

IS THE EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS CORRELATED WITH THE
JOB SATISFACTION OR PERFORMANCE OF THEIR TEACHERS?

Ryan E. Cobbs
B.S.A. Ottawa University 2000
M.A.S. Emporia State University 2004

Submitted to the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies and the Faculty of
the Graduate School of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of:

Doctor of Education (Ed.D)

Dissertation Committee

Chairperson: Dr. Argun Saatcioglu

Dr. Mickey Imber

Dr. Howard Ebmeier

Dr. Perry Perkins

Dr. Marc Mahlios

Date Defended

The Dissertation Committee for Ryan E. Cobbs
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

DOES THE EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE OF SECONDARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS HAVE AN
ASSOCIATIVE EFFECT ON TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION?

Chairperson: Dr. Argun Saatcioglu

Date approved: _____

ABSTRACT

This study examines the association between secondary school administrators' emotional intelligence (EI) and teacher job satisfaction. Two separate questions guided the study. First, does the emotional intelligence of secondary school administrators relate to teacher job satisfaction and secondly, is there a relationship between EI of administrators and teacher job performance? Principals of 84 Kansas high schools participated in the Mayer Salovey Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) with at least two of their staff members participating in a teacher survey that included questions regarding Job Construct, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Job Scope, Role Stress, and Burn Out. The surveys for both parties were distributed online through a website with a username and password. The MSCEIT was offered through Multi-Health Systems database while the teacher survey was offered through survey monkey. Overall 7 different levels of EI were tested as they related to both job satisfaction and job performance. Initially the study concluded that there were findings of significant correlation between Branch 1 of the EI quotient (Perception of Emotion) and job satisfaction, however, that finding was actually negatively correlated showing that the higher the Branch 1 score of the principal, the less satisfied their staff members were with their job. When compared with job performance no significant correlation was found. Subsequently, this study shows that regardless of the claims of those pushing EI, further study is needed to verify those claims. The findings here indicate that EI has little to no significant association to either job satisfaction nor performance.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I cannot express enough the gratitude and respect I have for Dr. Argun Saatcioglu. Without his assistance and guidance the completion of this project may never have been realized. His understanding of my needs and abilities coupled with his intellect, drive, and ambition has enabled me to reach my goals. Dr. Argun, I will forever be indebted to you for all that you have helped me to accomplish.

I would also like to thank the entire Education Leadership and Policy Studies staff at the University of Kansas for your guidance and inspiration. I also feel that a special thank you should be extended to Dr. Perry Perkins for helping not only myself, but our entire cohort with meeting our goals. Finally, I would like to thank the dissertation committee for their time and efforts in helping me to reach the final destination of this journey.

It should be stated that this study could not have been completed without the efforts of the many high school principals and their staff that participated. I am extremely grateful for their participation, time, and cooperation.

Finally I would like to thank Angie and Shawn for their countless hours of revision and thoughts in turning this document into the final product.

DEDICATION

To my wife Abbi who has been the rock and stability in my life during this process. I truly appreciate your love and understanding for without it I do not believe I would have made it to the end of this process. I will never truly be able to explain to you what your companionship means to me.

To my kids Casey and Shelby; who have had to deal with their father's late nights of class and studying. The need to be someone who you both can look up to and admire gave me the strength to continue this program.

Finally to my mother Diane who has instilled in me the importance of education and the will to succeed. Your support in all of my endeavors through the years has never waned.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
DEDICATION.....	iv
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Statement of Problem.....	1
1.2 The Purpose.....	2
1.3 The Relevance.....	2
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	5
2.1 Emotional Intelligence.....	5
2.2 Beyond Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso’s Definition of Emotional Intelligence.....	6
2.3 Emotional Intelligence and Leadership.....	7
2.4 Emotional Intelligence and the School Principal.....	9
2.5 Changing One’s Emotional Intelligence.....	10
2.6 Teacher Job Satisfaction.....	11
2.7 Role of the Principal.....	13
2.8 Effects of Principal Support.....	15
2.9 In Conclusion.....	16
3. METHODOLOGY.....	18
3.1 Emotional Intelligence Tests.....	18
3.2 MSCEIT’s Four Branch Approach.....	19
3.3 Validity of MSCEIT.....	20
3.4 Descriptive Data.....	21
3.4.1 Emotional Intelligence Data Collection.....	22

3.4.2	Teacher Job Satisfaction Data Collection.....	22
3.5	Measures of Teacher Job Satisfaction.....	23
3.5.1	Role Stresses.....	23
3.5.2	Job Construct.....	23
3.5.3	Burnout.....	23
3.5.4	Job Scope.....	24
3.5.5	Organizational Citizenship.....	24
3.6	Regression Analysis.....	25
3.7	Limitations.....	25
4.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	27
4.1	Aggregation of Emotional Intelligence Quotient (EIQ) via MSCEIT.....	27
4.2	Description of Data.....	29
4.2.1	Emotional Intelligence Descriptors.....	29
4.2.2	Interpreting Scores.....	30
4.2.3	Principal Descriptors.....	31
4.2.4	School Descriptors.....	32
4.2.5	Job Performance & Satisfaction Descriptors.....	33
4.3	Findings.....	33
4.3.1	The purpose.....	33
4.3.2	Analysis of Regression.....	33
4.3.3	Job Satisfaction Explanation.....	36
5	DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION.....	37
	Tables.....	43

Table 1 Structure and Levels of Feedback from MSCEIT.....	43
Table 2 Overview of Four Branch Model of Emotional Intelligence.....	44
Table 3 Overview of MSCEIT Scores.....	45
Table 4 Descriptives.....	46
Table 5 Guidelines for Interpreting MSCEIT Scores.....	47
Table 6 Regression EI TOTAL.....	48
Table 7 Regression EI AREA.....	49
Table 8 Regression EI BRANCH.....	50
Table 9 Measures.....	51
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	52
APPENDIX A.....	58
Teacher Survey.....	58
APPENDIX B.....	62
MSCEIT Sample Booklet Questions.....	62

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Statement of the Problem

Although secondary school administrators hold the same degree, the qualifications one must possess significantly differ within the expectations of individual titles. However, the difficulties of each of their jobs are not as similar as their backgrounds. High school principals must communicate a vision to their staff and adapt to a rapidly changing environment, especially in the wake of current drastic budget reductions. Principal leaders have been forced to align their leadership methodologies to support initiatives such as No Child Left Behind in order to ensure that their buildings meet adequate yearly progress requirements. In order to meet these expectations, principals require support from local constituents including staff, parents, students, school board, and community members.

Therefore, it has become evident that secondary school administrators must be able to manage their emotional state as well as the emotions of their staff in order to create a plan for school success. Research shows that the ability to manage various emotional states directly relates to a leader's Emotional Intelligence (EI) which is defined as the set of attributes (such as perceiving emotions, facilitating thought, understanding emotions, and managing emotions) that enable a person to manage himself/herself and others (Goleman, 1995). Boyatzis, Goleman and Rhee define EI more explicitly as the frequency with which a person demonstrates or uses their attributes (described in the four branches of EI), inherent in

emotional intelligence to determine the ways in which he/she deals with themselves, their life and work, and others (2000).

The Purpose

The purpose of this study is to explore the association between an administrator's EI as defined by Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso and a teacher's satisfaction and performance as defined by the job satisfaction survey described in Chapter 3. In doing so, this study will attempt to focus on each principal's EI and the level of association that each of those competencies (perceiving emotions, facilitation of thought, understanding emotions, and managing emotions) might have with a school's success with the understanding that there is evidence of higher school effectiveness in buildings where teachers feel important (Shann, 1998). Principals who respond quickly and effectively to dynamic environments and implement the necessary changes have been most successful in the development of sustained and long-term growth in student achievement (Fullan, 2002). Although Fullan was not speaking specifically to EI, it is EI by definition that helps a principal meet these goals.

The Relevance

If the association between administrator EI to teacher satisfaction and performance can be shown, the possibility of improving a current leader's EI as well as hiring principals that are strong in EI coupled with the other requirements for the principalship may ultimately result in the hiring of individuals that can best promote job satisfaction and general organizational health. According to Dr. Weisinger, "EI can be nurtured, developed, and augmented—it isn't a trait that you either have or don't have" (1998). If schools were to utilize the opportunity through professional development to improve their leader's (principals and teachers) EI, it

could have a profound effect on the culture of the building, and relationships between staff and students.

Although there are several models of EI currently being published, one such model is a five-prong approach that includes self-awareness and control, empathy for others, social expertness, personal influence, and mastery of purpose (Lynn, 2008). Lynn has used this model to develop an interview method that determines the interviewee's emotional intelligence in each of these areas. This is important due to the fact that a growing body of evidence points out that when individual job skills are constant, EI competencies account for the success of many different positions (Lynn, 2008). Moreover, in many positions, EI competencies account for a higher rate of job success than do specific job skills. Accordingly, various studies have shown that EI competencies account for anywhere from 24% to 69% of job performance success. Therefore, companies would be remiss if they did not consider screening aimed at EI competencies (Lynn, 2008).

According to studies by Colbert and Wolf (1992) and Ingersoll and Smith (2003) an estimated 40% to 50% of beginning teachers leave the profession within 5 years. For example, Inman and Marlow found that most teachers who leave, have fewer than 10 years of teaching experience. Furthermore, their report indicated that 25%-50% of beginning teachers resign during their first three years of teaching (2004). Teachers commonly cite lack of administrative support and insufficient involvement in decision making as reasons for this attrition (Gonzalez, 1995). Inman and Marlow emphasized principals who stifled teacher creativity as a major factor in teacher attrition (2004). Researchers have determined a link between satisfaction of principal leadership and teacher job satisfaction and specifically to teacher attritions in schools

with a lack of leadership (Rinke, 2008, & Betancourt-Smith, Inman, & Marlow, 1994).

Anderman, Belzer, and Smith (1991) found that principals' actions create distinct working environments within schools that are highly predictive of teacher satisfaction and commitment.

This study examines the correlation between how principals manage their staff emotionally, and the associative relationship of that behavior toward job satisfaction and performance.

CHAPTER 2

Review of Literature

The implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2002 requires administrators of secondary schools to be more involved in school improvement than before. However, teachers have grown to appreciate the autonomy and discretion they had at work prior to NCLB, particularly with regard to teaching and school affairs. This contradiction of needs has created a conflict of pressures for today's administrators. In order to manage the schools of the present and the future, principals need greater people skills to be successful. Contemporary research on leadership offers the concept of EI to help explore this issue.

The review of literature in this study, focuses on the following, how EI has affected leadership with regard to school administrators, the ability to change one's EI, The No Child Left Behind Act and how it has changed the role of the school administrator, what teachers expect in order to create satisfaction throughout their careers, the conflict between what administrators need to accomplish vs. what teachers want and finally, how EI may be able help them manage that situation.

Emotional Intelligence

The idea of emotional intelligence was popularized in 1995 by Daniel Goleman after the release of his book *Emotional Intelligence*. However, the phrase Emotional Intelligence was actually coined 5 years prior to the book release by Salovey and Mayer who described the term as "a type of emotional information processing that includes accurate appraisal of emotions in oneself and others, appropriate expression of emotion, and adaptive regulation of emotion in such a way as to enhance living" (1990). Through further research, Mayer, Caruso, and Salovey later amended their definition of EI as "an ability to recognize meanings of emotions and their

relationships, and to reason and problem solve on the basis of them. Emotional intelligence is involved in the capacity to perceive emotions, assimilate emotion related feelings, understand the information of those emotions and manage them” (2000). After defining EI, it is not difficult to understand why it has taken a strong hold in the development of leadership across all facets of business, and how it could play a major role in the realm of educational leadership.

Beyond Mayer, Salovey, and Carusso’s Definition of Emotional Intelligence

Emotional intelligence is the composite set of capabilities that enable a person to manage themselves and others (Goleman, 1998). Moreover, the frequency that a person demonstrates or uses the constituent capabilities, or competencies, inherent in EI determine the ways in which they deal with themselves, their life and work, and others (Boyatzis, Goleman, and Rhee, 2000). Within the concept of EI, there are four subgroups that help to define the entire scope of exactly what those competencies address. Those subgroups include: (1) Self-Awareness, including emotional self-awareness, accurate self-assessment, and self-confidence; (2) Self-Management, including achievement orientation, adaptability, initiative, trustworthiness, conscientiousness, and self-control; (3) Social Awareness, including empathy, service orientation, and organizational awareness; and (4) Social Skills, including leadership, influence, communication, developing others, change catalyst, conflict management, building bonds, teamwork, and collaboration (Boyatzis, Goleman, and Rhee, 2000).

Scott-Ladd and Chan, authors of *Emotional Intelligence and Participation in Decision Making*, found that individuals who understand their own emotions are more capable of accurately identifying responses, therefore have a greater ability to change them.

Furthermore, if one can harness their intellectual use of emotions, they are better able to assimilate information, make judgements, be more creative and better problem solvers. Emotionally intelligent individuals are more aware of their strengths and limitations, allowing them to be more confident, optimistic, flexible, innovative, and comfortable with new ideas (2004).

Emotional Intelligence and Leadership

Positive leadership is bound in the definition of EI. Leaders who are best suited to orchestrate positive change with an organization have the ability to recognize the need for change and are able to remove barriers that may complicate that change (Goleman, 1998). Effective leaders challenge the status quo behaviors of their organizations and enlist the help of others to facilitate the change process. Quality leaders are effective at modeling change in behaviors for others to follow. Of course, the emotion in which they construct these actions plays a significant role in how these competencies will be demonstrated to their staff.

EI includes four major aspects that most influence and lead positive leadership initiatives. They include: the leader's ability to assess and express emotions within their organization; a leader must capitalize on the understanding of emotions to facilitate the decision making process; there must be significant knowledge of their own emotional processes and that of their staff; and they will need to manage emotion effectively (George, 2000). EI should facilitate the transformation of current leadership practices and has been shown to be useful in changes that address the individual needs of the organization's members (Moss, 2006).

There are several studies that have been done validating this point. In 2006 (Groves) a study was leveled including 108 senior organizational leaders who were asked to complete a survey measuring emotional expressivity that also gathered organizational data. Three hundred and twenty five staff members working for these leaders were asked to fill out evaluations rating their leader's level of visionary leadership, effectiveness of leadership, and the ability to create organizational change. The study determined that there was a significant relationship between a leader's ability to express his/her emotions and his/her visionary leadership. Furthermore, the study showed that the top 33 leaders with respect to emotional expressivity and vision were also leading companies with the highest levels of organizational change (Groves, 2006).

In 2000 an English company, Hay Management Consultants, compared 200 highly effective principals to 200 senior executives in business. The group identified five domains of leadership: Teamwork and Developing Others, Drive and Confidence, Vision and Accountability, Influencing Tactics and Politics, and Thinking Styles (conceptual and analytical) (Fullan).

Fullan compares this study to a claim made by Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee made in 2002 in which they stated that emotionally intelligent leaders and emotionally intelligent organizations are essential in complex times. Leaders of today's schools have to be aware of their own emotions, need to be sensitive and inspiring to their staff and others, and have to be able to deal with the day-to-day problems of a school while trying to create fundamental, sustained changes in the culture of the organization (2000).

EI and the School Principal

However, the research on EI and its effect on public education is limited at best. Since the adoption of NCLB into public schools, numerous studies have shown that traditional forms of leadership development may not be preparing administrators for the organizational changes that schools will be facing in the future. EI has been utilized to address a number of these deficiencies (Dearborn, 2002).

Michael Fullan claims that “effective school leaders are key to large scale, sustainable, education reform” (2002). In order to achieve quality reform, the capacity of the principal to develop teachers’ knowledge and skills, professional community, program coherence, and technical resources are key (Newmann, King, and Youngs). Therefore, it is the schools’ responsibility to develop principals who hold all of five essential components of a “change principal” including moral purpose, an understanding of the change process, the ability to improve relationships, knowledge creation and sharing, and coherence making (Fullan 2002). In essence, it takes administrators who are emotionally intelligent to create and sustain positive educational reform.

In Goleman’s book, *Emotional Intelligence*, he saw three points that created much intrigue to our nations’ educators. First and foremost, for schools he saw that rudeness, irresponsibility, and violence were serious issues plaguing not only our schools, but our country as well. He went on to claim that scientists had found a link between high EI and prosocial behavior. Finally, Goleman claimed that at times EI, more than IQ, was the most reliable predictor of success in life and in school. However, there is little evidence to support that EI

contributes to or is dramatically linked to the success of principals (Mayer and Cobb 2000). This fact creates an opportunity for researchers to truly study the effects of emotional intelligence on high school administrators and their ability to achieve success.

Changing One's Emotional Intelligence

Fortunately, one's level of emotional intelligence is not solidified. According to Goleman, (1998) nearly every attribute to one's EI is a learned trait and subsequently not an innate ability one with which one is born. Therefore, the ability to increase one's EI is a legitimate possibility. Many schools across the nation have already implemented EI instruction for their students, but there has yet to be widespread curriculum intended for and required participation of principals and staff (Snyder and Lopez, 2002). Schilling (1996) recommends units on self-awareness, managing feelings, decision making, managing stress, personal responsibility, self-concept, empathy, communication, group dynamics, and conflict resolution to develop a greater emotional intelligence for our leaders.

An up and coming approach is the Weatherhead MBA program at Case Western Reserve University where training in social and emotional competency is integrated into the learning system for future business leaders (Boyatzis, Cowen, & Kolb 1995). These students undergo experiences designed to improve initiative, flexibility, achievement drive, empathy, self-confidence, persuasiveness, networking, self-control, and group arrangement. Many of these topics coincide with the recommendations of Schilling to improve one's emotional intelligence. There are other programs geared toward the same goal being incorporated in universities across America. Although a systematic evaluation of these programs has not been published, a

higher business growth rate has been found for businesses whose leaders have enrolled and finished these programs when compared to those who had not (Snyder and Lopez, 2002).

A growing body of evidence points to the promise that when technical competencies are equivalent, EQ competencies account for job success in multiple leadership positions. Moreover, in some of those positions, EQ competencies actually account for a greater percentage of success than to the technical competencies. Various studies have estimated that anywhere from 24% to 69% of job performance and success are attributed to emotional intelligence competencies (Lynn, 2008). If this is to be taken literally, the idea that administrators, the leaders of our nation's future and those responsible for educating our children, are not being selected without some level of emotional intelligence being measured and added to the equation. With abilities to measure EQ and train to improve it, embracing the need for our schools' leaders to be competent emotionally is a must.

Teacher Job Satisfaction

Teacher job satisfaction has been often associated in a two-dimensional view through extrinsic and intrinsic motivators by most researchers although some have added a third dimension. Extrinsic satisfaction relates to those items provided by the organization through rewards such as salary and benefits, promotion, status, a safe environment, and security in their position (Taylor and Tashakkori, 1995). When teachers' satisfaction is found through the individual and relate to performance such as the opportunity to contribute, involvement in challenging work, and the autonomy to pursue a variety of job tasks, it is said to be intrinsic (Taylor and Tashakkori, 1995). In today's educational economy, teachers are often stripped of

the opportunity to rely on extrinsic motivators and therefore, must rely on the intrinsic motivators of their position to enjoy their jobs. Moreover, with the position becoming more difficult on a daily basis, the opportunity for intrinsic rewards may be fading as well.

Subsequently, intrinsic factors including strong leadership and administrative support seem to play a paramount role in motivating individuals to remain in the teaching profession (Cerit, 2009).

Ziggarelli (1996) found that teacher satisfaction is a highly significant predictor of effective schools. Moreover, schools are only as good as the teachers dealing with students. Therefore, it has become a focal point of districts to ensure that they are hiring quality teachers and finding ways to ensure that they stay within that school or district. Subsequently, schools must give more attention to improving job satisfaction amongst their staff members (Heller, Clay, & Perkins, 1993).

Numerous studies have been done supporting the idea that job satisfaction is positively related to participative decision making and transformational leadership (Somech 2010 & Rossmiller, 1992). Burns described transformational leadership as followers and their leaders who inspire each other to achieve higher levels of morality and motivation (1978), the essence of Emotional Intelligence. Somech reiterates what has already been discussed in this paper by showing that teachers report greater satisfaction when their leader is someone who they see as one who shares information with their counterparts, provides leadership opportunities, and communicates well with teachers (2010).

Principals have the latitude to provide their teachers with the opportunity to participate in the betterment of their schools. Because intrinsic motivation has been shown to result in high-quality learning and creativity, it becomes a focal point in detailing the factors that provide those intrinsic opportunities (Ryan and Deci, 1999). Therefore, the Emotional Intelligence of a principal could have a direct correlation to administrators creating areas in which teachers can find and explore their intrinsic motivators.

Role of Principal

The secondary school administrator is, in essence, the educational leader of the staff. The significance of that leadership has been discussed over the past 30 years as it relates to quality/effective schools. Hallinger and Heck (1998) found that school level leaders account for a measurable impact on the effectiveness of the school organization in terms of student achievement. Moreover, it was discovered that there was a substantial relationship between school level leadership and student achievement (Waters, 2003). Therefore, it would seem plausible that the administrator is the most noteworthy individual when determining how well schools perform on assessments.

Past research on effective schools has consistently discovered several indicators leading to school effectiveness. These include, academic rigor, high expectations for student achievement, a positive school climate/culture, effective use of data, positive home-to-school relationships, and the instructional leadership of the school principal. Edmonds research in 1979 found the following to be characteristics of effective schools which still hold themselves to be relevant today: 1. Effective schools have strong administrative leadership without which

the disparate statements of good schooling can neither be brought nor kept together 2. Effective schools have a climate of high expectations for all students 3. The effective school's atmosphere is orderly and quiet without being rigid and oppressive. It is conducive to instruction 4. Effective schools have clarity of instructional purpose 5. Resources are used to enhance instruction 6. Effective schools monitor pupil progress and use data to improve instruction. What this shows is that the blueprint for success has not changed significantly, however, the role of the administrator has.

The school administrator is no longer the manager of the school dealing mostly with budget, discipline, and the bus schedule. The job is now focused upon data analysis, curriculum development, and instructional leadership as well as a host of other responsibilities. Not only do these factors weigh heavily on the principal, they must also deal with more diverse student populations whether through economics, ethnicity, or disabilities. Administrators must now find highly qualified teachers to fill the vacancies developed to deal with these student "sub-groups." All of these factors have drastically changed the role of the school administrator as well as the time and training needed to perform this job.

NCLB (2002) creates an accountability system for student achievement thus compelling administrators to become instructional leaders, resulting in the establishment of the link between student achievement and principal leadership. Specifically, NCLB mandates that administrators demonstrate instructional leadership skills to help teachers and students alike meet the challenging demands of academic standards (2002, Title II, Section 2113).

In order to meet those challenges, administrators must address two deliberate functions: provide direction and exercise influence (Lethwood and Riehl, 2003). They go on to mention several implications that administrators must possess in order to run productive schools; 1. Leaders work with others to create a shared sense of purpose focusing on student achievement. A vision if you will. 2. Leaders work mostly through and with other people and establish the conditions to foster the success of others. 3. Leadership is more of a function than a role. In essence, the message is that principals are the glue that binds the school together.

Effects of Principal Support

Administrator support is a crucial link shown to decrease job stresses and teacher burn-out (Dworkin, 1987). Those stresses are reduced primarily through communication and mutual obligation (Cobb, 1978). Although these particular insights are now over 30 years old, new studies are proving that these ideas still hold true in our schools. Sharplin, O'Neil, and Chaplin show that principal support is indeed still a very prominent piece in teacher longevity and job satisfaction (2010). Principals communicate effectively by providing constructional feedback, encouraging and providing opportunities for professional growth, and communicating to teachers that their positions are valued and their work is meaningful. Anderman, Belzer, and Smith (1991) found that a school whose culture emphasizes accomplishment, recognition, and affiliation is related to teacher satisfaction and commitment. They went on to show that principals' actions create distinct working environments within schools that are highly predictive of teacher satisfaction and commitment.

The principal is the leader of the school and the integral piece in shaping the organizations conditions under which teachers work (Lam, Chen, & Shaubroeck, 2002; Rosenholtz, 1989). When administrators offer feedback, encouragement, acknowledge their successes, allow the opportunity to be involved in decision making processes, and are provided time to collaborate with their colleagues, teachers are more committed (Dufour & Eaker, 1998; Rosenholtz, 1989). Moreover, principals who are considerate, encourage participation in decision making, provide recognition and approval, trust teachers to work in a responsible way, and encourage interpersonal relationships in the school environment have teachers who are more satisfied with their jobs (DuFour & Eaker, 1998; Littrell, Billingsley, & Cross, 1994).

Administrator support affects teacher retention and attrition as well. According to Billingsley and Cross, intent to stay in teaching was higher among teachers who received high levels of administrative support (1992). Further correlations have also been shown between supportive administrators and teachers who find their work more rewarding (Dworkin, 1987) and enjoy a more motivating work environment (Blase, 1987). Teachers who feel there is little support from administration tend to feel frustrated and unimportant in their profession (Dworkin, 1987) and can create an atmosphere in which teachers feel discontent (Rosenholtz, 1989).

In Conclusion

The introduction of No Child Left Behind has ultimately changed the landscape of educational leadership. In order to answer the call of No Child Left Behind, the priorities and expectations of administrators have become drastically different. Their ability to manage

people, their behaviors, and provide the intrinsic motivation for teachers to do their jobs successfully and remain in the profession for an extended period, fall under the definition of emotional intelligence. Therefore, the conclusion that a administrator's emotional intelligence could have a dramatic impact on both teacher job satisfaction as well as performance stands to reason.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This section describes how the assessments were chosen and the data gathered from secondary administrators and their staff from the state of Kansas whose schools were included in the study. Following the descriptive data is information outlining principal emotional intelligence and teacher job satisfaction, as well as how those figures were determined and how the assessments and surveys were administered.

Emotional Intelligence Tests

There are three leading experts in the area of emotional assessment. They include Daniel Goleman, Ph. D; Reuven Bar-On, Ph. D; and collectively John Mayer, Ph.D, Peter Salovey, Ph. D., and David Caruso, Ph. D. These experts created multiple valid Emotional Intelligence Assessments that are the most widely used assessments including the EQ-i, the MSCEIT, and the ECI 360. Each of these assessments is utilized in a different manner and has been revised from its original format.

Bar-On's EQ-i was the first scientifically validated emotional intelligence assessment. The EQ-i examines both the social and emotional strengths and weakness of the individual. In this assessment, the respondents self-report on their workplace performances in 15 key areas of emotional skill that have been shown to correlate to proficiency in complex business activities.

Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso's emotional intelligence test (MSCEIT) evaluates the respondents EI through a series of objective and impersonal questions. It tests the

respondent's ability to perceive, use, understand, and regulate emotions. This measuring device determines how well people perform tasks and solve emotional problems, rather than having them provide their own subjective assessment of their skills.

Goleman's ECI 360 is a tool designed to assess the emotional and social competencies of individuals in organizations. This assessment is based upon the emotional competencies Goleman identified in his book *Working with Emotional Intelligence* (1998). This test has been limited to accredited users who have shown the ability to provide quality feedback to their clients.

Although these are not the only EI assessment tools available, these three developers are the cutting edge of this research. The tool used in this research study was narrowed to these three instruments. The ECI 360 was ruled out based upon lack of accreditation. Therefore, the Bar-On and the MSCEIT were chosen for further examination. Multi Health Systems Incorporated offered both assessments through a database available to researchers. Multi Health Systems felt that the MSCEIT was ultimately the best choice in trying to recruit administrators to take the assessment based upon its lack of reliance upon self-reporting of job capabilities.

MSCEIT's Four Branch Approach

Emotional Intelligence as defined by Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso is based upon a four branch model. Perceiving emotion (Branch 1) is described as the ability to perceive emotions in oneself and others, as well as in objects, art, stories, music, and other stimuli. Branch 2 is focused on the facilitation of thought or the ability to generate, use, and feel emotion as necessary to communicate feelings or employ them in other cognitive processes.

Understanding emotions (Branch 3) focuses on the ability to understand emotional information, how emotions combine and progress through relationship transitions, and to appreciate such emotional meanings. Finally, Branch 4, or Managing emotions, works to explain the ability to be open to feelings, and to modulate them in oneself and others so as to promote personal understanding and growth. (See Table 2)

The MSCEIT offers questions used to determine a person's intelligence quotient in each of these branches. In order to determine a person's perceiving emotions intelligence quotient (PEIQ), two task levels of the MSCEIT are used. Section A (Faces) and Section E (Pictures) are combined as task scores to indicate the PEIQ. One's facilitation of thought (FEIQ) is determined through Section B (Facilitation) and Section F (Sensations). Understanding of Emotions (UEIQ) is found through the combination of Section C (Changes) and Section G (Blends). The final branch is managing emotions (MEIQ) which is determined through Section D (Emotional Management) and Section H (Emotional Relations). (See Table 1) The two tasks scores equate to the branch score and the four branch scores combine to determine the overall emotional intelligence quotient of the test taker.

Validity of MSCEIT

The MSCEIT has been validated by independent studies in four different areas. First, face validity concerns itself with whether a test appears to measure what it was intended to measure. Pusey (2000) analyzed the face validity of the MSCEIT in a work setting. The author concluded that overall the MSCEIT had "good face validity."

The second area of validation came from content or sampling validity. This concerns whether a test's items are rationally drawn from the domains that the test is supposed to

cover. According to the MSCEIT user's manual, a study was done to determine the development of the original MSCEIT to the current version. It determined that the new model had good coverage of the 1997 model, which was validated through study, subsequently creating validity for this model.

Structural or factorial validity represents the third area of validation. This test validates the number of items this test measures. Ciarrochi, Chan, Caputti (2000) reported that the number of solutions in this test indicate good representations of the subtask interrelations.

Predictive validity refers to the degree to which a test predicts items of importance. Two types of predictive validity are of importance: distinctiveness and criterion validity. In this case Ciarrochi, Chan, Caputti, and Roberts (2001) again validates that this instrument is both distinct and valid.

Descriptive Data

Data for this study was gathered after contacting every school district in the state of Kansas to provide superintendents with the knowledge of the proposed study on March 8, 2010 through the use of email. After the initial contact was made with school districts, phone contact was made with 261 Kansas High Schools beginning with schools starting with the letter "A" and ending with schools whose names began with "R". Of those 261 high schools, 121 principals were directly contacted between March 22, 2010 and April 21, 2010. A total of 119 secondary school administrators agreed to taking the MSCEIT to measure their emotional intelligence. Additionally, two staff members from each school were selected by their administrators to take a survey through a web based surveying site (www.surveymonkey.com) to determine their level of job satisfaction and performance. The number of schools

completing all parts of the study totaled 84 schools, with another 10 schools missing at least a portion of the study. Twenty-five schools that agreed to participate failed to record any of the needed data.

EI Data Collection

The principal's Emotional Intelligence test was provided and monitored through Multi-Health Systems Inc. of North Towanda, New York. An application process for study was submitted on 2/23/2010 to MHS and approved the same day under the supervision of Dr. Argun Saactioglu at the University of Kansas. Upon principal acceptance to participate in the study, an email was sent containing a URL as well as a password providing access for the assessment. After completion, their information was stored in a database for collection until retrieved.

Teacher Job Satisfaction Data Collection

The teacher satisfaction survey was developed through survey monkey and distributed to principals at the same time as their EI test. Administrators then provided the URL, username, and passwords to two of their staff members for completion. Upon survey completion, teachers' or assistant principals' information was stored in a database for collection until retrieved and scored.

The satisfaction survey was developed from several satisfaction surveys utilized in multiple studies by other authors. The survey included five essential areas to measure teacher job satisfaction after the initial page determining personal information of the teacher and school. The survey asked questions to determine insight to job construct, organizational

citizenship behavior, job scope, role stress, and burn out. The questions to the survey may be found in Appendix A.

Measures of Teacher Job Satisfaction

Role Stresses

The role stressors for this study were assessed by three separate first order measures that included role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload. Role conflict and ambiguity were both measured by three items utilized by House, Rizzo, and Lirtzman in 1970. Role overload measured three items as well drawn from Beehr, Walsh, and Taber's scale in 1976. The responses for this survey were scored on a six point Likert scale ranging through strongly disagree (6 pts), disagree (5 pts), somewhat disagree (4 pts), somewhat agree (3 pts), agree (2 pts) and strongly agree (1 pt).

Job Construct

Job construct included measures for participation, feedback, and autonomy based upon the work of Hackman and Oldham in 1976. The participation portion of this survey involved four items utilized in Pugh and Hickson's work in 1976, while the section on feedback consisted of four questions adapted by Teas in 1983. Finally, the portion measuring autonomy borrowed three questions from Hackman and Oldham in 1976. These questions were again measured using a six point Likert scale ranging through strongly disagree (6 pts), disagree (5 pts), somewhat disagree (4 pts), somewhat agree (3 pts), agree (2 pts) and strongly agree (1 pt).

Burnout

In order to determine teacher burnout, three dimensions were focused upon including emotional exhaustion, reduced personal accomplishment, and depersonalization. These

measures were taken from a scale developed by Maslach and Jackson in 1981. These items were modified to include statements about students, principals, colleagues, and superintendents rather than non-specific “recipients” (e.g. “I feel indifferent toward some of my recipients” became “I feel indifferent toward some of my students”). These questions were again measured using a six point Likert scale ranging through strongly disagree (6 pts), disagree (5 pts), somewhat disagree (4 pts), somewhat agree (3 pts), agree (2 pts) and strongly agree (1 pt).

Job Scope

Teacher based outcome variables including job performance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions were utilized in this survey. These questions provided some insight as to whether teachers had an overall favorable or unfavorable attitude toward the job. These questions were again measured using a six point Likert scale ranging through strongly disagree (6 pts), disagree (5 pts), somewhat disagree (4 pts), somewhat agree (3 pts), agree (2 pts) and strongly agree (1 pt).

Organizational Citizenship

Organizational Citizenship was measured after utilizing a scale created by DiPaola and Hoy in 2004. These questions provided insight as to how devoted teachers were to their schools, students, committees, and work overall. These questions were again measured using a six point Likert scale ranging through strongly disagree (6pts), disagree (5 pts), somewhat disagree (4 pts), somewhat agree (3 pts), agree (2 pts) and strongly agree (1 pt).

Regression Analysis

This study used a regression analysis with principal emotional intelligence utilized as the independent variable and teacher job satisfaction as the dependent variable. In order to ensure a quality measurement, controls for the administrator gender, age, salary, years in current position, and years of experience, were used in the study. School ethnicity, gender, ELL populations, special education populations, and school socio-economic status also were put in place.

Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. The first limitation is based upon the fact that each of the administrators rated themselves through the MSCEIT assessment. This assessment is different than the Bar-on in that it is not specifically related to the leadership position and the 360 in that the co-workers of the leader are not providing information in an EI assessment for their boss. The MSCEIT utilizes a four-branch approach determining perception of emotions, facilitation of thought, emotional understanding, and emotional management, all of which are gauged upon the administrator's own perceptions of those feelings.

The second limitation to this study emerges from the understanding that there may be administrators with high or low emotional intelligence that have been placed in buildings with a history of high job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Therefore, the emotional intelligence of the principal may have not had the opportunity to alter the enjoyment of teachers within their particular schools.

Finally, the fact that administrators were able to choose who would take the job satisfaction survey may have some impact upon the overall findings of this study. It is possible

that administrators chose teachers that they had relationships with and knew would participate in this study. All three of these issues may have an impact in determining the correlation between administrator emotional intelligence and teacher job satisfaction or performance.

CHAPTER 4

Results and Discussion

Aggregation of Emotional Intelligence Quotient (EIQ) via MSCEIT

Prior to discussion as to the results of this study, there should be an understanding of how the respondent's Emotional Intelligence was determined. The total emotional intelligence score is an overall index of the respondents' emotional intelligence based upon their two area scores. The area scores are divided by Experiential Emotional Intelligence (EEI) and Strategic Emotional Intelligence (SEI). The EEI "score provides an index of the respondent's ability to perceive emotional information, to relate it to other sensations such as color and taste and to use it to facilitate thought" (MSCEIT User's Manual). The SEI "score provides an index of the respondent's ability to understand emotional information and use it strategically to plan and self-management" (MSCEIT User's Manual).

Insert Table 1 Here

The area scores are determined through four separate branch scores which include Perceiving Emotions, Facilitating Thought, Understanding Emotions, and Emotional Management. Each of these branches measures a particular ability of the respondent. The perceiving emotions score is indicative of the respondent's ability to identify emotion in

themselves and those around them. The facilitating thought score measures the respondent's ability to utilize their emotions to improve thought. The understanding emotions score dictates how well the respondent is able to understand the complex nature of emotional meanings, translations, and situations. Finally, the emotional management score identifies the ability of the respondent to manage his/her own emotions as well as others (MSCEIT User's Manual).

Insert Table 2 Here

The area scores are a compilation of the respondent's individual task scores. These scores correspond to the eight tasks of the MSCEIT including faces, pictures, sensations, facilitation, blends, changes, emotion management, and emotional relations. These scores are designed to provide supplemental information in particular cases that may be of value.

Insert Table 3 Here

The application of each of these scores, results in the total EIQ score. The previous sections create some understanding that Emotional Intelligence, as assessed by MSCEIT, involves four components or branches describing the ability to perform specific tasks: 1) Perceive emotions 2) Access, generate, and use emotions to assist thought 3) Understand

emotions and emotional knowledge and 4) Regulate emotions so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth (MSCEIT User's Manual, 2002).

According to the MSCEIT User's Manual (2002), the "Total Score gives an overall picture while the area scores enable the administrator to gain insight into possible differences between a client's ability to perceive and utilize emotions and their ability to understand and manage emotions. If further insight is required, the branch scores may be utilized to provide information on the client's specific emotional abilities of perceiving emotions, facilitation of thought, understanding emotions, and managing emotions."

Description of Data

Emotional Intelligence Descriptors

The major component of this study is indicative of the Emotional Intelligence of Kansas secondary school administrators. All 84 principals that participated in this part of the study created scores for the 4 branch levels of EI, the 2 area levels including experiential and strategic scores, and finally the overall EI score.

Branch 1 ranged from 31 to 132, with a mean of 91.92 and a standard deviation of 15.751. Branch 2 ranged from 56 to 131, with a mean of 95.07 and a standard deviation of 15.067. The third branch of the EI components ranged from 59 to 108, averaging 91.98 with a standard deviation of 10.061. The final branch had the lowest standard deviation of 8.418, a mean of 93.86, and ranged from 73 to 113.

The first of the two area scores combines the scores of Branch 1 and 2. The experiential component ranged from 33 to 144, with a mean of 92.35 and a standard deviation of 16.661. The second component (strategic: SSREA) ranged from 73 to 107, with a mean of 91.02 and a standard deviation of only 7.883. Finally, the Total EI score averaged 89.33, with a standard deviation of 11.54 and ranges from 56 to 114.

Insert Table 4 Here

Interpreting Scores

The overall Emotional Intelligence Quotient (EI score) or EIQ is based upon a normal curve and multiple standard deviations. Scores consist of of the following categories: Consider Development, Consider Improvement, Low Average Score, High Average Score, Competent, Strength, and Significant Strength. If a respondent scores an overall MSCEIT EIQ of 100, they are in the High Average range of emotional intelligence. If they score 115, they are one standard deviation above that in the Competent category. If they score 92, they are one standard deviation below High Average in the Low Average category.

Insert Table 5 Here

Principal Descriptors

There were multiple controls related to the position of principal, utilized in this study. The controls include salary, age, total years in the current position, total years as an administrator, and the highest level of degree earned. The descriptives were analyzed to determine a mean and standard deviation to provide this study with an understanding of the range and average values being controlled.

A total of 84 principals participated fully in this study and provided a range of outcomes. Administrator salaries averaged \$84,507.94 with a standard deviation (SD) of nearly \$17,000. An interesting piece dealt with level of degree earned. In the state of Kansas, administrators must be licensed with at least a Master's Degree in Building Level Administration. This data set shows that principals have attained at least a master's degree, although higher degrees have been attained. However, with a mean of 2.23 out of 84 entries, most administrators do not attain a higher degree other than that which is required for the position. Finally, descriptive data examined age and years of service. Age ranged from 28 to 63 for a total of 35 years, with a mean of nearly 49. This study also collected data from administrators in their first year with no experience to principals with 30 years of experience all in the same position. The average life span of a principal in one building was nearly 6 years rising to over 11 in any principal position.

Insert Table 4 Here

School Descriptors

School levels were also controlled in order to quantify the information provided in this study. They included the percentage of free and reduced lunch students, students with disabilities (special education students), white and non-white students, and English Language Learners. AYP numbers and graduation rates were left out of the control as there was little to no differentiation between the schools taking part in this study.

Of the 84 schools participating, 82 had complete data sets in these areas. Each area is represented in percentages of the total school population in order to standardize the data. The mean for free and reduced lunch students in these schools was 36%, with a maximum of nearly 67% and a minimum of only about 6%. The mean created a range of 61% and a standard deviation of nearly 14%. Special education populations averaged 12%, with a maximum of approximately 26% and a minimum of just over 5%, creating a range of 21% with a standard deviation of nearly 14%.

The schools studied were predominantly white schools reaching a mean of nearly 87%, which is not surprising in relation to the makeup of the state. One school's population reached over 98% white with the lowest being just under 22% with a standard deviation of nearly 12%. The English Language Learners ranged from 0% to 2% with a standard deviation of 4.6%.

Insert Table 4 Here

Job Performance & Satisfaction Descriptors

The dependent variables in the regression analysis were job satisfaction and job performance. Statistical values of that data include all 84 schools providing 2 teachers completing surveys leading to this information. The minimum score for satisfaction was 10 points, while the maximum was 42.5. The mean was nearly 17, with a standard deviation of just under 5. The job performance ranged from 7.5 to 15, with a mean of over 11. The standard deviation in this area was only 1.58.

Findings

The Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is an association between a administrators EI and their teachers' satisfaction of work as well as their job performance. This study focused on each individual competency of a principal's E.I. and the level of association that each of those competencies might have with teacher job satisfaction.

Analysis of Regression

The intent of this statistical analysis is to determine if there is a predictive relationship between Emotional Intelligence of secondary school administrators and their teachers' job satisfaction that can ultimately be exploited in practice. These correlations could suggest a possible causal relationship; however, that is not the intended purpose of this particular study. Multiple regressions were run to determine the independence of teacher job satisfaction and job performance as it relates to emotional intelligence. Statistical analysis of each of those

correlations will be explained in detail in the next sections, while tables can be found at the end of this chapter.

In order to determine an appropriate understanding of the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and teacher job satisfaction, multiple regressions were run based upon each of the foundations of EI. A total of 3 separate regressions analysis showed just one instance in which statistical significance was found and that finding was negatively correlated. When utilizing Total EI Scores, Area Scores including Experiential and Strategic EI Scores, there were no significant findings regarding teacher job satisfaction or performance.

Insert Table 6 Here

Insert Table 7 Here

Due to the lack of findings from the initial EI scores, each of the branch scores including Branch 1: Perceiving Emotions, Branch 2: Facilitating Thought, Branch 3: Understanding Emotions, and Branch 4: Managing Emotions were regressed with teacher job satisfaction and performance in three steps. Initially, each of the four branches were regressed against

performance and satisfaction. School controls were then added including free and reduced lunch populations, white and non-white students, special education populations, and English Language Learner populations. Finally, administrator controls were added including salary, age, the number of years in current position, years in administration, and their highest level of degree.

The regression showed that Branch 1 was the only scale showing a statistical significance predicted by teacher job satisfaction at the .05 level; however, it was negatively correlated showing that teachers were less satisfied when their principals score high in the area of perceiving emotions (see table Appendix D). There were no other statistically significant findings in either the job satisfaction area or the job performance area.

The significance of this finding is debatable. The first branch of the Emotional Intelligence Spectrum is defined as perceiving emotions and further understood as the ability to perceive emotions in oneself and others, as well as in objects, art, stories, music, and other stimuli. With only one branch showing a significant correlation and that correlation being negative, a determination of the analysis is needed to create a better understanding of whether Emotional Intelligence has an associative effect on the satisfaction of teachers.

Insert Table 8 Here

Job Satisfaction Explanation

After finding that Branch 1 of the Emotional Intelligence Quotient was the only aspect to have any significant correlation, and furthermore, that it negatively correlated to teacher job satisfaction, there is a need to explain why this may happen. There are three possibilities that could explain this. It is possible that the principals creating this effect were brought into schools where teachers were dissatisfied with the previous leadership. Subsequently, these principals may have been hired because of their emotional abilities and have simply not had enough time to change the existing culture of their schools.

Another possibility is based upon the idea that the leaders who have the innate ability to understand emotions of others, may use their talents to manipulate those around them. If teachers feel as if they are being manipulated based upon the administrator's ability to read them, it would certainly lead to a situation where teachers would predominately feel dissatisfied in their environment.

A third possibility is that the organizational culture of the school is one of dissatisfaction. Therefore, regardless of the principal's abilities or knowledge of his/her staff, there is a pessimistic nature occurring amongst them indicating a negative correlation to this idea of Emotional Intelligence and teacher job satisfaction. However, with no findings to substantiate this thought, the easier explanation prevails: Emotional Intelligence has become a buzzword that districts and schools cling to because it makes sense.

CHAPTER 5

Discussion & Conclusion

This study's purpose was to identify an association between teacher job satisfaction/performance and the Emotional Intelligence of the school's administrator. If a correlation could have been identified, certain changes in the hiring process at the central office for school leaders would have undoubtedly been discussed through multiple studies. If EI showed an association in the level of satisfaction teachers had in their positions, it would make sense that district training of administrative personnel in the area of EI and hiring practices, would expose the importance of EI to the incoming school leaders. Therefore, EI would come to the forefront of educational decision making.

The utilization of EI assessments in the realm of Human Resources and its importance to the hiring of employees has become a relevant and highly debated topic. In the wake of drastic budget cuts to education across the country, every opportunity to cut costs has been considered. School districts utilizing assessments to measure principal/teacher EI either believe that those high in EI provide an added incentive to employment worth the cost or are making ill-informed decisions regarding their hiring practices.

The importance of this study is based on the fact that much has been made about EI and the improvement of leadership, relationship building, and managing one's emotions in times of stress. This study worked under the hypothesis that it would indeed find an association between the level of EI in administrators and the level of satisfaction teachers reported. This

assumption is based upon the understanding that EI is foundational in relationship building as well as the ability to maintain a sense of calm when stresses mount, both of which are important facets of public education institutions during this current economic crisis.

Data for this study indicated that there was no significant correlation found with regard to the EI of secondary school administrators and its association to teacher job performance. This is interesting considering that EI is founded in the idea that the attributes of EI are equally as important as technical attributes in a job setting. However, this study provides credence to the contrary, indicating that there is no need to incorporate professional development in the area of EI to any staff.

Furthermore, the study's findings indicate that there may actually be a negative correlation to administrators with a high level of EI and teacher job satisfaction. This finding is even more disturbing when those driving EI state that leaders must be managers of emotion, provide for factors of intrinsic motivation in staff, and communicate effectively in order to improve organizational change. Subsequently, these findings indicate that high levels of EI in school leaders have no positive association to teacher job satisfaction.

This finding adds to the current debate as to whether EI is indeed a viable and integral piece of business that should be given the respect currently afforded to it. There is no doubt that the idea behind EI is thought provoking and intelligent on the surface. Although there is current evidence in the business world as to the importance and need for leaders to be emotional leaders, there is little evidence in the educational world providing evidence to support its usage in schools. Its use is widespread and at a cost that is no doubt detrimental to school district budgets. This study's findings did nothing to support the need for EI in the

educational setting and actually provided some incentive to disregard the notion of EI at least as it relates to leadership and job satisfaction/performance.

Although the findings of this study are eye opening, the idea of EI and its impact on teachers, needs further exploration. An option that could ultimately improve further study would be to utilize the entire staff in gathering data through the satisfaction/performance questionnaire. The utilization of two staff members taking the survey limited this study in its ability to truly differentiate between staff members that are undoubtedly happy in their positions and feel the administrator is performing at high levels, and those that do not. Allowing the entire staff to participate in the surveys provides data that is more indicative of their true feelings. More importantly, the use of the entire staff would eliminate any indifference caused by outliers in the data. Furthermore, this study lent itself to administrators choosing who took the survey, thus leading to the possibility of inconsistency. The utilization of the entire staff would negate this opportunity and provide an unbiased result.

Further exploration of high schools may provide some added insight as well. There were three types of schools utilized in this study including rural, suburban, and inner city schools. The difference in size and support structures are different in each of these particular types of schools and lead to inconsistent results through comparison. A closer look at each type of school provided insight as to how changes in the current study format could result in different outcomes.

Rural Kansas schools are typically run by one administrator and relationships between administration and staff, students, parents, and community are optimal. It is common for those leading and staffing these schools to have closer relationships with one another based upon

need and proximity. Rural school leaders have to rely on teachers to function on multiple levels, thus creating the need for administrators to create that relationship where individuals feel needed and a part of the overall school process.

Inner city and suburban schools are typically run by a hierarchial power set where the lead administrator's role may be more of a political role, rather than a functional role leading to lessened correspondence with staff. Therefore, these facets could lead to a vastly different outcome if measured where the foundations of EI played an important role in the structure of the school. Many suburban schools have multiple assistant principals who deal with many of the day to day operations of the school. In doing so, the principal does not develop the same types of relationships nor emotional experiences with the staff that rural school leaders do.

High schools were the focus of this particular study; however, they are certainly not the only type of school in Kansas or in the nation for that matter. The idea of EI truly lends itself to the elementary levels where feelings and a "family" atmosphere are at the forefront of the teacher workday. The result of this atmosphere leaves room for further interpretation of how EI affects teacher job satisfaction and performance when we look at individual types of schools and have the entire staff take part in the survey. Elementary schools are typically run by a single administrator who is the educational leader of that school. With the implementation of professional learning communities, the opportunity for administrators to develop and work with their staff has increased. With the shared decision making and the opportunity to understand the strengths, weaknesses, and emotional states of staff, administrators in these schools may rely heavily on their EI to help the school progress and ensure teacher satisfaction and performance.

Subsequently, the school types play a major role in the data collected. Further studies should ultimately take these items into account. Suggestions would include quantifying data by particular types of schools by looking at only rural elementary schools with attendance less than 300 students. The involvement of the entire staff in gathering data regarding teacher satisfaction/performance is also essential. A second thought would be to consider looking at entire districts where philosophies, expectations, curriculum, etc. are consistent throughout each individual building.

The true question to determine an answer beyond whether EI of secondary school administrators has an association to teacher job satisfaction/performance is a question of causality. Further study given the prior recommendations may provide insight as to whether EI is actually associated with satisfaction and performance. However, the next question to then ask would be whether EI is causal for performance and satisfaction or whether it is simply consequential. The market for EI training in school districts would increase exponentially if data were found linking its relationship to satisfaction and performance as causal. In other words, if data could link principal EI as the leading factor in teacher satisfaction and performance, the possibility for a flood in the EI market to schools would be undoubtable.

The concept of EI has been thoroughly discussed and scrutinized through this study. The idea of EI as an educational concept lends itself to some considerations that need to be addressed. The findings of this study suggest that Emotional Intelligence and its ability to improve the workings of a school may be nothing more than an opportunity for consultant groups to dip their hands into the pocket books of school districts. If EI is founded in its claim to the reformation of business, then schools have yet to see those same results. It was stated

earlier that multiple schools have utilized instruction in EI and HR departments have mandated professional development in this area; however, to this point, EI has been nothing but a fad in the realm of education which can be supported by this study.

In the end, this study only furthers the debate on EI, at the same time lending itself to more questions while failing to answer any of them definitively. The resounding result of this study is the determination that there is a need for more information before decisions should be made regarding EI in education with respect to satisfaction and performance. The recommendation for further exploration is certainly warranted. Furthermore, the progression of EI in schools is certainly questionable at this point and should be regarded as unstable terrain. The future of education and its association of EI is most certainly on a definitive course; however, caution should be heeded when utilizing tax payer dollars to develop this concept.

Table 1
Structure and Levels of Feedback from the MSCEIT
Version 2.0

Overall Scale	Two Areas of the MSCEIT	Four Branches of the MSCEIT	Task Level	
Emotional Intelligence (EIQ)	Experiential Emotional Intelligence (EEIQ)	Perceiving Emotions (PEIQ)	Faces	(Section A)
			Pictures	(Section E)
		Facilitating Thought (FEIQ)	Facilitation	(Section B)
			Sensations	(Section F)
	Strategic Emotional Intelligence (SEIQ)	Understanding Emotions (UEIQ)	Changes	(Section C)
			Blends	(Section G)
		Managing Emotions (MEIQ)	Emotional Management	(Section D)
			Emotional Relations	(Section H)

MSCEIT User's Manual

Table 2

Overview of the Four Branch Model of Emotional Intelligence

(Mayer & Salovey, 1997)

Branch Name	Brief Description of skills involved
Perceiving Emotions (Branch 1)	The ability to perceive emotions in oneself and others, as well as in objects, art, stories, music, and other stimuli.
Facilitating Thought (Branch 2)	The ability to generate, use, and feel emotion as necessary to communicate feelings, or employ them in other cognitive processes.
Understanding Emotions (Branch 3)	The ability to understand emotional information, how emotions combine and progress through relationship transactions, and to appreciate such emotional meanings.
Managing Emotions (Branch 4)	The ability to be open to feelings, and to modulate them in oneself and others so as to promote personal understanding and growth.

MSCEIT User's Manual

Table 3
Overview of MSCEIT Scores

Total EIQ (Overall Score)				
Area Scores	Experiential EIQ		Strategic EIQ	
Branch Scores	Perceiving Emotions EIQ	Facilitating Thought EIQ	Understanding Emotions EIQ	Managing Emotions EIQ
Task Scores	Individual Task Scores			
	Faces Pictures			
		Sensations Facilitation		
			Blends Changes	
				Emotion Management Emotional Relations
Supplemental Scores	Scatter Score, Positive-Negative Bias Score, Omission Rate			

MSCEIT User's Manual

Table 4

Descriptives

	Maximum	Minimum	Mean	Standard Deviation
<u>Emotional Intelligence</u>				
El Total	114	56	89.33	11.544
Strategic EI	107	73	91.02	7.883
Experiential EI	144	33	92.35	16.661
Perceiving Emotions	132	31	91.92	15.751
Facilitating Thought	131	56	95.07	15.067
Understanding Emotions	108	59	91.98	10.061
Managing Emotions	113	73	93.86	8.418
<u>Controls</u>				
% Free Reduced Lunch	0.667	0.056	0.364	0.138
% Special Education	0.256	0.038	0.12	0.04
% White	0.984	0.219	0.869	0.117
% ELL	0.211	0	0.021	0.046
Principal Salary	129612	7000	84507.94	16672.008
Principal Age	63	28	48.86	8.02
Principal Yrs In Position	30	1	5.92	4.848
Principal Total Years	30	0	11.27	7.29
Principal Degree	4	2	0.588	0.588

Table 5

Guidelines for Interpreting MSCEIT Scores

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

MSCEIT User's Manual

Table 6

Regression Tables

	<u>Job Satisfaction</u>				<u>Job Performance</u>			
	<u>Model 1</u>		<u>Model 2</u>		<u>Model 1</u>		<u>Model 2</u>	
	<u>COEF</u>	<u>S.E.</u>	<u>COEF</u>	<u>S.E.</u>	<u>COEF</u>	<u>S.E.</u>	<u>COEF</u>	<u>S.E.</u>
<u>Emotional Intelligence</u>								
EI TOTALS	-0.072	0.049	-0.065	0.051	0.003	0.016	-0.002	0.016
<u>Controls</u>								
% Free & Reduced Lunch			-1.23	16.357			1.184	1.547
% White			5.198	4.894			-3.186	2.441
% Special Education			33.086 **	7.719			-7.242	5.172
% ELL			34.367 *	19.751			-7.386	6.245
Principal Salary			0	0			0	0
Principal Age			0.059	0.095			0.027	0.03
Principal Years in Position			0.088	0.147			-0.035	0.047
Principal Years Experience			-0.071	0.129			-0.023	0.041
Principal Degree			0.383	1.157			-0.344	0.366
Constant			7.483	11.635			16.507	3.679
R2	0.028		0.124		0.001		0.141	

Table 7

Regression Tables

	<u>Job Satisfaction</u>				<u>Job Performance</u>			
	<u>Model 1</u>		<u>Model 2</u>		<u>Model 1</u>		<u>Model 2</u>	
	<u>COEF</u>	<u>S.E.</u>	<u>COEF</u>	<u>S.E.</u>	<u>COEF</u>	<u>S.E.</u>	<u>COEF</u>	<u>S.E.</u>
<u>Emotional Intelligence</u>								
Experiential EI	-0.034	0.038	-0.034	0.04	0.001	0.012	-0.001	0.012
Strategic EI	-0.041	0.076	-0.026	0.084	0.011	0.024	0.008	0.026
<u>Controls</u>								
% Free & Reduced Lunch			-1.361	4.967			1.091	1.565
% White			5.425	7.962			-3.045	2.508
% Special Education			33.28	16.753			-6.904	5.277
% ELL			35.189	20.071			-7.109	6.322
Principal Salary			0	0			0	0
Principal Age			0.056	0.096			0.027	0.03
Principal Years in Position			0.085	0.15			-0.037	0.047
Principal Years Experience			-0.065	0.132			-0.02	0.041
Principal Degree			0.363	1.205			-0.373	0.379
Constant			7.205	13.313			15.7	4.193
R2	0.022		0.118		0.004		0.142	

Table 8

Regression Tables

	<u>Job Satisfaction</u>				<u>Job Performance</u>			
	<u>Model 1</u>		<u>Model 2</u>		<u>Model 1</u>		<u>Model 2</u>	
	<u>COEF</u>	<u>S.E.</u>	<u>COEF</u>	<u>S.E.</u>	<u>COEF</u>	<u>S.E.</u>	<u>COEF</u>	<u>S.E.</u>
<u>Emotional Intelligence</u>								
Percieving Emotion	-0.081 *	0.039	-0.087 *	0.046	0.006	0.013	0.007	0.015
Facilitating Thought	0.064	0.041	0.055	0.048	-0.006	0.014	-0.011	0.015
Understanding Emotions	0.05	0.054	0.051	0.06	0.002	0.019	-0.004	0.019
Managing Emotions	-0.133 *	0.062	-0.106	0.075	0.005	0.022	0.014	0.024
<u>Controls</u>								
% Free & Reduced Lunch			-3.406	4.885			1.384	1.594
% White			7.658	7.877			-3.403	2.57
% Special Education			33.186	16.404			-6.897	5.351
% ELL			33.891	19.579			-7	6.387
Principal Salary			0	0			0	0
Principal Age			0.018	0.095			0.033	0.031
Principal Years in Position			0.1	0.145			-0.038	0.047
Principal Years Experience			-0.052	0.128			-0.022	0.041
Principal Degree			0.658	1.215			-0.407	0.396
Constant			10.059	14.027			15.784	4.576
R2	0.109		0.189		0.004		0.153	

Table 9

Measures	
<u>Variable Name</u>	<u>Description</u>
Emotional Intelligence	The total score based upon the combination of the strategic EI and Experiential EI scores.
Strategic EI	The total score based upon the combination of the understanding emotions and managing emotions scores.
Experiential EI	The total score based upon the combination of the perceiving emotions and facilitating thought scores.
Perceiving Emotions	The total score based upon to perceive emotions in oneself and others, as well as in objects, art, stories, music, and other stimuli.
Facilitating Thought	The total score based upon the ability to generate, use, and feel emotion as necessary to communicate feelings, or employ them in other cognitive processes.
Understanding Emotions	The total score based upon the ability to understand emotional information, how emotions combine and progress through relationship transactions, and to appreciate such emotional meanings.
Managing Emotions	The total score based upon the ability to be open to feelings, and to modulate them in oneself and others so as to promote personal understanding and growth.
Principal Salary	Yearly salary of the individual principal.
Principal Age	Age of the individual principal.
Principal Years In Position	Total number of years principal has spent in their current position.
Principal Years Experience	Total number of years principal has spent as an administrator regardless of school or district.
Principal Degree	Highest degree principal has obtained.
% Free & Reduced Lunch	The percentage of students that have qualified and filled out paperwork to receive free or reduced lunches.
% Special Education	The percentage of students currently working under an individualized education plan.
% White	The percentage of students claiming caucasian on their enrollment forms.
% ELL	The percentage of students currently enrolled in the English language learners program.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A Nation At Risk (1999). www2.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk.html. (Accessed 25th of March 2009).
- Anderman, E. M., Belzer, S., & Smith, J. (1991, April). *Teacher commitment and job satisfaction: The role of school culture and principal leadership*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Beehr, T. A., Walsh, J. T., & Taber, T. D. (1976). Relationship of stress to individually and organizationally valued states: Higher order needs as a moderator. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 7, 641-647.
- Betancourt-Smith, M., Inman, D., & Marlow, L. (1994). Professional Attrition: An examination of minority and nonminority teachers at-risk. Paper presented at the annual meeting of themed-South Educational Research Association. November.
- Billingsley, B.W. and Cross, L.H. (1992). "Predictors of Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Intent to Stay in Teaching: A Comparison of General and Special Educators." *The Journal of Special Education*, 25(4), pp. 453-471.
- Blase, J. (1987). Dimensions of effective school leadership: The teacher's perspective. *American Educational Research Journal*, 24, 589-610.
- Boyatzis, R.E., Cowen, S.S., & Kolb, D.A. (1995). *Innovation in professional education: steps in a journey from teaching to learning*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Boyatzis, R.E., Goleman, D., & Rhee, K. (2000). Clustering competence in emotional intelligence: Insights from the emotional competence inventory (ECI). In R. Bar-On, & J.D.A. Parker (Eds.), *Handbook of emotional intelligence* (pp. 343-362). San Francisco; Jossey-Bass.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Cerit, Y. (2009). The effects of servant leadership behaviors of school principals on teachers' job satisfaction. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*. 37. pp. 600.
- Ciarrochi, J.V., Chan, A.Y.C., & Caputi, P. (2000). A critical evaluation of the emotional intelligence concept. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28, 539-561
- Ciarrochi, J., Chan, A., Caputi, P., & Roberts, R.D. (2001) Measuring emotional intelligence. In J. Ciarrochi, J.P. Forgas, & J.D. Mayer (Eds.), *Emotional intelligence in everyday life* (pp.25-45). New York: Psychology Press.

- Cobb, S. (1978) Social support and health through the life cycle. Paper presented at the American Association for the Advancement of Sciences, Washington, DC. February.
- Cohen, A. (2000). The relationship between commitment forms and work outcomes: A comparison of three models. *Human Relations*, 53, 387-417.
- Colbert, J., & Wolff, D. (1992). Surviving in urban schools. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 43, 193-199.
- Cusik, P.A. (January 2003). A study of Michigan's school principal shortage. Policy Report No. 12. Retrieved March of 2009 from www.epc.msu.edu.
- Dearborn, K., (2002). Studies in emotional intelligence redefine our approach to leadership development. *Public Personnel Management* 31(4), pp. 523-42
- DiPaola, Michael F., & Hoy, Wayne K. (2004). Organizational citizenship of faculty and achievement of high school students. *The High School Journal* 88(3), pp. 35-40.
- DuFour, R., & Eaker R. (1998). Professional learning communities that work: best practices for enhancing student achievement. ASCD Solution Tree Press.
- Dworkin, A.G. (1987). Teacher burnout in the public school: Structural causes and consequences for children. New York: State University of New York.
- Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37, (1), 15-24.
- Ferrara, M. M., & Ferrara, P. J. (2005). Parents as Partners. *Clearing House*, 79(2), 77-81.
- Firestone, W.A., & Pennell, J.R. (1993). Teacher commitment, working conditions and Differential incentive policies. *Review of Educational Research*, 63, 489-525.
- Fullan, M. (2002). The change leader. *Educational Leadership*. May
- Fullan, M., (2002). Principals as leaders in a culture of change. *Educational Leadership*, Special Issue, May 2002.
- George, J.M. (2000). Emotions and leadership: The role of emotional intelligence. *Human Relations*, 53(8), pp. 1027-1055.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence. Why it can matter more than IQ*. New York: Bantam.

- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., and McKee, A. (2002). *Primal Leadership*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam.
- Gonzalez, P. (1995). Factors that influence teacher attrition. NSTEP Information Brief, No. 1, 1-9. Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Inc.
- Groves, K.S. (2006). Leader emotional expressivity, visionary leadership, and organizational change. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, 27(7), pp 566-583.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 638-642.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R.H. (1998). Exploring the principals' contribution to school effectiveness: 1980-1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 9(2), 157-191.
- Heller, H.W., Clay, R., & Perkins, C. (1993). The relationship between teacher job satisfaction and principal leadership style. *Journal of School Leadership*, 3(1), 74-86.
- House, R., Rizzo, J. R., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15, 150-163.
- Ingersoll, R. & Smith, T. (2003). The wrong solution to the teacher shortage. *Educational Leadership*, May, 30-33.
- Inman, D., & Marlow, L. (2004). Teacher retention: why do beginning teachers remain in the profession? *Education*, 124.
- Justice, M. and Espinoza, S. (2007). Emotional intelligence and beginning teacher candidates. *Education* (127). pp. 456-461.
- Koch, E.L. (1982). Quality of working life (QWL): Some potential applications to education. *Urban Education*, 17, 181-197.
- Lam, S. S. K., Chen, X. P., & Schaubroeck, J. (2002). Participative decision making and employee performance in different cultures. The moderating effects of allocentricism/idiocentrism and efficacy. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 905-915.

- Leithwood, K. A., & Riehl, C. (2003). What do we already know about successful school leadership? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Littrell, P.C., Billingsley, B.S. & Cross, L.H. (1994). The effects of principal support on special and general educators' stress, job satisfaction, school commitment, health, and intent to stay in teaching. *Remedial and Special Education*, 15(5), 297-310.
- Lynn, Adele B. (2008). *The EQ interview: finding employees with high emotional intelligence*. New York: Amacom.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 2, 99-113.
- Mayer, J.D., and Cobb, C.D. (2000). Educational policy on emotional intelligence: does it make sense? *Educational Psychology Review*, (12)2, pp. 163-181.
- Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., and Caruso, D.R. (2000). Competing models of emotional intelligence. In Sternber, R.J. (Ed.). *Handbook of Human Intelligence* (2nd ed.), pp. 396-420. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., and Caruso, D.R. (2002). *Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test User Manual*.
- Moss, J. (2006). *How to succeed with making schools inclusive*. Curriculum Corporation.
- Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W., & Steers, R.M. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-247.
- Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W., & Steers, R.M. (1982). *Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. New York: Academic Press.
- Newman, F., King, B., & Youngs, P. (2000). Professional development that addresses school capacity. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association.
- No Child Left Behind Act (2002). www.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtml. (Accessed 25th March, 2009).
- Pugh, D. S., & Hickson, D. J. (1976). *Organizational structure in its context: The Aston program*. I. Grover, UK.

- Pusey, F. (2000). Emotional intelligence and success in the workplace: Relationship to job performance. Unpublished master's thesis, Pepperdine University. Malibu, CA.
- Qualter, P., Gardner, K.J., & Whiteley, H.E. (2007). Emotional intelligence: Review of the literature and implications for practice. *Pastoral Care in Education, 25 (1)*, 11-20.
- Rice, E.M., & Schneider, G.T. (1994). A decade of teacher empowerment: An empirical analysis of teacher involvement in decision making, 1980-1991. *Journal of Educational Administration, 32(1)*, 43-58.
- Rinke, C. (2008). Understanding teachers' careers: linking professional life to professional path. *Educational Research Review 3*, 1-13.
- Rosenholtz, S.J. (1989). Workplace conditions that affect teacher quality and Commitment: Implications for teacher induction programs. *The Elementary School Journal, 89*, 421-438.
- Rossmiller, R. (1992). "The secondary school principal and teachers' quality of work life." *Educational Management Administration Leadership, 20(3)*, pp. 132-146.
- Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*, 68-78.
- Salovey, P., and Mayer, J.D. (1990). Emotional Intelligence. *Imag. Cog. Personal. 9*: 185-211.
- Schilling, D. (1996). *Fifty activities for teaching emotional intelligence: Level 1: Elementary*. Torrance CA: Innerchoice Publishing
- Scott-Ladd, Brenda, and Chan, Christopher C.A., (2004). Emotional intelligence and participation in decision-making: strategies for promoting organizational learning and change. *Strategic Change (13)* pp. 95-105.
- Shann, M.H. (1998). Professional commitment and satisfaction among teachers in urban middle schools. *Journal of Educational Research, 92(2)*, 67-73.
- Shaplin, E., O'Neill, M., & Chapman, A., (2010). Coping strategies for adaptation to new teacher appointments: intervention. *Teaching and Teacher Education*.
- Somech, A. (2010). Participative decision making in schools: a mediating-moderating analytical framework for understanding school and teacher outcomes. *Education Administration Quarterly 46*, 174-209.

Snyder, C.R., and Lopez, Shane J., (2002). *Handbook of positive psychology*. Oxford University Press.

Taylor, D., & Tashakkori, A. (1995). Decision participation and school climate as predictors of job satisfaction and teachers' sense of efficacy. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 63, 217-230.

Teas, R. K. (1983). Supervisor behavior, role stress and the job satisfaction of industrial salespeople. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 20, 84-91.

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

Weisinger, H. (1998). *Is yasaminda duygusal zeka*. Istanbul: MNS Yayıncılık.

Zigarelli, M.A. (1996). An empirical test of conclusions from effective schools research. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 90(2), 103-109.

APPENDIX A

Personal Information

1. What school do you currently work for?
 2. What is your principal's name?
 3. Are you employed as a Teacher or Assistant Principal?
 4. How many years have you worked in this school?
 5. How many years have you been in education?
-

Job Construct

These questions were scored on a Likert scale ranging from Exceptional (1 pt.), Above Average (2 pt), Average (3 pt.), Below Average (4 pt.), and Poor (5 pt.).

1. How would you rate yourself in terms of quality of work you achieve?
2. How do you rate yourself in terms of your ability to reach your goals?
3. How do you rate yourself in terms of potential you have for reaching the top 10% of teachers in your district?
4. How do you rate yourself in terms of quality of your performance in regard to student relations?
5. How do you rate yourself in terms of quality of your performance in regard to management of time, palling ability, and management of expense?
6. How do you rate yourself in terms of quality of your performance in regard to knowledge of your district goals, and student needs?

These questions were scored on a Likert scale ranging from Strongly Agree(1 pt.), Agree (2 pt), Somewhat Agree (3 pt.), Somewhat Disagree (4 pt.), Disagree (5 pt.), and Strongly Disagree (6 pt.).

7. My work gives me a sense of accomplishment.
8. My job is exciting.
9. My work is satisfying.
10. I'm really doing something worthwhile in my job.
11. Overall, I am satisfied with my job.
12. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond what normally is expected in order to help this school be successful.
13. I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.
14. I really care about the fate of this school.
15. Overall, I am very committed to this school.
16. It is likely that I will actively look for a new job next year.

17. I often think about quitting.
 18. I will probably look for a new job next year.
-
-

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

These questions were scored on a Likert scale ranging from Strongly Agree(1 pt.), Agree (2 pt), Somewhat Agree (3 pt.), Somewhat Disagree (4 pt.), Disagree (5 pt.), and Strongly Disagree (6 pt.).

1. Teachers help students on their own time.
 2. Teachers waste a lot of class time.
 3. Teachers voluntarily help new teachers.
 4. Teachers voluntarily serve on new committees.
 5. Teachers voluntarily sponsor extra-curricular activities.
 6. Teachers arrive to work and meetings on time.
 7. Teachers take the initiative to introduce themselves to substitutes and assist them.
 8. Teachers begin class promptly and use class time effectively.
 9. Teachers give colleagues advanced notice of changes in schedule or routine.
 10. Teachers give an excessive amount of busy work.
 11. Teacher committees in school work productively.
 12. Teachers make innovative suggestions to improve overall quality of our school.
-
-

Job Scope

These questions were scored on a Likert scale ranging from Strongly Agree(1 pt.), Agree (2 pt), Somewhat Agree (3 pt.), Somewhat Disagree (4 pt.), Disagree (5 pt.), and Strongly Disagree (6 pt.).

1. I receive enough information from the principal about my job performance.
 2. I receive enough feedback from my principal on how well I am doing.
 3. There is enough opportunity in my job to find out how I am doing.
 4. I know how well I am performing on my job.
 5. My job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in my work.
 6. My job has enough opportunity for independent thought and action.
 7. I have enough freedom to do what I want on my job.
 8. I frequently participate in the decisions to hire staff.
 9. I frequently participate in the decisions about personnel promotions.
 10. I frequently participate in the decisions to adopt new policies.
 11. I frequently participate in the decisions to adopt new programs.
-

Role Stress

These questions were scored on a Likert scale ranging from Strongly Agree(1 pt.), Agree (2 pt), Somewhat Agree (3 pt.), Somewhat Disagree (4 pt.), Disagree (5 pt.), and Strongly Disagree (6 pt.).

1. I receive an assignment without the manpower to complete it.
2. I receive incompatible requests from two or more people.
3. Overall, I often receive conflicting directions.
4. I am unclear about the goals/objectives that exist for my job.
5. I am unclear about what exactly is expected of me.
6. I am uncertain about how my performance is going to be evaluated.
7. Overall, I am uncertain about my job expectations.
8. I have to take work home in the evenings or on weekends to stay caught up.
9. I spend too much time in unimportant meetings that take me away from my work.
10. I am responsible for an almost unmanageable number of projects or assignments at the same time.
11. Overall I have too much work to do in this job.

Burn Out

These questions were scored on a Likert scale ranging from Strongly Agree(1 pt.), Agree (2 pt), Somewhat Agree (3 pt.), Somewhat Disagree (4 pt.), Disagree (5 pt.), and Strongly Disagree (6 pt.).

1. Working with students is really a strain for me.
2. I feel I am working too hard for my students.
3. Working with my principal puts too much stress on me.
4. I feel emotionally drained by the pressure my principal puts on me.
5. I feel frustrated because of working directly with other teachers.
6. I feel I work too hard trying to satisfy my fellow teachers.
7. I feel dismayed by the actions of the district office.
8. I feel burned out trying to meet the district office's expectations.
9. I feel I perform effectively to meet the needs of students.
10. I feel I am effective in solving problems of my students.
11. I feel I am an important asset to my principal.
12. I feel my principal values my contribution to the school.
13. I feel my coworkers truly value my assistance.
14. I feel I am a positive influence on my coworkers.
15. I feel I satisfy many of the demands set by the central office.
16. I feel I make a positive contribution to district office goals.

17. I feel I treat some students as if they were impersonal "objects."
 18. I feel indifferent toward some of my students.
 19. I feel a lack of concern for my principal.
 20. I feel I am becoming more hardened toward my supervisor.
 21. I feel I have become callous toward my coworkers.
 22. I feel insensitive toward my coworkers.
 23. I feel I am becoming less sympathetic toward the district office.
 24. I feel alienated from the district office.
-

APPENDIX B

MSCEIT SAMPLE BOOKLET QUESTIONS

This is a sample of each of the 8 sections of the Mayer, Salovey, Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test.

General Instructions

The MSCEIT contains eight different sections. Each section has its own instructions. Try to answer every question. If you are unsure of the answer, make your best guess.

Section A



(This is not the exact picture provided in the assessment)

Instructions: How much is each feeling below expressed by this face.
(Please select a response for each item).

- | | | | | | | |
|------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--------------------|
| 1. No happiness | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Extreme happiness |
| 2. No fear | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Extreme fear |
| 3. No surprise | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Extreme surprise |
| 4. No disgust | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Extreme disgust |
| 5. No excitement | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Extreme excitement |

Section B

Instructions: Please select a response for each item.

1. **What mood(s) might be helpful to feel when creating, new exciting decorations for a birthday party?**

	Not Useful			Useful	
a. Annoyance	1	2	3	4	5
b. Boredom	1	2	3	4	5
c. Joy	1	2	3	4	5

2. **What mood(s) might be helpful to feel when composing an inspiring military march?**

	Not Useful			Useful	
a. Anger	1	2	3	4	5
b. Excitement	1	2	3	4	5
c. Frustration	1	2	3	4	5

3. **What mood(s) might be helpful for a doctor to feel when selecting a treatment plan for a patient with a cancerous tumor? The doctor must apply several known, but conflicting principles in the treatment of the tumor.**

	Not Useful			Useful	
a. Happiness	1	2	3	4	5
b. Neutral Mood	1	2	3	4	5
c. Anger and Defiance	1	2	3	4	5

Section C

Instructions: Select the best alternative for each of these questions.

1. **Marjorie felt more and more ashamed, and began to feel worthless. She then felt _____.**
 - a. Overwhelmed
 - b. Depressed
 - c. Ashamed
 - d. Self-conscious
 - e. Jittery

2. **Kenji felt content as he thought of his life and the more he thought about the good things he had done and the joy his acts had brought to others, the more he felt _____.**
 - a. Surprised
 - b. Depressed
 - c. Acceptance
 - d. Happiness
 - e. Amazement

3. **Natalie had never been more surprised in her life. But as she recovered a bit from the shock of the loss and realized she could gain some advantage from the situation if she planned carefully, she became _____.**
 - a. Amazed
 - b. Confused
 - c. Defying of the situation
 - d. Expectant
 - e. Pensive

Section D

Instructions: Please select and answer for every action.

1. **Mara woke up feeling pretty well. She had slept well, felt rested, and had no particular cares or concerns. How well would each action help her preserve her mood?**

Action 1: She got up and enjoyed the rest of the day.

- a. Very ineffective b. Somewhat ineffective c. Neutral d. Somewhat effective e. Very effective

Action 2: Mara enjoyed the feeling and decided to think about and appreciate all the things that were going well for her.

- a. Very ineffective b. Somewhat ineffective c. Neutral d. Somewhat effective e. Very effective

Action 3: She decided it was best to ignore the feeling since it wouldn't last anyway.

- a. Very ineffective b. Somewhat ineffective c. Neutral d. Somewhat effective e. Very effective

Action 4: She used the positive feeling to call her mother, who had been depressed, and tried to cheer her up.

- a. Very ineffective b. Somewhat ineffective c. Neutral d. Somewhat effective e. Very effective

2. **Andrew works as hard, if not harder than one of his colleagues. In fact, his ideas are usually better at getting positive results for the company. His colleague does a mediocre job but engages in the office politics so as to get ahead. So, when Andrew's boss announces that the annual merit award is being given to his colleague, Andrew is very angry. How effective would each action be in helping Andrew feel better?**

Action 1: Andrew sat down and thought about all of the good things in his life and his work.

- a. Very ineffective b. Somewhat ineffective c. Neutral d. Somewhat effective e. Very effective

Action 2: Andrew made a list of the positive and negative traits of his colleague.

- a. Very ineffective b. Somewhat ineffective c. Neutral d. Somewhat effective e. Very effective

Action 3: Andrew felt terrible that he felt that way, and he told himself that it wasn't right to be so upset over and event not under his control.

- a. Very ineffective b. Somewhat ineffective c. Neutral d. Somewhat effective e. Very effective

Action 4: Andrew decided to tell people what a poor job his colleague had done, and that he did not deserve the merit award. Andrew gathered memos and notes to prove his point, so it wasn't just his word.

a. Very ineffective b. Somewhat ineffective c. Neutral d. Somewhat effective e. Very effective

Section E

Instructions: How much is each feeling below expressed by this picture?

(Please select a response for each item)



www.shutterstock.com · 538241

(This is not the exact picture provided in the assessment)

- | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------|
| 1. No happiness | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Extreme happiness |
| 2. No sadness | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Extreme sadness |
| 3. No fear | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Extreme fear |
| 4. No anger | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Extreme anger |
| 5. No disgust | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Extreme disgust |

Section F

Instructions: For each item below, you are asked to imagine feeling a certain way.

Answer as best you can, even if you are unable to imagine the feeling.

- 1. Imagining feeling guilty that you forgot to visit a close friend who has a serious illness. In the middle of the day, you realize you completely forgot to visit your friend at the hospital. How much is the feeling of guilt like each of the following.**

	Not Alike			Very Much Alike	
a. Happiness	1	2	3	4	5
b. Neutral Mood	1	2	3	4	5
c. Anger and Defiance	1	2	3	4	5

- 2. Imagine feeling content on a wonderful day, with terrific news about your job and family. How much is the feeling of contentment like each of the following sensations?**

	Not Alike			Very Much Alike	
a. Warm	1	2	3	4	5
b. Purple	1	2	3	4	5
c. Salty	1	2	3	4	5

Section G

Instructions: Select the best alternative for each of these questions.

1. **A feeling of concern most closely combines the emotions of _____.**
 - a. Love, anxiety, surprise, anger
 - b. Surprise, pride, anger, fear
 - c. Acceptance, anxiety, fear, anticipation
 - d. Fear, joy, surprise, embarrassment
 - e. Anxiety, caring, anticipation

2. **Another word for “consistently anticipating pleasure” is _____.**
 - a. Optimism
 - b. Happiness
 - c. Contentment
 - d. Joy
 - e. Surprise

3. **Acceptance, joy, and warmth often combine to form _____.**
 - a. Love
 - b. Amazement
 - c. Anticipation
 - d. Contentment
 - e. Acceptance

Section H

Instructions: Please select and answer every response.

- 1. John developed a close friend at work over the last year. Today, that friend completely surprised him by saying he had taken a job at another company and would be moving out of the area. He had not mentioned he was looking for other jobs. How effective would John be in maintaining a good relationship, if he chose to respond in each of the following ways.**

Response 1: John felt good for him and told his friend that he was glad he got the new job. Over the next few weeks, John made arrangements to ensure they stayed in touch.

a. Very ineffective b. Somewhat ineffective c. Neutral d. Somewhat effective e. Very effective

Response 2: John felt that his friend was leaving, but he considered what happened as an indication that the friend did not much care for him. After all, the friend said nothing about his job search. Given that his friend was leaving anyway, John did not mention it, but instead went looking for other friends at work.

a. Very ineffective b. Somewhat ineffective c. Neutral d. Somewhat effective e. Very effective

Response 3: John was a very angry that his friend hadn't said anything. John showed his disapproval by deciding to ignore his friend until the friend said something about what he had done. John thought that if his friend didn't say anything, it would confirm John's opinion that the friend was not worth talking to.

a. Very ineffective b. Somewhat ineffective c. Neutral d. Somewhat effective e. Very effective