# Emotional Intelligence and Leadership Styles in Education

**John Pellitteri**
Queens College – City University of New York

UNIVERSITY
OF OSTRAVA

**Abstract** Emotional Intelligence (EI) was initially proposed as an organized theory by Salovey and Mayer (1990) and later expanded (Mayer & Salovey, 1997) and was popularized in the general media by Goleman (1995). EI refers to a set of abilities for using emotional information in adaptive ways. This psychological construct is important and relevant to leadership since emotional factors play a role in personal well-being, interpersonal relationships, motivation, workplace adjustment and learning processes. EI can be applied to educational leadership since the school leader must continually work with individuals and groups (i. e. school personnel such as teachers, teaching aids, school psychologists, counselors, other administrators as well as students and parents). Using emotions adaptively is critical for effective interpersonal relationships as well as for creating an emotional-toned environment in the school context. Two models of EI are presented. The first model (Mayer & Salovey, 1997) is the ability-model that considers four major emotion skill sets (perception, facilitation, understanding and managing). The second model (Goleman et al., 2002) organizes EI competencies across two dimensions: capacities (emotion recognition & regulation) and application domains (toward self & others). There is some overlap between these models with regard to emotional perception (recognition) and regulation (managing). The Mayer's and Salovey's (1997) model is distinct for its abilities to use emotional concepts and the use of emotions to facilitate decision-making and emotional planning. Goleman and colleagues' (2002) model includes organizational and social intelligence features. Research on the relationship between EI and effective leadership will be reviewed. Generally, studies have found predictive correlations between EI and effective, transformational leadership (Mills, 2009; Palmer et al., 2001; Sayeed & Shanker, 2009). A useful model proposed by Guillen & Florent-Treacy (2011) divides leadership behaviors into two groups: Getting along (with others) and getting ahead (meeting organizational goals). Goleman's (2011) six styles of EI leadership will be discussed as approaches

to educational leadership with an examination of the strengths, limitations and emotional dynamics of each style. The six styles are: *Directive* (using authoritarian methods); *Pace-setting* (expecting leader-determined standards); *Visionary* (creating inspirational purposes); *Affiliative* (leading through relationships); *Participative* (using democratic consensus building) and *Coaching* (helping individuals develop). These styles are further described in terms of the previously mentioned leadership categories of getting along or getting ahead. In addition, the styles are determined to be either dissonant or resonant with regard to the emotional tone they create in the organization. The necessity of advocating for EI in school contexts will be emphasized. The potential for various professionals (such as school psychologists and school counselors) to take on leadership functions as facilitators of emotional processes in the school settings will also be considered. Educational leaders (whether formally as administrators or functionally as school counselors and psychologists), can have a positive impact on school personnel and students as well as the larger school context through the application of EI capacities and through considering the emotional dynamics in leadership styles.

**Keywords** emotional intelligence, educational leadership, leadership styles.

## Introduction

Emotional Intelligence (EI) was initially proposed as an organized theory of emotional abilities by Salovey and Mayer (1990) and later expanded (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). The concept was popularized in the general media by Goleman (1995) who developed his own model of emotional capacities (Goleman et al., 2000). These two models of EI will be presented in the context of educational leadership. The first model (Mayer & Salovey, 1997) is the ability-model that considers four major emotion skill sets (perception, facilitation, understanding and managing). The second model (Goleman et al., 2002) organizes EI competencies across two dimensions: capacities (emotion recognition & regulation) and application domains (toward self & others). There is some overlap between these models with regard to emotional perception (recognition) and regulation (managing). The Mayer's and Salovey's (1997) model is distinct for its abilities to use emotion concepts and the use of emotions to facilitate decision-making and emotional planning. Goleman and colleagues' (2002) model includes organizational and social intelligence as unique features and for this reason is considered a mixed model in contrast to the ability-model (Mayer et al., 2000).

As a psychological construct, EI is important and relevant to leadership since emotional factors play a role in personal well-being, interpersonal relationships, motivation, workplace adjustment and learning processes (Brackett et al., 2016; Caruso & Salovey, 2004; Fischer & Manstead, 2016; Zeidner et al., 2009). EI is highly relevant to educational leadership since the school leader must continually work with individuals and groups (i. e. teachers, students and parents) and make decisions that impact the social functioning of the whole school. Gray (2009) examined EI abilities in the context of educational leadership noting how school administrators cannot completely remove emotions from decision-making and therefore must be cognizant and intentional with emotions. Using emotions adaptively is critical for effective interpersonal relationships as well as for creating an emotional-toned environment in the school context. A study by Brackett et al. (2011) found that EI skills were associated with better emotional climate in the classroom and improved student conduct which are factors that would be desired goals for educational leaders. In another study Brackett et al. (2010) found a positive relationship between EI and both job satisfaction and reduced burnout in teachers that was mediated by positive emotions in schools and by principal support. These set of studies point to the importance of EI factors in improved school functioning and also to the role of educational leaders in facilitating these factors for teachers and students.

Research on the relationship between EI and effective leadership will be reviewed. Studies have found predictive relationships between EI and effective, transformational leadership (Mills, 2009; Palmer et al., 2001; Sayeed & Shanker, 2009). Transformational leadership is considered a style that empowers and inspires members to move toward positive organizational change and is "based on trust and commitment created and sustained in the organization" (Sayeed & Shanker, 2009, p. 595). A useful model proposed by Guillen and Florent-Treacy (2011) divides leadership behaviors into two groups: Getting

along (with others) and getting ahead (meeting organizational goals). Goleman's (2011) six styles of EI leadership will be discussed as approaches to educational leadership with an examination of the strengths, limitations and emotional dynamics of each style. The six styles are: *Directive* (using authoritarian methods); *Pacesetting* (expecting leader--determined standards); *Visionary* (creating inspirational purposes); *Affiliative* (leading through relationships); *Participative* (using democratic consensus building) and *Coaching* (helping individuals develop). These styles are further described in terms of the leadership categories of getting along or getting ahead. In addition, the styles are determined to be either dissonant or resonant with regard to the emotional tone they create in the organization.

The necessity of advocating for EI in school contexts will be emphasized. The potential for various professionals (such as teachers, school psychologists, counselors) to take on leadership functions as facilitators of emotional processes in the school settings will also be considered. Educational leaders (whether formally as administrators or functionally as school counselors and psychologists), can have a positive impact on school personnel and students as well as the larger school context through the application of EI capacities and through considering the emotional dynamics in leadership styles.

## Emotional intelligence: Definitions and models

A brief and essential definition of EI drawn from the more elaborate Mayer and Salovey model (1997) model is that *EI is a set of abilities for using emotional information in adaptive ways*. The first aspect of this definition – ability sets, aligns EI with general intelligence and will be described below. The second part of the definition is the idea of emotions as a source of information. This is a valuable aspect of the model in that information from various sources is critical for decision-making, problem-solving and effective leadership overall. Potential bias and judgment about emotions (i. e. that negative emotions are undesirable or non-productive) can be dispelled with the more neutral view of emotions as information. For example, negative emotions such as frustration in students is information that there is a block toward students' goals. Disappointment in a teacher indicates that his or her expectations have not been met. Each emotional state is a package of information that contains the causes, meanings and needs associated with each emotion for a particular individual or group. Educational leaders would benefit from unpacking the need and meanings of the emotions expressed by their school personnel in order to better understand these workers and the potential for future actions and motivations.

The third aspect of the brief definition is that EI moves toward adaptive purposes, that is, toward intelligent and desirable outcomes in a given context. What is determined to be adaptive or desirable can vary across socio-cultural context as well as occupational contexts. However, while the specific goals of educational settings likely differ from other occupational contexts the basic functions of emotional dynamics appear to operate similarly. Côte (2014) in a review of literature on organizations considered job roles with higher emotional demands (which would include educational services) and identified EI

as having stronger associations over personality factors in relation to job performance. Brackett et al. (2011) reviewed the EI literature and found similar benefits for the ability model as measured by the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) across educational and occupational contexts. The previously mentioned study (Brackett et al., 2010) illustrates how the school administrator is both an educator (concerned with classroom learning environments and student conduct) as well as an organizational manager (concerned with teacher burnout and job performance) thus integrating the sometimes distinct educational and organizational contexts.

The first formal theory of EI was proposed by Salovey and Mayer (1990) and later expanded (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). This theory considers EI as a set of abilities similar to how IQ or general intelligence is a set of visual, mathematical and problem-solving abilities. A major distinction from the IQ construct – which formed initially in response to differentiating educational potential in schools – is that EI is a set of abilities related to emotions rather than to academic-related areas. Several studies note the correspondence between EI abilities and IQ as being in the moderate range with correlations between 20 and 50 (Brackett et al., 2011; Pellitteri, 2010) with the emotional knowledge component of the Mayer and Salovey model as most closely correlated with general IQ. A general distinction can consider how IQ (general intelligence) may predict success in intellectually-based domains and tasks while EI is better suited for social and emotional domains (i. e. interpersonal relationships). However, upon closer examination of these relationships it can be seen how emotional factors also influence academic learning. Sněhotová et al. (2021) emphasize the important role of emotions in self-regulated and self-directed learning, noting how metacognition is essential for persistence and goal attainment. They relate EI to their Self-Directed Learning model considering the importance of emotion management (regulation) abilities. Thus, the important interplay between emotions and cognitions must be considered in the distinctions between IQ and EI.

The components of the two EI models are presented below to illustrate their convergence and distinctions. The four major ability sets of the Mayer & Salovey (1997) model include:

1. Perception (or recognition) of emotions includes tendencies toward attention to emotions, distinguishing emotion cues, and identifying emotions in oneself and others.
2. Facilitation of emotions involves cognitive-affective processes, accessing emotions as resources for decision making, emotional planning, and anticipation of emotional outcomes.
3. Emotional knowledge (understanding) includes conceptual cognitive structures of emotions such as emotion categories, understanding emotional transitions over-time, identifying blends or complex emotions, and identifying the causes and meanings of emotions.
4. Emotion regulation (management) involves strategies and skills to alter the intensity and valence of emotional states in oneself and on others.

Goleman (1995) references the original research by Salovey and Mayer (1990) but later proposed a mixed model of EI that incorporated social intelligence and organizational attitudes (Goleman et al., 2000). This mixed model presents a four-quadrant schema that simplifies some of the basic EI capacities and parallels the first and fourth ability sets of the Mayer & Salovey model (1997) model. The two basic clusters of EI capacity are (1) recognition and (2) regulation of emotions. These are mapped against the two domains of self and others as illustrated in Table 1.

**Table 1**
*Four quadrant of EI capacities (Goleman et al., 2002)*

|  | SELF | OTHERS |
| --- | --- | --- |
| RECOGNITION | Self-Awareness | Social-Awareness |
| REGULATION | Self-management | Relationship Management |

This organization of capacities does not directly consider emotional knowledge and facilitation abilities as described in the Mayer and Salovey (1997) model. The four-quadrant model does emphasize the social aspects of EI with capacities applied toward individual emotional processes and toward the emotional processes in others (i. e. interpersonal relationships). In both models, the initial process of attention to emotional factors and recognition of emotion states is essential in order to apply effort to regulate or alter emotions. One cannot intentionally change an emotion that is not initially identified in some form. The following section will examine research on EI and leadership, followed by a description of EI within various leadership styles.

## Research on emotional intelligence and leadership

Several studies found positive correlations between levels of EI and both transformational and effective leadership styles (Mills, 2009; Palmer et al., 2001; Sayeed & Shanker, 2009). In a meta-analysis of 48 studies, Mills (2009) found moderately strong effects for EI and effective leadership (effect size r = .380). Components of transformational leadership – idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration – were found in the research literature to correspond with components of both the Mayer and Salovey and the Goleman EI models (Mills, 2009, p. 23) and the author makes an argument for the inclusion of EI in educational leadership training programs. Palmer et al. (2001) using the same dimension of transformational leadership found correlations with a modified Trait Meta Mood Scale. Dividing the TMMS items into an emotional monitoring variable (i. e. recognition) and an emotional management variable (regulation), Palmer et al. (2001) found correlations particularly between EI monitoring emotions and idealized influence (r = .44), inspirational motivation (r = .42) and individual consideration (r = .55) as well as between EI managing emotions and inspirational motivation (r = .37) and individual consideration (r = .35). Sayeed and Shanker (2009) using factor analysis found correspondence with dimension of transformational leadership and

EI with the strongest loadings of EI items on factors labeled as futuristic leadership style (.82), nurturant task-oriented style (.56) and visionary style (.49).

Segredo et al. (2017) examined EI, leadership styles and school culture in a sample that included 57 principals and 850 teachers within a large urban school district in the USA. Ratings of school culture were positively associated with transformative and transactional leadership styles but had negative correlations with passive-avoidant styles of leadership. After controlling for leadership style, the principals' level of EI was associated with the quality of school culture. Chen and Guo (2018) in a sample from China that included 534 teachers across 54 primary schools found that the principals' level of EI and patterns of leadership behaviors were related to teachers' instructional strategies.

As noted previously Guillen and Florent-Treacy (2011) organized leadership behaviors into two groups: getting along and getting ahead. Getting along consists of variables such as being team players, organizational citizens, empowering others, collaborative styles. Getting ahead included aspects of being directive, inspirational, accomplishing organizational goals, communicating and implementing vision, controlling task processes and rewarding people. Their study included 929 managers and found that EI has significant effects on collaborative behaviors at work (getting along), which in turn influenced inspirational side of leadership effectiveness (getting ahead). Getting along behaviors mediated the relationship between EI and getting ahead behaviors thus underscoring the importance of social relationships as a foundation for effective EI leadership.

Caruso and Salovey (2004) describe several studies on EI and management noting how work teams high on EI were better able to mobilize and accomplish tasks more quickly compared to low-EI teams. They emphasize the importance of interpersonal relationships from research studies indicating that individuals with lower EI were more likely to have problems with peers, engage in interpersonal conflicts, and use substances while those higher in EI had more positive social relationships and supportive work-related interactions. In a summary of research in the field, Zeidner et al. (2009) found support for EI in the workplace and well as in school settings. They refer to studies that find negative correlations between EI and students' deviant school behaviors as well as tobacco and alcohol use while noting EI as a mediating variable for academic achievement through increases in motivation, stress management and self-regulation habits. Finally, Weite (2013) found a 31% difference in effective leadership development between organizations that value EI over those that do not, indicating that the organizational culture is important as well as the leadership capacities.

## Emotions and leadership styles

Goleman and colleagues (Goleman et al., 2002; Goleman, 2011) have outlined six leadership styles based on research by the consulting firm Hay/McBer that used a random sample of 3,871 leaders /managers. While this model was developed in various organizational settings, the styles generated from the studies can be applied to education because the dynamics of leadership are not restricted to specific contexts. The six styles can be divided

into two groups of dissonance-creating and resonant-creating. The first group includes the leadership styles *Directive* and *Pacesetting*. The resonant-creating group includes four types: *Visionary, Affiliative, Participative, Coaching*. Each style creates a particular emotional tone in the school environment and can be beneficial or problematic at different times. For these reasons, effective educational leaders use several types.

Abubakari (2017) used Goleman's typology and examined the frequency of each style used in a polytechnical educational organizations in Ghana. From a sample of 214 leaders in teaching and non-teaching role, four styles (coaching, pacesetting, democratic, and affiliative) were identified as being used most frequently. The author notes how a mix of styles were used in varying situations thus emphasizing the strengths that each style offers and the importance of matching style to particular tasks. Setiawan and colleagues (2021) studied educational settings in Somaliland and found that the directive (autocratic) leadership style was associated with lower levels of efficiency, job satisfaction and morale while participative (egalitarian) and visionary (transformative) and transactional styles have associations with higher employee morale, efficiency and engagement. Another study using sample of 100 respondents across 12 organizations in Serbian found that the participative leadership style was more strongly predictive of the quality of leader--member exchanges (Stojanović Aleksić et al., 2016).

Saxena and colleagues (2017) examined the use of Goleman's leadership styles with a sample of 42 administrators in medical educational settings across three hierarchical levels of authority. At the lowest of the three levels of administration (those with relatively less authority) the predominant style was Democratic (Participative). The middle level administrators tended to use Coaching styles while the senior administrators used multiple styles with no one emerging as predominant. Women tended to use Democratic leadership styles while men, in general tended to use Coaching. The dissonant-creating styles (Directive and Pace-setting) were noted and attributed to the demands to produce quick results in physician-training practices.

The six leadership styles of Goleman's topology (Goleman, 2011; Goleman et al., 2002) will be described below through the lens of the emotional dynamics that they create. The limitations and benefits of each style will be described and summarized in  in table 2.

## Directive

The directive style is also referred to as commanding and authoritarian which explains its dissonance-creating quality. This type of leader demands compliance from subordinates. A school leader with this style will convey the message, "Do so because I say so". This style is one of the least effective styles because it creates excessive and negative emotions in the school personnel. Workers under this type of leadership can often feel resistance, distrust, disrespected, powerless or discouraged. Such negative emotional states will be associated with low morale, burnout and excessive stress (Goleman, 2011). The directive style can be beneficial however in a crisis, when a competent leader is needed to take charge. In these circumstances, the directive leader, (if competent) can create feelings of confidence

or hope. This leadership style is associated with the "getting ahead" category of leadership behaviors as noted previously (see Guillen & Florent-Treacy, 2011).

## Pacesetting

This style is also a dissonant-creating type because the leader conveys the message, "Do it my way". While focusing on high standards, the leader sets the tone and expects workers to follow his or her goals. This is also in the category of getting ahead behaviors. Problematic aspects of this style are that workers can feel resentment, excluded, discarded, unappreciated or anxious. Similarly, to the directive style, the pacesetting approach can infuse negative emotions into the workers, that are detrimental to organizational goals and motivation (Goleman, 2011). Benefits can occur if workers share the exact same values as the leader and if they are independent in their work (i. e. needing little direction or guidance). Outside of these conditions, workers may have difficulty keeping pace with the leader.

## Visionary

A third type of getting ahead leadership behavior is the visionary style which is also referred to in the literature as transformational (Mills, 2009). This approach aims to inspire others toward a larger purpose or vision for the school. In contrast the previous styles, the visionary style is a resonant-creating style as it engages others in the idealized goals. This style uses self-confidence and empathy to involve others in working toward a bigger purpose. It is a transformational leadership style that can create feelings of hope, optimism and inspiration in workers. The disadvantage is that if the leader is not credible in the eyes of the workers, then it can create feelings of discouragement or anxiety.

## Affiliative

This style is in the category of getting along and is a resonant-creating approach that emphasizes the creation of harmony between workers. The message from these types of leaders is, "People come first and tasks are second". The benefit of the affiliative style is the increase in workers' sense of well-being and group cohesion. It is highly recommended for repairing group conflicts as it can create feelings of safety, caring trust and harmony (Goleman, 2011). The disadvantages however come when a group needs direction, corrective feedback and to achieve goals. While the emphasis on people and getting along is important, these types of leaders can falter in the getting ahead goals that might lead to feelings of general organizational inadequacy and frustration when goals are not achieved.

## Participative

This style is also known as the democratic style in that it aims to build consensus and collaboration. It is a resonant type and in the getting along category of leadership

behaviors. The emotional dynamics of a democratic approach is that it creates engagement and participation through listening to others' perspectives. The participatory style builds a sense of commitment and involvement in the organization through the involvement in the leadership process (Goleman, 2011). The positive feelings of feeling appreciated, trusted and valued have obvious benefits. However, this style can also create frustration when progress toward goals takes excessive time, or if blocked by lack of consensus when the school needs decisive and directed action.

## Coaching

The coaching style is resonant-creating and a getting along type. The aim is to help the individual workers to develop as professionals. The benefits of this approach include assisting workers to identify their strengths and areas for improvement. The school leader as a coach helps school professionals evolve through providing support and growth-oriented challenges. It can provide feelings of being supported, encouraged and motivated. The limitations however come when short-term directive results are needed and do not allow for the long-term process of professional development. Workers may also feel frustrated when their own development is not a valued goal.

**Table 2**
*Summary of leadership styles (Goleman et al., 2002)*

| Leadership Style | Description | Message to workers | Leadership Behavior type | Dissonant or resonant effects |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Directive | Commanding, authoritarian | "Do so because I say so" | Getting ahead | Dissonant |
| Pacesetting | Expects high standards determined by leader | "Do it my way" | Getting ahead | Dissonant |
| Visionary | Inspirational toward larger purpose | "Here is where we can go" | Getting ahead | Resonant |
| Affiliative | Leadership through relationships | "People first, tasks second" | Getting along | Resonant |
| Participative | Democratic, building consensus | "Let's decide together" | Getting along | Resonant |
| Coaching | Help individuals develop | "Let me help you grow" | Getting along | Resonant |

## Applications to Educational Leadership

Effective educational leaders likely adopt one or more of the styles described by Goleman (2011) and generally have the flexibility to shift their styles as the situation requires (Abubakari, 2017). Applying EI to leadership styles will enhance the effectiveness and transformational capacities of the school leader by drawing attention to the emotional dynamics inherent in each style. An emotionally intelligent leader is aware of his or her

own emotions as well as the emotions of others and uses emotions as information to make effective decision and to adjust styles and strategies to be optimally adaptive (Goleman et al., 2000; Mayer & Salovey, 1997). When a dissonant-creating leadership style is warranted (i. e. directive style in a crisis) the EI leader is aware of the negative emotional consequences of such styles and returns to a different leadership approach once the crisis is resolved in order to maximize the benefits of the style while minimizing the disadvantages. Likewise, while an affiliative style creates a pleasant emotional atmosphere in the school environment, an effective leader should know that always putting people first (getting along) and tasks second can detract from achieving important organizational goals (getting ahead) thus leading to frustration or inadequacy. Finding a balance of several styles increases the overall effectiveness of the leader.

A school leader high in EI will also likely consider the emotional-tone of the school environment and within the school personnel (Segredo et al., 2017). In applying emotional recognition abilities (i. e. perception of emotions skills) the EI leader will be attentive to emotions in individuals as well as groups in the school and use his or her understanding of the emotions to better engage and guide school personnel. By "unpacking" the emotions of others, the leader can acquire valuable information (such as individual's needs, motivations and potential actions) that can then be used to make effective interventions. Effective leaders are skilled at facilitating the moods of groups or individuals and managing others' emotions.

For example, a teacher might come across as disengaged in the classroom and is not working effectively at instructing the students. In taking an emotional perspective of this situation, the EI leader may discover that the teacher might feel unappreciated in his or her job and discouraged that he or she is not reaching the students enough to see progress in them. The school leader might apply emotion regulation capacities to manage and alter the teacher's feelings about the work. Expressing genuine appreciation for the teacher's pedagogical skills and efforts might change his or her feelings of being unappreciated. Shifting to a coaching leadership style the leader might give guidance, support and concrete strategies to be more effective at teaching thus changing the teacher's feeling of discouragement toward hope or optimism. If the leader empathizes with the teacher's struggles to reach the students perhaps through sharing his or her own difficulties as a teacher, he or she might create comfort or at least a feeling of being understood. Working through the leadership styles a school leader will utilize several of the EI recognition and regulation capacities as outlined previously in the abilities and capacity EI models.

Brady (2006) outlines the Goleman leadership styles in the context of school administrators noting the importance of EI for positive school environments and also emphasizes how school counselors or other professionals (i. e. school psychologists, teachers) can take on leadership roles toward these efforts. The leader in a school is not only the school principal but can be an engaged school professional that influences others and the school ecology in positive productive ways. Leadership is also not confined to the practical administrative tasks of operating a school organization but could be (and should be) focused on the students, their families and school professionals as human beings.

Another example of applying EI could relate to teacher-parent relationships. In response to a parents' complaints about their child's schoolwork, the teacher (or other school personnel) would be required to accurately recognize the parent's emotions in the situation. This would also involve an evaluative process to determine if the parent is somewhat concerned versus annoyed versus angry. The differences in these levels of emotional intensity will guide the teacher's reactions towards different paths of problem resolution. The type of emotion and its intensity will directly influence cognitive processes such as negative emotions narrowing attention and restricting information processing (Clore & Schiller, 2016). The EI teacher's response in the case of intense negative emotions (i. e. anger) may first be to listen non-judgmentally and empathically to the parent in order to reduce the level of intensity and hopefully creating a less intense emotional state that is more conducive to effective reasoning and communication. With a mild level of emotional intensity (i. e. concerned) the teacher can move more directly into discussing problem-solving. In a parallel process to the perception of and attunement with the parent's emotions, the teacher him or herself, will need to be perceptive and aware of his or her own emotions and engage in emotion self-management during the exchange with the parent. Thus, the two major and overlapping dimensions of the abilities (Mayer & Salovey, 1997) and competency (Goleman et al., 2000) models- recognition and regulation, are often engaged together. While the teacher is not formally in a leadership "role" with regard to the parent, he or she is exerting influence on the immediate interpersonal exchange and bringing qualities of the affiliative (relationship building) and participatory (democratic, collaborative) leadership styles would be best suited to address the parent's needs and work toward a productive resolution to the problem.

Education is inherently an interpersonal process as student learning is enhanced in part, through the emotional relationship with their teachers and other school professionals (Zull, 2002). In this way adopting an EI focus in the school can be beneficial not only for the school administrators, but for the school community as a whole. School counselors, psychologists and teachers can choose to embrace and practice the principles of EI and promote these values in their work. In this way the educational professional becomes the "emotional center" of the school ecology (Pellitteri et al., 2006, p. 4) and promotes EI toward the social-emotional development of all. The school leader in choosing and matching effective leadership styles to a situation manages the emotional dynamics of those involved facilitating the most optimal outcome as well as enhancing the overall emotional tone of the school environment.

## References

Abubakari, A. R. (2017). The nature of leadership styles of leaders in selected polytechnics in Ghana. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management, 19*(6), 36–46. https://doi.org/10.9790/487X-1906023646

Brackett, M. A, Rivers, S. E., Bertoli, M. C., & Salovey, P. (20186). Emotional intelligence. In L. Feldman--Barrett, M. Lewis & J. M. Haviland-Jones (Eds.), *Handbook of Emotions* (pp. 513–531). (4th ed.). Guilford.

Brackett, M. A., Palomera, R., Mojsa-Kaja, J., Reyes, M. R., & Salovey, P. (2010). Emotional-regulation ability, job satisfaction, and burnout among British secondary school teachers. *Psychology in the Schools, 47*, 406–417. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.20478

Brackett, M. A., Reyes, M. R., Rivers, S. E., Elbertson, N. A., & Salovey, P. (2011). Classroom Emotional Climate, Teacher Affiliation, and Student Conduct. *The Journal of Classroom Interaction, 46*(1), 27–36. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23870549

Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., & Salovey, P. (2011). Emotional Intelligence: Implications for Personal, Social, Academic, and Workplace Success. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 5*(1), 88–103. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2010.00334.x

Brady, K. P. (2006). Emotionally intelligent school administrators: Developing a positive school climate. In J. Pellitteri, R. Stern, C. Shelton & B. Muller-Ackerman (Eds.), *Emotionally intelligent school counseling* (pp. 151–165). Erlbaum.Routlege.

Caruso, D. R., & Salovey, P. (2004). *The emotionally intelligent manager: How to develop and use the four key emotional skills of leadership*. Jossey-Bass.

Chen, J., & Guo, W. (2018). Emotional intelligence can make a difference: The impact of principals' emotional intelligence on teaching strategy mediated by instructional leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 48*(1), 82–105. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143218781066

Clore, G. L., & Schiller, A. J. (2016). New light on the affect-cognition connection. In L. Feldman-Barrett, M. Lewis & J. Haviland-Jones (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (pp. 532–546). (4th ed.). Guilford.

Côté, S. (2014). Emotional Intelligence in Organizations. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 1*, 459–488. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091233

Fischer, A. H., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2016). Social functions of emotions and emotion regulation. In L. Feldman-Barrett, M. Lewis & J. M. Haviland-Jones (Eds.), *Handbook of Emotions* (pp. 424–439). (4th ed.). Guilford.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. Bantam Books.

Goleman, D. (2011). *Leadership: The power of emotional intelligence: Selected writings*. More than Sound Publishers.

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence.* Harvard Business School Press.

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & Rhee, K. (2000). Clustering competence in emotional intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI). In R. Bar-On & J. D. A. Parker (Eds), *The Handbook of emotional intelligence: Theory, development, assessment, and application at home, school, and in the workplace* (pp. 343–362). Jossey-Bass.

Gray, D. (2009). Emotional Intelligence and School Leadership. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, 4*(4), 1–3.

Guillen, L., & Florent-Treacy, E. (2011). *Emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness: The mediating influence of collaborative behaviors.* Social Science Research Network.

Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Implications for Educators* (pp. 3–31). Basic Books.

Mayer, J., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. (2000). Models of emotional intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of intelligence* (pp. 396–420). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511807947.019

Mills, L. B. (2009). A meta-analysis of the relationship between emotional intelligence and effective leadership. *Journal of Curriculum and Instruction, 3*(2), 22–38. https://doi.org/10.3776/joci.2009.v3n2p22-38

Palmer, B., Walls, M., Burgess, Z., & Stough, C. (2001). Emotional intelligence and effective leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 22*(1), 5–10. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01437730110380174

Pellitteri, J. (2010). Emotional intelligence in the context of adaptive personality: Implications for counselling psychology. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 23*(2), 129–141. https://doi.org/10.1080/09515071003775962

Pellitteri, J., Stern, R., Shelton, C., & Muller-Ackerman, B. (2006). The emotional intelligence of school counseling. In J. Pellitteri, R. Stern, C. Shelton & B. Muller-Ackerman (Eds.), *Emotionally intelligent school counseling* (pp. 3–14). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 9*(3), 185–211. https://doi.org/10.2190/DUGG-P24E-52WK-6CDG

Saxena, A., Desanghere, L., Stobart, K., & Walker, K. (2017). Goleman's Leadership styles at different hierarchical levels in medical education. *BMC Medical Education, 17*(169). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-017-0995-z

Sayeed, O. B., & Shanker, M. (2009). Emotionally intelligent managers & transformational leadership styles. *The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, 44*(4), 593–610.

Segredo, M. R., Cistone, P. J., & Reio, T. G. (2017). Relationships between emotional intelligence, leadership style, and school culture. *International Journal of Adult Vocational Education and Technology, 8*(3), 25–43. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJAVET.2017070103

Setiawan, R., Cavaliere, L. P. L., Navarro, E. R., Wisetsri, W., Jirayus, P., Chauhan, S., Tabuena, A. C., & Rajan, R. (2021). The Impact of Leadership Styles on Employees Productivity in Organizations: A Comparative Study Among Leadership Styles. *Productivity Management, 26*(1), 382–404. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3875252

Stojanović Aleksić, V., Stanisavljević M., & Bošković, A. (2016). The interdependence of leader-member exchange relation and the leadership style: Research in Serbian organisations. *Economic Themes, 54*(3), 363–383. https://doi.org/10.1515/ethemes-2016-0018

Weite, A. K. (2013). *Leadership and emotional intelligence: The Keys to Driving ROI and Organizational Performance*. Human Capital Institute.

Zeidner, M., Matthews, G., & Roberts, R. D. (2009). *What we know about emotional intelligence: How it affects learning, work, relationships, and our mental health*. MIT Press.

Zull, J. (2002). *The art of changing the brain*. Stylus Publishing.

Correspondence author: John Pellitteri, Department of Educational and Community Programs, Queens College, City University of New York, 65-30 Kissena Blvd, New York 11367, USA. Email: john.pellitteri@qc.cuny.edu