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THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRINCIPAL’S EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE QUOTIENT, SCHOOL CULTURE, AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between secondary school principal’s emotional intelligence quotient, school culture, and student achievement. Partial correlation was conducted to examine the degree of relationships between principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and school culture controlling for the effect of student achievement, and between principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and student achievement controlling for school culture. Multiple regression analysis was utilized to examine the combined effect of principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and school culture on student achievement. The study population consisted of secondary school principals and teachers within Virginia Department of Education’s Region VII. Quantitative data were collected using two survey instruments and publicly available standardized test pass percentage data: Emotional Intelligence Appraisal (see Appendix A for sample questions) by TalentSmart (Bradberry & Greaves, 2010); the School Culture Survey (see Appendix B) developed by Gruenert (1998); and The Commonwealth of Virginia’s Standards of Learning (SOL) test data. The results showed principal’s emotional intelligence quotient was not significantly associated with school culture, and negatively associated with student achievement. Further, the combination of predictor variables principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and school culture, did not significantly predict student achievement. Suggestions for further research are also included.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Increased public scrutiny and demand, high stakes testing and graduation rate requirements, and the changed state of globalization and a world economy have brought to the forefront what should have already been occurring in schools. Student achievement and academic success for all students are common themes for politicians and the general public, and response to these worldly demands pose challenges for schools across the United States. School leaders and staff have become acutely aware of the duty to find ways to meet the unique individual educational needs of all students to help them achieve school success at the highest possible level. To accomplish this goal, school personnel have evaluated and implemented different reform efforts and programs they decided would propel achievement for their students. These reform efforts have focused on many areas of education, yet, without the proper leadership, research indicates these efforts could be destined to fail (Fullan, 2002; Moore, 2009).

In recent years there has been a significant change in the responsibilities and demands of principals. The emergent global nature of the world, servant expectations of society, and increased demand of accountability for student achievement, has necessitated principals grow their leadership abilities. No longer can principals be a facilities and process manager of a school, they need other skills. To be successful leading a school today in light of public demands, and ensure all students achieve academic success, principals must have a broad focus and understanding if success is to occur and sustain, it is their skill for leading people which will make the ultimate difference (Bipath, 2008; Fullan, 2002; Hyatt, Hyatt, & Hyatt, 2007; Stephens & Hermond, 2010).
Principal’s leadership abilities make a difference in how and what occurs in schools. What principals do and how they do it impacts people in the building and the greater school community, and sets the stage which can either enhance or diminish student success. The principal’s leadership skill, and school culture molded through their leadership, will either foster an autonomous, systems thinking school that embraces high performance learning environments for teachers and students, or one which is not. Parents, students, teachers, tax payers, politicians; the entire school community has an emotional investment in local schools. Principals must comprehend, appreciate and manage the emotional nature of those affiliated with the school at all levels to create an environment which fosters high expectations and motivation toward meeting those expectations. To accomplish this, school leaders need to possess and demonstrate high skill in an area that has gained abundant attention in business leadership, and in recent years, an increasing amount in school leadership research: emotional intelligence (Curry, 2004; Moore, 2009; Stephens & Hermond, 2010).

As school principals consider what they can do to have a positive impact leading to higher student achievement, it may be the little things within their overwhelming scope of responsibility that have the largest influence. Principals are responsible for ensuring a safe, secure, and orderly environment; managing school operations and facilities; overseeing the school vision and mission; fostering community relations and involvement; personnel hiring, evaluating, and leading; setting and maintaining high expectations for all; developing and maintaining an instructional focus within the building; coordinating extra-curricular activities; and among others the extremely
important crafting and nurturing school culture (Nettles & Herrington, 2007). It may be focusing on being an instructional leader with emotional intelligence, with a spotlight on school culture, makes all the other responsibilities less daunting, challenging, and obtainable.

A school’s culture has to do with what people involved with the school care about and spend time doing. School culture is the way held beliefs of administrators, teachers, students, parents, and the greater school community is carried out through actions and interactions; if there is not a manifestation of the beliefs, they are only words with little meaning. These beliefs speak to the schools’ goals and what is important within the school (MacNeil, Prater, & Busch, 2009), and affect how and what happens. Principals who possess emotional intelligence will understand the important role their emotional management plays in shaping the school's culture. By being a leader who is calm in times of trial, bases decisions on fact without emotional interference, yet, with empathy directed to solutions, principals build trust, respect, and motivation within the school community (Greenockle, 2010; Sand, Cangemi, & Ingram, 2011).

Emotional intelligence can generally be described as non-cognitive abilities for understanding of and skill in developing relationships and the importance emotions play in that role. People possessing emotional intelligence are observed when they demonstrate “competencies that constitute self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and social skills at appropriate times and ways sufficient to be effective in the situation” (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002, p. 3).

Daniel Goleman (1995), a Harvard professor, writer, a leading theorist and
researcher of emotional intelligence, advocates it is more than cognitive intelligence that leads to leadership success. In his book, *Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ*, Goleman provides his argument for why leaders must have emotional intelligence along with cognitive intelligence to be successful. Not possessing emotional intelligence, he argues, explains why some with high intelligence quotients may not be successful leaders, going so far as to state:

> We see intellect and clear thinking largely characteristics that get someone in the leadership door. Without those fundamental abilities, no entry is allowed. However, intellect alone will not make a leader; leaders execute a vision by motivating, guiding, inspiring, listening, persuading—and, most crucially, through creating resonance. The neural systems responsible for the intellect and for the emotions are separate, but, they have intimately interwoven connections (Goleman, et al., 2002, p. 26).

Further, Goleman advocates intelligence quotient contributes at most 20 percent of the factors related to life success with other factors accounting for the remaining 80 percent. Thus, he suggests emotional intelligence may be as or more important for success as a leader than cognitive intelligence (Goleman, 1995).

Principal’s emotionally intelligent leadership abilities may significantly impact the learning environment of a school. Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2002) argue it does not necessarily make a difference what school principals do; it is how they perform their responsibilities that matters. The manner they complete their responsibilities, interact, read, and respond to others can determine their success as a leader (Goleman, et
al, 2002). It is leading with emotional intelligence that makes the difference in principal’s impact on teacher and student success (Barent, 2005).

**Problem Statement**

Schools today require leadership that is able to meet vast demands and orchestrate a place where teachers teach to higher levels and students achieve to their maximum potential. For this to occur, the school leader needs not only be intelligent, possess instructional knowledge, and understand local, state, and federal guidelines, policies, and law, they also need to know why, when, and how to act. The changed role of principals from a manager to an instructional leader with the ability to provide syntheses of responsibilities, has focused research on what the principal can actually do to positively impact student achievement (Rosete & Ciarrochi, 2005; Wendorf-Heldt, 2009).

Leadership effectiveness has been studied from many angles over the years; yet, there is still uncertainty about what it takes to effectively lead an organization toward success (Greenockle, 2010; Rosete & Ciarrochi, 2005). Many of these studies indicate a leader must have the ability to develop, inspire, motivate, and effectively communicate the organization's vision to move people toward successfully meeting the vision; considered one measure of success. This is a different paradigm for the 21st century than in the past; being a manager of things. People today are more independent, empowered, involved, outspoken, and service minded, therefore, requiring leaders who understand leading with positive interpersonal relationships is a critical elemental skill to possess (Greenockle, 2010); the emotional domain of intelligence becomes an important aspect of leadership (Wendorf-Heldt, 2009). Relationship development skill, however, may be
more of a rarity than some would think. According to Fullan (2002), leaders in education and business find developing relationships and team building as one of the most difficult skill sets they need to posses.

The changed competency of leadership impacts school leadership as well. School leaders, more than ever, are looking at ways to improve their leadership effectiveness to positively impact and increase student achievement. As a result, research on school leadership has investigated the leader’s impact on student outcomes from many angles. Increasing understanding and determining if a specific intelligence capacity contributes to principals positively impacting student achievement leads the investigation of this study (Mees, 2008).

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this correlation study was to examine if a relationship exists between principal’s emotional intelligence quotient, school culture, and student achievement. The researcher believes when principals are able to combine the managerial and instructional leader aspects of the job with high emotional intelligence, they have the key to developing a positive school culture that provides avenues for all students to succeed. The resultant culture will facilitate higher student achievement as teachers and students are motivated by the leadership to their work with enthusiasm, cooperation, and commitment (Boyatzis, Goleman, & Rhee, 2000; Goleman, 1995).

Within the body of research on organizational effectiveness, an emergent pattern demonstrates emotional intelligence skill as needed by leaders to meet today’s demands. Rosete and Ciarrochi (2005) concluded in a correlational study leaders with high
emotional intelligence are more likely to meet outcome goals, considered effective by subordinates, and deal more effectively with colleagues and staff. These results mirror other organizational leadership studies which have propelled research of emotionally intelligent leadership’s effect in schools (Greenockle, 2010; Sand, et al., 2011).

While studies can be found which research the impact and relationship between principal’s emotional intelligence and school culture, principal’s emotional intelligence and school success or student achievement, none were found which look at the relationship of students’ achievement through the culture created in the school by emotionally intelligent leadership. This study examined if the consistent association shown between emotionally intelligent leadership and organizational success in business research holds true in educational research (Egley & Jones, 2005; Greenockle, 2010; Hyatt, et al., 2010; Lee & Shute, 2010; Moore, 2009; Schoo, 2008).

Research Questions

This study examined the following research question(s):

1. What is the relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and teacher perceived culture of the school?

2. What is the relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and student achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment?

3. What is the relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient, teacher perceived school culture, and student achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment?
Null Hypotheses

The research null hypotheses for this study are:

1. There is no significant correlation between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and teacher perceived school culture.

2. There is no significant correlation between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and student achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment.

3. There is no significant correlation between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient, teacher perceived school culture, and student achievement on the end-of course reading assessment.

Significance of the Study

The study attempted to examine a leadership capacity which may significantly impact schools and enhance students’ academic progress. Research has shown principal’s leadership is a critical factor in influencing what happens in school (Bipath, 2008; Egley & Jones, 2005; MacNeil et. al., 2009; Moore, 2009). Further, research has indicated leaders who possess emotional intelligence more productively move their organization toward goals (Egley & Jones, 2005; Greenockle, 2010; Hyatt, et al., 2010; Lee & Shute, 2010; Moore, 2009; Schoo, 2008). When a principal is able to combine educational knowledge, intellectual ability, and the affective domain of emotional intelligence, a culture can be created in the school which builds a shared commitment and dedication toward the goal of all students experiencing academic success (Bipath, 2008; Lee & Shute, 2010; MacNeil et. al., 2009; McWilliam & Hatcher, 2007; Moore, 2009).
When principals possess emotional intelligence, they could have a significant positive impact on the culture in a school that leads to more effective efforts by teachers and students. Often students do not have a support system outside the school to promote, support, and strengthen learning. Thus, it is imperative schools provide optimum environments for academic endeavors. Research has indicated supportive environments can foster the attitudes, practices, and relationships that make a major difference in student achievement (Cooper & Crosnoe, 2007; Cuthrell, et. al., 2010).

That is why this research is significant. If an emotionally intelligent principal’s impact on school culture is associated with increased student achievement, then schools, school leaders, and school systems will be more knowledgeable in their administrator hiring practices, leadership development actions, and support for principals in their leadership practice (Cuthrell, et. al., 2010).

**Definition of Core Terms**

The following definitions of terms are presented to provide clarity of vocabulary referenced in the study.

*Emotional intelligence:*

Daniel Goleman (1995, p. 34) defines emotional intelligence as “abilities such as being able to motivate oneself and persist in the face of frustration; to control impulse and delay gratification; to regulate one’s moods and keep distress from swamping the ability to think, to empathize, and to hope.”

*Leadership:* “… a social influence process in which one individual exerts internal influence over others to structure activities and relationships in a group or organization”
Multiple Intelligence Theory:

Howard Gardner’s multiple intelligence theory postulates a person’s overall intelligence encompasses not just intelligence quotient (IQ), but, a person has as many as nine intelligence attributes (Hoffman & Frost, 2006).

Instructional leadership:

Defined by Nettles & Herrington (2007) as “principals as facilitators, guiding and encouraging an educational environment in which administrators and teachers work collaboratively to diagnose and solve the problems facing their schools” (p. 725).

SOL End-of-Course test:

Criterion referenced test which assesses student progress towards mastery of Virginia Standards of Learning, the statewide curriculum of Virginia.

Student achievement:

For the purpose of this study student achievement will be measured by scores on Virginia Standards of Learning, English End-of-Course reading assessment.

School culture:

MacNeil, Prater, and Busch (2009, p. 75) define school culture as the “values and norms of the school.”
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter contains related research to provide an understanding for the basis of studying emotional intelligence of principals and how this skill impacts a school’s culture leading to student achievement. Research has indicated practices school administrators undertake can increase student achievement though “successful implantation of these practices may be dependent on the emotional intelligence of the school leader” (Moore, p. 23). In this chapter will be a review of the theoretical framework of this study including: (1) Goleman’s Emotional Intelligence Theory; (2) history of emotional intelligence theory development; (3) why Goleman’s Emotional Intelligence Competence Model; (4) other prevalent emotional intelligence models; (5) emotional intelligence misconceptions; (6) emotional intelligence and leadership; (7) principals’ leadership, (8) emotional intelligence and the principal; (9) the principal and school culture; (10) emotionally intelligent principal and school culture; and (11) review of related research.

Introduction

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) act of the 2001, reauthorization of the United States Elementary and Secondary Education Act, has drawn significant attention to student achievement in public schools of the United States. The act specifically states every child (100%) will perform at a proficient level on state accountability tests by the 2013-2014 school year with incremental benchmarks to determine adequate performance measured each year until then (U.S. Department of Education, 2002). For principals, the focus on proficient standardized test scores for all students presents leadership challenges toward meeting that goal and how to lead staff and students in a manner which leads to
increased improvement on standardized tests and achievement for all students. Further, the world has transformed to an open global economic framework requiring principals to change from being school managers to instructional leaders of schools (Greenockle, 2010; McWilliam & Hatcher, 2007; Nettles & Herrington, 2007) who are able to influence personnel to accomplish goals (Greenockle, 2010). School principals, therefore, are faced with increasing achievement accountability demands meshed with the intricacies of a frequently changed staff, community and student demands, and negative societal issues (Egley & Jones, 2005; Greenockle, 2010; Maulding, et al., 2010; Stephens & Hermond, 2010).

Theoretical Framework

The primary theory utilized in this research was Daniel Goleman’s Emotional Intelligence Theory. Due to his 1995 book, Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ, Goleman’s Emotional Intelligence Theory is possibly the most widely recognized and known of those available. According to his definition, emotional intelligence is “the capacity for recognizing our own feelings, and those of others, for motivating ourselves and for managing emotions well in our relationships” (Goleman, 1995, p. 316). Emotional intelligence can similarly be defined as “a type of social intelligence that involves the ability of one to monitor one’s own and others’ emotions, to discriminate among them and to use the information to guide one’s thinking and actions” (Maulding, et al., 2010, p. 2). Regardless of the definition, theories of emotional intelligence share commonalities though the chosen wording may be different; each contains the essence of being aware of your and others’ mind-set and behavior to
positively impact situations (Greenockle, 2010). A principal, as the leader in the building, that possesses high emotional intelligence can utilize this intelligence to create a culture with high expectations, trusting and respectful relationships, and shared vision of success for all (Egley & Jones, 2005; Moore, 2009).

Goleman contributes much of his theory development to the work of Salovey and Mayer during the 1990s, and articles they published (Allen, 2003). Salovey and Mayer’s articles inspired Goleman’s interest in emotional intelligence, and he began to study the concept focused largely on emotional intelligences impact on leadership. He states emotionally intelligent leaders are aware of their emotions, perceptive and understanding of others emotions, utilize and manage emotions for rational behavior and thought, understand appropriate actions and words in given situations, know the importance of relationships and how to cultivate them, and make correct decisions that get results without negative emotional interference (Bipath, 2008; Greenockle, 2010; Hyatt, et. al., 2008; Maulding, et. al., 2010; McWilliam & Hatcher, 2007; Moore, 2009; Schoo, 2008; Stephens & Hermond, 2010). Through his work, he delineated four components in his emotional intelligence model:

**Self-awareness** – A self-aware person knows who they are, strengths and weaknesses, and are able to monitor actions based on the knowledge (Bipath, 2008; Greenockle, 2010; Schoo, 2008). Security from this realization increases competence to tolerate uncomfortable situations and control negative feelings; thus, control emotions for positive outcomes. Self-aware persons realize difficult situations are not personal and react accordingly; they are
cognizant of situations and control and manage them (Greenockle, 2010);

**Self-management** – The ability to control and manage impulses, inner feelings, behaviors, and actions is self-management. Self-management includes adaptability, innovation, and initiative in given situations; not being a self-manager leads to decreased credibility and respect. When there is self-management of emotions, competence is demonstrated and creates the impression of transparency and integrity (Greenockle, 2010);

**Social awareness** – Social awareness is the ability to cultivate positive relationships with sensitivity to others’ needs and desires (Bipath, 2008; Greenockle, 2010). The leader understands the interpersonal aspect of leadership including sympathy and empathy for persons in the organization. They identify with others, are skilled in communication and interaction, and let each person they work with know they are important to organizational goals. The leader demonstrates a service mentality that nurtures a calm supportive environment which inspires dedication and trust (Greenockle, 2010); and,

**Relationship management** – The emotional intelligence component of relationship management is “the skill or adeptness at inducing desirable responses in others” (Bipath, 2008, p. 61). Relationship management is having the ability to build others competency and inspire them to expand their current state to higher levels. With skilled communication, the leader understands the importance of building relationships that connects a person to the leader and organization. This connection allows effective two way communication and
growth from the constructive feedback provided. Thus, relationship management allows the leader to create a positive environment and builds commitment to organizational values and goals (Bipath, 2008; Greenockle, 2010; Schoo, 2008).

**History of Emotional Intelligence Theory Development**

Even though emotional intelligence was brought to the forefront of discussion in today’s world by Daniel Goleman’s 1995 book, most trace the infancy of recognizing emotional intelligence to E. L. Thorndike in 1920 (Greenockle, 2010). Thorndike’s article, *Intelligence and its Uses*, in *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, introduced the concept by defining social intelligence as “the ability to understand men and women, boys and girls-to act wisely in human relations” (Thorndike, 1920, p. 228).

Over the next sixty years a few researchers dabbled in social intelligence, one of the more prominent being psychologist David Wechsler’s 1940s work which recognized there are non-cognitive aspects to a person’s intellect. Wechsler postulated intelligence consists of cognitive and emotional abilities and a true measure of intelligence cannot occur without considering both (Cherniss, 2000; Wechsler, 1950).

In 1983 Howard Gardner (1983) brought attention to non-intellectual intelligences when he introduced Multiple Intelligence Theory, which is considered to have had the largest impact on the development of emotional intelligence theories. Gardner originally named seven intelligences in his theory, and over the years has added to the number and currently names as many as ten. Intelligences included in Gardner’s theory include: linguistic, musical, logical-mathematical, spatial, body-kinesthetic, intrapersonal, naturalist, and interpersonal; recently spiritual, and existential intelligences have been
gaining attention and may be added (Christodoulou & Kunkel, 2009; Sellars, 2008).

Multiple Intelligence Theory is based on there being more than just intelligence quotient (IQ), when defining a person’s intellect. Biological and cultural factors contribute to intellectual ability based on individual brain functions and cultural exposures (Brualdi, 1996). These factors contribute to the degree of development for Gardner’s intelligences and impact the manner person’s process information and exhibit intelligence. Leaders who are considered successful generally exhibit intellect in most Multiple Intelligence Theory’s intelligences. Gardner’s multiple intelligences can easily be categorized into cognitive, social, behavioral, and emotional intelligences (Hoffman & Frost, 2006). His proposal of a person having multiple intelligences for cognitive and non-cognitive intellect, including interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences, was foundational to furthering the development of emotional intelligence theories (Allen, 2003; Sellars, 2008).

Expanding on Gardner’s work, Salovey and Mayer derived the first formal theory of emotional intelligence in 1990. Salovey and Mayer (1990) defined emotional intelligence as “the subset of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one’s own and other’s feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and actions” (p. 189). From this definition, Salovey and Mayer formalized the framework of an emotional intelligence theory. Originally including five components, Salovey and Mayer condensed the theory into four (Mayer, et al., 2000) over their years of research, consisting of “how people appraise and communicate emotion and how they use that emotion in solving problems” (Salovey &

After Salovey and Mayer began their work, Daniel Goleman, at the time a science writer for the New York Times, happened upon their writings on emotional intelligence and became intrigued in the role it played in leadership (Cherniss, 2000). Goleman began studying and researching the topic, which lead to the publication of his 1995 book that is considered “largely responsible for bringing the topic of emotional intelligence into the mainstream” (Allen, 2003, p. 27).

**Why Goleman’s Emotional Intelligence Competence Model**

Goleman’s model of emotional intelligence was chosen specifically for the study given his adaptation allows prediction of personal effectiveness in leadership (Curry, 2004). Goleman’s theory offers a broad conceptualization of emotional intelligence that is fitting to the complex demands of principals through the components of self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management. These components of Goleman’s theory are essential skills of principals for “possessing the ability to influence in the areas of relationships, vision, motivation, and conflict” (Barent, 2005, p. 49). The assessment instruments based on Goleman’s theory often provide a quotient based on self perceptions of the person's emotional intelligence. The perception score may be more relative to school settings, which are open environments exposed to internal and external pressures, where perceptions of behavior may be as or more important than actual behavior (Reed, 2004).
High abilities in Goleman’s theory components can enable a principal to effectively lead the school to success. Each component is required daily by a principal in nearly each action and interaction encountered. The physical, mental, and emotional requirements are demanding and draining. Thus, knowing one’s emotions and effects, “internal states, preferences, resources, and intuitions” (Bipath, 2008, p. 59, Goleman, et. al, 2002) allows the principal to be confident of their strengths and limits without insecurity. Principals must maintain composure in all situations, managing emotions in a manner which exemplifies the integrity, flexibility, and leadership necessary for the position. Principals are nearly continually integrated into social interactions and their ability to demonstrate empathy, organizational awareness, and recognition of others’ needs during these interactions is crucial. Emotional intelligence lends to the principal’s skill in managing the relationships needed in a collaborative, influential, and inspiring manner (Bipath, 2008).

**Other Prevalent Emotional Intelligence Models**

Emotional Intelligence Theories have generally been broken into either a trait (mixed ability) or ability perspective depending on the researcher(s) framework. Trait models of emotional intelligence blend the ability of having emotional intelligence with certain personality traits which would be demonstrated by the ability as well as some non-ability based characteristics. Ability models focus on the inherent aptitude a person has for being emotionally intelligent based on three criteria: knowledge there are right and wrong answers, measured ability is in line with other intellectual measures, and a person’s ability increases with age (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000).
Each framework assumes the person has the cognitive ability to demonstrate proper leadership (Hyatt, et. al., 2007) and an emotional intelligence level which enhances cognitive ability toward effective leadership. Overall, the theories have derived from Howard Gardner’s Multiple Intelligence Theory, which postulates that a person possesses different intelligences to draw from, some may be more developed than another at any given time, and a person may have more capability in some over others; however, different intelligences are at their disposal (Christodoulou & Kunkel, 2009; Sellars, 2008).

**Salovey and Mayer model.**

Salovey and Mayer introduced the first formal theory of emotional intelligence in 1990 through two articles, providing a concrete definition of the construct. Their extensive research has increased knowledge of emotional intelligence and lead to their development of measurement instruments. Salovey and Mayer’s theory is an ability model Emotional Intelligence Theory and currently consists of four components:

- **Emotional perception** – Emotional perception encompasses a person being able to discriminate emotional states, feeling, and thoughts in self and others;

- **Assimilating emotion in thought** – This skill set includes a person having the ability of “weighting emotions against one another and against other sensations and thoughts and allowing emotions to direct attention” (Mayer, et al, 2000, p. 400);

- **Understanding and analyzing emotion** – Persons with this ability can label and prioritize their emotions and reason through the implications of their actions; and,
Reflective regulation of emotion – Persons at this highest level of emotional intelligence have the ability to regulate their and others’ emotions while being open to understanding those emotions and work thoughtfully toward goals (Mayer, et al., 2000).

Bar-On model.

A trait model of emotional intelligence was presented by Bar-On in 1997 that sought to bridge why some persons are successful and some are not. He defined emotional intelligence as “a cross-section of interrelated emotional and social competencies, skills and facilitators that determine how effectively we understand and express ourselves, understand others and relate to them, and cope with daily demands” (Bar-On, 2006, p. 15). Bar-On’s emotional-social model combines mental and emotional intellect to predict the likelihood of a person’s success through five main components:

Intrapersonal skill – a person’s awareness and understanding of their emotions and feelings;

Interpersonal skill – the awareness and understanding of others emotions with empathy which leads to the development of a positive relationship;

Adaptability – having the ability to adapting or changing feelings depending on the situation;

Stress management – being able to cope with stress and controlling the emotions stress can bring on; and,

General mood – being an optimistic person who feels and expresses positive emotions (Allen, 2003; Bar-On, 2006; Berrocal & Extremera, 2006).
**Emotional Intelligence Misconceptions**

Study and empirical research about emotional intelligence is relatively new, thus, it is important to address misconceptions concerning its application. Emotional intelligence is not being pleasant all the time or having a happy-go-lucky demeanor, which would not represent emotional intelligence. Emotionally intelligent persons may need to be confrontational, yet, do so with an increased perception of others’ emotions and can respond in context of the situation while managing and expressing thoughts and emotions appropriately. Emotional intelligence is not personality, however, it may be manifested in personality, and is a quotient which persons possess, can improve upon, and is important to success. Not discounting intelligence quotient, emotional intelligence abilities can improve the likelihood a person is successful by as much as 25-45 percent (Goleman, et al., 2002). There is a genetic impact on emotional intelligence, however, the intelligence can be developed and increased over time (Gray, 2009).

**Emotional Intelligence in Leadership**

Emotional Intelligence Theory has been researched in various organizational leadership settings, however, most prevalently in the business world. Research indicates emotional intelligence has a significant relationship with a person’s “job performance, motivation, decision making, successful management, and leadership” (Assanova & McGuire, 2009, p. 3) capabilities. Emotional Intelligence Theories recognize the importance of leaders’ cognitive abilities; however, add it is the inner properties of a person that allows them to be an effective leader. Since each person has and responds to emotions that affect behavior and actions, funneling these emotions positively aids in
leading toward organizational success (Assanova & McGuire, 2009). Through understanding emotions roused from different stimuli and the implications of those emotions, a person with high emotional intelligence can direct disruptive emotions to positive outcomes. Recent awareness and acceptance of constructively managing emotions, instead of categorically dismissing them as negative, has become acknowledged in leadership (Assanova & McGuire, 2009; Reed, 2005).

Research shows emotions impact a person’s thinking and actions; managing these emotions is critical for rational thinking and effective leadership. An individual’s psyche affects how they feel and express themselves. When a person is aware of their emotions and how emotions impact actions, they can maintain motivation and creativity in work and personal endeavors while infecting others with the same (Assanova & McGuire, 2009; Reed, 2005). Bardach (2008) states “A leader who is able to identify the motivators within himself and others will often find himself experiencing greater levels of organizational success than leaders who may be deficient in these areas” (p. 12). Thus, the leader with emotional intelligence positively impacts others in the organization toward success (Assanova & McGuire, 2009; Bardach, 2008; Barent, 2005).

The most prevalent effective leadership theories include some aspect of the leader having the ability to positively impact subordinates productivity by the way they lead; defining leadership as “a social influence process in which one individual exerts internal influence over others to structure activities and relationships in a group or organization” (Hoy & Miskel, 2005, p. 375). When a leader understands their ability to affect positive organizational outcomes by the manner which they lead, they understand their personal
fundamental assumptions about human nature, behavior, and motivation; their knowledge of self is an extremely important component of being a leader. With this understanding, the leader employs behaviors and actions which support relationship development and positive emotions regarding work, exercise power and authority appropriately, make quality decisions, communicate effectively, and positively affect morale and climate which leads to productive employees (Assanova & McGuire, 2009; Bardach, 2008; Barent, 2005; Reed, 2005).

A leader’s action is extremely important to employees’ perception of the climate and culture in the organization. Goleman et al. (2002) accounts up to 70 percent of workers' perceptions of climate is related to their leader’s actions and between 20-30 percent of employees’ performance is related to this perception. Emotional intelligence has been shown to provide leaders with a humble attitude of service to those supervised which fosters loyalty, trust, respect, and motivation (Boyatzis, 2009; Goleman, 1995; Goleman et al., 2002). Leaders are assumed to possess the cognition and skills necessary for their position, and often are judged more by how they handle themselves and relate to others; their emotional intelligence competency (Curry, 2004).

Principal’s Leadership

Effective school leadership is an extensively studied research topic. In a search of various databases, an abundance of peer reviewed articles, research reports, and dissertations on school leadership were located. Even with the large amount of research, questions remain on how leadership impacts a school and student achievement. Much of the previous research considers practices principals undergo in the school and some
consider leadership styles (Hebert, 2011, May & Supovitz, 2011, Nettles & Herrington, 2007). Analyses of these studies indicate principal’s practices and leadership style can improve school climate, culture, and instruction leading to improved student achievement. In particular, Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) completed a meta-analysis of sixty-nine studies indicating several principal practices that improve student achievement. These studies lead to the conclusion that “effective educational leadership makes a difference in improving learning; there is nothing new or especially controversial about this idea” (Nettles & Harrington, 2007, p. 725). In other words, school principals do make a difference in the schools they serve (Marzano, Walters, & McNulty, 2005).

Principals, in their leadership role, are vital in constructing what occurs in a school, and how they lead makes a difference in what occurs (Egley & Jones, 2005; Maulding, et al., 2010; Stephens & Hermond, 2010). Research has shown the principal’s leadership is a critical factor toward influencing student motivation and achievement (Bipath, 2008; Egley & Jones, 2005; MacNeil et. al., 2009; Moore, 2009). Their “leadership has a direct effect on school organization, school ethos, teacher efficacy, staff morale and satisfaction, staff retention, teachers’ commitment, teachers’ extra work, and teachers’ attitude” (Moore, 2009, p. 22) all which affects student success (Bipath, 2008; Maulding, et al., 2010; Stephens & Hermond, 2010). Hyatt, Hyatt, and Hyatt (2005) state it is essential, if the leader is to be successful, to effectively identify and respond to challenges, and possess a high degree of emotional intelligence; perhaps their “most important attribute” (p. 2) for success.

School principals have many stakeholders to answer to in performing their job
(Figure 1); it is nearly impossible for principal job descriptions to include all tangible and intangible responsibilities. In fact, varied stakeholders would typically have different interpretations of principals’ job functions, increasing the complexity principal’s face in meeting the needs of constituents (Lyons, 2005). This stress, as well as previously mentioned pressures, has led to a shortage of those who pursue and accept principal positions (Cruzeiro & Boone, 2009).

**Figure 1.** Stakeholders impacting principals.

In response to the need for strong school leadership, to provide guidelines for principal preparation programs, and to address ever changing roles and expectations, the *Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards for School Leaders* was developed in 1996, updated in 2008, by the National Policy Board for Educational
Administration (NPNEA). These standards were developed to describe expectations for principals, recognizing growing expectations, and define the characteristics, duties, and responsibilities of school administrators (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2008, p. 5).

The six ISSLC standards define what indicates quality school leadership:

**Standard 1:** An educational leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders;

**Standard 2:** An educational leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth;

**Standard 3:** An educational leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment;

**Standard 4:** An educational leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interest and needs, and mobilizing community resources;

**Standard 5:** An educational leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner; and,

**Standard 6:** An educational leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, economic, legal, and cultural context (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2008, pp. 14-15).
Much of the research on educational leadership indicates for a building principal to have a direct or indirect influence on student achievement, they must be an instructional leader (Leithwood, Patton, & Jantzi, 2010; May & Supovitz, 2011; Nettles & Herington, 2007). The requirement of achievement accountability for all students and demanding global society has forced principals to change from building managers to leaders of instruction (Greenockle, 2010; McWilliam & Hatcher, 2007). Nettles & Herrington (2007) define instructional leadership as “principals as facilitators, guiding and encouraging an educational environment in which administrators and teachers work collaboratively to diagnose and solve the problems facing their schools” (p. 725). The expansion of principals’ responsibilities, in addition to being accountable for school management, taxes many and requires skilled persons to meet the demands of the job. At least seven descriptors of effective school leadership have been noted in the research literature for instructional leadership:

**Safe, orderly environment** – Students need and deserve to feel safe and secure within an orderly educationally focused environment so they can focus on learning; a primary responsibility of the principal (Kruger, Witziers, & Sleeegers, 2007; Leithwood, et al, 2010; Nettles & Herrington, 2007);

**Mission and vision** – Principals need to have a clear understanding of goals and objectives for what and how the school is looking to accomplish. The responsibility of the principal is to provide direction, support, and leadership in assessing and leading a school’s mission and vision (Kruger, et al., 2007; Leithwood, et al, 2010; Maulding, et al);
**Stakeholder involvement** – Principals who organize and utilize community and other stakeholders are correlated with student achievement (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999; Nettles & Herrington, 2007);

**Monitor progress** – Principals who demonstrate interest and concern for student progress, including presence within classrooms, active in curriculum development, and monitor student progress, lead effective schools (May & Supovitz, 2010; Nettles & Herrington, 2007);

**Instructional focus** – When the principal is focused on instruction and takes responsibility for protecting and creating an instructionally focused environment, students achieve at higher levels (May & Supovitz, 2010; Nettles & Herrington, 2007);

**High expectations** – Research indicates when the principal communicates and has high expectations for all staff and students, school performance is increased (Moore, 2009; Nettles & Herrington, 2007). The effect is strengthened by the principal modeling the level of commitment required from high expectations. The principal being committed to high expectations for staff and students is the highest rated behavior teachers desire; the principal’s emphasis on expectations may be the catalyst for school performance and student success (Egley & Jones, 2005); and,

**Professional development** – Effective principals understand the need to design and provide professional development specific to staff needs and participate in the activity with the staff (Louis & Wahlstrom, 2011; Nettles & Herrington, 2007).
Fullan (2002) writes being an instructional leader is only the beginning for a principal to lead for success. In today’s schools, Fullan indicates, principals must be able to conceptualize the bigger picture and lead others through teamwork if success is to be sustained. According to Fullan, for the principal’s impact to be lasting, the following are necessary components of their leadership: have a moral purpose, understand the change process, understand the importance of relationships, share knowledge, and coherently blend these together (Fullan, 2002).

Moral purpose begins with “the direct goal of making a difference in the lives of students” (Fullan, 2002, p. 4). From this goal, the principal is cognizant of how to treat and interact with others with a focus on school climate, knowing its importance for all students to achieve. Principals also know how to spread this mindset in the building recognizing it is a process occurring over time through relationships with and between staff and community. When a principal shares up-to-date knowledge, practices, and educational research which impacts teachers’ effect on student achievement, building collaboration among staff, an environment leading to fulfilling the moral purpose is created (Fullan, 2002).

Principals face many barriers and obstacles fulfilling the role of instructional leader. In a 2001 national survey conducted by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) with 3,359 principals responding, half of them identified the need for instructional leadership training to increase their skills in this area. Strategic planning, assessment, program and teacher evaluation, identifying quality professional development needs, program evaluation, and curriculum needs were the predominant
topics identified in the survey. Part of the problem indicated in the survey, however, is the non-instructional tasks that dominate principals’ time: parent issues, discipline, facilities management, school management including sports, community related task, and public relations. The extraneous, non-instructional duties take valuable time away from what principals identified should be their top three priorities: school climate, personnel growth and development, and instructional leadership including time in classrooms (National Association of Secondary School Principals, 2001).

Aside from leadership practices, the principal’s leadership style has also been extensively studied and shown to have a direct effect on school effectiveness. Research investigating transformational, transactional, laissez-faire, inviting and various other styles with school success factors has been conducted. Through analysis of these studies, transformational leadership has been the predominant style studied and has consistently shown a strong positive impact for successful schools (Bardach, 2008; Curry, 2004; Hebert, 2011; Leithwood, et al., 2010; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Mees, 2008).

Transformational leadership is carried out by the school leader extending the focus beyond day-to-day operations in order to encourage teachers to professionally learn, achieve, and grow by becoming a leadership mentor through role modeling, challenging, and fostering trust and respect. As a school leadership model, transformational leadership consists of three categories of vision, people development, and organizational health. Harms & Crede (2010) characterize transformational leadership with five dimensions:

**Idealized influence attributed** – The leader emanates a perception of charisma,
confidence, competence, and commitment to excellence throughout the organization;

**Idealized influence, behavioral** – The leader’s demonstration of values, beliefs, and ideals which are motivational to others;

**Individualized consideration** – The extent a leader demonstrates concern and empathy for others’ needs and concerns, including showing interest, giving advice, providing encouragement, and empowering others with more responsibilities;

**Inspirational motivation** – The amount a leader affects others by challenging and encouraging them to meet challenges that leads to empowerment; and, **Intellectual stimulation** – The way a leader challenges followers to test personal beliefs, take risks, and use creativity in actions and deeds (Harms & Crede, 2010).

The principal’s primary means of positively affecting student achievement is through teachers. It is the ability to inspire, influence, and challenge teachers that enable the principal to craft a student-centered environment that positively impacts student achievement (Leithwood, et al., 2010; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; May & Supovitz, 2010; Nettles & Herrington, 2007). In a meta-analysis of research between 1996 and 2005, Leithwood & Jantzi (2005) concluded there is significant evidence transformational school leadership has a positive effect on school culture, organizational commitment, teacher job satisfaction, changed teacher practices, instructional quality, organizational learning, teacher efficacy, student engagement, and student academic outcomes (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005).
As indicated, a key ingredient to transformational leadership is the social-emotional process and support provided by the leader. As a transformational leader, the principal would know the people on staff well and provide individual attention to each person’s needs. The direct contact that builds the relationships between the principal and staff is necessary for the school’s success. Further, it helps create the trust, respect, motivation, and commitment necessary for the principal to positively lead the school (Mees, 2008).

Emotional intelligence, then, could be considered an essential element of the Transformational Leadership Style for principals. Hebert (2011) conducted a correlational study examining the relationship between emotional intelligence, transformational leadership, and effectiveness in school principals. The study found a strong positive relationship \( r = .90, p < .01 \) between the three. Indicating, to optimize leading a school toward student success, the principal’s leadership would be maximized by possessing emotional intelligence (Hebert, 2011).

**Emotional intelligence and the principal.**

Fullan (2002) states “leaders must be consummate relationship builders with diverse people and groups – especially with people different than themselves. This is why emotional intelligence is equal to or more important than having the best ideas. In complex times, emotional intelligence is a must” (p. 7). It is this ability that can make the difference between a good principal and an outstanding principal. Those who are outstanding, recognize differences in staff members, are genuinely concerned for staff, students, and school community, and have emotional intelligence capabilities that enable
them to uniquely relate with each.

Schooling is an emotional business. Students, parents, communities, and teachers have investment in what happens and how it happens. Emotional intelligence is a cornerstone intelligence maturity for school administrators in the current state of a demanding public and accountability at the state and national level (Egley & Jones, 2005; Greenockle, 2010; Hyatt, et al., 2007; Maulding, et al., 2010; Stephens & Hermond, 2010). State and national testing mandates have focused additional emphasis on increasing student achievement and particularly raising the performance of students who struggle to achieve academic success (Maulding, et al., 2010; Waxman, Lee, & MacNeil, 2008).

Principals, therefore, need to ensure they lead their school in a manner that fosters student motivation for academic success. Emotional intelligence has become the new necessity for leadership success. The authoritarian “boss” manager is no longer able to be successful; the emotion perceptive principal is needed (McWilliam & Hatcher, 2007). They are successful by developing an environment of respect, trust, optimism, and purpose that provides an environment for everyone in the school to experience success (Bipath, 2008; Egley & Jones, 2005). Through strong emotionally intelligent leadership abilities, principals will positively impact students, teachers, and school community; second only to teacher instruction (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Maulding, et al., 2010; Moore, 2009).

An emotionally intelligent principal is aware of their emotions, perceptive and understanding of others’ emotions, utilize and manages emotions for rationale behavior
and thought, understand appropriate actions and words in given situations, know the importance of relationships and how to develop them, and make decisions that get results without negative emotional interference (Bipath, 2008; Greenockle, 2010; Maulding, et. al., 2010; McWilliam & Hatcher, 2007; Moore, 2009; Hyatt, et. al., 2008; Schoo, 2008; Stephens & Hermond, 2010).

**The principal and school culture.**

There is no shortage of research indicating school principals can make a positive impact on a schools’ success and student achievement. Much of the impact is an indirect effect that provides an arena for student achievement to occur (Kruger, Witziers, & Sleegers, 2007; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999; Leithwood, Patten, & Jantzi, 2010; May & Supovitz, 2010); also, research has shown a significant direct effect of the principal’s impact on school culture (Kruger, et al., 2007; Leithwood, et al., 2010; MacNeil et al., 2009). One of the primary responsibilities, a critical responsibility, of principals is to shape the schools’ culture for effectiveness that supports student achievement (Habegger, 2008; Hebert, 2011; Louis & Wahlstrom, 2011).

Research has shown schools where teachers have positive morale tend to have higher student achievement. They will have a better attitude with peers and students, work harder at meeting the needs of all students, and tend to have higher efficacy linked to student motivation for achievement (MacNeil, et al., 2009; Moore, 2009; Willis & Varner, 2010). An aspect of schools that is related to teacher morale is school culture. A positive culture tends to be one where staff are inspired and motivated, feel a sense of contribution and belonging, share a vision for the school, are academically focused, and
are supported in their efforts. Thus, they work actively for all students to ensure they succeed in personal and academic endeavors (Lee & Shute, 2010; MacNeil, et al., 2009).

While a concrete definition of school culture is hard to establish (Bush, 2010), it is generally considered “comprising values and norms of the school” (MacNeil, et al., 2009, p. 75) that are demonstrated throughout. It consists of the heart of the school and what draws people to or away from it. A characteristic of schools with strong cultures is high student achievement which is fostered among the school community. Teachers in such schools are motivated to ensure all students achieve at high levels and are willing to do what is needed to help them achieve (Lee & Shute, 2010). Teachers’ daily interactions with students help determine the culture and includes being “committed to and persistent about their students learning, possessing high drive and self confidence, and feeling good about their teaching and the professional support system provided to them” (Lee & Shute, 2010, pg. 195). Principals have strong influence in crafting teacher attitudes in a school. Vail (2005) identifies ten things a principal can do to positively affect a school’s tone:

- support new teachers;
- clue in to climate;
- empower teachers and staff;
- recognize and reward teachers and staff;
- do not ignore administrator morale;
- deal with student discipline;
- treat teachers as professionals;
- ask employees what’s going on;
- keep facilities tidy; and,
- develop emotional IQ (p. 4-5).

Principals with the skills to provide these create a strong culture in their school and have a positive impact on student achievement. Their leadership actions and behaviors make a difference to the soul of the school and what occurs within (MacNeil et al., 2009).

Marzano et al.’s (2005) meta-analysis identified twenty one skills school leadership research has shown to positively impact student achievement:

1. Affirmation: Recognizes and celebrates accomplishments and acknowledges failures;
2. Change Agent: Is willing to actively challenge the way things are and occur;
3. Contingent Rewards: Recognizes and rewards individual accomplishments;
4. Communication: Establishes strong lines of communication with and among teachers and students;
5. Culture: Fosters shared beliefs and a sense of community and cooperation;
6. Discipline: Protects teachers from issues and influences that would detract from their teaching time or focus;
7. Flexibility: Adapts his or her leadership behavior to the needs of the
current situation and is comfortable with dissent;

8. Focus: Establishes clear goals and keeps those goals in the forefront of the school’s attention;

9. Ideals/Beliefs: Communicates and operates from strong ideals and beliefs about schooling;

10. Input: Involves teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions and policies;

11. Intellectual stimulation: Ensures faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories and practices and makes the discussion of these a regular aspect of the school’s culture;

12. Involvement in Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment: Is directly involved in the design and implementation of curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices;

13. Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment: Is knowledgeable about current curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices;

14. Monitoring/Evaluating: Monitors the effectiveness of school practices and their impact on student learning;

15. Optimizer: Inspires and leads new and challenging innovations;

16. Order: Establishes a set of standard operating procedures and routines;

17. Outreach: Is an advocate and spokesman for the school to all stakeholders;
18. Relationships: Demonstrates an awareness of the personal aspects of teachers and staff;
19. Resources: Provides teachers with materials and professional development necessary for the successful execution of their jobs;
20. Situational Awareness: Is aware of the details and undercurrents in the running of the school and uses this information to address current and potential problems; and,

Developing positive school cultures, fostering relationships, and emotionally intelligent leadership are headings that could incorporate many of these twenty one skills. A strong “effective culture is the primary tool with which a leader fosters change,” (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 48), and impacts student achievement. Principals have a primary responsibility to establish and mold a school’s culture including development of positive relationships within the school community (MacNeil et al., 2009; Lee & Shute, 2010). When they possess inviting leadership behavioral characteristics, they positively impact the culture of the school which increases academic motivation of students and dedication from teachers (Egley & Jones, 2005). The manner principals relate to teachers, students, and the school community affects the establishment and sustainability of a culture focused on student achievement.

Emotionally intelligent principal and school culture.

Study has indicated a correlation between school atmosphere, teacher motivation,
and student achievement (Barent, 2005). Motivation for teachers and students tends to be increased when there are positive relationships within the school community; leading to higher student achievement (MacNeil, et al., 2009). Donaldson (2001) gives four steps for principals to build a culture for student achievement: empowering staff, strong and caring relationships, common vision and sense of purpose, and sharing challenges of the profession. Principals who have emotional intelligence understand and can foster these steps leading to a culture where teachers feel trusted to teach, and students achieve (Barent, 2005).

In a positive school culture, the vision and values of the school are understood and each knows their obligations and expects each other to meet or exceed those obligations (Rhodes, Stevens, & Hemmings, 2011). Such an environment is one where there is a shared purpose by all with a continuous commitment to student learning and staff growth. Teachers are empowered to make decisions in their teaching and do so with a commitment toward the common vision and goal of the school, students are motivated to do well, and parental support is increased because the trust and respect developed from the positive culture (Barent, 2005).

Harde, et al., (2006) found in a study of factors which affect students’ academic motivation that students’ perception of schools’ climate and culture impact their motivation to academically achieve. Schools must have a structure and environment which kindle this motivation. “If students are to perform well, they need working conditions which allow them to concentrate on their task” (Samdal, Wold, & Bronis, 1999, p. 300).
Much of what leads to positive school culture begins with school relationships and behaviors that come from those relationships. The “relationships between teachers and students, teachers with other teachers, and teachers with parents” (Rhodes, et al., 2011, p. 83) and all with the school principal define the behaviors of those affiliated with the school. Supportive relationships have been shown in research to be extremely beneficial to students. Schools which focus on all students and a school culture which creates such an environment are better positioned to help students succeed academically (Cooper & Crosnoe, 2007; Martin & Dowson, 2009). These schools have a school community atmosphere of belonging, respect, and student self efficacy of success. The relatedness students perceive from this culture is a critical part of motivating them to achieve in school (Martin & Dowson, 2009). There is a link to meeting students psychological needs that allow them to focus on academics instead of safety, security, and survival; producing a sense of belonging which positively influences their behaviors in social and intellectual actions. It increases students’ happiness in school and positively impacts their intrinsic motivation for academic achievement (Martin & Dowson, 2009).

Principals that possess a high level of emotional intelligence have a vital foundational component to creating such a culture. Emotionally intelligent principals, those at the base definition understand and can manage their and others emotions, create relationships with staff and community that lead to a positive culture within the school. The relationships they build allow the creation of an environment of respect, confidence, and optimistic purpose for everyone in the school being successful (Bipath, 2008; Egley & Jones, 2005).


**Related Research**

The impact of emotional intelligence on leadership and organizational success has been widely studied in the business world and has shown high levels of emotional intelligence as critical to success. Companies such as Johnson & Johnson (Curry, 2004), Abbott Laboratories, General Electric, Swatch, L’Oreal, Cannon, and the United States Air Force has placed value on emotional intelligence as a predictor of hiring successful personnel (Barent, 2005). Investigating the impact of emotionally intelligent leadership has gradually transferred to educational research, yet, is still in infancy.

In a search of databases, related studies can be found on the principal’s emotional intelligence impact on schools. Studies of the impact on school culture (Barent, 2005), school climate (Allen, 2003), student achievement (Bardach, 2008; Maudling, et al., 2010), school accountability ratings (Stephens & Hermond, 2010), leadership effectiveness (Bipath, 2008; Curry, 2004; Reed, 2005), and others exist; yet, with some conflicting results. The same consistency found in the business world on the impact of leaders’ emotional intelligence has not been determined for schools and continued study is needed. Some indicate it plays a vital role, while others do not.

Barent (2005) conducted a study on which components of emotional intelligence may be relative to the principal’s influence on school culture and obtained mixed results. Utilizing the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) and the David C. Anchin School Culture Quality Survey (SCQS), Barent obtained data relative to the principal’s emotional intelligence level and teachers’ ratings of school culture. Statistical data analysis generated mixed results with some components exhibiting a
significant positive relationship and one a significant negative relationship; indicating it impaired school culture (Barent, 2005).

A study examining if a relationship exists between emotional intelligence and school climate of selected principals in Kanawha County, West Virginia, determined mixed results as well, depending on how the data was examined. Using Bar-On’s Emotional Quotient Inventory, EQ-I, and CFK Ltd. School Climate Profile, Allen (2003) found a significant negative correlation between the principal’s level of emotional intelligence and teachers’ rating of school climate. When the variables of principal’s age, total administrative experience, and tenure in current school were included, the analysis indicated a statistically significant relationship (Allen, 2003).

In examining the impact of the principal’s level of emotional intelligence and student achievement or accountability ratings based on student standardized test results, Bardach (2008) and Greenockle (2010) found principal’s emotional intelligence made a positive difference. Bardach examined principal’s total emotional intelligence level being a predictor of student and school achievement. Using the MSEIT and state testing results for math and reading, logistic regression was utilized to determine the association between principal’s emotional intelligence score and school ratings. The researcher found when principals possess higher levels of emotional intelligence; the school had greater success meeting accountability benchmarks. Greenockle (2010) examined two schools, one whose accountability rating was functional and one rated dysfunctional, investigating the emotional intelligence competencies principals possessed and if they made a difference in school ratings. It was determined conclusively the principal’s
emotional intelligence had a significant impact on schools’ effectiveness rating.

Stephens and Hermond (2010), however, did not find similar results. They compared schools rated as recognized with similar schools rated acceptable to determine if a relationship existed between the emotional intelligence of the principal and schools’ rating. No significant difference was found between the paired schools. Similarly, Maulding et al., (2010) conducted a study in Mississippi on the relationship between principal’s emotional quotient, as determined by the Emotional Intelligence Quotient Inventory (EQ-I), total or subscale scores at low or high performing schools as defined by Mississippi’s state accreditation system. Through Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and correlational analysis no significant differences or correlations were found; indicating principal’s emotional intelligence was not related to the school’s performance.

Bipath (2008), Curry (2004), and Reed (2004) conducted studies on the principal’s emotional intelligence level and the impact on their leadership roles within schools. Each proposes the challenge of leading a school requires “leaders who possess high levels of EI” (Moore 2009, p. 22). Bipath conducted a case study examining two principal’s and their impact on the functionality of the schools. One principal possessed a high emotional intelligence quotient, while the other did not. Conclusively, by examining test scores, culture, climate, school artifacts, and interviews, Bipath determined the principal with high emotional intelligence led a high functioning school and the other was a poorly functioning school.

Curry (2004) conducted a study in five rural school divisions of Virginia to examine the relationship between principal’s self perceived emotional intelligence and
leadership at the elementary, middle, and secondary level. Goleman’s four components as well as total emotional intelligence was examined against leadership effectiveness utilizing the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal, Me-Edition to obtain emotional intelligence scores. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5X) measured self perceived leadership style and perceived leadership effectiveness. Statistical analysis using Pearson Product Moment Correlation resulted in a statistically significant relationship between self perceived emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness. Further analysis comparing principal’s leadership style between the domains of Goleman’s emotional intelligence components was not affected by demographic factors of gender, age, number of years in the principalship, or level of education.

Reed (2004) utilized an emotional intelligence measurement instrument designed based on Goleman’s components, Emotional Competency Inventory v. 2.0 (ECI v. 2.0), to examine the extent emotional intelligence impacts principal’s leadership behaviors and school climate. Through descriptive statistical analysis, factor analysis, and correlation analysis, Reed concluded many of the components of emotional intelligence positively impact leadership behaviors that foster school climate.

Summary

It is undeniable the nature of school leadership has changed with increased pressure of accountability for student achievement and societal demands placed upon school staff and principals (Bardach, 2008; Egley & Jones, 2005; Greenockle, 2010; Maulding, et al, 2010; Stephens & Hermond, 2010). This change requires the principal be an instructional leader, while, not lessening the school management role required for
efficient structure, quality facilities, and execution of schooling (Curry, 2004; Nettles & Herrington, 2007). This makes the job of principal a demanding and taxing profession choice that requires the person be able to manage themselves and others through the frustration which can occur. Possessing emotional intelligence allows for meeting these demands in a manner which fosters relationships and develops a respectful, trusting culture where the school community, students, and school staff are committed to student achievement (Egley & Jones, 2005; Lee & Shute, 2010; Moore, 2009).
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Chapter three describes the design of research methodology utilized for this study. The chapter explains the process for investigating the research questions and hypotheses proposed by the researcher. The chapter is broken into five sections consisting of: overview and research questions, research design, setting, participants, instrumentation, data gathering, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis.

Overview and Research Questions

The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and student academic achievement. The research questions will examined through the influence of the principal’s emotional intelligence quotient on school culture as a relationship to student achievement as measured by the Virginia Standards of Learning English End-of-Course reading standardized assessment scores. Specifically, the research questions and null hypotheses for this study are:

1. What is the relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and teacher perceived culture of the school?
   
   Null Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and teacher perceived school culture.

2. What is the relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and student achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment?
   
   Null hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and student achievement on the English End-of-
Course reading assessment.

3. What is the relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient, teacher perceived school culture, and student achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment?

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient, teacher perceived school culture, and student achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment.

Research Design

Correlational research was utilized to explore the extent of relationships between independent and dependent variables and their interactions. Correlational research is not utilized to note causation; it is to indicate if further experimental research is necessary to investigate causation depending on the strength of variable relationships. Correlations can be positive or negative depending on whether the independent variable has a positive or negative influence on the dependent variable. The numerical value of a correlation ranges between -1.0 and +1.0, with a correlation (r) equal to zero indicating there is not a relationship between the variables (Howell, 2010). Results from two surveys provided data for two of the variables, principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and school culture. The third data set utilized in the study was the 2012 Virginia’s Standards of Learning (SOL) End-of-Course assessment results for English 11 reading.

Setting

The study population was geographically restricted to secondary schools in Virginia Department of Education’s Region VII, consisting of 19 school districts and a
total of 40 secondary schools. This geographical region was chosen for the study due to the proximity of the researcher and the demographically similar communities within. These communities of Southwest Virginia in rural Appalachia have limited ethnic or cultural diversity, all being similar. The vast majority of families in this area of Virginia generate income from small manufacturing, mining, service, and agriculture endeavors with per capita personal income nearly fifty percent less than the state average of $44,246. Nineteen percent of households in Southwest Virginia fall below the federal poverty line which is reflected in the schools free and reduced lunch participation rates (Tippett, 2011).

Participants

The two participant groups in this study were derived by convenience sampling from secondary schools in Virginia Department of Education’s Region VII. The first participant group and gatekeepers to the second group, was principals of secondary schools who have served in their role at least one year. Principals were asked to participate in the study by completing an online emotional intelligence survey. By choosing to participate, they agreed to allow teachers in their building be asked to voluntarily complete an anonymous school culture survey.

Teachers, the second participant group, who had taught in the school with a participating principal for at least one year, were asked to anonymously complete a paper and pencil school culture survey. The survey administration was facilitated by a lead teacher identified by the school principal during a short meeting. The lead teacher distributed the invitation letter to participate (see Appendix C), notice of
informational/informed consent document (see Appendix D), read survey directions provided by the researcher (see Appendix E), administered the survey, then collected and sealed completed surveys in a self addressed stamped manila envelope that was mailed to the researcher. For a schools result to be incorporated into the research, a minimum of six teacher responses per school was required. The minimum number of responses was chosen due to the small size of some schools, thus, requiring nearly fifty percent of those schools’ teaching staff to participate.

Data Gathering

After approval for research from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) (see Appendix F) at Liberty University, permission from the Virginia Department of Education’s nineteen Region VII school division superintendents to conduct the study in corresponding secondary schools was requested (see Appendix G). Once permission was granted by superintendents, secondary principals, who had served at least one year in that building, were invited by email invitation (see Appendix H) requesting their participation in the research. In this email they were provided an informational/informed consent document (see Appendix I), a link directing them to the survey, and a password to access the survey. Follow up requests were conducted by email and a phone call at two and four week intervals if needed. By choosing to participate, principals understood that they agreed with allowing teachers in their school to be asked to complete a school culture survey. Principal’s participation required completing an online administration of a self perceived emotional intelligence inventory, the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal, Me-Edition (see Appendix A for sample questions). Upon completing the survey, the
principal immediately obtained a report from TalentSmart that included their overall emotional intelligence score as well as scores for each of the four components of Goleman’s Emotional Intelligence Theory. Further, suggested activities for individualized growth and development of emotional intelligence based on the principals’ results were provided by TalentSmart (Bradberry & Greaves, 2010).

Teachers in participating schools, with at least one year of experience in that building, were asked by an invitation letter (see Appendix C) to voluntarily complete an anonymous paper and pencil school culture survey during a short meeting: The School Culture Survey (see Appendix B). The survey administration was coordinated by a lead teacher who read the survey instructions, distributed the survey instruments, collected completed surveys, and sealed them in an envelope to be mailed to the researcher in a self addressed stamped envelope. To ensure teacher confidentiality, neither the school’s principal nor the researcher were present or knew which teachers on staff chose to complete the survey. Further, neither the principal nor researcher was made aware of individual teacher responses. School principals were provided a summary report of the school culture survey at their request for consideration and use regarding their school’s culture.

Virginia publishes an annual school report card indicating school pass percentages of core subject area accountability tests per school. The report card is readily available on the Virginia Department of Education’s website. Student achievement measures were evaluated utilizing spring 2012 English End-of-Course reading assessment results. Students taking the English End-of-Course reading assessment, which passing is required
for graduation, have generally been a student in the school three years unless the student has transferred into that school during that time.

**Instrumentation**

Instruments used to determine emotional intelligence evaluate the construct from either an ability or trait (mixed ability) intelligence. Ability measures assess emotional intelligence by considering if the individual possesses the inherent mental competencies for emotional intelligence. Trait measures assess emotional intelligence by evaluating if persons perceive they have and demonstrate emotional intelligence (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000). For this study, a trait (mixed ability) emotional intelligence instrument based on Goleman’s Emotional Intelligence Theory was utilized.

School culture surveys are typically designed to evaluate and identify the positive and negative aspects of a school's culture. These instruments help school administrators and school leadership teams identify negative cultural issues that need to be improved upon or areas of positive school culture that need to be celebrated and maintained (Barent, 2005).

**Emotional Intelligence Appraisal.**

The Emotional Intelligence Appraisal, Me-Edition (see Appendix A for sample questions), was developed by Bradberry and Greaves (2010), founders of TalentSmart, a company that develops and makes available emotional intelligence tests, resources, training, and consulting. TalentSmart serves as a research team of trained scientists specializing in statistics and organizational psychology that continually conducts research and validation supporting emotional intelligence and the Emotional Intelligence
Appraisal, Me-Edition (see Appendix A for sample questions) (Bradberry & Greaves, 2010). Permission was requested to use the survey in this research and granted by TalentSmart (see Appendix J).

The Emotional Intelligence Appraisal, Me-Edition (see Appendix A for sample questions), is a twenty-eight question self-report instrument based on Goleman’s four components of emotional intelligence through a number of question items measuring each area. Scores are provided for overall emotional intelligence quotient and the four components of Goleman’s Emotional Intelligence Theory. Participants respond to each item through a six point Likert-type scale including: 1) Never, 2) Rarely, 3) Sometimes, 4) Usually, 5) Almost Always, and 6) Always. The four components of Goleman’s Emotional Intelligence Theory, with the number of assessment questions, are defined as (Bradberry & Greaves, 2010):

1. Self Awareness (6 items): Self awareness consists of persons understanding their internal framework, inclinations, abilities and feelings:
   - Awareness of emotions and their effects;
   - Self assessing strengths and weaknesses; and,
   - Confidence in sense of worth and competency (Boyatzis, 2009).

2. Self Management (9 items): Self management of internal states, urges, and resources:
   - Self management of disruptive emotions and impulses;
   - Transparency leading to integrity aligned with values;
   - Adaptability allowing improvement toward meeting excellence;
• Continually achieving improvement toward excellence;
• The initiative to act on opportunities; and,
• Optimistic persistence toward pursuing goals despite obstacles (Boyatzis, 2009).

3. Social Awareness (5 items): Social awareness in handling relationships and individual’s feelings, needs, and concerns:
   • Empathy for others’ perspectives and active interest in their concerns;
   • Organizational awareness by interpreting emotional currents and power relationships; and,
   • Service orientation with foreseeing, recognizing, and meeting needs (Boyatzis, 2009).

4. Relationship Management (8 items): Relationship management by having the skill for facilitating desirable responses from others:
   • Developing others by sensing their needs to increase their abilities;
   • Inspirational leadership for individuals and groups;
   • Change catalyst by initiating and managing changes;
   • Influence by utilizing effective persuasion tactics;
   • Conflict management by negotiating resolutions to disagreements; and,
   • Directing teamwork & collaboration toward shared goals that creates group synergy (Boyatzis, 2009).
Validity has been established for the instrument through job performance studies on thousands of leaders across various industries. It is statistically valid ($R^2 = .132, p < .05$) with a strong relationship to job performance, explaining about twenty percent variance in individuals’ productivity. Cronbach’s Alpha indicates strong reliabilities for the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal, Me-Edition (see Appendix A for sample questions) ranging from .86 to .99. Individual reliability coefficients on the four emotional intelligence components are: self-awareness from .86 to .96, self-management from .94 to .97, social awareness from .92 to .96, and relationship management from .96 to .99 (Bradberry & Greaves, 2010).

The Emotional Intelligence Appraisal has been compared to ability based and 360º instruments; 360º instruments obtain an emotional intelligence score from combining self perception as well as ratings by others. The MSCEIT, ability type emotional intelligence inventory developed by Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso, and the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal, Me-Edition (see Appendix A for sample questions) was taken by 273 senior leaders of three organizations from different industries. Standardized regression weights for the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal, Me-Edition (see Appendix A for sample questions) and MSCEIT were $R^2 = 0.585, p < .003$ and $R^2 = 0.061, p < .748$ respectively; significant for the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal, Me-Edition (see Appendix A for sample questions) and not the MSCEIT. “The difference between the regression weights for the Emotional Intelligent Appraisal and the MSCEIT emotional intelligence scores yields a z score of 6.1 indicating a large and statistically significant difference between the values” (Bradberry & Greaves, 2010, p. 10).
In comparison against a traditional 360° assessment, one that includes self and other ratings, the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal had highly significant connections with the 360° instruments leadership competencies (Table 1).

Table 1

*Coefficients and Correlations between Emotional Intelligence Appraisal and a 360° Assessment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients Beta</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations Zero-order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing others</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic thinking</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilizing others</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results focus</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence Appraisal</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School Culture Survey.**

The School Culture Survey (see Appendix B) was developed by Gruenert (1998) in his dissertation *Development of a School Culture Survey*. Permission was requested to utilize the School Culture Survey (see Appendix B) and granted by the Middle Level Leadership Center, University of Missouri (see Appendix K). The survey is a thirty five question Likert-type instrument with five response options: strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, and strongly disagree. The instrument provides information about the schools' shared values and beliefs, patterns of behavior, and relationships in the school through six factors:

- Collaborative Leadership: The degree school leaders create and maintain
collaborative relationships with school staff. This is accomplished through valuing teachers’ ideas, input, decision making, and professional judgment in support of different and innovative ideas to improve education for students;

- Teacher Collaboration: The degree teachers in the school share dialogue, plan, evaluate, discuss, and increase knowledge of programs and practices that improves the educational vision of the school;

- Professional Development: The degree teachers value personal and school wide improvement through seminars, colleagues, organizations, and professional resources to remain current in instructional practices;

- Collegial Support: The degree teachers work together effectively through trust, respect, and support to accomplish tasks and goals;

- Unity of Purpose: The degree teachers work toward a shared mission of the school; understanding, supporting, and performing to accomplish the mission; and,

- Learning Partnership: The degree teachers, parents, and students partner for the good of students. Parents and teachers have common expectations and students assume responsibility for learning (Gruenert, 1998).

Gruenert (1998) computed Cronbach’s alphas for reliability indicating internal consistency for each of the SCS’s factors (Table 2). Validity for the instrument was established through correlation with the National Association of Secondary School Principals CASE-IMS Climate Survey (Gruenert, 2005).
### Table 2 Reliability Coefficient and Number of Questions Accessing SCS Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Reliability Coefficient</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Leadership</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Collaboration</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Support</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity of Purpose</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Partnerships</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standards of Learning test (SOL).**

The Commonwealth of Virginia’s Standards of Learning was adopted in June of 1995 in an effort to improve education for students in Virginia’s schools through a challenging and rigorous educational curriculum. Further, individual student achievement would be increased with teacher, school, and division accountability for student attainment through testing on the statewide standards. Student testing in the four core area standards began with field testing in 1997 and full testing in 1998 (Yecke, 1999).

Reliability and validity have been established for the Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL) test. Overall reliability for the multiple choice core area tests range from Cronbach’s Alpha’s of .82 to .93 and the English writing Stratified Alpha’s .89 to .92. Validity is assured in the Virginia Standards of Learning Assessments Technical Report, 2008-2009 Administration cycle by the:
...rigor with which the SOL Test Blueprint specifications match the emphases in the SOL Curriculum Frameworks and the involvement of Virginia educators in insuring that each test form matches the blueprint specifications and that each item on each form adequately, appropriately, and fairly address the standard of learning being measured (Yecke, 1999).

**Data Collection**

TalentSmart is a world leader in providing emotional intelligence tests, products, and training. TalentSmart consults with over seventy-five percent of the Fortune 500 companies by evaluating and training personnel in emotional intelligence. The company’s individual emotional intelligence instrument, The Emotional Intelligence Appraisal, Me-Edition (see Appendix A for sample questions), is available in either a paper or online format. Principals were solicited to participate in the study by email invitation and asked to complete the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal, Me-Edition (see Appendix A for sample questions) online through TalentSmart’s assessment page. The principals were provided individual login codes for accessing the online survey instrument to guarantee confidentiality and secure data collection. By agreeing to participate, principals were informed and understood teachers in their schools would be asked to complete the School Culture Survey (see Appendix B). Teachers who chose to participate in the research completed the anonymous paper and pencil survey voluntarily during a short meeting conducted by a lead teacher. Given the small size of some of the schools in Virginia Department of Education’s Region VII, a minimum of six teachers
per school completing the survey was required for the schools’ data to be included in the research. Student achievement data based on Virginia’s Standards of Learning tests are readily available through school report cards available on Virginia Department of Education’s Website.

**Data Analysis**

SPSS software was utilized to analyze data for the study. Descriptive statistics, partial correlation, and multiple regression between variables were computed and analyzed considering the research questions and corresponding hypotheses. The following null hypotheses guided the study:

1. There is no significant relationship between principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and teacher perceived school culture.

2. There is no significant relationship between a principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and student achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment.

3. There is no significant relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient, teacher perceived school culture, and student achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment.

To explore hypotheses one (1) and two (2), partial correlation was conducted using SSPS software. For hypothesis (3), examining the relationship between principal’s emotional intelligence quotient, school culture and student achievement, multiple regression was conducted utilizing SPSS software. Partial correlation allows investigating the relationship between an independent and dependent variable while
controlling, or removing, the effect of other variables. Multiple regression combines the effect of two or more independent variables on one dependent variable and provides a prediction of the combined relationship between the independent variables and dependent variable (Howell, 2010). If results of these tests are significant, the researcher can conclude predictive variables of student achievement. Further, the researcher will be able to predict from this study if principal’s emotional intelligence quotient, school culture, or both are correlated with student achievement.
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

The purpose of the study was to examine relationships between principal’s emotional intelligence quotient, school culture, and student achievement through three research questions. Chapter Four reports the data and consequent analysis used to investigate the research questions and hypotheses of the study. The findings will be reported in the following format: purpose, research questions, and null hypotheses; review of study design, sample population description, survey instrumentation, analysis of research questions and null hypotheses, and chapter summary.

Purpose, Research Questions, and Null Hypotheses

The overall purpose of the study was to investigate a gap in research on the impact principal’s emotional intelligence quotient has on school culture and student achievement. The research examines this purpose from the direct and indirect effect of principal’s emotional intelligence quotient through three research questions and corresponding null hypothesis:

1. What is the relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and teacher perceived culture of the school?

   Null Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and teacher perceived school culture.

2. What is the relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and student achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment?

   Null hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between principal’s overall
emotional intelligence quotient and student achievement on the English end-of-course reading assessment.

3. What is the relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient, teacher perceived school culture, and student achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment?

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient, teacher perceived school culture, and student achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment.

**Review of Study Design**

The research was a correlational investigation of the impact of a principal’s emotional intelligence quotient on school culture and student achievement. A convenience sampling of secondary principals in Virginia Department of Education’s Region VII and teachers in corresponding buildings was asked to participate. Voluntary participation by principals required the completion of an online emotional intelligence assessment and the agreement that teachers voluntarily complete an anonymous paper and pencil school culture survey. Results from these two quantitative instruments, the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal, Me-Edition (see Appendix A for sample questions) and the School Culture Survey (see Appendix B), were combined with school’s student pass percentages on the 2012 Virginia SOL English End-of-Course reading assessment.

**Sample Population Description**

The sample population for the study consisted of forty secondary principals and teachers in Virginia Department of Education’s Region VII’s nineteen school divisions.
Emails were sent to superintendents of these divisions describing the study and requesting permission to invite the division’s secondary principals and corresponding teachers to participate. Of the nineteen requests sent to superintendents, permission was granted from fourteen of the nineteen (74%), leaving a potential principal sample population of twenty-eight. After excluding those who were beginning their first year as principal in that building during the 2012-2013 school year, twenty-four principals remained and were invited to participate in the research. The initial email invitation and follow-up communications resulted in thirteen principals completing the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal, Me-Edition (see Appendix A for sample questions) online, allowing inviting teachers in corresponding buildings to participate. From the principal response rate of 54%, all but one of the schools returned the minimum number of completed school culture surveys and are included in the research (92.3%). A total of 253 teachers completed the school culture survey.

**Survey Instrumentation**

Principals who participated in the study completed a self-report online version of the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal, Me-Edition (see Appendix A for sample questions), developed by Bradberry and Greaves of TalentSmart, Inc. TalentSmart claims to be the world’s #1 organizational provider of assessment, training, coaching, and consulting resources of emotional intelligence by graduate trained behavioral psychologist. A statistically valid instrument, \( R^2 = .132, p < .05 \), the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal, Me-Edition (see Appendix A for sample questions) reports an overall emotional intelligence score and a score for each component of Goleman’s Emotional Intelligence
Theory. The twenty eight Likert-type online questions provide a quick and accurate emotional intelligence score for participants as well as suggested strategies designed to increase test takers’ emotional intelligence ability (Bradberry and Greaves, 2010).

Participating principal’s received an overall score and individual scores for each of the components of Goleman’s Emotional Intelligence Theory upon completing the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal, Me-Edition (see Appendix A for sample questions). These scores range from 1 to 100, with a mean of 75 and standard deviation of 10. Scores between 90 and 100 indicate an area of strength for the participant, between 80 and 89 a strength area to build on, between 70 and 79 an area of potential strength, between 60 and 69 an area needing work, and scores 59 and below areas that need to be addressed. Scores for each principal by survey code are listed in Table 3.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal #</th>
<th>Overall EI</th>
<th>Self-Awareness</th>
<th>Self-Management</th>
<th>Social Awareness</th>
<th>Relationship Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal #3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal #7</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal #13</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal #14</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal #15</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal #16</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal #17</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Principal participants’ mean overall emotional intelligence scores ranged from 63 to 89 with a mean of 77.5, a standard deviation of 7.10, and median score of 79.

Descriptive statistics of the four components of emotional intelligence were: self-awareness scores ranged between 72 and 98 with a mean of 79.2, standard deviation of 7.74, and median of 78; self-management scores ranged from 51 to 91 with a mean of 76, standard deviation of 10.8, and median of 77; social awareness scores ranged from 64 to 87 with a mean of 76.4, standard deviation of 6.84, and a median of 77; relationship management scores ranged from 61 to 89, with a mean of 77.8, standard deviation of 8.16, and a median of 78 (Table 4).

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics (N=12)</th>
<th>Overall EI</th>
<th>Self-Awareness</th>
<th>Self-Management</th>
<th>Social Awareness</th>
<th>Relationship Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher perceived school culture data was gathered from participating schools by completion of a paper and pencil survey. The School Culture Survey (see Appendix B) was originally developed by Gruenert in his dissertation and has been refined by him and Valentine, working together at the Middle Level Leadership Center, University of Missouri (Gruenert & Valentine, 1998). The Likert-type survey consists of 35 questions with response choices valued from 1 to 5 of: strongly disagree, disagree, undecided, agree, and strongly agree. The six dimensions of school culture included in the School Culture Survey (see Appendix B) were derived through a review of available literature on school culture: collaborative leadership, teacher collaboration and professional development, unity of purpose, collegial support, and learning partnership (Gruenert & Valentine, 1998). From these components, an overall school culture rating was derived for each participating school by averaging the component scores. Of the thirteen schools whose principal chose to participate in the research, twelve returned the minimum number of teacher surveys for data to be included in the research; a total of 253 teachers completed the survey (Table 5).

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Teacher Surveys Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The School Culture Survey (see Appendix B) was utilized to ascertain each school’s culture as perceived by the faculties through six factors. The descriptive data from the School Culture Survey (see Appendix B) administration includes the mean score, standard deviation, variance, minimum and maximum score for each of the six factors and overall rating as presented in Table 6 below:

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overall culture</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collaborative leadership</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher collaboration</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL) 2011-2012 English End-of-Course reading assessment results were used in the study as the measure of student achievement. Students who enroll in courses which have an End-of-Course test must complete the corresponding SOL test. Students receive a numerical score and rating of Pass/Advanced, Pass/Proficient, or Fail/Does Not Meet depending on the score. Scores of 500 and above are rated Pass/Advanced, 400-499 Pass/Proficient, and 399 or below as Fail/Does Not Meet. All students are required to take and pass the English 11 course and obtain a passing score on the English End-of-Course reading assessment as part of the requirements for an advanced or standard diploma. For this study, the percent of students who achieved a Pass/Proficient or Pass/Advanced make up the schools’ passing percentage, all students who pass the test. The English End-of-Course reading assessment mean score was 94.75 with a standard deviation of 2.56, a variance of 6.58, and a maximum pass percentage of 99 and a minimum of 91 (Table 7).
Table 7

*Virginia English Reading SOL test Descriptive Statistics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Minimum Percent</th>
<th>Maximum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English 11Reading</td>
<td>94.75</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>6.568</td>
<td>91.00</td>
<td>99.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Analysis**

**Assumption Testing**

Correlation and regression analysis was used in this study to examine the research questions and null hypotheses. Partial correlation was utilized for research questions 1 and 2, and multiple regression for research question 3 to determine the degree of relationship between the variables. Assumptions need to be met on variables for the results of these tests to be considered reliable. First, variables or residuals are checked for normal distribution by visual examination of their normality histogram for the correlations and multiple regression, and through skewness and kurtosis examination. Values of skewness and kurtosis of zero indicate a normal distribution with an acceptable range between -2 and +2 (Kendall, Stuart, Ord, & Arnold, 1999). All skewness and kurtosis results were within acceptable ranges. Histograms of principal’s emotional intelligence quotient, school culture, and student achievement are shown in Figure 2, Figure 3, and Figure 4 below; a normal P-P Plot of the regression residuals is shown in Figure 5.
Figure 2. Normality histogram for principal’s emotional intelligence quotient.
Figure 3. Normality histogram for teacher perceived school culture.
Figure 4. Normality histogram for student achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment.
Figure 5. Normality plot for student achievement.
The second and third assumptions for partial correlation and multiple regression, linearity between the independent and dependent variables and homoscedasticity, were evaluated. These assumptions were visually examined through scatterplots and found to be tenable. Scatterplots for linearity between principal’s emotional intelligence quotient, school culture, and student achievement are shown in Figure 6, Figure 7, and Figure 8 below. Homoscedasticity was determined by the data being evenly dispersed around the line of best fit for the bivariate relationships.
Figure 6. Linear relationship between principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and school culture.
Figure 7. Linear relationship between principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and student achievement.
Figure 8. Linear relationship between school culture and student achievement.
Multicollinearity is an assumption which must be considered when conducting multiple regression. Multicollinearity exists when a linear relationship between the independent variables are to a degree which diminishes the benefit of considering more than one of the highly correlated independent variables. If a highly linear relationship exists, adding the additional variable does not introduce new information to the model. The variance inflation factors, (VIF), measure indicate the variance of estimated coefficients increase if no correlation exists between the variables. If a VIF is over 10, multicollinearity may be an influence. Evaluating the VIF measures indicate the multicollinearity assumption is met (Table 8).

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal’s emotional intelligence quotient</td>
<td>.965</td>
<td>1.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher perceived school culture</td>
<td>.965</td>
<td>1.036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Question 1**

What is the relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and teacher perceived culture of the school?

**Null Hypothesis 1**

There is no significant relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and teacher perceived culture.

**Results Analysis 1**

Partial correlation was conducted to test the null hypothesis there is no significant
relationship between principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and teacher perceived culture of a school while controlling for student achievement. Assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity were evaluated. Analysis of the data indicated by principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and teacher perceived school culture affirms the null hypothesis. When controlling for student achievement, principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient is not significantly associated with school culture, $r = .380, p = .249$. The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

**Research Question 2**

What is the relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and student achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment?

**Null Hypothesis 2**

There is no significant relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and student achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment.

**Results Analysis 2**

Partial correlation was conducted to test the null hypothesis there is no significant relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and student achievement as measured on the English End-of-Course reading assessment while controlling for school culture. Assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity were evaluated. Analysis of the data indicated by principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and student achievement leads to rejecting the null hypothesis. A strong negative correlation was found, $r = -.627, p = .039$, indicating lower student achievement
is associated with higher principal’s emotional intelligence quotient. The researcher rejects the null hypothesis. The zero order correlation between principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and student achievement, \( r = -0.562 \), indicates controlling for school culture had some effect on the relationship between the variables.

**Research Question 3**

What is the relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient, teacher perceived school culture, and student achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment?

**Null Hypothesis 3**

There is no significant relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient, teacher perceived school culture, and student achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment.

**Results Analysis 3**

Null hypothesis for question 3 states there is no significant relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient, teacher perceived school culture, and student achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment. Assumptions of normality, linearity, homoscedasticity, and multicollinearity were evaluated and found tenable. The research question hypothesized the combination of principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and teacher perceived school culture would predict students’ achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment.

Linear multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine if the predictor variables of principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and teacher perceived
school culture could be used to predict student achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment. The multiple regression model with the two predictor variables was not a statistically significant fit to the data, $F(2, 11) = 3.27, p = .085, R^2 = .421$. The data revealed the magnitude of the relationship from the combination of principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and teacher perceived school culture with student achievement as ($R$) of .649. Therefore, there was a moderately strong, .649, degree of relationship between the independent and dependent variables (Cohen, 1988).

The multiple determination coefficient ($R^2 = .421$), indicates 42.1% of the variance in student achievement can be explained by the linear combination of principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and teacher perceived school culture (Table 9).

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Regression Predicting the Relationship between Principal’s Emotional Intelligence, School Culture, and Student Achievement</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>2.156</td>
<td>3.273</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analyzing the individual contributions for significance to the model (Table 10) at $p > .05$, principal’s emotional intelligence quotient significantly contributed to the variance in student achievement, $\beta = -.624, p = .039$. School culture did not meet the criteria to significantly impact student achievement, $\beta = .331, p = .232$; indicating the higher the principal’s emotional intelligence level, the lower students score on the English End-of-Course reading assessment.
Table 10

Regression Coefficients for Student Achievement by Predictor Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>zero –order</th>
<th>partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal’s Emotional</td>
<td>-.624</td>
<td>-.225</td>
<td>-2.415</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-.562</td>
<td>-.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Culture</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.3041</td>
<td>1.280</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.392</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Results

Chapter 4 has presented the findings of analysis of the research questions through partial correlation and multiple regression. Partial correlation was used to analyze the relationships between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and teacher perceived school culture, and principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and student achievement. Multiple regression was utilized to analyze the predictability of student achievement from principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and teacher perceived school culture.

Null hypothesis 1, there is no significant relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and teacher perceived culture, was supported by the data derived by partial correlation, ($r = .380, p = .249$). Therefore, principal’s emotional intelligence quotient was shown to not be significantly associated with school culture.

Null hypothesis 2, there is no significant relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and student achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment, was rejected by the data derived by partial correlation, ($r = -.627, p = .039$). Therefore, principal’s emotional intelligence quotient was shown to be significantly associated with student achievement; when principal’s emotional
intelligence quotient is higher, student achievement is lower.

Null hypothesis 3, there is no significant relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient, teacher perceived school culture, and student achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment, was supported by the data derived by multiple regression. When principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and teacher perceived school culture were predictor variables, there was not statistical significance for predicting student achievement, \( F(2, 11) = 3.27, p = .085, R^2 = .421. \)

Chapter 5 provides a summary and discussion of the study findings, implications in light of relevant literature and theory, study limitations, and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

Chapter four provided results of data and analysis examining the magnitude of relationships between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient, teacher perceived school culture, and student achievement measured on the English End-of-Course reading assessment. This study was driven by research which indicates a leader with emotional intelligence has a significant impact on an organizations culture and success (Assanova & McGuire, 2009; Curry, Goleman, 1995; Fullan, 2002; Goleman et al., 2002; Hoy & Miskel, 2005; Rosete & Ciarrochi, 2005; Stephens & Hermond, 2010; Wendorf-Heldt, 2009). To examine if those findings are transferable to the school setting, three research questions and corresponding null hypotheses were investigated utilizing principal’s self reported emotional intelligence quotients, teacher perceived ratings of school culture, and student academic achievement based on Virginia’s English End-of-Course reading assessment.

1. What is the relationship between the principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and teacher perceived culture of the school?

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and teacher perceived school culture.

2. What is the relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and student achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment?

Null hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and student achievement on the English end-of-
course reading assessment.

3. What is the relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient, teacher perceived school culture, and student achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment?

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient, teacher perceived school culture, and student achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment.

Two quantitative survey instruments and publicly available SOL pass percentages were utilized to collect data for the study. Participating secondary principals in Virginia Department of Education’s Region VII completed the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal, Me-Edition (see Appendix A for sample questions) administered online by TalentSmart, and teachers in corresponding schools voluntarily completed an anonymous paper and pencil administration of The School Culture Survey (see Appendix B), developed by Gruenert and Valentine (1998) at the Middle Level Leadership Center, University of Missouri. Student pass percentages on the English 11 End-of-Course reading assessment are publicly available on the Virginia Department of Education’s web page. Chapter five provides a summary and discussion on the findings of the analysis, study implications in light of relevant literature, study limitations, and recommendations for future research on the impact of principal’s emotional intelligence.

**Summary and Discussion**

**Hypotheses Results Summary and Discussion**

Null hypothesis 1 stated there is no significant relationship between principal’s
overall emotional intelligence quotient and teacher perceived school culture. To investigate the hypothesis, partial correlation was performed using SPSS between principal emotional intelligence and school culture while controlling for the effect student achievement may have on school culture. Analysis of the data from principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and teacher perceived school culture affirm the null hypothesis. When controlling for student achievement, principal’s emotional intelligence quotient is not significantly associated with teacher perceived school culture, $r = .380, p = .249$.

Result of data analysis for hypothesis 1 suggests principal’s emotional intelligence as a leadership capacity would not significantly affect the culture in a school. The partial correlation results produced a small, yet insignificant relationship between the two, going against findings of other studies. Research has consistently found the principal’s leadership affects school culture both directly and indirectly (Kruger, et al., 2007; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999; Leithwood, et al., 2010; May & Supovitz, 2010, MacNeil et al., 2009). The researcher approached the study to investigate if principal’s emotional intelligence, as a leadership construct shown to be a trait effective leaders possess (Assanova & McGuire, 2009; Bardach, 2008; Reed, 2005), would impact school culture in a positive way. The current study results do not support a significant association between principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and school culture.

Null hypothesis 2 stated there is no significant relationship between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient and student achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment. To investigate the hypothesis, partial correlation was performed using SPSS between principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and student
achievement while controlling for the effect of school culture on student achievement. Analysis of the data from principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and student achievement leads to rejecting the null hypothesis. When controlling for school culture, principal’s emotional intelligence quotient is significantly associated with student achievement, $r = -.627$, $p = .039$. The direction of the magnitude, however, is negative; an increase in principal’s emotional intelligence quotient is associated with a decrease in student achievement. The finding is not what the researcher expected or what has been demonstrated by previously mentioned studies. Conducting partial correlation and controlling for school culture impacted the association in a more negative direction than the zero-order correlation of principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and student achievement, $r = -.562$.

Results of data analysis for hypothesis 2 suggest principals with higher emotional intelligence quotients are negatively associated with student academic achievement. The partial correlation results produced a moderately strong negative correlation between principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and student achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment. Research has shown the quality of educational leadership is an extremely important factor for student achievement (Bipath, 2008; Egley & Jones, 2005; MacNeil et. al., 2009; Moore, 2009). The researcher approached the study having completed the literature review, expecting to find a positive correlation between principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and student achievement. The current study does not support the researcher’s expected findings; instead, the research indicates increased principal’s emotional intelligence quotient leads to decreased student
achievement.

Null hypothesis 3 stated there is no significant correlation between principal’s overall emotional intelligence quotient, teacher perceived school culture, and student achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment. The research question hypothesized the combination of principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and school culture would assist predicting students’ achievement on the English End-of-Course reading assessment. To investigate this hypothesis, linear multiple regression was performed using SPSS with principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and school culture as predictor variables and student achievement as the outcome variable. Results of the analysis indicated the model was not a significant fit to the data, $F(2, 11) = 3.27$, $R^2 = .421$, $p = .085$, leading to accepting the null hypothesis.

The data did reveal a moderately strong degree of relationship between the predictor and outcome variables, $R = .649$. The coefficient of multiple determination, $R^2 = .421$ indicated 42.1% of the variance in student achievement could be explained by the combination of principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and teacher perceived school culture. The individual contributions of the predictor variables indicated principal’s emotional intelligence quotient significantly contributed to the model, $\beta = -.624$, $p = .039$, while school culture did not, $\beta = .331$, $p = .232$. The negative, yet significant contribution of principal’s emotional intelligence quotient supports the findings of research question 2; increases in principal’s emotional intelligence quotient can lead to predicting lower student scores on the English End-of-Course reading assessment.

Results of the data analysis for hypothesis 3 suggest, while the model is not a
significant fit to the data, a moderately strong degree of association exist between principal’s emotional intelligence quotient, school culture, and student achievement.

Research has indicated separately principal’s emotional intelligence and school culture are significant predictors of student achievement. Bardach (2008) and Greenockle (2010) investigated the impact of principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and student achievement based on standardized test, and found a significant relationship between the variables. Krastek (2008) conducted an analysis of the role of the principal in transforming a school’s culture through leadership with emotional intelligence. His qualitative study concluded leading with emotional intelligence led to changing a school’s culture into a positive environment that became a model for an entire school district.

Implications from Literature Review

The literature review formed the foundation for the study. The researcher sought to build from previous research on leadership, emotional intelligence, school culture, and how to impact student achievement as a basis for the investigation. The current dynamic of being a school principal necessitates the person being skilled in a myriad of areas to motivate all constituents toward helping each student in school achieve academic success, thus, school success. Further, a principal, as the leader of the school and a model for students themselves, needs to lead in a manner that motivates students to work for their own success. From the literature review, the researcher hypothesized when principal’s leads with emotional intelligence, the result would lead to a positive school culture and increased student achievement.
Results of the study did not positively compare to results of other studies investigating the impact of leader’s emotional intelligence on an organization’s culture and success in the business environment. As concluded by research from the Center for Creative Leadership (2006), a major reason executives do not succeed is due to deficiencies in emotional competence.

Further, results of studies examining relationships between principal’s emotional intelligence with school culture and student achievement separately have been mixed; some finding significant relationships and associations and some not. Barent (2008) conducted a correlation study between the building atmosphere created by the school principal, motivation for teachers, and resultant student achievement, finding significant associations. Harde, et al., (2006) found student academic motivation is affected by the school culture crafted by the principal. Allen (2003), however, found a negative relationship between emotional intelligence and school climate. Bardach’s (2008) quantitative study examined the relationship between principal’s emotional intelligence and student achievement, finding higher emotional intelligence scores were associated with higher school accreditation ratings. Stephens and Hermond (2009) found the opposite. When examining the relationship between the principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and school's accountability rating, they found no significant difference.

Additional research is needed in the area of principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and the impact the capacity has on schools. Especially considering the negative correlation found in this study between principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and
student achievement and an insignificant association with school culture. These findings go against what the researcher expected after conducting the literature review. Also, the findings conflict with what common sense might indicate given the demonstrated impact of leadership in general and principal’s leadership in particular (Bipath, 2008; Boyatzis, 2009; Egley & Jones, 2005; Goleman, et al., 2002; Marzano, et al., 2005; Maulding, et al., 2010; Nettles & Harrington, 2007). Further, the research mentioned in the preceding paragraph and others have shown positive relationships between principal’s emotional intelligence quotient and student success (Greenockle, 2010; Maulding, et al., 2005).

Methodological and Practical Limitations

The focus of the study was associations between principal’s emotional intelligence quotient, school culture, and student achievement. To examine the associations, survey instruments were utilized to obtain quantitative measurements for principal’s emotional intelligence and school culture. The use of Likert-type survey instruments, the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal, Me-Edition (see Appendix A for sample questions) and School Culture Survey (see Appendix B), create limitations in the reliability and validity of answers provided by the participants. It was assumed participating principals and teachers would answer the instruments honestly without bias, and interpret the instruments questions accurately. Further, the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal, Me-Edition (see Appendix A for sample questions) is a self report measure of emotional intelligence which does not include others’ perceptions of the person’s emotional intelligence. Utilizing different instruments may lead to different results.

A second limitation of the study is that much of the convenience sample
population may have an existing relationship with the researcher. The study was limited to secondary school principals and teachers in Virginia Department of Education’s Region VII, where the researcher has worked in one form or another with many in the population.

Many variables aside from those investigated can affect school’s culture and student achievement is another limitation of the study. Factors such as socioeconomics (Bennett, 2008; Cuthrell et al., 2010; Gustafson, 2002), parental involvement (Boon, 2008, Lee & Shute, 2010), students with disabilities, school management practices and structure (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001), teacher experience and quality, teacher dedication and effort (May & Supovitz, 2011; Nettles & Herrington, 2007), student motivation (Harde, et al., 2006), and a myriad of others can have an impact on schools and students.

Generalization to a wider population is a limitation of the study. The study was limited to a rural Appalachian region and may not be relative to other populations. The demographics of the region are limited in cultural and ethnic diversity, population density, size of schools and districts, and may not adequately represent other locations.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The findings from the study indicate continued research is needed on the impact of a principal leading with emotional intelligence. Prior research in both the business and educational world have indicated leading with emotional intelligence guides a person’s decision making abilities, response to stimuli, behavior, relationships, ability to motivate, and inspiration for success (Curry, 2004, Moore; 2009; Stephens & Hermond, 2010). While this study did not find significant associations for research questions 1 and 3, and a
negative association for research question 2, exploring the questions from different constructs may be beneficial.

The study utilized Goleman’s (1995) Emotional Intelligence Theory as the theoretical foundation. This trait based theory has several measurement instruments available from both self-perception and 360º formats. It would be beneficial to conduct this study from a 360º model based on Goleman’s theory, as a replication using a different format. Further, as indicated in the literature review, two other prevalent emotional intelligence theories exist. Salovey and Mayer (2000) derived the initial emotional intelligence theory based upon an ability based framework: accessing a person’s inherent ability to be emotionally intelligent toward task and problem solving. Also, the Bar-On (2006) model, another trait based emotional intelligence theory, conceptualizes emotional intelligence differently than Goleman and includes mental acuity in the quotient calculation.

School culture ratings were derived utilizing the School Culture Survey (see Appendix B) instrument. Would the use of a different measurement instrument produce different ratings?

Future research could include multiple years, or multiple subject areas, of student achievement data instead of only one as utilized in the current study. Expanding the data base of test pass percentages may provide a more complete picture of the impact of principal’s emotionally intelligent leadership on school culture and student achievement than was derived in this study.

Further research could include some of the extenuating factors which can impact
student achievement. Given the complex nature of schools there are numerous players that impact what occurs and worthwhile of consideration in research.

Recommendations above are just a sample of the variations future research could focus on evaluating the principal leading their school with emotional intelligence. The stressful, multifaceted requirements of being a successful principal, typically judged by student achievement, seem to align with emotional intelligence theories and warrants further examination.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE APPRAISIAL

SAMPLE QUESTIONS FROM THE EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE APPRAISAL®
(sample only provided and are copyrighted by TalentSmart, Inc.)

PART ONE: For each question, check one box according to how often you…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>are confident in your abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>admit your shortcomings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognize the impact your behavior has upon others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>realize when others influence your emotional state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>play a part in creating the difficult circumstances you encounter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handle stress well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>embrace change early on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consider many options before making a decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strive to make the most out of situations, whether good or bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resist the desire to act or speak when it will not help the situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are open to feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognize other people’s feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accurately pick up on the mood in the room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hear what the other person is “really” saying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are withdrawn in social situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>directly address people in difficult situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communicate clearly and effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>show others you care what they are going through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use sensitivity to another person’s feelings to manage interactions effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explain yourself to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B

**SCHOOL CULTURE SURVEY**

### School Culture Survey

Indicate the degree to which each statement describes conditions in your school.

Please use the following scale:

1 = Strongly Disagree  
2 = Disagree  
3 = Undecided  
4 = Agree  
5 = Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teachers utilize professional networks to obtain information and resources for classroom instruction.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Leaders value teachers’ ideas.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teachers have opportunities for dialogue and planning across grades and subjects.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teachers trust each other.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teachers support the mission of the school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teachers and parents have common expectations for student performance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Leaders in this school trust the professional judgments of teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Teachers spend considerable time planning together.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Teachers regularly seek ideas from seminars, colleagues, and conferences.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Teachers are willing to help out whenever there is a problem.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Leaders take time to praise teachers that perform well.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The school mission provides a clear sense of direction for teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Parents trust teachers’ professional judgments.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Teachers are involved in the decision-making process.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Teachers take time to observe each other teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Professional development is valued by the faculty.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Teachers’ ideas are valued by other teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Leaders in our school facilitate teachers working together.  
19. Teachers understand the mission of the school.  
20. Teachers are kept informed on current issues in the school.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=Strongly Disagree  2=Disagree  3=Undecided  4=Agree  5=Strongly Agree

21. Teachers and parents communicate frequently about student performance.  
22. My involvement in policy or decision making is taken seriously.  
23. Teachers are generally aware of what other teachers are teaching.  
24. Teachers maintain a current knowledge base about the learning process.  
25. Teachers work cooperatively in groups.  
26. Teachers are rewarded for experimenting with new ideas and techniques.  
27. The school mission statement reflects the values of the community.  
28. Leaders support risk-taking and innovation in teaching.  
29. Teachers work together to develop and evaluate programs and projects.  
30. The faculty values school improvement.  
31. Teaching performance reflects the mission of the school.  
32. Administrators protect instruction and planning time.  
33. Teaching practice disagreements are voiced openly and discussed.  
34. Teachers are encouraged to share ideas.  
35. Students generally accept responsibility for their schooling, for example they engage mentally in class and complete homework assignments.  

Steve Gruenert and Jerry Valentine, Middle Level Leadership Center, University of Missouri, 1998. 
Reproduce only by authors’ written permission.
APPENDIX C

INVITATION LETTER TO SECONDARY TEACHERS

Dear Teacher:

I would like to invite you to participate in a doctoral dissertation research study I am conducting as a student at Liberty University. The purpose of this study is to examine the correlation between secondary school principals’ emotional intelligence quotient, school culture and student achievement.

Your participation in this survey is voluntary; however, your assistance is needed to provide information that could help identify and lead to the development of a principal’s leadership capacity that can improve school culture and student achievement. Your perception of the school culture is an important part of this study as research indicates a positive school culture is correlated with student academic success. Therefore, I request only teachers who have served in the building at least one year consider participating in this survey.

Completing the School Culture Survey should take you ten (10) minutes or less. Your responses are completely anonymous and cannot be linked to you in any way; please do not write your name on the survey. Your principal, school administration, I, nor any other entity will know your responses. As participation in this survey is anonymous, there is no known potential risk to you and no penalty if you chose to not participate.

Further, my serving as the director of instruction of a school division in Virginia Department of Education’s Region VII, is not to influence your choice of participation, nor be considered a conflict of interest on my part. To assure you of this, your participation is completely anonymous with your identity unknown to me, and the survey is not being administered by me but a fellow teacher.

Thank you for your participation in this study, if you have questions or concerns about completing the survey or participating, please feel free to contact me at __________ or ______________.

Sincerely,

Jeff Noe
Doctoral Candidate
APPENDIX D

TEACHER’S INFORMATIONAL/INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

The Relationship between Principal’s Emotional Intelligence Quotient, School Culture, and Student Achievement

Jeff Noe
Liberty University
Department of Education

You are invited to be in a research study of the impact a principals’ emotional intelligence quotient has on school culture and student achievement. You were selected as a possible participant because you serve as a secondary teacher in a school located in Virginia Department of Education’s Region VII. I ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to participate in the study.

This study is being conducted by: Jeff Noe, doctoral candidate in Educational Leadership at Liberty University.

Background Information
The purpose of this study is to examine correlations between a secondary school principal’s emotional intelligence quotient, school culture, and student achievement.

Procedures: If you agree to voluntarily participate in this study, you will be asked to anonymously complete a school culture survey, taking approximately ten (10) minutes. Please do not put your name on the survey document. Once completed, return the survey to the survey administrator who will seal them in an envelope.

Risks and Benefits of being in the Study
The study poses no known and at most minimal risk to you as a participant; no more than what would be encountered in everyday life.

The benefits to participation include providing information that could lead to school principals improving their leadership abilities, providing school districts with valuable information for hiring and training administrators to be more effective, and providing principal education programs with information to improve their preparatory programs.

Compensation: There is no compensation to you for choosing to participate in this research study.

Confidentiality: The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report that might be published, no names will be included and no information will make it possible to identify a participant or school. Research records will be stored securely in a locked
file cabinet or password protected computer only the researcher will have access to. Paper copies of data will be destroyed after transcribed.

**Voluntary Nature of the Study:** Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Liberty University or any person in Region VII. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships.

**Contacts and Questions:** The researcher conducting this study is Jeff Noe. You may ask any questions you have now or at any time by contacting Jeff Noe at Wythe County Public Schools, _________. Also, you may contact Dr. Deanna Keith at ___________. Liberty University faculty advisor in this research study.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher(s), **you are encouraged** to contact the Institutional Review Board, Dr. Fernando Garzon, Chair, 1971 University Blvd, Suite 1582, Lynchburg, VA 24502 or email at fgarzon@liberty.edu.

*You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.*
APPENDIX E

SURVEY ADMINISTRATION DIRECTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATING TEACHER

School Culture Survey administration directions to be read by the administrating lead teacher:

“You are being asked to take a survey that will measure your school’s culture in 6 key areas: (1) collaborative leadership, (2) teacher collaboration, (3) professional development, (4) collegial support, (5) unity of purpose, and (6) learning partnerships. Your participation in this research and completing the survey is voluntary and completely anonymous. You are not to place your name on the surveys or provide any identifiable information. The results of this survey will be included in research that examines factors that may lead to increased student academic achievement.

If you chose to participate in this survey, please:

- Make solid marks that fill the oval.
- Mark only one oval per question.
- Cleanly erase any marks you decide to change.
- Please respond in terms of how your felt the question represents your school.
- Once completing the survey, please place in the provided manila envelope, this will be mailed directly to the researcher and not viewed by any other person.

Thank you for your help in this research project.”
July 9, 2012

Jeffery Noe

IRB Approval 1367.070912: The Relationship between Principal’s Emotional Intelligence Quotient, School Culture, and Student Achievement

Dear Jeffery,

We are pleased to inform you that your above study has been approved by the Liberty IRB. This approval is extended to you for one year. If data collection proceeds past one year, or if you make changes in the methodology as it pertains to human subjects, you must submit an appropriate update form to the IRB. The forms for these cases were attached to your approval email.

Thank you for your cooperation with the IRB and we wish you well with your research project.

Sincerely,

Fernando Garzon, Psy.D.  Professor, IRB Chair Counseling  (434) 592-4054
Liberty University  |  Training Champions for Christ since 1971
Dear Superintendent:

I am requesting your support of a doctoral dissertation study I am conducting as a student at Liberty University. The purpose of this study will be to examine the correlation between secondary school principal’s emotional intelligence quotients with school culture and student achievement.

To complete this study, secondary principals in your division will be asked to participate by completing an online emotional intelligence assessment, about 10 minutes in length; teachers will be asked to anonymously complete a school culture survey, about 10 minutes in length; and 2012 English Reading Standards of Learning scores will be obtained from Virginia Schools Report Cards.

This study focuses on how the emotional intelligence level of the principal impacts the creation of a cultural environment that impacts student’s achievement. Secondary principals in your division will be provided results of their emotional intelligence assessment with suggested activities to increase their quotient that could contribute to their personal growth as leaders.

Confidentiality will be maintained at all times through this process with results being anonymous and not connected to individuals or schools. Sample copies of the surveys to be utilized are attached for your review.

I am more than willing to discuss this further if you have any questions or concerns and would appreciate any assistance you can provide.

If you would, please respond (reply) to this email expressing approval to conduct this research with your secondary schools. Thank you for your help in this project.

Sincerely,

Jeff Noe
Doctoral Candidate
Liberty University
APPENDIX H

EMAIL INQUIRY TO SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Dear Principal:

I would like to invite you to participate in a doctoral dissertation research study I am conducting as a student at Liberty University. The purpose of this study is to examine the correlation between secondary school principal’s emotional intelligence quotient with school culture and student achievement.

Your participation in this survey is voluntary, however, your assistance is needed to provide information which can help you and other educational leaders have a greater impact in our efforts to help students succeed academically. I believe this research can provide you valuable information to help you in completing your challenging jobs as high school principals and the vast array or responsibilities you have. There is no known risk for your participation and any information related to you or your school will be completely confidential.

I know your schedules are very busy and every minute is important, thus, I only ask you take about ten (10) minutes to complete the linked assessment below. This assessment will calculate your emotional intelligence overall and subscale scores. The results will be shared with you including suggested activities that may facilitate your own personal growth. This information is confidential and will not be shared or linked to you or your school in any form at any time.

Then, please allow me to conduct a voluntary anonymous survey of school culture with teachers in your building. I ask you to allow teachers with at least one year of experience in your building to complete an evaluative school culture survey. This survey is voluntary for them, will take ten (10) minutes or less, and can be conducted in a brief meeting facilitated by a lead teacher of your choice. I will provide copies of the survey to be administered and an addressed postage paid envelope the leader teacher can seal the surveys in and mail after the administration.

Thank you for your participation in this study, and, if you have questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at any time. I can be reached at ________________, or ________________.

[Assessment link centered and bold]

Please click on the above link to access the assessment.

Sincerely,

Jeff Noe
Doctoral Candidate
Liberty University
APPENDIX I

PRINCIPAL’S INFORMATIONAL/INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

The Relationship between Principal’s Emotional Intelligence Quotient, School Culture, and Student Achievement
Jeff Noe
Liberty University
Department of Education

You are invited to be in a research study of the impact a principal’s emotional intelligence quotient has on school culture and student achievement. You were selected as a possible participant because you serve as a secondary principal in Virginia Department of Education’s Region VII. I ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

This study is being conducted by: Jeff Noe, doctoral candidate in Educational Leadership at Liberty University.

Background Information: The purpose of this study is to examine the correlations between secondary school principals’ emotional intelligence quotient, school culture, and student achievement.

Procedures: If you agree to voluntarily participate in this study, you will only be asked to complete an online survey that should take less than ten (10) minutes of your time.

Risks and Benefits of being in the Study: The study poses no known risk, and at most only minimal risk if you choose to participant: no more than what would be encountered in everyday life.

The benefits from your participation include providing information that could lead to school principals improving their leadership abilities, providing school districts with valuable information for hiring and training administrators to be more effective, and providing principal education programs with information to improve their preparatory programs.

Compensation: There is no compensation to you for participating in this research study.

Confidentiality: The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report that might be published, no names will be included and no information will make it possible to identify a participant. Research records will be stored securely in a locked file cabinet and only researcher will have access to the records. Your individual emotional intelligence reports will have identifiable information removed then number coded to
match school culture and 2012 English reading SOL pass percentages. A master coding list will be stored separate from all other research data in a locked filling cabinet which only the researcher will have access to. Paper copies of data with identifiable information will be destroyed by shredding.

**Voluntary Nature of the Study:** Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Liberty University or any person in Region VII. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships.

**Contacts and Questions:** The researcher conducting this study is Jeff Noe. You may ask any questions you have now or at any time by contacting Jeff Noe at Wythe County Public Schools ______________. Also, you may contact Dr. Deanna Keith, at ____________, Liberty University faculty advisor of this research study.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher(s), you are encouraged to contact the Institutional Review Board, Dr. Fernando Garzon, Chair, 1971 University Blvd, Suite 1582, Lynchburg, VA 24502 or email at fgarzon@liberty.edu.

*You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records*
Thank you for your request for permission to use Emotional Intelligence Appraisal Me edition in your research study. We are willing to allow you to use the instrument as outlined in your request at a 50% discounted rate ($19.98 per assessment) with the following understanding:

- You will use this survey only for your research study and will not sell or use it with any compensated management/curriculum development activities.
- You will include the copyright statement on all copies of the instrument.
- You will send your research study and one copy of reports, articles, and the like that make use of this study data promptly to our attention upon completion.

If these are acceptable terms and conditions, please indicate so by signing one copy of this letter and returning it to us.

Best wishes with your study.

Sincerely,

______________________________
Signature

I understand these conditions and agree to abide by these terms and conditions.

Signed_______________________  Date____________

Expected date of completion: ____________
APPENDIX K

PERMISSION TO USE THE SCHOOL CULTURE SURVEY

From: Valentine, Jerry W. (Emeritus) [ValentineJ@missouri.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2012 10:40 PM
To: Jeff Noe
Cc: Steve Gruenert
Subject: RE: Dissertation Use of the SCS

Jeff
You did a fine job crafting your statement. It is what I needed to see.

You have permission to use the School Culture Survey specifically for the purposes of your graduate research.

Best of luck with your study. Please send me and Dr. Gruenert a PDF of the study once it is finished so we can see your findings.
Jerry Valentine

Jerry W. Valentine, Ph.D.
Professor Emeritus
University of Missouri
1266 Sunset Drive
Columbia, MO 65203
(573) 356-8948