



The relationship between emotional intelligence and school management

Osman Ferda Beytekin *

Phd., Ege University Faculty of Education, Bornova, İzmir, Turkey

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between emotional intelligence and school management. This research tries to identify key emotional and social competencies needed by principals for appropriate necessities and responsibilities to their school environment. It is obvious that the emotional intelligence is completely associated with an individual's ability to cope with environmental demands and uncertainties (Mayer, Caruso & Salovey, 1999). The ability to read feelings and emotions of oneself and the others was named as emotional intelligence by Mayer and Salovey (1990). According to Bar On (1997, 2000), emotional intelligence was the combination of some certain related dimensions; intrapersonal abilities, interpersonal abilities, adaptability, and stress management abilities. Goleman (2006, 2007) described two types of competency for emotional intelligence; the first one was emotional competency and the second one was the social competency. The sample of this study included randomly selected 262 school administrators (principals and vice principals) from 120 primary schools in İzmir City, Turkey. The data was collected by Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i; Bar-On, 1997) and school management questionnaire from school administrators in 2011-2012 educational years. Results showed that there was positive significant relation between emotional intelligence and school management abilities in total, and emotional intelligence was a significant predictor of school management abilities.

© 2013 European Journal of Research on Education by IASSR.

Keywords: Emotional intelligence, school management, school administrators

1. Introduction

From the beginning of the human history, the effects of mind and emotions on human's behaviours constantly have been a matter of argue. The assumption of emotions directing people to wrong decisions and on the contrary the usage of mind and logic leading to better life conditions has been accepted during the history even if it was not completely true (Mayer, Roberts and Barsade, 2008). Emotions are not, as commonly accepted during the history, on the service of mind and logic, but also responsible from people's behaviour more than mind and logic. Emotions do not only give a direction to people's behaviour but also give a meaning to their lives. Salovey and Mayer (1990) proposed that the traditional approach in the west for a long time accepted emotions as an element that preventing and keeping people from exact thinking, but actually emotions had an important function on people's right decision making process. Now, contemporary understanding is constantly emphasizing the function of emotions effect on people's right decision making process.

People's existence in organizations are vital both for individual and organizational success. Administrators' effectiveness shouldn't be evaluated only for their proficiency but also for their skills to manage their own emotions and the relationships with their environment. Individual's being aware of his own and the other emotions and the successful management of them are called that person's emotional and social competence (Goleman, 2006). One of

* E-mail address: ferda.beytekin@ege.edu.tr

the key elements of one administrator's being effective on management processes is his capacity of emotional and social competence. Leaders aware of their own emotions and manage them, by more easily controlling themselves and having confidence and respect of others can be a role model. Besides, leaders understand others emotions, grasp their expectations and sensitivity and can be a source of inspiration. Leaders give importance to people and have relationships with people both in the group and reciprocally can manage their relationships effectively (Barling, Slater and Kelloway, 2000).

The approaches dealing with emotional intelligence can be classified according to their point of view as 'ability and integrated models'. The models accept emotional intelligence as ability defines it either as a pure cognitive ability or as an unalloyed intelligence. The model of Salovey and Mayer (1990) is accepted as an ability model; on the other hand the models of Bar-On (1997), Cooper and Sawaf (2000) and Goleman (2006) are called integrated models. Salovey and Mayer's cognitive ability approach defines emotional intelligence as an abstract kind of intelligence. Bar-On's integrated approach defines emotional intelligence as a combination of cognitive abilities and personal characteristics. Bar-On's model, is focused on cognitive and personal variables' effects on people's general mood of happiness. On the third model developed by Goleman, suggests that emotional intelligence consists of cognitive and personal characteristic. However, different from Bar-On, Goleman focused on how cognitive and personal variables assess the success at work (Stys and Brown, 2004).

Researchers at first described the intelligence as cognitive aspects, such as memory and problem-solving. On the other hand, there were other researchers recognizing that the non-cognitive aspects played also important role in human intelligence. Wechsler (1940) referred to "non-intellective" as well as "intellective" elements, by which he meant affective, personal, and social factors (Cherniss, 2000). According to Bar-On model, emotional-social intelligence is a cross-section of interrelated emotional and social competencies, skills and facilitators that determine how effectively we understand and express ourselves, understand others and relate to them, and cope with daily demands. Emotional intelligence is the combination of some certain related dimensions like intrapersonal abilities, used for recognizing and understanding one's feelings; interpersonal abilities, used for reading the emotions or non-verbal communication of others; adaptability, used for being able to adjust one's emotions and behaviours to changing situations and conditions; and stress management abilities, used for resisting or delaying an impulse (Bar On, 1997, 2000). Two types of competency was described for emotional intelligence; including self-awareness and self-management the emotional competency was the first one, and including social awareness and social skills the social competency was the second one ; (Goleman, 2006, 2007).

Another model, The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence was developed from an intelligence-testing tradition formed by the emerging scientific understanding of emotions and their functions (Mayer, Salovey and Caruso, 2002). The first branch of Emotional Intelligence is related to perceiving of emotions; in other words the ability to perceive emotions in oneself and others as well as in objects, art, stories, music, and other stimuli. The second one is connected with facilitating thought; that is, the ability to generate, use, and feel emotions as necessary to communicate feelings or employ them in other cognitive processes. The third one is the ability to understand emotional information, to understand how emotions combine and progress through relationship transitions, and to appreciate such emotional meanings. And the last and the fourth one is about managing emotions; particularly the ability to be open to feelings, and to modulate them in oneself and others so as to promote personal understanding and growth.

On the other hand, Bar-On (2006) referred to emotional intelligence as a set of ability and competence that ensures individual's being successful in life and healthy in general and psychologically. For him, these abilities and competences compose individual, emotional and social dimensions of intelligence. Bar-on distinguished emotional and social intelligence since the first one represents individual, emotional and social abilities and the second one represents cognitive abilities. Besides, Bar-On suggested that, contrary to cognitive intelligence, emotional intelligence predicts individual's success better since it shows the application style of knowledge to the current situation. Bar-On's emotional intelligence model and its dimensions are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Bar-On's Model of Emotional-Social Intelligence (ESI)

EQ-i	Measured EI Competences and Abilities
Introvert	Awareness and expressing him/herself
Self-respect	Individual's accurate perception, comprehension of him/herself
Emotional awareness	Individual's realization and comprehension of his/her own feelings
Self-confidence	Individual's expressing his/her emotions effectively, constructively
Independence	Individual's self-assurance and behaving freely
Self-realization	Individual's making good use of his/her potential and to reach his/her aims.
Extrovert	Social awareness and extrovert relations
Empathy	Individual's being aware of and understanding other's feelings
Social responsibility	Individual's making cooperation with others
Extrovert relations	Reciprocally having satisfactory relations and getting on well with the others
Stress management	Emotional management and inspection
Resistance to stress	To manage emotions effectively and constructively
Inspection of motives	To inspect emotions effectively and constructively
Conformance	Change management
Overlapping with reality	Individual's confirmation of his/her own feelings and thoughts with outside world realities
Being flexible	Individual's adaptation of his/her thoughts and emotions to new situations
Problem-solving	Solving problems effectively
Moods in general	Self-motivation
Optimism	Being positive and seeing the good aspects of life
Happiness	Individual's being at peace with him/herself and with others and with life in general

Bar-On, R. (2006). The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence.

2. Methodology

The sample of this study included randomly selected 262 school administrators (principals and vice principals) from 120 primary schools in İzmir City, Turkey. The data was collected by Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i; BarOn, 1997) and school management questionnaire which is developed for the present study in 2011-2012 educational years. Participating school administrators provided information about their emotional intelligence by completing the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i; BarOn, 1997). The EQ-i is a 125-item self-report instrument arranged to measure the core features of emotional intelligence using 5-point Likert scales for each item (ranging from "1" being "very seldom true of me" to "5" being "very often true of me"). The EQ-i generates 4 main scales, which make up total emotional intelligence: intrapersonal (consisting of 5 subscales: self-regard, emotional self-awareness, assertiveness, independence, and self-actualization), interpersonal (consisting of 3 subscales: empathy, social responsibility, and interpersonal relationship), adaptability (consisting of 3 subscales: reality testing, flexibility, and problem solving), and stress management (consisting of 2 subscales: stress tolerance, and impulse control). The EQ-i also includes a general mood scale (consisting of 2 subscales: optimism and happiness).

High scores on these scales can be interpreted as follows: Those scoring high on the intrapersonal scale tend to understand their emotions and are able to express and communicate their feelings and needs. Those scoring high on the interpersonal scale are likely to have satisfying interpersonal relationships, are good listeners and are able to understand and appreciate the feelings of others. Those with high adaptability scores are flexible, realistic, and effective in managing change; good at finding positive ways of dealing with daily problems. Those with high scores on the stress management scale are generally calm and work well under pressure; they are rarely impulsive and can usually respond to a stressful event without an emotional outburst. Those scoring high on the general mood scale feel satisfied with their lives and maintain a positive outlook.

School administrators completed a 21-item self-report questionnaire, developed for the present research assessing school management. The items on this instrument were selected from a review of various skills and abilities of school administrators. The factor structure of each questionnaire was tested using exploratory factor analysis. These analyses revealed a two-factor structure for the data from the self-report ratings. Factor 1 includes 11 items related to "task-oriented management", while factor 2 includes 10 items related to "relationship-oriented management". Internal reliability coefficients for the two factors in the present sample are 0.72 and 0.74 for the questionnaire. The items on the two factors added together provide a total school management score.

3. Findings

Gender by position (principals, vice principals) ANOVAs were performed with each of the EQ-i scales (intrapersonal, interpersonal, adaptability, stress management, and general mood) as dependent variables. Women were found to score higher than men only on the interpersonal scale of the EQ-i [$F(1, 300) = 18.43, p < .001$]. Principals and vice principals also did not differ ($p > .05$) on any of the EQ-i scales. Gender by position (principals vs. vice principals) ANOVAs were also performed with mean scores from each of the school management ratings as the dependent variables. Men and women did not differ ($p > .05$) on any of the ratings. Table 2 presents correlations between EQ-i scores (scales and subscales) and school management (task-oriented, relationship-oriented, total, and overall rating). The majority of the correlations were moderate and significant ($p < .001$).

Table 2. Intercorrelations for the EQ-i and school management

EQ-i scales	School Management			
	Task-Oriented	Relationship-Oriented	Total	Overall
Intrapersonal	.46	.37	.46	.33
<i>Self-Regard</i>	.32	.21	.30	.26
<i>Self-Awareness</i>	.32	.27	.32	.23
<i>Assertiveness</i>	.40	.21	.35	.33
<i>Independence</i>	.41	.20	.35	.34
<i>Self-Actualization</i>	.34	.23	.33	.20
Interpersonal	.32	.43	.46	.27
<i>Empathy</i>	.32	.43	.42	.21
<i>Social Responsibility</i>	.25	.32	.31	.13**
<i>Interpersonal Relation</i>	.35	.34	.36	.29
Adaptability	.42	.41	.43	.31
<i>Reality Testing</i>	.35	.32	.33	.21
<i>Flexibility</i>	.36	.22	.36	.24
<i>Problem Solving</i>	.43	.45	.42	.27
Stress Management	.26	.32	.36	.26
<i>Stress Tolerance</i>	.34	.34	.38	.33
<i>Impulse Control</i>	.11*	.26	.21	.11*
General Mood	.35	.23	.37	.26
<i>Optimism</i>	.43	.26	.34	.31
<i>Happiness</i>	.32	.21	.28	.20
Total EI	.52	.42	.54	.35

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; All other correlations are significant at $p < .001$; $N = 262$

Several multiple regression analyses were also performed using gender, intrapersonal abilities, interpersonal abilities, adaptability skills, stress management skills and general mood, as predictors of school management: task-oriented, relationship-oriented, and total.

Table 3. Significant predictors of school management

Criterion	Predictors	SE	β	sr	t	p
Task-Oriented $F(9, 372) = 18.65$ $p < .000, R^2 = .286$ adj. $R^2 = .281$	Gender	.045	.105	.094	2.30	< .05
	Intrapersonal	.072	.302	.174	4.02	.000
	Interpersonal	.065	.132	.091	2.25	< .05
Relation-Oriented $F(9, 398) = 14.94$ $p < .000, R^2 = .274$ adj. $R^2 = .236$	Adaptability	.073	.255	.142	3.41	.001
	Gender	.046	.175	.163	3.76	.000
	Interpersonal	.064	.394	.266	6.13	.000
Total $F(9, 356) = 0.45$ $p < .000, R^2 = .312$ adj. $R^2 = .301$	Adaptability	.077	.247	.139	3.20	< .01
	Mood	.074	.171	.107	2.52	< .05
	Gender	.042	.156	.141	3.43	.001
	Intrapersonal	.078	.173	.091	2.22	< .05
	Interpersonal	.065	.297	.194	4.72	.000
	Adaptability	.071	.287	.153	3.81	.000

Table 3 presents the results from the analyses with the school management data and only the results for significant predictors. Collectively, the independent variables were moderate predictors of school management ability: R 2 was 0.286 for task-oriented, 0.274 for relationship-oriented and 0.312 for total.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

Although total emotional intelligence was a significant predictor of successful school administration, some dimensions of emotional intelligence were better predictors than others. Women were found to score higher than men on the interpersonal dimension. On the other hand no difference was found when the EQ-i measures for principals and vice-principals compared. The factor analysis of the school management revealed that two types of school management: task-oriented and relationship-oriented. The task oriented dimension consists of managing resources, delegating tasks, and planning for the future and the relationship-oriented dimension consists of motivating others, intercommunicating, as well as in small groups. The EI and school management findings support the past research on effective school management like effective school management involves both task-oriented and relationship-oriented skills (Humphrey, 2002). Behaviours related to emotional self-awareness, self-actualization and impulse control have been found to be important for task-oriented management.

References

- Bar-On, R. (1997). *The Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory™ (EQ-i™): A test of emotional intelligence*. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.
- Bar-On, R. (2006). The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence (ESI). *Psicothema*, 18, 13-25.
- Bar-On, R. (2000). Emotional and social intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i). In Reuven Bar-On and James D.A. Parker (Eds.), *Handbook of emotional intelligence: Theory, development, assessment and application at home, school and in the workplace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 363-88.
- Bar-On, R. (2007). The Bar-On model of emotional intelligence: A valid, robust and applicable EI model. *Organizations and People*, 14, 27-34.
- Barling, J., Slater, F. & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Transformational leadership and emotional intelligence: An exploratory study. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 21(3), 157-161.
- Boyatzis, R. E. (2008). Competencies in the 21st Century. *Journal of Management Development*, 27(1), 5-1.
- Cherniss, C. (2000). *Emotional Intelligence: What it is and why it Matters*, Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, New Orleans.
- Cooper R. & Sawaf, A. (2000). *Executive EQ: Emotional intelligence in business*. New York: Texere Publishing Limited.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R.E., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Goleman, D. (2006). *Emotional Intelligence*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Goleman, D. (2007). *Social Intelligence*. London: Arrow Books.
- Humphrey, R.H. (2002). The many faces of emotional leadership, *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(5), 493-504.
- Mayer, J. D., Roberts, R. D. & Barsade, S. G. (2008). Human Abilities: Emotional Intelligence. *The Annual Review of Psychology*, 59, 507-536.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P. & D. R. Caruso (2002). *The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT)*. Toronto, Ontario: Multi-Health Systems, Inc.
- Salovey, P. & Mayer, J. D. (1990). *Emotional intelligence*. Baywood Publishing Co., 185-211.
- Stys, Y. & Brown, S. L. (2004). *A Review of the emotional intelligence literature and implications for corrections*. A research report for research branch correctional service of Canada, No: R-150, Ottawa.