Theses and Dissertations (All)

12-21-2009

Correlation of Emotional Intelligence of School Leaders to Perceptions of School Climate as Perceived by Teachers

Cosmas C. Curry
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Follow this and additional works at: http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd

CORRELATION OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE OF SCHOOL LEADERS TO

PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CLIMATE AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies and Research

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

Cosmas C. Curry

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

December 2009

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
The School of Graduate Studies and Research
Department of Education

We herby approve the dissertation of

Cosmas C. Curry

Candidate for the degree of Educational Doctorate

_____   _____
                                    Sussie Eshun, Ph.D.
                                    Professor of Psychology, Co-Chair

_____   _____
                                    Cathy Kaufman, Ed.D.
                                    Professor of Education, Co-Chair

_____   _____
                                    Doug Lare, Ph. D.
                                    Professor of Education

Accepted

_____   _____
Timothy P. Mack, Ph.D.
Dean
School of Graduate Studies and Research

Title: Correlation of Emotional Intelligence of School Leaders to Perceptions of School Climate as Perceived by Teachers

 Author: Cosmas C. Curry

Dissertation Co-Chairs: Dr. Sussie Eshun and Dr. Cathy Kaufman

Dissertation Committee Member: Dr. Douglas Lare

Research in the business sector indicates that leaders with high levels of emotional intelligence (EI) are more successful than others in leading their companies. School climate has been studied linking classroom level environment to student achievement. In the realm of public education, studies examining the connection between EI of school leaders and school climate as perceived by teachers are lacking. This study will investigate whether such a connection exists.

This mixed-factors study uses data from the School Level Environment Questionnaire (SLEQ) which measures teachers' perceptions of school climate and the Mayer Salovey Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) which measures the EI of school leaders. The study determined if the two are connected. The data gathered was analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. The quantitative piece used correlational coefficients and regression analysis to determine if there is a link between the emotional intelligence of school leaders and school climate based on the perceptions of teachers in the schools surveyed. The data was also correlated using a regression line of best fit to get an R-squared to determine the amount of variance in school climate ratings which may be attributed to variables such as gender, years of administrative experience, and age. The qualitative data was gathered through random interviews with school leaders who complete the MSCEIT.

This quantitative research involved 14 school leaders from schools in Northeastern United States who participated by taking the MSCEIT. The R-SLEQ survey was taken by 354 teachers from within the schools of the school leaders who participated. In all, teachers had a 52% response rate per school average. Qualitatively, 8 school leaders participated in interviews. Interviews were taped recorded along with notes from the researcher which were later transcribed.

Findings indicated that EI of school leaders was not correlated to school climate as perceived by teachers; however, there were significant correlations between the two when compared to some factors of the SLEQ. Quantitative analysis indicated that school climate and EI of school leaders are linked.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Emotional Intelligence and School Climate

The needs of students, parents, and staff in schools today vary from those of the

same groups even a few years ago. Schools face a tremendous pressure to have their

students score proficient or advanced on state tests. In addition, schools face drug, gang,

policy, budget, and personnel issues. School leaders must understand and address the

needs of people to foster a positive school climate in order to achieve educational

success. Increasingly, school leaders need to possess emotional intelligence (EI).

Emotional intelligence is a type of intelligence that has been heavily studied in

social sciences, psychology, and business sect, but not in the educational arena. On the

other hand, the connection between student achievement and school climate as perceived

by both students and teachers has been widely examined. This study will analyze whether

school climate as perceived by teachers is linked to the emotional intelligence of school

leaders.

Background of Emotional Intelligence

Before exploring the link between emotional intelligence and school climate, the

researcher must define emotional intelligence and distinguish it from general intelligence.

Additionally, we must describe school climate. Emotional Intelligence (EI) differs from

General Intelligence. Emotional intelligence is defined by Mayer and Salovey (1997) as

the ability to perceive emotions, access and generate emotions to assist thought, to

understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and to reflect on and regulate emotions

1

to promote emotional and intellectual growth. General intelligence is sometimes referred to as Intelligence Quotient (IQ) more commonly known as rational intelligence. Intelligence is broadly defined by *The American Heritage Dictionary* (1997, p. 706) as:

1. The capacity to acquire and apply knowledge.

2. The faculty of thought and reason.

3. Superior powers of the mind.

Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (2004b) propose that there is no consensus regarding what intelligence is and how it is best measured. Gardner (1995) states that:

My theory of multiple inte lligences poi nts to a hithe rto m issing and p ossibly important piece of the p uzzle. Mo st leader s obviously have gifts in th e realm of personal intelligence- th ey know a lot about how to reach and affect other hum an beings. Such knowledge, however, stands in danger of being lock ed inside, in the absence of the way of expressing it. (p.34)

Gardner (1995) recognizes that emotions must be understood by leaders in order to connect to the other intelligences that he describes. Gardner's (1983) theory of multiple intelligences includes seven types: spatial, logical-mathematical, bodily-kinesthetic, linguistic, interpersonal, intrapersonal, and musical. Gardner (1983) describes these intelligences as unique; yet he describes interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences as the intelligences most commonly associated with emotional intelligence. Mayer and Salovey (1997) also claim that inter/intrapersonal intelligences are the essence of emotional intelligence. Goleman (1995) did a study of emotional intelligence to create competency models for business leaders by:

…asking senior managers at companies to identify the capabilities that typified

the organization's most outstanding leaders. To create other models, the

psychologists used objective criteria such as a division's profitability to

differentiate the star performers at senior levels within their organization from the

average ones. Those individuals were then extensively interviewed and tested and

their capabilities compared. This process resulted in the creation of lists of

ingredients for highly effective leaders. (p. 94)

The results found that, "Technical skills, IQ, and emotional intelligence are ingredients of

excellent performance;" however, "emotional intelligence proved to be twice as

important as the others for jobs at all levels" (Goleman, 1995, p. 94).

While IQ tests measure mathematical, verbal, and comprehension abilities; EI is

related to empathy, self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, and social skills

(Weymes, 2003). Emotions and the study of emotional intelligence have been a source of

research primarily in the business sector, not in education with school leaders. The study

of emotions and how they relate to job success, and the extent to which leaders are aware

of their own emotional intelligence, has caused some researchers to believe that one's EI

is more important in determining job success than one's IQ (Akers & Porter, 2003;

Humphreys, Weyant, & Sprague, 2003; Weymes, 2003). According to Burbach, Barbuto,

Jr., and Wheeler (2003), emotional intelligence may be an important, even necessary

ability for leaders. Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (2002) claim that emotional intelligence

may enhance job performance in certain positions. The evaluation of job performance or

success on the job is often ba sed on the perceptions of th e school staff and public. T his support for the importance of EI among school leaders is credible.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this mixed-methodology study was to examine how the emotional intelligence of school leaders affects the climate of their schools. Pool (1997) states that, "Emotional well-being is the strongest predictor of achievement in school and on the job," and that "recent studies have shown that emotional intelligence predicts about 80 percent of a person's success in life" (p. 12). Pool's (1997) claims confirm Goleman's (1995) findings. If emotions play such a significant part in the success of leaders, then it must be critical for school leaders to know what EI is. In addition, leaders must have an awareness of their own EI level, what their staff perceive their EI to be, and if there is a relationship between the EI of school leaders and school climate. Shutte, Malouff, Bobik, Coston, Greeson, and Jedlicka, et al. (2001), claim that people with higher emotional intelligence are more likely to exhibit better social skills and be more adept in social situations. Goleman (1995) argues that emotional intelligence is revealed as "character" (p. 285). When leaders demonstrate character, they create an atmosphere among staff and peers that is motivational and inspirational and may lead to a positive school climate.

Leaders with high levels of EI treat the people with whom they work with respect, kindness, compassion, and understanding. Having emotional intelligence allows leaders to understand the inter- and intra-personal emotions of colleagues as decisions are made. Leaders with high EI employ higher-level processes regarding their attention to feelings, clarity of feelings, discriminability of feelings, and mood-regulating strategies (Mayer &

4

Salovey, 1993). This is important as school leaders work with a variety of people, such as students (both minors and adults), employees (teachers, support staff, bus drivers, and cafeteria workers) parents, school board members, business and industry leaders, sports booster groups, alumni, parent-teacher groups, politicians, lawmakers, community members, and local law enforcement personnel. Emotionally intelligent leaders are able to work with these individuals and groups and may provide a school environment conducive to learning and open communication. Fisher and Grady (1998) state:

> Furthermore, as school leaders confront continual demands for improvement and accountability it is worth noting that the manner in which teachers go about their work and the way they feel about it are related to the mental images they have of their school. (p. 335)

Johnson, Johnson, and Zimmerman (1996) refer to this as the "personality of the school" (p. 64). Leaders must be mentally equipped to work with all people regardless of age, sex, creed, gender, ethnicity, and other variables.

This study was a contribution to the empirical research exploring the link between emotional intelligence and school climate as perceived by teachers. This may have implications for hiring qualified leaders who are able to inspire, motivate staff and students, and build positive school climate.

Statement of the Problem

This research study was conducted in order to determine if there is a relationship between the emotional intelligence of school leaders and school climate. Emotional intelligence testing will determine if school leaders have an understanding of the four

branch ability model of emotional intelligence as identified by Mayer and Salovey (1997). The four branch model includes, "a) accurately perceiving emotions in oneself and others, b) use of emotion to facilitate thinking, c) understanding emotional meanings, and d) managing one's own emotions" (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2004a, p. 199). The question is, does the level of emotional intelligence of school leaders have a link to the school climate as perceived by teachers?

It is important to understand what school leaders do on a daily basis, which is often different from the activities of leaders in business, athletics, and government. School leaders work with various groups of stakeholders within the school and the community. Issues such as budget, discipline, curriculum, personnel, policy, and a myriad of others fill the day of a school leader. Leaders must be equipped with the emotional wherewithal to handle a range of tasks from the mundane to highly charged political problems. The researcher of this study theorizes that school leaders EI affects the leaders' ability to deal with these problems, thus impacting school climate.

Most studies to date have used government officials, business leaders, and military officers as subjects in studying emotional intelligence. Most school climate studies have used students and/or teachers in their research. This study will determine whether the emotional intelligence of school leaders is linked to school climate as perceived by teachers. The study includes a review of the literature examining both emotional intelligence and school climate.

Research Questions

The research questions to be asked are:

1) Is school climate as perceived by teachers correlated to the emotional intelligence of school leaders?

2) Is the emotional intelligence of school administrators a significant predictor of school climate ratings?

3) Compared to other factors that have been known to influence school climate such as gender, age, and years of administrative experience, is an administrator's emotional intelligence more significant than the other factors that have been identified?

Site Selection and Population

Site selection for this study was conducted through a non-random purposive sample. School leaders were contacted and invited to participate in this research study. School leaders' invitations followed all steps in the school leader verbal instruction protocol described in Appendix A. School leaders are defined as principals who lead a faculty of teachers. Teachers in the schools of the school leaders were asked to participate in this research study by completing the Revised School Level Environment Questionnaire (R-SLEQ) survey as outlined in the teacher verbal instruction protocol in Appendix B.

This study used a mixed methodology to determine if a school leaders' emotional intelligence level is a determining factor in the perceptions of the school climate as perceived by teachers. The instruments used to gather data include the Mayer Salovey

Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) and the Revised School Level

Environment Questionnaire (R-SLEQ). School leaders took MSCEIT and the teachers in

the schools of the participating school leader took the R-SLEQ. The MSCEIT is a 141

item test that has four branch scores aligned to the four-branch ability model. The R-

SLEQ is a 21 item instrument to determine school level environment as perceived by

teachers. The 21 questions of the Revised-SLEQ are organized into five categories called

factors and include collaboration, student relations, school resources, decision-making,

and instructional innovation. Revised-SLEQ items are measured in a Likert scale as to the

extent to which a teacher agrees with a statement.

An analysis of correlation coefficients was conducted to determine if a links exists

between EI and school climate as well as a regression to determine if the variables predict

a link between school climate and emotional intelligence. The research methodology

employed was both quantitative and qualitative. The quantitative analysis used data from

the R-SLEQ and MSCEIT. The qualitative perspective included interviews with school

leaders who complete the MSCEIT. Data collected from this study was used to determine

if the emotional intelligence of school leaders was linked to school climate.

Significance of the Study

Emotional Intelligence

Emotional intelligence is an intelligence that has multiple characteristics such as

empathy, motivation, and self-awareness (Schutte et al., 2001). Emotional intelligence is

viewed as a greater predictor of success than IQ (Pool, 1997). Goleman (2005) states "at

best that 20% of success in life is dependent on IQ, while 80% comes from other factors

or forces" (p. 34). Akers and Porter (2003) ask, "Is success in life and career determined

primarily by rational intelligence (the IQ, or Intelligence Quotient) or emotional

intelligence (the EQ, or Emotional Quotient)" (p. 65)? Their research has indicated that

IQ accounts for roughly 10% (at best 25%) of success in life, while the rest depends on

everything else, including EQ (Akers & Porter, 2003). Goleman (2005) describes

intelligence quotient as an intelligence that is synonymous with SAT scores. This type of

intelligence is a critical tool used by colleges for admission and retention, and in various

workplaces when considering job applicants.

However, Akers and Porter (2003), and Goleman (2005) believe that success in

life depends on a person's ability to understand, react to, and interpret their own emotions

in addition to the emotions of others. According to Goleman (2005), "effective leaders

are alike in one crucial way: they all have a high degree of emotional intelligence" (p.

94). Leaders who are the most successful at understanding emotional intelligence often

have a high level of responsibility, self-awareness, and high financial performance in

their companies (Goleman et al., 2002).

Dearborn (2002) describes effective leaders as having the ability to be visionary

people, moving toward shared goals and objectives, and when appropriate, make

changes. Dearborn (2002) also includes a coaching component to leadership and shows

how it impacts climate by helping focus on long-term capabilities as well as creating

harmony within the organization. Dearborn (2002) defines leadership as that which

incorporates emotional intelligence by using the following skills: visionary, coaching,

involving others, motivating staff, setting and meeting goals, and having to "kick start problem employees when needed" (p. 527).

Barbuto Jr. and Burbach (2006) describe leaders as having, "charisma, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration" (p. 52). Antonakis, Avolio, and Sivasubramaniam (2003) refer to charisma as idealized influence to help move organizations toward positive behavior and goal achievement. Mayer and Salovey (1997) have referred to emotional intelligence as an aptitude, whereas Goleman (1995) has called it skills or traits.

Goleman (1995) describes three personal capabilities that drive outstanding performance. They are: (1) technical skills; (2) cognitive skills; and (3) emotional intelligence (Goleman, p. 94). Technical and cognitive skills involve planning and analytical reasoning. According to Goleman (1995), these skills account for about 20% of a person's success in life, while emotional intelligence accounts for the other 80%. Goleman's assertions are supported by Weymes (2003) who holds that, "the primary purpose of leadership is being able to influence the feelings and emotions of those associated with the organization, to create the emotional heart of the organization and thus to determine the tenor of relationships" (p. 320). Successful leaders create relationships in which the five areas of emotion are utilized to create a school level environment where participants of the team are inspired. Weymes (2003) describes the five areas of emotions as clusters and they are: (a) self-awareness; (b) self-regulation; (c) motivation; (d) empathy; and (e) social-skills.

To understand the concept of EI, one must know something about intelligence and emotion (Mayer et al., 2004a). Intelligence represents the abilities to carry out abstract thought, to solve problems, and to adapt to the environment (Wechsler, 1997). This ability to adapt is represented by a commonality referred to as a g (Spearman, 1927). A g is the abbreviation for the general intelligence factor, and is a widely used construct in psychology. A g helps quantify scores of intelligence tests. Spearman (1927) theorized that two factors can help explain intelligence tests. The first is the factor specific to an individual mental task making a person more skilled at one task than another. The second factor is a general factor that governs performance on all cognitive tasks.

However, Mayer et al., (2004a) provide examples of different kinds of intelligence including spatial, vocabulary, mathematical, and extended textual messages. Gardner (1983) states that there are multiple specific intelligences, called "hot intelligences" that are characterized as social, practical, personal, and emotional. Gardner proposed that there are seven areas of intelligence one of which is interpersonal intelligence. Mayer and Salovey (1997) believe that Gardner's interpersonal intelligence is similar to emotional intelligence.

The term emotional intelligence was used in the early 1990s by Salovey and Mayer. Emotional intelligence by definition is "the ability to monitor one's own and others' feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions" (Salovey & Mayer, 1990, p. 189). The term emotional intelligence has also been found to be synonymous with terms such as emotional quotient, character education, and emotional fitness. Mayer et al. (2004a) have defined a

11

four-branch model of EI in which the abilities of EI are grouped. This is known as the ability approach of emotional intelligence (Mayer & Cobb, 2000). The ability approach is defined as an intelligence that includes the use of feelings to perceive and abstractly understand other people (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). These four branches are: (a) to perceiving emotion; (b) the using emotion to facilitate thought; (c) to understanding emotions; and (d) to managing emotions (Mayer et al., 2004a, p. 199). A person in branch one of this model is good at recognizing emotions in others through examining facial expressions and posture. In branch two, the person uses emotions to assist in thinking and decision making. This is the feeling branch. Often, leaders appeal to the hearts of people to motivate them. In branch three, the leader must understand emotions. Leaders understand the emotions of others and reflect the capacity to analyze emotions, appreciate the trends of emotions over time, and understand the possible outcomes of emotions (Roseman, 1984). The fourth branch is management of emotions. In this branch, the leader can manage his or her emotions, which affects the rest of his or her personality (Mayer et al., 2004a). According to Mayer et al. (2004a), the order of these branches is critical in understanding an individual's personality.

In order to test whether emotional intelligence is a form of intelligence, a valid and reliable instrument must be used. Carson, Carson, and Birkenmeier (2000) developed an Emotional Intelligence Survey instrument that used 269 terms which were positively or negatively worded to correspond to five emotional intelligence components. The 269 individual items were assessed to determine which ones best represented EI. These terms came from work credited to Goleman (1995). They were then examined

using "principle-axes factor analysis with an orthogonal rotation to a varimax criterion" (Carson et al., 2000, p. 36). This means the items were examined and categorized to produce a valid and reliable measure of EI. This verification of a construct put the 269 questions into what Carson et al. (2000) called a five-factor solution. The five factors are empathetic response, mood regulation, interpersonal skills, internal motivation, and self-awareness. Carson et al. (2000) developed the final product which was a 30-item questionnaire that measures a person's ability to understand the emotions of ones' self and others. The 30 items were retained from the six highest loadings from these five factors. The responses are on a five-point likert scale and the analysis produced a reliability coefficient of .72, making this a desirable instrument to measure EI (Carson et al., 2000). As Humphreys et al. (2003) states, "The current sample produced an overall internal reliability coefficient of 0.72" (p. 199).

In order for the test for emotional intelligence to be considered a valid and reliable, one must decide whether the instruments used to measure EI produce correct answers. Mayer et al. (2004a), surmise that correct or "better" answers from 75% or more of respondents are adequate in determining the meaning of EI questions. In other words, another way to assess the correctness of answers is to utilize expert criterion. In Mayer et al. (2004a) study, the Mayer Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS) correlation scores were between r = .43 and .78. In a later version of a similar test, the Mayer Salovey Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) correlated between r = .96 and .98 (Mayer et al., 2004a). In this comparison, r stands for the relationship between the reliability of the question on the test and the degree it measures consistency. The former test used two

experts, while the latter used 21. The MSCEIT is more valid and reliable than the earlier MEIS. The 21 experts in the area of emotional intelligence read the questions and answers, and scored them for inter-rater reliability, therefore increasing the validity and reliability of the test. Although both the Carson et al. (2000) and Mayer et al. (2004a) tests for EI are valid and reliable, the MSCEIT instrument developed by Mayer et al. (2004a) will be used in this study.

Emotional Intelligence and School Climate

Connections between EI and the success of business leaders has been well researched; just as research suggests that socio-economic status (SES) is a key school climate factor in determining student achievement. However, research connecting the EI of school leaders to school climate as perceived by teachers is lacking. Emotional intelligence of school leaders may not help student achievement as far as SES is concerned, but may help improve school climate which may lead to better student achievement. Organizations led by people are complex and varied. Determining whether EI of school leaders is linked to school climate may help improve people in certain situations. These situations may be in the hiring process, productivity, and/or student achievement. Since EI has such a positive impact in business, it is reasonable to assume it will have a positive impact in schools.

Leaders must implement several key activities to help staff develop and allow an organization to prosper. Hughes (2002) cites the following skills needed by leaders as developed by the Human Resource Planning Society (HRPS): (a) provide direction; (b) assure alignment; (c) build commitment; and (d) face and adapt to challenges. Hughes

14

(2002) conceptualizes that a person can be viewed as having leadership potential by scoring high on an assessment of being visionary. This means the person can articulate a plan to motivate people to help accomplish the goal of the plan. Assuring alignment is described as being organized. The organization that functions under an organized leader encounters fewer distractions in accomplishing the vision. Building commitment is defined here as employee engagement. Hughes (2002) states:

> Emotional intelligence seems to be a clear advantage in accomplishing the leadership task of building commitment… It should also be clear that when employees are not engaged, the leadership task of building commitment is that much more challenging. (p. 5)

Leaders must also face and adapt to challenges. This means that leaders must be problem solvers. If EI and leadership are so closely connected to the success of business organizations, it is reasonable to review research from the business sector to see why the EI of leaders in business leads to a positive climate.

Goleman (1995) assesses leadership in the emotional intelligence context by asking what it means in the workplace. Goleman divided leaders' emotional intelligence into four domains: (a) self-awareness, (including "gut sense," knowing one's strengths and weaknesses, and self-confidence); (b) self-management (meaning being in control of and adapting to situations); (c) social awareness (meaning empathy and service to others); and (d) relationship management, (being inspirational, developing others, resolving conflicts, and building team unity in the organization).

Goleman (1998a) analyzed competency models from over 180 global companies. He found that when capabilities leading effective change were grouped, emotional intelligence was a key component to the leader's success in being a change-agent. In one example, Goleman (1998a) cited an executive who was thought to be low on empathy (one of the five emotional intelligences at work) indicating she had an inability to listen. It was suggested she be told by a colleague when she was failing to listen. She would then repeat the scenario and "demonstrate her ability to absorb what others are saying" (Goleman, 1998a, p. 97). Goleman (1998a) found that with practice and perseverance, EI can be improved. Goleman (1998a) also found that, "Emotional intelligence played an increasingly important role at the highest levels of the company, where differences in technical skills are of negligible importance" (p. 94). Goleman (1998a) concludes by answering a question about social skills (one of the five emotional intelligences at work) related to the business sector. He states:

> Is social skill considered a key leadership capability in most companies? The answer is yes, especially when compared with other components of emotional intelligence. People seem to know intuitively that leaders need to be able to manage relationships effectively; no leader is an island. After all, the leader's task is to get work done through other people, and social skill makes that possible. A leader who cannot express her empathy may as well not have it at all. And a leader's motivation will be useless if he cannot communicate his passion to the organization. Social skill allows leaders to put their emotional intelligence to work. (p.102)

16

Goleman's work explores the use of social skills and relationships to improve

organizations. Weymes' (2003) research supports Goleman's findings. Weymes (2003)

argues that the success of organizations is dependent on the relationships between leaders

and followers, not leadership unto itself. Weymes (2003) states, "The challenge for the

Chief Executive is to establish an environment that facilitates the development of

sustainable relationships" (p. 320). Weymes (2003) describes John Schuerholz of the

Atlanta Braves organization not as a charismatic leader, but rather as "an individual who

built an organization founded on trust and integrity, allowing a complex web of

relationships to develop" (p. 324). Emotionally intelligent leadership helped make the

Atlanta Braves to be the team of the 1990's. Boyatzis, Goleman, and Rhee (2001), as

cited in Weymes (2003) state:

> Emotional intelligence is observed when a person demonstrates the competencies
>
> that constitute self-awareness, self management, social awareness and social skills
>
> at appropriate times and ways in sufficient frequency to be effective in the
>
> situation. (p. 326)

Weymes (2003) concludes his study by suggesting that a CEO with high EI will

lead successful organizations; however, it is not necessarily the case that EI is the only

condition for success. Successful leaders must have a vision and purpose for the

company to prosper. The success of an organization is more likely when vision and

purpose are coupled with high EI of CEO's.

Emotional intelligence is a key to successful leadership and therefore has a direct

impact on school climate which Bernstein (1992) described as the amount of negative

17

student behavior in a school. Humphreys et al. (2003) state that "leaders operate using personal value systems that cannot be exchanged between individuals" (p.191). Leaders must bring people together within an organization for a common goal. Humphreys et al. 2003) state, "Leaders create a unifying force by altering their followers' goals and beliefs" (p. 191). Leadership through a team approach uses EI as the guiding factor. Humphreys et al. (2003) state that leaders must be able to, "conceptualize that emotional intelligence has the greatest influence upon intellect through leadership" (p. 192). Therefore, understanding school leaders EI is critical in determining the relationship between EI and school climate.

Although various people have researched EI and school climate independently, none have linked them. However, Gardner (1995) as well as Avolio and Bass (1999) have suggested that emotionally intelligent leaders may enhance follower motivation and morale because these leaders have better control, recognize, and monitor their own EI. This is supported by Bass and Avolio (1994) when they surmise that emotional intelligence and leadership are intuitive. This leads one to conjecture that leaders who have high EI tend to improve the climate in their schools.

Humphreys et al. (2003) concludes that leader behavior and emotional intellect have influence over follower commitment. Humphreys et al. (2003) found that an individual's emotional intellect was significantly correlated to the person's commitment to the organization. Employees who were more committed also perceived the leader as more motivational than those who were not. Commitment of staff leads to commitment to the organization.

18

It is important to investigate why high EI and its link to school climate are critical. Burbach et al. (2003) state, "Emotional intelligence may be an important, even necessary, ability for leaders" (opening statement; para. 1). Burbach et al. (2003) suggest that research needs to be done to validate their finding, which in summary is, "A growing body of research supports that the use of emotions to help solve problems and live a more effective life involves a set of cognitive abilities" (Discussion section, para. 1). Emotionally intelligent leaders should be able to respond better to negative situations and facilitate positive outcomes in themselves as well as with those who are negative (Mayer & Salovey, 1997).

The literature shows that several researchers (Bass, 1998; Goleman, 1998b; Humphreys et al., 2003) propose that EI contributes to effective leadership. This finding is consistent with Barbuto and Burbach (2006), who found several correlations that reinforce the role of EI and leadership in areas of motivation, empathy, interpersonal skills, and mood regulation. Linking EI to leadership is a well researched topic; however, the next step is to understand school climate theory and how the EI of school leaders may be related to school climate.

This study was conducted to determine whether a relationship exists between the emotional intelligence of school leaders and school climate as perceived by teachers. Previous research in the business sector has found that EI is a factor in the climate of successful companies. Therefore, if EI is such an important factor for businesses, it is reasonable to argue that EI and school climate may be connected.

19

In summary, EI and school climate may be linked. Understanding this relationship may improve the leader/follower model and thereby help student achievement.

Definitions

Emotional Intelligence. Emotional intelligence is the ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions so as to assist thought, to understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and to reflectively regulate emotions so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth (Mayer & Salovey, 1997).

Empathy. A skill where people understand what others are going through even if they have not experienced it themselves.

Inter-personal. A set of characteristics linked to emotional intelligence that include skills such as empathy, self-monitoring in social situations, cooperation with others, relations with others, ability to get along with others, the need for emotionally intelligent partners (professional relations), and other positive traits typically described as character.

Intra-personal. A set of skills referring to the ability to process emotional information as it pertains to perception, assimilation, expression, and regulation and management of emotions (Mayer, et al., 2000b).

MSCEIT. Mayer Salovey Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test. A test of emotional intelligence developed by Mayer et al. (2002). The test is a four-factor model which tests for (1) differentiation between emotional expressions; (2) use of emotions to facilitate decision-making and problem solving; (3) understanding complex relationships among emotions; and (4) solving emotional problems without suppressing negative emotions.

EIQ. Emotional Intelligence Quotient. Mayer et al. (2002) define EIQ as scores from the MSCEIT which are calculated according to the criterion of what most people say (the general consensus), and/or according to criterion of what experts say (the expert consensus) (p. 8).

School Climate. The social system within a school which includes shared norms and expectations (Brookover, Schweitzer, Schneider, Beady, Flood, & Wisenbaker, 1978); and the physical and mental health of the organization (Freiburg, 1999).

Revised- School-Level Environment Questionnaire. A 21 item survey developed by Johnson, Stevens, & Zvoch (2007) which measures in a likert scale teachers perceptions of school climate.

Assumptions

Akers and Porter (2003) believe success in life is attributed more too emotional intelligence than rational intelligence. This is confirmed by Goleman (1995) and Pool (1997), who both agree that emotional intelligence is a stronger predictor of success on

the job, and that EI accounts for 80 percent of a person's success in life. According to

Goleman (1995) and Pool (1997), many leaders have high IQ scores yet fail to perform at

a high level in the workplace. Educational leaders with high levels of emotional

intelligence have the opportunity to have more successful and rewarding careers because

of their ability to interact and connect with the emotions of their staff (Tucker, Sojka, &

Barone, (2000). When staff feel that their leader (boss) genuinely cares about them and

the goals of the organization, an emotional connection is made which provides for

motivation and better morale (Shutte et al., 2001; Zeidner, Matthews, & Roberts, 2004).

Mayer and Salovey (1997) conclude that staff want their leaders to exhibit traits such as

empathy, motivation, awareness of one's own emotions, an ability to "read" emotions of

others (inter- and intra-personal skills, also called social skills), and the self-regulation of

emotions. Mayer et al. (2004a) describe the person with high EI as an individual who:

> Can better perceive emotions, use them in thought, understand their meanings,
>
> and manage emotions better than others. Solving emotional problems likely
>
> requires less cognitive effort for this individual. The person also tends to be
>
> somewhat higher in verbal, social, and other intelligences, particularly if the
>
> individual scored higher in the understanding portion of EI. The individual tends
>
> to be more open and agreeable than others. The high EI person is drawn to
>
> occupations involving social interactions such as teaching, and counseling more
>
> so than to occupations involving clerical or administrative tasks. (p. 210)

Educational leaders who lack emotional intelligence have less satisfying

relationships with staff and are held in lower regard (Shutte et al., 2001; Zeidner et al.,

2004)). Leaders who have low EI often see their job as mundane, trivial, and filled with anxiety. True teamwork comes from leaders who exhibit high levels of EI and are able to manage their own emotions (Humphreys et al., 2003; Mayer, et al., 2004a).

Mayer et al. (2004b) submit that EI must meet criteria to be considered standard intelligence. These criteria include (1) having an operationalized assessment as a mental ability; (2) meeting correlational criteria that represent a new kind of performance when compared to other personality dispositions; and (3) exhibiting growth with age.

The operationalized assessment criteria are described as consensus between general and expert test takers. The MSCEIT correlated between $r = .96$ and .98 when calculated using this consensus method. Mayer et al. (2004b) report that EI "is relatively easy to acquire and teach" (p. 209). EI can be developed and people can improve their own EI through developmental coursework and experiences, EI is therefore similar to other intelligences (Mayer et al. 2004b).

Limitations

This study presents several limitations. One limitation of this study will include data of the subjects where growth with age is shown when using the current ages as benchmarks for their EI. This means that since participating individual school leader EI is being measured for the first time, we do not know if the school leader EI has improved since beginning their jobs in leadership. Another limitation is the limited number of schools in which the subjects are being studied. Limiting the non-random sample to a small number of public schools in the Northeastern United States does not guarantee diversity in years of experience, gender, and age. Therefore, generalizability is limited.

A further limitation may be that the MSCEIT test is too long. Consideration was given to require participants to complete only part of the test rather than all of it. A selectively abbreviated test would have permitted assessment of the EI levels of all participants.

The R-SLEQ has its own set of limitations. The researcher must understand that time of year, internal and external events in the school and community, staff turnover, and media exposure all play a part in the perceptions of school climate. The school climate findings in a particular school may change by the day. Researchers have found that the R-SLEQ is a valuable instrument to investigate school climate with large numbers of teachers. This study seeks to determine whether there is a link between school climate as perceived by teachers and the emotional intelligence of school leaders. Johnson et al. (2007) suggest that along with the R-SLEQ, interviews be conducted to assess teachers' perceptions of school climate and how they have changed over time. Fraser (1999) found the SLEQ can be useful to those at a particular school in providing information helpful to teachers in identifying elements of school climate they wish to change.

Another limitation of this study may be that administrators may find something out about themselves they would rather not know. This study requires them to take a reflective look at themselves and where improvements can be made within themselves and their schools. With all the challenges that school administrators face such as school boards, parents, employees, and students, this is an opportunity to learn the emotional intelligence of self and determine if school climate is linked to the leader's EI.

One last limitation may be the sample size. Statistical use of correlation coefficients predict much better when large sample sizes are used. Depending on the number of respondents, more research may be needed using a larger sample size. However, determining if EI of school leaders and school climate are linked is possible with a minimum of 12 subjects.

Summary

In summary, emotional intelligence is a set of abilities that allows a leader to excel in working relationships. Goleman (1995) refers to emotional intelligence as "character," and goes on to say that "academic intelligence offers virtually no preparation for the turmoil--or opportunity-- life's vicissitudes bring" (p. 36). Educational leaders are faced with the daunting task of working with everyone and understanding and motivating each as an individual. This can be accomplished with a leader who has high levels of emotional intelligence, one who can lead his or her staff to common goals by understanding what motivates them.

This study will address whether educational leaders have a grasp of inter- and intra-personal skills which are related to emotional intelligence. The purpose is to determine if a relationship exists between the emotional intelligence of school leaders and school climate as perceived by teachers.

The questions to be studied will provide data to reflect the emotional intelligence of school leaders from fourteen different K-12 schools in the Northeastern United States. The chapters following will include a detailed literature review, the methodology of the study, presentation and analysis of data and findings.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Emotional Intelligence (EI) is a type of intelligence that differs from Intelligence Quotient (IQ). While IQ tests are important in the areas of mathematical, verbal, and comprehension abilities, EI skills are those related to empathy, self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, and social skills (Weymes, 2003). Emotions, and the study of emotional intelligence, have been studied and researched primarily in the business sector; while school climate research has primarily been in the area of student achievement. The study of emotions and the extent to which leaders' are aware of their own emotional intelligence, has caused some researchers to believe that one's EI is more important in determining job success than one's IQ.

Emotional intelligence (EI) is a term that was first conceptualized by Thorndike (1920) when he used the term social intelligence. Law, Wong, and Song (2004) describe EI as studied primarily in the social sciences. Law et al. (2004) also point out that Thorndike (1920) used the definition of social intelligence to describe a person who has the ability to, "…understand and manage men and women, boys and girls, and to act wisely in human relations" (p.228). Mayer et al. (2004a) confirm the history of EI as being seated in the social/psychological sciences. Mayer et al. (2004a) describe the term emotional intelligence as being used in the 1960's, and again in a dissertation by Payne (1986). It was in 1990 that EI was further developed into a theory, definition, and instrument (Mayer, DiPaolo, & Salovey, 1990; Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Mayer et al.

(2004a) describe the "political turmoil" of the 1960's as being a cultural influence for the interest and research of EI from a social context (p. 198). Gardner (1993) also used EI theory to describe one area of his theory of multiple intelligence. Gardner (1993) states that interpersonal intelligence is the ability to "notice and make distinctions among other individuals and, in particular, among their moods, temperaments, motivations and intentions" (p. 239). This definition can be applied to the inter- and intra- personal intelligence of people (Law et al., 2004; Mayer et al., 2004a). Mayer et al., (2004a) propose that "EI operates on emotional information" (p. 198). The theory of EI has been influenced by multiple researchers who want to expand the study of EI as intelligence and use an operational instrument to assess the EI level of subjects. Some of these researchers include (Gardner, 1983; Mayer et al., 2004a; Salovey, Mayer, & Caruso, 2002). This study investigated the relationship of EI to school climate.

School Climate

School leaders play a critical role in the development, maintenance, and public perceptions of school climate. Johnson and Stevens (2006) state, "School climate is a term that is commonly used but one without a commonly agreed upon definition" (p. 111). Depending on the study, "The school climate might be called school environment or school-level learning environment" (p. 111). This study used the definition of Freiberg, (1999) who refers to school climate as the physical and emotional well-being of an organization. Phillips (1997) describes school climate in two different aspects; one is academic excellence and the other community climate. Stewart (1979) found that there was a difference between classroom level and school level environments. Classroom

level environments tend to focus on the relationships between students and teachers whereas school level environments tend to relationships of teachers to other teachers and teachers to administration. Moos (1974) describes three dimensions that should be understood when trying to learn about any environment. These dimensions are (1) relationship dimensions which describe relationships with other people; (2) Personal development dimensions which refer to how people grow in an organization; and (3) System maintenance and system change dimensions which are related to how people respond to change. These dimensions are similar to Mayer and Salovey's (1993) theory of emotional intelligence regarding the ability to understand the relationships of people, understanding emotions, reacting to emotions, and tempering one's own emotion, which are all vital in the overall health of organizations. Anderson (1982) and Fisher, Docker and Fraser (1986) associate school level environment research with school leaders. Fisher and Fraser (1990) state, "The study of school environment is clearly important because it is likely to contribute to understanding and improvement of the school's functioning and to satisfaction and productivity within the school" (p. 3). Fisher and Fraser (1990) also view school climate as involving relationships with other teachers and administrators (leaders).

The purpose of this study is to determine whether a relationship exists between emotional intelligence in school leaders and the school climate as perceived by teachers. This study also examined whether school leaders' inter- and intra-personal skills are connected to their levels of emotional intelligence and if variables such as gender, age, and year's administrative experience have any correlation to school climate.

This chapter includes a detailed literature review and an evaluation of the research of both emotional intelligence and school climate. The business sector has provided much of the primary research in the area of emotional intelligence. The leading researchers who have examined emotional intelligence are, Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (1997, 2000a, 2004a), Zeidner et al., (2004), Carson et al., (2000), Gardner (1995), Goleman (1995), and Weymes (2003). Regarding school climate, the SLEQ has been used to study school climate in the United States and around the world by such researchers as Fraser and Rentoul (1982), Mailula and Laugksch (2003), Johnson and Stevens (2001), Johnson et al. (2007), and Johnson and Templeton (1999). Few current studies examine a connection between emotional intelligence and school climate. The literature review focuses on identifying common or emerging themes to help answer several research questions. The research questions to be explored are:

1. Is school climate as perceived by teachers correlated to the emotional intelligence of school leaders?

2. Is the emotional intelligence of school administrators a significant predictor of school climate ratings?

3. Compared to other factors that have been known to influence school climate such as gender, age, and years of administrative experience, is an administrator's emotional intelligence more significant than the other factors that have been identified?

<center>*Synthesis of the Literature*</center>

Criteria for Selecting the Literature

The literature chosen for review in this study came primarily from the business sector and psychological studies. The literature was previewed and screened by use of multiple combinations of terms to help qualify material that met the theme of this study. The terms used to help identify the relevant research were developed from previous studies. These terms are emotional intelligence, leadership, education, school climate, MSCEIT, SLEQ, and R-SLEQ. Emotional intelligence studies included those assessing business, political, educational, and military persons. As for the school climate, the literature review was limited to the School Level Environment Questionnaire (SLEQ) and its applications.

Context of the Problem

Some researchers have conjectured that emotionally intelligent leaders account for more successful careers, greater job satisfaction, and more loyal staff than leaders lacking in EI. This conjecture has been extensively studied in business and military organizations. However, research examining the relationship between the emotional intelligence of school leaders and school climate is lacking. Independent valid and reliable instruments to measure emotional intelligence and school climate are available. However, empirical research which may determine whether there is a connection between the two is lacking.

<center>30</center>

Johnson and Stevens (2006) state:

Schools in which teachers perceived a positive school climate, with a high

degree of affiliation among teachers, an atmosphere of innovation, high

involvement of teachers in the decision-making process, cooperative, friendly

students and adequate resources and facilities, had better average student

achievement. (p. 118)

It is therefore reasonable to link good school climate with high student achievement and

good school leaders who are emotionally intelligent. School leaders must be able to

understand the interests and views of students, staff, parents, and other constituents

within the school system. Rentoul and Fraser (1983) view schools as formal

organizations where much of the school climate research is based. Johnson and Stevens

(2006) describe formal organizations as, "measured by structural characteristics like size,

resources, and teacher/student ratios" (p. 112). Research must focus on the school

environment not the classroom environment to find links that may exist between school

leaders and school climate. Evaluating the school climate can help in the understanding

of what inspires staff and also gauge the success of the school based on the school

climate.

Barbuto, Jr. and Burbach (2006) state that, "Leaders who exhibit positive

leadership behaviors such as intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and

individual consideration achieve better employee performance, effort, and satisfaction"

(p. 51). Barbuto, Jr. and Burbach (2006) also state that, "The problem is there are few

means for predicting which behaviors identify such leaders" (p. 52). It is therefore

important to ask qualitative questions of leaders to help determine what these leadership

behaviors may be. If a high level of EI is a key to successful organizations, then

identification of high EI may help schools better predict the best candidates for leadership

positions.

Cherniss (1998) "calls for leaders in education to rely more on consensus than

autocracy" (p. 26).   Consensus involves relationship with staff, and involving staff as

part of the decision-making process. Cherniss (1998) also states that, "effective leader's

base self-confidence on self-knowledge. Educational leaders must work in highly charged

environments and how they handle their emotional reactions will strongly affect their

leadership" (p. 27).   This research indicates that the cultivation of positive relationships

is a primary factor when working in such environments (Cherniss, 1998, p. 28). Barbuto,

Jr. and Burbach (2006) suggest, "More research is needed to test the relationship of

emotional intelligence to other leadership behaviors and to test the relationship in other

populations" (p. 60). Barbuto, Jr. and Burbach (2006) and Cherniss (1998) both argue

that leaders must build and sustain relationships to have positive work environments, and

that emotions play a part in building and sustaining relationships. Therefore, relationships

are a critical component of school climate.

Schools with good school climate as perceived by teachers indicate high levels of

student achievement. Johnson and Stevens (2006) research findings indicate that school

climate is linked to student achievement. Their research also suggests further studies

which use "other mediating variables" and "school climate over time should be tested"

(Johnson & Stevens, 2006, p. 119). This study will use other variables such as gender,

age, and year's administrative experience. School climate tested over time is suggested by Johnson and Stevens (2006) who state:

> Teachers' perceptions of school climate could change at different times of the school year or be dependent on or influenced by major events in the school, such as change in administration, or publication of school's test results in the local newspaper. (p. 119)

Johnson and Stevens (2006) indicate the aforementioned as their rationale as to why school climate needs testing over time to increase reliability of the SLEQ.

In analyzing the works of Barbuto, Jr. and Burbach (2006), Cherniss (1998), and Johnson and Stevens (2006), it is clear that emotions play a part in building and sustaining positive environments. Since positive school climate is linked to student achievement, it is reasonable to assume that emotional intelligence of school leaders is correlated to school climate as perceived by teachers. Johnson and Stevens (2006) recommend studies using "other mediating variables" (p.119). Other variables would include school leader's age, gender, and years of administrative experience. Another variable would include replacing student achievement with EI, and then correlate EI to school climate.

Review of Previous Research, Findings, and Opinions

Mayer and Cobb (2000) describe emotional intelligence as "the ability to process emotional information as it pertains to the perception, assimilation, expression, regulation, and management of emotion" (p.163). Leaders who can read the emotions and perceptions of people tend to be happier and more satisfied with their jobs (Goleman,

1998a; Tucker et al., 2000; Zeidner et al., 2004). Emotionally intelligent leaders make a difference in the lives of their staff, who tend to be happier employees. Mayer and Salovey (1993) further developed the idea of emotional intelligence as a type of intelligence (Mayer & Salovey, 1993; Mayer & Salovey, 1997; Salovey & Mayer 1990). Mayer and Salovey (1997) developed a four-branch ability model of EI. This four-branch model is known as ability approach of emotional intelligence (Mayer & Cobb, 2000). This ability approach is defined as an intelligence that includes the use of feelings to perceive and abstractly understand other people (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). Mayer and Cobb (2000) argue that, "the ability version emphasizes that emotional intelligence exists" (p.15). Burbach et al., (2003) prefer the ability model because, "…it is skill based. The ability model has an inherent link to leadership behaviors because it focuses on how emotions can facilitate thinking and adaptive behavior" (Current constructs of emotional intelligence section, para 6).

Researchers have studied emotional intelligence in the business sector since the early 1990s. In 1990, Mayer and Salovey first formally defined emotional intelligence and demonstrated that aspects of it could be measured (Mayer, et al., 1990; Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Emotional intelligence became a synonymous term for other studies of EI using different words from different researchers to describe it. Mayer and Cobb (2000) state, "Like emotional intelligence (EI), EQ was employed on an occasional basis to mean an assortment of different terms such as, education quotient, ethics quotient, effectiveness quotient, and others, in addition to being synonymous with emotional quotient" (p. 165). Terms such as EQ and ethics quotient are synonymous to EI. These

various terms grew out of various articles in the popular media and have caused a "divide in the field" of EI researchers (Mayer et al., 2004a, p. 197). The divide in the field of terms became widespread as a result of EI being called a "hot" intelligence, and as a result of the popular claim of EI contributing more to success than IQ. The various terms became confusing thus leading to concerns among researchers whether there can be too many types of intelligences (Sternberg, 2000).

Some researchers argue that emotional intelligence can be conceptualized as, "biological, individual, procedural, social, ecological, declarative, and easy or hard to operationalize" (Zeidner, Matthews, Roberts, & MacCann, 2003, p. 90). Conceptualize means that EI is viewed as intelligence, can be measured, has a cognitive aspect, and has been viewed as a "social, practical, and personal intelligences that we have come to call the hot intelligences" (Mayer at al., 2004a, p. 197). Like other intelligences, EI can predict what people with EI will be like (Matthews, Zeidner, & Roberts, 2002).

As a result of these findings, Mayer et al. (2004a) submit that EI meets the standards for a traditional intelligence because EI can be operationalized, shows patterns of correlation to other intelligences, and develops with age. The operationalized assessments are varied and have been proven to be both valid and reliable (Barbuto, Jr., & Burbach, 2006; Dulewicz, Young, & Dulewicz, 2005; Mayer et al. 2004a).

As indicated, EI has taken on various terms which are synonymous with it. Goleman (1995) describes another term synonymous with EI called character. Goleman (1995) states, "There is an old fashioned word for the body of skills that emotional intelligence represents: character" (p.285). According to Mayer and Cobb (2000)

character education and socioemotional learning each teach moral values and interpersonal skills, and they are complementary to each other (p.168). In this respect, character education and socioemotional learning are related to emotional intelligence. Goleman (1995), Bar-On (1997), Cooper and Sawaf (1997), Dulewicz and Higgs (2000) have equated character with emotional intelligence. According to Mayer and Cobb (2000), emotional intelligence has become a catch phrase for anything that involved motivation, emotion, or good character. Goleman (1995) provides the link between emotional intelligence and character education.

Goleman (1995) states that attending to students' emotional competencies will result in a "caring community where students feel respected, cared about, and bonded to classmates" (p. 280). This finding lends much support and credibility to achieving a positive school climate through leaders with high EI. Mayer and Cobb (2000) state, "In the academic literature, emotional intelligence was a focused set of abilities; and emotional intelligence and character education were equated as much as possible" (p. 170). The same holds true with adults working in a public school system. When administrators are hired, a key component to the hiring process is to question and do extensive background checks on an applicant's character. Character, which is synonymous with EI, is what schools use to gauge the expected success of the leader when hired.

Leaders increase the perceptions of positive school climate through the relationships they create (Johnson & Stevens, 2006). King (1999) found that practicing school administrators better perceived and reacted to emotions of staff and showed

overall higher emotional intelligence than non-practicing administrators. Salovey and

Mayer (1990) described possible character outcomes of emotional intelligence as

including optimism and motivation. Goleman equates these character outcomes with the

intelligence itself. This subtle shift has led emotional intelligence to become a catch-

phrase for anything that involved motivation, emotion, or good character (Mayer &

Cobb, 2000, p.170). Constantine and Gainor (2001) state that emotional intelligence is

viewed as a somewhat enduring trait-like characteristic. The trait like characteristic can

best be described as intangible character-like qualities of individuals who lead using

emotions to guide them. Emotional intelligence involves a set of mental abilities in which

individuals employ higher-level processes regarding their attention to feelings, clarity of

feelings, discriminability of feelings, and mood-regulating strategies (Mayer & Salovey,

1993). Leaders who have the mental abilities to solve problems using awareness and

regulation of emotions are said to have high EI and be better leaders. Researches in the

business sector and military organizations have proven this by testing their hypothesis

(Ashkanasy & Dasborough, 2003; Dulewicz, et al., 2005; Maulding, 2002).

Research in the business sector and military have studies which indicate a

correlation between business climate and leadership. It is therefore reasonable to assume

that school climate is linked to leadership and leadership to EI. School climate as

perceived by teachers is one way to determine principal (school leaders) leadership skills

as they exist or need to exist. Teachers' perceptions of school climate as indicated by use

of the R-SLEQ can predict what improvements are needed as well as what leadership

qualities are recognized. The R-SLEQ indicates whether school leaders provide

37

opportunities for teachers to contribute to improvement of school climate. The

opportunities include, affiliation to create a welcoming and user-friendly environment,

innovation to encourage out-of-the-box thinking and creative lessons, participatory

decision-making to give staff ownership and a share in the stakes, resource adequacy to

provide learning opportunities for students, and student support to encourage safety,

security, and a learning environment that inspires life long learners (Johnson & Stevens,

2006). School leaders who function and direct staff using the aforementioned indicators

from the R-SLEQ have schools where the school climate is rated as positive as perceived

by teachers.

Webster and Fisher (2003) found that school level environment is as important as

how teachers deliver the curriculum. Johnson and Stevens (2001) also found indicators

from the SLEQ which would link higher student achievement to a good school climate.

The SLEQ was the survey instrument used before the R-SLEQ. The SLEQ contained

more questions than the R-SLEQ. Johnson et al. (2007) found that the R-SLEQ structure

and measurement properties apply equivalently for elementary, middle, and high school

teachers. The R-SLEQ can be used to help leaders in their vision for school improvement

through an understanding of school environment as perceived by teachers.

Theoretical Framework

The theory of EI is grown out of both intelligence and emotional information.

Mayer et al., (1990) and Salovey & Mayer, (1990) developed a theory of EI and a

construct to measure it. Mayer &Salovey (1997) describe the theory of EI as initially

developed by the former and call it the four-branch ability model. In this theory, EI is

divided into four skills or abilities which include "(a) perceive emotion; (b) use emotion to facilitate thought; (c) understand emotions; and (d) manage emotion" (p. 199.) Mayer et al. (2004a) describe the branches as follows: Branch 1 is the ability to recognize emotion in others facial and postural expressions. This includes using nonverbal communication in recognizing emotions in others. Branch 2 involves the capacity of emotions to assist thinking. This can be described as using feelings and past experiences to use emotions to help solve problems (Schwarz, 1990; Mayer & Mitchell, 1998). Branch 3 is described as the understanding of emotion and the capacity to analyze emotions (Roseman, 1984). Branch 4 reflects the management of emotion, which necessarily involves the rest of the personality.

This theory is one in which the premise of much research concerning emotional intelligence takes root. Emotional intelligence as presented in this study will hold to this framework. Emotional intelligence is the ability to look at another person and distinguish the feelings, moods, and motivation of them. People who are said to be emotionally intelligent understand what people are feeling and react according to the emotions sensed. The understanding in dealing and working with a person successfully is what distinguishes an emotionally competent leader from one who does not know or care about the emotions of the person with which he/she is working. The four-branch ability model is a theory on which emotional intelligence is based; we now need to establish a school climate theory.

School climate theory is based on work by Rentoul and Fraser (1983) and Docker, Fisher, and Fraser (1989). These researchers used Moos's (1974) dimensions of

psychosocial environments as school climate theory was developed. Johnson and Stevens (2006) cite these researchers as using constructs from the 1950's and 1960's such as the College Characteristic Index (CCI) and Coughlans School Survey to use teacher perceptions to link school climate to student achievement. Brookover et al., (1978) found that school climate was better at predicting student achievement than other variables. Brookover et al. (1978), Hoy and Hannum (1997) and West (1985) found that school climate and achievement went beyond socioeconomic and ethnic factors and that student achievement and school climate are linked. This is important information to have as it leads to the purpose of this study which will determine if EI correlates to school climate.

Leaders are in a position to act as judge and jury in the decision-making process. Being able to read verbal as well as non-verbal cues often separates good leaders from great leaders when decisions are being rendered. When leaders are able to be aware of others' emotions as well as their own, they are said to be inspirational (Weymes, 2003). Thus leadership through emotions is an integral aspect of success for leaders as measured by leaders themselves (self-reported), as well as reported by staff. The theory that high EI of school leaders will correlate to a positive school climate as perceived by teachers is based upon the work of Mayer et al. (2004b), where there is support for relationships to leadership and organizational behavior.

Other Themes of Emotional Intelligence and School Climate

With a theoretical framework established, other themes in the literature will be reviewed to better understand EI and school climate. Zeidner et al. (2004) state, "Emotional intelligence also connects with several cutting-edge areas of psychological

science, including the neuroscience of emotion, self-regulation theory, studies of

metacognition, and the search for human cognitive abilities beyond 'traditional academic

intelligence" (p.372). The self-regulation theory is described as the way leaders

understand their own and others' emotions (Zeidner et al., 2004). Leaders with a high

level of EI experience more success on the job, have better relationships with colleagues,

and lead more effectively (Cooper & Sawaf, 1997). There is considerable difficulty in

objectively determining how leaders perceive themselves and their emotional intelligence

(Zeidner, Roberts, & Matthews, 2002). Triangulation can help alleviate the difficulty of

perceptions by gathering data from the leader, follower, and having multiple methods to

review the data to more objectively draw conclusions. From a leadership perspective,

Zeidner et al. (2003) view integration of EI as intelligence when there is a "positive"

temperament and EI self-awareness is used as emotional regulation (p.90). As for school

leaders, they are most interested in the link between emotional intelligence and

socioemotional learning (Mayer & Cobb, 2000, p. 170).   Although this may be true, few

studies have drawn conclusions where EI and school climate relationships are studied.

Researchers have claimed that EI is an important factor in organizational leadership

(Zeidner et al., 2004). This is supported in business and military leadership studies

(Maulding, W.; 2002). Thus school leaders EI is important to understand because it will

indicate if EI is related to school climate.

Since EI is linked to leadership, it is reasonable to assume that school leaders

must know something about EI and how they can utilize EI to better their school. Mayer

and Cobb (2000) describe a four-step approach to understanding educational leadership

and policy-making, and also state that many accept emotional intelligence as an intelligence needed to learn and behave appropriately (p. 170). The four-step approach includes accurately perceiving emotions in one self and others, using emotions to facilitate thinking, understanding emotional meanings, and managing emotions. This approach is the ability model of EI (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). Schutte et al. (2001) state:

> Because central components of EI are the ability to understand others' emotions and the ability to regulate and harness one's own emotions adaptively, one would expect persons with higher emotional intelligence to be more socially adept and display better social skills. (p 526)

This is the expectation, but do the social skills improve school climate? Research has indicated that the higher one's emotional intelligence, the more able they are to lead. When leaders are aware of their own emotions, there is a positive correlation between EI and leadership ability (Mayer et al., 2004a). This is critical in that it may lead to more positive school climate. Mood regulation is also a component of emotional intelligence that leaders demonstrate at times. Mood is an extension of emotional intelligence (Goleman, D.; Boyatzis, R.; McKee, A., 2002). Goleman et al., (2002) describe the key element to business success is emotional leadership, in which mood of the leader is a component.

Elias, Weissberg, Frey, Greenberg, Haynes, Kessler, et al., (1997) refer to emotional intelligence as an "integrative concept" (p.27). Integrative means that emotional intelligence has a specific definition and other concepts are part of it, concepts such as character and relationships. This rationale blends character education and

socioemotional learning (Mayer & Cobb, 2000). Pool (1997) suggests higher level processing and understanding of emotions predicts success through the use of EI. Pool states, "Emotional well-being is the strongest predictor of achievement in school and on the job" (p. 12).

Mayer and Cobb (2000) state "policy experts conclude that emotional intelligence is readily observable and assessable" (p. 171). Goleman (1998b) adds, "The good news about emotional intelligence is that it is virtually all learned" (p. 40). Mayer and Cobb (2000) state "This information affirms that policy makers are informed by journalistic accounts of science rather than by science itself" (p. 171.) As a learned intelligence, it is emotional intelligence that motivates us to pursue our unique potential and purpose, and activates our innermost values and aspirations, transforming them from things we think about to how we live (Cooper, 1997). Mayer and Salovey (1997) define emotional intelligence as the capacity to reason about emotions, the ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions and knowledge of emotions, and to advance emotional and intellectual growth. Mayer and Salovey's (1997) ability definition of emotional intelligence has the longest history (the first version originating in 1990) and the most support in the psychological literature, and for that reason we focus on it here (Mayer & Cobb, 2000, p. 172). The definition Mayer and Salovey use to describe emotional intelligence comes from a four-branch model that describes four areas or capacities involving the abilities to: accurately perceive emotions in one and others, use emotions to facilitate thinking, understand emotional meanings, and manage emotions (Mayer et al., 2004a, p. 197). This is the model which will be used in this study.

Like Mayer and Cobb (2000), Cooper (1997) also describes a four-step approach to emotional intelligence which he refers to as cornerstones. Each cornerstone has four principle character references to help define what the primary cornerstone is. The primary cornerstones are emotional literacy, emotional fitness, emotional depth, and emotional alchemy. These cornerstones apply directly to administrators as executives needing emotional intelligence in work and life (Cooper, 1997). Emotional intelligence must be demonstrated to be a useful model of an actual intelligence (Mayer & Cobb, 2000, p. 172). Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso, (2000b) regard emotional intelligence as a mental ability, and 'mixed models' describe emotional intelligence as consisting of both cognitive abilities and aspects of personality and motivation that facilitate application of abilities for handling emotion in real-world settings. Goleman (1998b) also proposes an emotional intelligence model and lists five dimensions of emotional intelligence, each consisting of three or more emotional competencies. Goleman (1998b) defines these competencies as self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills. Schutte et al. (2001) call these competencies interpersonal relations. In the cases aforementioned, all exemplify aspects of the four-branch model of EI. The models discussed are similar, and many researchers have relied on each others research as the quest for empirical data of the relationship of EI to school climate continues.

Criticism of Emotional Intelligence

When reviewing the literature of EI, one must remember that, "scientific research rarely begins with fully agreed definitions, though it may eventually lead to them" (Neisser, Boodoo, Bouchard, Boykin, Brody, Ceci, et al., 1996, p. 77). Mayer et al.

44

(1997) indicate that critics have been skeptical about emotional intelligence describing there is little evidence it exists, that it cannot be measured reliably, and it does not predict important outcomes. Zeidner et al. (2003) also claim that there are a variety of ambiguities within both ability and mixed models of emotional intelligence. Much work on EI assumes that it resides in aptitudes that can be reported verbally (e.g., via questionnaire) (Zeidner et al., 2003, p.71). Zeidner et al. (2003) claim, "much emotional behavior, ranging from generating facial expressions to responding to nonverbal social cues, appears to be implicit, depending on 'procedural' skills that are inaccessible to conscious awareness" (p. 71).

Zeidner et al. (2003) state, "As for causal status of EI, there is little evidence to exclude substantial biological influences on EI as a stable competence that is antecedent to learning specific emotional skills. A valid test for EI should predict real-world competence and adaptation" (p. 71). However, the literature on emotional intelligence indicates that the real-world outcomes encountered may be evaluated differently depending on the criteria used (e.g., emotional distress, short-term costs and benefits, long-term costs and benefits, and personal vs. societal gain) (Matthews & Zeidner, 2000).

Shutte et al. (2001) conducted seven studies examining the link between emotional intelligence and interpersonal relations, and investigating empathy and self-monitoring of one's own emotional intelligence. Their results showed "higher scores for emotional intelligence as related to empathic perspective taking, but were not related to empathic fantasy, empathic concern, and personal distress, because these three types of empathy are less emotionally adaptive than empathic perspective taking" (Shutte et al.,

2001, p. 531). When multiple criteria are used and the studies are done with various cultures of leaders, the results indicate a high relationship of EI to leadership. However, this study wants to correlate multiple variables as relating EI to school climate. Mayer, Caruso, and Salovey (1999) also like the ability model of emotional intelligence because it has been empirically validated. Using this ability model and correlating it to the R-SLEQ may determine if EI is linked to school climate.

Zeidner et al. (2003) state, "There also appear to be some limitations to using the four-branch model as a framework for differentiating the multiple emotional capabilities that emerge during early childhood" (p. 72). Zeidner et al. (2003) claim the model omits some important aspects of emotional capability such as emotional expression and empathy. Schutte et al. (2001) echo this belief, stating that empathy and emotional expression are what participants said were vital in recognizing and managing both self and others' emotions. Zeidner et al. (2003) believe that EI is part of a "common core" of processes, while Mayer et al. (1999) view EI as separate abilities. Zeidner et al. (2003) also submit that it is unclear that each of the four-branches of the ability model corresponds to a psychologically coherent set of abilities.

Zeidner et al. (2003) continue their argument against EI as needing developmental competencies in children. They state, "Developmental evidence suggests a parallel rather than a serial relationship among the four branches. The more primitive forms of emotional regulation do not depend on explicit understanding. The challenge for a developmental theory of EI is to show that there is a common core to these multiple processes" (p. 73). The four branch ability model by Mayer et al. (1997) demonstrates

that EI is deep seeded in theory. The evidence presented by Zeidner et al. (2003) present more of a biological and genetic growth model for EI as EI is developed through life by individuals.

Zeidner et al., (2003) and Averill (1992) share the same biological beliefs of how EI develops. Averill (1992), interprets Mayer et al.'s (2004b) position on emotion as: "a) each kind of emotion (anger, fear, etc.) shares certain essential features that are biologically based, b) simpler emotions may combine to form more complex emotions, and c) emotions may be regulated but not fundamentally altered to display rules" (Averill's study as cited in Mayer et al., 2004b, p. 250). To add to the work of Averill (1992), Mayer et al. (2004b) surmise that "emotions have the functional purpose of signaling relationships and changes in relationships, real or imagined, principally between people and their environments" (p. 250). Mayer (2001) adds that emotion and cognition represent different functions of the mind, if not the brain, recognizing that the two often interact and are expressed in an integrated form. When leaders are aware of their own emotions and the emotions of others, the relationship between the two is such that both leader and staff sense trust between each other, allowing a working relationship to prosper (Weymes, 2003). When Mayer et al. (2004b) describe the real or imagined role of relationships, they are referring to a bond between two or more people that is promulgated by the emotions and understanding thereof.

Evaluation of the Instrument

Emotional intelligence is hard to measure, for there is not a psychometrically sound tool created to examine the theory of emotional intelligence (Mayer et al., 2004b,

p. 250). Mayer et al. (2004b) state, "Testing by itself cannot answer everything necessary about a concept. Other approaches can work together to enrich a topic. The particular value of testing, to our minds, is to provide clear limits and measures of concepts" (p. 251). In opposition to EI testing, Brody (2000) states his view as, "We know how to measure something called intelligence, but we do not know what has been measured" (p. 30). Mayer et al. (2004b) state, "We are not pessimistic … in our view of the state of the field of emotional intelligence or its measures with the MSCEIT (p. 249). Mayer et al. (2004b) prescribe that the assessment of intelligence, be it EI or general intelligence "can be a far more informative and rewarding enterprise than that suggested by such a view" (Mayer et al., 2004b, p. 249). Knowing what is measured is strength of the MSCEIT. The use of this test to determine emotional intelligence has been assessed with valid and reliable results.

One method that is most useful in scoring is the use of agreed upon answers by experts in the field (Mayer et al., 2004b). Mayer et al. state "Emotional problems, more so than the usual cognitive IQ test problems, often involve multiple correct and multiple incorrect answers" (p. 251). Research also points out that nonconsensual correct answers in the emotions are unclear, while nonconsensual answers in the emotional intelligence realm are acceptable (Mayer et al., 2004b). A valid test that studies have supported is the Mayer Salovey Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT). The MSCEIT has eight tasks: two to measure each of the four branches of EI (Mayer et al., 2004b, p. 200).

Mayer et al. (2004b) reviewed studies that "support the scoring methods, content coverage, factorial structure, discriminant properties, and convergence with related tests,

48

general predictive power, and even neuropsychological patterns of the MSCEIT" (p.

252). This leads to the conclusion that valid emotional intelligence abilities of leaders

can be measured to help determine emotional intelligence. "The most direct measure of

emotional intelligence is in the form of ability tests. That is, they ask people to solve

emotional problems. Ecological validity refers to how well a test or laboratory situation

can generalize to situations in real life" (Mayer et al., 2004b, p. 201). Mayer et al.

(2004b) further suggest "written and visual items about EI are intrinsically ecologically

valid, and that different methods converge to a single criterion endorsed by emotional

experts" (p. 201).

The "MSCEIT has an overall reliability rating of r = .91 or .93" (Mayer et al.,

2004a, p. 202). The variance is determined by whether expert of general scoring is used.

Davies, Stankov, & Roberts (1998) stated, "Objective measures of emotional intelligence

suffer from poor reliability" (p. 1013). Matthews et al. (2002) stated, "…the reliabilities

are far from optimal (p. 198); however, "the MEIS/MSCEIT provide an overall

assessment of EI that has high internal consistency (reliability)…" (p. 516).

The Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS), which includes 12 ability

tasks related to emotional intelligence, has begun to demonstrate the validity of the

Mayer and Salovey model (Mayer & Cobb, 2000, p. 172). The MEIS, as explained by

Mayer & Cobb, (2000) indicates that factor analysis has one general factor of emotional

intelligence and three subfactors. The three subfactors are: "(1) the accurate perception of

emotion, (2) the understanding of emotional meaning, and (3) the regulation of emotion"

(Mayer & Cobb, 2000, p. 173). The MEIS test has also tested each factor to be highly

reliable with a full test alpha reliability of $r = .96$. Reliability coefficients of above .90 are an acceptable level of reliability when using different tests (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2006). Results from the MEIS strongly suggest the existence of an emotional intelligence (Mayer & Cobb, 2000, p. 173). Mayer and Cobb (2000) state, "If the existence of emotional intelligence as a part of personality becomes widely accepted within the scientific community," and that EI can be learned, then theoretically speaking, emotional intelligence can lead to emotional and socioemotional learning and be considered intelligence; and "If evidence against the intelligence mounts, then the connection will no longer remain" (p. 173-174).

The MSCEIT V2.0 is a test based on the idea that, "…emotional intelligence involves problem solving with and about emotions" (Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, & Sitarenios, 2003, p. 97). The MSCEIT has developed and changed from its earlier forms known as the MEIS and the MSCEIT RV1.1. Mayer et al. (2003) have described their test as being criticized in the area of reliability. Another criticism is that various answers for the same questions are dependent on the grader. This indicates there could be some subjectivity to the test. Standardization of data reported in the MSCEIT V2.0 address problem area questions through empirical data. The three questions they address are: "a) Do general and expert criteria for correct answers to EI test items converge? b) What is the reliability of such tests? and c) Is the factor structure of such tests consistent with theoretical models of EI?" (Mayer et al., 2003, p. 98).

To answer the first question, Mayer et al. (2003) describe the test as being graded by general and experts on emotions. General refers to non-experts who have some

knowledge of emotional intelligence. Correct test answers can be identified according to the response of a group of unselected test takers and compared to the experts to see if scores are the same or extremely different from each other. To alleviate the problem which arose from this technique in the original MEIS test, more experts of emotions were requested to help score the test for reliability. This form of triangulation helped give the test more validity and reliability. The 21 experts were all members of the International Society for Research and Emotions (ISRE) who volunteered their time in this study.

The reliability of the MSCEIT V2.0 is adequate according to Mayer et al. (2003) who measured reliability using split-half reliability coefficients. The correlation between the two score sets ranged between $r = .96$ to .98 across all branches and areas of total EI scores based on expert and general criteria (Mayer et al., 2003). Correlations near .90 or higher is considered highly reliable. The MSCEIT has a high reliability coefficient according to Mayer et al. (2004a).

 To assess the validity of the MSCEIT, the test must first be operationalized. Researchers such as Matthews et al., (2002) have suggested that, "content validity is a difficult area, given disputes over the definition and conceptualization of EI and attendant sampling difficulties" (p. 46). Because most content validity is based on an authors position, the four-branch ability theory used to assess EI employs two tasks to measure each and they have been studied over a ten year period (Mayer et al., 2004a).

A further investigation of EI and the validity of the MSCEIT as researched by Mayer et al. (2004a) identifies the MSCEIT as a test that measures unitary intelligence and also measures the four-branch model which includes perception of emotions, using emotions,

51

understanding emotions, and managing emotions. The four-branch model can be separated into two categories for measurement purposes known as experiential and strategic. The experiential EI involves perception and use of emotions, while strategic EI involves understanding and managing emotions.

The MSCEIT is arguably a new intelligence instrument. In neuropsychological tests, Jausovec, Jausovec, and Gerlic (2001) found that the MSCEIT test required less cognitive effort, for those who had high levels of EI as measured by the use of standard patterns for intelligence through electroencephalographic activity of the brain. The understanding branch of the MSCEIT has correlations of other intelligences in the range $r = .25 - .35$ when correlated with other instruments measuring EI (Mayer et al., 2004a, p. 203). These findings suggest that measures for social intelligence may be no higher than traditional intelligence (Mayer et al., 2004a).

When the MSCEIT is measured against other emotional intelligence tests as self-report measures it correlated $r = .21, .18,$ and $-.31$, which indicates weak overlap of self-report tests of EI (Mayer et al., 2004a, p. 203). Typical self-report measures for standard intelligence correlate at $r = .30$. Some reasons for this are EI as defined in other tests are different than EI as it is defined in the MSCEIT. Also there is a difference as to how people perceive intelligence versus what their actual intelligence is.

In regard to EI and validity, research has indicated that the more emotionally intelligent a person is the better their academic performance is in school (Boone & DiGiuseppe, 2002). These predictions also hold true for defiant behavior where EI and

deviancy vary inversely when coupled with violence, bullying, and drug use (Rubin, 1999).

The factor concern for the MSCEIT has shown the test can measure from one to four domains of emotional intelligence. These domains are perceptions of ones' own emotions, understanding others' emotions, managing emotions of self, and facilitating emotions (motivation) (Mayer et al., 2003). The test can be given in its entirety or in sections to measure levels of EI in these four areas.

The MSCEIT V2.0 is a 141 item test to measure the four branches of EI which include perception, using emotions to facilitate thought, understanding emotions, and managing emotions. The first branch, perception of emotions "uses faces and pictures" to measure the emotional intelligence, the second branch uses "sensations and facilitation tasks to measure the emotional thought process;" understanding emotions is measured with "blends and change tasks;" and "managing emotions is measured with emotions management and emotional relationship tasks" (Mayer et al., 2003, p. 99).

Mayer et al. (2003) have stated that "Those who use the MSCEIT can feel more confident about the quality of the measurement tool to assess EI," and that, "the value of the MSCEIT as a measure of EI will be settled by studies of its validity and utility in predicting important outcomes over and above conventionally measured emotion, intelligence, and related constructs" (p. 104).

Mayer et al. (2004b) also believe "the MSCEIT has demonstrated considerable and growing evidence for ability measures of emotional intelligence" (2004b, p. 252). There is discussion among researchers which indicate that controls for tests and the way they

are given should be considered. Mayer et al. (2004b) argue this in saying there are three

reasons why test matters should be controlled. The three reasons are:

> First, statistically controlling for multiple tests is likely to partial out legitimate
>
> variance from overlapping tests. Second, statistically controlling for multiple tests is
>
> likely to partial out legitimate variance drawn from chance linear combinations of the
>
> scales employed. Third, the more tests included, the lower one's statistical power.
>
> (p. 252)

This is reminding researchers that in the study of emotions as intelligence, that validation

of tests will vary greatly because of the number of combinations of emotions that are

researched. Gohm and Clore (2002) suggest that more cross-cultural studies be

conducted; and, that more lab work research be conducted, graded, and observed so as to

improve and validate how people who take self-report tests really respond. Are self-

reporters reporting the way they say when given situations as described in the MSCEIT?

Does emotional intelligence relate to success? This is the question Mayer and

Cobb (2000) have tried to answer. They ask, "Is it that emotional intelligence, defined in

the broader popularized fashion (e.g., including motivation, social skills), predicts a great

deal?" (2000, p. 174). Mayer and Cobb (2000) indicate that "Goleman's research is the

same as a personality test, and EI in this sense is nothing new" (p. 174). The way to

interpret the broad definition of EI is to study the idea that special traits of a special class

are highly important, but this thinking is not supported by empirical research (Mayer &

Cobb, 2000). When traits were studied, there was a 2-3% variance level, as opposed to

intelligence, which has a variance level of 10-25% (Mayer & Cobb, 2000). The claim that

EI out predicts IQ comes from Goleman (1995) where he implies that EI might predict up to 80% of one's success in life (Mayer & Cobb, 2000). Further research led Goleman (1998b) to state, "I found that 67 percent-two out of three-of the abilities deemed essential for effective performance were emotional competencies" (p.31). This 67% is based on 25 characteristics that claim to predict on-the-job success and job satisfaction of managers, but only through intense research and inquiry can it be determined if traits lead to success in jobs (Mayer & Cobb, 2000). The similarity between Mayer et al. (2002) and Goleman (1998b) is they describe EI as an ability. Mayer & Cobb (2000) describe Goleman's definition of EI as "broad" (p.175).

Mayer et al. (2004b) point out "emotional intelligence is not meant to compete with general intelligence, but rather to strengthen the concept of intelligence" (p. 254). Mayer et al., (2004b) indicate "The number of people involved in research studies, and the number of studies available in the area encourage us in the belief that studies of emotional intelligence, measured as an ability, and of intelligence testing more generally, both have a great deal to offer the enterprise of understanding human performance and how to best foster it" (p. 254).

Thus far, emotional intelligence predicts favorably as both an intelligence and valid and reliable test. However, there are critics and controversies surrounding EI, and these controversies must be analyzed to better understand the argument as to why EI is useful in predicting success of school climate. Mayer et al. (2004a) describe several controversies surrounding EI. These controversies include the concern that "EI test items be operationalized, show patterns of correlations with other intelligences, and that EI

55

develops with age" (Mayer et al., 2004a, p.200). Mayer et al. (2004a) explain that to properly grade answers to EI questions, general consensus may be used. This method can be wrong and that the general consensus should pick the optimal answer. Using this methodology may actually allow for testers to pick an alternative answer, so for that reason alternatives to this scoring procedure of general consensus must be evaluated. Mayer et al. (2004a) go on to say that expert criterion may be used to grade an EI test. Roberts, Zeidner, and Matthews (2001) think that expert scoring can create scores that vary from standard intelligence tests scoring. Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, and Sitarenios (2001) report that using this method to grade the MEIS test showed a correlation of r =.43 to.78. Mayer et al. (2001) attributed this low correlation to only two scorers grading the test.

Mayer et al. (2004a) also point that weakness in an area of EI is the "popularizations of the concept, and particularly the irresponsible claims in the popular press" (p. 210). They go on to also accept that criticism exists where EI is used as a self-report measure. Mayer et al. (2004a) state, "Certain of those self-report approaches are appropriate as measures of self-perceived EI, but do not actually measure EI ability" (p. 210). They cite another limitation of EI is the lack of referencing work from the latest scientific journals. This is the result of EI studies rapid growth, which leads to a similar critique, that there is still much to be studied. Mayer et al. (2004a) end what they believe criticisms to be by asking themselves the question, "How much does this matter?" and "How high a priority is it?" (p. 211).

In all, Mayer et al. (2004a) see the criticisms of EI as being further researched in the areas of what EI predicts, how it relates to other intelligences, whether there is a process by which EI can be graded, whether EI can be schooled, and how EI tests correlate to different age groups.

In one study, Dearborn (2002) describes a leadership profile, "as being a visionary, coach, and affiliative, which means impacting climate by motivating, being democratic, pacesetting, and commanding" (p. 527). Dearborn (2002) also uses these descriptors in her study of emotional intelligence. Thus, the definition of leadership and leadership development is shaped by the emotional intelligence levels of leaders. Emotional intelligence and leadership go hand-in-hand. Thus leaders' EI may directly influence school climate. This study may determine if a relationship exists between EI and school climate.

School climate

School climate plays an important role in how schools are perceived. Johnson and Stevens (2006) state, "School climate is a term that is commonly used but one without a commonly agreed upon definition. Depending on the study, the school climate might be called school environment or school-level learning environment" (p. 111). Freiberg, (1999) refers to school climate as the physical and emotional well-being of an organization. Phillips (1997) described school climate in two different aspects, one being academic excellence and the other community climate. Stewart (1979) found that there was a difference between classroom level and school level environments. Classroom level environments tend to focus on the relationships between students and teachers

whereas school level environments tend to indicate relationships of teachers to other teachers and teachers to administration.

Moos (1974) described three dimensions that should be understood when trying to learn about any environment. These dimensions are relationship dimension which describe relationships with other people; personal development dimension, which mean how people grow in an organization; and system maintenance and system change dimension which show how people respond to change. These dimensions are similar to Mayer and Salovey's (1993) theory of emotional intelligence in that the ability to understand the relationships of people, understanding emotions, reacting to emotions, and tempering one's own emotion are all vital in the overall health of organizations. Anderson (1982) and Fisher et al. (1986) associate school level environment research with school leaders. Fisher and Fraser (1990) state, "The study of school environment is clearly important because it is likely to contribute to understanding and improvement of the school's functioning and to satisfaction and productivity within the school" (p. 3). Fisher and Fraser (1990) also view school climate as involving relationships with other teachers and administrators (leaders). This study will focus on linking emotional intelligence of school leaders to school climate as perceived by teachers.

The School Level Environment Questionnaire (SLEQ) is a survey instrument that was developed by Rentoul and Fraser (1983) to satisfy weaknesses in other school climate instruments. The original SLEQ had 56 survey items in eight different scales. Fisher and Fraser (1990) describe the eight scales as: (1) student support which is described as good student behavior and good rapport between students and teachers; (2)

affiliation means teachers have help and feel encouraged by colleagues; (3) professional interest where teachers discuss professional matters, show interest in their work, and seek out professional development; (4) staff freedom with staff free of set rules, guidelines, and procedures, and of supervision to ensure rule compliance; (5) participatory decision making so that teachers have the opportunity to participate in the decision making; (6) innovation by which the school supports experimentation and fosters classroom openness; (7) resource adequacy where resources are suitable and adequate; and (8) work pressure or the extent to which work pressure dominates the school environment. Rentoul and Fraser (1983) developed the SLEQ in compliance with six criteria which include: (1) school level environment characteristics based on the existing literature; (2) dimensions based on Moos (1974) work (Moos describes the dimensions as relationship dimension, personal development dimension, and system maintenance and system change dimensions); (3) developed with schools and teachers in mind through interviews; (4) with only school level material included; (5) designed with the economy in mind; and (6) keeping the instrument simple with minimal survey items and scales. The SLEQ has been used in studies around the world (Fraser and Rentoul, 1982; Mailula & Laugksch, 2003; Johnson and Stevens, 2000; and Johnson & Templeton, 1998). The SLEQ has gone through several revisions resulting in fewer survey items and less scales of environment. The SLEQ was originally tested and used in Australia and has recently been used extensively in schools in the Southwestern United States. Johnson and Templeton (1999) used the SLEQ for the purpose of determining what aspects of school climate should be used in the survey in an effort to improve schools. Aldridge, Laugksch, and Fraser (2006)

59

state, "The SLEQ was designed to assess school teachers' perceptions of psychosocial dimensions of the environment of the school and includes eight scales with seven items each" (p.127). Fisher and Fraser (1990) describe three advantages in administering the SLEQ. The advantages of the SLEQ are accessibility, design for use in schools, and it is economical in that there is less time testing and scoring.

Rentoul and Fraser (1983) explored the school climate instruments that were being used and identified the problems with them in an effort to make a more valid and reliable instrument. They looked at several problems which included: (1) instrument development without enough peer reviewed literature regarding school environments; (2) crossover between school climate and classroom climate; (3) application for non-school environments; (4) instruments being too long; and (5) not applicable for needs desired. Strength of the original 56 item SLEQ is that it had internal consistency coefficients from .070-0.87 for most scales. However, some scales were less than 0.70 in the internal consistency coefficients. Another weakness was "There have been no published reports of reliability checks with samples outside of Australia" (Johnson and Stevens, 2001, p. 327). Fisher and Fraser (1990) found the discriminant validity ranged from 0.10-0.42; indicating "that the SLEQ measures distinct although somewhat overlapping aspects of school environment" (p. 10). They felt this was satisfactory and that the instrument measured what it intended in addition to other areas of climate such as classroom.

Johnson and Stevens (2001) figured that to best analyze the data of over 5,000 teachers who took the SLEQ, they would use an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The EFA was used to study the relationship between

60

items in the first half of the sample. It was assumed that factors of the SLEQ might be "intercorrelated" (p.329). The CFA was used to determine if the EFA could confirm the second half of the sample. The 56 items were scores on a Likert scale. Johnson and Stevens (2001) state "The purpose of the EFA was to investigate the factors underlying the SLEQ" (p. 330). Factors were put to an oblique rotation and analyzed. If a factor correlated over a 0.20 after each analysis, it was kept. After oblique rotation, factors not loading at least 0.30 were eliminated. This sequence occurred for each of the factors. In all 13 items were eliminated and the SLEQ now had 43 items. Of the 13 items eliminated, "five did not load substantially," while others showed "low internal consistency (alpha reliability) coefficients" (Johnson & Stevens, 2001, p. 324). Use of CFA on the new 43 item SLEQ confirmed what was found using the EFA. However, "Chi-square/ *df* ratio was more than 2.0, indicating the model did not fit the data well;" however, "the Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) of 0.05 indicated good model fit" (p. 335). The eight scales of the SLEQ were reduced to seven in the new 43 item SLEQ.

Johnson and Stevens, (2001) ran a second model which eliminated two scales (staff freedom and work pressure). That left five scales and 35 items on the SLEQ which showed comparable measurements using the Chi-square/ *df* ratio, Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI), RMSEA, Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI). What Johnson and Stevens (2001) found was no major changes in Goodness of Fit (GOF) measures between the five and seven factor model. Johnson and Stevens (2001) state:

The modified five-factor model, with 35 items arranged in five factors, clearly fits

the data best. It had the best values for Chi-square/ *df* ratio, GFI, AGFI, CFI,

RMSEA, and Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) (comparing to a null model) compared to

the other models. (p. 336)

Statistically, Johnson and Stevens (2001) found the Chi-square/*df* ratio was 1.71

well below the 2.0, GFI measured 0.91 above 0.90, AGFI 0.89 close to 0.90, (CFI) 0.94

above 0.90, RMSEA 0.04 below 0.05 and TLI (null) 0.94 above 0.90 of the 35 item

SLEQ. "Squared multiple correlations for individual items ranged from 0.07-0.63 and for

factors from 0.20-0.64" (Johnson & Stevens, 2001, p. 337). Internal consistency of the

SLEQ showed an overall alpha coefficient of 0.90. Item elimination at this point would

not have improved the coefficients. Individual alpha coefficients for different scales

ranged between 0.70-0.90 (Johnson and Stevens, 2001). Fisher, Fraser, and Wubbels

(1993) found similar internal consistency using Cronbach alpha which ranged from 0.65-

0.92. Fisher and Fraser (1990) provided further validation of the SLEQ by reporting

discriminant validity coefficients ranging from 0.10-0.42. This indicated the "SLEQ

scales measured different but somewhat overlapping parts of the overall construct of

school environment" (Johnson & Stevens, 2001, p. 327).

Johnson and Stevens (2001) found the 35 item SLEQ to be good for use by

elementary school teachers. The five scales SLEQ was a good instrument to examine

relationships between student achievement and teachers perception of school climate.

Johnson and Stevens suggest that further study may reveal a SLEQ with fewer factors

and items. Much of the research by Johnson and Stevens (2001) is using the SLEQ and

linking it to student achievement. This study may link school climate to the emotional intelligence of school leaders in elementary, middle, and high schools.

Johnson et al. (2007) have revised the SLEQ to a 21 item five scale school climate instrument. The five scales include collaboration, decision making, instructional innovation, student relations, and school resources. The SLEQ was given to 4,920 teachers in a large school district in Southwestern United States with a 52% responding rate. Similar to the Johnson and Stevens (2001) study, this study by Johnson et al. (2007) used an EFA and CFA to determine factor structure and confirmatory structure of the factors in the SLEQ. They also used invariance testing as well as an ANOVA to study if the instrument wholly or by factors could delineate climate differences between schools.

Johnson et al. (2007) found that interfactor correlations ranged from .29-.63 which justified using an oblique rotation. Using CFA model for the 21 items, the AGFI was .93 and the CFI a .94. These were close to the recommended .95. The root mean square was .052 lower than the recommended .06 as cited in Hu and Bentler (1999). Shumacker and Lomax (1996) described the root square as significant, which does not fit the model well; yet with such a large sample size ($N = 1,274$) even minor differences may result in statistical significance. Invariance testing was done to determine how the SLEQ would work if used in all three levels of schools which include elementary, middle, and high schools. Johnson et al. (2007) used six models to test root square, Chi-square/*df*, CFI, p values, and the change of root square and Chi-square/ *df*. After all six models were tested, the CFI value was .937 which is a high level. "These results indicate that the CFA

model was essentially invariant across elementary, middle and high school teachers"
(Johnson et al., 2007, p. 840).

Johnson et al. (2007) also found acceptable reliability coefficients which ranged
from .77-.86. This confirms coefficients from studies completed by Fisher and Fraser,
1990; and Fraser, Williamson, and Tobin 1987. ANOVAs were then used to study if the
SLEQ could be used across schools and detect differences in schools. Johnson et al.
(2007) state, "if the instrument cannot do so, either there are no differences in climate
among schools and teachers' perceptions of those climates, which is extremely unlikely,
or the instrument is not sensitive enough to pick up those differences" (p. 841). Johnson
et al. (2007) found that significant differences between schools on each of the five
climate factors as well as the overall climate factors had p values < .001. Johnson and
Stevens (2006) found that the R-SLEQ as a whole when measuring school climate had an
alpha reliability coefficient of 0.90 and the five factors (scales) ranged from 0.77-0.86.
These were the same reliability coefficients found by Johnson and Stevens (2001). Other
studies have also confirmed the validity and reliability of the SLEQ. These studies
include Cresswell and Fisher, 1999; Fisher and Fraser 1991; Rentoul and Fraser, 1983;
and Templeton and Jensen, 1995. Johnson and Stevens (2001) also used an exploratory
and confirmatory factor analysis of the SLEQ to further validate the quality of the SLEQ.
"These results indicated that a Revised SLEQ was a reliable and valid instrument to
measure perceptions of school environment" (Aldridge et al. 2006, p. 127).

Johnson et al. (2007) found that the 21 item Revised-SLEQ demonstrated factorial
validity which was found using the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmed

using the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). These statistical methods were used

because the, "underlying theoretical structure was hypothesized and because it was

assumed that the dimensions or factors describing the structure might be intercorrelated"

(Johnson et al., 2007, p. 835-36). Johnson et al. (2007) state, "The structure and

measurement properties of the R-SLEQ were found to apply equivalently for elementary,

middle, and high school teachers" (p. 841). Johnson and Stevens (2006) point out that the

limitations of this study were that the perceptions of the teachers who did not complete

the SLEQ are not known. Could they have responded negatively? Johnson and Stevens

(2006) state:

> There were no statistically significant differences between the participating and
>
> nonparticipating schools in terms of the variables being measured, but it is not
>
> known whether responding teacher's perceptions of school climate were the same
>
> as non-respondent's perceptions. It is possible that the low rate response from the
>
> 19 schools not included in the analysis was due to some extent that the teachers
>
> in those schools having lower perceptions of school climate and lower general
>
> satisfaction. It could also be that those who responded had stronger feelings one
>
> way or another, felt under less pressure and so had more time to participate, or
>
> any other number of other possibilities. (p.117)

 It is therefore important to not generalize findings. School climate needs to be time

tested, and as well the researchers must understand that time of year, internal and external

events in the school and community, staff rollover, and media exposure all play a part in

the perceptions of school climate. The school climate findings in a particular school may

change by the day. They go on to find that this is a valuable instrument to investigate other factors with large numbers of teachers. This study attempts to determine if there is a link between school climate as perceived by teachers and emotional intelligence of school leaders. Johnson et al. (2007) suggest that along with the SLEQ, interviews are performed to assess teachers' perceptions of school climate and how it has changed over time. Fraser, (1999) found the SLEQ can also be useful to those at a particular school in providing information helpful to teachers in identifying elements of school climate they wish to change. Johnson et al. (2007) state in respect to school climate that, "The R-SLEQ is a tool that can help us in our attempts to unravel its mysteries" (p. 842).

Evaluation of the Literature

Summary of the Review

Various studies show a relationship linking emotional intelligence and leadership to school climate and student achievement. The purpose of this study is to determine whether a relationship exists between EI and school climate. The research examines the four emotional competencies defined by researchers Goleman (1995); Mayer et al. (2000a); and others. These competencies include self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management of emotions. Leaders with emotional intelligence are aware of self, self-confident, self-controlled, optimistic, willing to help others', understand others emotions and use emotions to help in decision-making. The research has shown emotional intelligence is more critical to effective leadership than IQ tests. Studies also show that positive school climates produce better student achievement; however, few studies have correlated EI to school climate. The purpose of

66

this study is to determine whether a relationship exists between the EI of school leaders and school climate as perceived by teachers using the MSCEIT and the R-SLEQ.

Gaps and Saturation Points

Saturation points occur in the independent study of emotional intelligence and leadership and school climate and student achievement. Much of the research done has been in the area of business, industrial, and the military realms (Ashkanasy & Dasborough, 2003; Dulewicz et al. 2005; Maulding, 2002; Tucker, et al., 2000. Gaps in the research indicate that correlation studies should be done which may lead to self-assessment instruments that have a higher reliability coefficient between EI and leadership. Antonakis, et al., (2003) says the studies of EI and leadership have not stayed within the bounds necessary to prove through empirical data that the EI construct is valid. Antonakis goes on to say that, "because boundary conditions were not considered, many arguments for EI are incomplete or misleading, suggesting that their propositions will not stand up to empirical testing" (p. 356). The boundaries referred to are national culture, hierarchical level, leader-follower gender, and organizational and environmental conditions. Most of the research reviewed was qualitative in nature.

As for school climate, the R-SLEQ was found to be valid and reliable in its use for elementary, middle, and high school use. The studies have also found that there is a strong relationship between teacher's perceptions of school climate and student achievement (Johnson & Stevens, 2006). Johnson and Stevens (2006) also revealed that there is a strong relationship between schools and communities where positive school climate exists.

The recommendations for further research propose using other variables to study the link between school climate to student achievement; and recognizing that teacher perceptions of school climate may change throughout the year thus producing different relationships of student achievement to school climate (Johnson and Stevens, 2006). This means that variables such as ethnicity, gender, administrative experience of school leaders and teachers, and local and worldly events may have an impact on school climate, and that school climate may change almost daily depending on such variables as listed. More research needs to be conducted using such variables to determine cause. Studies have focused on student achievement as linked to school climate and EI as linked to leadership styles.

Avenues for Further Inquiry

Further inquiry opportunities are needed in the study of relationships between emotional intelligence and school climate. The need for further research lies in the area of education administration. Many studies have been conducted testing the theory of emotional intelligence and leadership; and school climate and student achievement; however, empirical data is lacking in the area of EI of school leaders and the relationship to school climate as perceived by teachers. Avenues to be explored will be to research school leaders in public education in public schools in Northeastern United States to determine if a relationship exists between emotional intelligence and school climate.

Chapter Summary

A common theme that appears throughout the literature is the belief that leaders with high levels of emotional intelligence are better leaders' (Antonakis et al. 2003;

Barbuto, Jr., & Burbach, 2006; Humphreys et al., 2003). Such leaders are more aware of

their own emotions and are able to perceive the emotions of others. In the school climate

research, teacher perceptions of positive school climate were determined to be a factor in

good student achievement. The methodology of this research study will be reviewed in

detail in chapter three.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Overview of the Study

Studies of emotional intelligence have indicated that people with high levels of emotional intelligence make better leaders (Mayer et al., 2004a; Dulewicz et al., 2005). Emotional intelligence is a critical component in developing or maintaining school climate. Studies of public school administrators and their emotional intelligence levels as they pertain to inter- and intra- personal skills, empathy, and regulating self-awareness of their emotions are sparse. This study examined the school leaders' level of emotional intelligence and whether there is a link between emotional intelligence and school climate.

Emotional intelligence is a type of intelligence that involves skills including empathy, self-awareness, self-regulating emotions, social skills, and motivation. Most research on emotional intelligence has been conducted in the business sector. There have been some studies in educational research in which public school administrators were studied to determine their emotional levels as well as their leadership style, each independent of the other (i.e., emotional intelligence and leadership were not correlated). This mixed methodology research study focused on the emotional intelligence levels of public school administrators to determine if EI is linked to school climate. The results of this study may have implications for the hiring of school administrators as well as training of school leaders. Additionally, it revealed whether educational leaders have a grasp of inter and intra-personal skills as they relate to emotional intelligence. The

purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between emotional intelligence of school leaders and school climate as perceived by teachers. This study used data from the Revised School Level Environment Questionnaire (R-SLEQ) and Mayer Salovey Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT). The data was analyzed to determine if school climate is related to the school leaders' level of emotional intelligence.

<p align="center">*Problem*</p>

The study was designed to determine if there is a correlation between a school leader's emotional intelligence and school climate. The research conducted gathered teachers' perceptions of school climate via the R-SLEQ; and through a correlation and regression statistical analysis, determined if a link exists to the MSCEIT. In stating the Null hypothesis, high EI of school leaders does not improve school climate. The MSCEIT measured the five factors of emotional intelligence which includes empathy, motivation, inter- and intra-personal skills, and self-regulating awareness of emotions within the ability model of EI and the four branches it measures. The four branches are referred to as the ability model of emotional intelligence. The purpose of measuring the EI of school leaders and determining whether EI is linked to school climate is to assist school districts in the hiring process of school leaders. According to Goleman, 1998a; Dulewicz et al., 2005; and Pool 1997, the more aware leaders are of their own emotional intelligence, the better they will be able to perform their job functions and better morale will be created in the workplace. Johnson and Stevens (2006) similarly describe this as, the better the morale the better the school climate.

Students play a part in the school climate; however, teacher relationships with school leaders also factor into positive school climate. Thus, school leaders will help to create a positive or negative school climate. Therefore, the problem is to determine if there is a link between school climate as perceived by teachers and emotional intelligence of school leaders.

<p align="center">*Purpose*</p>

The purpose of this mixed-methodology study was to examine the school climate and its link to emotional intelligence of school leaders. If emotions play such a big part in the success of leaders, then it must be a critical factor for school leaders to know what emotional intelligence is and how it is used in leadership situations. Leaders with high levels of emotional intelligence lead people with kindness, respect, and compassion, while allowing for staff autonomy. Emotional intelligence is character, the use of morals and ethical behavior in leadership roles (Goleman, 1998a). In regards to school climate, emotional intelligence may have a link between the ability to lead through the awareness and self-regulation of emotions.

Fisher and Fraser (1990) also view school climate as involving relationships with other teachers and administrators (school leaders). Relationships are a critical part of building, maintaining, and perceiving a school as having a positive school climate. The researchers explain that there must be healthy relationships both inter-personally and intra-personally in order to have a positive school climate. This study will determine if there is a correlation between school leaders EI and school climate as perceived by teachers.

The following research questions may determine if a relationship exists between emotional intelligence and school climate. The conclusions developed from this study will add to the growing body of knowledge in the area of emotional intelligence and school climate. They will be especially useful in the area of education where studies of emotional intelligence and school climate being linked together are limited. The final result may determine if a relationship exists between emotional intelligence and school climate.

After reviewing the literature and analyzing various instruments which measure emotional intelligence and school climate, the following questions developed for this study are:

1) Is school climate as perceived by teachers correlated to the emotional intelligence of school leaders?

2) Is the emotional intelligence of school administrators a significant predictor of school climate ratings?

3) Compared to other factors that have been known to influence school climate such as gender, age, and years of administrative experience, is an administrator's emotional intelligence more significant than the other factors that have been identified?

These questions will provide salient data to determine the school climate as linked to emotional intelligence levels of school leaders in public education. The findings

73

may determine if school leaders with high levels of emotional intelligence can predict

better success in creating positive school climate.

Research Design

The research design of this study was a mixed-factors study of quantitative and

qualitative data. The quantitative data came from the R-SLEQ and the MSCEIT.   The

MSCEIT assessed the emotional intelligence of the school leaders' and the R-SLEQ

measured perceptions of school climate as perceived by teachers (Appendix C).

The MSCEIT was given to school leaders to determine their emotional intelligence

level (Appendix D). The MSCEIT can be administered via two versions, one being

paper/pencil, the other being an online version. Orders are placed through Multi-Health

Systems (MHS) at www.mhs.com. This study used the online version of the MSCEIT.

Due to researching the clients' EI via online testing, a hard copy of the MSCEIT cannot

be provided in the appendix. Examples of what questions can be expected from each of

the four branches of emotional intelligence can be found on the MHS website/ Emotional

Intelligence link. These questions pertain to the Four-Branch Model of Emotional

Intelligence and emotional intelligence skill sets. The four-branches and examples of

what each branch assesses are, (1) perceptions of emotions in which the ability to

perceive emotions in oneself and others in objects, art, stories, music, and other stimuli;

(2) facilitation of thought which assesses the ability to generate, use, and feel emotion as

necessary to communicate feelings or employ them in other cognitive processes; (3)

understanding emotions or the ability to understand emotional information, how emotions

combine and progress through relationships transitions, and to appreciate such emotional

meanings; and (4) managing emotions, which is the ability to be open to feelings, and to modulate them in oneself and others so as to promote personal understanding and growth (retrieved from www.mhs.com June 24, 2008).

Although the MHS website gives broad expectations of what the MSCEIT assesses, an example of a MSCEIT question found in the professional literature would be, "Given a specific situation, how could you cheer someone up?" (Mayer et al., 2004b, p. 252). Mayer et al. (2004a) cite another example from the MSCEIT as, "Which two emotional experiences might blend together in the feeling of contempt?" (p. 200). Possible answers are anger and disgust or joy and challenge. Mayer et al. (2004a) state, "The MSCEIT has eight tasks: two to measure each of the four branches of EI" (p. 200).

The online version of the MSCEIT was ordered in the number needed. A code and password was provided by Multi-Health Systems and was valid for one year after purchase. A PDF was set up with codes and passwords for clients. MHS refers to this researcher as the manager of the MSCEIT and the participants as the clients. For a $5.00 per client fee the researcher received all the data from each test taker. All final scores were sent in an Excel spreadsheet for the purpose of saving time and minimizing errors in the entry of the data. The reports contain the raw data which was analyzed by the researcher. Funding for this research study was the sole responsibility of the researcher. There was no expense to participants in this research study. Online version of the MSCEIT did not come with an answer key; all scores are returned directly to the researcher. The data was analyzed using correlation coefficients and regression analysis

to determine if the level of emotional intelligence of school leaders is linked to the school climate as perceived by teachers.

The qualitative part of the study was conducted through eight interviews of school leaders on sight where the participants work; or, through telephone interview due to distance. The eight interviews were conducted from among the fourteen school administrators who participated in this research. The original interviews included six school leaders; however, to give better balance to the study, two additional school leaders were non-randomly asked to participate in the interview. Merriam (1998) refers to this type of sampling as nonprobability sampling. Honigmann (1982) states that nonprobability sampling are:

Logical as long as the field-worker expects mainly to use his data not to answer questions like 'how much' and 'how often' but to solve qualitative problems, such as discovering what occurs, the implications of what occurs, and the relationships linking occurrences. (p. 84)

Qualitative questions to be asked of school leaders selected at random revolved around school climate and EI (Appendix E).

Qualitative questions were piloted using expertise of seven superintendents, four school administrators, and one independent consultant. The questions were given in hard copy form and electronic e-mail to the above listed references. These people read the questions and discussed with me either via phone, in person, or by responding in writing what they thought the questions asked. After multiple discussions and changes to the questions, the questions were put into the format as presented here. Participant responses

described each of the qualitative questions used for the interviews with school leaders in similar fashion when asked what their perceptions of what each question asked. The questions as presented in this format are focused to answer the research questions in this study to determine if school climate as perceived by teachers is linked to emotional intelligence of school climate.

Data gathered from the interviews was reduced into categories using a grounded theory approach. Glaser and Strauss (1967), describe grounded theory as built inductively from data. Emotional intelligence and its link to school climate have not readily been studied; therefore, a new theory was deduced from the data through data collection, analysis, and report writing.

The data collection took place through tape recorded open-ended interviews and observations of the emotions as the answers were given. The observations were documented in a notebook journal as the interviews were taking place. Evidence of seriousness, body language, excitement level in voice, and eye position, were all documented to help determine the framework and theme development in answering the research questions.

Analysis of the transcribed interviews used three types of data. This included open coding, axial coding, and selective coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Johnson and Christensen (2008) describe open coding as the, "…first stage in grounded theory data analysis. It begins after some data have been collected, and it involves examining the data (usually reading the transcripts line by line) and naming and categorizing discrete elements in the data" (p.413). Axial coding is the second stage of grounded theory

development. Axial coding is described as developing concepts into categories and organizing concepts into categories (Johnson & Christensen, 2008). During axial coding, themes emerge from the data and relationships are categorized if relationships exist. Selective coding is the last stage of data analysis. Selective coding is described as the process of refining the open coding and axial coding to develop a main theme or "main idea" (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 415). As data continues to be analyzed, the analysis refers back to the grounded theory it is steeped in.

Methods of Verification

Methods of verification of the qualitative questions used various techniques to preserve the academic integrity of the data. Lincoln and Guba (1985) propose using various constructs to verify and establish "Trustworthiness" of the research data (p. 290). Creswell (1998) refers to the verification process as "a process that occurs throughout the data collection, analysis, and report writing of a study and standards as *criteria* imposed by the researcher and others after a study is completed" (p. 194). The following methods of verification were used to establish validity and reliability in this study and include: (1) referential adequacy; (2) triangulation of data; (3) member checks/peer review; (4) low-inference descriptors; (5) and inductive analysis.

Referential Adequacy

Creswell (1998) describes referential adequacy as the use of audio taping and transcribing verbatim the interviews. Wolcott (1994) discussed talking a little and listening a lot. Listening in the case of recorded interview allows the researcher to go back and further verify what was said to clarify and verify the accuracy of the data. Note

78

taking along with the recording should occur as soon as possible after the event, even during the interviews to minimize the chance of forgetting or misinterpreting the data, leading to a bias (Wolcott, 1994). The researcher took notes during the audio taping of the interview to purposefully avoid going back and using recollection to preserve the data as it was voiced.

Triangulation

Triangulation of data is the use of multiple sources of documentation to establish academic integrity (Creswell, 1998). The qualitative study utilized eight interviews of school leaders located in the Northeastern United States. Creswell (1998) describes using multiple sites as a means of increasing participation, thus increasing common themes in the data. Both audio taped interviews and notes from the interview provided multiple sources of data to provide an accurate, dependable, credible, and trustworthy verification process (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Member Check

Member check was used when the researcher had to ask a participant to qualify their response. This happened with one participant during the interview process. The member check was a phone call to clarify a finding on the tape recorded data. Peer review included non-connected professionals who have experience in qualitative research. These people included professionals with an earned doctorate, the researcher's committee, and paid editors.

Low Inference Descriptors

Low inference descriptors were the direct quotes from participants. Johnson and Christensen (2008) describe a grounded theory approach to explain some phenomenon. In this research, the direct quotes for the school leader participants were used to explain the correlation of school climate as perceived by teachers to the emotional intelligence level of the school leader.

Inductive Analysis

Inductive analysis was used to interpret the raw data from the interviews. Johnson and Christensen (2008) define inductive analysis as, "Immersion in the details and specifics of the data to discover important patterns, themes, and interrelationships; begins by exploring, then confirming, guided by analytical principles rather than rules, ends with creative synthesis" (p.393). The details in the themes which emerged have provided a connection between the school leader's emotional intelligence and how emotional intelligence is linked to school climate.

<center>*Sample/Population*</center>

The sample for this survey consisted of 14 school leaders from public elementary, middle, and/or high schools in the Northeastern United States. School administrators are defined as principals in elementary, middle, and high school programs. The school leaders were selected from within the school districts in Northeastern United States. School leader participation was achieved through non-random purposive sample which in this study is defined as invitation to participate. School leaders were contacted after permission from school superintendents was granted and their signature on the

superintendent permission form was returned (Appendix F). The non-random purposive

sample was needed in this case due to the complexity of steps needed to achieve the

desired data to answer the questions of this study. This also gave the researcher an

opportunity to explain the purpose of the study and any expected risks and/or discomforts

to the participants in person.

Non-randomness in the sample was also needed to coordinate the teacher

participation of the survey. There are no restrictions on how long the school leader is

employed at the school as this is a variable which will be used to measure variance in

school climate ratings. School leaders can use this information in leading and making

changes within their respective buildings based on the survey results. School leaders and

teacher participation are voluntary and any participant can withdraw at any time. All

applicable rules and laws of research will be followed and are described in the

introductory letter (Appendix G).

Instrumentation

The instruments used to gather data for the quantitative component of this

study are the R-SLEQ and the MSCEIT V2.0. The Revised-SLEQ is a 21 item survey

which measures by means of a likert scale the school climate of the school as they

perceived by teachers. The School Level Environment Questionnaire (SLEQ) is a survey

instrument that was developed by Rentoul and Fraser (1983). The original SLEQ had 56

items before revisions. The current 21 item R-SLEQ was developed by Johnson et al.

(2007).

Out of interest to shorten the survey and maintain its validity and reliability, Johnson et al. (2007) revised the R-SLEQ to a 21 item five scale school climate instrument. The five scales include collaboration, decision making, instructional innovation, student relations, and school resources. The SLEQ was given to 4,920 teachers in a large school district in Southwestern United States with a 52% responding rate. Similar to the Johnson and Stevens (2001) study, this study by Johnson et al. (2007) used an EFA and CFA to determine factor structure and confirmatory structure of the factors in the SLEQ. They also used invariance testing as well as an ANOVA to study if the instrument wholly or by factors could delineate climate differences between schools.

In the current study, packets containing invitations to participate were sent to select school administrators in Northeastern United States (Appendix H). Select is defined as non-random. The goal of the non-random purposive sample was to have at least 12 school leaders and their faculties participate in the study. The response format for the R-SLEQ is a 5 point likert scale which makes the survey easy for the teachers to complete. The R-SLEQ and MSCEIT tests wording will be in Standard English. The researcher coordinated with the school leaders to give the R-SLEQ through surveymonkey.com, which allowed for the faculty to complete the 21 item instrument at their leisure within the given time period. A copy of the R-SLEQ directions was in the cover letter which was sent to the school leaders requesting voluntary assistance and anonymity. The R-SLEQ takes 7-10 minutes to complete.

The MSCEIT is a 141 item test which assesses a person's ability to perceive, facilitate, use, and manage emotions. The MSCEIT produces a total emotional intelligent

quotient (EIQ) score, two area EIQ scores, four branch EIQ scores, and eight task scores (Mayer et al. 2002). The MSCEIT was scheduled online with the school leader and on average took between 30 and 45 minutes to complete. The MSCEIT was automatically graded and filed by MHS upon completion. MHS sent a confirmation email to the researcher to communicate the client, date, and time they completed the MSCEIT. The development procedures for administering the MSCEIT include various objectives such as goals, response formatting, item wording, and directions to test takers.

Data Collection

The MSCEIT and the R-SLEQ are the two instruments used in this study. The MSCEIT was taken by school leaders and the R-SLEQ was given to faculty members of the school leader (Appendix I and J). The MSCEIT measured school leaders EI levels. Although sampling was non-random, a written invitation to participate included instructions on what the MSCEIT entailed and how teacher participation of the R-SLEQ was needed to determine if EI is linked to school climate. Research instructions were mailed via first class United States mail with directions as to the purpose of the research. There was also an explanation of how the information was helpful to the participants in the study. The data collection of the MSCEIT was completed online through Multi-Health Systems Inc. (MHS). A user name and password was purchased along with the MSCEIT from MHS, and a window of opportunity was coordinated with the school leaders to complete this emotional intelligence test. The user name and password are valid for one year from purchase; however, for the sake of the research, a one month window was recommended for school leaders to complete the MSCEIT. If an

administrator could not complete within the one month period, the researcher coordinated

a more convenient time. Since administrators were participating in a non-random

purposive sample, the researcher had contact with the volunteers for administering the

MSCEIT to keep the process moving, with an expected degree of completion within the

one month time period. Once completed, the MSCEIT was automatically graded and

returned to the researcher.

The R-SLEQ was given to teachers who rated the school climate based on their

perceptions in the same school as the school leader who took the MSCEIT. Teachers took

the 21 item Revised-SLEQ via survey monkey within a two week window as per

protocol. The researcher explained the directions to teachers following protocol as

outlined in Appendix B. The researcher set up opportunities to talk with the faculties of

the school leaders participating in the study during regularly scheduled faculty meetings.

Faculties, which the superintendents did not allow the researcher to speak with, either

because of preference or contract issues, had the study explained to them by the school

leader who followed the same protocol used by the researcher. The researcher and

principal reviewed the procedure prior to the meeting with the faculty. Teachers were

then contacted through the principals of the schools participating in the study with log-in

information and password to the site where the survey could be taken. As the data from

the R-SLEQ was collected, it was kept in an excel spreadsheet and coded to match the

school leader and preserve confidentiality. The R-SLEQ participation of the teachers was

coordinated prior to the school leader taking the MSCEIT. The MSCEIT and the R-SLEQ

had to be completed in order for completion of the study. All participating schools had

prior permission from their superintendent to participate in this study. Teachers took the R-SLEQ within a two week time period after the user names and passwords were distributed. The Revised-SLEQ was offered through surveymonkey.com.

Once the study was completed, the school leaders were invited on an appointment basis to review the data from both the MSCEIT and the R-SLEQ. The findings in the study were shared at this time. Sharing of the data was intended to bring awareness, validity, and closure to the study for the participants.

Data Analysis Procedures

To better understand the data, various statistical tests were conducted to determine the link between emotional intelligence and school climate. The study used a mixed methodology of both quantitative and qualitative research. The MSCEIT and the R-SLEQ scores were analyzed quantitatively using Pearson correlations and regressions, to determine the amount of variance in school climate ratings which may be attributed to following variables; EI, gender, years administrative experience, and age. Gay et al. (2006) define correlational research as determining whether a relationship exists between two variables. The variable must be quantifiable and expressed as a coefficient. Variables that affect school climate may be gender, age, year's administrative experience, and emotional intelligence. The research will determine which variable is significant. Scores were computed using the SPSS program. Scores ranged from a -1.00 to 0.00 to +1.00. Gay et al. (2006) state, "A coefficient near +1.00 indicates high size and a positive direction," while "coefficients closer to -1.00, indicates a high size and a negative or inverse direction" (p. 193). Gay et al., (2006) view correlation coefficients as high

85

relationships when between +.65 and -.65, moderate relationships between +.35 and -.35, and low or no relationship when lower than +.35 and -.35. By using data from the MCSEIT and R-SLEQ instruments, an R-squared can be computed to find if variance in school climate is attributed to EI.

Data analysis was gathered qualitatively through random interviews with school administrators. The selection for school leader interviews was randomly drawing coded numbers from a hat to determine who was interviewed. The coded numbers coincided with the names of the school leaders. The purpose of coding the names with numbers was to preserve confidentiality. The researcher then contacted the school leaders individually and explained the qualitative piece. The same protocol used here was explained in the introductory letter. School leaders were told they could deny the interview or withdraw at any time during the process. Some school leaders, because of distance, preferred a telephone interview. In the case of telephone interview, the same format described above was used and the telephone call audio-taped. Appointments were made and the interviews conducted. Qualitative interview questions are listed as follows:

A) School leaders are expected to deal with teacher personnel problems which are typically emotionally charged situations. For example, the school leader must confront a teacher who has alcohol and/or drug problems. Another example may include the school leader confronting a teacher who has misused his/her authority. Recall an experience from your work as a school leader and describe the emotions you sensed the teacher felt as you approached the

86

situation. Did the emotions you sensed as you approached the teacher alter your approach?

B) School climate is defined as the social system within a school which includes shared norms and expectations (Brookover et al., 1978); and the physical and mental health of the organization (Freiburg, 1999). Emotional intelligence is defined as the ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions so as to assist thought, to understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and to reflectively regulate emotions so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). Based on these definitions, do you think that emotional intelligence of school leaders negatively impacts school climate?

C) How do you monitor school climate within the definition listed in question (B)?

D) What do you feel are the most difficult aspects of maintaining a positive school climate?

E) Having a greater understanding of EI, cite up to three (3) changes you will make in your leadership and why.

These questions were audio-taped with the consent of the administrator and accompanied by hand written notes from the interview. The data was recorded, coded for confidentiality, and the tapes destroyed upon completion of the interview after translation to paper. The researcher transcribed verbatim the interviews from the tape. The interpretive validity was accomplished through descriptive detailed data and triangulated

by use of both recorded and written notes. The recordings were via hand held tape recording machine with a standard blank audio tape. The interviews were analyzed using inductive reason. Interview answers were analyzed and thematically described in answering the three primary research questions this study proposed.

Sharing Results with School Leaders

School leaders were debriefed of the study to include their personal EI score, branch scores, and differences among branch scores (Appendix K). The R-SLEQ that the respective teachers in each of their buildings took was discussed with school leaders as well as the results of the research study. It was stated earlier in this document that school leaders may learn something about themselves that they did not know. This involves accepting criticism of self and changing the way one leads and makes decisions. The only risk of the study was that school leaders may find something out about themselves they did not want to know. To help school leaders overcome the fact that they may not have done so well on the MSCEIT, the researcher explained the MSCEIT results in terms of how emotions are scored, in context to overall personality, explained the formation of the MSCEIT questions, and suggestions on how to use the results.

MSCEIT scores compare the answers with the individual school leader with the general population. Emotional responses are scored using a method that compares response within a range (Mayer et al., 2002). Mayer et al. (2002) state, "The answer is that there is not a single best or correct way to feel" (p. 88). Scores are rated higher based on other people who have taken the test. The MSCEIT was standardized on a sample population of over 5,000.

88

The researcher also explained that in context to all aspects of personality, emotional intelligence plays a small part. School leaders who would want to improve their EI by understanding the MSCEIT and how it measures EI, using multiple measures to assess EI, and/or attending workshops where EI is taught. Mayer et al. (2002) state, "Research conducted using the MSCEIT indicates that emotional intelligence does play a role in certain areas of life, but not in all areas" (p. 89).

The MSCEIT questions are based on how a person feels or should feel in a given situation. The questions are different than most assessments school leaders have taken, and in some ways "may not appear to be relevant to what you do" (Mayer et al., 2002, p. 89). Mayer et al. (2002) describe the MSCEIT assessment measures emotional abilities in "direct and indirect ways" (p. 89). The MSCEIT is valid and reliable and can be related to on the job performance in schools.

Finally, the researcher helped the school leader learn about the emotional abilities using thoughts and feelings based on empathetic response as well as "body posture, facial expressions, and other emotional clues" (Mayer et al., 2002, p. 103). Suggestions were given to school leaders as to how they can improve their EI. Improvement is through self-reflection and by answering several questions which according to Mayer et al. (2002) include:

> (1)How do I feel? How do the others feel? (2) How are these feelings influencing our judgments, decisions, and thinking? Are we focused on the right things? How should we feel? (3) Why do we feel this way? How will feelings change as a result of different events or outcomes? If I say 'x' how will the other people feel?

89

(4) Can I stay open to these feelings, even if they are unwelcome? What are the

feelings communicating and how can I utilize the information to take the best

course of action? (p. 104)

This is a first step toward improving EI as EI can be taught. There are other strategies to

improve EI; and include self learned, workshops, EI courses, and research studies.

Finally, the researcher explained school climate scores and how they are linked to the EI

of each school leader and other results of the study.

Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations

Akers and Porter 2003; Goleman 1995; and Pool 1997, believe success in life is

attributed primarily to emotional intelligence more so than rational intelligence.

According to Goleman (1995) and Pool (1997), there are many leaders who have high IQ

scores yet fail to perform at a high level in the workplace. Educational leaders with high

levels of emotional intelligence have the opportunity to have a more successful and

rewarding career because of their ability to interact and connect with the emotions of staff

(Tucker et al. (2000). When staff feel that their leader (boss) genuinely cares about them

and the goals of the organization, an emotional connection is made, which provides for

motivation and better morale (Shutte et al., 2001; Zeidner et al. 2004). Mayer and

Salovey (1997) perceive traits such as empathy, motivation, self-awareness of one's own

emotions, an ability to "read" emotions of others (inter- and intra-personal skills), also

called social skills, and self-regulating of emotions are the skills staff want of their leader.

Educational leaders who are lacking emotional intelligence are in less satisfying

positions regarding their relationships with staff and are held in less regard by staff

90

(Shutte et al., 2001; Zeidner et al., 2004)). Leaders who have low EI often see their job as mundane, trivial, and filled with anxiety. True teamwork comes from leaders who exhibit high levels of EI and are able to manage their own emotions (Humphreys et al., 2003; Mayer, et al., 2004a).

Mayer et al. (2004b) cite that EI must "exhibit growth with age" (p. 200). A limitation of this study will include data of the subjects where growth with age is shown when using the current ages as benchmarks for their EI. Growth with age would need to be accomplished in a future study using this MSCEIT data as a baseline.

A further limitation may be that the MSCEIT is time consuming. Considerations were being taken to give part of the MSCEIT test as opposed to the entire test. A shorter version will still allow for the EI levels to be assessed. After thinking through, the decision was to give the entire MSCEIT and not the abbreviated version.

Another limitation of the study may be that administrators may find something out about themselves they would rather not know. This study involves a reflective look at oneself and where improvements can be made within self and within school. With all the challenges that school leaders face and the various groups they work with such as school board, parents, employees, and students; this is an opportunity to seek the emotional intelligence of self and determine if school climate is linked to the leaders EI.

One last limitation may be the sample size. Statistical use of correlation coefficients predict much better when large sample sizes are used. Depending on the number of respondents, more research may be needed using a larger sample size. The small N = 14 of school leaders in Northeastern United States was due to the complexity

91

of the study. Therefore, generalizability is limited. Overall, determining if a relationship exists between EI and school climate is possible with a minimum of 12 subjects.

Timeframe

The study began in the spring of 2005 as an interest of motivation from this researcher. This study was completed in December of 2009. The work completed included various tasks such as coordinating the MSCEIT with school leaders as well as coordinating the R-SLEQ with teachers at the schools of the participating school leaders. Introductory letters were developed and mailed to all participating schools leaders. School leader participation was known prior to the letters being mailed in that participants were chosen via non-random sample. This method of selection was due to the complexity of coordinating with the study participants. The instructions described the R-SLEQ survey, how it is measured, and gave school leaders an opportunity to review prior to deciding whether they will participate. The materials included envelopes, return postage paid envelopes, and school leader consent questionnaire. The setting for the MSCEIT test will be online with a one month window of opportunity for completion. The R-SLEQ teacher survey was completed through surveymonkey.com in coordination with the participating school leaders. Teachers were given a two week window for completion of the survey. The MSCEIT informed consent form (Appendix I) was given to school leaders and the R-SLEQ informed consent form (Appendix J) was given to teacher participants.

Summary

The purpose of this mixed methodology study was to determine if there is a link between emotional intelligence and school climate as perceived by teachers. If emotions play such a big part in the success of leaders, then it must be a critical factor for school leaders to know what emotional intelligence is. In addition to knowing what EI is, leaders must also have an awareness of what level of EI they possess and what their subordinates perceive their EI to be. Shutte, et al., (2001) have found that people with higher emotional intelligence are more likely to exhibit better social skills and be more adept in social situations. Goleman defined the skills that emotional intelligence represent as "character" (1995, p. 90). Goleman (1995) found leaders who demonstrate high EI through these character traits are leaders who create an atmosphere among subordinates and peers that is motivational and inspirational.

Leaders with high levels of EI lead people with respect, kindness, and compassion; and understand and work with the feelings of the people with whom they work. Having emotional intelligence allows the leaders to understand the inter- and intra-personal feelings of others and themselves as decisions are made. Leaders with high EI display a set of mental abilities in which individuals pay more attention to feelings and moods of others as they make decisions. These mental abilities allow leaders to understand the relationships of people, understanding emotions, reacting to emotions, and temper ones own emotions which are all vital in the overall health of organizations.

Anderson (1982) and Fisher et al. (1986), associate school level environment research with school leaders. Fisher and Fraser (1990) state, "The study of school

93

environment is clearly important because it is likely to contribute to understanding and improvement of the school's functioning and to satisfaction and productivity within the school" (p. 3). Fisher and Fraser (1990) view school climate as positive when relationships between teachers and administrators (leaders) flourish.

This study may determine whether a relationship exists between emotional intelligence of school leaders and school climate as perceived by teachers. It will use the MSCEIT and the R-SLEQ as instruments, as they are both valid and reliable. This researcher hypothesizes that EI does not improve school climate as perceived by teachers. EI will be measured using the MSCEIT which measures the four-branches of EI as founded by Mayer et al. (1997). The four ability branches of EI are awareness of emotions, regulation of one's own emotions, ability to perceive emotions in others, and how to best deal with emotional situations.

The R-SLEQ measures teachers' perceptions of school climate on a Likert scale. The survey measures the degree to which teachers either agree or disagree with statements about school climate. The survey has 21 items which fall into one of five different factors including collaboration, school resources, decisions-making, student relations, and instructional innovation.

This completed study has provided empirical research to an area which at this point has not been sparsely studied, that area being the relationship between emotional intelligence and school climate. The purpose of the study was to answer the research questions using scientific methods which led to salient results to better add to the body of knowledge of emotional intelligence and its relationship to school climate. The research

94

conducted determined if there is a correlation between emotional intelligence and school climate. Randomly selected school leaders participated in an interview and all school leaders took the MSCEIT to determine emotional intelligence level. Teachers completed the R-SLEQ to determine school climates as perceived by them.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Introduction

The research determined if there is a relationship between the emotional

intelligence of school leaders and school climate. Emotional intelligence testing

determined if school leaders have an understanding of EI based on the four branch model

of emotional intelligence as identified by Mayer and Salovey (1997). The four branch

model includes, "a) accurately perceiving emotions in oneself and others, b) use of

emotion to facilitate thinking, c) understanding emotional meanings, and d) managing

one' own emotions" (Mayer et al., 2004a, p. 199). Emotional Intelligence was linked to

school climate. School climate was assessed through teacher participation of the R-

SLEQ.

Purpose

This mixed-methodology study examined how the emotional intelligence of

school leaders affects the climate of their schools. If emotions play such a big part in the

success of leaders, then it must be critical for school leaders to know what EI is. In

addition, leaders must also have an awareness of what level of EI they possess, what their

staff perceive their EI to be, and if there is a relationship between the EI of school leaders

and school climate. Shutte et al. (2001), claim that people with higher emotional

intelligence are more likely to exhibit better social skills and be more adept in social

situations. When leaders demonstrate a working knowledge of EI, they create an

atmosphere among staff and peers that is motivational and inspirational and may lead to a positive school climate.

Fisher and Grady (1998) state, "Furthermore, as school leaders confront continual demands for improvement and accountability it is worth noting that the manner in which teachers go about their work and the way they feel about it are related to the mental images they have of their school" (p. 335). Johnson et al. (1996) refer to this as the "personality of the school" (p. 64). Leaders must be mentally equipped to work with all peoples regardless of age, sex, creed, gender, ethnicity, and other variables.

This study has contributed to the empirical research exploring the link between emotional intelligence and school climate as perceived by teachers. This research has implications for hiring qualified leaders who are able to inspire and motivate staff and students through application of the four-branch model of EI, thus positively affecting school climate.

The Research Questions

The research questions were developed to determine if a relationship exists between emotional intelligence of school principals and the mean school climate ratings of the teachers in their respective schools. The findings in this chapter add information to the literature about the link between EI and school climate. Studies linking EI and school climate are few. The research questions investigated are as follow:

1) Is school climate, as perceived by teachers, correlated to the emotional intelligence of school leaders?

2) Is the emotional intelligence of school administrators a significant predictor of

school climate ratings?

3) Compared to other factors that have been known to influence school climate such

as gender, age, and years of experience, is an administrator's emotional

intelligence more significant than the other factors that have been identified?

Quantitative Results and Data Analysis

The subjects who participated in this study are fourteen principals of elementary,

middle, and high schools in the Northeastern United States. The demographics of

principal participants were as follows (see Table 1): five elementary principals (K-5) of

which two were female and three male; five middle school principals (6-8) of which three

were female and two male; and four high school principals (9-12) of which all four were

male. Ages of the principals ranged from 31-60, with an average age of 37.6. Year's of

administrative leadership experience of the participants ranged from 1 through 18 years.

Table 1

Demographic Description of Principal Participants (N = 14)

Principal Assignment K-12	Principal Experience in Years	Gender	Age
Elementary	2	M	33
High School	6	M	46
High School	10	M	49
Elementary	6	M	31
High School	6	M	40
High School	8	M	37
Middle School	7	F	39
Elementary	1	F	46
Middle School	8	F	34
Middle School	10	M	41
Elementary	18	F	60
Middle School	3	M	43
Elementary	4	M	47
Middle School	2.5	F	51

The demographic variables of the principals listed above provided balance of EI from both a male and female perspective. The principals were chosen from a non-random purposeful sample. Participant principals completed the Mayer Salovey Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) to determine EI. Collectively, 354 teachers from the respective schools of the principals completed the R-SLEQ to determine school climate (Table 14). Scores from the MSCEIT were computed and categorized using the EI guidelines in Table 2 (Mayer et al., 2002, p. 18).

Table 2

Guidelines for Interpreting MSCEIT Scores

EIQ Range	Qualitative Range
69 or less	Consider Development
70-89	Consider Improvement
90-99	Low Average Score
100-109	High Average Score
110-119	Competent
120-129	Strength
130+	Significant Strength

The R-SLEQ is comprised of 21 items which are subdivided into five factors,

namely collaboration, student relations, school resources, decision making, and

instructional innovation (Johnson et. al, 2007). The survey contains five categories a

teacher can check ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree with disagree, neither

agree or disagree, and agree between them. Total R-SLEQ scores were determined by

assigning scores to option on the Likert scale as follows: strongly disagree = 1, disagree =

2, neither agree nor disagree = 3, agree = 4, and strongly agree = 5.

For the purpose of the current study, the School Resources subscale of the R-

SLEQ was not included in the component score and one survey item from the Decision-

Making subscale was omitted. These subscale items were omitted after reliability tests

were performed yielding a revised version of the R-SLEQ. The revised version for

analysis will be called the SLEQ-R. Table 3 indicates SLEQ-R survey items used in

analysis. This revision was necessary because reliability and scale analysis indicated that

those specific items were not significantly related to the other items. Moreover, the

questions were not directly related to the administrator's ability, as many other factors

(e.g. available funds) go into the determination of EI. The specific items deleted were the entire School Resources subscale which include the following questions: #3 – Instructional equipment is not consistently available, #8 – The school library has sufficient resources and materials, #13 – Video equipment, tapes, and films are readily available, and #18 – The supply of equipment and resources is not adequate. Question #9 under Decision-Making subscale was also omitted after reliability tests were performed. The SLEQ-R survey was found to be internally consistent and reliable with a Cronbach's Alpha level of 0.824.

Table 3

SLEQ-R Survey Items

SLEQ-R Items used in this research as adapted from the R-SLEQ
1. Teachers design instructional programs together
2. Most students are well mannered or respectful of the school staff
4. Teachers are frequently asked to participate in decisions
5. New and different ideas are always being tried out
6. There is good communication between teachers
7. Most students are helpful and cooperative with teachers
10. New courses or curriculum materials are seldom implemented
11. I have regular opportunities to work with other teachers
12. Students in the school are well behaved
14. I have very little say in the running of the building
15. We are willing to try new teaching approaches in my school
16. I seldom discuss the needs of individual students with other teachers
17. Most students are motivated to learn
19. Teachers in this school are innovative
20. Classroom instruction is rarely coordinated across teachers
21. Good teamwork is **not** emphasized enough at my school

Table 14 (p.166) illustrates the demographic data from the 14 participant principals in the current study. EI scores ranged from 57.5 – 106.11 with an average of

90.99 with a standard deviation of 12.9. When categorized using the interpretive guidelines in Table 2, two participants scored in the "high average" range, six participants scored in the "low average" range, five were in the "consider improvement" category, and one was in the "consider development" category. Table 4 illustrates the mean SLEQ-R and subscale scores as indicated from teacher's which were computed for school leaders by gender. This indicates a significant gender difference in SLEQ-R and subscale scores.

Table 4

Mean SLEQ-R and Subscale Scores of Principal by Gender

	Gender of Principal	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
R-SLEQ fe	male	122	75.11	7.9
m	ale	203	71.9	8.49
SLEQ-R fe	male	124	59.00	7.17
m	ale	203	56.61	7.65
Collaborative fe	male	133	22.29	3.76
m	ale	213	20.93	4.02
Student Relations	female	134	14.30	2.83
m	ale	211	14.84	2.59
Decision-making fe	male	132	8.96	2.00
m	ale	213	8.27	2.11
Instructional innovation	female	133	15.43	2.03
m	ale	213	14.95	2.08
Decision-makingR fe	male	133	6.66	1.57
m	ale	213	5.95	1.77

To investigate the first question of relationship between administrators' emotional intelligence and school climate, Pearson correlations were computed for MSCEIT and

SLEQ-R scores. As shown in Table 5, there was no significant correlation between school climate and administrators emotional intelligence ($r = .092$). In other words, no reliable relationship existed between the principals' emotional intelligence scores on the MSCEIT and the mean SLEQ-R scores for the teachers in their respective schools. Additional analyses were completed for the individual subscales of the SLEQ-R, which yielded a significant negative correlation between emotional intelligence and the Decision Making subscale of the SLEQ-R ($r = -.370$). Specifically, the higher a principal's emotional intelligence level, the less likely they were perceived to involve their teachers in decision making. It is worth noting that the non-significant correlations may be a result of the small sample size of 14 participants.

Table 5

Pearson Correlations between EI and School Climate

Variable	N	sig.(2-tailed)	Pearson Correlation
Age 14		.732	.101
Experience 14		.061	-.512
EI category	14	.000	.836(**)
SLEQ 14		.857	-.053
SLEQR 14		.753	.092
Collaborative 14		.655	.131
Student relations	14	.296	.301
Decision-making 14		.193	-.370
Decision-making Revised	14	.354	-.268
Instructional innovation	14	.975	.009

The second question investigated whether emotional intelligence of school administrator is a significant predictor of school climate ratings. Similar to the results of the Pearson correlations, emotional intelligence (EI) was not a significant predictor of school climate ratings. Overall, R – squared values indicated that EI accounted for only .003% of the variance in SLEQ-R scores. Further analyses using EI categorization (i.e. below 90 vs. above 90 averages on MSCEIT) still indicated that EI categorization only accounted 2% of the variance in school climate ratings. This is indicated in Table 6.

Table 6

Regression Analysis of the Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and School Climate Ratings

Variable	N	R-Squared	F	p-level
Emotional Intelligence Score	14	0.003	0.034	0.857
Emotional Intelligence category	14	0.021	0.257	0.621

Dependent variable: SLEQ (School Climate)

The third research question focused on whether emotional intelligence was a better predictor than factors that have been known to influence school climate such as gender, age, and years of administrative experience. Regression analyses were conducted to answer this question, and also find out the extent to which these variables together influence school climate. As demonstrated in Table 7a, emotional intelligence, age, gender, and administrative experience together accounted for a significant proportion of the variance in school climate, with a multiple correlation (R) of 0.588 and R-squared value of 0.346. In other words, aside from all other variables that may influence school climate, emotional intelligence, age, gender, and administrative experience together accounted for approximately 35% of the variance in teachers' ratings of school climate as assessed by the SLEQ-R. Further analyses showed that gender was the only factor which was a significant predictor by itself (beta = -0.739, $p < .05$). All the other variables were only significant when combined with other variables.

Table 7a

Regression Analysis of the Relationship between Emotional Intelligence, Age, Gender, Administrative Experience, and School Climate Ratings

Predictor Variable	N	Beta	t	p-level
Emotional Intelligence Score	14	0.588	1.375	0.202
Age	14	-.525	-1.424	0.188
Gender	14	-.739	-2.168	0.05*
Administrative Experience	14	0.241	0.614	0.555

Please note:
Dependent variable: SLEQ (School Climate)
Multiple Correlation (R) = -.588
R-Squared = 0.346

Based on results for the SLEQ-R Decision-Making subscale, further regression analyses using the same predictor variables (EI, age, gender, and administrative experience) to determine the extent to which they are reliable predictors of school climate. Similar to findings reported earlier in this chapter, the four variables combined accounted for a remarkable percentage of the variance in school climate; however, the proportions were not significant, with a multiple correlation value of 0.516 and R-squared of 0.267. These results are shown in Table 7b. As discussed earlier and also later in this chapter, the non-significant results may be due to the small sample size of 14.

Table 7b

Regression Analysis of the Relationship between Emotional Intelligence, Age,
Gender, Administrative Experience, and Decision-Making Ratings on the SLEQ-R

Predictor variable	N	Beta	t	p-level
Emotional Intelligence Score	14	0.029	0.067	0.948
Age 14		-.274	-.692	0.507
Gender 14		-.367	-1.004	0.342
Administrative Experience	14	0.445	1.056	0.318

Please note:
Dependent variable: Decision Making (SLEQ-R subscale)
Multiple Correlation (R) = 0.516
R-Squared = 0.267

Other analyses showed that although emotional intelligence scores as measured by

the MSCEIT were not a significant predictor of the Decision-Making subscale, emotional

intelligence categorization of the MSCEIT score was a significant predictor of the

Decision-Making subscale, with an R-squared value of 0.391. In other words, EI

categorization accounted for approximately 39% of the variance in teacher's ratings on

the Decision-Making subscale (see Table 7c).

Table 7c

Regression Analysis of the Relationship between Emotional Intelligence
Categorization and Decision-Making Subscale of SLEQ-R

Predictor Variable	N	Beta	t	p-level
Emotional intelligence category	14	-.625	-2.776	0.017**

Please note:
Dependent variable: Decision Making subscale of SLEQ-R (School Climate)
Multiple Correlation (R) = 0.625
R-Squared = 0.391

Given the emotional intelligence scores and categorization were not significant predictors of school climate on their own, but were significant in combination with other predictor variables, there was the need to explore the relationship between emotional intelligence and other predictor variables. Thus further regression analyses indicated that age, gender, and administrative experience were each significant predictors of emotional intelligence as assessed by the MSCEIT. As shown in Table 8, the three variables combined accounted for approximately 57% of the variance in emotional intelligence scores, with each variable contributing significantly to emotional intelligence (see Beta values).

Table 8

Regression Analysis of the Relationship between Age, Gender, Administrative Experience, and Emotional Intelligence

Predictor Variable	N	Beta	t	p-level
Age	14	.515	2.175	0.05*
Gender	4	.473	2.157	0.05*
Administrative Experience	14	-.652	-2.889	0.016*

Please note:
Dependent variable: Emotional Intelligence (MSCEIT)
Multiple Correlation (R) = 0.756
R-Squared = 0.571

Based on the results, additional analyses were done comparing the scores of teachers depending on the gender, emotional intelligence categorization, and administrative experience categorization of their respective principals. As indicated in Table 9, teachers who had female principals gave comparatively higher school climate

108

ratings on the SLEQ-R and all the sub scale scores, with the exception of the Student

Relations subscale.

Table 9

Gender Differences in School Climate Scores

	N		Mean		df	t	p
	F	M	F	M			
SLEQ	122	203	75.11 (7.99)	71.90 (8.49)	323	3.397	.001*
Collaborative	133	213	22.29 (3.76)	20.93 (4.02)	344	3.127	.002*
Student Relations	134	211	14.30 (2.83)	14.84 (2.59)	343	-1.838	.067
Decision Making	132	213	8.96 (2.00)	8.27 (2.11)	343	3.009	.003*
Instruct Innovation	133	213	15.43 (2.03)	14.95 (2.08)	344	2.108	.036*

p < .05

Further analyses were performed comparing SLEQ-R scores for teachers based on

their principal's EI categorization (i.e. MSCEIT below 90 or above 90 averages).

Although emotional intelligence categorization was not a significant predictor of mean

SLEQ-R scores, significant differences existed in the mean SLEQ-R scores and decision

making subscale of teachers whose principals were categorized as below average

compared with those with categorization above average (see Table 10).

Table 10

Differences in School Climate Scores for EI Categorizations of Above and Below Average

	N		Mean		df	t	p
	Below	Above	Below	Above			
SLEQ	121	204	74.57 (9.39)	72.24 (7.65)	323	2.44	.015*
SLEQRev	122	205	58.30 (8.28)	57.05 (7.06)	325	1.45	.149
Collaborative	132	214	21.60 (4.19)	21.39 (3.85)	344	.375	.708
Studentrelations	134	211	14.49 (2.73)	14.73 (2.67)	343	-.806	.421
Decisionmaking	130	215	9.39 (1.89)	8.02 (2.05)	343	6.22	.000*
Instructinnovation	132	214	15.40 (2.33)	15.00 (1.88)	344	1.85	.066
decisionmkaingR	131	215	6.84 (1.60)	5.85 (1.72)	344	5.40	.000*

$p < .05$

Last, principals were categorized into "below" and "above" average in terms of their administrative experience, with 7 years as the cutoff point. Overall, there was no significant difference in the SLEQ-R scores of principals with less and more experience. As shown in Table 11, the only subscales that were significant were Student Relations and Decision-Making.

Table 11

Differences in School Climate Scores for Administrative Experience of Above and Below Average

	N		Mean		df	t	p
	Below	Above	Below	Above			
R-SLEQ 167		158	72.84 (7.82)	73.38 (9.00)	323	-.573	.567
SLEQ-R 168		159	57.52 (7.30)	57.50 (7.83)	325	.025	.980
Collaborative 176		170	21.34 (4.00)	21.57 (3.95)	344	-.550	.583
Studentrelations 173		172	15.07 (2.44)	14.20 (2.87)	343	3.06	.002*
Decisionmaking 177		168	8.12 (2.10)	9.00 (2.10)	343	-3.83	.000*
Instrucinnovation 177		169	15.01 (1.91)	15.30 (2.22)	344	-1.17	.243
decisionmakingR 177		169	6.00 (1.76)	6.50 (1.70)	344	-2.89	.004*

p < .05

Clarification of Quantitative Results

In clarifying the quantitative findings presented in chapter four, several key points must be reviewed. Statistical significance was not proven when correlating EI of school leaders to school climate as perceived by teachers. Although the sample size of teachers was significant, the small N=14 of school leaders may be the reason for non-significance in some computations. When EI was compared to variables such as gender, age, and year's experience, statistical evidence supports that males had higher EI than females;

111

however, females had better school climate. School leaders EI indicated that age was not a factor in EI scores. Age was a factor when analyzed as a predictor of EI. Evidence supported that no difference in school leaders EI existed based on experience. There were significant differences in SLEQ-R subscale scores of student relations and decision making where EI experience was categorized as above or below average.

The null hypothesis was rejected in terms that the researcher did not find what was hypothesized correlating EI to school climate. Other findings included that together, the variables of EI, age, gender, and year's administrative experience influenced variance of school climate in teacher's ratings as indicated on the SLEQ-R. Although the four variables indicated high variance, the proportions were not significant. Gender was the only significant predictor by itself. The SLEQ-R subscale score for Decision-Making indicated high variance when all variables were analyzed to predict school climate.

Emotional intelligence was not a significant predictor of subscale scores in decision making; however, when EI was categorized as above or below average, it was a significant predictor for the subscale decision making. Furthermore, EI scores and categorization were not significant predictors of school climate on their own, but were significant in combination with other variables. Variables such as age, gender, and year's administrative experience were significant predictors of emotional intelligence based on the MSCEIT. The three variables combined were significant to overall EI. Finally, EI was not a predictor of mean SLEQ-R scores; however, mean SLEQ-R scores and subscale decision making were significant where school leaders had below average EI scores.

The first part of this chapter presented and analyzed quantitative data from 14 school leaders in Northeast United States who took the MSCEIT, and teachers from within schools of these leaders who participated in the school climate (R-SLEQ) survey. There was no significant correlation between school climate and school leaders' emotional intelligence. When variables such as age, gender, administrative experience, were correlated together, the variables accounted for significant influence on school climate. Gender was the only variable which was a significant predictor of school climate. Emotional intelligence scores of school leaders were categorized as below or above average for further analysis. Categorization of EI scores was not a significant predictor of mean SLEQ-R scores; however, significant differences did exist in the subscale decision making where school leaders were categorized as below average. Chapter 5 will detail the findings of the quantitative analysis to address the major research questions, and answers to the research questions will be discussed and interpreted.

Given that the present study was utilize a mixed-methodology using both qualitative and quantitative, another component of the analysis of results involved randomly selecting a subset of principals from the original sample for follow-up interviews. Qualitatively, the principal participants were then randomly chosen for interview. The interview consisted of five questions to give more information whether EI of school leaders is linked to school climate as perceived by teachers. Originally, the researcher had chosen six clients randomly for interview. This random selection yielded

113

two female elementary principals, two female middle school principals, and two male high school principals. To give better balance to the qualitative research, the researcher received permission from the IRB board to non-randomly select two males, one from the elementary level and one from the middle school level to give better balance to the qualitative research. This allowed for both a male and female perspective of the questions. There were no female high school principal participants. The participants were interviewed and answers were tape recorded along with notes taken by the researcher. The tapes were transcribed by the researcher, who after transcription, went back and replayed the tape to assure accuracy in the text of the participants. The tapes were destroyed upon completion of the transcription. Notes were kept to better capture the essence and body language of the participant during the interview.

Qualitative Study

The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore whether school climate as perceived by teachers is correlated to emotional intelligence of school leaders. The qualitative study is used to practically determine if school leaders EI is linked to school climate. School leaders' discussed experiences which reinforced the information gained through statistics, and in some instances countered it. The interview questions were developed to better understand how the link of school climate and emotional intelligence exists.

School leaders (principals) were selected purposefully for interviews. The interview protocol consisted of five questions developed by the researcher to better understand if emotional intelligence (EI) of school leaders is correlated to school climate

as perceived by teachers. Merriam (1998), states, "Purposeful sampling is based on the assumption that the investigator wants to discover, understand, and gain insight and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be learned" (p. 61). With the sample of school leaders solidified, interviews were then conducted.

The interview responses were tape recorded. The researcher also took detailed notes of the interview in order to preserve the accuracy of the answers and triangulate the data to capture the essence of it. The audio-taped interviews were then transcribed verbatim and put into the format presented here. Wolcott (1994) describes the importance of recording accurately by taking notes "during" interviews "to supplement mechanically recorded ones" (p. 349). The tapes were then destroyed to protect the confidentiality of the clients. The school leaders were given a client identification number for the interview for organization purposes as well as confidentiality (Table 12). The results of the interview presented several themes and subthemes. Themes of emotional intelligence as linked to school climate are categorized into main themes and subthemes as presented in Table 13. Themes that surfaced through interviews align with the four branch model as identified by Mayer and Salovey (1997). Mayer et al. (2004a) describe a person with high EI as a person who can perceive, use, understand, and manage emotions. This includes recognition of one's own emotions as well as others emotions. The demographics of school leaders for qualitative analysis are listed in Table 12. The themes and sub-themes represent the school leader's emotional response to how they link emotional intelligence to school climate in practice (Table 13).

Table 12

School Leader Demographic Data for Qualitative Study

School leader number	Gender	Grade level
A100	Female	Elementary
A200	Male	High
A300	Male	High
A400	Female	Middle
A500	Female	Middle
A600	Female	Elementary
A700	Male	Elementary
A800	Male	Middle

Themes which emerged through data analysis aligned with the four-branch model of EI and included (1) Perceiving emotions on oneself and others; (2) Use of emotion to facilitate thinking; (3) Understanding and controlling emotions; and (4) Managing one's own emotions (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). The sub-themes which emerged became apparent after analysis of the data as described by school leaders. The sub-themes were the words used by school leaders as they related how EI is linked to school climate. These sub-themes are titled as follows in the following sequence: (1) Listen- Keep your ears open!, (2) Inter/Intra relationships- Happy employees are more productive employees., (3) Communication, (4) Negative people, (5) Character- Respect kindness, compassion!, (6) Empathy. See it through their eyes!, (7) Maintenance. A must for positive school climate!, and (8) Visibility. Just for them to know that I'm there. Two

116

smaller sub-themes called "trust" and "celebrate!" were used by school leaders to describe how they use EI to better school climate. The narrative that follows is based on the analysis of school leaders EI as linked to school climate.

Table 13

Themes and Sub-themes of Qualitative Data.

Theme	Sub-theme
Perceiving emotions in oneself and others	Listen Inter/intra personal relationships
Use of emotion to facilitate thinking	Communicate Negative people
Understanding and controlling emotions	Character –Respect, Kindness, Compassion, Empathy
Managing one's own emotions	Maintenance Visibility

Perceiving Emotions

     Mayer et al. (2002) define perceiving emotions as, "the ability to recognize how an individual and those around the individual are feeling" (p. 19). Emotionally charged situations vary between elementary and secondary level students; and how school leaders respond and their understanding of the emotions is critical in demonstrating both competence and consistency of school leaders. The school leader's ability to effectively deal with emotional situations also leads to a better school climate. The following themes explore school leaders' perceptions of how the emotional intelligence of school leaders is linked to school climate.

117

The emotions sensed by the elementary principals from the teachers they worked with varied. Elementary school leaders indicated that perceiving emotions in oneself and others at times did alter their approach to handling emotionally charged situations with staff. Client A100, a female elementary principal responded by stating:

> I ran into this situation earlier in the year where she (my secretary) was sending home letters to the parents with my name and I found out quite by accident, and had to confront her. She was shocked, the look on her face was shock and disbelief, kind of why would you not want me to do this I was just helping?

A100 described her secretary as in "shock and disbelief," but her secretary had no idea what she did wrong. The principal went on to explain to her, "There was a letter in the newspaper where someone had referred to me as illiterate, and I'm far from illiterate. Then I found out where this was coming from and was a little upset." Her secretary had mailed home information with the principal's name on it. A100 goes on to say that my secretary thought "I didn't trust her," so after considering the emotion my secretary was feeling, the principal put herself in her secretary's position and altered her approach and:

> So what I did was I sat down and I thought about the position she was in and it wasn't by her own choice - she was running the building for all these years and I sat down and talked with her about it and said I know change is hard, it's hard for me, it's hard for you, but I explained it in detail that I was being scrutinized by individuals and finding my name in the newspaper and kind of figuring out where some of the stuff was coming from.

The knowledge of emotions that A100 sensed changed her approach form harsh to a more gentle approach. A100 also described a situation she perceives as volatile. She says:

> I also have a situation now where a person I replaced as a coordinator was put into a teaching position, and whenever I have a meeting with Title I teachers, she pretty much comes armed to do battle with me; and it's not bad when we're together as a group, but she finds a way to get me alone, and then it will escalate into a situation where she doesn't approve of the changes that I'm making, and some things that I've done, and really won't back down, and is very aggressive with the arguments!

In this situation, A100 senses anger from the teacher to the point that A100 had to be "really prepared" in meetings because of the fight this teacher would cause. A100 states, "I found myself avoiding her for awhile." A100 did alter her approach and realized that I "am the supervisor" and "it was very immature" to not address the situation.

The perceptions of emotions are powerful as it often dictates how a situation will be handled by a school leader, if at all! Client A600 describes her perception of emotions:

> The experience that I am thinking about involved me as assistant principal going to a teacher. The concern was there was an alcohol related incident that had been ongoing for quite sometime with him within the school. The emotions that I was sensing on the part of the person who was having the problem with, I think… the person was feeling very guilty, very scared, very nervous, as to what was going to happen as a result of what had been going on, the emotions that I sensed I don't think altered the approach that I took at all, I felt that I had to be very direct

119

regardless of what I was feeling or what that person was feeling and that is the

way it was handled, and it turned out to work out very well. Actually the person

ended up being terminated but I don't think the emotions I was feeling at that time

altered the way I handled the situation.

A600 did not let the emotions of a highly volatile situation affect her judgment. Client

A100 and A600 both indicated perceiving what was happening, yet both handled

situations differently. Client A700 had a similar circumstance relating to alcohol use by a

teacher. He perceived the teacher, "was uncomfortable and nervous" and told himself to

stay direct. However, when the teacher started describing excuses as to why she smelled

of alcohol, he found himself "getting a little more compassionate." His perceptions of her

waivered throughout as he describes the situation:

> I did keep my, my message very direct although as she started describing excuses
>
> for why maybe she had smelled of alcohol, I can sense myself getting a little
>
> more compassionate in her reasoning, for that that it wasn't alcohol but it could
>
> have been mouthwash you start thinking you start thinking and going through the
>
> natural process of thinking well could it be actually something else it was difficult
>
> to keep it as direct as I had planned to be in, that you know going into the
>
> situation I thought okay I am going to nail this one to the wall and that is it end of
>
> story then in started really getting feedback from the person and she was visibly
>
> upset about it and did have some excuses that could be valid, it was a little more
>
> difficult to be as direct, but all in all I kept my message the same and did not alter

from that just based on the emotions that she was sensing. My tone became less

direct and a little more compassionate.

The end result was the same, yet his approach was different than A600.

Middle school leader A800 described his perception of emotional altering as "drama" between two female teachers. Client A400 perceived a teacher who was going through emotional problems as her friend, confidant, and mentor. A500 described her emotional perception experience as "embarrassment and fear" for a teacher who was intoxicated at work. In each case of middle school leaders, all used the term "preparation" when it came to addressing the emotional perceptions they were feeling from staff. In cases where the perceptions were intense due to a person being, "bullied and intimidated," to a situation where "alcohol" was affecting performance in front of students, all school leaders said when prepared for a strong emotional response they did not back down. Prepared meaning anticipated.

High school leaders' perceptions were interpreted correctly which led to swift and immediate response in two different yet serious situations. A200 described his experience in a classroom as, "immediately I did notice and perceive that she was intoxicated," and "had to get things in gear." Perceptions of emotions are fast moving and change by the moment; however, when something happens as serious as intoxication in a classroom, decisions occur quickly. There is not time to second guess, reaction is fast and accuracy of perceptions of emotions is critical to preserve trust and fairness of leader relationships with staff, which leads to a positive school climate.

121

A300 describes a situation where he perceived lack of classroom control. He states:

> I was an assistant principal my first month on the job and I walked into a classroom and it was chaotic, students were literally all over the place, students were up and down and I saw a student throw something up to the ceiling on a video camera and the teacher came up to me and said hey everything's good in here, they all calmed down when they saw me.

Both high school leaders had situations where perceptions were critically important on first glance as each perception led to a teacher dismissal.

Perceptions of school leaders are powerful in that they come into a leaders mind, process the thoughts for accuracy, and then must act on the emotions they perceive. Client A100 said that emotional intelligence is positively linked to school climate. She bases this perception on the fact that she has worked in the building she now leads. She states, "In this particular situation, I came into a school with very low morale that used to be treated like a stepchild, and it was pretty high on my list to improve morale." She also described the staff of the building as being "emotionally crippled and immature." The ability to recognize such emotions in a school environment allows the school leader to put a plan in place to adjust school climate. A100 did this by talking with the staff about the issue. A200 describes a similar perception in the high school he leads. He stated, "It is really important for me to be able to perceive what my building is feeling, the atmosphere, so that I can adapt or change the things that I'm doing, or the way I rule things out." He also describes emotional intelligence as being linked to school climate,

and excitingly he said, "I whole-heartedly believe that the best leader in the one who displays a high level of people skills or in this case emotional intelligence."

Client A400 explains that emotional intelligence will lead to a good school climate as long as the school leader is able to "understand" what the cause of the emotions is. She felt that by researching the history of the school leader before her she as able to find the reason for the "frustration and anger" she perceived from staff. A500 shared her thoughts on the middle school she leads. She said that positive school climate goes hand-in-hand with emotional intelligence, and that "…emotional intelligence of the school leader should enhance school climate depending on how the school leader perceives, accesses, and generates the emotions," and that "school climate would be enhanced not only for teachers and students, but also for the school leader." A600 perceives that EI and school climate is related. She states:

I think that it tends to enhance it, I think the higher the EI is I think it makes it easier it is to approach teachers on an individual basis knowing what direction to take when you meet with each individual person or even when small groups are meeting if it's a grade level or for special people, I think it having a sense of how people are feeling, or where they are coming from helps you deal with the situation in hand, and helps you get things done better, it helps you understand what the teacher are thinking and it makes you easier how to deal with that particular teacher.

Client A700 describes higher EI as positively affecting school climate. He states, "I think as a school leader you need to be able to have an understanding of the types of

123

emotions that will come about in certain situations." By perceiving what staff feels, you can then appropriately act on the emotion. Client A800 also said, "To have a good emotional intelligence, to be able to read people and access what's going on, only good things can happen out of that." Perceptions are critical in leading to a god school climate. A800 also describes that perceptions are the first phase; you must act on perceptions for school climate to improve or be maintained at a positive level.

Listen- Keep your ears open! The Listen- "Keep your ears open!" sub-theme emerged from participants' descriptions of how they use emotions to monitor school climate. Seven out of eight school leader's (87.5%) described listening as a critical characteristic of high emotional intelligence and how listening helps in monitoring school climate. School leaders described themselves as listeners and use listening to gauge school climate based on the emotions of the words heard when listening.

A100 said "You have to keep your ears open!" she describes listening to concerns from staff, some of which "I don't want to hear," allows her to reflect and keep an ongoing dialogue between her and her staff. She feels that if everybody has been heard, "…then the chips kind of fall where they may" once a decision is made. She talks with staff about new decisions as well as decision that have been made to better gauge climate through what is "working well."

A200 uses a similar strategy when utilizing listening skills to gauge emotions and monitor school climate. He focuses on "finding those people to help me with the perceptions of my entire staff," and deciphering between "people who tell me things just to tell me things, and want to make me feel good." He refers to team work by stating, "I

can't do it alone!" He relies on staff to let him know what is good and bad about the decisions, and based on emotions and how it affects school climate makes adjustments to the issues he is hearing.

A800 described his listening experiences where he "had to be careful that both of them felt like I had listened to what their concerns were." He also states "I listen to my team leaders..." and "You listen to kids." Listening involves all groups of people in a school. These groups are parents, students, faculty, support staff, other administrators, and school board members. By listening to these groups, I feel, "We have pretty good communication." The way I accomplish this is "just talking to teachers randomly." I ask them "how's the year going, things like that." This allows me to understand what concerns they have. I can perceive the emotions from the conversation, and gauge school climate by listening.

A700 describes his listening skill set by, "…your everyday interactions with the staff…" Listening allows me to "monitor school climate", hear the "concerns", find out what is "working well", and "things that are challenging." He also describes that listening must occur with "…staff, students, and community members." He states, "…this helps me judge how our school is moving forward as far as our culture and climate."

A400 said, "To have your ears open… ask for input … get their senses about it..." Listening is critical and, "You need to be able to understand, not just read the temperature, but understand it, and know what's behind it, what's the cause of it." She says to read emotions and link them to the school climate; she must listen first, and then

125

determine if the read she perceives matches the read form the staff. She relies on her senses of listening and interpreting emotions to build positive school climate.

A300 cites his behavior as "I've learned to listen a lot more." He describes listening about school and family concerns, and offers his help, in which most of the time the help is "listening."

A500 describes her listening skills of staff through, "…conversation, monitoring interaction between staff, and staff and students, asking questions, allowing people to offer opinions…" She said that by "acknowledging" the emotions of people, school climate is enhanced because I listen and accept their "feelings and thoughts regarding what's happened during the school day."

Inter/Intra relationships- "Happy employees are more productive employees." The sub-theme inter/intra relationships correspond to Mayer et al. (2002), findings in emotional intelligence and its link to success through relationships. School leaders direct many decisions in the course of a day. One decision that cannot be overlooked in the decision to not communicate with people! School climate is built on relationships, and emotional intelligence is understanding people through their emotions. In linking emotional intelligence to school climate, school leaders describe the connection using phrases, "I correlate that to people skills," "it is all about emotions," and "school climate would be enhanced." These phrases are all a piece of larger phrases which indicate that school climate and EI are correlated, and that relationships play a large part in the connection between the two.

A100 describes a situation where she has a person on staff that she needed to replace with another. This person has been unkind to her, to the point that she "comes armed to do battle with me," fighting everything. In an effort to help the relationship, A100 has extended herself to, "go out of my way to make sure she feels that I'm not angry." Simple cares like this help in building relationships that contribute to the overall quality of school climate. A100 also said she has "talked with them more about what was broken, before I tried to fix anything," and that she "is trying to make things easier for them." She closes by saying "I think our maturity level was definitely affected." Her attitude of involving staff and talking with them leads to employees that feel "valued."

Client A600 discussed her relationships with staff as important in understanding the problems in the school. She said:

> Having a sense of how people are feeling or where they are coming from helps you deal with the situation in hand, and helps you get things done better, it helps you understand what the teachers are thinking, and it makes it easier to deal with that particular teacher.

Knowing people and addressing problems at the level they are at emotionally helps in staff productivity, motivation of staff, and support from the school leader. She adds that a difficulty in maintaining positive school climate is the lack of time to talk directly with staff. She states:

> I think also that a lack of time to deal with the teachers on an everyday basis and to connect with them personally everyday can lead to a very negative school climate, so we have to make sure that we are finding the time to deal directly

127

everyday with all the teachers in the building in making sure that their needs are

met; and we are helping them to deal with all the things that we have to –that they

have to deal with now that are very different from the way things used to be.

She closes by discussing technology as a barrier to building and maintaining

relationships. She said by using email, the inter-personal dialogue leads us to "lose the

personalization with everybody in the building," and hurts school climate due to less

"personnel communications." She provides professional development to teachers to help

them "deal with situations…so that the morale does not become poor."

Male principal A200 enjoys the relationships he has with staff, and finds

opportunity in staff that distances themselves. He relies on staff that he refers to as "true"

to help him with the "perceptions of my entire staff." The relationships he has developed

have allowed the school climate to flourish because he believes in the team concept and

openly admits, "I can't do it alone." Open candor such as this gives staff the opportunity

for input as they, "…all help me monitor."

Male high school A300 uses a different approach to how he interacts and builds

inter/intra personal relationships with staff. He walks around in the morning before

school begins and talks with staff. He talks with staff about school, family, or other

topics. He said, "That is an opportunity for them to give me a one-on-one…," and it by

doing so "that does make the climate so much better." He continues, "It also helps me

understand what is going on at home..." This allows teachers to know that he is there and

willing to help them, both with their problems and as a resource. A300 summarizes his

128

need to build relationships by being able to, "…empathize and inter-relate with teachers to create a positive school climate."

Female middle school leader A500 said, "School climate is best controlled by meaningful dialogue between staff and me as principal." She was concerned for her ability to work with such a "large staff," as she described it difficult to see teachers "with concerns in a timely manner." She said that outside forces "are my biggest hurdle" to get back to people on a "consistent basis." Her genuine concern for this problem is a strong indicator that she cares for her staff, and wants to do what is best for them, so the staff does not feel negative leading to negative school climate.

Male high school principal A200 empathically stated:

I mentioned earlier about emotional intelligence correlating to people skills. Going into any job interview that I've ever had, I've always expressed the importance of a leader with people skills; because fortunately, I've been in positions where I see leaders who display a high level of emotional intelligence or people skills and those who don't and it's helped me grow. I certainly believe that the successful leader is going to be the one with a higher level of emotional intelligence and people skills. My philosophy is happy employees are more productive employees, so my job is to be a leader and to lead my teachers into something that's going to make them happy because they're going to be more productive if they enjoy it.

His belief in leading by example and being a "role model" for staff has helped him transform into a person who has realized that relationships are critical in the success of

129

the school. He states, "I am very reactive," and by working and trusting others, I am able to think and get back to people "smarter" about situations. It helps in having good relationships "…when I have people on my side helping me."

Use of Emotions

Use of emotions to facilitate thought, "…reveals how much a respondent's thoughts and other cognitive activities are informed by his or her experience of emotions" (Mayer et al., 2002, p. 19). Client A300 used his emotional senses a staff member by stating:

> I walked down to the teacher and said, would you come with me, and as he was coming, I saw him starting to shake. My first approach was that I was going to show him some of the tape and say, "now here's what we are going to have to do." But when I saw his mannerisms where he started to shake, he looked visibly like he was going to break down, I changed. I said, "Come on in and have a seat, do you want something, do you want a glass of water."

Humane treatment in this case allowed the integrity of the teacher to be maintained while working through an issue that led to a dismissal. Client A200, male high school principal also used a similar strategy in working with a staff member. His use of emotions to facilitate how to effectively handle an emotional situation is described as:

> You start thinking very quickly how do I handle this and I think the worst thing that I could have done was approach her and immediately reprimand her or ripped her out. So I did approach her and asked her how are you doing, how's your day going thus far. I think she did sense that I was on to her. My reaction did change

130

a little bit, but I thought it was very important to stay calm and treat her with

respect, and at that time I asked her to walk down to the office with me. I brought

her in here where we're seated right now and I think it was really important

throughout the process treating her as an adult, treating her knowing that she has a

problem. We came in here, I got her water, we went through the whole process

and ultimately because of the way we dealt with the situation I don't think it could

have turned out any better for both her and our school district.

In each case, both school leaders used emotions to accentuate something positive amidst

negative situations, even if the positive was respect and getting them a glass of water.

Mayer et al. (2002) describe using emotions for better, "problem-solving, decision-

making, and creative endeavors" (p. 19). In this situation the problem was solved

through a decision-making emotional response which was to treat people with dignity.

Middle school leader A800 used a combination as described above to solve a

problem while capitalizing on the emotions of two teachers. He said:

I was frustrated enough to the point in dealing with the situation, I guess that kind

of goes to this question; I really didn't care at that point what they were feeling. I

told them, here we are, you guys say what's on your mind, the second person will

say what's on their mind, we'll get all that behind us and then we're going to

move forward and come up with solutions. I framed it that it was going to be

uncomfortable for both of you, you're not going to necessarily like each other in

the end, but we're here for the kids.

131

In this case, A800 allowed his emotions to become a source of reverse frustration with staff. His emotions were facilitated by disgust in working with these two teachers for some time prior to this meeting described above. Client A400 shared an experience in using emotions to focus on the positive. She asks if this teacher "trusts" her before she speaks to get her to calm down, then together they solve a problem. Client A500 handles her faculties' emotions stating, "When I am in a situation where the emotions of the teacher may not be obvious I think I'm a careful to decipher where the person is emotionally in order to insure that the conversation is going to be productive." This thought pattern reveals that emotions are integral in the decision making among school leaders and by focusing on creative, positive ways to inspire, school climate improves (Simon, 1982).

One can understand that use of emotions is critical in handling highly volatile situations. Client A200 shares that he uses emotions "…so that I can change the things that I'm doing or the way I rule things out." This is a critical component in using EI to facilitate thought. A700 uses emotions similarly and says:

So I think as a school leader you have to be able to get certain emotions out of your staff members. I see that as a positive thing to be able to do that, the only way it can be negative is if you abuse that as a school leader. There is a chance that can be abused and that where I would see it more negatively impacting school climate.

A700 uses a style where emotions dictate the intensity of how to approach situations. He adds, "I believe it just confirms that there are going to be times we need to be a little

more charged and a little more serious in how were responding to certain situations." A800 summarizes his experiences in understanding emotions that school leader's need to have their "…thumb on the pulse of the building…" By using emotions to facilitate thought, school leaders can help people see things from different perspectives (Mayer et al., 2002).

Sharing ideas and expectations, and being able to facilitate emotions is essential in the successful school climate as indicated in the responses from the school leaders. The theme described that having high EI makes it easier to approach teachers, understanding what types of emotions that will come about in certain situations, and if you don't understand the climate of the school you're walking into "you can upset the apple cart". These thoughts from the school leader's perspective draw on experiences that require the drawing of emotions out of staff to better gauge school climate. The school leaders use emotions to determine how the climate of the building is measured and make adjustments through the use of emotions to facilitate thought.

Communication. Communication surfaced as a theme from all school leaders, and it assumed multiple varieties such as written, oral, and electronic. School leaders described the importance of communication in developing and maintaining school climate; and also linked the communication to emotional intelligence. Emotional intelligence, "I equate that with people skills," said A200.

A100 found herself "avoiding emails" from a staff member because of the negative nature of the emails. She realized it "was really immature" and sought help. "I am her supervisor!" She explains that she would carefully plan her emails and delivery to

be sure not to offend this person. Because this school leader had worked in this building, she has seen what has worked and what has not worked. She says you must "talk with your staff regularly…," because she has witnessed, "Veterans are resistant to change, even if it's for the better." By communicating one can better change mindsets and create a school climate that adapts to the changing needs of students.

A600 described her communication style as "direct," finding time to work with teachers "daily" and through minimal "technology." The idea of face-to-face communication is crucial in use of emotions, for if the emotions are not directly sensed; mistakes can be made in handling situations with staff.

Client A300 manages by walking around. He states, "What I do is start every morning- and I walk around, every morning I've made it a point to walk around and see the teachers…" By doing this, they become, "…accustomed to seeing me and that adds to the climate." Female principal A500 also uses face-to-face communication to build school climate. She states, "I monitor school climate through conversation…allowing people to offer opinions…" She asks for input of staff to better understand emotions and "feelings and thoughts regarding what's happened during the school day." Male elementary principal A700 uses communication face-to-face much like the high school and elementary principal aforementioned. He stated, "Just by having conversations with them," and "I would say just your everyday interactions with staff…" is how he monitors school climate. A800 describes an identical approach in his communication style "Just talking to teachers randomly…," and "one-on-one." He said that teachers, "…are a little more open to things…" when talking to them individually rather than in a larger group.

134

A400 uses a one-on-one technique in communicating with staff. She said, "…ask for input…get their sense about it…."Open direct dialogue allows for trust to be developed. She said I will ask, "Do you trust me?" to teachers who she knows are having difficulty, and before she can help she needs their trust. Communication is therefore not only a theme in using emotions, but also a way to monitor school climate.

Negative people. School leaders face a myriad of challenges on a daily basis. The job of school leaders is management of people; and to do the job successfully requires principles of management, motivation, inspiration, communication, and parenting. Emotionally intelligent people identify what motivates people, and use the emotions of others and self to guide and direct decisions. Mayer, et al. (2002), state, "What emotional intelligence allows one to do is to think and plan by taking emotions into consideration" (p. 17). School leaders need to understand this concept of emotion as there are many negative situations that occur daily. How school leaders respond to them will determine whether the outcome is successful. A theme that emerged from the data revolved around negative people. School leaders described negative people as the difficult aspect of maintaining school climate.

Rookie elementary principal A100 described negative teacher attitudes by stating, "Veterans are resistant to change, even if it's for the better. The attitude that we've always done things this way so this is the best way." This attitude is a common problem school leader's face. It aligns to A600 experienced elementary school leader's response who said:

135

One of the difficult things is for teachers to see the big picture of what is going

on; and, I think until they see the big picture, they don't always get the full sense

of what's happening, and so that can sometimes give the negative school climate.

What A600 describes is a narrow-sighted/tunnel vision viewpoint from within the teacher

ranks. School leaders are the expected people to overcome unwillingness to change, or

see why change is needed. Thus, these teachers breed negativity if their concerns are not

addressed. A700 describes his elementary experience in negative people as, "It takes

only one person who is not satisfied, and if that is not addressed, to quickly gain mass

and have additional people, getting additional people to believe, for whatever reason, that

there is a concern or that something is not right." This situation leads to "a negative

school climate," if "taking the time to address situations in a timely fashion" is not taken

care of.

High school leaders describe staff a little more harshly than elementary. By that,

the body language and tone varied in responses. A200 leaned forward in his chair; put is

elbows on his desk, and seriously states:

The most difficult aspect of maintaining a positive school climate is dealing with

negative people, because no matter what you do or where you go or what

profession you're in, you're going to deal with negative people; and

unfortunately, we have people on our staff that are negative- no matter what you

try to do- or what direction you're headed in, they will try to find a way to prove

you wrong! Thankfully, that's usually a minority. That's the most difficult

aspect of my job, dealing with those people who are ultimately negative and those

people are the hardest to change.

He says the way to combat negative people is "to keep them close." By keeping them

close, communicate with them and involve them in the processes of the school. A300

response was similar in that he also said you have to "keep negative people close, keep

them in your hip pocket" (as he motioned his right hand into his pocket). He views

negative people as those who spread rumors. He tries to maintain a positive school

climate and monitor the "rumor mill" by, "…go to the source, try to find out who the

source is," that is spreading rumors. He feels that if rumors are not handled personally

and with the staff, the rumor can lead to a "ruin of the entire school." By focusing on one

negative individual, he feels he can help them. He stated:

What I try to do is I try to find the people that are negative and get with them and

try to talk to them and ask them: What's the problem? You're more than likely

not going to resolve the problem, but at least you're listening. Even if you resolve

the problem, what I found is there is another problem with that. There is always

another problem. I just try to help and resolve and just try to help them through.

He describes a scenario that is insurmountable, yet continues to try and keep

communication open and direct to keep school climate positive. By understanding and

focusing on the negative emotions of individuals, the school leaders are better able handle

negative situations through emotional thinking.

Middle school leaders describe negativity from three different viewpoints. Male

A800 describes the educational "team" as a group that "don't hate each other;" rather,

137

"that can work together to form a good team." He cited the need for people's "personalities," and making sure "personalities mesh together" within the confines of the team. He views negative people can be overcome by placing them on appropriate teams. He added, "You have to do your research and make sure… everybody can work together." His answer was different than rookie female middle school principal A400. She made no mention of people as a group or individually, rather, she directed her thoughts toward a difference between climate and culture. She views negativity as cultural instead of climate related. She describes culture as "Something that has happened over time;" and climate as "a daily change." She analogized the two using a metaphor of "temperature" using a thermometer. She stated, "Climate can change- temperature changes day to day, but culture is engrained. So a negative culture is much more challenging to maintain than daily climate or change to daily climate." Her philosophical belief is that the school leader must focus on daily climate to inflict change on the overall culture. She said the "greatest challenge" is to overcome a "negative culture." A500 female middle school leader said her perceptions of negative people stem from her lack of time to effectively deal with,"…those people that are feeling negatively, then ultimately, morale is low, and that affects school climate." Each leader at the middle level describes a different perspective of negativity and where it stems from. In each described scenario, the school leaders use the negative emotions to aid them in handling the negative personnel issues to promote a positive school climate.

Understanding Emotions

School leaders must understand a variety of emotions to be successful in daily managerial tasks. Misunderstanding or ignoring emotions of subordinates can lead to more intensive emotions if understanding of emotions is poor (Mayer et al., 2002). Client A100 describes "the look on her face was shock and disbelief." If she had chosen to ignore or misread this emotion as anger, and lash out in defense, or not bother to address the emotion, it could have easily escalated to paranoia and led to a bigger problem than it needed to be. Instead, A100 recognized a need to address a problem and interceded with a calm and rationale discussion to help solve a problem between her and her secretary. A600 describes similar understanding of emotions when she stated, "I think the person was feeling very guilty, very scared, very nervous…" As a result of interpreting the emotions properly, she was able to focus intensely on the matter at hand without backtracking. A700 also described his understanding of emotions of a staff member as "uncomfortable and nervous," and he described another situation where a staff member was "very agitated." He described his understanding of emotions as a way to help him in addressing the needs of staff directly and without waiver.

A800 described his situation in middle school as staff showing "apprehension" about meeting. Knowing that he knew he would control the meeting and did so to move on with a problem and help students. A500 sensed "embarrassment and fear" from a teacher. As a result she concluded by stating, "…when I am in a situation where the emotions may not be obvious, I think I'm careful to decipher where the person is emotionally in order to insure that the conversation is going to be productive." Mayer et.

139

al (2002) describe this knowledge of emotions, "…is important in one's dealings with other people and in enhancing one's self-understanding" (p. 19).

Client A200 used a series of questions to gauge if a problem existed. He describes first that "I think she did sense I was on to her." He decided to remain calm instead of "rip her out" because he knew the emotions were teetering toward possible chaos. He stated, "I thought it was very important to stay calm and treat her with respect…" By understanding the emotions of the case, he avoided a situation which could have intensified into a bad situation becoming worse. Client A300 used understanding of emotions by stating, "…when I saw his mannerisms where he started to shake, he looked visibly like he was going to break down." As a result, "I changed." A300 changed his approach to the situation and said, "It was totally different than what we anticipated." He figured he had the teacher and was going to fire him on the spot and be done with it; however, after he read the emotions, he approached the person humanistically, and changed his approach to one of mercy and respect. The same outcome was derived at using kindness instead of harshness as a result of using emotions.

Understanding emotions to monitor school climate is successful when the school leader uses knowledge of emotions to adjust to conflict. Client A100 says "you have to talk with your staff regularly" to fully understand what is happening. A200 uses emotions to monitor school climate by relationships with staff who he knows "are true!" He defines "true" as staff that will be honest with him and share their emotions about specific decisions that are made. A200 must then understand what is happening emotionally with staff and make adjustments to keep school climate positive.

140

Client A300 takes a different approach to monitoring school climate by understanding the emotions of staff by talking with them informally. He uses time in the morning to talk with staff about school, home life, and their families. He said this, "It also helps me understand what's going on at home, because what's going on at home in a teacher's life affects them here sometimes." By understanding the emotions from staff members, A300 can make better decisions when working with staff and understand the emotions of staff. I have a staff member who is dealing with the emotions linked to cancer. By talking with this teacher regularly, he can lead them better at work and keep them focused and on task while at school.

Client A500 also comes to understand emotions through "…conversation, monitoring interaction between staff, and staff and students, asking questions, allowing people to offer opinions…" By utilizing this style, A500 also monitors school climate and can use emotions to guide and direct the school climate positively by addressing the needs of staff.

School leader A700 said he understands emotions by reading the "body language" of staff. He also informally uses "conversations," and more formally "meeting with team leaders" on a monthly basis to gauge school climate through the emotions of staff. He adds, "But one of the best ways, really, is to be walking around and try to visually see it for yourself."

Client A800 used similar methods of understanding emotions of staff such as "one-on-one" conversations and faculty meeting where you have a "bigger audience." He also discussed a completely different method of understanding emotions and how it

relates to school climate, and that is the "Christmas party!" He stated that, "If you've got a lot of people showing up at the Christmas party, they all seem like they want to be around each other. If it dips down, then maybe something's going on." This informal measure of understanding a 'cause' for why staff does not want to be with each other is a response to understanding various emotions that can lead to negativity in school climate.

A school leaders' understanding of emotions "change over time" (Mayer et al., 2002, p. 19). School leader's responses indicate how understanding of EI has changed their management role in helping school climate improve, has provided valuable insight "in one's dealing with other people and in enhancing one's self-understanding" (Mayer et al., 2002, p. 19). Upon self-reflection, A100 said she must consider the "politics" of situations. She said that her "brutal honesty" did not work immediately staff felt incensed with her comments. She stated, "I have to be not so honest and a little more political-minded with my comments." By her awareness of the needed change, she may prevent a simple frustration to turn into an irritation leading to a problem that did not have to be as a result of the emotion.

Veteran school leader A600 said, "I have always been very aware, extremely aware of the EI, and you know, the feelings of other teachers." Even though she understands emotions, she cited that there is still the intricate need to help teachers see "the big picture." By guiding staff to see situations from different perspectives, she feels this will "make for a much better and positive school climate." She also described "providing professional development" and "celebrating achievement." All of her responses lean toward a humanistic approach to understanding people, and reaching out

142

to help involve them, thus discerning emotional needs being met and school climate as being positive.

Male elementary client A700 said he found himself getting to emotionally wrapped up in situations depending on who he was talking to at the time. He said, "It is very easy to get caught up in situation where you typically demonstrate your emotions of how you feel, but knowing that to be a leader, you need to, for the most part, stay neutral." He said this because you can give the perception that you are taking a side. He cited, "I think it is important to listen to that person but not make any judgments… until you have all the facts."

In an effort to better understand others and self, both high school principals learned patience. A200 went from "I don't think it through," to telling staff "give me some time to think about this." He stated, "…you're smarter about the situation than you were the day before." A300 said, "I've learned to listen a lot more. Stop, listen, and maybe get not get back for a day or so, but let them know if you're not getting back," and that you are "still thinking." This clearly illustrates the various emotions school leaders need to understand before making decisions.

Middle school leader A400 learned that understands emotions means that, "I need to… step back before I make a judgment about what's going on." She said I "view it through their eyes," before I act or respond. A500 has come to understand that she has changed to "be more aware of the emotions of others" through conversations, body language, and validate what it is she senses with that staff member. She also cited her understanding of emotion similar to A700 where she needs to "not react with emotion"

143

herself. Client A800 said this study has caused him to refocus on school climate through understanding of emotions. He said, "I think I do a pretty descent job with them," involving them in decisions regarding school issues. He feels that understanding emotions leads to a positive connection with staff to foster positive school climate.

The clients have provided content in their responses which "indicate how well the respondent understands the complexities of emotional meanings, emotional transitions, and emotional situations (Mayer et al., 2002, p. 17). They also described the understanding of understanding emotions and linked it to positive school climate.

Character-Respect, kindness, compassion! Mayer et al. (2002), use the term emotional intelligence differently than the popular definition. The popular definition of EI points towards terms such as, "…motivation, empathy, sociability, warmth, and optimism" (Mayer et al., 2002, p. 17). Goleman (1995) uses the term "character" to describe EI. School leaders were given a definition of EI defined by Mayer and Salovey (1997). Even having the definition in hand, school leaders responded to questions linking EI to school climate, and linked character traits to leaders with high EI. School leaders describe their ability to understand emotions by deciphering emotional meanings, transitions, and situations (Mayer et al., 2002). The school leaders described character traits as to how they accomplish this understanding of emotions.

A100 described a situation where she sensed emotional distress between herself and her secretary. Her compassion toward the secretary surfaces when she stated, "I sat down and thought about the position she as in…she was running the building for all these years, and I sat down and talked with her about it. I said, I know change is hard, it's hard

for me, it's hard for you, but I explained in detail…" the issues she had put me in. This compassionate response healed a fractured relationship. Albeit, compassion is a character trait, it was the emotional understanding of something wrong being sensed, and approaching indicates a level of EI where emotions enhanced an intelligent response.

A700 described a similar response to a different situation where he "can sense himself getting a little more compassionate." He used a humanistic approach and applied objective thinking, putting himself in this person's shoes, sensing her emotions, to have a compassionate response as a leader. This links to maintaining a positive school climate as a result of the respectful response in the negative situation. His response came because she "became visibly upset." A200 said he it was important to, "stay calm and treat her with respect." His situation was a similar response to A700, in that he sensed the emotional instability of the person knowing she was in trouble. A300 demonstrated a compassionate and respectful response when he saw the person starting to shake. He stated, "I changed. Come on in and have seat, do you want something, do you want a glass of water." The response at surface level seems routine; however, the tone of voice changed from directive-like to understanding and calming. Respectful responses to staff came from all aforementioned as a result of the emotional response they described.

Empathy. See it through their eyes! Emotional intelligence is viewed by school leaders as a necessary intelligence to school climate. The school leaders described situations where they used empathy, or the humanistic approach to understanding others before they made a decision. A700 used this response when he was faced with a teacher discipline issue He stated, "You start thinking and going through the natural process of

145

thinking, 'well could it be actually something else', it was difficult to keep as direct as I had planned…" His response was in an effort to understand "the other side of the story."

Middle school leader A800 said in response to two teachers fighting, "So I've tried, throughout the year, to listen to the people, their sides." By putting himself into a position to see it from each perspective, and knowing that, "…they both feel they're right," he "…felt the truth runs in between those two things." His logic provided for a positive outcome, leading to two people getting along and reminding them "we're here for the kids." He said school climate improves from this type of thinking.

A500 puts herself in the shoes of the other person when emotionally charged situations occur. She stated, "I'm careful to decipher where the person is emotionally on order to insure that the conversation is going to be productive." She added that she does this when it is "…emotions of the teacher may not be obvious…" This empathetic technique was also used by high school leaders A200. He said, "…I think it was really important throughout the process treating her as an adult, treating her knowing that she has a problem." He adds, "It's better when you stop and think about what they are actually feeling, why are they acting this way?" as a result of this, "I don't think it could have turned out better for both her and the district."

A300 had an empathetic response in a decision as he described a teacher problem, "When I saw his mannerism… I changed." He thought on first approach, be direct; however, when human behavior reach highly charged emotional levels, the emotional situation leads to a different response.

A100 described a situation where school climate was poor. She stated, "I came into a school with very low morale…instead of coming in swinging an axe!... I talked to them…" By talking I am able to understand and "make their life a little bit better and therefore improve the school climate." A200 described a similar strategy in that, "It's really important for me to be able to perceive what my building is feeling, the atmosphere, so that I can adapt or change the things that I'm doing or the way I rule things out."

A400 discussed how she used the history of her position as she "came here last year on the heels of a very difficult administrator." She continues, "I didn't know all of it until I got here. That really informed my approach to people and my tolerance for their frustrations, their anger; their suspect!" She clearly uses empathy in solving emotional issues to better improve school climate:

> One of the things that I need to do is to step back before I make a judgment about what's going on. Take it in and then think about it and view it through the eyes of whoever the participants are. So if it's a situation with teachers, view it through their eyes, or if it's a situation with kids, view it through their frame of reference before I act or respond. Another thing is to not react with emotion myself. Apply some of the same strategies that I use with challenging kids to a challenging adult situation, whether it's a parent, a staff member, a colleague; utilize the strategies that I know work.

The strategy used is empathy. A600 said, "I think the higher the EI is, the easier it is to approach teachers on an individual basis, knowing what direction to take when you meet…" She adds, "I think having a sense of how people are feeling or where they are coming from helps you deal with the situation in hand." A700 responded with similar words in saying:

> I think as a school leader, you need to be able to have an understanding of the types of emotions that will come about in certain situations, so when you talk to staff, you need to be able to pull from those emotions.

A100 uses this practice and in reality looks like this when applied:

> Bottom line is that you have to talk with your staff regularly and ask them not so much how am I doing but how has this decision affected you? Is it working well, especially if it was a unilateral decision? If it's something we did as a group then the chips kind of have to fall where they may.

Working together, seeing 'what is happening' through the eyes of staff, and asking questions of staff and self relative to performance enhance the school climate. A500 said that she tries to be "as fair as possible with staff." Fairness! She uses the word to state that by being fair and considering the words of staff you are, "…acknowledging that emotions are an important part of school climate, and not only emotions, but feelings and thoughts regarding what's happening during the school day."

A100 also described an empathetic situation from a teacher to teacher perspective. She states:

148

I find in this particular school it's really interesting because I have new teachers in the building this year, very friendly, we're all family, we've had funerals together, births together, but only if you're already here. If you're a new teacher, a new person they make many assumptions about what you should already know. There was a worry that the new teachers wouldn't fit in and I find they have a false perception of themselves so that's kind of hard to change. That's going to be difficult to do and it's something that I'm still working on; and I think it's going to be better when I have more of my own staff in here, when I get to choose a little bit more within the building; but for now it's a false perception, and it makes it difficult for the new teachers to fit in, because they're expected to know all these things, and teachers don't help them like they should.

A700 discloses his empathetic response by stating, "So, I think it's very important to listen to that person, but not make any judgments based on what you're hearing until you have all the facts in front of you and you have a chance to talk to both parties." A500 said:

Understand, that sometimes what I may perceive as a concern or an emotional feeling, I might perceive as not being important in the big picture. I have to realize more that that may be what is driving that staff member to be who they are.

Managing Emotions

Mayer et al. (2002), define managing emotions as, "…at appropriate times, one feels the feeling rather than repressing it, and then uses the feeling to make better

149

decisions" (p. 19). Thematic responses from clients will be similar to understanding

emotions from the context that "emotions form a rich and intricately interrelated symbol

set…" (Mayer et al., 2002, p. 19). Client A100 describes her current staff as having "The

attitude that we've always done things this way so it is the best way." She feels that the

best way to manage her situation is to work with people individually knowing that the

current staff will be "hard to change." She feels that management of emotions will be

better over time and that "I think it's going to be better when I have more of my own staff

in here." Here she is referring to hiring new teachers as veterans retire.

A600 is a 25 year veteran administrator and shares views similar to A100. She

feels that managing emotions is hard. She says:

> One of the difficult things is for teachers to see the big picture of what is going on
>
> and I think until they see the big picture they don't always get the full sense of
>
> what s happening and so that can sometimes give the negative school climate I
>
> think also we have to watch for difficult parents and a particular number of
>
> students with special needs, that can lower moral and have a negative impact on
>
> school climate I think we have to take the time to be able to professionally
>
> develop the teachers for dealing with the situations that can come up so they can
>
> handle them and if their not so that the morale does not becoming very poor. I
>
> think also that a lack of time to deal with the teachers on an everyday basis and to
>
> connect with them personally everyday can lead to a very negative school climate
>
> so we have to make sure that we are finding the time to deal directly everyday
>
> with all the teachers in the building in making sure that their needs are met and we

are helping them to deal with all the things that we have to –that they have to deal with now that are very different from the way things used to be. I think also one other thing is that we have to be careful with the technology we have nowadays because of email and that sort of thing I think it is very easy to lose that personalization with everybody in the building so I think we have to be sure we are not letting technology take over to the extent that we are losing that personal communication with teachers on a regular basis.

A600 has a management style which accounts for personal connection with staff. She describes aspects of the job interfering with the positive daily interaction needed to maintain positive school climate in addition to managing the emotions of staff.   The emotions must first be understood in an effort to manage them. By losing the "personalization" we lose the emotional connection and can only guess emotions in problem-solving rather than clear interpretations of emotions from face-to-face contact.

A700 describes his management of emotions by working with people one at a time. He said that the most difficult management characteristic is that "you are not going to satisfy every single person." However, if their emotional needs are not met, then they can quickly encourage others to believe that problems exist and lead to a negative school climate. A700 laments that:

I would say one of the most difficult aspects of maintaining it *(school climate, my emphasis)* is taking the time to address situations in a timely fashion, taking time to celebrate successes, taking the time to acknowledge staff members and students for their successes. The most difficult aspect I would say is taking that time to do

151

that, to be reflective and take time to acknowledge people for the work that

they're doing. In taking that time, it will save you a lot of time down the road if

those things aren't addressed.

This insight parallels Mayer et al. (2002), where they describe, "managing emotions

involves the participation of emotions in thought, and allowing thought to include

emotions" (p. 19). By "taking time," school leaders can manage emotions of staff

through active participation through relationships. Therefore, management of emotions

directly impacts the school climate by addressing emotional needs.

High school principal A200 manages emotions similar to A700 where finds the

most difficult aspect of school and maintaining positive school climate is "negative

people." He has managed his staff well and has "accepted" the fact that negative people

may never change. He would like to say all staff is happy and satisfied; however:

From my last answer, the most difficult aspect of maintaining a positive school

climate is dealing with negative people, because no matter what you do or where

you go or what profession you're in, you're going to deal with negative people

and unfortunately we have people on our staff that are negative no matter what

you try to do or what direction you're headed in they will try to find a way to

prove you wrong. Thankfully, that's usually a minority. That's the most difficult

aspect of my job, dealing with those people who are ultimately negative and those

people are the hardest to change.

This described negative people 'headache' affects nearly all school leaders. Emotions

need to be channeled even if negative. The management suggestion from A200 is to keep

negative people "close" and use their energy, even though negative, to lead to positive

productivity.

High school principal A300 shares a similar viewpoint as A200. His management

style is to keep an ear out for "rumors." He manages by going to the "source" of the

rumor, and by doing so, prevents the "entire school" from being demoralized from

negative thoughts. He says, "You're more than likely not going to resolve the problem,

but at least you're listening." He also likes to "keep negative people close." He

understands that even when a problem is resolved, a negative person find a problem with

the solution to their first problem. It never ends; however, the negative person feels they

you have "listened."

Client A500 employs a management method that is best controlled by meaningful

dialogue between her and her staff. She finds the daily tasks of the job does not always

allow her to get "to those things" such as negative school problems. She understands that

by not managing the emotions people feel will lead to low morale, and that "affects

school climate." The daily grind of the school leader's job inhibits her to "provide what

the staff needs." She defines staff needs to include technology, answers to questions in a

timely manner, and consistency in providing those answers. She points that managing a

large staff is her "biggest hurdle." She views the largeness of the staff as a "difficulty" in

facilitating "meaningful dialogue on a consistent basis, knowing that somebody might be

having a bad day, or they might not understand what is happening with a particular

situation." By understanding that the emotional connection may be lost as result of he daily tasks of school leadership, she feels that school climate can be affected for the worse. Staff can view the leader as not caring; however, A500 tells her staff that this only happens when "I can't control" external influences of the job.

Maintenance. A must for positive school climate! School leaders problem-solve on a daily basis. Maintaining positive school climate involves a delicate balance of relationships, communication, and emotional recognition by school leaders of staff members. Mayer et al. (2002), state, "the ability to manage emotions successfully often entails the awareness, acceptance, and use of emotions in problem-solving" (p. 19). Client A100 said, "I have to go out of my way to make sure she feels I'm not angry." Thought of emotions has helped her in reaching out as leader to help a staff member. She continued by stating:

> I talked to them more so about what was broken before I tried to fix anything and I'm going easy in trying to make things easier for them, to make their life a little bit better; and therefore, it will improve the climate in the building- and hope that when it does come to bigger issues and district initiatives, they'll follow me and trust me. I have seen where it has gone opposite. I've seen people walk in and not understand, not take the time, and if you were outside the district that would be really important to figure out what was going on in that building. I'm fortunate; I already knew what was going on here. I think our maturity level was definitely affected.

154

By taking time to understand the 'mental state' of the staff, the school climate is positively impacted through the use of emotional awareness.

A300   maintains school climate through positive outlook. He said, "It doesn't matter if it's a faculty member, a student, if something is happening in the school it's up to the administrators to keep a positive outlook, even the most negative situation, try to present the positive in it."

A500 describes school climate as positive when the school leaders is able to "perceive access, and generate emotions." She said, the higher the EI of a school leader, the more it will "enhance" school climate. A600 responded similarly in saying, "I think the higher the EI is- I think it makes it easier to approach teachers on an individual basis…" She also said that this helps to "enhance" school climate.

A700 views high EI of a school leader as a positive way to manage school climate. He said:

I think as a school leader, you need to be able to have an understanding of the types of emotions that will come about in certain situations, so when you are talking about your staff, you need to be able to pull from those emotions...

He believes school leaders have to create a school climate that is positive, energetic, and inspired to affect student achievement. He said:

If you have teachers with that sense of urgency all year long your school climate is definitely going to be impacted, so you as a school leader knowing that you could initiate this sense of urgency in staff if you do that throughout the entire school year. Your climate is going to be very different, and that will impact

155

student achievement as well, because the students will take direct- they will see that in teachers and they will have an impact as well.

A800 describes high EI as a critical piece of positive school climate. He said, "To have a good emotional intelligence- to be able to read people, and access what's going on, only good things can happen out of that!"

School leaders have good EI when they are able to manage their own emotions. Maintenance of self emotionally will positively affect school climate, because repressing emotions causes the opposite desired outcome by definition (Mayer et al., 2002). A100 said, "I hear more things that I don't want to hear that can directly impact some of the decisions I make- and make me reflect on some decisions that I've made." Even though she hears things she does not want to hear, she continues to "talk with staff regularly." A200 maintains school climate "…by finding people to help me with the perceptions of my entire staff;" and A500 uses a like approach in maintaining positive school climate "through conversation, monitoring interaction between staff and staff and students, asking questions, allowing people to offer opinions…" This technique allows for awareness and acceptance of emotions in problem-solving leading to a positive school climate.

A400 said she found "it more challenging to maintain that daily climate or change that daily climate" if there is a negative culture in place. She described culture as "entrenched" as far as beliefs and philosophy of staff, and climate as something that changes daily like the" temperature."

156

Maintenance of staff is critical is promoting positive school climate. A100 said she "reflects" of her decision-making. She also maintains school climate through "…carefully considering the politics of everything." She said, "There is old quote, 'see things not as they are, but as we are'." She makes adjustments and problem solves to maintain school climate being "pretty honest and just tell it like it is." A600 maintains school climate by "helping teacher see the big picture."

Having high EI means to check emotions of self. A700, through reflection of self, views maintaining school climate through "…being more neutral, rather than show my emotions…" This ability opt control emotions keeps A700 from getting "caught up in situations" so appearance-wise, "…you are not taking one side versus another."

A200 added that, "…as a leader and being a role-model…," I must always focus on "…being positive no matter what…" This helps in positive school climate maintenance.

Self reflection of EI and how it impacts school climate are related according to the school leaders interviewed. A500 described maintaining school climate through self regulating her own EI. She said:

Based on the definition of EI that is provided I will try and be more aware of the emotions of others in my conversations and interactions, especially if I don't have a sense or a feeling of what they may be prior to those interactions. Ill try to be more aware just through body language, just through tone of voice, through the words that the people may be choosing- I'll be more aware of what they are- and

I'll also encourage staff to share their thoughts and opinions more frequently than

I currently do.

She submits, that if school leaders understand EI that, "school climate would only be

enhanced, not only for the teachers and students, but also for the school leader."

She adds:

I'm going to try to validate concerns regardless of my perception of their validity

more regularly so that I try and understand that sometimes what I may perceive as

a concern or an emotional feeling I might perceive as not being important in the

big picture I have to realize more that that may be what is driving that staff

member to be who they are here. So I need to validate those concerns more

regularly.

Visibility. Just for them to know that I'm there. School leaders will have a

difficult time discerning emotions of staff if they do not spend time with them. Using EI

to promote positive school climate is only productive if school leaders actually "see

staff." A100 says "you have to talk with your staff regularly." This gives a sense for what

their needs are as well a sense of what's happening in the building.

A300 said, "What I do is I start every morning and I walk around…and see

teachers…" He said he does this because "it helps me understand what's going on…"

both at home and in school, and "just for them to know I'm there." Since he has started

this it "makes the climate so much better."

A400 "seeks out people" to show her visibility in the school, while A500 is

visible through "conversation" and "monitoring interaction…" A700 said, "But one of

158

the best ways, really, is to be walking around and try to visually see it for yourself." He described "it" as "school climate."

A600 said school leaders need to be, "…sure we are finding time to deal directly everyday with all the teacher in the building…" Regular visits are critical in developing and maintaining positive school climate. According to A200, these visits will help build "teacher leaders" who will help in growth of a positive school climate.

Trust. Trust emerged as a sub-theme as described by some school leaders. The rationale for trust is rooted in improving school climate. A100 said by talking with staff and "trying to make things easier for them," her staff will "follow me and trust me!" A300 described in his strategy for building school climate, that staff, "have to trust me," and the decisions that are made. A400 said she began asking early on in teacher relationships, "Do you trust me?" She added that trust is needed before "she can proceed, because she knows that we have established that trust!"

Each of these scenarios depicts trust as being a factor in building a positive school climate. The other interesting facet of trust is that is can fall into any of the four branches of emotional intelligence. Trust and perceiving emotions are integrated by a person's ability to recognize an individual and how they are "feeling" about people (Mayer et al., 2002, p. 19). "Do you trust me?" is an example. Trust can be categorized as facilitating thought when "trust" is used to help problem-solve. Trust is linked to understanding emotions through the following example: If a person does not trust, it can lead to an argument, anxiety, and/or anger, if not clearly isolated as an identified emotion. Finally, trust and managing emotions are linked through a feeling where a person may state, "I

159

trust this person" as they make decisions. The feeling of trust allows for them to feel comfortable about their decision.

Celebrate!   Two school leaders cited celebrating achievement as a way of improving school climate. Successful schools contain successful attitudes and attitudes are recognized as an emotional response according to A600 and A700. A600, a 25 year veteran said that understanding EI allows for "recognition for the good things that are going on!" Therefore, "Celebrate achievement of teachers…, be aware of how they are feeling, what their interests are…" and this will "have a positive impact where they will want to try a lot harder to make changes." Her thoughts align to A700 where he said that, "…taking time to celebrate successes, taking time to acknowledge staff members and students for their successes," is important in a positive school climate. He adds, "In taking that time, it will save you a lot of time down the road…for acknowledging people for the work they're doing."

Clarification of Qualitative Results

The qualitative results indicated a correlation of emotional intelligence and school climate. The themes and sub-themes demonstrated in practice that school leaders' methods of guiding school climate are accomplished through employment of the emotional intelligence ability model (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). Perceiving emotions in one self and others surfaced as a theme where school leaders described situations that allowed them to make decisions based on how those around them were feeling. Sub-themes that developed from this major theme included "listening" and "personal relationships" and how they compliment positive school climate.

160

The theme "using emotion to facilitate thinking" was found through school leaders abilities to use their experiences to shape decisions that foster positive school climate. Sub-themes of using emotions indicated how school leaders "communicate" with staff and how "negative" people are dealt with in the effort to promote positive school climate.

School leaders demonstrated "understanding and controlling emotions" in the data provided through the experiences of their jobs. "Character" and "empathy" emerged as sub-themes, which were also indicated in the stories they described through the people they work with.

Finally, "managing one's own emotions" thematically encapsulated the four-branch ability model of EI as described by school leaders. School leaders provided detailed descriptive evidence of how they practically apply this branch in their daily routines. The sub-themes "maintenance" and "visibility" supported the major theme and gave closure to the qualitative data which indicated that emotional intelligence of school leaders is correlated to school climate.

Blending Quantitative and Qualitative Results

In analyzing both data sets, qualitative results contradicted the quantitative results. When Pearson correlations were computed, data indicated that EI was not linked to school climate; however, qualitative interviews suggested otherwise. Every school leader indicated that their EI directly impacts school climate. School leaders described this phenomenon by stating EI is correlated to "people skills," and another "it's all about

161

emotions…that helps the climate of the school," and "school climate would be enhanced" by having high EI.

Another quantitative finding indicated that SLEQ-R subscale scores indicated a significant negative correlation between EI and decision-making. This data indicates that the higher the EI of the school leader, the less they involve staff thus decreasing the positive perception of school climate. Qualitative data contradicts this finding, because the school leaders thematic descriptions of listen, inter/ intra relationships, communicate, and character all describe how they involve teachers in decision-making. One school leader said "I can't do it alone!" I need staff to tell what is good and bad about decisions.

The quantitative finding of females having better school climate than males, even though males had higher EI, did not surface qualitatively as indicated in the statistical data. The female school leaders indicated a keen understanding of EI as indicated in the descriptions of their school climate. The themes that emerged from analysis of the interview data came from both males and females. They had similar responses to the questions indicating that they use similar techniques in applying EI to foster positive school climate in their respective buildings regardless of gender.

When variables age, gender, administrative experience, and EI were analyzed, there was significant variance in school climate. This was confirmed through the qualitative data, in that all school leaders interviewed shared similar responses and ideas regardless of any of the variables analyzed.

When school leaders EI were categorized there was no significance in predicting mean SLEQ-R scores. However, there was significant difference for the mean subscale

162

decision-making for school leaders with below average EI. This indicated that the life experiences of the school leaders is such that their EI exceeded others even though they had lower EI scores. This was contradicted in the qualitative data as school leaders indicated responses such as "asking for input," regarding decisions and another stating, "I listen to my team leaders…they let me know what is going on." These two examples from school leaders fell into categories of above and below average EI.

Summary

This chapter presented and analyzed data both quantitatively and qualitatively. The statistical data used correlation coefficients and regression analysis to determine if school climate as perceived by teachers is linked to emotional intelligence of school leaders. Qualitative data was gathered from interviews and emerging themes were analyzed. The common themes from the interviews came from comments and opinions from practicing school leaders. The themes were tape recorded, transcribed, coded, and grouped thematically from the responses. Themes that were presented emerged from the data analysis and included perceiving, using, understanding, and managing emotions in oneself and others.

The Null hypothesis was rejected. Age, decision making, and administrative experience coupled with EI did show statistical significance as it affects school climate. Age showed a more positive influence while administrative experience had a negative influence. Experience in life seems more practical than true administrative experience. Statistically, decision making was correlated as a link between EI of school leaders to school climate as perceived by teachers; however, it was a negative correlation. In spite

of what the statistical analysis shows, results from the qualitative analysis suggests that respondents still believe that EI is a significant predictor of school climate. Chapter five will focus on the discussion and interpretation of the data analysis to address the study's three major research questions. There will be recommendations for further study and all findings will be summarized.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

This chapter will briefly review the research problem, purpose, and methodology

used throughout this study. A detailed summary of the results and discussion will follow.

Finally, the results will be linked to usability in practice and recommendations for further

research.

The research was conducted to determine if there is a correlation between

emotional intelligence of school leaders and school climate as perceived by teachers.

Data for the study was gathered from 14 school leaders who are principals in K-12 public

schools, and teachers from within the buildings of these school leaders. There were three

instruments used to collect data. The first instrument taken by school leaders was the

MSCEIT, a 141 item test which provided information on emotional intelligence. The

teachers completed the second instrument, the R-SLEQ, a 21 item survey which measures

school climate in likert scale format. The 21 item R-SLEQ is divided into five factors,

and each factor was correlated with emotional intelligence along with the entire R-SLEQ.

See Table 14 for EI scores and teacher participation. Teacher participation varied from

15% to 100%. The third instrument was an interview with 8 of the 14 school leaders. The

school leaders were interviewed individually in person or via telephone as a result of

long-distance. The interview questions were asked to learn more about school leaders

own emotional intelligence and their perceptions of how they use it in respect to the four-

branch model theory developed by Mayer and Salovey (1997).

Summary of Results

This study focused on fourteen school leaders in Northeastern United States, to determine if emotional intelligence is linked to school climate. Collectively, over 350 teachers, from 14 schools participated in this study. Teachers gave their perceptions of school climate. The quantitative data collected from the research is summarized as follows:

- The entire teacher population who took the R-SLEQ did so voluntarily to help their school leaders better understand what they believe to be the climate of their individual schools.

- The R-SLEQ was adapted to become the SLEQ-R. The SLEQ-R dropped the school resources factor in addition to one question from the decision-making factor based on reliability tests.

- The SLEQ-R items were chosen for use in this research as they were found to be internally consistent and reliable.

- School leaders EI scores were categorized with two having high average EI, six having low average EI, five scored consider improvement, and one in consider development.

- Pearson correlations indicated no significant correlation between school climate and school leaders EI.

- SLEQ-R subscale scores indicated a significant negative correlation between EI and the decision making subscale of the SLEQ-R.

166

- Emotional intelligence of school leaders was not a significant predictor of school climate. This was indicated through regression analysis where EI was not a strong predictor of school climate based on the SLEQ-R.

- Age, EI, gender, and administrative experience collectively accounted for a significant proportion of variance in school climate. This is based on the teacher's ratings of school climate on the SLEQ-R.

- Emotional intelligence predicting school climate was significant when combined with other variables.

- Gender proved to be the only significant predictor by itself.

- Analysis of the SLEQ-R subscale decision-making indicated that when variables were combined, there was a large variance in school climate. The individual variables (age, gender, year's administrative experience, EI) by themselves were not significant.

- Emotional intelligence scores from the MSCEIT were not a significant predictor of the SLEQ-R subscale decision-making. When EI was categorized as 'above' or 'below' average, there was significance as a predictor for EI to the subscale decision-making.

- Average MSCEIT scores were based on an above or below score of 90.

- Emotional intelligence scores and categorization of EI scores was not a significant predictor of school climate on their own. There was significance in combination with other predictor variables.

- Age, gender, and administrative experience were significant predictors of EI as assessed by the MSCEIT.

- Teachers indicated higher school climate ratings for female school leaders with the exception of the student relations subscale of the SLEQ-R.

- Emotional intelligence categorization was not a significant predictor of mean SLEQ-R scores. There was significant difference in the decision-making subscale for school leaders with below average EI compared with those who had above average EI.

- School leaders were categorized as 'above' and 'below' average in EI, and categorized into administrative experience with seven years as a cut off point. There was no significant difference in the SLEQ-R scores of school leaders based on administrative experience.

    The school leaders EI were the main focus of the study. All 14 school leaders took the MSCEIT, and 8 of the 14 were interviewed to get their perspective of EI and its link to school climate. The information is summarized as follows:

- Mayer et al. (2002) have found that young adults do not score as well as older adults. This did not hold true for this study.

- Experienced administrators did not do as well on the MSCEIT than newly appointed administrators.

- There were fewer female school leader participants in the study than male.

- There was a balance of male and female school leaders interviewed at four each.

- The themes that emerged from the interviews paralleled the four-branch ability model of EI as developed by Mayer and Salovey (1997). This included Branch 1 (perceiving emotions), Branch 2 (use of emotion to facilitate thinking), Branch 3 (understanding and controlling emotions), and Branch 4 (managing one's own emotions).

- Sub-themes that emerged under Branch 1 were listening and inter/intra personal relationships.

- School leaders described communication and negative people as sub-themes under Branch 2.

- Branch 3 sub-themes referenced character-kindness, respect, compassion as a key to positive school climate. Empathy was also listed as a sub-theme under this branch.

- Branch 4 revealed the sub-themes maintenance and visibility. Maintenance is in regard to relationships with co-workers.

- Trust and celebrate emerged as two smaller sub-themes as indicated by school leaders.

The results suggest areas for consideration. First, school leaders EI may not be accurately measured by one EI test. Multiple assessments may provide greater insight to the overall EI of participants. The MSCEIT is a valid and reliable test; however, unfamiliarity with EI, test anxiety, time of year the test was taken, time devoted to the

test, and fidelity in taking the test are all possibilities as to the overall scores on the test as indicated in Table 14. After the MSCEIT was completed, the researcher called and thanked the participant for their participation. Of the 14 school leaders, 6 of them used the word "strange" or "very strange" to describe the MSCEIT and three others used the word "interesting." The remaining five had similar adjectives such as "unusual", "different", and, "I never took a test like that!" in describing the MSCEIT test. This indicates that even with preparation according to the suggestions in the MSCEIT Users Manual, school leaders had never experienced such a test. It is reasonable to assume, that the test scores would be improved with a second administration of the MSCEIT, for EI can be learned.

The school climate survey (R-SLEQ) presented its concerns for accuracy in answers. Teachers who took the R-SLEQ did so confidentially with no way of tracking which teachers took the survey. For this reason, answers may reflect some inaccuracies as a result of the time of day the teachers took the survey, the time they had to devote to it, the type of day they were having or had, interactions with the school leader either minutes or weeks prior to taking the survey (especially if there was a negative exchange), the type of relationship that already existed between the teacher and school leader, the belief that taking the survey would have no effect on change-therefore having teacher's not want to participate, and concerns that the school may look bad if anything except positive answers were documented. In other words, teacher's perceptions may be influenced by relationships, preconceived ideas, their own emotional bank account, and opinions of their school leaders. Conversely, teacher's lack of participation in the study

170

could have been for any of these reasons as well. The teacher participation reflected a 51.7% completion rate of all the possible teachers who could participate. This mirrors the work by Johnson and Stevens (2001) where they had 51.8% return rate when validating the R-SLEQ. All participating schools had responses ranging from 15% to 100% (see Table 14). There were no schools that did not respond.

The interviews that eight school leaders participated in provided insight as to the practical application of EI in the school environment and its link to school climate. Interviews were well organized with plenty of time for the interviewees to answer questions. The appointments were set up with the school leaders at the time and place they requested. The researcher worked around their schedule to assure a comfortable environment with limited outside distractions. In some interviews, the interviewee started slowly and not much detail in answers; however, as the interview continued, the school leaders' comfort level became apparent and the interview became more of a dialogue. Facial expressions, body language, emphasis on words and situations, allowed the researcher to gain better insight into the four branches of EI through the answers of the school leaders. Telephone interviews were conducted for two of the eight interviews as a result of long-distance. The researcher could only gauge emphasis on words and situations in this case, and assumes facial expressions and body language, both of which were not documented for purpose of this research.

Table 14

School Leaders' EI and Teacher Participation

School leader	EI score	EI rank	Total teachers	Teachers participation
1	81.2	Consider improvement	52	25
2	84.68	Consider improvement	38	14
3	98.99	Low average score	44	25
4	78.64	Consider improvement	91	15
5	83.18	Consider improvement	43	21
6	102.17	High average score	27	24
7	106.11	High average score	18	18
8	99.94	Low average score	63	38
9	90.12	Low average score	39	23
10	99.8	Low average score	17	15
11	97.07	Low average score	60	26
12	57.5	Consider development	121	60
13	96.06	Low average score	33	27
14	98.4	Low average score	36	23

Discussion

This study was designed to determine if school leader's emotional intelligence

level was correlated to school climate as perceived by teachers. It has provided statistical

evidence and perceptions of this hypothesis from a school leader's perspective.

Emotional intelligence as linked to school climate did not hold true based on statistical

evidence; however, the practical application of such a belief was evident in the stories of

the eight school leaders interviewed. Two aspects of EI surfaced from this study. The two aspects are EI ability and EI behavior. In other words, the study indicated the four-branch ability model of EI in practice is used by school leaders as linked to school climate. The behavioral aspect indicated that school leaders have high EI and use this intelligence daily to guide decisions that affect school climate. It became apparent in the interview process, that school leaders use a multifaceted approach in using EI to create, develop, and maintain school climate. The school leaders discussed relationships with teachers as being important in the overall affect on school climate. This relationship is best defined as a professional, collegial union, who are working toward a single goal. In a word, the relationship is about "respect!" When teachers respect school leaders and vice versa, the school climate becomes positively affected, and that leads to positive outcomes for students.

The MSCEIT was used to assess emotional intelligence of school leaders. The test scores ranged from "consider improvement" to "high average." Of the 150 maximum points that can be earned on the MSCEIT, 14% of the scores were in the top third. While the MSCEIT is a valid and reliable instrument, the scores can be misleading. School leaders who scored in the bottom two-thirds were led to understand that the scores "reflect the quality of the response" (Mayer et al., 2002, p. 11). In other words, the scored items are based on expert responses, and the participants had there answers scored in relation to how the experts answered. If the MSCEIT was rushed through, poor testing conditions, or the school leaders is not a good test taker, the scores may not reflect the true ability of the participants EI.

173

The results of this study indicate that the higher EI did not equate with positive school climate. This may be the result of not fully understanding EI and how it can be used or how a school leader is currently using EI in the decision-making of the school. High EI based on one assessment does not guarantee that one fully understands EI, thus the difference in statistical versus practical significance. Teachers' perceptions of school climate did not correspond to the EI scores in every case, but every school leader indicated a "user friendly" version of EI in practice as described in interviews. Interviews also revealed that school leaders had a better working knowledge of EI and how it practically correlates to school climate based on their perceptions of situations they were confronted with in their respective schools in comparison to the MSCEIT. This working knowledge and understanding of EI in the field did not always equate to the highest MSCEIT score.

Other factors which may have had impact on the MSCEIT scores may have been the location where the participant took the test, the day of week, the time of day, personal interest in the test, type of day the person had, and other factors which some may define as "excuses," yet in reality are real influences which may affect outcomes. School leaders had a four week window to complete the MSCEIT. The on-line version of the test was taken at the desire of the participant within this four week window. School leaders who could not take the test during this window were accommodated with an extension. The test was completed at all different times throughout the day. The researcher does not know if these were optimal times for the school leader to be taking the test. Multi-Health

Systems (MHS) sent confirmation emails to the researcher of who completed the test, the time of day, and how long it took each respondent to complete the test.

The school leader's completion times of the MSCIET varied. Mayer et al. (2002) suggest it takes most participants 30 to 45 minutes to complete the test. The fourteen school leaders test completion times varied from 17 to 84 minutes. Mayer et al. (2002) state, "There are no imposed time limits, but respondents should complete the inventory at one sitting and work at a steady pace" (p. 10). When tests are scored, it is important to consider time-on-test when evaluating final scores. If the school leaders were at all disrupted, had a bad day, under stress, tired, or were surprised at the test, it may have affected the validity of the scores (Mayer et al. 2002). When scores were reported to school leaders, it was emphasized that this is one test and that, "MSCEIT scores change over time as the skills and abilities that produce those scores either improve or deteriorate with changing factors in the respondent's life" (Mayer et al., 2002, p. 10).

Teacher participation was critical in helping understand the climate in the schools of the school leaders who took the EI test. In all, 354 teachers participated in the R-SLEQ school climate survey out of a potential 682. Teachers voluntarily completed the 21 item R-SLEQ survey through www.surveymonkey.com. The researcher met with the faculties of each individual school and explained as per protocol the study and their part of it except where superintendent's suggested otherwise. After the protocol was reviewed, there was an opportunity for teachers to ask questions. There were two questions that were asked by two different faculties as clarification, and these were: (1) Will we see the

175

final results?, and (2) When will we get the results back? There were no questions by twelve of the fourteen faculties.

The R-SLEQ is the survey instrument that was used in this research to gather data regarding school climate. The R-SLEQ is a survey that went through several revisions before settling at 21 items. In preliminary data analysis, the five factors of the R-SLEQ were put through reliability tests as linked to EI. What was found was the 21 item R-SLEQ had five questions that were not used in computations as a result of their poor reliability for research purposes in correlating EI to school climate. The results in this study are from the SLEQ-R, which is the survey questions originally asked with the five removed for reliability purposes. The SLEQ-R consists of 16 questions. The School Resources factor was removed as well as one question under Decision-Making. No relationship existed between School Resources and EI; therefore, there was no justification to use that component. The 16 questions used were found to be internally consistent and reliable.

School leader scores on the MSCEIT were automatically scored at MHS. When all the scores were received, they were categorized according the MSCEIT User's Manual (2002). There was no link of EI category to school climate as responses rates from teachers are concerned. What was recognized is the school leaders with the highest EI also had the best response rate from teachers at 100% and 88%. This may indicate that the relationships are in place to allow for honest feedback from teachers which will be acted on by school leaders with integrity.

176

In response to the first research question, there was no significant correlation between school leaders EI and school climate. This could be explained in the categorization of EI scores. Twelve of the fourteen scores were between "consider development" and "low average range," which reflect the lower two-thirds of the MSCEIT. This indicates that EI may not be utilized as readily as school leaders realize. What stands out is that EI scores and school climate ratings based on teacher perceptions do not correlate. Interpretation of this data indicates that teachers do not have good school climate because the EI scores of the school leaders are low; therefore, by possessing low EI, school leaders are not affecting the school climate positively. However, there were teacher surveys completed which indicated positive school climate.

Now that school leaders have had the opportunity to take the MSCEIT test, a second administration after learned EI skills may produce a result which supports the hypothesis. Mayer et al. (2002) state, "Skill changes occur gradually, and it is likely that several months would be necessary before any detectable changes might occur" (p. 10). Emotional intelligence scores may have been affected for any of the aforementioned reasons earlier in this chapter.

Even though school leaders EI did not correlate to school climate as perceived by teachers as a whole, there were subscales of the school climate survey that did correlate to the EI scores. The decision-making subscale had a significant negative correlation to EI. In other words, the higher the EI of the school leader, the less they involved teachers in the decision-making process. This is interpreted as teachers wanting to be part of the team, sit on committees within the school, and be involved with decision that affect

177

student achievement. School leaders with high EI often feel it is their job to make the decisions alone, more of a "top down approach;" however, leaders with high EI recognize that the statistically significant correlation of this subscale should lead to the process of listening and involving teachers.

In regression analysis', EI was not a significant predictor of school climate for both the R-SLEQ and the SLEQ-R. This statistical evidence clearly is opposite what school leaders believes happens in practice. The low significance of EI predicting school climate causes further challenges to school leaders because each individual believes that they have high EI, and use EI in the daily operation of their respective schools as evidenced in the qualitative data. These are "high-achieving and highly intelligent professionals" (Mayer et al., 2002, p. 21). School leaders view their daily routine as contributing to school climate; however, since there are multiple aspects of personality, EI does not predict school climate based on this analysis, which indicates that other aspects of personality may contribute to school climate more so than EI alone. Mayer et al., (2002) defend this rationale by describing that many successful people have lower than average EI and "compensate" using other means in plying their job (p. 21).

Emotional intelligence did not predict school climate; however, there were variables that did indicate significant variance in school climate. These variables include age, gender, administrative experience, and EI. When these variables were analyzed compared to SLEQ-R scores, collectively they had significance in predicting school climate. This means that school leaders who have more experience as school leaders, are older age-wise, female, and with EI taken into account, have better school climate than

178

those who have lesser of these variables. With the exception of gender, the individual variables did not predict school climate. This research found younger, less experienced school leaders scored better on the MSCEIT. This is interpreted as these leaders having significantly different experiences in life which lead to them having higher EI. School leaders with lower EI are faced with a decision as to how they can improve their EI. This decision will be based on their own security in themselves, and how important it is for them to improve their own EI to help them become more successful.

Emotional intelligence by itself did not correlate to school climate; however, EI was a significant predictor of school climate when coupled with the variables of age, gender, and administrative experience. Regardless of individual differences in each variable, the EI scores based on the given situations of each school leader did predict school climate with the variables present. This means that school leaders with lower EI had impact on school climate as a result of combining the variables of their age, experience, and gender as much as those school leaders with high EI coupled with the same variables. Mayer et al., (2002) state, "Many highly successful people have lower than average EIQ scores" (p. 21). This means that there are other factors which make up personality. If a school leader with low EI wanted to improve a branch or overall MSCEIT score, they can "take a course or enroll in a training program in this area" (Mayer et al., 2002, p.3).

Analysis of the SLEQ-R subscale decision-making indicated that when the variables age, administrative experience, EI, and gender were combined, there was significant variance in school climate. School leaders are decision makers. Often in

179

schools, the more experiences one has, the better decisions are made as a result of having been in similar situations and having specific experiences to draw from. In education, most states require minimum years' of teaching experience before a person can become a school leader. This allows for educators to gain enough individual classroom experience before leading a school. Thus, the more experience a person has in education the older they are age-wise. Therefore, age and experience blend together as variables in supporting the finding. This finding further indicates that regardless of gender and EI score; age, administrative experience, EI, and gender collectively lead to significant variance in school climate in the subscale decision-making. In practice, this means the older, more experienced school leaders have impact when making decisions and involving the teachers regardless of gender and EI score alone.

Emotional intelligence scores on the MSCEIT were not a predictor of the SLEQ-R subscale decision-making. When EI was categorized as 'above' and 'below' average with cut scores of 90, there was significance for EI to predict decision-making. Ninety was chosen as a result of not having enough school leaders to use the categories in Table 2. This indicates that the EI levels of school leaders predict that the decisions that are made are based on the "ability to read people and access what's going on," and by doing so, "only good things can happen out of that." School leaders with high EI are more apt to involve teachers in decision-making in addition to using emotions to guide the decisions. This involves the school leader using empathy, communicating, listening, and interpersonal relationships with teachers to aid in the decisions. This ability allows for greater success of decisions because the leader uses their EI to guide them in

understanding the person and situation before deciding. In practice this means that the school leaders' experiences in life and work have shaped their ability to use emotions to help them make decisions.

Although categorized EI scores were not a significant predictor of school climate, there was significance in combination with other predictor variables. Age, gender, and administrative experience were significant predictors of EI as assessed by the MSCEIT. This is consistent with research which indicates that EI develops with age and experiences (Mayer et al., 2004a). As school leader's age, their experiences also increase, thus giving them more experiences to draw from therefore increasing the EI. Since EI can be learned, people who recognize they have low EI and want to improve EI to improve job performance or keep their job can participate in workshops to better themselves. This research describes males as having high EI relative to the variables. In other words, older males with administrative experience have higher EI scores than females.

Gender was the only variable which was a significant predictor of school climate as a stand alone variable. Males scored higher on the MSCEIT and had higher EI scores than females, however, females had better school climate. This indicates that females' abilities of perceiving, using, managing, and facilitating emotions in themselves and others led to better school climate than males. This means that males have adequate EI to impact school climate but are not using it to their advantage in the respect to promote positive school climate.

When gender was added into the variable mix when comparing EI to school climate, females had better school climate than males as a stand alone variable. This was clearly indicated in the data for all subscales of the SLEQ-R with the exception of the subscale Student Relations. This means that under the subscale, "Collaboration," females did a better job in coordinating classroom instruction between teachers, work with teachers regularly, communicate with them, emphasize teamwork, discuss individual students with teachers, and design instructional programs together with teachers. The subscale Decision-Making indicates that females are more likely to ask teachers to participate in decisions and listen to them about how the school should be run. The subscale Instructional Innovation indicates that females are more willing to encourage new teaching approaches, try new and different ideas, allow for innovation by teachers, and implement new curriculum materials. Males did have higher school climate ratings in the subscale Student Relations. This indicates that males have schools where students are more mannerly, respectful, and behaved; students are cooperative with their teachers, and students are more motivated to learn. This means males have better relationships with students, are visible, and students respect them as a result of the better behavior as perceived by teachers. Teachers perceived females as involving them more in Decision-Making and curriculum development of the school. Females also collaborate better than males according to teachers. In practice, this means females may have lower EI; however, they do a better job of promoting positive school climate as indicated in the subscale descriptors. Males have higher EI and use it to better work with students.

Emotional intelligence categorization was not a significant predictor of mean SLEQ-R scores. School leaders with 'below' average EI scores did have significant difference in the subscale decision-making compared to school leader with 'above' average EI. This indicates that school leaders of below average EI may have above average EI and not use it or realize the hidden talent that exists as a result of several factors. These factors include, age, experience, and knowledge of EI and how it is utilized within the four model ability theory. This also indicates that school leaders with below average EI use a multifaceted approach in handling situations, particularly Decision-Making. Mayer et al. (2002) have described that there are hundreds of parts that make up ones' personality; EI is one of those pieces. If EI is below average, people can still be successful as they rely on other aspects of personality to help them. This also means that school leaders with below average EI have experiences that those with high EI do not, which may have helped shape their abilities to make decisions that better impact school climate as reported by teachers. In analyzing and comparing EI scores of school leaders and SLEQ-R survey data, school leaders with below average EI scores had positive responses from some teachers on the SLEQ-R, and conversely, school leaders with above average EI scores had some negative responses. Overall, the abilities of school leaders who employ the four-branch EI model have greater impact in decision-making as indicated by teachers than just high EI scores. In practice, this means that teachers perceive school leaders with below average EI as leaders who rely on teamwork to accomplish initiatives in the school, who listen, communicate, and have relationships built around trust, rather than "top down approach." Fisher and Fraser (1990), describe

183

positive school climate as a way of increasing satisfaction and productivity in the school which comes as a result of the relationships between teachers and administrators.

School leaders EI categorization of 'above' and 'below' average were then analyzed based on years of administrative experience with seven years as a cut-off. School leaders were put into categories of above and below seven years administrative experience. This data indicated that administrative experience had no significant difference in school climate. This finding contradicts the evidence in the literature. This means school leaders can successfully perform the job duties regardless of experience, as there is no difference in outcomes of school climate based on administrative experience alone.

Mayer et al. (2002) have found that young adults do not score as well as older adults. This did not hold true for this study. EI should develop with age; however, in this case, EI made no significant difference based on the MSCEIT scores as related to school climate where age mattered. This means that young school leaders can immediately have impact on school climate regardless of EI score. The youngest school leaders with the least amount of administrative experience had the higher EI scores in this research. This was true of school leaders regardless of age and administrative experience. In practice, this means schools can hire leaders with no experience, as evidence from this research supports that where EI is concerned, the younger, in-experienced leaders have as likely a chance at successful school climate than veteran school leaders.

The aforementioned discussion is related to quantitative data; however, this research study also involved analysis of qualitative data. In spite of what the statistical

184

analysis show, results from the qualitative analysis suggest that respondents still believe that EI is a significant predictor of school climate. The quantitative data came from five questions for eight school leaders. There were four male and four female school leaders interviewed. Compared to other factors that have been known to influence school climate such as age, gender, and years administrative experience, is a school leader's EI more significant than the other factors that have been identified? School leaders' unanimously believe that EI is directly related to school climate. In analysis of the interviews with school leaders, four main themes emerged which directly corresponded to the four-branch ability model of Mayer and Salovey (1997). It was also discovered that the five emotional clusters as described by Weymes (2003) aligned with the themes and sub-themes found through the qualitative analysis. Eight other sub-themes were identified within the four main themes and will be discussed.

The first theme identified was, "perceiving emotions in oneself and others." In this theme, 100% of the school leaders interviewed described situations where they recognized the feelings of those around them and used their perceptions to make a decision. This often involved the school leaders' perceiving highly volatile emotional situations with teachers, and had to remain focused on the problem and not let the emotions affect the outcome. Perceived emotions ranged form "shock and disbelief," to "frustration and anger." Perceiving emotions was summarized as by one school leader as the first step in the process of using EI to improve school climate. He added that the next step is to use the emotional information. Weymes (2003) describes this as emotional self-awareness.

185

The sub-themes of perceiving emotions as indicated from school leaders was "listen," and "inter/intra personal relationships." Seven of the eight school leaders identified "listen" as an important aspect of EI as linked to school climate. "You have to keep your ears open!" was intently said by a rookie school leader, indicating the importance of this skill in the art of "emotional management." This ability was echoed from six others who not only listen, but ask questions first and then listen to better understand the nuances of problems that school leaders must handle on a daily basis.

Listening integrated directly into the "inter/intra personal relationships" with teachers as an aspect of using EI to manage school climate. Of the eight school leaders interviewed, 62.5% of them described relationships as needed to build and maintain positive school climate. Therefore, listening develops relationships of trust and caring; and when teachers perceive this in their leaders, they work better as they feel they have a voice and are heard. Cherniss (1998) describes relationships as effective when staff describes school leaders as "warm, caring, and positive" (p. 28). Weymes (2003) links strong relationships between leaders and staff as critical for success in organizations. Relationships which emphasize teamwork and collaboration lead to motivation and drive of people which leads to success in organizations (Weymes, 2003). One school leader said, "Happy employees are more productive employees." This is substantiated in literature where leaders who can read the emotions and perceptions of people tend to be happier and more satisfied with their jobs (Goleman, 1998a; Tucker et al., 2000; Zeidner et al., 2004). Weymes (2003) adds that by establishing positive leader/follower relationships, a "harmonious family-like" organization emerges (p. 331).

The second theme that emerged is titled, "Use of emotion to facilitate thinking." This theme is based on the thoughts of the school leaders based on the previous experiences they have had. This theme is also confirms other aspects of the quantitative analysis where the past experiences shaped the link between school climate as perceived by teachers and EI of school leaders. The qualitative themes confirm that age, gender, years' administrative experience and EI predict school climate based on SLEQ-R. The subscale Decision-Making was a significant predictor based on age, gender, year's administrative experience, and EI; and above and below average EI was a significant predictor to decision-making. In respect to the interview data, 75% of school leaders indicated they use emotions to promote positive school climate. The situations described where school leaders used emotions were based on past experiences or plain instinct. A female school leader said, she is "careful to decipher where the person is emotionally" in order to accurately make decisions based on the emotions she perceives. If not sure of her senses, more information is needed and that is where the sub-themes weave their way into this second theme.

The sub-themes "Communication," and "Negative people" emerged from theme two. Communication is most recognized through "conversation," and was discussed by 100% of the school leaders. The conversations allow for more information to be exchanged and school leaders to get a "better handle" on situations. This sub-theme is linked to relationships. One male school leader said of communication, "I equate that with people skills." People skills are critical in school business where you are surrounded by people daily. The sub-theme "negative people" emerged as a result of the constant

187

negative barrage of situations that occur daily in schools. Much like people who do not

take items to repair shops if they work, so people do not communicate positive to school

leaders, rather a majority of negative feedback is given. School leaders are in the people

management business and the job requires the handling of problems. In all, 87.5% of

school leaders described negative people. This causes them to always think of a way they

must use emotions to facilitate thinking. The school leaders' daily challenge is to

maintain positive school climate amidst people within that want to tear it apart.

Overcoming the perception, "we've always done things this way so this is the best way,"

is a constant work in progress for school leaders to overcome in maintaining positive

school climate. Negativity comes from "not handling situations timely," and "one person

who is not satisfied" to quickly spread like cancer among teachers, which affects school

climate. The way school leaders handle negative people is to "keep them close," and

communicate and try and build relationships with them. School leaders use the perceived

negative emotions to help them understand and handle negative people to direct a school

climate that is positive.

The third theme that emerged from 100% of the school leaders is called,

"Understanding and controlling emotions." In this theme, school leaders not only

understand emotions, but describe situations where they interpret the emotions

accordingly as decisions are rendered. Weymes (2003) calls this self-regulation of

emotions. The ability to understand teachers' emotions leads to positive school climate

according to the school leaders. School leaders describe understanding emotions as

important in handling emotionally charged situations with respect and kindness. Mayer et

al. (2004b), view relationships with staff, whether real or imagined as a bond brought out through emotions, and understanding of the emotions. One school leader said they felt the teacher was "uncomfortable and nervous." By understanding these emotions, the school leader was better able to confront the teacher with warmth and caring and diffuse a situation to better accomplish the desired goal. If the school leader had misunderstood the emotions, then, they come across as a non-caring person. This attitude quickly is communicated among staff thus having a negative impact on school climate. However, since the school leader handled the situation with empathy and compassion, the school climate is maintained and could increase as a result of the respect given to the teacher. One school leader said of a given situation, "I thought it was very important to stay calm and treat her with respect," rather than "rip her out." A similar response came from another school leader who was ready to fire a teacher; but when they saw how visibly upset the teacher became "I changed," my demeanor and became compassionate and kind.

The school leaders' understanding of emotions led to the emergence of sub-themes, "Character- respect, kindness, compassion," and "empathy." Half of the school leaders identified an aspect of character as a direct cause to positive school climate. Cherniss (1998) states, "Astute administrators have long recognized that effective leadership depends as much on character as on cognition" (p. 28). They described stories where character impacts school climate through their ability to decipher emotional meanings, transitions, and situations (Mayer et al., 2002). Tone of voice, body position, and body language were noted when school leaders were describing the scenarios they

189

had experienced. As one school leaders described her situation, she went from talking loud and direct to back at that point in time when she said to the teacher softly, "I know change is hard, it' s hard for me, it's hard for you," and she continued to relate compassion for the person rather than demonstrate "a lack of bedside manners." This is best described as humanistic awareness. The decisions, regardless of severity, were accepted as a result of the kind, respectful, compassionate delivery which was a direct result of the school leaders' ability to understand and control their own emotions.

Empathy was described by 100% of the school leaders interviewed. Goleman (1998b) calls empathy an emotional competency as one piece of his model of EI. "See it through their eyes!" became a sub-theme of understanding and controlling emotions. One school leader stated, "By putting yourself into a position to see it from each perspective…" allows for this understanding aspect of emotions; and to "stop and think about what they are actually feeling," is part of controlling one's own emotions so as not to take an immediate side or over-react. By seeing "what is happening" through the eyes of the staff, and asking questions of staff are helpful components in building positive school climate. Weymes (2003) views empathy as an integral skill needed by leaders. Empathy leads to better understanding of others thus leading to success in organizations. School leaders view EI and school climate as related in concert with the stories they have told.

The fourth theme which emerged linking EI to school climate is, "Managing one's own emotions." Seventy-five percent of school leaders interviewed described situations where they used feelings to make better decisions. Their feelings come from

190

the professional relationships developed with staff and these relationships allow for honest feedback. School leaders use EI to interpret feelings to get to the heart of the matter to solve problems and thus make better decisions. School leaders who do not manage their own emotions are viewed as weak-minded, and incompetent. When leaders are perceived as wanting to do all for self-promotion, school climate suffers as the element of "team" is lost. Managing emotions also involves maintenance and visibility with and among staff.

Maintenance and visibility became sub-themes of managing emotions. School leader A300 said that no matter what happens, "It's up to the administrator to keep a positive outlook." A600 said that the higher EI a school leader has, the easier it is to approach teachers to solve problems, and this leads to a more positive school climate. By understanding one's own emotions and managing them effectively, school climate becomes positive and energized as described by A700. Maintenance of school climate is accomplished by interactions with teachers and helping them understand "why" decisions are what they are. Every school leader cited maintenance as an aspect of positive school climate. When school leaders get busy and teachers sense that the leader does not have time for them, climate tends to slip and grumbling begins among teachers' because the perception is the school leader does not care. Managing one' sown emotions also involves visibility of school leaders. Teachers need to know leaders are there to support them. Being visible improves school climate because of relationships are fostered as a result of presence. In all, 87.5% of school leaders identified visibility as a critical piece of positive school climate.

Finally, two smaller sub-themes emerged which are also a part of having positive school climate. Trust and celebrate are these two smaller sub-themes. Trust was specifically stated by 37.5% of the school leaders. Leaders view this aspect of school climate being correlated to how one manages their own emotions. Trust was described as needed before anything can move forward. If teachers do not trust their leader, the school climate will suffer. Celebrate was described by 25% of school leaders as being an important piece of school climate. If people and successes are not recognized, the tasks become viewed as mundane with no consideration for the human element of the successes. The adage, "success breeds success" is alive and well in school campuses. When school leaders capitalize on recognition, all work harder as teachers feel like they make a difference. Happiness in jobs is brought about by the climate where people work, not always the dollar they earn.

There was tremendous overlap in qualitative responses that were analyzed. It was at this point that saturation of the data became evident and the integration of the four-branch model was being implemented by all school leaders; even though they did not realize it prior to this research, or did it correlate statistically. It is for these reasons qualitative findings contradicted the quantitative data.

Even though the quantitative measure indicates that there is no link between EI and school climate, the qualitative data indicates there is a correlation. The themes and sub-themes that emerged indicated that school leaders correlate EI to school climate. The four-branch ability model of EI was the essence of the four main themes while sub-themes were also supported by previous research. Quantitative data indicated significance

192

in some areas of EI and school climate; however, the main question asking if EI of school leaders is correlated to school climate as perceived by teachers was rejected.

Final Conclusions

The fourteen school leaders who answered the invitation to participate in this research were encouraging. They all indicated a desire to learn about themselves, their schools, and find ways to improve them. They were all quick to return phone calls, set up meetings, take tests, and gave the researcher access to their faculty.

Teachers were inviting and respectful in the faculty meetings held as the study was explained. Teachers indicated their willingness to participate in the research as they too wanted to learn about their school and be part of the improvement of it.

Overall, school leaders indicated a passion for their jobs, a commitment to their staff, and an open-minded outlook to see improvement for the benefit of student achievement through their participation. School leaders indicated belief that their own EI has a direct impact on the school climate in spite of the statistical analysis. Teacher responses on the school climate survey indicated that they have good school climate in each of their respective buildings; however, they all have room to improve.

Limitations

This study has provided information linking EI to school climate. In spite of the findings, there are limitations on the data presented. These limitations give more insight to the delicate nature in which data exists. The first limitation exists in the instruments. The MSCEIT is a valid and reliable test; however, the EI which it measures is only as valid and reliable as the seriousness from the test-taker who took it. School leaders did

comment on the difficulty and "strangeness" of the test, and other previous factors identified such as date, time of day or week, and sincerity of effort are all possibilities as to the quality of the data collected.

The R-SLEQ taken by the teacher's shared similar concerns as the MSCEIT, the only difference being teachers took the survey instead of school leaders. The teacher answers could contain inaccuracies due to relationships with the school leaders, the type of day or week the teacher had, if any disagreement took place prior to the survey, and other negative influences which may affect outcomes. The threat does exist that a teacher or teachers could have deliberately put opposite information in the survey to cause anguish to the school leader. Another limitation is that more teachers could have completed the survey. Reasons teachers did not complete the survey may be they had no time, feel their answers would not change anything, feel school climate is already good, or because of the relationship with the school leader as it existed that day.

The five interview questions of the qualitative study also pose its own set of limitations. Even though the questions were piloted; comfort level with the researcher, time of day or week the interview was scheduled, incidents prior to the interview, and concerns for how the data may be used may have led to anxieties and affected the answers.

Other limitations include the low N= 14 of school leaders. Due to the complexity of the study and coordination among both school leaders and teachers, the small N was chosen through non-random sampling. A larger N could have increased the statistical significance in the research. The researcher settled on 14 as research studies linking EI to

school climate were not found as a literature basis for this research other than independently from each other.

Another limitation of the study was to not include teachers in the interview process. This could have given more qualitative insight to EI and school climate. Asking teacher questions about their school leaders EI is another way of assessing EI. The MSCEIT is a valid and reliable tool; however, to better enhance results, a more in depth assessment of EI may be needed to capture the EI of the school leaders. Another area that needs to be evaluated is how school climate is measured. In addition to teachers, parents, students, support staff, and other community stakeholders need to have their perceptions heard to better gauge EI of school leaders and correlate to school climate.

Age more positively influenced EI, while administrative experience negatively influenced EI. Shortcomings of the data included the low N = 14 of school leaders participating in the research did not lead to statistical significance; however, due to the complexity of the study and coordination to make this research happen, the results did provide insight in that female school leaders EI is significantly linked to school climate factors. Factors included such areas as Collaboration, Student Relations, Decision-Making, Decision-Making Revised, and Instructional Innovation.

In resolving any misleading elements within the research, EI and school climate were not correlated. What was found was that the gender differences did prove to correlate, which was not hypothesized originally. The inconsistencies would be that the original R-SLEQ was altered after reliability tests were run in relation to the EI of school leaders. The original 21 item survey was adapted to 16 questions. This does not

contradict what the findings are; it only enhanced them as being statistically valid and reliable. The reason for eliminating the school resources factor from the R-SLEQ was that there was no justification for that component as related to EI after reliability tests were computed (Table 3).

Implications for Practice

Positive school climate is accomplished through a team effort of all stakeholders which is led by the principal. This research indicates that school leaders EI and school climate as perceived by teachers is not correlated as determined by the statistical analysis. The statistical analysis did provide information indicating significance in SLEQ-R subscales factors, and variables when collectively correlated to EI of school leaders. Gender also surfaced as a significant predictor of EI and school climate. In spite of the overall finding that EI and school climate are not linked, school leaders believe that EI and school climate are linked.

Statistically speaking, school leaders who review the data from this research will be able to self-reflect that females have better school climate than males. Males will have a decision to make as to the way they will approach involving staff to help improve school climate. This will happen on an individual basis and be determined by the internal beliefs of how school leaders accept this finding.

One aspect of this is based on the subscale Decision-Making. Teachers indicated that males do not involve them in the decision-making process as much as female school leaders. In practice, male school leaders will need to understand what the feelings are of the teachers based on this data, and then use the feeling to involve them in the decision-

making process as females do. Males may view females as "not in charge" if they cannot make a decision, and view females as "weak," if they are not making the decisions. However, to improve school climate, the involvement of staff in this process is a key component regardless of gender.

Even though females had better school climate, males got along better with students than females as indicated in the subscale Student Relations. In practice, females need to reflect on this and determine why they are not perceived as getting along with students as well as males. Common interests, how and what is said to students, and ability to gauge emotions of students could indicate the reasons for this difference. Perhaps the males are more visible than females and have more interaction with students indicating a "better bond" between them and students.

Another statistically practical use for this information lies in the variables. The variables EI, age, gender, and year's administrative experience had significance in predicting variance in school climate. In practice, this means when all the variables are applied to school climate as perceived by teachers, school climate is predicted to be better than any of the variables alone. Therefore, school leaders who may have low EI based on the MSCEIT can still have good school climate by virtue of their experience, age, and gender. It is important to recognize that individual variables were not significant predictors of school climate with the exception of gender.

Gender as a standalone variable indicates in practice that females have better school climate than males. Practically, males would need to be aware of the subscales where they are not significantly linked and work to overcome the perceptions of staff.

This would include speaking with staff, calling attention to the deficit and specifically indicating that the school leader recognizes their own awareness of what staff "feel" and how they plan to improve this aspect based on teacher responses.

When EI is categorized as above and below 90 averages, decision-making can be predicted. This has implications in practice in that if school leaders are below average, they can learn EI and improve through training. This indicates that the life experiences of the individual leader coupled with the work experiences on the job help in predicting decision-making.

Another finding indicated that age did not matter as related to school climate. This indicates that when hiring a school leader, "fit" is as important as previous experiences in life and the work place. Fit refers to how the person will be accepted among the group based on communication, relationships, compassion, kindness, and other traits that emerged as themes of school leaders EI. The person who is hired for the job must have a good attitude, be willing to work for all stakeholders, and have a good moral and ethical "compass." In other words, where school climate is concerned, age of the school leader does not matter.

Several themes and sub-themes emerged from analysis of interviews with school leaders indicating that EI and school climate are linked. These themes represent the actual day-to-day actions and decisions that school leaders make. This contradicts what the statistical analysis indicated. Reasons for this contradiction may include lack of attention to emotional actions, school leaders' knowledge of EI, and a need for professional training in EI. These contrary reasons and others are detailed in recommendations for

198

further research. The implications for the emergent themes in practice indicate that when school leaders apply the four-branch ability model of EI, school climate is maintained or improved.

In practice, school leaders described how they perceive emotions in one and others. They indicated that listening is an important ability in school climate. Teachers will not always agree with the decisions that are made by school leaders; however, by listening and soliciting input from staff, the teachers feel like they have a "voice" and that their concerns are at least examined prior to a decision. Knowing that they have been heard allows for better acceptance of the decision because of the ability to listen.

Listening also helps foster positive relationships. Weymes (2003), describes school leaders primary purpose is, "…to influence the feelings and emotions of those associated with the organization" (p. 320). By creating, developing, and maintaining positive relationships with teachers, school climate is improved as all involved feel they are making a difference in it. The relationship becomes the impetus for perceiving emotions so that both school leader and teacher understand each other personally and professionally.

School leaders who use emotion to facilitate thinking use EI to better communicate with staff. Communication allows for the school leader to understand what the person in whom they are talking is feeling; and this is accomplished by reading facial expressions and body language, and using this information to aid them in the decision-making process. Communication can be written and verbal. Verbal communication allows for the best opportunity to determine emotions and be more accurate in

deciphering emotions. Written communication such as emails, letters, or notes do not always indicate emotion and leave one speculating in these impersonal types of exchanges.

Through open communication, relationships' come back into play as a forum for school leaders to work with staff and complete a process of weaving the various sub-themes into using EI to create positive school climate. School leaders make a difference in the school climate by perceiving and using emotions in decision-making and in communicating with teachers. This is because the people with whom they are communicating are heard, and know that the school leader understands them as messages are communicated. This leads to relationships that prosper professionally and personally, thus leading to better school climate.

This practice of communicating and building relationships helps manage school climate and deal with negative people. Negativity of teachers can destroy the school climate through their discussions, complaining, lack of work ethic, and other disagreements. By keeping negative people "close," school leaders communicate with them, try and build relationships with them, and try and involve them to better combat the negativity, with a hope that they will better understand the goals and vision for what the school leaders have set. "It's all about emotions," and understanding emotions to get people to work as a team for the betterment of school climate.

Understanding and controlling emotions is another practice that school leaders employ. In practice, this looks like leaders who empathize with staff, and have resounding character traits such as kindness, compassion, and respect for others and self.

The school leaders who control their emotions do not "rip-out" people even though they may want to. They manage their emotions so well that one cannot tell if they are happy or sad, aggravated or calumny. Teachers understand and respond to this respect. Teacher's set the same expectation of students in their classroom. The "give respect get respect" mantra exists as related to school climate. Teachers want leaders that are in control of themselves. Principals are viewed as the leaders of the school and represent the organization; therefore, the standard for understanding people and being in self-control rise to become traits that symbolize the leader. School leaders who use EI in practice have positive school climate.

When school leaders talked about empathy, they were indicating the ability to walk in the footsteps of other people. They asked themselves, "How would I want to be treated in a similar situation?" Emotional intelligence is steeped in this cognitive process as it assists school leaders in the emotional thought of self and those they work with. "See it through their eyes!" These five words summarized the practice of empathy. This is a humanistic response to working with others and continuing in the theme of build, create, and manage relationships with teachers. As a result of empathetic responses, school climate is viewed as improving as indicated by school leaders.

The practice of managing one's own emotions is practiced in being visible to teachers and maintaining relationships with them. This allows for school climate to prosper, because it is at this point that school leaders are not viewed as "sitting behind the desk or hiding in the office." The school leaders' visibility helps in maintaining relationships. When school leaders are visible in the school building, teachers will talk to

them, and by talking relationships are built, created, or maintained, which leads to the school leaders to better perceive, use, understand and manage the emotional responses from others and self. The "trust" that is tendered between teachers and school leaders is enhanced through the EI of the school leader, therefore improving school climate.

School leaders cited recognition of teachers who have excelled above the normal expectation as a practice that improves school climate. The schools leaders who recognize the value of EI and use it to positively enhance school climate help teachers grow professionally, improve relationships between them, and improve the school climate. This is supported by Hughes (2002) who said that leaders must give direction, build commitment, and face and adapt to challenges. Leaders with high EI have an advantage over those who do not in creating an environment conducive to success (Hughes, 2002). All of the themes and sub-themes discovered in this research interrelate. The EI and school climate growth that takes place is accomplished through professional teamwork, professional development in the area of interpersonal relations, EI workshops and trainings, and open dialogue at faculty meetings. This is all for the sake of using EI to improve school climate.

Recommendations for Further Research

Recommendations for further research should be continued to determine if EI is correlated to school climate. Although this research had contrary results between the quantitative and qualitative findings, it does not rule out that EI and school climate may not be linked due to limitations of the study as aforementioned. These limitations may also include lack of attention to emotional actions from school leaders, the school

leaders' knowledge and understanding of EI in theory, and professional training to improve EI for school leaders. Further investigation based on the following recommendations may help determine if EI and school climate are linked.

As a result of this research, it is clear that further study needs to occur to determine if EI and school climate are related. Based on this research and the MSCEIT data, school leaders had an overall average level of EI; however, in practice, school leaders believe they are performing the skills and abilities to direct school climate through use of their EI at a higher level. This indicates that this group of school leaders may need to have their EI retested to determine if quantitative improvements of EI occur. Teachers could retake the R-SLEQ and determine if there is change in the statistical evidence to support EI and school climate being correlated. This same research study should be replicated using a larger number of school leaders and teachers.

Replication of this research may determine if school climate is linked to EI with two additional modifications. The first modification is to increase the number of school leaders in the study. Even though the current research indicated a lack of statistical significance linking EI to school climate, it may have been to the low N. By inviting more school leaders, and having the faculties of the school leaders take the school climate survey, significance may be proven linking EI of school leaders to school climate as perceived by teachers. A minimum of 30 school leaders and their faculties may allow for greater statistical power when correlating. The second modification would be to randomly interview teachers of the school within the school leaders. Questions would need to be developed and piloted for teachers regarding the school leaders EI; and how

the school leaders EI affects school climate. The piloted questions can then be asked of random faculty members within the schools of the school leader; or, teachers could volunteer and be interviewed individually or in small groups.

Another recommendation for further research would be to analyze the four individual branch scores from the MSCEIT in relation to the five factors of the school climate survey. By correlating the individual MSCEIT branch scores to the school climate factors, strengths of the school leaders EI would be more apparent as related to school climate. This would be a correlational study linking EI branch scores to factor scores of R-SLEQ. This may indicate if school leaders EI is stronger in one branch over another as correlated to school climate. Strengths and weaknesses in a particular area may surface of school leaders which in turn may lead to school leaders being trained in a branch that correlates weaker than others. The training may improve school climate through the EI professional development the school leader learns.

Another option similar to the preceding idea may be to test part of the MSCEIT and correlate the branch and task scores to the factors of the R-SLEQ to determine if a relationship exists. Each branch has two tasks. School leaders can take a specific branch of the MSCEIT. The results can be analyzed which may determine if one or all four branches of the MSCEIT are correlated to school climate. This may lead to results of specific strengths in school leaders EI by branch. The results of this research may lead to better preparation programs for aspiring school leaders and current school leaders. This may also lead to a better hiring process as questions can be tailored around the branches and tasks to better understand potential school leaders EI.

Further research options also include the need to test all groups within a school using the R-SLEQ and correlate in relation to the school leaders EI. These groups include, support staff, parents, board members, community members, bus drivers, and students. The data collected from these groups would better indicate school climate, for school climate does not exist through the school leaders and teachers alone; rather, an entire team of people working together to promote success of students. Individuals from these groups can be interviewed to qualitatively determine perceptions of school climate as correlated to EI of school leaders.

A final recommendation revolves around three approaches which may improve school leaders EI, thus improving school climate. The first two approaches are for school leaders to receive EI professional development for both aspiring and current school leaders. The third approach is incorporating assessment of emotional knowledge in the hiring practices of schools. By focusing on emotional knowledge and how it is applied in the school, leaders can better understand emotions of others as they render decisions. The leadership development may be obtained through a variety of means such as internships and practicum's, various experiences in different settings with students, parents, and communities, seminars, conferences, and surveys. The research using these approaches would be pre and post training; or comparison to school leaders who have received EI training as analyzed against those who did not.

Hiring practices may lead to school leaders EI being linked to school climate through investigating questions asked during interviews of emotional situations and how and what school leaders would look for in answering the emotionally situational

205

questions. The results of this type of study may even produce a sample hiring protocol in searching for emotionally competent school leaders. School leaders could even be given mock interview scenarios and asked to play out how they would handle the situation. Another option may even include a brief EI test. The recommendation to use these ideas may lead to a link between EI and school climate.

EI can be measured using several instruments. Future research recommendations would include measurement of EI using more than one instrument, and school climate surveys being given to all groups within a school organization. Follow- up studies can then be conducted after EI training for the improvement of school leaders. The school climate can then be linked to one or all aspects of school climate such as character of school, classroom climate, student achievement, and one or all factors of the R-SLEQ.

Summary

Emotional intelligence and school climate independently have many studies supporting valid and reliable instruments to measure each. The four-branch model of EI provides valuable insight as to the perception, use, management, and control of emotions in oneself and others. When these abilities are put into practice, school climate improves. School climate as perceived by teachers provided information about how teachers view their school leader's ability to collaborate, relate to students, make decisions, and bring in innovative instructional idea. Although statistical evidence does not fully support the idea that EI and school climate are linked, school leaders believe that both are correlated based on the EI level of the school leaders.

School leaders qualitatively indicated that their use of EI to guide and direct

school climate exists in the way they handle the complex problems they face in the daily operation of their respective buildings. They described situations where they listen, communicate, demonstrate character, form and maintain relationships, are visible, acquire trust, and make empathetic decisions. When school climate information of school leaders EI was statistically compared to school climate from teachers' survey responses, it was indicated that male school leaders had higher EI while female school leaders had better school climate. This was for overall school climate. Sub-scale scores indicated significance linking EI to school climate in some areas, but not all. It is certain that teachers' beliefs of school climate are based in part on the behaviors and attitudes of their school leaders. This may or may not be related to their EI as there are hundreds of aspects of personality that make up a person with EI being a small part of the cognitive abilities of school leaders.

As school leaders reflect on the EI information from this research, and as information of school climate is shared with faculty, both groups need to strive for relationships that will prosper the school. Albeit, school leaders have the brunt of the task in creating, building, and maintaining relationships with teachers, it is a "two-way street" as school climate is concerned. The level of professionalism of teachers must increase to improve school climate, even in schools where positive relationships exist. Both school leaders and teachers need extend hands to each other to promote good example, to be role-models, to exemplify the professional standards as set forth in most school systems, to be moral and ethical in the treatment of others, and use this relationship to better student achievement. Schools must be places where leaders: gain credibility through self-

regulated behavior, empathize, build trust, challenge and support others, visionary, team

players, care, and share leadership (Kouzes & Posner, 2000). This allows for school

climate to improve as a result of "relationships that flourish" (Weymes, 2003).

REFERENCES

Akers, M., & Porter, G. (2003). Your EQ skills: Got what it takes. *Journal of Accountancy, March* 2003, 65-69.

Aldridge, J. M., Laugksch, R. C., & Fraser, B.J. (2006). School-level environment and outcomes-based education in South Africa. *Learning Environ Res, 9*, 123-147.

Anderson, C.S. (1982). The search for school climate: A review of research. *Review of Educational Research, 52*, 368-420.

Antonakis, J., Avolio, B.J., & Sivasubramaniam. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full range leadership theory using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *Leadership Quarterly*, *14*, 261-295.

Ashkanasy, N., & Dasborough, M. T. (2003). Emotional awareness and emotional intelligence in leadership teaching. *Journal of Education for Business*, 79 (1), 18-23.

Averill, J.R. (1992). The structural bases of emotional behavior: A metatheoretical analysis. *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, 13, 1-24.

Avolio, B.J., & Bass, B.M. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 72*, 441-463.

Barbuto, Jr., J. E.; & Burbach, M. E. (2006). The emotional intelligence of transformational leaders: A field study of elected officials. *The Journal of Social Psychology,* 146(1), 51-64.

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

Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational Leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bernstein, L. (1992). Where is reform taking place? An analysis of policy changes and school climate. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 14*, 297-302.

Boyatzis, R., Goleman, D., & Rhee, K. (2001). Clustering competence in emotional intelligence: Insights from the emotional competence inventory, unpublished paper, with permission from the authors, Case Western University.

Brody, N. (2000). History of theories and measurements of intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of intelligence*, (pp. 16-33). New York: Cambridge University.

Brookover, W.B., Schweitzer, J.H., Schneider, J.M., Beady, C.H., Flood, P.K., & Wisenbaker, J.M. (1978). Elementary school social climate and school achievement. *American Educational Research Journal, 15*, 301-318.

Boone, R.T., & DiGiuseppe, R. (2002). *Emotional intelligence and success in professional graduate programs in psychology.* Paper presented at the International Society for Research on Emotions, July, Cuenca, Spain.

Burbach, M.E., Barbuto, Jr., J.E., & Wheeler, D.W., (2003, April) Linking an ability model of emotional intelligence to transformational leadership behaviors. *46th Annual Midwest Academy of Management Meeting.* St. Louis, MO.

Carson, K.D., Carson, P.P., & Birkenmeier, B.J. (2000). Measuring emotional

  intelligence: Development and validation of an instrument. *Journal of Behavioral*

  and applied Management, 2, 32-44.

Cherniss, C. (1998). *Social and emotional learning for leaders*. Educational Leadership.

  Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, April.

Constantine, M. G. & Gainor, K. A. (2001). Emotional intelligence and empathy: Their

  relation to multi-cultural counseling knowledge and awareness. *Professional*

  School Counseling, (*5*), 1096-2409.

Cooper, R. K., & Sawaf, A. (1997). *Executive EQ Emotional Intelligence in Leadership*

  and Organizations. New York: Grosset/Putnam.

Cresswell, J.W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five*

  traditions. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cresswell, J. & Fisher, D.L. (1999). *A school level environment study in Australia*. Paper

  presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research

  Association, April, Montreal, CA.

 Davies, M., Stankov, L., & Roberts, R.D. (1998). Emotional intelligence: In search of an

  elusive construct. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* (75), 989-1015.

Dearborn, K. (2002). Studies in emotional intelligence redefine our approach to

  leadership development. *Public Personnel Management*, 31(4), 523-530.

Docker, J.G., Fisher, D.L., & Fraser, B.J. (1989). Differences in psychosocial work

  environment of different types of schools. *Journal of Research in Childhood*

  Education, 4, 5-7.

Dulewicz, V., & Higgs, M. (2000). Emotional intelligence: A review and evaluation study. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 15*(4), 341-372.

Dulewicz, C., Young, M., & Dulewicz, V. (2005). The relevance of emotional intelligence for leadership performance. *Journal of General Management. 30*(3), 71-86.

Elias, M.J., Weissberg, R.P., Frey, K.S., Greenberg, M.T., Haynes, N.M. Kessler, R., et al. (1997). *Promoting social and emotional learning: Guidelines for educators.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Fisher, D.L., Docker, J.G., & Fraser, B.J. (1986). *Assessment of teachers' perceptions of school level environment.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, April, San Francisco, CA.

Fisher, D.L., & Fraser, B.J. (1990). Validity and use of the school level environment questionnaire. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Research Association, Boston, MA, April 16-20, 1990, 1-28.

Fisher, D.L., & Fraser, B.J. (1991). Validity and use of school environment instruments. *Journal of Classroom Interaction, 26*, 13-18.

Fisher, D.L., Fraser, B.J., & Wubbels, T. (1993). Interpersonal teacher behavior and school climate. In T. Wubbels & J. Levy (Eds.), *Do you know what you look like? Interpersonal relationships in education* (pp. 103-112). London: The Falmer Press.

Fisher, D., & Grady, N. (1998). Teachers' images of their schools and perceptions of their work environments. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 9*(3), 334-348.

Fraser, B.J. (1999). Using learning environment instruments to improve classroom and school climates. In H.J. Freiberg (Ed.), *School Climate: Measuring, improving and sustaining healthy environments (*pp. 65-83), Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Fraser, B.J., & Rentoul, A.J. (1982). Relationships between school-level and classroom-level environment. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 28*, 212-225.

Fraser, B.J., Williamson, J.C., & Tobin, K.G. (1987). Evaluating alternative high schools in terms of their classroom environments. *Studies in Educational Evaluation* 13, 211-217.

Freiberg, H.J. (1999). *School Climate: measuring, improving, and sustaining healthy learning environments*. London: Falmer Press.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind*. New York: Basic Books.

Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice*. New York: Basic Books.

Gardner, H. (1995). *Leading minds: An anatomy of leadership*. New York: Basic Books.

Gay, L.R., Mills, G.E., & Airasian, P. (2006). *Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Applications. 8th ed*. Pearson Prentice Hall: Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine.

213

Gohm, C.L., & Clore, G.L. (2002). Affect as information: An individual differences approach. In L.F. Barrett & P. Salovey (Eds.), *The wisdom in feeling: Psychological processes in emotional intelligence*, (pp. 89-113). New York: Guilford.

Goleman, D. (1995). Emotional Intelligence. New York: Bantam Books.

Goleman, D. (1998a). What makes a leader? *Harvard Business Review. November-December.* 93-102.

Goleman, D. (1998b). *Working with Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.

Goleman, D. (2005). *Emotional intelligence.* New York: Bantam Books.

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

Honigmann, J.J. (1982). *Sampling in ethnographic fieldwork.* In, Burgess, R.G. (Ed.), Field research: A sourcebook and field manual, (pp. 79-90). London: Allen and Unwin.

Hoy, W.K., & Hannum, J.W. (1997). Middle school climate: an empirical assessment of organizational health and student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 33*, 212-225.

Hu, L. & Bentler, P.M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling, 6*, 1-55.

Hughes, R. (2002). Reflections on the state of leadership and leadership development. *Human Resource Planning*, 25(2), 4-6.

Humphreys, J. H., Weyant, L.E., & Sprague, R.D. (2003). Organizational commitment: The roles of emotional and practical intellect within the leader/follower dyad, *Journal of Business and Management*. 9(2), 189-209.

Jausovec, N., Jausovec, K., & Gerlic, I. (2001). Differences in event-related and induced electroencephalography patterns in the theta and alpha frequency bands related to human emotional intelligence. *Neuroscience Letters, 311*, 93-96.

Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2008). *Educational research quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (3rd Ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Johnson, W.L., Johnson, A.M., & Zimmerman, K. (1996). Assessing school climate priorities: A Texas study. *Clearing House, 70*, 64-66.

Johnson, B., & Stevens, J.J. (2001). Exploratory and confirmatory analysis of the school level environment questionnaire (SLEQ). *Learning Environments Research, 4,* 325-344.

Johnson, B., & Stevens, J.J. (2006). Student achievement and elementary teachers' perceptions of school climate. *Learning Environment Research, 9*, 111-122.

Johnson, C.E., & Templeton, R.A. (1999). Promoting peace in a place called school. *Learning Environments Research, 2*, 65-77.

Johnson, B., Stevens, J.J., & Zvoch, K. (2007). Teachers' perceptions of school climate: A validity study of scores from the revised school level environment questionnaire. *Education and Psychological Measurement, 67*(5), 833-844.

Jost, D.A. (1997). *The American Heritage College Dictionary*. 3rd edition, Houghton Mifflin Company: Boston.

King, D.H. (1999). Measurement differences in emotional intelligence of preservice educational leadership students and practicing administrators as measured by the Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 60(03A)*, 0606.

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2000). The janusian leader. In S. Chowdhury (Ed.) *Management 21C*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Law, K. S., Wong, C., & Song, L.J. (2004). The construct and criterion validity of emotional intelligence and its potential utility for management studies. *Journal of American Psychology 89*(3), 483-496.

Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Mailula, E. M., & Laugksch, R. C. (2003). School-level environment and the implementation of outcomes-based education in South Africa. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (April). Chicago, IL.

Matthews, G., & Zeidner, M. (2000). Emotional intelligence, adaptation to stressful encounters, and health outcomes. In Bar-On & J.D.A. Parker (Eds.), *Handbook of Emotional Intelligence*, (pp. 459-489), New York, NY: Jossey-Bass.

Matthews, G., Zeidner, M., & Roberts, R. (2002). Emotional intelligence: science and myth. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Maulding, W. (2002). *Increasing organizational productivity through heightened emotional intelligence.* Educational Resources Information Center.

Mayer, J.D., Caruso, D.R., & Salovey, P. (1999). Emotional intelligence meets traditional

> standards for an intelligence. *Intelligence, 27,* 267-298.

Mayer, J.D., & Cobb, C. D. (2000). Educational policy on emotional intelligence: Does it

> make sense? *Educational Psychology Review, 12,* 163-183.

Mayer, J.D., DiPaolo, M.T., & Salovey, P. (1990). Perceiving affective content in

> ambiguous visual stimuli: A component of emotional intelligence. *Journal of*
>
> *Personality Assessment, 54*, 772-781.

Mayer, J.D., & Mitchell, D.C. (1998). Intelligence as a subsystem of personality: From

> Spearman's *g* to contemporary models of hot processing. In W. Tomic & J.
>
> Kingma (Eds.), *Advances in cognition and educational practice* (Vol. 5, pp. 43-
>
> 75). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Mayer, J.D., & Salovey, P. (1993). The intelligence of emotional intelligence.

> *Intelligence, 17*, 433-442.

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

> Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational*
>
> *implications,* (pp. 3-31). New York: Basic Books.

Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D.R. (1997). *Multifactor Emotional Intelligence*

> *Scale (MEIS).* Unpublished instrument – Item and answer booklet, University of
>
> New Hampshire.

Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D.R., (2000a). Emotional intelligence as zeitgeist, as

> personality, and as standard intelligence. In Bar-On & J.D.A. Parker (Eds.),
>
> *Handbook of Emotional Intelligence*, 92-117, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D.R. (2000b). Models of emotional intelligence. In R.J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of intelligence,* (pp. 396-420). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D.R., & Sitarenios, G. (2001). Emotional intelligence as a standard intelligence. *Emotion, 1,* 232-242.

Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D.R. (2002). Mayer Salovey Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test User's Manual. Multi-Health Systems Inc. NY.

Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D.R., & Sitarenios, G. (2003). Measuring emotional intelligence with the MSCEIT V2.0. *Emotion, 3*, 97-105.

Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D.R. (2004a). Emotional intelligence: Theory, findings, and implications. *Psychological Inquiry, 15*, 197-215.

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2004b). A further consideration of the issues of emotional intelligence. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15, 249-255.

Merriam, S.B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Moos, R.H. (1974). *The social climate scales: An overview*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.

Neisser, U., Boodoo, G., Bouchard, T., Boykin, A., Brody, N., Ceci, S., et al. (1996). Intelligence: knowns and unknowns. *American Psychologist, 51*, 77-101.

Payne, W.L. (1986). A study of emotion: Developing emotional intelligence: Self-integration; relating to fear, pain, and desire. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 47, 203A (UMI No. AAC8605928).

Phillips, M. (1997). What makes schools effective? A comparison of the relationships of

    communitarian climate and academic climate to mathematics achievement and

    attendance during middle school. *American Educational research Journal,34*,

    633-662.

Pool, C.R. (1997). Up with emotional health. *Education Leader, 54*, 12-14.

Rentoul, A.J., & Fraser, B.J. (1983). Development of school level environment

    questionnaire. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *21*, 21-39.

Roberts, R.D., Zeidner, M., & Matthews, G. (2001). Does emotional intelligence meet

    traditional standards for an intelligence? Some new data and conclusions.

    Emotion, 1, 196-231.

Roseman, I. (1984). Cognitive determinants of emotions: A structural theory. In P.

    Shaver (Ed.), *Review of Personality and Social Psychology: Emotions,*

    Relationships, and Health, 5,(pp. 11-36). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Rubin, M.M. (1999). Emotional intelligence and its role in mitigating aggression: A

    correlational study of the relationship between emotional intelligence and

    aggression in urban adolescents. Unpublished dissertation, Immaculata College,

    Immaculata, Pennsylvania.

Salovey, P. & Mayer, J.M. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and*

    Personality, 9, 185-211.

Salovey, P., Mayer, J.D., & Caruso, D.R. (2002). The positive psychology of emotional

    intelligence. In C.R. Snyder & S.J. Lopez (Eds.), *The handbook of positive*

    psychology (pp. 159-171).New York: Oxford University Press.

Schumacker, R.E., & Lomax, R.G. (1996). *A beginner's guide to structural equation modeling.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Schutte, N.S., Malouff, J.M., Bobik, C., Coston, T.D., Greeson, C., Jedlicka, C., et al. (2001). Emotional intelligence and interpersonal relations. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 141(4), 523-536.

Schwarz, N. (1990). Feelings as information: Informational and motivational functions of affective states. In E.T. Higgins & E. M. Sorrentino (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition* (Vol. 2, pp. 527-561). New York: Guilford.

Simon, H. A. (1982). Affect and cognition: Comments. In M.S. Clark & S. T. Fiske (Eds.), Affect and Cognition: The Seventeenth Annual Carnegie Symposium on Cognition (pp. 333-342). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Spearman, C. (1927). *The abilities of man*. New York: Macmillan.

Strauss, A.L., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Sternberg, R.J. (2000). *Handbook of intelligence*. In Sternberg, R. J. (Ed.), Chapter 1: The concept of intelligence, (pp.3-15). Cambridge University Press: UK.

Stewart, D. (1979). A critique of school climate: What is it, how can it be improved and some general recommendations. *Journal of Educational Administration, 27*, 148-159.

Templeton, R.A., & Jensen, R.A. (1995). How exemplary teachers perceive their environments. In D.L. Fisher (ed.), *The study of learning environments, 7*, (pp.

94-105), Perth, Australia: Science and Mathematics Education Centre, Curtin University of Technology.

Thorndike, E.L., (1920). Intelligence and its uses. *Harpers Magazine, 140* (3), 227-235.

Tucker, M. L., Sojka, J. Z., & Barone, F. J. (2000). Training tomorrow's leaders: Enhancing the   emotional intelligence of business graduates. *Journal of Education for Business,* 75(6), 331-337.

Webster, B.J., & Fisher, D.L. (2003). School environment and student outcomes in mathematics. *Learning Environments Research, 6*, 309-326.

Wechsler, D. (1997). *WAIS-III: Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale* (Third ed.). San Antonio, TX. The Psychological Corporation.

West, C.A. (1985). Effects of school climate and school social structure on student academic achievement in selected urban elementary schools. *Journal of Negro Education, 54*, 451-461.

Weymes, E. (2003). Relationships not leadership sustain successful organizations. *Journal of Change Management, 3*(4), 319-331.

Wolcott, H.F. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data: Description, analysis, and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zeidner, M., Roberts, R. D., Matthews, G. (2002). Can emotional intelligence be schooled? A critical review. *Educational Psychologist, 37*(4), 215-231.

Zeidner, M., Mathews, G., Roberts, R. D., MacCann, C. (2003). Development of

emotional intelligence: Towards a multi-level investment model. *Human

Development, 46*, 69-96.

Zeidner, M., Matthews, G., Roberts, R. D. (2004). Emotional intelligence in the

workplace: A critical review. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 53

(3), 371-399.

Appendix A

School leader verbal instruction protocol

1) Call school principals to solicit participation
2) Explain study (link school climate as perceived by teachers to emotional intelligence (EI) of school leaders)
3) Define rational and aims (as read from abstract)
4) Outline measures of MSCEIT
5) Explain benefits to school leader
6) Explain potential risks to school leader
7) Explain Revised-SLEQ that teachers will need to take to school leader
8) Explain benefits for teachers
9) Explain potential risks for teachers
10) Explain withdraw or discontinue at any time of test or survey of both school leader and teachers
11) Explain protocol for administering Revised-SLEQ survey and time expected to complete the survey
12) Explain protocol for administering MSCEIT and time expected to complete the MSCEIT (Appendix D)
13) Describe consent protocol procedures and invitation to participate
14) Participants shall bear no expense in this research study
15) Ask if any questions or clarification
16) Ask permission to schedule and speak with faculty during a regularly scheduled faculty meeting

Appendix B

Teacher verbal instruction protocol

1) Call school principals to solicit participation and permission to speak with faculty during a regularly scheduled faculty meeting
2) Explain study (link school climate as perceived by teachers to emotional intelligence (EI) of school leaders)
3) Define rational and aims (as read from abstract)
4) Outline measures of MSCEIT
5) Explain benefits to school leader participating
6) Explain potential risks to school leader
7) Explain Revised-SLEQ teachers take
8) Explain benefits to teachers
9) Explain potential risks to teachers
10) Explain withdraw or discontinue at any time of test or survey of both school leader and teachers
11) Participants shall bear no expense in this research study
12) Explain protocol for administering survey and time expected to complete the test and survey
13) Ask for consent forms to be signed after both verbal and written letter of procedures and invitation to participate by school leader only
14) Ask if any questions or clarification

Appendix C

Revised SLEQ – Items & Factors

Collaboration

20. Classroom instruction is rarely coordinated across teachers.
11. I have regular opportunities to work with other teachers.
 6. There is good communication among teachers.
21. Good teamwork is not emphasized enough at my school.
16. I seldom discuss the needs of individual students with other teachers.
 1. Teachers design instructional programs together.

Student Relations

 2. Most students are well mannered or respectful of the school staff.
12. Students in this school are well behaved.
 7. Most students are helpful and cooperative with teachers.
17. Most students are motivated to learn.

School Resources

18. The supply of equipment and resources is not adequate.
 3. Instructional equipment is not consistently accessible.
13. Video equipment, tapes, and films are readily available.
 8. The school library has sufficient resources and materials.

Decision Making

 4. Teachers are frequently asked to participate in decisions.
14. I have very little say in the running of the school.
 9. Decisions about the school are made by the principal.

Instructional Innovation

15. We are willing to try new teaching approaches in my school.
 5. New and different ideas are always being tried out.
19. Teachers in this school are innovative.
10. New courses or curriculum materials are seldom implemented.

From Johnson, B., Stevens, J. J., & Zvoch, K. (2007). Teachers' perceptions of school climate: A validity study of the revised School Level Environment Survey (SLEQ). *Educational and Psychological Measurement 67*, 833-844.

School-Level Environment Questionnaire - Revised

The following are statements about the school in which you work and your working environment. Indicate how well each statement AGREES WITH YOUR DESCRIPTION OR VIEWS of your school environment.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1.	Teachers design instructional programs together.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.	Most students are well mannered or respectful of the school staff.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.	Instructional equipment is **not** consistently accessible.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.	Teachers are frequently asked to participate in decisions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.	New and different ideas are always being tried out.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6.	There is good communication among teachers.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7.	Most students are helpful and cooperative with teachers.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8.	The school library has sufficient resources and materials.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9.	Decisions about the school are made by the principal.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10.	New courses or curriculum materials are seldom implemented.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11.	I have regular opportunities to work with other teachers.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12.	Students in this school are well behaved.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13.	Video equipment, tapes, and films are readily available.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14.	I have very little say in the running of the school.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15.	We are willing to try new teaching approaches in my school.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16.	I seldom discuss the needs of individual students with other teachers.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17.	Most students are motivated to learn.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18.	The supply of equipment and resources is **not** adequate.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19.	Teachers in this school are innovative.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20.	Classroom instruction is rarely coordinated across teachers.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21.	Good teamwork is **not** emphasized enough at my school.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

From Johnson, B., Stevens, J. J., & Zvoch, K. (2007). Teachers' perceptions of school climate: A validity study of the revised School Level Environment Survey (SLEQ). *Educational and Psychological Measurement 67*, 833-844.

Appendix D

Protocol for administering MSCEIT

The researcher will follow the protocol as described below in speaking individually with the 14 school leaders:

1) Researcher contact MHS and order 14 online MSCEIT tests.
2) Call and arrange times for the school leaders to participate in the MSCEIT.
3) Explain that participants must be 17 years of age or older.
4) Explain that the MSCEIT is written at an 8th grade level.
5) Explain there are no time limits for test, however, most respondents complete the test   in 30-45 minutes.
6) Explain that school leaders should take the MSCEI when relaxed and have ample time, and not to rush before going into a meeting; and neither to complete immediately when coming out of a meeting, etc…
7) Ask if candidate has a computer to use for online-test administration.
8) Re-enforce that confidentiality will be guaranteed!
9) Have school leader sign consent to test form.
10) Bias will be avoided as the school leader will take test alone and will not be used against the person.
11) Explain a scheduled feedback session will be reported once the entire research study is complete (Appendix C).
12) Review the following with candidate:
   - Give test ID number and log-on information
   - Review signed consent form
   - Review purpose of test
   - Explain content and expectations
   - Review expected test time
   - Explain importance of quiet setting when taking test
   - MHS will contact researcher via e-mail when test is complete
   - Call and thank participating school leader

Protocol from Mayer et al., (2002).

Appendix E

Qualitative questions to be asked of school leaders selected at random

A) Working with various groups of people in a school setting is the job of school leaders. School leaders have interaction with parents, students, teachers, support staff, school board members, and community business leaders on a daily basis. In describing one group of the aforementioned, how do you solve teacher personnel problems?

B) What strategies do you use in developing school climate?

C) What strategies do you use in maintaining school climate?

D) With school climate defined as the social system within a school which includes shared norms and expectations (Brookover, Schweitzer, Schneider, Beady, Flood, & Wisenbaker, 1978); and the physical and mental health of the organization (Freiburg, 1999); and emotional intelligence defined as the ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions so as to assist thought, to understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and to reflectively regulate emotions so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth (Mayer & Salovey, 1997), describe your perceptions of how school climate and emotional intelligence are correlated?

E) As you self-reflected since taking the MSCEIT, what changes have you made about your own emotional intelligence?

Appendix F

Superintendent permission form

Cosmas C. Curry has been given permission to conduct research in the _____ School District. My signature denotes that I am informed of the research which includes principal(s) in said district taking an emotional intelligence test and faculty participating in a school climate survey. There shall be no mention of district names or personnel in the study. Confidentiality is guaranteed. There are no known risks associated with this study.

Superintendent: _____

Date: _____

Appendix G

Cosmas C. Curry
Columbia – Montour AVTS
5050 Sweppenheiser Drive
Bloomsburg, PA 17815
ccurry@cmvt.us
December 8, 2008

Dear School Leader:

I am a doctoral student in Leadership and Administration at Indiana University of Pennsylvania under the supervision of Dr. Sussie Eshun, East Stroudsburg University Chairperson. I am writing to ask your participation in my research study which will investigate and determine if emotional intelligence is linked to school climate. The results of this research will give leaders and districts important information about how emotions correlate to school climate. It will also provide information for school leaders so institutions can better provide leaders with leadership skills and attitudes needed to successfully guide elementary/secondary schools, and for districts that need to develop current school leaders and hire and train new ones.

I am asking your participation in this study by taking the Mayer Salovey Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) and having your faculty complete the Revised-School Level Environment Questionnaire (SLEQ). The MSEIT a 141 item test that takes 35- 45 minutes to complete. The MSCEIT test measures ability to determine the emotional state of another. The second part of the study includes permission to have faculty take the Revised-SLEQ. The Revised-SLEQ is a 21 item survey that teachers take measuring their perceptions of school climate. The Revised SLEQ takes approximately 10 minutes to complete. I want to determine if emotional intelligence of school leaders is linked to school climate. After completion of the MSCEIT, I will randomly interview 6 individual school leaders. Leaders will be coded and numbers put in a hat and numbers drawn to determine who I interview. This is an opportunity to learn about yourself and your school and will be completely confidential. All tests and surveys will be completed on-line with a user name and password that will be provided with your consent to participate in this study. Teachers will follow a similar on-line construct. I would need at least fifteen teachers to randomly participate per school to allow for valid and reliable information. I would request opportunity to speak with your faculty at a regularly scheduled faculty meeting to review the protocol for this study. I will make arrangements with you as school leader once your participation is given. Please complete the consent form indicating your commitment to participate in the MSCEIT and have teachers take the Revised-SLEQ and return it to me either by fax at (570) 784-3565 or in the self-addressed stamped envelope as soon as possible. Your participation is critical to my study. As a school leader myself, I realize that your time is valuable. I appreciate your cooperation. Surveys and

data will be stored separately in locked drawers and will be available only to this researcher. **This study will not identify individual schools or leaders**.
Please retain this letter for information regarding informed consent.
Your participation and participation by teachers in this study is voluntary, and you and teachers are free to withdraw at anytime. There are no known risks and/or discomforts associated with this study. Participants shall bear no expense in this research study. Every precaution will be made to maintain the confidentiality of your response. However, there is always a minimal risk that the confidentiality of the data could be compromised due to unforeseen circumstances beyond the control of the investigator. My handling of your data will be consistent with the standards in the *Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects* (Federal Register, 1991) and the *Ethical Principles in the Conduct of Research with Human Participants* (APA, 1982). Data will be analyzed within the context of available aggregated data obtained from your school profile on the Pennsylvania Department of Education website. The end product will protect your confidentiality. Only the principal investigator will have access to the codes that match survey to data. If you have any questions about this study, please contact me at (570) 784-8040, extension 3325 or 570-204-1040, or via email at ccurry@cmvt.us. You may also contact my advisor, Dr. Sussie Eshun, at East Stroudsburg University (570) 422-3363 or at seshun@po-box.edu.edu. You can also contact Dr. Shala Davis, Chairperson of the Internal Review Board at East Stroudsburg University at SDavis@po-box.esu.edu. Specific information regarding the outcomes of the study, the MSCEIT, and the Revised SLEQ will be shared upon completion of the study by appointment. I will make every effort to take a minimum amount of your precious time. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Cosmas C. Curry

Appendix H

School leader consent questionnaire

Name:

School District:

Building level within school district:

Years experience Administrating:

Total Years experience in education:

Gender:

Age:

Ethnicity:

Certification area(s):

Permission to participate in the MSCEIT and have staff participates via the Revised-SLEQ:

Signed: _____ Date:_____

Appendix I

MSCEIT Informed Consent Form

Title of Project: Role of school climate and relationship to emotional intelligence

1. **Purpose of Study:** The purpose of this study is to determine if school climate and emotional intelligence (EI) are linked.
2. **Procedures to be followed:** You will be asked to complete the Mayer Salovey Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT).
3. **Benefits:** The research might provide a better understanding of school leader training for such positions as well as an opportunity to learn about self and hiring practices for school leader positions.
4. **Duration:** The MSCEIT will take approximately 30-45 minutes to complete.
5. **Statement of Confidentiality:** Your participation in this research is anonymous. Your information will be stored and secured in a locked file under a coded name. In the event of publication or presentation resulting from the research, no personally identifiable information will be shared.
6. **Right to Ask Questions:** You can ask questions about this research. Please contact Dr. Sussie Eshun at (570) 422-3736 (seshun@po-box.esu.edu) with questions or concerns about this study. You may also contact Dr. Douglas Lare at (570) 422-3431 (dlare@po-box.esu.edu), Dr. Shala Davis, Chair of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at (570) 422-3336 (sdavis@po-box.esu.edu) or Dr. Cathy Kaufman at (724) 357-3928 (cathy.kaufman@iup.edu). If you feel the need to speak to a mental health professional, please call the University Counseling Services at (570) 422-3277.
7. **Voluntary Participation:** Your decision to be in this research is voluntary. You can stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer. Participants shall bear no expense in this research study.

Completion and return of the survey is considered you implied consent to participate in this study. Please keep this form for your records.

Appendix J

Revised- SLEQ Informed Consent Form

Title of Project: Role of school climate and relationship to emotional intelligence

1. **Purpose of Study:** The purpose of this study is to determine if school climate and emotional intelligence are linked.
2. **Procedures to be followed:** You will be asked to complete the Revised- School Level Environment Questionnaire (Revised-SLEQ)
3. **Benefits:** The research might provide a better understanding of school leader training for such positions as well as an opportunity to learn about self and hiring practices for school leader positions as well as provide data to school leaders regarding school climate as perceived by teachers.
4. **Duration:** The Revised-SLEQ will take approximately 7-10 minutes to complete.
5. **Statement of Confidentiality:** Your participation in this research is anonymous. Your information will be stored and secured in a locked file under a coded name. In the event of publication or presentation resulting from the research, no personally identifiable information will be shared.
6. **Right to Ask Questions:** You can ask questions about this research. Please contact Dr. Sussie Eshun at (570) 422-3736 (seshun@po-box.esu.edu) with questions or concerns about this study. You may also contact Dr. Douglas Lare at (570) 422-3431 (dlare@po-box.esu.edu), Dr. Shala Davis, Chair of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at (570) 422-   (sdavis@po-box.esu.edu) or Dr. Cathy Kaufman at (724) 357-3928. If you feel the need to speak to a mental health professional, please call the University Counseling Services at (570) 422-extension 3277.
7. **Voluntary Participation:** Your decision to be in this research is voluntary. You can stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer. Participants shall bear no expense in this research study.

Completion and return of the survey is considered you implied consent to participate in this study. Please keep this form for your records.

Appendix K

Protocol for Interpreting MSCEIT scores with School Leaders

The MSCEIT test is one measure of emotional intelligence that measures one aspect of personality. The researcher recognizes that the school leaders are highly intelligent people with much responsibility; therefore, to help the school leader understand the results of the MSCEIT, the following steps will be communicated along with the rational for doing so. The referenced steps are taken from the <u>MSCEIT Users Manual</u> by Mayer et al. (2002).

1. Personal phone call to each school leader to set up appointment. Appointments are recommended to be in person and will take approximately one hour.
2. Have documentation with the total EI results, guidelines to interpret EI scores, review branch scores, and examine differences between branch scores for each school leader.
3. Explain how emotions are scored and interpreted (p. 88).
4. Explain that the scores of school leaders are compared to the normative sample.
5. School leaders will be given feedback in two categories: (1) School leaders with high expectations will be helped to understand that "many successful people have lower than average EIQ scores," and that, "People compensate for this in a variety of ways," and explain these ways, (p. 21) and (2) School leaders with low scores may be due to statistical error; misunderstanding test questions; time of day, week, and or year; and time devoted to the test. School leaders who performed well likely will not need justification as described above.
6. Explain context of scores and the MSCEIT questions (p. 89).
7. School leaders will also be debriefed of the qualitative findings and themes of the study. Those who provided interviews will be given further analysis of there EI level based on their answers and how the answers they correlated to the four-branch model of EI.
8. Explain how EI practically helps school leaders and give suggestions on how to improve or where to seek improvement from (p. 103-104).
   - How to use MSCEIT results
   - Learn about emotional abilities
   - Read people more accurately
   - Enhance emotional empathy
   - Development of your own management ability
9. Review R-SLEQ scores and how they are linked to the EI of the school leader.
10. Review results from the research study.
11. Ask if any questions or if any clarification of results is needed.
12. Explain practical application of research to school leaders.
13. Explain suggestions for further research.

For more information or clarification of the study, you can contact the researcher, or any of the faculty listed in the original letter of invitation (Appendix G).