Educational Research (ISSN: 2141-5161) Vol. 4(2) pp. 143-152, February, 2013
Available online@ http://www.interesjournals.org/ER

Full Length Research Paper

Leadership Performance of Emotionally Intelligent Subject Leaders

[*1]Norma Ghamrawi, [2]Tarek Shal, [3]Najah Ghamrawi

[1]Lebanese University, [2]Beirut Arab University, [3]Lebanese University

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship existing between the emotional intelligence of subject leaders and their leadership performance. The study was carried out in 23, K-12 private schools in Beirut, Lebanon where 10 subject leaders from each school participated. Thus the sample was comprised of 230 subject leaders. Participant completed two surveys: (1) Emotional Intelligence Appraisal (Bradberry and Greaves , 2003), which measures (a) self–awareness, (b) self–management, (c) social awareness, (d) relationship management, and (e) overall emotional intelligence; and (2) Educational Leadership Improvement Tool (DeFranco and Golden, 2003), which assesses leadership performance in the area of (a) leadership attributes, (b) visionary leadership, (c) community leadership, (d) instructional leadership, (e) data-driven improvement, (f) organization to improve student learning, (g) organization to improve staff efficacy, (h) cultural competence, and (i) educational management. SPSS 18.0 was employed to carry out a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) in order to determine the relationship between emotional intelligence and subject leaders' leadership performance.

Keywords: Emotional intelligence, Educational leadership, Subject leadership, Leadership performance, School improvement.

INTRODUCTION

A huge body of research on school reform addressed emotions that accompany its realization, including tumult, conflict, anxiety, tension, angst, pressure, anguish, fear, anger, frustration, obstruction and many others (Blankstein, 2004; Dufour et al., 2008; Evans, 1996; Moore, 2009). At the same time, the literature indicates that any school reform fails if it doesn't address school leadership (Lewis et al., 2004; Moore, 2009). Probably for this reason, emotional intelligence has been considered as one of the important descriptors of effective leaders (Goleman, 1998) as it supports school leaders in confronting such emotions in school settings especially during school reform initiatives. In fact, it has been argued that "the most effective leaders are alike in one crucial way; they all have a high degree of what has come to be known as emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1998, p. 94). Emotional intelligence (EI) can be defined as the "ability to monitor one's own and others' feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use this information to guide one's thinking and action" (Salovey and Mayer, 1990, p.189).

On the other hand, effective leadership has been described, according to the literature, to be delocalized in the school (Ghamrawi, 2006; 2010; 2011; 2013). So the school principal is not the only figure in school that enjoys the privileges and bears the responsibilities of leadership. Distributed or shared forms of school leadership often dominate in schools known to succeed with school improvement initiatives (Ghamrawi, 2011). When leadership is distributed, teacher leadership and subject leadership arise in school settings (Ghamrawi, 2010; 2011). Subject leaders are "specialists who are responsible for an aspect of the academic curriculum" (Wise and Bush, 1999, p.184).

The literature is increasingly attributing roles to subject leaders that are traditionally known to be part of school principals' tasks (Bell and Richie, 1999; Bennett et al., 2003; Blandford, 1997; Brown et al., 2000; Busher et al., 2000; Busher and Harris, 1999; Dinham et al., 2000; Ghamrawi, 2010; Harris,

*Corresponding Author E-mail: dr.norma_ghamrawi@hotmail.com

1999; Turner, 1996; Turner and Bolam, 1998; Wise, 2001). For example, Ghamrawi (2010) distinguishes 15 roles played by subject leaders in schools involved in her study including the subject leader as:" pedagogical expert, staff developer, action researcher, change agent, proficient raconteur, managed leader, policymaker, cultural developer, resource manager, curriculum developer, strategic planner, quality controller, liaison, problem solver and data manager" (p.307). Busher and Harris (1999) argue that subject leaders play "a bridging and brokering function" in which they, "translate the perspectives and policies of senior staff into the practice of individual classrooms" (p. 307). Likewise, Busher (2005) assures that subject leaders "mediate the values and demands from [wider] contexts to their colleagues, students and their students' parents and careers, as well as taking account of their colleagues', students' and students' parents' values and beliefs" (p. 139). Fitzgerald and Gunter (2006) consider subject leaders to be key people in effective schools. In fact, they "continue to make a vital contribution to school improvement" (Naylor et al., 2006, page 11).

While there is some evidence that there is a correlation between emotional intelligence and leadership performance in schools (Bardach, 2008; Cook, 2008; Stone et al., 2005; Williams, 2007), no research attempted to investigate this relationship for the case of subject leadership.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship, if any, existing between the emotional intelligence of subject leaders and their leadership performance. In fact, similarly to school principals who have been described above to be in strong need for emotional intelligence as they deal with emotions that accompany school reform; subject leaders are also confronted with enormous emotions that they are urged to deal with, on daily- basis, with their teachers within their departments. In fact, as subject leaders' role expands and their sphere of influence inflates to include tasks that have been traditionally and historically attributed to their principals (Ghamrawi, 2010), it is justifiable to ponder about their leadership performance, the same way leadership performance of school principals is questioned. Thus this study attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. How do subject leaders rate their levels of emotional intelligence?
2. How do subject leaders rate their effectiveness in terms of leadership performance?
3. What are the effects of emotional intelligence on leadership performance of subject leaders?

Review of Related Literature

Emotional Intelligence and Leadership

Goleman (1995) defines emotional intelligence to describe motivation, self-awareness, recognizing emotions, and behavior of individuals. Bar-On (1997) defines emotional intelligence as the "capabilities, competencies, and skills that influence one's ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures" (p. 14). Combining both definitions, Mayor and Salovey (1997) distinguish emotional intelligence as the ability to process emotional information, particularly as it involves the perception, assimilation, understanding, and management of emotion).

Several studies assure that emotional intelligence has a strong relationship with effective school leadership (Allen, 2003; Barent, 2005; Reed, 2005; Cook, 2006). Speaking of leadership and its relation to emotional intelligence, it is important to draw the line between leadership and management. Management is focused on specific tasks or functions; while leadership is influencing of other to achieve common goal (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 2000; Yukl, Wall, & Lepsinger, 1990). Although leaders need more than emotional intelligence to be successful, it can help facilitate the process by which effective leaders influence others (Caruso, Salovey, & Mayer, 2003). It is sufficient to look at Hochschild (2003) description of educational leadership in which he considers it to be primarily an emotional labor; to realize the importance of emotional intelligence in such a domain. Several other studies have explored the emotional elements of leadership in schools (Beatty, 2000; Crawford, 2007). Evidence have shown that the pressure that school leaders face can negatively impact their emotional well-being (Allison, 1997; Carruth, 1997; Welmers, 2008; Williams, 2001).

Emotional intelligence has been considered by a huge body of research to be a predictor of success. Sawaf (1997) argue that "If the driving force of intelligence in twentieth century business has been IQ, then . . . in the dawning twenty-first century it will be EQ" (p. xxvii). Evidence has shown that emotional intelligence is an effective tool in the leadership repertoire of school administrators (Bardach, 2008; Cook, 2006; Stone et al., 2005).

An emotionally intelligent leader is likely to utilize a transformational approach to leadership (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006). The positive effects of a transformational leadership approach have previously been established: to increase commitment (Barling et al., 2000), to enhance employee satisfaction (Hater and Bass, 1988), to raise trust (Barling et al., 2000; Pillai et al., 1999), and to increase job performance (Howell and Avolio, 1993).

Mayer and Salovey (1997) identify four areas in which leaders need to be proficient. Effective leaders are

able to identify emotions in others, use emotions to motivate others, understand the source and reason of others' emotions, and manage emotions within themselves. In fact, the regulation of the leader's emotion so that positive emotions are primarily displayed perpetuates positive employee moods and increased productivity (George, 1995; Friedman et al., 1988).

According to Barach and Eckhardt (1996): "Leadership, which embraces the emotional side of directing organizations, pumps life and meaning into management structures, bringing them to life" (p. 4). Due to the social complexity of today's organizations, Dearborn (2002) suggests managers with high emotional intelligence may be more capable of getting more output from less people and recognizing the nuances of dynamic situations while creating positive outcomes. Malek (2002) discovered that conflict resolution skills among leaders increase with emotional intelligence levels.

Emotional Intelligence, Gender and Sex

Bar-On (1997) suggests that there are "no significant differences between males and females in overall emotional intelligence" (p. 93) based on a correlational study between age and gender and scores on the EQ-i. In a similar study, older groups scored significantly higher than younger groups, suggesting emotional intelligence can increase with age (Bar-On and Handley, 1997). However, Allen (2003) indicates female principals tend to slightly outscore male principals on the EQ-i by one-half of a standard deviation, but there is no significant difference between principals' age and EQ-i scores. Similarly, studies carried out by Mayer et al., (1999) as well as Mayer and Geher (1996) confirm that women typically outscore men as far as emotional intelligence is concerned.

Women have been found to display more complexity and articulate their emotional experience more than men, even after controlling for verbal intelligence (Barrett et al., 2000). Lopes et al., (2003) confirm this finding and suggest higher emotional intelligence in women may be linked to mother-child interactions where female children tend to receive greater emotional expression from their mothers than male children. The part of the brain designated for emotional processing may also be larger in women (Gur et al., 2002). However, women are more likely to be perceived negatively in the leadership role when compared to men when women do not use their emotional abilities and act as autocratic leaders, typically a male stereotype, rather than as democratic leaders (Eagly et al., 1992). More interestingly, women more often underestimate their emotional intelligence, whereas men overestimate (Petrides and Furnham, 2000).

Components of Emotional Intelligence

Goleman's (1995) original model of EI consists of 25 skills, abilities, and competencies categorized into four distinct domains:

1. Self-awareness—the ability to read one's emotions and recognize their impact while using gut feelings to guide decisions.
2. Self-management—involves controlling one's emotions and impulses and adapting to changing circumstances.
3. Social awareness—the ability to sense, understand, and react to others' emotions while comprehending social networks.
4. Relationship management—the ability to inspire, influence, and develop others while managing conflict.

On the other hand, another classification of emotional intelligence is offered by Mayer and Salovey (1997) who built a model that is structured around four levels of emotional intelligence, and each level contains a number of discrete emotional abilities. These levels are:

1. Perception and expression of emotion. This level is the most basic and involves the identification and expression of emotions in one's physical states, feelings, and thought in addition to recognizing emotional expression in other people.
2. Assimilating emotion in thought. The ability allows people to weigh emotions against one another and allows emotion to direct and prioritize attention. At this level, emotions also aid in memorization by tying specific emotions with specific events.
3. Understanding and analyzing emotion. This level addresses how people are able to label emotions, recognize why they occur, and how to reason with the complexity of emotions and simultaneous feelings. In addition, there is an ability to understand relationships associated with shifts of emotion.
4. Reflective regulation of emotion. The highest level of emotional intelligence, this level deals with the ability to stay open to feelings and reflectively monitor and regulate emotions that promote emotional and intellectual growth. (Mayer and Salovey, 1997, p. 11)

Finally, Bar-on (1997) offer a widely spread model, which is a trait model of emotional intelligence that sought to bridge why some persons are successful and some are not. He defined emotional intelligence as "a cross-section of interrelated emotional and social competencies, skills and facilitators that determine how effectively we understand and express ourselves, understand others and relate to them, and cope with daily demands" (Bar-On, 2006, p. 15). Bar-On's emotional-social model combines mental and emotional intellect to predict the likelihood of a person's success through five main components:

1. Intrapersonal skill – a person's awareness and understanding of their emotions and feelings;
2. Interpersonal skill – the awareness and understanding of others emotions with empathy which leads to the development of a positive relationship;

3. Adaptability – having the ability to adapting or changing feelings depending on the situation;
4. Stress management – being able to cope with stress and controlling the emotions stress can bring on; and,
5. General mood – being an optimistic person who feels and expresses positive emotions (Allen, 2003; Bar-On, 2006; Berrocal and Extremera, 2006).

Importance of the Study

While the literature exploring the link between emotional intelligence and leadership is vast, the majority of this research has been conducted in corporate settings. A few studies focused on emotional intelligence in the context of principals' leadership (Bardach, 2008). No studies have highlighted the impact of subject leaders' emotional intelligence on their leadership performance.

Moreover, much of the available literature examining the correlation between emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness is mixed. There are many examples where emotional intelligence has been correlated with leadership abilities (e.g., Kerr et al., 2006; Leban and Zulauf 2004; Rosete and Ciarrochi, 2005). Yet, it is important to note that other studies showed significant correlation between emotional intelligence and leadership performance (e.g., Law et al., 2007; Wilson and Brown, 2007).

While the majority of literature reports a strong correlation between emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness, further research is needed in school settings. This study attempted to investigate the possible relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership performance of a group of individuals in schools who seem to be playing a very critical role in schools: subject leaders.

METHODOLOGY

The Sample

In fact, invitation to participate in this study was administered to all schools located in Beirut, the capital of Lebanon. Principals were encouraged to communicate back with the researcher via email, telephone, fax or airmail. They were invited to complete the consent form which committed them to the involvement in the research study, yet also provided confirmation concerning the anonymity of the school and the information collected from it. Out of 101 private schools in Beirut, 31 schools contacted the researcher and expressed their interest in taking part in the study. However, when the questionnaire was delivered to those schools, 8 of them apologized explaining that their staff were highly occupied with school matters and were not able to complete the forms. As requested, 10 subject leaders from each school completed the surveys. Thus the sample included 230 subject leaders. Surveys were collected by research assistants in person from schools.

The Research Instruments

Participant completed two surveys: Educational Leadership Improvement Tool (DeFranco and Golden, 2003) and Emotional Intelligence Appraisal (Bradberry and Greaves , 2003).

The Educational Leadership Improvement Tool developed by DeFranco and Golden (2003), assesses leadership performance in nine areas, including: (1) leadership attributes, (2) visionary leadership, (3) community leadership, (4) instructional leadership, (5) data-driven improvement, (6) organization to improve student learning, (7) organization to improve staff efficacy, (8) cultural competence, and (9) educational management. The details of such areas appear in Table 1.

The instrument consists of 6 point Likert scale statements that corresponding to three performance areas which are: Developing, Meets, and Exceeds. A score of 1 or 2 indicate the leader is developing in that element, a score of 3 or 4 show the leader is meeting that element, and a score of 5 or 6 show the leader is exceeding in that element. When no score is noted, the Not Met option was used. Scores for the four elements were added, and their sum was divided by 4 to arrive at an overall rating for a given leadership performance area.

The Educational Leadership Improvement Tool was developed originally by DeFranco and Golden (2003) to assess leadership performance of school principals. The researcher customized the tool and piloted it with a sample of 53 subject leaders who were attending a conference organized by the researcher. Many words were amended after the conduction of the pilot study and hence the instrument was ready for administration with the research sample.

The Emotional Intelligence Appraisal developed by Bradberry and Greaves (2003) measures 4 dimensions of emotional intelligence including: (1) self–awareness, (2) self–management, (3) social awareness, (4) relationship management, and it provides as overall score for emotional intelligence. The details of each dimension of emotional intelligence appear in Table 2.

Scores on the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal can range from 0 to 100. The scores are scaled as follows: 59 or below is significantly below average, 60 to 69 is below average, 70 to 79 is average, 80 to 89 is above average, 90 to 100 is significantly above average. The Emotional Intelligence Appraisal was piloted with the same group described above to ensure the readiness of this research instrument for actual data collection in schools.

Finally, subject leaders also completed a

Table 1. Standards Addressed through the Leadership Improvement Tool (DeFranco and Golden, 2003)

Areas	Core Meaning
leadership attributes	The school leader encourages and models communication, is receptive to feedback, and is actively involved in building relationships with staff, students, parents, and community leaders. Student learning is at the core of activities and decisions. The school leader visits classrooms regularly and is willing to encourage and implement creative solutions to problems. The school leader communicates and models core values.
visionary leadership	The school leader fosters a shared vision. The school leader considers the vision when making key decisions, and has high expectations for all staff and students.
community leadership	The school leader actively seeks out and communicates with parents and community members. The school leader demonstrates pride in the school, integrates the school with the community, and employs a network in the community to solicit resources.
instructional leadership	The school leader facilitates linkages among curriculum, instruction, and assessment and understands the key elements of curriculum and instructional practice. The school leader works with teachers to create goals, utilizes effective evaluation methods to provide assistance to teachers, and conducts meaningful classroom observations. The school leader keeps staff focused on closing the achievement gap and is knowledgeable about theories and teaching strategies for learning.
data-driven improvement	The school leader uses data to drive improvement. The school leader integrates teachers into the creation or gathering of data, understands internally gathered and externally proved data, and regularly uses data to identify what needs to be done within the school.
organization to improve student learning	The school leader maximizes student learning time. The school leader creates a student-centered environment, creates systems within the school to assist transitions between grades, seeks resources for increased technology, and uses technology as an instructional tool to increase student learning.
organization to improve staff efficacy	The school leader is knowledgeable about theories, techniques, and practices for learning and shares that information with staff. The school leader provides sustained professional development opportunities for staff, delegates to staff teams to create proposals or suggest decisions, and requests staff input on how to address issues.
cultural competence	The school leader focuses on the values of diversity. The school leader provides frequent education and training in diversity, creates opportunities for cultural experiences for staff, and promotes understanding of diversity between and within cultures.
educational management	The school leader adopts innovative organizational and management strategies to manage the school and effectively utilize space, supplies, and equipment. The school leader selects, assigns, and organizes staff to best achieve the school's vision and effectively works with the staff to manage resources.

Table 2. Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence

Dimension	Core Meaning
Self-awareness	recognizing emotions and how they affect thoughts and behavior, knowing ones' strengths and weaknesses, and displaying self-confidence
Self-management	Ability to control impulsive feelings and behaviors, managing emotions in healthy ways, taking initiative, following through on commitments, and adapting to changing circumstances.
Social awareness	Understanding the emotions, needs, and concerns of other people, picking up on emotional cues, feeling comfortable socially, and recognizing the power dynamics in a group or organization.
Relationship Management	Knowing how to develop and maintain good relationships, communicating clearly, inspiring and influencing others, working well in a team, and managing conflict.

Table 3. Demographic Characteristics of Participants

	%
Gender	
Male	45.8
Female	54.2
Age (Years)	
Less than 25	16.9
26-35	39.6
36-45	28.9
46 and above	15.6
Experience (Years)	
Less than 4	10.4
5-9	20.9
10- 14	23.1
15- 19	22.9
20 and above	22.7

Table 4. Means and Standard Deviations of of Emotional Intelligence Self-Appraisal

Dimensions	**Score**	
	Mean	**SD**
Self-awareness	82.91	4.12
Self-management	80.12	5.02
Social awareness	83.67	4.98
Relationship Management	80.01	5.23
Total Emotional Intelligence	81.67	5.03

The mean scores for all 230 subject leaders responding to the Emotional Intelligence Self-Appraisal was 81.67 (SD=5.03). Subject leaders rated themselves high on all dimensions of emotional intelligence. The highest score was given to social awareness (M= 83.67 and SD= 4.98), followed by self-awareness (M= 82.91 and SD=4.12), followed by self-management (M= 80.12 and SD= 5.02) and finally by relationship management (M= 80.01 and SD= 5.23).

demographic survey asking them their gender, age, and years of experience.

Data Analysis

Data was analyzed using SPSS 18.0 for windows. Descriptive statistics were used to describe and summarize the properties of the mass of data collected from the respondents. Means scores, standard deviations and percentages were calculated per each item of the survey instruments. In addition, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine the effects of emotional intelligence on subject leaders' leadership performance and a factorial analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine the influence of gender, age, and years of experience on emotional intelligence and leadership performance.

RESULTS

Demographic Data

The sample was 45.8% males and 54.2% females. The majority (39.6%) of teachers' age range was between 26-35 and novice teachers were no more than 10.4%. The demographic characteristics of participants are presented in Table 3.

Research Question 1: How do subject leaders rate their levels of emotional intelligence?

The means and standard deviations for the subject leaders on the Emotional Intelligence Self Appraisal are reported in Table 4.

Research Question 2: How do subject leaders rate their effectiveness in terms of leadership performance?

Data derived from the Leadership Improvement Tool (DeFranco and Golden, 2003) was used to respond to this research question. Scores obtained for the nime areas are presented in Table 5. The score points are defined as follows: "Not Met" (0), "Developing" (1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 2.5), "Meets Expectations" (3.0, 3.5, 4.0, 4.5), and "Exceeds Expectations" (5.0, 5.5, 6.0).

Table 5. Scores obtained for Subject Leaders via the Leadership Performance Self-Appraisal

Areas	Scores Not Met		Developing		Meets Expectations		Exceeds Expectations	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
leadership attributes	0	0	0	0	201	87.3	29	12.6
visionary leadership	5	2.1%	26	11.3	156	67.8	43	18.6
community leadership	0	0	91	39.5	121	52.6	18	7.8
instructional leadership	0	0	0	0	188	81.7	42	18.2
data-driven improvement	0	0	91	39.5	121	52.6	18	7.8
organization to improve student learning	0	0	0	0	55	23.9	175	76.1
organization to improve staff efficacy	0	0	0	0	49	21.3	181	99.7
cultural competence	0	0	0	0	55	23.9	175	76.1
educational management	0	0	5	2.1	196	85.3	29	12.6

Table 5 indicates that the majority of subject leaders rated themselves very high in terms of leadership performance. In fact 36.6% rated themselves as 'exceeds expectations' and 55.1% rated themselves as 'meets expectations'. Thus a total of 91.7% of respondents believed that their leadership performance was quite bold. 10.2 % of participants rated themselves as 'developing' and only 2.1% rated themselves as undeveloped or did not give an answer so were rated as 'not met'.

On the other hand high percentages were recorded for 'organization to improve staff efficacy' (99.7% exceeded expectations); organization to improve student learning (76.1% exceeded expectations); cultural competence (76.1% exceeded expectations). Contrary to that, 'community leadership' and 'data-driven improvement' both scored equally highest on the low score continuum (39.5%).

Research Question 3: What are the effects of emotional intelligence on leadership performance of subject leaders?

A one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine the effects of subject leaders' level of emotional intelligence on leadership performance. Subject leaders' emotional intelligence scores were analyzed and aggregated to create the following three comparison groups: "needs improvement" (scores = 70 - 79), "strength" (scores = 80 - 89), and "high strength" (scores = 90 - 100). Twenty two subject leaders were classified in the highest category "high strength" of emotional intelligence, 151 in the "strength" category, and 57 in the "needs improvement" category.

Results from the MANOVA found that the average ratings across all nine leadership performance categories differed significantly by subject leaders' level of emotional intelligence, Wilks' Lambda .75, $F = 2.497$, $p < .01$. The multivariate effect size based on Wilks' Lambda was strong (.149). The power of the MANOVA test was .996 indicating a very small chance of Type II errors for this analysis. Means and standard deviations for subject leaders' self-ratings for each of the nine leadership performance categories are reported in Table 6.

Post hoc tests found that subject leaders classified in the "High Strength" category of emotional intelligence skills rated themselves as having significantly higher leadership skills in seven of nine areas as compared to subject leaders' classified in either the "Strength" or "Needs Improvement" emotional intelligence categories. Higher strength subject leaders evidenced significantly higher in the leadership performance categories of leadership attributes, visionary leadership, instructional leadership, data driven improvement, organization to improve student learning, organization to improve staff efficacy, and education management. However, results for comparisons of the community leadership and cultural competence performance areas found that subject leaders classified as "High Strength" evinced higher average ratings than subject leaders classified as "Needs Improvement," but not significantly higher than those classified in the "Strength" category of emotional intelligence. The largest differences between emotional intelligence categories was found for "leadership attributes" category ($M = 4.82$, $SD = .41$) and the smallest differences among categories was found for the "cultural competence" leadership performance area ($M=3.01$, $SD = .89$).

CONCLUSION

This study investigated the relationship existing between subject leaders' emotional intelligence and their leadership performance; an area of research that has

Table 6. Means and Standard Deviations for Subject Leaders' Self-ratings

Leadership Performance	Emotional Inteligence Categories Needs Improvement		Strength		High Strength	
	N= 57		N= 151		N= 22	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
leadership attributes	4.24	.32	4.51	.89	5.12	.21
visionary leadership	3.95	.71	4.47	.61	4.44	.36
community leadership	3.55	.88	4.48	.42	4.46	.91
instructional leadership	3.99	.58	4.26	.78	5.03	.23
data-driven improvement	3.78	.96	5.01	.56	4.96	.51
organization to improve student learning	4.12	.84	4.49	.69	5.23	.15
organization to improve staff efficacy	3.11	.85	4.01	.78	4.46	.62
cultural competence	2.01	.66	3.75	.88	4.13	.51
educational management	3.23	.56	4.44	.89	5.21	.33

never been addressed before. Findings indicate that subject leaders' levels of emotional intelligence significantly affect their performance as educational leaders. Findings also revelaed that across the leadership performance categories, subject leaders who rated their emotional intelligence as "a strength to capitalize on" also rated themselves "exceeds expectations" on the Leadership Performance Self Appraisal. This finding is consistent with the research on the effect of emotional intelligence on leadership performance, yet of school principalship. Literature indicates that emotional intelligence has a significant influence on leadership performance, and this has been extended to include subject leaders (Cherniss and Goleman, 2001; Stone et al., 2005).

Limitations of the Study

Several issues constitute limitations to the current study. These include:

1. Self-rating: which is a common bias when participants are requested to complete self appraisals. Individuals have difficulty rating their behavior with accuracy. Individuals often tend to overrate or underrate themselves.
2. Research Instruments: The research instrument 'Educational Leadership Improvement Tool' has been originally developed by DeFranco and Golden (2003) in order to assess the leadership performance of school principals. In this study it was adapted and customized so as to de administered to subject leaders. Though a pilot study was carried out inorder to assure its validity and reliability; other rigorous large scale tests need to be administered to assure these concerns.
3. The Sample: Only 23 outof 101 schools located in Beirut participated in this study. This constitutes approximately 23% of city schools. Such a percentage indicate that results are not really generizable; though several important lessons may be derived.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study indicates that emotional intelligence has a significant impact on subject leaders' leadership performance. However, with the limitations descried above, additional research is needed to validate the findings of this study. Ideas for future research should focus on: (1) investigating the same topic qualitatively; (2) using a more representative sample of the Lebanese School Population; (3) invite subject leaders to complete self-reports and their subordinate teachers to complete surveys about their subject leaders to ensure the avoidance of bias in the study; and (4) examining the impact of subject leaders' emotional intelligence on student achievement.

Recommendations for Practice

This study has indicated that the emotional intelligence of subject leaders impact their leadership performance. In other words, leadership practice of subject leaders may be enhanced if their emotional intelligence is boosted. Thus, professional development designers are encouraged to incorporate emotional intelligence training in their programs.

REFERENCES

Allen L (2003). *The relationship between the emotional intelligence competencies of principals in the Kanawha County School System in West Virginia and their teachers' perceptions of school climate.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia.

Allison DG (1997). Assessing stress among public school principals in British Columbia. *Psychological Reports*, *80*(3, Pt. 2), 1103-1114.

Andrews RL and Soder R (1987). Principal Leadership and Student Achievement. *Educational Leadership*, 44, 9-11.
Barach JA and Eckhardt DR (1996). *Leadership and the job of the executive*. Westport, CT: Quorom Books.
Barbuto JEJr and Wheeler DW (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group and Organization Management*, *31*(3), 300-326.
Bardach RH (2008). *Leading schools with emotional intelligence: A study of the degree of association between middle school principal emotional intelligence and school success* (Doctoral dissertation). Capella University, Minneapolis, MN.
Barent J (2005). *Principals' levels of emotional intelligence as an influence on school culture*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana.
Barling J, Slater F, Kelloway EK. (2000). Transformational leadership and emotional intelligence: An exploratory study. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, *21*(3), 157-161. doi:10.1108/01437730010325040
Bar-On R (1997). *BarOn Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i): Technical manual.* Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.
Bar-On R (2000). Emotional and social intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-I). In R. Bar-On and Parker JDA (Eds.), *Handbook of emotional intelligence* (pp. 363-388). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Bar-On R and Handley R (1999). *Optimizing people.* New Braunfels, TX: PRO-Philes Press.
Bar-On R, Handley R, Fund S (2006). The impact of emotional intelligence on performance. In Druskat, V.U.
Barrett LF, Lane RD, Sechrest L and Schwartz GE (2000). Sex differences in emotional awareness. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 26*(9), 1027-1035.
Beatty BR (2000). The emotions of educational leadership: Breaking the silence. *Int. J. Leadership in Edu.*, *3*(4), 331-357.
Blandford S (1997). *Middle management in schools: How to harmonize managing and teaching for an effective school*. London: Pitman.
Blankstein A (2004). *Failure is not an option: Six principles that drive student achievement in high performing schools.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
Bradberry T and Greaves J (2001-2006). *Emotional intelligence appraisal: There is more than IQ*, San Diego, CA: Talent Smart Inc.
Bradberry T and Greaves J (2003). *Emotional intelligence quick book: Everything you need to know*, San Diego, CA: Talent Smart Inc.
Bradberry T and Greaves J (2004). *Emotional intelligence appraisal: There is more than IQ, technical manual update*. San Diego, CA: Talent Smart Inc.
Brown M, Rutherford D, Boyle B (2000). Leadership for school improvement: the role of the head of department in UK secondary schools. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 11(2), 237-258.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1076/0924-3453(200006)11:2;1-Q;FT237
Busher H (2001). *Managing change to improve learning*. In Bush, T and Bell, L (Eds.) (2002) Educational Management: Principles and Practice. London: Paul Chapman.
Busher H (2005) "Being a Middle Leader: Exploring Professional Identities". *School Leadership and Management*, 25 (2), 137 – 153.
Busher H and Harris A (1999). Leadership of school subject areas: tensions and dimensions of managing in the middle. *School Leadership and Management*, 19(3),305-15.
Carruth RJ (1997). *High school principal burnout: A study relating perceived levels of professional burnout to principals' reliance on social bases of power* (Doctoral dissertation). University of La Verne, La Verne, CA.
Caruso DR, Salovey P, Mayer JD (2003). Emotional intelligence and emotional leadership. In R.E. Riggio and S.E. Murphy (Eds.), *Multiple intelligences and leadership* (pp. 55-73). Mahway,NJ: Erlbaum.
Cherniss C (2000). *Emotional intelligence: What it is and why it matters*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizaitonal Psychology, New Orleans. LA. Retrieved November 11, 2003, from http://www.eiconsortium.org/research/what_is_ emotional_ intelligence.htm.
Cherniss C (2003). *The business case for emotional intelligence*, The Consortium for Research on Emotional Intelligence in Organizations, Retrieved November 8, 2003, from http://www.eiconsortium.org/research/business_case_for_ei.htm.
Cherniss C and Adler M (2000). *Promoting emotionla intelligence in organizations: Make training in emotional intelligence effective*. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development.
Cherniss C and Goleman D (2001). *The emotionally intelligent workplace*. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.
Cook CR (2006). *Effects of emotional intelligence on principals' leadership performance* (Doctoral dissertation).
Cooper R and Sawaf A (1997). *Executive EQ*. New York, NY: Perigee Trade.
Crawford M (2007). Emotional coherence in primary school headship. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *35*(4), 521-534.
Dearborn K (2002). Studies in emotional intelligence redefine our approach to leadership development. *Public Personnel Management, 31*, 523-530.
Dinham S, Brennan K., Collier J, Deece A, Mulford D (2000). *The secondary head of department: Key link in the quality teaching and learning chain*. Canberra: Australian College of Education.
Dufour R, Dufour R, Eaker R (2008). *Revisiting professional learning community at work: New insights for improving schools*. Bloomingon, IN: Solution-Tree.
Eagly AH, Makhijani MG, Klonsky BG (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 111*, 3-22.
Evans R (1996). *The human side of change.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Fabio S and Mount G (2006). *Linking emotionional intelligence and performance at work: Current research evidence with individuals and groups*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Fitzgerald T and Gunter H (2006) "Leading Learning: Middle Leadership in Schools in England and New Zealand". *Management in Education*, 20 (3), 6 – 8.
Friedman HS, Riggio RE, Casella DF (1988). Nonverbal skill, personal charisma, and initial attraction. *Personality and Applied Social Psychology, 25*, 778-794.
George JM (1995). Leader positive mood and group performance: The case of customer service. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 827-844.
Ghamrawi N (2010). No teacher left behind: subject leadership that promote teacher leadership. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership, 38*(3), 304-320.
Ghamrawi N (2011). Trust me. Your school can do better-A message from teachers to principals. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership, 39*(3), 333-348.
Ghamrawi N (2006). Investigating teacher leadership in three private K-12 schools in Beirut, Lebanon (Unpublished doctoral thesis). University of Leicester, UK.
Ghamrawi N (2013). In principle, it is not the principal: Teacher leadership architecture in schools. International Education Studies, 6(2), 148-159.
Goleman D (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*, New York: Bantam Book.
Goleman D, Boyatzis R, McKee A (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
Gur R, Gunning-Dixon F, Bilker WB, Gur RE (2002). Sex differences in temporo-limbic and frontal brain volumes of healthy adults. *Cerebral Cortex, 12*, 998-1003.
Hersey P, Blanchard K, Johnson D (2000). *Management of organizational behavior: Leading human resources.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
Hessel K. and Holloway J (2002). *A framework for school leaders: Linking the standards to practice*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
Hochschild AR (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Horner M (1997). Leadership theory: past, present and future. *Team Performance Management*, 3, 270-287.
Howell JM and Avolio BJ (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation:

Key predictors of business unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *78*, 891-902.
justice: Similarities and differences across cultures. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *30*(4), 763-779.
Lopes P, Salovey P, Straus R (2003). Emotional intelligence, personality, and the perceived quality of social relationships. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35, 641-658.
Malek M (2002). The relationship between emotional intelligence and collaborative conflict resolution styles. *Dissertation Abstract International*, 61, 2805.
Mayer JD and Salovey P (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 9*(3), 185-211.
Mayer JD and Geher G (1996). Emotional intelligence and the identification of emotion. *Intelligence, 22*, 89-113.
Mayer JD, Caruso DR, Salovey P (1999). Emotional intelligence meets traditional standards for an intelligence. *Intelligence, 27*, 267-298.
Moore B (2009). *Inspire, motivate, collaborate: Leading with emotional intelligence.* Westerville, OH: National Middle School Association. Montana State University, Bozeman, MT.
Naylor P, Gkolia C, Brundrett M (2006). "'Leading From the Middle': An Initial Study of Impact". *Management in Education*, 20 (1), 11 – 16.
Petrides KV and Furnham A (2000). Gender differences in measured and self-estimated trait emotional intelligence. *Sex Roles, 42*(5-6), 449-461.
Pillai R, Scandura TA, Williams EA (1999). Leadership and organizational
Salovey P and Mayer JD (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality, 9*(3), 185-211.
Salovey P, Bedell BT, Detweiler JB, Mayer JD (2000). Current directions in emotional intelligence research. In *Handbook of emotions, 2nd ed.*, Lewis, M. & Haviland-Jones, J.M. editors. New York, NY: The Guildford Press.
Schulze R and Roberts RD (2005). *Emotional Intelligence: An international handbook*. Cambridge, MA: Hogrefe & Huber Publishers.
Stone H, Parker JDA, Wood LM (2005). *Report on the Ontario principals' council leadership study*. Consortium for Research on Emotional Intelligence in Organizations. Retrieved from http://www.eiconsortium.org/reports/opc_leadership_study_final_report.html
Waters JT, Marzano RJ, McNulty BA (2003). *Balanced Leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement*. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning, Retrieved July 16, 2004, from http://www.mcrel.org.
Welmers JA Jr (2008). *Predicting principals' stress* (Doctoral dissertation). East Carolina University, Greenville, NC.
Williams RK (2007). *Emotional intelligence and leadership style: An investigation within a major telecommunications company*. Saarbrücken, Germany: VDM Verlag.
Wise C (2001). The monitoring role of the academic middle manager in secondary schools. *Educational Management and Administration*, 29(3), 333-341.
Yukl GA, Wall S, Lepsinger R (1990). Preliminary report on the validation of the management practices survey. In K.E. Clark and M.B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 223-238). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.