assistant administrator.

<div align="center">Instrument Background, Reliability, and Validity</div>

EQ-i 125 (BarOn Emotional Quotient Inventory)

The EQ-i is the first measure of its kind to be published by a psychological test publisher and was the first such measure to be peer-reviewed in the Buros Mental Measurement Yearbook (Bar-On, 1997a). The EQ-i is the most widely used measure of emotional-social intelligence (Geher, 2004).   The EQ-i consists of 125 items in the form of short sentences, and uses a 5- point response scale that has a textual response format ranging from *very seldom or not true of me* (1) to *very often true of me or true of me* (5).

The individual responses render a total EQ score as well as scores on the following five composite scales and 15 subscales:

1. *Intrapersonal:* self- regard, emotional self-awareness, assertiveness, independence, self-actualization;

2. *Interpersonal:* empathy, social responsibility, interpersonal relationships;

3. *Stress management:* stress tolerance, impulse control;

4. *Adaptability:* reality testing, flexibility, problem solving; and

5. *General Mood*: optimism, happiness.

The EQ-I 125 includes the following four validity indicators: omission rate, inconsistency index, positive impression and negative impression (Bar-On, 2004). The psychometric instrument has a built-in correction factor that automatically adjusts the scale scores based on the Positive Impression and Negative Impression scale scores, which increases the accuracy of the results obtained (Bar-On, 2004). Raw scores on the EQ-i 125 are tabulated and converted into standard scores based on a mean of 100 and standard deviations of 15; this scoring system resembles the scoring system used by cognitive intelligence tests that generate IQ (Intelligence Quotient) scores.

The development of the EQ-i 125 has undergone extensive review. The development of the EQ-i proceeded in six phases over a period of 17 years:

1. Identifying and logically clustering various emotional and social competencies, skills and facilitators thought to impact human performance and psychological well-being based on clinical experience and review of the literature;

2. Clearly defining the individual key clusters of competencies and skills that surfaced;

3. Initially generating approximately 1,000 items based on clinical experience, review of the literature and on input from experienced healthcare practitioners;

4. Determining the inclusion of 15 primary scales and 133 items in the 1997
   published version of the instrument based on a combination of theoretical
   considerations and statistical findings generated primarily by item analysis
   and factor analysis;

5. Initially, norming the final version of the instrument on 3,831 adults in North
   America in 1996; and

6. Continuing to collect data, norm and validate the instrument across cultures
   around the world. (Bar-On, 2011)

As the first emotional intelligence measure to be peer-reviewed by the Buros
Mental Measurement Yearbook in 1999, its presence has continued; it is the only
emotional intelligence measure used in a Congressional Report, which was submitted to
the U.S. Senate by the United States General Accounting Office in January 1988 (Bar-
On, 2011). Since 1997, the EQ-i has been used by more than one million individuals,
and it is the most widely used emotional intelligence measure to date (Bar-On, 2011).
Clifton's (Gallup, 2003) *StrengthsFinder*, developed by the Gallup Organization under
the leadership of educational psychologist Donald Clifton, is an online measurement of
personal talent that identifies areas where an individual's greatest potential for building
strengths exists. The foundation of the profile is based on a strengths philosophy that
formed the basis for the *positive psychology* movement. *Positive psychology* is a field
that emphasizes optimal human functioning and factors that contribute to a sense of well-
being and how individuals can productively contribute to society (Seligman &
Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). With a focus on mental health rather than mental illness, Clifton
designed the interviews that became the basis for the *Clifton StrengthsFinder* with the

question, "What would happen if we studied what is right with people" (Lopez, Hodges, & Harter, 2005, p.12). Widely known for its polls and employee selection research (Gallup, 2003) the Gallup Organization developed numerous semi-structured interviews to identify talent that could be used for positive outcome in the work setting; and under the leadership of Clifton, Gallup developed the Clifton StrengthsFinder as an objective measure of personal talent that could be administered online in less than one hour (Asplund, Lopez, Hodges, & Harter, 2007).

 The 177-item pairs were based on the theory and research foundation related with semi-structured personal interviews used by Selection Research Incorporated and Gallup for a period of over 30 years (Harter, Hays, & Schmidt, 2004; Schmidt & Rader, 1999). Each item lists a pair of potential self-descriptors, and the descriptors are opposites. Participants are given 20 seconds to respond to a given item, as developmental research showed that the 20-second limit resulted in a negligible item non-completion rate (Asplund, Lopez, Hodges, & Harter, 2007).

Two reliability studies related to the Clifton StrengthsFinder profile have been conducted: one measuring internal consistency and one measuring the extent to which scores are stable over time (Buckingham & Clifton, 2001). In a study involving over 50,000 respondents, the average internal consistency for each theme was 0.785 (Buckingham & Clifton, 2001). Reliability over time was measured in a separate study; technically known as "test-retest," the majority of the 34 StrengthsFinder themes demonstrated test-retest reliability between .60 and .80 over a six-month interval (p. 252).

To assess their ability to accurately identify and measure themes, many items were pilot tested and a balance was developed utilizing the items with the strongest

psychometric properties along with a proper assessment length (Lopez et al., 2005). In a study of over 600,000 respondents to analyze construct validity, Lopez, Hodges & Harter (2005) found that "the average item-to-theme correlation (corrected for part-whole overlap) was 6.6 time as large as the average item correlation to other themes (p. 2).

Data Collection

Principals in all elementary, middle and high schools in the participating district were invited to participate in the study (N=111). Once participating principals were identified, an assistant principal or assistant administrator from each participating school was selected so that there was an administrative pair from the school represented. Selection of the assistant principal/assistant administrator was random. Participant information was collected in three major areas: principal completed the Bar-On EQ-i 125, assistant principals/ assistant administrators completed the StrengthsFinder profile and all participants completed a demographic survey. The following demographic data was collected: (a) level of current work assignment, (b) current position, (c) number of years in current administrative position, (d) number of years working with current administrator with whom data will be correlated, (e) total number of years in education, (f) undergraduate degree/academic field, (g) gender, (h) race, and (i) ethnicity. Additionally, the demographic survey will obtain information from the following open-ended questions:

1. When meeting as an administrative team, is there open discussion regarding job duties/responsibilities? If so, please explain the format.

2. Describe any formal training you have received in recognizing strengths and weaknesses in yourself or among professional colleagues.

3. Describe the consideration you give to your perceived strengths of members of the administrative team when specific job duties/responsibilities are assigned to member of the administrative team.

4. Make a statement about the level of confidence you feel that your perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of your administrative team members are accurate.

5. To what degree to you feel formal training in recognizing strengths in yourself and others would benefit school leaders?

6. What do you consider a key strength that every administrator, at every school level should have?

Additionally, assistant principals/assistant administrators were asked to list the results (top 5 strengths) identified when the StrengthsFinder Profile was completed.

Data Analysis

A hierarchical multiple-regression was used to determine the relationship between the dependent variable- number of assistant principal/assistant administrator strengths that principals identified correctly, and the independent variables-number of years serving as principal and number of years working together on a school leadership entered in the first step with the emotional intelligence score entered in the second step. Feedback from qualitative information obtained from the open-ended questions will be organized into themes.

Summary

The researcher further explored the role emotional intelligence played in leaders' decision making in regard to assigning or delegating specific tasks to others on the leadership team in the school setting. With the data collected from the research

conducted, current practices in the assignment of responsibilities within school leadership teams were analyzed and efforts made to share insight to school leadership teams. Chapter III discusses the methodology of the study including the sample, instrumentation and limitations. Chapter IV presents the study results, and findings of the research.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The push for accountability in the school setting, particularly with the implementation of No Child Left Behind, has highlighted the need for effective school leadership. Leadership teams at the school level play a vital role in the establishment of the school vision, implementation of school strategic plans, and monitoring effective instructional practices. Additionally, school leadership teams are responsible for the overall management of the daily functions of the school. Understanding the impact of emotional intelligence on leadership is critical, as research indicates that emotional intelligence is a factor in developing more influential, inspiring and nurturing school leaders (Moore, 2009). Additionally, the identification of strengths of individual team members plays a key role in establishing effective leadership practices (Buckingham & Clifton, 2001).

This chapter presents a summary of the data generated in the quantitative phase through the collection of EQ-I 125 scores for participating school principals, the collection of StrengthsFinder Profile results from participating assistant principals/assistant administrators and data generated through the collection of surveys. Specifically, this chapter will describe the demographics related to the sample population surveyed; report and describe findings related to the research questions; report and describe findings from the results of the open-ended questions answered by the participating principals and assistant principals/assistant administrators, and present a summary of data findings.

Results

Principals from sixteen high schools, twenty-five middle schools, and seventy elementary schools were invited to participate in the study. Additionally, one assistant principal or assistant administrator was randomly chosen from each of the schools to participate. Twenty-six administrative pairs consisting of one principal and one assistant principal/assistant administrator participated in this study to examine the impact emotional intelligence has on the ability of the principal to identify the top five strengths of the assistant principal/assistant administrator.

Participating principals were asked to complete the Bar-On EQ-i 125 Emotional Intelligence Quotient Inventory and a survey. Additionally, the principals were given a document that provided a brief description of the 34 Strength themes identified in the StrengthsFinder Profile and asked to score the participating assistant principal/assistant administrator on the 34 themes using a scale of 1-10, with increments of .10. Of the respondents, the average time served in the capacity as a school principal was 4.65 years ($SD = 2.73$) with the majority serving at the elementary level (50%). The principal's average total years in education was 23.73 years ($SD = 6.67$). The majority of the principals were female (73.1%) and reported themselves as white (92.3%), as illustrated in Table 1.

The assistant principals/assistant administrators were given *StrengthsFinder 2.0*, which contained an access code for a web-based version of the StrengthsFinder Profile. Additionally, the assistant principals/assistant administrators were given the same survey as the principals, with an additional question that asked them to identify the results of the StrengthsFinder Profile, developed by the Gallup Organization which is an assessment

used to identify participant's top five strengths. Of the respondents, the average time served in the capacity as assistant principal/assistant administrator was 4.54 years (*SD*=4.93). The assistant principal/assistant administrator's average total years in education was 18.88 years (*SD* = 6.87). The majority of the assistant principals were female (69.2%) and reported themselves as white (92.3%), as illustrated in Table 2.

Additionally, five open-ended questions were asked concerning beliefs about strengths and weaknesses in school leadership and the impact they hold on a successful administrative team. This research was approved by the Institutional Review Board for the protection of human subjects in both the school district and the University of Southern Mississippi.

Table 1

Principal Demographic Data

Variable	Principal	Percentages
Gender		
Female	19	73.1 %
Male	7	26.9 %
Race		
Asian	1	3.8%
African American	1	3.8 %
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific	0	0%
White	24	92.3%
Other	0	0%
Level of Assignment		
Elementary	13	50%
Middle	8	30.8%
High	5	19.2%

Table 1 (continued).

Academic Field

English	5	19.2%
Mathematics	1	3.8%
Science	1	3.8%
Social Studies	3	11.5%
Physical Education	2	7.7%
Foreign Language	0	0%
Career Tech/Business	1	3.8%
Counseling	0	0%
Other	13	50%

Table 2

Assistant Principal Demographic Data

Variable	Assistant Principal / Assistant Administrator	Percentages
Gender		
Female	18	69.2 %
Male	8	30.8 %
Race		
Asian	0	0%
African American	2	7.7 %
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific	0	0%
White	24	92.3%
Other	0	0%
Level of Assignment		
Elementary	13	50%
Middle	8	30.8%
High	5	19.2%
Academic Field		
English	5	19.2%

Table 2 (continued).

Mathematics	1	3.8%
Science	2	7.7%
Social Studies	1	3.8%
Foreign Language	0	0%
Physical Education	1	3.8%
Career Tech/Business	1	3.8%
Counseling	1	3.8%
Other	14	53.8%

Statistical Results

In order to address the hypothesis regarding the relationship between principal EQ scores, the length of time the pair serve together, the length of time the principal has served in the capacity of principal and the principal's ability to identify the top five strengths of their assistant principal/assistant administrator, both quantitative and qualitative data were gathered. Descriptive statistics and simple correlations among predictor variables (principal's EQ score, length of time administrative pair serve together, principals' total years in principal position) and between predictor and criterion variables (number of matched strengths) appear in Table 3. The participating principals' total years in education ranged from 13 to 34, with the average being 23.73 ($SD = 6.67$). The participating assistant principal/assistant administrators' total years in education ranged from 10 to 34 with the average being 18.88 ($SD = 6.87$). The principals and assistant principals/assistant administrators reported an average time of working together as 2.12 years ($SD = 1.50$), and consisted of a range from 1 to 6 years. The EQ-i scores for the principals ranged from 90 to 121, and had a mean of 107.69 ($SD = 8.89$). There were no significant correlations between these variables and the average number of top five strengths accurately identified by the principals was only 1.539 ($SD = 1.208$).

Table 3

Simple Correlations Among Predictors with Criterion Variables (N=26)

	Yrs Princ[1]	Yrs Together[2]	EQ-i Score[3]
Yrs Principal[1]		-.009	.202
Yrs Together[2]			.194

	Yrs Pric[1]	Yrs Together[2]	EQ Score[3]	Mean(SD)
Strength Match[4]	.253	.052	.087	1.539(1.208)
Mean(SD)	4.654(2.727)	2.115(1.505)	107.692(8.898)	

[1]Number of years serving in the position of principal

[2]Number of years principal and assistant principal/assistant administrator working together

[3]Emotional intelligence score of principal

[4]Correct number of top five strengths principal identified from the results of the StrengthsFinder Profile taken by the assistant principal/assistant administrator

A hierarchal multiple regression was used to assess the ability of the predictor measures (EQ-i score of principal) to explain the number of assistant principal/assistant administrator top five strengths that principals identified correctly, after controlling for the influence of the number of years principal serving in the position of principal and the number of years principal and assistant principal/assistant administrator have worked together (as seen in Table 4). The number of years the principal served as principal and the number of years the principal and assistant principal/assistant administrator worked together were entered in Step 1, explaining 6.7% of the variance of the number of assistant principal/assistant administrator top five strengths identified correctly ($R^2 =$

0.067, $F = 0.827$, $p = 0.450$). After entering emotional intelligence scores in Step 2, the

total variance explained was 6.8% with a change in R^2 of 0.001 ($F = 0.533$, $p = 0.664$).

Neither model indicated that any variable significantly related to the number of correct

matches principals made with the assistant principal/assistant administrators' top five

strengths as identified upon completion of the StrengthsFinder Profile.

Table 4

Hierarchical Regression of Predictor Variables on Number of Assistant

Principal/Assistant Administrator Strengths that Principals Identified Correctly (N=26)

Step 1		Strength Match[4]			
		$R^2 = .067$			
		$F(2, 23)=.827$, p=.450			
	b	T	P	pr^2	sr^2
Y-intercept	.922	.562	<.132		
Yrs Principal[1]	.112	1.260	.220		
Yrs Together[2]	.044	.272	.788		

Step 2		Strength Match[4]			
		$\Delta R^2 = .001$			
		$\Delta F(1, 22)= .016$, p=.9			
	b	T	P	pr^2	sr^2
Y-intercept	.546	.180	.859		

Table 4 (continued).

Years Principal	.110	1.180	.251
Years Together	.040	.236	.816
Principal EQ[3]	.004	.127	.900

$$R^2 = .068$$

$$F(1, 22) = .533, p=.664$$

[1]Number of years serving in the position of principal

[2]Number of years principal and assistant principal/assistant administrator working together

[3]Emotional intelligence score of principal

[4]Correct number of top five strengths principal identified from the results of the StrengthsFinder Profile taken by the assistant principal/assistant administrator

Participating principals and assistant principals/assistant administrators were asked the following open-ended questions:

Question 10: When meeting as an administrative team, is there open discussion regarding job duties/responsibilities among the team? If so, describe the format.

Question 11: Describe any formal training you have received in recognizing strengths and weaknesses in yourself or among professional colleagues.

Question 12: Describe the consideration you give to your perceived strengths of members of the administrative team when specific job duties/responsibilities are assigned to members of the administrative team.

Question 13: Make a statement about the level of confidence you feel you're your perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of your administrative team members are accurate.

Question 14: To what degree do you feel formal training in recognizing strengths in yourself and others would benefit school leaders?

Question 15: What do you consider a key strength that every administrator, at every school level should have?

Open-ended Questions

Assistant principals/assistant administrators participating in the study were also asked to list the results of the top five strengths identified upon their completion of the StrengthsFinder Profile. The responses to the open-ended questions were organized, highlighted, notated, and analyzed for emergent themes regarding the participants' insights into their perceptions of the impact the identification of strengths has in the assignment of duties and responsibilities within the administrative team at their schools. Clear, repetitive patterns became evident in the responses suggesting that saturation had been achieved.

In *Question 10*, participants were asked the following question: "When meeting as an administrative team, is there open discussion regarding job duties/responsibilities among the team? If so, describe the format." A large majority (96.2%) of the respondents indicated that there is open discussion regarding job duties/assignments (see Table 5). Overwhelmingly, although unsolicited, while answering this question, the principals and assistant principals/assistant administrators included the frequency of the administrative meetings.   Among the team surveyed, 65.4% met weekly to discuss job duties and responsibilities. The results indicate that the majority (67.9%) of the assigned duties/responsibilities are negotiated during administrative meetings and discussion, while 17.3% of the respondents made mention specifically that most duties are pre-

assigned. Interestingly, 5.7% of the responses make reference to a consideration of one's perceived strengths during open discussion of job duties/responsibilities. The salient theme from the answers in this open-ended question is the mention of task completion, with many noting a sense of urgency. For instance, 84.4% of the answers included statements that indicated the primary discussion with job duties and responsibilities had a focus of getting tasks completed, while only 7.7% made mention of using this discussion as an opportunity to assign responsibilities as a learning tool. The survey response patterns in this question further suggest that a priority for school administrators is to complete the tasks that are put before them on a daily basis, with little time to consider the most effective way of accomplishing the tasks through the utilization of strengths based leadership.

Table 5

Frequency Distribution (Percentages) Summary of Themes from Open-Ended Responses Regarding Question 10.

	Response	Frequency (Percent)
Open Discussion Regarding Job Duties/Responsibilities Among Team	Yes	50 (96.2%)
	No	2 (3.8%)
Frequency of Meeting to Discuss Duties/Responsibilities	Daily	9 (17.3%)
	Weekly	34 (65.4%)
	Annually	9 (17.3%)
Assignment of Duties	Duties are pre-assigned	9 (17.3%)
	Duties are negotiated	28(67.9%)
Purpose of Administrative Meeting	Ensure tasks will be completed	44(84.6%)

Question 11 investigated participants' amount of formal training in the identification of strengths and weaknesses. Of the respondents, 53.8% indicated that at some point they had been introduced to various personality inventories. Additionally, 26.9% of the respondents reported receiving Clifton & Buckingham's (2001) *Now Discover Your Strengths* through the Leadership Academy within the school district, but with no formal training. All of these respondents were in assistant principal/assistant administrator positions. Finally, 19.2% of the respondents indicated that they had received no training at all.

Principals were asked in Question 12 whether consideration of perceived strengths was given when assigning specific job duties to members of the administrative team. The majority of the principals (88.5%) responded that consideration of administrative team members' strengths are considered when assigning responsibilities. Of those, five principals indicated that a great amount of consideration is given, while four of the principals indicated that additional consideration is given to the need for growth in diverse areas, and assignments/duties were often based on that need for growth. Of the respondents, 11.5% indicated no consideration (see Table 6). In question 13, participants were also asked to make a statement about the level of confidence they feel regarding the accuracy of their perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of their administrative team members. The responses were grouped into three specific themes: very confident, confident, and not confident. The majority (92.3%) indicated that they were confident or very confident regarding the accuracy of their perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of their administrative team members.

Table 6

Frequency Distribution (Percentages) Summary of Themes from Open-Ended Responses of Principals and Assistant Principals/Assistant Administrators For Questions 11, 12 and 13

	Response	Frequency (Percent)
Question 11. Formal Training in Recognizing Strengths and Weakness in Yourself or Colleagues	Yes	14 (26.9%)
	No	10 (19.2%)
	Exposure to Personality Inventories	28 (53.8%)
Question 12. Consideration Given to Perceived Strengths of Members of the Administrative Team When Specific Job Duties/Responsibilities Are Assigned (Principals Only)	Yes	23 (88.5%)
	No	3 (11.5%)
	Annually	9 (17.3%)
Question 13. Statement About The Accuracy in the Level of Confidence Of Your Perceptions of the Strengths and Weaknesses of Administrative Team Members	Very Confident	23 (44.2%)
	Confident	25 (48.1%)
	Not Confident	4 (7.7%)

In Question 14, participants were asked to what degree they felt formal training in recognizing strengths in themselves and others would benefit school leaders. The recurring theme emerging from the responses to this question indicate that the participants see a benefit to formal training, with 42.3% viewing it as very important (see Table 7). Finally, in *Question 15* the participants were asked to identify a key strength

that every school administrator, regardless of the school level assignment, should possess. After a thorough review of the answers, the responses were categorized into the following strength themes: (a) good communication/relating well with others, (b) good organization/structure, (c) good leadership, (d) flexibility/responding appropriately, (e) effective listening skills/exhibiting empathy, and (f) command of academic content. The majority of the respondents (50%) chose good communication skills as a key strength every school administrator should possess. The responses to the categories of organization/structure, good leadership, flexibility/appropriate response, and effective listening/empathy were all equal, with 11% of the participants naming strengths in each of these categories.

Table 7

Frequency Distribution (Percentages) Summary of Themes from Open-Ended Responses of Principals and Assistant Principals/Assistant Administrators for Questions 14 and 15

Question	Response	Frequency (Percent)
Question 14. What Degree You Feel Formal Training in Recognizing Strengths and Weaknesses in Yourself and Others Is Beneficial	Very Important	22 (42.3%)
	Important	16 (30.8%)
	Somewhat Important	10 (19.2%)
	Not Important	4 (7.1%)

Table 7 (continued).

Question 15. Key Strength Every Administrator Should Have	Good Communication Skills/Positive Relations with Others	26 (50.0%)
	Good Organization/Structure	6 (11.0%)
	Good Leadership Skills	6 (11.0%)
	Flexibility/Appropriate Responses	6 (11.0%)
	Good listener/Exhibit Empathy	6 (11.0%)
	Command of Academic Content	2 (2.0%)

Summary

This study indicates that the emotional intelligence of school principals has no significant

impact on their ability to identify the top five strengths of their assistant

principal/assistant administrator. Analysis of the open-ended questions indicates that

principals overwhelmingly see the importance of identifying strengths and weaknesses of

members of their team in order for the most beneficial assignment of duties and

responsibilities to take place. Additionally, the majority of the principals stated that

consideration is given to perceived strengths and weaknesses, and that they have

confidence in their abilities to accurately perceive strengths and weaknesses, yet the

research indicates a low success rate among the principals in this study in identifying the

top five strengths of their assistant principals/assistant administrators. Additionally, the

results from the open-ended questions indicated that the majority of the respondents with

EQ-i scores in the lower range indicated that they do not provide a lot of open dialogue

regarding the distribution of job responsibilities. Chapter V will integrate the insights

generated from the analyses in this study with those of past empirical work, and how they

converge and diverge with the findings of others. Theoretical, practical, and research-

based implications of this study will be explored. Limitations with regard to the design,

methodology, and validity of the study will also be presented. Finally, recommendations

for future research will be made.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

Introduction

Chapter V offers a review of the purpose and design of the study, a summary of findings and conclusions, possible limitations of the study, implications for practice and recommendations for future research. Respective to each research question in the study, this chapter will include a summary of the findings compared to related research, as well as conclusions based on findings and relevant research.

Review of the Purpose and Design of the Study

The purpose of this study was to illuminate effective leadership through an exploration of the relationship between emotional intelligence of school principals, and their ability to identify the top five strengths or talents of a member of their leadership team using the StrengthsFinder Profile. There were three research questions in this study:

1. Do emotional intelligence levels of principals have an impact on their ability to identify the top five strengths of their assistant principals/assistant administrators?

2. Does the length of time a school principal and assistant principal/assistant administrator work together have an impact on a principal's ability to identify the strengths of the assistant principal/assistant administrator?

3. Does the length of time a school principal serves in the role of principal have an impact on a principal's ability to identify the strengths of an assistant principal/assistant administrator on their administrative team?

Chapter I introduces related research beginning with the theoretical foundation including a discussion of effective leadership, emotional intelligence and strengths based leadership. Chapter I also includes a definition of the problem statement, a discussion of the statement of purpose, approach, assumptions, delimitations, and a definition of terms. Chapter II reviewed literature about theory and research related to the study in the areas of leadership, leadership teams, theories and perspectives of effective leadership, emotional intelligence, applications of emotional intelligence and leadership, and strengths based leadership. Chapter III detailed the design of the study through description of the research approach and methodology, research instrumentation through data collection from the Bar-On EQ-I 125 Emotional Intelligence Quotient Inventory, the StrengthsFinder Profile, and a survey. Additionally, Chapter III discussed the study procedures, data analysis and limitations as well as background validity information on the Bar-On EQ-i Emotional Intelligence Quotient Inventory and the StrengthsFinder Profile. Chapter IV presented and summarized data generated by the study design in alignment to the study research questions. This final chapter will integrate the findings from the analyses with past literature and describe how they converge and diverge with the findings of others. Theoretical, practical, and research-based implications of this study will be explored. Limitations with regard to the design, methodology, and validity of the study will also be presented in this chapter. Finally, recommendations for future research will be made.

<div align="center">Summary of Findings and Conclusions</div>

The first question in this study asked, *Do emotional intelligence levels of principals have an impact on their ability to identify the top five strengths of their*

assistant principals/assistant administrators? Twenty-six school principals, from traditional school settings in elementary, middle, and high schools in a large school district in the southeastern United States participated in a web-based, self-reporting EQ-i 125 Emotional Intelligence Quotient Inventory that measured their emotional intelligence. Additionally, the participating principals were provided a document with a brief description of the 34 strength themes included in the StrengthsFinder Profile and were asked to score a member of their leadership team on a scale of 1 to 10 with increments of .10. Correlations were calculated between the total EQ-i score of the principals and the correct number of strengths that matched the actual results from the StrengthsFinder Profile completed by their team counterpart. The correlation between emotional intelligence of the school principals and the correct number of strength matches was .087, which indicates that there is no significant relationship between principals' emotional intelligence and their ability to identify the top five strengths of a member of their leadership team.

This finding contradicts previous research and theory reported in the literature reviewed from Chapter II. Previous research has indicated that a leader's emotional intelligence makes a difference in how effectively he or she accomplishes expectations as well as developing stronger organizational performance (Caruso & Salovey, 2004; Goleman, 2004). Additionally, Cook (2006) found that emotional intelligence has a positive effect on principals' leadership performance. The literature reviewed in this study suggests that emotional intelligence has an impact in general leadership performance outcomes. Furthermore, Rath and Conchie (2008) specifically list the following keys to being a more effective leader: knowing your strengths and investing in

others' strengths, getting people with the right strengths on your team, and understanding and meeting the four basic needs of those who look to you for leadership. Lyons (2005) found the competencies of emotional intelligence as essential components for school principals to possess, further noting that dealing effectively with tasks and dealing effectively with people are required elements of successful school leadership, particularly with school-based administration. Finally, Patti and Tobin (2006) suggest that the development of emotional intelligence is central to the development of effective school leaders, noting that emotionally intelligent leaders recognize position differences in leadership and possess the competencies to help others develop the necessary skills needed for more effective leadership.

As empirical work seems to confirm findings specifically linking emotional intelligence to research-based school leadership practices (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty 2005), it would seem reasonable to suggest that school leaders who are emotionally intelligent may also be likely to engage in those practices that make them effective leaders. Wendorf-Heldt (2009) examined the role emotional intelligence plays in the link to school leadership practices that increase student achievement. The research indicated that there is a strong correlation between emotional intelligence and research-based school leadership practices, with the strongest correlations found within the domain of relationship management (Wendorf-Heldt, 2009). The result of this research defines the research-based school leadership practices most highly correlated with emotional intelligence competencies in regard to the reaction of the principal as:

1. Contingent Rewards, which is defined as the extent to which the principal recognizes and rewards individual accomplishments.

2. Resources, which is defined as the extent to which the principal provides teachers with materials and professional development necessary for the successful execution of their jobs.

3. Visibility Annually, which is defined as the extent to which the principal has quality contacts and interactions with teachers and students.

4. Flexibility, which is defined as the extent to which the principal adapts his or her leadership behavior to the needs of the current situation and is comfortable.

5. Focus, which is defined as the extent to which the principal establishes clear goals and keeps those goals in the forefront of the school's attention.

6. Communication, which is defined as the extent to which the principal establishes strong lines of communication with teachers and among teachers.

7. Relationships, which is defined as the extent to which the principal demonstrates awareness of the personal aspects of teachers and staff.

8. Optimize, which is defined as the extent to which the principal inspires and leads new and challenging innovations.

9. Situational Awareness, which is defined as the extent to which the principal is aware of the details and undercurrents in the running of the school and uses this information to address current and potential problems.

With an ultimate impact on student achievement, research suggests that the development of emotionally intelligent leadership is necessary. One would assume that the ability to identify strengths of fellow administrative team members is a key leadership practice. In fact, as research from Rath and Conchie (2008) suggests, for a team to create

sustained growth, leaders must continue to invest in each person's strengths. Although there is ample empirical support to suggest that emotional intelligence is a key factor in successful leadership, we lack research that illuminates the experiential application. As this study suggests, results from the open-ended questions indicate that a principal's focus is often on the tasks set before them and the link between their ability to efficiently complete the tasks. Unfortunately, there appears to be a disconnect between how to more efficiently complete the tasks through the utilization of individual strengths among team members.

The second question in this study asked: *Does the length of time a school principal and assistant principal/assistant administrator work together have an impact on a principal's ability to identify the strengths of the assistant principal/assistant administrator?* Data collected from the survey taken by the 52 participating principals and assistant principals/assistant administrators were used to calculate correlations between the number of years the paired administrators worked together and the number of correct matches the principal achieved. The results indicate there is no significant relationship between the number of years the administrative pair worked together and the correct number of strength matches ($r = 0.052$). Administrative teams in large school districts often face changes within administrative team structures, sometimes on a yearly basis. As Hart (1993) notes in *Principal Succession: Establishing Leadership in Schools*, a principal's succession affects all who work in and with a school, often creating a period of unknown.

The third question in this study asked: *Does the length of time a school principal serves in the role of principal have an impact on a principal's ability to identify the*

strengths of an assistant principal/assistant administrator on their administrative team?

Data collected from the survey the participating principals completed, indicating the

number of years they had served in the role of principal, were correlated with the correct

number of strength matches the principal made with the results of the StrengthsFinder

Profile the assistant principal/assistant administrator completed, and the results indicated

there was little correlation ($r = .253$). Hart (1993) further describes the challenges facing

first time principals as an experience of double socialization; they must experience

professional socialization to school administration and organizational socialization to

their immediate work setting.

<div align="center">Limitations of the Study</div>

A relatively small sample size generalizing to similar populations may be less

powerful. Also as in the case with any generalizing any findings demographic

differences in populations may negatively impact the generalizability of these findings.

In addition, the inherent differences among school systems and how they organize and

structure their administrative teams may weaken the applicability of these findings or

usefulness of these insights within demographically similar systems. Certainly, large

metropolitan school systems have different leadership training programs opportunities

than those afforded to smaller, rural districts. In this study, participants were from

elementary, middle and high school levels and a further limitation may be that this study

didn't seek to discern the differences in job responsibilities within these levels. An

additional limitation within this study is the variance in formal training other school

districts might have established in the identification of strengths of team members.

Another limitation may be a conceptual one. That is, so far empirical work offers a

conceptualization of emotional intelligence as it relates to leadership. It falls short of framing the experiential component of leadership, offering clarity. Perhaps a better conceptualization of leadership based on emotional intelligence would be in defining strengths as talents, rather than skills. A further limitation is methodological. This study was based on a quantitative design with qualitative data gathered to offer support. However the analysis was largely statistical. Perhaps a study designed on rigorous qualitative methodology may offer greater clarity of the reality of administrative team leadership as it relates to emotional intelligence, and of the differences between skills, talents, and the development of strengths.

Another limitation of this study involved the instrumentation. Both the Bar-On EQ-i 125 and the StrengthsFinder Profile were self-reported. It is possible that they did not present an accurate portrait of themselves. A final limitation in this study involved range restriction in the EQ-i scores reported for the participating principals. Of the participating principals, the range and standard deviation in EQ scores was limited

<div align="center">Implications for Practice</div>

Based on the findings and conclusions related to the literature review from this study, there are several recommendations for practice that should be considered. The demands placed upon school leaders in the 21st century provide a platform for the development of both intellectually and emotionally strong leadership. For those seeking to be effective leaders, emotional intelligence is a positive contributing factor. Additionally, the demand for school leaders due to retirement, school districts will need to begin a strategic plan to identify potential school leaders in order to build an effective leadership succession plan. New conceptualizations of leadership should be expanded

beyond a focus on strengths as merely skills or talents to those of character that could provide a form of navigational leadership. The increasing demands placed on school leaders calls for movement from leadership that merely accomplishes task completion to a form of sustained leadership that is proactive rather than reactive.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study utilized a composite EQ-i score for the school principal in the correlation with the matched strengths of assistant principals/assistant administrators. A future study may statistically analyze specific components of the EQ-i with the ability to identify strengths of a team member. Although not the design of this study, data collected in this study could be used to achieve this analysis.

This study offered insights into the lack of correlation between emotional intelligence of school principals and their ability to identify strengths of a member of their leadership team. Given the lack of correlation, many new questions have been raised. Further studies could illuminate the processes involved with properly identifying and optimizing strengths of team members, namely by addressing future research questions.

For instance, would formal training using the StrengthsFinder Profile for school administrative teams lead to increased insight for effective school leadership? A study like this might compare a group who has been trained using the StrengthsFinder Profile with a demographically similar group who has no training with the StrengthsFinders Profile. A leadership instrument, such as the McRel Balanced Leadership Instrument could be utilized to determine differences in leadership effectiveness within the two groups.

Another research question worthy of investigation is suggested through the responses obtained in the survey in this study. Specifically, during the analysis of the open-ended questions, it revealed a pattern where the administrators transposed consideration of one's skills for strengths. Without underlying talent, learning a skill is a survival technique. As you build your strengths, skills will actually prove most valuable when they are combined with genuine talent. Perhaps an ethnographic study of an effective leadership team would provide clarity into the differences between skills, talents and strengths and their impact on the completion of job duties and tasks.

Another future direction for research may offer a more holistic perspective of individual strengths- that is going beyond defining strengths as skill sets or styles, to including character strengths. Character strengths may give a vector, so to speak. In other words, through what character dispositions are these skills going to best manifest themselves? Recent work from the emerging field of Positive Psychology has yielded a classification of 24 universal character strengths, known as the VIA Classification of Character Strengths and Virtues. Research related to this classification supports the idea that awareness of one's strengths and how to use them in navigating life can lead to optimal functioning and well-being. A future study may focus on how leadership teams who have been trained in awareness and effective use of their strengths as measured by the VIA Classification function more effectively.

Supporting continued growth for school administrators may provide a key to developing stronger administrative teams in schools. As research has suggested, emotional intelligence enhances effective leadership. Furthermore, the identification of individual strengths leads to a stronger, strengths-based leadership. Clearly, to improve

educational leadership individuals must become more aware of their own strengths and take a closer look at ways of identifying the strengths of others as that talent may not be inherently present.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY

Name:_____ School:_____

1. Level of current assignment: (circle) Elementary   Middle   High
2. Current Position: (circle)   Principal   Asstistant Principal   Assistant
   Administrator
3. Number of years in current administrative position:_____
4. Number of years working with current assistant principal/assistant administrator
   with whom data will be correlated:_____
5. Total number of years in education:_____
6. Undergraduate degree/academic field: (circle)

   English   Foreign Language
   Math   Career Tech/Business
   Science   Counseling
   Social Studies   Other
   Physical Education

7. Gender: (circle)   Male   Female

8. Race: (circle)
   American Indian or Alaska Native
   Asian
   Black or African American
   Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   White
   Other

9. Ethnicity: (circle) Hispanic or Latino   Not Hispanic or Latino

10. When meeting as an administrative team, is there open discussion regarding job
    duties/responsibilities among the team? If so, describe the format.

11. Describe any formal training you have received in recognizing strengths and
    weaknesses in yourself or among professional colleagues.

TURN OVER!!

12. **Principals only**: Describe the consideration you give to your perceived strengths of members of the administrative team when specific job duties/responsibilities are assigned to members of the administrative team.

13. Make a statement about the level of confidence you feel that your perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of your administrative team members are accurate.

14. To what degree do you feel formal training in recognizing strengths in yourself and others would benefit school leaders.

15. What do you consider a key strength that every administrator, at every school level should have?

Assistant Principals/Assistant Administrators: Please list the results (top 5 strengths) identified when you completed the StrengthsFinder Profile:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

APPENDIX B

STRENGTHS RATING FOR PRINCIPALS

Principal Name:_____ Asst. Principal/Asst.
Admin:_____
Principals: Please rate (score) your Assistant Principal/Assistant Administrator on the following themes
using a scale of 1-10, with increments of 0.1 (example scores: 9.5, 6.0, 7.3, 4.2), with 10.0 being most likely to describe that person and 1.0 being least likely to describe that person.

Score	Theme	Description of Theme
	Achiever®	People strong in the Achiever theme have a great deal of stamina and work hard. They take great satisfaction from being busy and productive.
	Activator®	People strong in the Activator theme can make things happen by turning thoughts into action. They are often impatient.
	Adaptability®	People strong in the Adaptability theme prefer to "go with the flow." They tend to be "now" people who take things as they come and discover the future one day at a time.
	Analytical®	People strong in the Analytical theme search for reasons and causes. They have the ability to think about all the factors that might affect a situation.
	Arranger™	People strong in the Arranger theme can organize, but they also have a flexibility that complements this ability. They like to figure out how all of the pieces and resources can be arranged for maximum productivity.
	Belief®	People strong in the Belief theme have certain core values that are unchanging. Out of these values emerges a defined purpose for their life.
	Command®	People strong in the Command theme have presence. They can take control of a situation and make decisions.
	Communication®	People strong in the Communication theme generally find it easy to put their thoughts into words. They are good conversationalists and presenters.
	Competition®	People strong in the Competition theme measure their progress against the performance of others. They strive to win first place and revel in contests.
	Connectedness®	People strong in the Connectedness theme have faith in the links between all things. They believe there are few coincidences and that almost every event has a reason.
	Consistency® / Fairness™	People strong in the Consistency theme (also called Fairness in the first StrengthsFinder assessment) are keenly aware of the need to treat people the same. They try to treat everyone in the world fairly by setting up clear rules and adhering to them.
	Context®	People strong in the Context theme enjoy thinking about the past. They understand the present by researching its history.
	Deliberative®	People strong in the Deliberative theme are best described by the serious care they take in making decisions or choices. They anticipate the obstacles.
	Developer®	People strong in the Developer theme recognize and cultivate the potential in others. They spot the signs of each small improvement and derive satisfaction from these improvements.
	Discipline™	People strong in the Discipline theme enjoy routine and structure. Their world is best described by the order they create.
	Empathy™	People strong in the Empathy theme can sense the feelings of

		other people by imagining themselves in others' lives or others' situations.
	Focus™	People strong in the Focus theme can take a direction, follow through, and make the corrections necessary to stay on track. They prioritize, then act.
	Futuristic®	People strong in the Futuristic theme are inspired by the future and what could be. They inspire others with their visions of the future.
	Harmony®	People strong in the Harmony theme look for consensus. They don't enjoy conflict; rather, they seek areas of agreement.
	Ideation®	People strong in the Ideation theme are fascinated by ideas. They are able to find connections between seemingly disparate phenomena.
	Inclusiveness® / Includer®	People strong in the Inclusiveness theme are accepting of others. They show awareness of those who feel left out, and make an effort to include them.
	Individualization®	People strong in the Individualization theme are intrigued with the unique qualities of each person. They have a gift for figuring out how people who are different can work together productively.
	Input®	People strong in the Input theme have a craving to know more. Often they like to collect and archive all kinds of information.
	Intellection®	People strong in the Intellection theme are characterized by their intellectual activity. They are introspective and appreciate intellectual discussions.
	Learner®	People strong in the Learner theme have a great desire to learn and want to continuously improve. In particular, the process of learning, rather than the outcome, excites them.
	Maximizer®	People strong in the Maximizer theme focus on strengths as a way to stimulate personal and group excellence. They seek to transform something strong into something superb.
	Positivity®	People strong in the Positivity theme have an enthusiasm that is contagious. They are upbeat and can get others excited about what they are going to do.
	Relator®	People who are strong in the Relator theme enjoy close relationships with others. They find deep satisfaction in working hard with friends to achieve a goal.
	Responsibility®	People strong in the Responsibility theme take psychological ownership of what they say they will do. They are committed to stable values such as honesty and loyalty.
	Restorative®	People strong in the Restorative theme are adept at dealing with problems. They are good at figuring out what is wrong and resolving it.
	Self-Assurance®	People strong in the Self-assurance theme feel confident in their ability to manage their own lives. They possess an inner compass that gives them confidence that their decisions are right.
	Significance®	People strong in the Significance theme want to be very important in the eyes of others. They are independent and want to be recognized.
	Strategic™	People strong in the Strategic theme create alternative ways to proceed. Faced with any given scenario, they can quickly spot the relevant patterns and issues.
	Woo®	People strong in the Woo theme love the challenge of meeting new people and winning them over. They derive satisfaction from breaking the ice and making a connection with another person.

APPENDIX C

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI IRB APPROVAL

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
118 College Drive #5147 | Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001
Phone: 601.266.6820 | Fax: 601.266.4377 | www.usm.edu/irb

NOTICE OF COMMITTEE ACTION

The project has been reviewed by The University of Southern Mississippi Institutional Review Board in accordance with Federal Drug Administration regulations (21 CFR 26, 111), Department of Health and Human Services (45 CFR Part 46), and university guidelines to ensure adherence to the following criteria:

- The risks to subjects are minimized.
- The risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits.
- The selection of subjects is equitable.
- Informed consent is adequate and appropriately documented.
- Where appropriate, the research plan makes adequate provisions for monitoring the data collected to ensure the safety of the subjects.
- Where appropriate, there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of all data.
- Appropriate additional safeguards have been included to protect vulnerable subjects.
- Any unanticipated, serious, or continuing problems encountered regarding risks to subjects must be reported immediately, but not later than 10 days following the event. This should be reported to the IRB Office via the "Adverse Effect Report Form".
- If approved, the maximum period of approval is limited to twelve months. Projects that exceed this period must submit an application for renewal or continuation.

PROTOCOL NUMBER: 12040305
PROJECT TITLE: The Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence of School Principals and Their Ability to Identify the Strengths or Talents of a Member of Their Leaderhip Team
PROJECT TYPE: Dissertation
RESEARCHER/S: Angela L. Bare
COLLEGE/DIVISION: College of Education & Psychology
DEPARTMENT: Educational Leadership & School Counseling
FUNDING AGENCY: N/A
IRB COMMITTEE ACTION: Expedited Review Approval
PERIOD OF PROJECT APPROVAL: 04/12/2012 to 04/11/2013

Lawrence A. Hosman, Ph.D.
Institutional Review Board Chair

APPENDIX D

DISTRICT APPROVAL

COBB COUNTY
SCHOOL DISTRICT

P.O. Box 1088
Marietta, GA 30061
Telephone: (770) 426-3300
www.cobbk12.org

A Community with a Passion for Learning

March 27, 2012

Ms. Angela Bare
3894 Blustery Way
Marietta, GA 30066

Dear Ms. Bare,

Your application to conduct research in Cobb County School District has been administratively approved and a copy of your proposal titled, The Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence of School Principals & Their Ability to Identify the Strengths or Talents of a Member of Their Leadership Team, sent to the principal of each proposed school. You may now contact the individual schools/departments about their participation in the study. Listed below are the schools identified in your application, along with the name and phone number of the principal. A copy of the *Principal Agreement To Participate Form* is included. After gaining approval from school principals, submit the original form to the Office of Accountability. Once the form has been received in the Office of Accountability and Research, a final letter of approval will be sent to you.

School	Principal	Phone
Acworth Intermediate School	Deborah Morris	770.975.6600
Argyle Elementary School	Robert Babay	678.842.6800
Austell Intermediate School	Patrick O Connell	770.819.2387
Austell Primary School	Dr. Marvin Bynes	770.819.5804
Belmont Hills Elementary School	Terry Floyd	678.842.6810
Birney Elementary School	Michael Perkins	678.842.6824
Brown Elementary School	Brett Ward	678.842.6838
Brumby Elementary School	Dr. Amanda Richie	770.916.7070
Bryant Intermediate School	Alfreda Williams	770.819.2402
Bryant Primary School	Dr. Patrice Moore	770.819.2402
Clarkdale Elementary School	Marjorie Bickerstaff	770.819.2422
Clay Elementary School	Florence Williams	770.819.2430
Compton Elementary School	Elizabeth Murphy	770.222.3700
Dowell Elementary School	Janis Komara	678.594.8059
Fair Oaks Elementary School	Dr. Cindy Szwec	678.594.8060
Green Acres Elementary School	Mitchel Bivens	678.842.6906
Harmony Leland Elementary School	Hermia Simmons-Deveaux	770.819.2483
Hayes Intermediate School	Teressa Watson	678.594.8127
Hayes Primary School	David Pearce	678.594.8127
Hollydale Elementary School	Lynn McWhorter	678.594.8143
Imagine International Academy of Mableton	Marcus Barber	678.384.8920
LaBelle Elementary School	Lisa Hogan	678.842.6955
Mableton Elementary School	Kym Eisgruber	770.819.2513
McCall Primary School	Thomas Farrell	770.975.9775
Milford Elementary School	Michelle Pearce	678.842.6966
Norton Park Elementary School	Douglas Daugherty	678.842.5833
Powder Springs Elementary School	Darlene Mitchell	770.222.3746
Powers Ferry Elementary School	Rattana Inthirathvongsy	770.578.7936
Riverside Intermediate School	Althea Singletary	770-819-2553
Riverside Primary School	Dr. Doris Billups-McClure	770.819.5851
Russell Elementary School	Nancy Dipetrillo	770.437.5937
Sanders Elementary School	Rebecca Jenkins	770.819.2569
Sedalia Park Elementary School	Jennifer Lawson	770.509.5162
Sky View Elementary School	Cynthia Cutler	770.819.2584

BOARD OF EDUCATION   Scott Sweeney, *Chairman* · David Morgan, *Vice Chairman*
Lynnda Eagle · Timothy Stultz · Kathleen Angelucci · David Banks · Alison Bartlett

SUPERINTENDENT   Michael Hinojosa, Ed.D

REFERENCES

Andrews, R., & Soder, R. (1987). Principal leadership and student achievement. *Educational Leadership, 55*, 9-11.

Armstrong, D. (2005). Leadership at the crossroads: Negotiating challenges, tensions, and ambiguities in the transition from teaching to the vice-principalship. In: Armstrong, D. (ed.) *Examining the Practice of School Administration in Canada*. Calgary, Canada: Detselig Enterprises, 113-128.

Aspinwall, L., & Staudinger, U. (2003). *A psychology of human strengths: Fundamental questions and future directions for a positive psychology.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Asplund, J., Lopez, S., Hodges, T., & Harter, J. (2007). *The Clifton StrengthsFinder 2.0 technical report: Development and validation.* Princeton, NJ: The Gallup Organization.

Bar-On, R., & Parker, J. D. A. (2000). *The Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory: Youth Version (EQ-i:YV) Technical Manual.* Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems, Inc.

Bar-On, R. (2004). The Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i); Rationale, description, and summary of psychometric properties. In Glenn Geher (Ed.), *Measuring emotional intelligence: Common ground and controversy*. Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers.

Bar-On, R. (1997). *Bar On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i): Technical manual.* Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.

Bar-On, R. (1997). *The emotional quotient inventory (EQ-i): A test of emotional intelligence.* Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems, Inc.

Barsade, S. (1998). The ripple effect: Emotional contagion in groups (working paper). New Haven, CT: Yale University School of Management.

Benda, S., & Wright, R. (2002). *The culture of elementary school as a function of leadership style and disciplinary climate and culture.* Presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Convention.

Bensimon, E. (1989). The meaning of "good presidential leadeship": A frame analysis. *The Review of Higher Education*, *12*(2), 107-123.

Bercheid, E. (1998). The greening of relationship science. *American Psychologist*, *54*, 260-266.

Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (1994). Looking for leadership: Another search party's report. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 30*(1), 77-96.

Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (2008). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Boyatzis, R., Cowan, S., & Kolb, D. (1995). *Innovations in professional education: Steps on a journey to learning.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Boyatzis, R., Goleman, D., and Rhee, K. (2000). Clustering competence in emotional intelligence: Insights form the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI). In R. Bar-On and J.D.A. Parker (eds.)., *Handbook of Emotional Intelligence*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bradberry, T., & Greaves, J. (2003). *Emotional intelligence quickbook: Everything you need to know.* San Diego, CA: TalentSmart.

Bradberry, T., & Greaves, J. (2004). *Emotional intelligence appraisal: There is more than IQ, technical manual update.* San Diego, CA: Talent Smart Inc.

Bradberry, T., & Greaves, J. (2009). *Emotional intelligence 2.0.* San Diego, CA: TalentSmart.

Brienza, D., & Cavallo, K. (2011). Retrieved from http://www.eiconsortium.org/research/emotional_competence_leadership_htm

Buckingham, M., & Clifton, D. (2001). *Now discover your strengths.* New York, NY: The Free Press.

Caruso, D., & Salvoey, P. (2004). *The emotionally intelligent manager: How to develop and use the four key emotional skills of leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.

Cherniss, C. (1999). *Model program summaries.* Technical report issued by the Consortium for Research on Emotional Intelligence in Organizations. Retrieved from http://www.eiconsortium.org

Cherniss, C. (2000). Emotional intelligence: What it is and why it matters. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology.* New Orleans, LA.

Cherniss, C. (2004). Intelligence, emotional. *Encyclopedia of applied psychology*, *2*, pp. 315-321.

Cherniss, C. (2011). The business case for emotional intelligence. *The Concortium for Research on Emotional Intelligence in Organizations*. Retrieved from http://www.eiconsortium.org/research/business_case_for_ei.htm

Cherniss, C., & Goleman, D. (2001). *The emotionally intelligent workplace.* San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.

Clifton, D. O. & Harter, J. K. (2003). Strengths investment. In J. D. K. S. Cameron, *Positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 111-121). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Cook, C. R. (2006). Effects of emotional intelligence on principals' leadership performance. (Doctoral dissertation, Montana State University, 2006). Retrieved from Proquest Information and Learning Company.

Council of Chief State School Officers (1996). *Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium: Standards for School Leaders, State Education Assessment Center*, Washington, DC.

Covin, T., & Kilmann, R. (1991). Profiling large scale change efforts. *Organizational Development Journal*, *9*, 1-8.

Daft, R. (2008). *The leadership experience* (4th ed.). Mason, OH: Thomson South-Western.

Daresh, J. (1991). A knowledge base for educational jleadership. Retrieved 05 10, 2010, from Retrieved from ERIC Database.

Davis, S. (1998). Taking aim at effective leadership. *Thrust for Educational Leadership*, *28*(2), 6-9, 37-38.

Day, A. Newsome, S., & Catano, V. (2002). *Emotional intelligence and leadership.* Kingston, Canada: Canadian Forces Leadership Institute.

Day, C., Harris, A. & Hadfield, M. (2001). Challenging the orthodoxy of effective school leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 4*(1), 39-56.

Division, G. E. (2011). *Gallup Education Division*. Retrieved from

    http://education.gallup.com/content/default.aspx?ci=22105

Druskat, V., Sala, F., & Mount, G. (2006). *Linking emotional intelligence and*

    performance at work: Current research evidence with individuals and groups.

    Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dubin, H. (2005). Building high-performance teams. *Chief Learning Officer*, *4*(7),

    46-49.

Duckworth, A., Steen, T., & Seligman, M. (2005). Positive psychology in clinical

    practice. Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, Positive Psychology Center,

    University of Pennsylvania, *1*, 629-651.

DuFour, R. (2002). The learning-centered principal. *Educational Leadership*, *59*(8),

    12-15.

Educational Research Service (2000). *The principal, keystone of a high-achieving*

    school: Attracting and keeping the leader we need. Arlington, VA: Author.

Fleishman, E., & Harris, E. F. (1962). Patterns of leadership behavior related to employee

    grievances and turnover. *Personal Psychology*, *15*, 43-56.

Fullan, M. (1998). Breaking the bonds of dependency. *Educational Leadership*, *55*, 6-11.

Fullan, M. (2002). The change leader. *Educational Leadership*, *59*(8), 16-20.

Gallup. (2003). *The Gallup Poll: Public opinion 2003*. Lanham, MD: Roman and

    Littlefield.

Gantner, M., Daresh, J., Dunlap, K., & Newsom, J. (1999). Effective school leadership

    attributes: Voices from the field. Retrieved from ERIC database.

Geher, G. (2004). *Measuring emotional intelligence: Common ground and controversy.* Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers.

George, J. (2000). Emotions and leadership: The role of emotional leadership. *Human Relations*, *53*(8), 1027-1055.

Gibbs, G. (2008). Tooting your horn? *Management in Education*, *22*(1), 14-17.

Giese, T. (2006). *Individual traits and organizational factors associated with managerial practices of high school principals in Texas*. (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, 2006). Retrieved from Proquest Information and Learning Company.

Glanz, J. (2004). *The assistant principal's handbook: Strategies for success*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence.* New York, NY: Bantam Books.

Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence.* New York, NY: Bantam Books.

Goleman, D. (2004). What makes a leader? *Harvard Business Review*, *82*(1), 2-10.

Goleman, D. (2006, September). Leader: new findings on the social nature of the brain reveal the need for principals to fashion a school culture of warmth and trust. *Educational Leadership*. *37*(6).

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2001). Primal leadership: The hidden driver of great performance. *Harvard Business Review, 79*(4).

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence. Harvard School Press.

Gravois, T., & Rosenfield, S. (2006). Impact of instructional teams on the disproportionate referral and placement of minority students in special education. *Remedial and Special Education*, *27*(1), 42-52.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980-1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, *9*(2), 157-191.

Hart, A. (1993). *Principal succession: Establishing leadership in schools*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Harter, J., Hays, T., & Schmidt, F. (2004). *Meta-analytic predictive validity of Gallup Selection Research Instruments [technical report]*. Omaha, NE: The Gallup Organization.

Heifetz, R., & Laurie, D. L. (2001). The work of leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, *79*(11), 131.

Heifetz, R., & Linsky, M. (2002). *Leadership on the line.* New York, NY: Harvard Business School Press.

Hemphill, J. (1959). Job description for executives. *Harvard Business Review*, *37*(5), 55-67.

Herman, R. (2000). A leadership evolution. *Employment Relations Today*, *26*(4).

Hertel, G., Kerr, N., & Messe, L. (2000). Motivation gains in performance groups: Paradigmatic and theoretical developments on the kohler effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*, 580-601.

Higgins, M., Young, L., Weiner, J., & Wlodarczyk, S. (2009). Leading teams of leaders. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *91*(4), 41-45.

Holly, M. (2009*). Effective leadership qualities and characteristics of urban school principals* (Doctoral dissertation, Robert Morris University, 2009). Retrieved from Proquest Information and Learning Company.

Hosin, S. (2009). Does the No Child Left Behind Act leave some children behind? *InternationalJournal of Learning*, *16*(3), 49-57.

Jacobson, L. (2008). Looming budget cuts fuel California fury. *Education Week*, *27*(20), 17-19.

Jarnigan, K. (2004). *Leadership behaviors in high school principals: Traits and actions that affect teacher morale* (Doctoral dissertation, East Tennessee State University, 2004). Retrieved from Proquest Information and Learning Company.

Jennings, S. & Palmer, B. R. (2007). Enhancing sales performance through emotional development. *Organisations and People*, *14*, 55-61.

Jewell, M. A. (2009). A study of leadership teams cohesiveness and school performance: An analysis of No Chiold Left Behind (Doctoral dissertation, Our Lady of the Lake University, 2009). Retrieved from Proquest Information and Learning Company.

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. Z. (2003). *The leadership challenge* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Landy, F. (2005). Some historical and scientific issues related to research on emotional intelligence. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *26*, 411-424.

LeDoux, J. (1998). *The emotonal brain: The mysterious underpinnings of emotional life.* New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2000). The effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement with school. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *38*, 112-129.

Levine, D. U., & Lezotte, L. W. (1990). *Unusually effective schools.* Madison, WI: The

   National Center for Effective Schools Research and Development.

Lopez, S., Hodges, T., & Harter J. (2005). *The Clifton StrengthsFinder technical report:*

   Development and validation. Unpublished report.

Lyons, T. (2005). *Emotional intelligence: An element to successful school leadership or*

   does it matter?   Retrieved from Masters Abstracts International,

   (AATMR09462).

Marshall, C., & Hooley, R., (2006). *The assistant principal: Leadership choices and*

   challenges,(2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Marzanao, R., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2005). *School leadership that works: From*

   research to results. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum

   Development.

Maulding,W., Townsend, A., Leonard, E., Sparkman, L., Styron, J., & Styron, R. (2010).

   The relationship betw**ee**n emotional intelligence of principals and student

   performance in Mississippi public schools, *Academic Leadership: The Online*

   Journal, *8*(4).

Mayer, J., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. S. Sluyter,

   Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Implications for educators

   (pp. 3-31). New York, NY: Basic Books.

McEwan, E. (2003). *10 traits of highly effective principals: From good to great*

   *performance.*Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

McKee, A., Boyatzis, R., & Johnson, F. (2008). *Becoming a resonate leader.* Boston,

   MA: Harvard Business Press.

Miller, J. G., & Bersoff, D. M. (1992). Culture and moral judgement: How are conflicts between justice and interpersonal responsibilities resolved? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *62*, 541-554.

Moore, B. (2007). *The emotional intelligence coaching of school administrators: A comparative case study.* Ashland, OH: Ashland University.

Moore, B. (2009). Emotional intelligence for school administrators: A priority for school reform? *American Secondary Education*, *37*(3), 20-26.

Mowrer Benda, S., & Wright, R. (2002). The culture of the elementary school as a function of leadership style and disciplinary climate and culture. ERIC Clearinghouse, Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED464726

Mullen, C., & Hutinger, J. (2008). The principal's role in fostering collaborative learning communities through faculty study group development. *Theory Into Practice*, *47*(4), 276-285.

National Association of Elementary School Principals. (2001). Leading learning communities: Standards for what principals should know and be able to do. Alexandria, VA: Author. Retrieved from www.naesp.org/llc.pdf

Northouse, P. (2007). *Leadership: Theory and practice*, (*4*th *ed.*). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Palmer, B. W. (2001). Emotional intelligence and effective leadership. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal, 21*(1), 5-10.

Patti, J. & Tobin, J. (2006). *Smart school leaders: Leading with emotional intelligence.* Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt.

Principals, N. A. (1990). *Principals for 21st centruy schools.* Retrieved 07 14, 2010, from

> http://web.ebscohost.com.logon.lynx.lib.usm.edu/ehost/detail?vid

Principals, N. A. (1998). *Is there a shortage of qualified candidates for openings in the*

> *principalship?* Alexandria, VA: National Association of Elementary School
>
> Principals and National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Rafoth, M. & Foriska, T. (2006). Administrator participation in promoting effective

> problem-solving teams. *Remedial and Special Education*, *27* (3), 130-135.

Rath, T. & Conchie, B. (2008). *Strengths based leadership.* New York, NY: Gallup

> Press.

Reese, S. (2004). Effective school leaderships. *Techniques: Connecting education and*

> *careers, 79*(6), 18-21.

Reeves, D. (2006). *The learning leader: How to focus school improvement for better*

> *results.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum
>
> Development.

Reeves, D. (2008). *Reframing teacher leadership to improve your school.*

> Alexandria,VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Reithel, S. M. & Finch, D. M. (2007). Leadership: Nature versus nurture. *Chief Learning*

> *Officer, 6*(2), 26-31.

Rintoul, H. & Goulais, L. (2010). Vice principalship and moral literacy: Developing a

> moral compass, *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*,
>
> DOI: 10.1177/1741143210379061, http://ema.sagepubcom/content/38/6/745

Salovey, P., & Sluyter, J. M. (1997). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition &*

> *Personality, 9*(3), 185-211.

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). *Emotional development and emotional intelligence.* New York: NY: Basic Books.

Schmidt, F., & Rader, M. (1999). Exploring the boundary conditions for interview validity: Meta-analytic validity findings for a new interview type. *Personal Psychology, 52*, 445-464.

Seligman, M., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 5-14.

Seligman, M. (1998). Positive social sciences. *APA Monitor, 29*(4), 2-5.

Seligman, M. (1999). Positive psychology. *Presidential address delivered at the 107th annual convention of the American Psychological Association.* Boston, MA.

Service, E. R. (2000). *The principal, keynote of a high-achieveing school: Attractng and keeping the leaders we need.* Arlington, VA: Author.

Sharma, R. (2010). *The leader who had no title.* Fort, Mumbai: Jaico Publishing House.

Shoda, Y., Mischel, W., & Peake, P. (1990). Predicting adolescent cognitive and self-regulatory competencies from preschool delay of gratification: Identifying diagnostic conditions. *Developmental Psychology, 26*(6), 978-986.

Stedman, L. (1987). The effective school formula: It is time we changed and still needs changing. *Phi Delta Kappan, 87*, 215-224.

Stein, S. J., & Book, H. E. (2000). *The EQ edge: Emotional intelligence and your success.* Canada: Multi-Health Systems.

Sternberg, R. J., & Hedlund, J. (2002). Practical intelligence, g, and work psychology. *Human Performance, 15*(1), 143-162.

Sternberg, R. (2005). A model of educational leadership: Wisdom, intelligence, and creativity, synthesized. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *8*(4), 347-364.

Stone, H., Parker, J., & Wood, L. (2005). *Report on the Ontario Principals Council Leadership Study.* Toronto, Canada: Ontario Principals' Council.

Stover, D. (2009). The breaking point. *American School Board Journal*, *196*(4), 26-29.

The Bar-On Model of Emotional-Social Intellgence. (2011). Retrieved from http://www.revenbaron.org/bar-on-model/

Thompson, M. (1995). *Involvement in instructional leadership and job satisfaction among assistant principals*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY.

Tirozzi, G. (2001, February). The artistry of leadership: The evolving role of the secondary school principal. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 434-439.

Van Rooy, D. L., & Viswesvaran, C. (2004). Emotional intelligence: A meta-analytic investigation of predictive validity and nomological net. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 65*(1), 71-95.

Walker, A., & Stott, K. (1993). *Preparing for leaderships in schools: The mentoring contribution.* London, England: Falmer: B. J. Caldwell & E. M. A. Carter.

Walter V. Clarke Associates (1997). *Activity vector analysis*: *Some applications to the concept of emotional intelligence*. Pittsburgh, PA: Clark Associates.

Waters, T., & Grubb, S. (2004). *The leadership we need: Using research to strengthen the use of standards for administrator preparation and licensure programs.* Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.

Waters, J. T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. A. (2003). Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.

Wechsler, D. (1940). Nonintellective factors in general intelligence. *Psychological Bulletin*, *37*, 444-445.

Wechsler, D. (1943). Nonintellective factors in general intelligence. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *38*, 100-104.

Wechsler, D. (1958). *The measurement and appraisal of adult intelligence.* Baltimore, MD: Williams & Wilkins.

Weisinger, H. (1998). *Emotional intelligence at work: The untapped edge for success.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Weller, L., & Weller, S. (2002). *The assistant principal.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Wendorf-Heldt, K. (2009). Emotional intelligence: The link to school leadership practices that increase student achievement (Doctoral dissertation), Retrieved from Proquest Information and Learning Company.

West, M. (1994). *Effective teamwork.* Exeter, England: BPC Wheatons.

Zellner, L., Ward, S., McNamara, P., Gideon, B., Camacho, S. & Edgewood, S. (2002).The lonliest job in town: Sculpting the recruitment and retention of the principal. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED468348.pdf