The Relationship of Emotional Competencies to Transformational Leadership: Using a Corporate Model to Assess the Dispositions of Educational Leaders

Paul T. Hackett & J. William Hortman
Columbus State University

Abstract
The work of Goleman (1998) in the area of Emotional Intelligence offers promise for the assessment and evaluation of leader behaviors not related to a technical skill set such as those related to finance, data analysis, curriculum alignment, law or strategic planning. Researchers at a West Central Georgia University initiated a project that examined the relationship between transformational leadership behaviors as articulated by Avolio and Bass (2004) and emotional competencies that have emerged from the work of Goleman (1998) and Boyatzis, Goleman and Rhee (2004). In this study, researchers administered the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire developed by Avolio and Bass (2004) and the Emotional Competencies Inventory-University Edition (ECI-U) based on the work of Boyatzis, Goleman and Rhee (2004) to 46 assistant principals from a southern urban school system. The resulting relationships between transformational leadership behaviors and emotional competencies are reported in this article along with recommendations for future study and ramifications for training educational leaders.

Introduction

School leaders in times past prepared for their roles in school administration by attending graduate studies programs in educational leadership emphasizing the areas of finance, law, organizational theory, and strategic planning. With the dawning of the age of accountability wrought by reform movements beginning in the 1980s, graduate programs in leadership changed that emphasis to a focus on skills required of an instructional leader (Hallinger, 2003; Jason, 2001). This change of emphasis culminated in the

1990s with the alignment of educational leadership curricula with standards set by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC). The ISLLC Standards focus on assessment, collaboration, professional development, curriculum and ethics. These standards emphasize the development and implementation of an organization-wide vision, data collection and analysis, and communication/collaboration with the various groups that make up a school community (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996). A major reason for the adoption of the ISLLC standards by educational leadership programs was that these standards were recognized by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the accrediting body for colleges of education.

Educational leadership programs aligned with ISLLC evolved from programs emphasizing only a set of knowledge, to an emphasis on performance of skills in field experiences and the development of dispositions in educational leadership candidates. Dispositions are defined by Perkins (1995) as proclivities that motivate and determine the direction of behavior, by Tishman and Andrade (1995) as "tendencies toward particular patterns of thinking" (p. 2), and by Tishman, Jay, and Perkins (1992) as "ongoing tendencies that guide intellectual behavior" (¶ 7). The rationale for the training of educational leaders in dispositions is the idea that unless a leader has appropriate dispositions to motivate the application of knowledge and skills, technical expertise would be of little use to the leader.

Efforts to develop dispositions in educational leaders have proven problematic, however. Definitions of behavioral indicators associated with dispositions often lack the specificity necessary for the development of curriculum, disposition-related behaviors are not clearly correlated with student performance, and dispositions prove difficult to assess (Tishman & Andrade, 1995). Even when they are clearly defined, transmission of dispositions proves difficult. According to Tishman, et al. (1992) "even at its best, a transmission model of teaching encounters fundamental problems when the aim is to cultivate dispositions" (¶ 15). The transmission of "rules" under which to behave in certain situations in no way ensures that a behavior will be exhibited in a given situation.

Preparing leaders for schools has always been a challenging task, but never more so than in the emerging global landscape where graduates will be in competition, not only with their peers in the United States, but with

their contemporaries throughout the world. Recent reports, however, raise concerns regarding the performance of students in the United States and call into question the efficacy of K-12 education. Among these concerns are lagging student performance, particularly in reading and math (Lemke et al., 2004), continuing performance gaps among students from different socio-economic groups (Perie & Moran, 2005), low representation of male students in the sciences, and declining production of graduates with doctoral degrees by universities in the United States (National Science Board, 2006).

Relationship of Dispositions to Leadership

Recent leadership literature from the corporate environment correlates leader behaviors with the performance of businesses in terms of profitability and return on investment (ROI). Romig (2001) has identified five leadership spheres supported by twenty leader behaviors. Of those spheres, four of the five reflect behaviors commonly associated with the development of a collaborative environment where teams do the work of creative innovation, product development, and service delivery. These four areas as outlined by Romig include: Personal Leadership, Interpersonal Leadership, Team Leadership, and Organizational Leadership. Romig, citing numerous studies, asserts that the leadership behaviors associated with this model correlate with corporate productivity in terms of ROI, profitability, and stock market performance. Though outlining basic principles that are related to dispositions, Romig's work does not define a set of behavioral indicators that can be assessed, quantified, and that can be used to improve the dispositions of an individual leader.

The work of Goleman (1998) in the area of emotional intelligence offers promise for the assessment and evaluation of leader behaviors not related to technical skills in the areas of finance, data analysis, curriculum alignment, law or strategic planning. Goleman outlines a set of emotional competencies that correlate with corporate performance measures such as return on investment, profit, and performance in the stock market.

According to Goleman, emotional intelligence is defined as awareness of emotions and using emotions to make good decisions in life. Using emotions effectively requires the ability to manage distressing moods, control impulses, attain a high level of motivation, and remain hopeful and optimistic in the face of adversity. Emotional intelligence involves empathy, managing emotions in

relationships, and persuading others (O'Neil, 1996). Basing their assertions on empirical data, Goleman (1998) and Salopek (1998) state that the competencies associated with emotional intelligence are more important in effective job performance than are cognitive ability and expertise. The higher one rises in an organization, the more important are the emotional competencies possessed by an individual, making emotional competencies crucial to the success of a leader. The work of Boyatzis, Goleman, and Rhee (1999), articulated a framework for the clustering of emotional competencies. According to Wolff (2005), the competencies can be assessed by an instrument based on this framework, the Emotional Competencies Inventory (ECI).

Transformational Leadership and Student Achievement

The concept of transformational leadership is a change-oriented framework comprised of a list of behaviors that contribute to change within schools and school systems. Transformational leadership has been defined by Lashway (1995) as leadership that inspires others to perform at optimal levels so that vision may be achieved. Leithwood (1993) articulated seven elements of transformational leadership including: identification and articulation of a vision; fostering the acceptance of group goals; establishment of high performance expectations; establishment of appropriate models; establishment of intellectual stimulation; establishment of contingent reward; and the practice of management by exception. Liontos (1992) defined more specific transformational behaviors including visiting classrooms daily, involving everyone in decision making, finding good things that are occurring and recognizing them, surveying the staff often, allowing experimentation, and finding workshops for teachers to attend.

Studies have shown a relationship between skills and behaviors identified with transformational leadership and positive outcomes in schools. In a series of case studies reported in 1993, Keedy analyzed the behaviors of four successful secondary principals. In this study, success was defined as leading the schools in change in terms of improving student behavior and performance. Of the four principals, three employed practices associated with transformational leadership thereby developing relationships with teachers characterized by mutual commitment to a mission.

Silins (1994) found through partial least squares analysis (PLSPATH) that

transformational leadership indicators based on the work of Bass (1985) and drawn from Australian perspectives on transformational leadership were related to specific outcomes to include student performance, curriculum outcomes, teacher outcomes, and improvement in school culture. The transformational leadership indicators included leadership behaviors concerned with Goal Achievement, Guiding School Ethos, Collaborative Problem Solving, Visionary Behaviors, and Individual Consideration and Support. Leader behaviors related to Goal Achievement and Ethos accounted for approximately one-third of the variance in student performance ($R^2 = 0.35$). Goal Achievement, Collaborative Problem Solving and Ethos accounted for close to two-thirds of the variance in curriculum outcomes ($R^2 = 0.62$) while Visionary Leader Behaviors, Individual Consideration and Support, and Collaborative Problem Solving accounted for over two-thirds of teacher outcomes ($R^2 = 0.78$). Finally, Goal Achievement, Individual Consideration and Support, and Collaborative Problem Solving, accounted for two-thirds of the variance in school culture outcomes ($R^2 = 0.71$).

The work of Avolio and Bass (2004) related to transformational leadership has resulted in the development of an instrument to measure transactional, non-transactional and transformational leadership. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) assesses transactional leadership behaviors associated with setting standards, monitoring implementation and correcting mistakes, non-transactional behavior associated with avoidance, and transformational leadership behaviors associated with inspiration, intellectual stimulation, visionary orientation, and exercise of charisma. These leadership behaviors are cited by managers, project leaders, and students as those exhibited by the leaders who had the most influence on them.

Purpose of the Study

Researchers in the Educational Leadership Program at a West Central Georgia university perceived a need to ascertain whether a relationship existed between dispositions and leadership skills. During program redesign and curriculum alignment activities, discussion took place regarding the relative importance of dispositions to successful leadership and the ramifications of a focus on dispositions for a leadership program. Issues under discussion ranged from the difficulty of defining specific dispositions related to successful

leadership to the paucity of research supporting the concept. Based on these program-specific concerns and practical considerations related to program design, researchers proposed a study to investigate the relationship between behaviors that could be defined as dispositions and established leadership behaviors previously correlated to student performance. Researchers proposed to administer both an assessment of dispositional behaviors proven to correlate with effective performance in the corporate sector and an assessment of transformational leadership behaviors correlated with effective schools indicators such as climate, teacher outcomes, and student performance. During this study, subjects completed the assessments and rated themselves on indicators. Researchers then examined the data to ascertain whether relationships existed between behaviors as assessed by the two instruments.

Method

The purpose of the study was to examine the relationships that exist among the twenty-one emotional competencies measured by the Emotional Competencies Inventory-University Edition (ECI-U) and the five factors of transformational leadership as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). Specifically, the study was focused on answering the following research question: how are the competencies that define emotional intelligence related to the behaviors and attributes of a transformational leader? The following methodology was employed to help answer this question.

Sample

Forty-six assistant principals were the subjects of this study. Each was currently serving in an elementary, middle, or high school in a large suburban public school district in Georgia. The assistant principals participated voluntarily and completed a demographic survey, the Emotional Competencies Index-University Edition (ECI-U) and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). The group of assistant principals included 24 males and 22 females. Among the total group, 19 were serving at the elementary level, ten at a middle school, and 17 at the high school level. Table 1 presents the disaggregated demographic data.

Data were gathered from the entire group of assistant principals in one location as they assembled for a day long professional development

session. Each assistant principal was asked to complete a short demographic questionnaire to report gender, years in education, earned degree, level of school, and years as an assistant principal. Additionally, each was asked to complete two survey instruments: the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and the Emotional Competencies Index-University Edition (ECI-U). Both of these instruments were administered as self-reported measures and required about 20 minutes each to complete.

Table 1
Demographic Characteristics of Assistant Principals

Gender	Elem	MS	HS	All
Male	8(17.4%)	6(13%)	10(21.7%)	24(52%)
Female	11(23.9%)	4(8.7%)	7(15.2%)	22(48%)
Years as Assistant Principal				
< 1 Year	1(2.2%)	3(6.5%)	3(6.5%)	7(15%)
1-5 Years	13(28.3%)	4(8.7%)	9(19.6%)	26(57%)
> 5 Years	5(10.9%)	3(6.5%)	5(10.9%)	13(28%)
Years as Educator				
< 11 Years	3(6.7%)	2(4.4%)	4(8.9%)	9(20%)
11-20 Years	5(11.1%)	4(8.9%)	5(11.1%)	14(31%)
> 20 Years	10(22.2%)	4(8.9%)	8(17.8%)	22(49%)
All Subjects	19(41%)	10(22%)	17(37%)	46(100%)

Note. N = 46; Elem = elementary; MS = middle school; HS = high school.

The MLQ is a 45-item survey that measures a full range of leadership styles by focusing on the characteristics and behaviors of transformational leadership. Additional leadership behaviors measured by the MLQ include transactional leadership behaviors associated with contingent reward systems,

and non-transactional leadership styles such as passive and avoidant behaviors. The instrument uses a 5-point Likert scale for each item (ranging from "0" being "not at all"; "1" being "once in a while"; "2" being "sometimes"; "3" being "fairly often"; and "4" being "frequently, if not always"). Five scale scores are generated from the scoring of the items written to assess transformational leadership attributes and behaviors. These items assess dimensions of transformational leadership including the following: Idealized Influence - Attributed (IIA), associated with ethics; Idealized Influence Behavior (IIB), associated with collective sense of mission; Inspirational Motivation (IM), associated with motivation of colleagues; Intellectual Stimulation (IS), associated with innovation; and Individual Consideration (IC), associated with coaching and mentoring. Descriptions of the MLQ scales are presented in Table 2.

The MLQ has undergone several revisions since Bass (1985) presented the original six factor structure to represent three leadership styles, including transformational leadership. Subsequent studies (Avolio & Bass, 2004, Bass & Avolio, 1990; Bass & Avolio, 1997) have used confirmatory factor analysis to establish the six factor model for the MLQ and support its construct validity. Avolio and Bass (2004) reported that estimates of internal consistency for the total items and for each leadership factor scale ranged from .64 to .92. All of the scale reliabilities exceeded .70 except for the active management by exception scale.

The ECI-U is a 63-item instrument that measures 21 competencies organized into four clusters defining emotional intelligence: Self Awareness, Self Management, Social Awareness, and Relationship Management. These competencies were based on the work of Goleman (1998) and Boyatzis, Goleman and Rhee (1999). Descriptions of the ECI-U competencies are presented in Table 3.

The response scale for the ECI-U is a 5-point Likert scale. The scale ranges from one to five: 1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, and 5 = consistently. Boyatzis and Sala (2004) reported internal consistency estimates ranging from .45 to .77 for the self-reported version of the ECI and Cronbach's alpha coefficients from .54 to .90 for the multi-rater form. Wolff (2006) reports internal consistency estimates for the 21 emotional competencies of the ECI 2.0 ranging from .70 to .87 based on multiple raters. Reliability coefficients calculated for self-reported data range from .47 to

Table 2
MLQ Transformational Leader Scale Descriptions

MLQ Scale	Description
Idealized Influence (attributed)	Leader is ethical, respected by others, trusted, wants to earn credit with followers, considers overall good ahead of self interest
Idealized Influence (behavior)	Leader emphasizes collective sense of mission, shares risks with followers, is consistent in actions, talks about values and beliefs
Inspirational Motivation	Leader motivates those around him/her, arouses team spirit, displays optimism and enthusiasm, articulates a compelling vision, expresses confidence that goals will be achieved
Intellectual Stimulation	Leader stimulates followers' innovation and creativity, solicits new solutions in a safe environment, questions assumptions and reframes problems
Individual Consideration	Leader acts as a coach and mentor for individual followers, creates new learning opportunities within a supportive climate, considers individual needs, abilities and aspirations

.76. Multiple-rater data for the ECI-U yielded internal consistency coefficients ranging from .52 to .82.

Bryne (2003) concluded from an overall study of the self-scored version of the ECI that the instrument showed good construct, discriminant, and criterion validity. Several unpublished studies of criterion and construct validity that supported the ECI's relationship with external outcomes such as organizational leadership, job performance, and organizational climate were reported in Boyatzis and Sala (2004).

The ECI-U was administered to assistant principals who responded to statements as to level of agreement/disagreement on a 5-point Likert Scale regarding the competencies. Twenty-one emotional competency scores

Table 3
ECI-U Competency Descriptions

Emotional Competency	Description
Emotional Self-Awareness	Is aware of own feelings, knows why feelings occur and understands implications
Accurate Self-Assessment	Has sense of humor, is aware of strengths/limits, open to feedback
Self-Confidence	Presents self in an assured manner, believes in self and capabilities
Emotional Self-Control	Keeps impulsive feelings and emotions under control, stays poised and positive
Trustworthiness	Is authentic, genuine, honest, shows integrity, takes responsibility for behavior
Conscientiousness	Has underlying drive for reliability, quality work, builds trust, follows through
Adaptability	Is flexible, adapts effectively in changing situations, juggles multiple demands
Optimism	Has mainly positive expectations, sees opportunities rather than threats
Achievement Orientation	Works toward a standard of excellence, sees measurable goals
Initiative	Acts rather than waits, strives to do better
Empathy	Is understanding of other people, accurately reads verbal and nonverbal cues
Organizational Awareness	Understands political forces, values, culture within organization
Service Orientation	Focuses efforts on proactively understanding and meeting others' needs

Table 3 (continued)

Developing Others	Mentors, coaches, recognizes strengths of others, fosters development of others
Inspirational Leadership	Articulates vision, builds teamwork and belonging, brings people together
Influence	Builds consensus for an agenda, persuades others
Communication	Sends clear, convincing messages, uses engaging presentation style
Change Catalyst	Removes barriers to change, leads initiatives for change
Conflict Management	Confronts conflict, focuses on issues rather than people, de-escalates conflict
Building Bonds	Builds, maintains close, friendly relationships, has network of colleagues
Teamwork/Collaboration	Works cooperatively with others

were generated and recorded for each participating assistant principal in the study.

Analysis and Results

The five MLQ scale scores, and the 21 ECI-U competency scores for each participating assistant principal were examined descriptively. Means and standard deviations were calculated for the group of 46 assistant principals and are reported in Table 4.

The mean scale scores and the standard deviations obtained from the five MLQ scales measuring transformational leadership style were very similar across scales. Means ranged from 3.28 (Idealized Influence) to 3.49 (Inspirational Motivation), and there was little difference in subscale variability. The ECI-U competency score means were more dispersed. Mean scores ranged from 3.37 (Initiative) to 4.73 (Conscientiousness) and standard deviations ranged from 0.34 to 0.71.

The relationships among the five MLQ scales and the 21

Table 4
Descriptive Statistics for MLQ Scale Scores and EI-U Competency Scores

	All Assistant Principals (n = 46)	
Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire	*M*	*SD*
Idealized Influence (A)	3.28	.46
Idealized Influence (B)	3.35	.46
Inspirational Motivation	3.49	.47
Intellectual Stimulation	3.30	.51
Individual Consideration	3.46	.42
Emotional Competency		
Emotional Self-Awareness	4.49	.51
Accurate Self-Assessment	4.61	.42
Self Confidence	4.17	.57
Emotional Self-Control	4.38	.57
Trustworthiness	4.15	.62
Conscientiousness	4.73	.36
Adaptability	4.27	.49
Optimism	4.59	.37
Achievement Orientation	3.89	.46
Initiative	3.37	.71
Empathy	4.38	.34
Organizational Awareness	4.18	.52
Emotional Competency		
Service Orientation	4.51	.42
Developing Others	4.38	.47
Inspirational Leadership	3.99	.58
Influence	4.01	.51
Communication	4.36	.48
Change Catalyst	3.89	.71
Conflict Management	3.99	.59
Building Bonds	3.72	.64
Teamwork and Collaboration	4.56	.38

emotional competency scores were examined by calculating Pearson correlation coefficients. The results of the correlation analyses are reported in Table 5 and clearly establish that emotional competencies as measured by the ECI-U are related to transformational leadership style as measured by the

MLQ. Specifically, 16 of the 21 emotional competencies were significantly positively correlated ($p < .05$) with the MLQ Intellectual Stimulation scale. Thirteen of the emotional competencies were significantly correlated to the MLQ Inspirational Motivation scale. One of the competencies (Developing Others) was significantly correlated to all five of the transformational leadership scales. Four competencies (Achievement Orientation, Initiative, Inspirational Leadership, and Conflict Management) correlated with four of the five transformational leadership scales and six of the competencies correlated significantly with three of the five transformational leadership scales.

Only five of the emotional competencies (Emotional Self-Awareness, Emotional Self-Control, Conscientiousness, Optimism, and Teamwork and Collaboration) did not correlate significantly with any of the transformational leadership scales. Over three-fourths (76%) of the competencies measured by the ECI-U were significantly related to transformational leadership attributes and behaviors self-reported by the assistant principals.

The Pearson correlation coefficients found to be statistically significant ($p < .05$) ranged from .290 (ECI-U: Change Catalyst with MLQ-IS scale) to .695 (ECI-U: Change Catalyst with MLQ-IC scale). As pointed out by Thompson (2002), the "noteworthiness" of research should be evaluated by criteria other than statistical significance. By using the squared correlation coefficients, it was determined that the proportion of common variation among these variables ranged from 8.4% to 48.3%. Therefore, the statistically significant relationships could be described as varying from weak to moderate in strength. Obviously the stronger relationships, where an emotional competency accounted for one-quarter or more ($r > .50$) of the variance in transformational leadership style, would contribute more to the practical application of these findings. A majority of the significant relationships found in this study involved emotional competencies in the Relationship Management domain and the Intellectual Stimulation scale of transformational leadership. Although the findings were varied, support was established for the further study of the role of emotional competency in effective educational leadership.

In summary, competencies in each of the four emotional intelligence domains were correlated with one or more of the five transformational leadership scales. The social awareness domain and the relationship management domain had the most competencies which correlated positively with being a transformational leader. In particular, the competencies that

Table 5
Significant r Correlations for MLQ Scales and Emotional Competencies (p < .05)

MLQ Scale	Emotional Competency	*r*	*Significance*
Idealized Influence (attributed)			
	Self Confidence	.588	.000
	Trustworthiness	.304	.040
	Adaptability	.469	.001
	Achievement Orientation	.490	.001
	Initiative	.326	.027
	Developing Others' Initiative	.349	.017
	Change Catalyst	.546	.000
	Conflict Management	.400	.006
Idealized Influence (behavior)			
	Achievement Orientation	.356	.015
	Organizational Awareness	.358	.015
	Service Orientation	.291	.050
	Developing Others' Initiative	.368	.012
	Inspirational Leadership	.324	.030
Inspirational Motivation			
	Self Confidence	.369	.012
	Trustworthiness	.316	.032
	Adaptability	.404	.005
	Achievement Orientation	.379	.009
	Initiative	.404	.005
	Empathy	.365	.013
	Service Orientation	.387	.008
	Developing Others' Initiative	.311	.036
	Inspirational Leadership	.392	.008
	Influence	.293	.049
	Communication	.452	.002
	Change Catalyst	.475	.001
	Conflict Management	.446	.002

Table 5 (continued)

Intellectual Stimulation		
Accurate Self-Assessment	.391	.007
Self Confidence	.588	.000
Trustworthiness	.406	.005
Adaptability	.555	.000
Achievement Orientation	.368	.012
Initiative	.507	.000
Empathy	.383	.009
Organizational Awareness	.340	.021
Service Orientation	.427	.003
Developing Others' Initiative	.538	.000
Inspirational Leadership	.411	.005
Influence	.340	.021
Communication	.617	.000
Change Catalyst	.695	.000
Conflict Management	.614	.000
Building Bonds	.327	.027
Individual Consideration		
Accurate Self-Assessment	.367	.012
Initiative	.303	.040
Empathy	.407	.005
Service Orientation	.282	.057
Developing Others' Initiative	.523	.000
Inspirational Leadership	.398	.007
Change Catalyst	.290	.051
Conflict Management	.307	.038

are involved with serving others' needs appear to be most important for the transformational leader: Service Orientation including mentoring, coaching, and helping others improve; Developing Others including leading groups to and through substantive change; Change Catalyst; and Conflict Management including working through disagreement to lead people towards positive outcomes.

Implications

The establishment of a relationship between a transformational leadership model shown to be correlated with positive student outcomes and an emotional competency framework associated with effectiveness in the corporate environment has implications for researchers, university educational leadership programs, leadership academies, and professional development in the schools. Many university educational leadership programs are aligned with Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards and accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Such programs focus on knowledge, skills, and dispositions of leaders. The difficulty in measuring dispositions presents challenges for programs attempting to effect change in the dispositional orientation of candidates. The emotional competency model provides a university faculty a way to measure dispositions that has been correlated with transformational leadership and has been shown to be related to leader effectiveness in the corporate setting.

The emotional competency model provides a rich source of action research for leadership academies and school systems. Professional development models for school leaders, often notoriously absent in school systems due to time restraints, could include the measurement of leader emotional competency from a variety of perspectives and subsequent examination for correlation with student achievement. The discussion and self-reflection generated by the implementation of such a professional development program could be transformative.

Finally, the theoretical framework supporting the emotional competency model is based on research showing that emotional competencies can be learned through awareness and practice (Goleman, 1998). The implications for university programs, academies, and school systems are exciting, since leadership dispositions can be assessed and growth experiences can be designed to facilitate the emotional competency growth of leadership candidates.

Recommendations for Future Study

Limitations of this study include the fact that it was conducted with assistant principals rather than principals. Additionally, the behaviors and attributes measured by the two instruments were self-reported. Finally, the study showed

weak to moderate correlation existing between transformational leadership as measured on the MLQ and emotional competencies as measured on the ECI-U. This correlation was interesting in light of the fact that transformational leadership has been shown to be related both to organizational performance and outcomes in schools. It was not within the scope of this study to investigate a relationship between self-reported behaviors and actual student achievement indicators in the schools where the subjects work. This fact implies future directions for research to include conducting studies with principals from a variety of settings. In those studies, the ECI-U should be administered not only to the principals, but to supervisors, colleagues, teachers and students in order to ascertain a variety of perspectives regarding the emotional competency of subjects. Student performance data from the schools led by the principals involved in the studies should be examined for relationships with emotional competencies. For this aspect of the research, a viable student performance model should be developed that takes into account the variety of settings in which the emotional competencies of principals are studied. Investigation of a possible relationship between emotional intelligences and student performance implied by this study has exciting potential for researchers and those who train educational leaders.

References

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Third edition manual and sampler set.* Menlo Park, CA: Mindgarden, Inc.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio B. J. (1990). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, *4*, 231–272.

Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (1997*). Full range leadership development: Manual for the multifactorleadership questionnaire*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.

Boyatzis, R. E., Goleman, D., & Rhee, K. (1999). *Clustering competence in emotional Intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI).* Retrieved March 18, 2008, from http://ei.haygroup.com/resources/Library_articles/Clustering%Competence%20in%20EI.pdf

Boyatzis, R. E., & Sala, F. (2004). "Assessing emotional intelligence competencies." In Geher, G (Ed.), *The measurement of emotional intelligence* [pp. 147-180]. Haupapage, NY: Novas Science Publishers

Bryne, J. C. (2003). *The role of emotional intelligence in predicting leadership and related work behavior*. Hoboken: Stevens Institute of Technology, Technology Management.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1996). *Interstate school leaders licensure consortium (ISLLC) standards for school leaders.* Washington, DC: Author. Available: http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/isllcstd.pdf

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

Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *33*(3), 329-351.

Jason, M. H. (2001). Principals' self-perceptions of influence and the meaning they ascribe to their leadership roles. *Research for Educational Reform*, *6*(2), 34-49.

Keedy, J. L. (1993, April). *Studying principal inner realities and their practice. Building the EA knowledge base.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 360 730)

Lashway, L. (1995). Facilitative leadership. *Digest 96.* Retrieved March 18, 2008, from http://eric.uoregon.edu/publications/digests/digest096.html

Leithwood, K. (1993, October). *Contributions of transformational leadership to school restructuring.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Houston TX. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 367 061)

Lemke, M., Sen, A., Pahlke, E., Partelow, L., Miller, D., Williams, T., et al. (2004). *International outcomes of learning in mathematics literacy and problem solving: PISA 2003 results from the U. S. perspective.* (NCES 2005-003). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

Liontos, L. B. (1992). Transformational leadership. *Eric Digest 92.* Retrieved March 18, 2008, from http://www.ericdigests.org/1992-2/leadership.htm

National Science Board. (2006). *Science and engineering indicators, 2006.* Two volumes. Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation (volume 1 NSB 06-01; volume 2 NSB 06-01 A).

O'Neil, J. (1996). On emotional intelligence: A conversation with Daniel Goleman. *Educational Leadership*, *54*(1), 6-11.

Perie, M., & Moran, R. (2005). *NAEP 2004 trends in academic progress: Three decades of student performance in reading and mathematics* (NCES 2005-464). U.S. Department of Education, *Institute of Education Sciences*, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Perkins, D. (1995). *Outsmarting I.Q: The emerging science of learnable intelligence.* New York: The Free Press.

Romig, D. (2001). *Side by side leadership: Obtaining outstanding results together.* Austin, TX: Bard Press.

Sala, F. (2002). *Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI) technical manual*. Hay Group: McClelland Center for Research and Innovation. Retrieved October 19, 2006 from http://www.eiconsortium.org/research/ECI_Tech_Manual.pdf

Salopek, J. J. (1998). Train your brain. *Training and Development*, *52*(10), 26-33.

Silins, H. C. (1994, April). *Leadership characteristics that make a difference to schools.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 383 086)

Thompson, B. (2002). "Statistical," "Practical," and Clinical": How many kinds of significance do counselors need to consider? *Journal of Counseling and Development, 80*, 64-71.

Tishman, S., & Andrade, A. (1995). *Thinking dispositions: A review of current theories, practices, and issues.* Retrieved March 18, 2008, from learnweb.harvard.edu/alps/thinking/docs/Dispositions.pdf

Tishman, S., Jay, E., & Perkins, D. M. (1992). *Teaching dispositions: From transmission to enculturation.* Retrieved March 18, 2008, from http://learnweb.harvard.edu/ALPS/thinking/docs/article2.html

Wolff, S. B. (2006). *Emotional Competency Inventory (ECI): Technical Manual*. Boston: Hay Group, McCelland Center for research and Innovation.