

South African Journal of Education

Copyright © 2007 EASA

Vol 27(3)541–563

Importance of emotional intelligence in conceptualizing collegial leadership in education

Prakash Singh, Peter Manser and Raj Mestry

Prakash.Singh@nm.mu.ac.za; manserp@arhs.escape.school.za; rajm@uj.ac.za

We focus on the importance of emotional intelligence (EI) in conceptualizing collegial leadership in education. Research findings, both nationally and internationally, strongly suggest that a technocratic (managerial) approach to leadership is in conflict with the visionary, people-centred approach of modern organisations, including educational institutions at school level. Research on leadership over the past two decades indicates that the emotional intelligence of leaders matters twice as much as cognitive abilities such as IQ or technical expertise. EI is not in opposition to IQ but it is an extension of the human's potential to succeed in a people-orientated environment. Traditional cognitive intelligence (IQ) is combined with non-cognitive intelligence (EI) to help leaders perform at their best and inspire their followers to be successful and happy. Although the principal's leadership is an essential element in the success of a school, current research indicates that the complexities of schools require a new focus on collaborative (collegial) leadership. This research on EI, collegial leadership, and job satisfaction is illustrated in the Triumvirate Leadership Grid. It strongly suggests that a personal and emotional accountability system is essential for positive human development within the learning environment.

Keywords: *collegiality; collegial leadership; emotional intelligence; emotionally intelligent behaviours; Triumvirate Leadership Grid*

Why emotional intelligence is needed in leadership

Emotional Intelligence has become a vital part of how today's leaders meet the significant challenges they face (Childs, 2004). Fullan (2001) points out that the culture of change is rife with anxiety, stress and ambiguity and therefore, it should come as no surprise then that the most effective leaders are not the smartest in an IQ sense but are those who combine intellectual brilliance with emotional intelligence. In 1980 when Reuven Bar-On investigated the qualities that led to success, he showed that there was much more than traditional intelligence or IQ that was associated with an individual's success and Bar-On consequently developed the concept of Emotional Intelligence. Thus the Emotional Quotient or EQ was born (Childs, 2004).

Emotional Intelligence (EI) can assist leaders in an evermore difficult leadership role and in the middle of the "Talent War". Especially at the highest levels in organisations, emotional intelligence can give developing leaders a competitive edge (Childs, 2004). In their work with emotional intelligence, Merkwowitz and Earnest (2006) have personally seen individuals improve their leadership capacities and skills in their professional role leading to an enhancement in their personal lives. According to Gardner and Stough (2002: 76), for educators to reach a level of job satisfaction that produces high levels

of efficiency and effectiveness, the principal needs to demonstrate very specific emotionally intelligent behaviours (EIBs) and leadership skills:

The ability of the leader to be able to identify and understand the emotions of others in the workplace, to be able to manage their own and others' positive and negative emotions, to be able to control emotions in the workplace effectively, to utilise emotional information when problem solving and to be able to express their feelings to others is integral to the leader being effective at creating appropriate levels of job satisfaction.

EIBs refer to those observable actions and reactions that determine one's level of EI or as Goleman (1998:26) suggests, the level of EI determines the potential for learning the practical skills that create emotional competences or EIBs. If there is a link between the EIBs of a school principal and an educator's sense of job satisfaction, then a school principal's leadership qualities and observable EIBs could influence an educators' attainment of job satisfaction (Manser, 2005).

EIBs are EI actions or reactions that can be observed and measured by others (Manser, 2005). They can be regarded as either being appropriate or inappropriate. They comprise a number of characteristics that make them identifiable as manifestations of EI and are important measures of a leader's ability to handle others and themselves in a manner that is regarded as compassionate, sensitive and appropriate. They are observed in the interpersonal domain (the appropriateness of a leader's responses and subsequent actions to the emotional signals emanating from others) and in the intrapersonal domain (the appropriateness of a leader's reaction and subsequent behaviour as a result of internal emotions being experienced) (Goleman, 2004).

The principal's EIBs demonstrate his/her collaborative leadership skills. The role of the principal is vital in creating a collaborative educational environment in which collegiality would flourish. As pointed out by Kochan and Reed (2005:73), an ideal learning community is organized in a way that fosters an open flow of thoughts; stimulates critical reflection about analyses of ideas, policies, problems, and solutions; creates notions of what is universally acceptable as being the common good and develops a concern for the rights and dignity of all people. It is expected that in such a setting, staff, learners, parents, and other stakeholders would function together using democratic principles to improve the school and enhance the quality of instruction and learning. Participatory teaching, learning and assessment would contribute to an improved school environment and would enable educational leaders to balance "bottom-up processes" with "top-down regulations" (Veugelers & Zijlstra, 2002).

In order for principals to ensure that educators become more fulfilled at school, Day (2000:113) recommends that principals need to ensure that educators are given opportunities to play participatory roles in the leadership of their school. The principal needs to provide the support, preparation and guidance for educators to fulfill such a role. According to Day (2000:118), successful school leaders are recognised as those who, in order to ensure that

their schools provide relevant learning opportunities, engage in reflective practices to maintain staff satisfaction and EI. They are able to mediate successfully between internal harmony and external needs because, as Day (2000:125) points out, they need to nurture their critical thinking and EI through reflection by testing what they know against what is happening both inside and outside the school.

It is aptly pointed out by Yukl (1998:324) that shared leadership not only involves leadership behaviours that build willing followers who commit themselves to the organization's objectives, but it also empowers followers to accomplish these objectives by their becoming leaders in their own fields of expertise. Enabling or empowering educators therefore is an important aspect in establishing emotionally intelligent collaboration, as the willing and satisfied participation of the educator staff may be the result of a principal's commitment to establishing a collegial environment as demonstrated by his/her EIBs (Manser, 2005).

In terms of conceptualizing leadership in education, the question that immediately arises is whether such an analysis should be confined to the cognitive abilities of the educator and whether this would be sufficient to focus on educational leadership traits. However, Goleman (2004) points out that research on leadership over the past two decades strongly suggests that the emotional intelligence of leaders matters twice as much as that of cognitive abilities such as IQ or technical expertise. Social and emotional abilities are four times more important than IQ in determining success (Sternberg, 1996).

Although the principal's leadership is an essential element in the success of a school, current research indicates that the complexities of schools require a new focus on collaborative (collegial) leadership and the creation of a sense of community in which leadership is shared (Retallick & Fink, 2002). The principal's ability to understand, identify and empathise with educators' emotions and then react appropriately are, according to Goleman (1996:119), integral factors which could help foster a feeling of job satisfaction amongst educators:

Those who are emotionally intelligent can connect quite smoothly with people, be astute in reading their reactions and feelings, lead and organise, and handle disputes that are bound to flare up. They are the natural leaders, the people who can express the unspoken collective sentiment and articulate it so as to guide a group towards its goals. They are emotionally nourishing — they leave people in a good mood.

According to Thilo (2004), emotionally intelligent leaders experience a greater sense of well-being, improved relationships, happier employees and lower employee turnover, better team work, greater job satisfaction and a greater degree of business success. Emotional intelligence is the most important factor in achieving success seeing that high levels of achievement, success, and happiness are self-defined and directed (Merkowitz & Earnest, 2006). Imagine looking through a pair of binoculars as a metaphor for leadership.

One lens of the binoculars represents IQ while the other represents EI. Monocular vision, using only IQ produces a very narrow view of the horizon. Binocular vision, combining IQ with EI produces a much clearer, broader and far reaching view. Exemplary leaders use both lenses to harness the best from their people and sustain high performance from individuals, teams and organizations (Human Performance Strategies, 2006).

Goleman (2004:4) points out that “when it comes to shaping our decisions and our actions, feeling counts every bit as much — and often more — than thought.” He believes that we “have gone too far in emphasizing the value and import of the purely rational — of what IQ measures — in human life. Intelligence can come to nothing when the emotions hold sway.”

In a study that examined how leaders of various personality types value and develop emotional intelligence, Richmond, Rollin and Brown (2004) found that emotional intelligence attributes such as vision, relationship building, and people development are essential to successful leadership. Additional attributes such as teamwork, initiative, achievement drive, optimism, and empathy were also high on the list of priorities defining leadership. The 265 leaders who participated in this international research project ranked the emotionally intelligent competencies higher than the general leadership abilities such as planning and financial management.

According to Childs (2004), leadership has had to evolve to match a growing sense of democracy and independence in the workforce and employees now have far more options and choices than the “foot soldiers of yesterday”. Leaders now need to manage and lead an empowered workforce and go beyond the consultative, co-operative and democratic styles of today. These new demands include (Childs, 2004):

- consultation and involvement — but leaders still get criticised for not having and communicating a compelling vision and purpose;
- autonomy and freedom — but leaders are still expected to take full responsibility when things go wrong;
- opportunities for growth, challenge and glory — but leaders must be on hand to coach and mentor us so that we develop our potential;
- inclusion and team spirit — but we still want our leaders to give us individual recognition and acknowledgement.

Zaleznik (in Northouse, 2004) has argued that leaders and managers are basically different types of people. He contended that managers are reactive and prefer to work with people to solve problems but do so with low emotional involvement. On the other hand, leaders are emotionally active and involved and consistently seek to shape ideas instead of merely responding to them.

Whilst there is considerable overlap between management and leadership, there are clear differences between management and leadership, or managers and leaders (Yukl, 1998). In distinguishing between the functions of management and leadership, Kotter (1990) argued that the overriding function of management is to produce order and consistency whereas the primary function of leadership is to produce change and movement. Bennis and Nanus

(1985:221) made the distinction very clear by stating that “Managers are people who do things right and leaders are people who do the right thing”. In this paper, our primary intention is to interrogate research accomplished on the EI (and EIBs) of educational leaders and determine what its effects are on addressing the concerns of conceptualizing leadership in education.

Conceptualization of emotional intelligence and leadership

EI is not in opposition to IQ, but according to Stein and Book (2001:6), is an extension of the human’s potential to succeed in a people orientated environment. Stein and Book (2001:6) furthermore pointed out that EI is not the antithesis of IQ, but rather a combination of both emotion and cognition.

EI is not a replacement for on the job skills and intelligent task related logical thinking, but adds to the variety of skills that enable one to develop people through the enhancement of one’s effective leadership skills (Caruso & Salovey, 2003:36). Goleman (1998:10) suggests that the importance of EI can be gauged by the fact that there are certain situations specifically in the areas of leadership where EI could be more effective than IQ in terms of personal communication, motivation, self-control and empathetic behaviour. In other words there are emotional factors that are not IQ related that play a relatively greater role in the acquisition of more favourable outcomes in the workplace when related specifically to relationships. It is suggested by Bazerghi (2003a:1), that traditional cognitive intelligence (IQ) is combined with non-cognitive intelligence (EI) to help leaders perform to their optimum and inspire their followers to be successful and happy. According to Bazerghi (2003b:1), this means that combining these two competencies could form the foundation for leadership effectiveness, inspirational workers, high levels of achievement and ultimately job satisfaction.

According to Goleman (1996:25), EI is almost wholly responsible for the superior performance in leadership roles and when one is asked to consider what makes memorable leaders so special, one’s response may correspond with their level of EI. Such leaders, Goleman claims (1996:25), may be described as showing emotional competence because of their ability to utilise their EI effectively. There is a clear distinction made by Goleman (1998:24) between EI and emotional competence, which is clearly evident in the following definition:

Emotional competence is a learned capability based on emotional intelligence that results in outstanding performance at work.

According to Bar-On, as quoted by Merkwitz and Earnest (2006), emotional intelligence is an array of non-cognitive capabilities, competencies, and skills that influence one's ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures. Broadly defined, emotional intelligence addresses the emotional, personal, social, and survival dimensions of intelligence. Emotional intelligence and emotional skills develop over time, change throughout life, and relate to one's potential for performance, are process-oriented, and can be improved through training. Mayer and Salovey (1997:10) define emotional

intelligence as follows:

Emotional intelligence involves the ability to perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotion; the ability to access and/or generate feelings when they facilitate thought; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; and the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth.

According to Bennis as quoted by Bliss (2006), all leaders seem to share some common traits. The first is a guiding vision or purpose. A leader who has a clear idea of what s/he wants to do professionally and personally will pursue the goal regardless of the setbacks. The second characteristic is passion or enthusiasm and the ability to communicate that passion to others. Third is integrity, consisting of three ingredients: self-knowledge, candour, and maturity. Self-knowledge is about knowing one's strengths and weaknesses. Candour is being honest with yourself and is the key to knowing yourself. Maturity is the result of the lessons learned through following, while observing others, learning to be dedicated, and working with others. It is being truthful and never servile. The last two traits go hand in hand: curiosity and daring. A leader wants to learn as much as possible and is willing to take risks (Bush, 1995). Bliss (2006) supports the notion that a leader has to have emotional intelligence to align personal and subordinate goals to accomplish organizational goals.

Belasco and Stayer (1993) suggest a leader must implement four responsibilities at all levels of an organization. Firstly, transfer ownership for work to the people who do the work. Secondly, create the environment where the transfer of ownership can take place, where each person wants to be responsible for his or her own performance. This entails painting a clear picture of what the organization believes great performance means for the organization and each person; focusing individuals on the few great performance factors; developing in each person the desire to be responsible for his or her performance; aligning organization systems and structures to send a clear message as to what is necessary for great performance; engaging each individual's heart, mind, and hands in the business of the organization; and energizing people around the institution's focus. Thirdly, develop individual capability and competence. Fourthly, create conditions in the organization that challenge every person to continually learn, including himself or herself. These four principles align personal and organizational goals through emotional intelligence.

Emotional intelligence is defined as a person's self-awareness, self-confidence, self-control, commitment and integrity, and a person's ability to communicate, influence, initiate change and accept change (Goleman, 1998). Studies have shown that emotional intelligence impacts a leader's ability to be effective (Goleman, 1998). Three of the most important aspects of emotional intelligence for a leader's ability to make effective decisions are self-awareness, communication and influence, and commitment and integrity. Managers who do not develop their emotional intelligence have difficulty in

building good relationships with peers, subordinates, superiors and clients (Goleman, 1998).

Saarni (2000:84) points out that *competence* has a history in western psychology as referring to one's mastery of some skill yet one need not necessarily perform the skill reliably because performance depends heavily on circumstances and incentives. Bliss (2006) believes that emotional intelligence is a combination of competencies. These skills contribute to a person's ability to manage and monitor his or her own emotions, to correctly gauge the emotional state of others and to influence opinions (Goleman, 1998). Goleman describes a model of five dimensions, namely: self-awareness, self-management or self-regulation, motivation, empathy and social skills. As pointed out by Bliss (2006), social skills are fundamental to emotional intelligence. They include the ability to induce desirable responses in others by using effective diplomacy to persuade (influence); listen openly and send convincing messages (communicate); inspire and guide groups and individuals (leadership); nurture instrumental relationships (building bonds); work with others toward a shared goal (collaboration, cooperation); and create group synergy in pursuing collective goals.

Leadership, management and power sharing

A leader does not simply wear a hat associated with a specific position and performs the functions associated with the job description in a technocratic and bureaucratic manner. This approach is usually associated with the functions of a manager. A leader wears many hats and consequently assumes several roles, and depending on the task situation the individual finds himself/herself in, s/he can be a leader or a subordinate, depending on the circumstances that prevail in the organisation (Kochan & Reed, 2005; Singh, 2005; Thilo, 2004; Kouzes & Posner, 1997).

Hellgriegl, Jackson, Slocum, Staude, Amos, Klopper, Louw and Oosthuizen (2006:6) define a manager as "a person who plans, organizes, directs, and controls the allocation of human, material, financial, and information resources in pursuit of the organization's goals". In terms of their definition, a successful manager capably performs four basic managerial tasks: planning, organizing, leading, and controlling. The task of leading involves communicating with and motivating others to perform the tasks necessary to achieve the organization's goals within the context of a supporting organizational culture (Hellgriegl *et al.*, 2006:9).

Hellgriegl *et al.* (2006: 286-287) note that leadership involves influencing others to act towards the attainment of a goal and this is based on interpersonal relationships, not administrative activities and directives. They believe that individuals throughout the organization can and should exercise leadership, and the best organizations have effective leaders at all levels. They further point out that successful leadership depends on the leader establishing trust, clarifying the direction in which people should be headed, communicating so that people would feel confident that they could make the right decisions, encouraging others to take risks, and finally, having a source

of power which Hellgriegl *et al.* (2006:287) regard as the ability to influence the behaviour of others.

Kouzes and Posner (1997:185) observed that credible leaders prefer to give away their power in the service of others and for a purpose larger than themselves. Such leaders accept and act on the paradox of power: we become the most powerful when we give our own power away (Kouzes & Posner, 1997: 185). Collegial leaders take the power that flows to them and connect it to the other members of their team. As pointed out by Kouzes and Posner (1997:187), when leaders share power with others, they demonstrate profound trust in and respect for other's abilities. Such leaders are most respected and most effective, not as traditional management myth has it, the highly controlling, tough-guy boss.

Where the principal is identified as "the leader", many principals find it difficult to give up power and control (Kochan & Reed, 2005). Kochan and Reed (2005:77) further point out that even when schools attempt to create empowering situations, barriers exist including language, positions, and attitudes implying that educators and other stakeholders should be afforded the opportunity to question issues that hinder the creation of equal power relationships. This is particularly true of parents, especially black parents, who may not be comfortable in a school setting and may feel unwelcome there (Department of Education, 1996; Singh, Mbokodi & Msila, 2004). Such individuals would feel intimidated by the situation and uncomfortable or distrustful because of past experiences (Seitsinger & Zera, 2002). Collegiality should be lauded as a democratic value in education that contributes to the enfranchisement and emotional wellbeing of all its stakeholders.

The empowerment of stakeholders in any organisation depends on the devolution of power by leaders. Traditional managers cling to power as an entitlement of their positions. In contrast, collegial leaders share their power base in order to flatten hierarchies (Kouzes & Posner, 1997:xvi). Empowered stakeholders therefore demonstrate a greater commitment to complete a task based on their increased sense of self-confidence, self-determination and personal effectiveness (Singh, 2005).

Kochan and Reed (2005:68) state that democratic leadership requires individuals to adopt a collaborative approach that includes building a sense of community with both internal and external stakeholders. This involves sharing power with others which involves multiple groups of stakeholders in decision-making in meaningful ways. As Bennis (1994) points out, a leader focuses on people and inspires trust whereas a manager focuses on systems and structures and depends largely on control measures to get the job done. A leader challenges the status quo which the manager accepts as "the classic good soldier" (Bennis, 1994). The differences between the manager and the leader as described by Bennis clearly distinguish the artist (leader) from the technocrat (manager). Evidently, the competences associated with EI are clearly identifiable in the expected traits of leadership.

A collegial approach in understanding leadership

Research conducted thus far is strongly supportive of collegiality as a key component in transforming traditional management practices in our schools. Dantley (2005:34) points out that much of the thinking in the field of educational leadership has been shaped by the ideas and tenets of what is generally referred to as scientific management and Frederick W Taylor is considered to be the father of this influential management theory. Scientific management explores the quickest methods to accomplish a task, with the least number of body motions necessary to do a job efficiently. The role of the manager, then, is to discover the most time and cost-efficient way to accomplish tasks and training is usually provided so that employees can reproduce the process, the results of which can always be predicted and quantified.

The traditional emphasis on bureaucracy is challenged by a normative preference for collegiality in many parts of the world, including South Africa (Manz & Sims, 2001; Kouzes & Posner, 1997; Singh, 2005; Bush, 2003:70). Traditional management implies that the “ideal organization is orderly and stable, that the organizational process can and should be engineered so that things run like clockwork” (Kouzes & Posner, 1997:15). Collegiality, on the other hand, is a collaborative process that entails the devolution of power to teachers and other stakeholders in order for them to become an integral part of the leadership processes of the school that are guided by that school’s shared vision (Sergiovanni, 1991:26). Collegiality is therefore considered as a process of assimilation that involves encouraging personal visions to become part of a shared vision built on synergy (Singh & Manser, 2002:57). This process is possible because collegial strategies tend to be more lateral or horizontal rather than being vertical and hierarchical, reflecting the view that all stakeholders should be involved in decision-making and “own” the outcome of discussions (Bush, 2003:70). As pointed out by Kouzes and Posner (1997: 12), leaders “know that no one does his or her best when feeling weak, incompetent, or alienated; they know that those who are expected to produce the results must feel a sense of ownership”.

Leadership, according to Kouzes and Posner (1997:30), is the “art of mobilizing others to want to struggle for shared aspirations”. They (Kouzes & Posner, 1997:31) state that “people in positions of authority can get other people to do something because of the power they wield, but leaders mobilize others to want to act because of the credibility they have”. Collegial leadership therefore focuses on the stakeholders’ capacity to play a participatory role in the leadership of the school (Lofthouse, 1994; Senge, 1990; Singh & Manser, 2002). Under these circumstances, collegial leadership should be viewed as a process that encourages and accommodates shared decision-making and shared leadership in the spirit of enabling people to want to act.

Kouzes and Posner (2001:85) point out that “leadership is a relationship between those who aspire to lead and those who choose to follow”. They state that at the heart of this relationship is trust. Without trust one simply cannot lead. Exemplary (collegial) leaders devote much of their time and effort to building sound relationships based on mutual respect and caring. Kouzes &

Posner (2001:85) further point out that long before empowerment “was written into the popular vocabulary, leaders understood that only when their constituents feel strong, capable, and efficacious, and when they feel connected with one another, could they ever hope to get extraordinary things done”.

For collegiality to be effective, the processes of shared leadership need to prevail (Singh, 2005). Bush (1993:33-39) identified three main advantages of collegiality that have their roots in the development of shared leadership:

- teachers participate fully in the management and leadership of the school;
- the quality of decision-making is improved when the teaching staff participate in this process and take the lead in finding solutions to problems; and
- the contribution of the teaching staff is important because they take the responsibility of implementing changes in policy.

Kouzes and Posner (1997:xx) succinctly capture the essence of shared leadership by pointing out that leadership is not the private reserve of a few charismatic men and women. It is a process ordinary people use when they are bringing forth the best from themselves and others. Liberate the leader in everyone, and extraordinary things happen.

According to Kouzes and Posner (1997:16), traditional “management teachings suggest that the job of management is primarily one of control: the control of resources, including time, materials, and people”. They point out that leaders “don’t command and control; they serve and support”. A collegial leader can be classified as an emancipator seeing that s/he contributes extensively to the creation of an environment for emancipation. The emancipation of teachers as decision-makers and leaders refers to the creation of a climate in a school that encourages teachers to participate in the development and change process in governing their school. Emancipation in a collegial climate will mean that teachers, who demonstrate power through expertise, are afforded the same opportunities and leadership rights as those placed in positions of hierarchical power (Singh, 2005). They need to feel comfortable in their capacity as decision-makers and be unafraid to take decisions based on professional work ethics and collegial principles. Emancipation does not mean that teachers are given unconditional freedom, but rather it includes the assumption of responsibility and accountability within an individual’s particular field of expertise. With freedom comes responsibility and commitment to the school’s shared and chosen direction (Singh, 2005).

According to Cherniss (2000:434), studies in several organisations suggest that about two-thirds of the competencies linked to superior performance are emotional or social qualities such as self-confidence, flexibility, persistence, empathy, and the ability to get along with others. This research data further indicate that in leadership positions, 90% of the competencies necessary for success are social and emotional in nature. Merkwitz and Earnest (2006) point out that healthy and effective relationships, personal leadership, self-management, intrapersonal growth and development, and recognition of potential problems are essential elements for creating a positive and healthy learning climate. Evidently, it is impossible to construe collegial

leadership qualities without focusing on EI. EI begets collegial leadership, which emerges clearly in the discussion following, based on recent research findings on the subject.

Research on EI and collegial leadership

Recent research (Manser, 2005; Singh & Manser, 2006; Msila 2002; Singh, Mbokodi & Msila 2004) as well as those quoted in this article, provide a strong foundation in linking EI with collegial leadership. These findings strongly suggest that one cannot consider collegial leadership without focusing on the personal and social competencies associated with IE. The discussion below is based on the research accomplished by one of us (PM). This research places the need to consider EI (EIBs) in the conceptualization of collegial leadership in education in perspective. A brief overview of the research findings will be followed by a discussion of the Triumvirate Leadership Grid (TLG), which is based on these findings. Due to space constraints, the reader is advised to refer to the primary source of the study for the entire report (Manser, 2005).

Brief overview of research method and findings

Four hundred and seventy-four educators participated in this study. A quantitative research method was used to determine the influence of the school principals' EIBs on the job satisfaction of educators. Questionnaires were completed by teachers, heads of departments, and deputy principals in primary and secondary schools in the Eastern Cape. The findings clearly indicated that a significant relationship exists between the development of a collegial environment which is identified by collaborative teamwork, shared decision-making, shared core values, a shared vision, shared leadership opportunities and meaningful empowerment and a principal's EIBs.

The respondents' support for a leadership style that offers them the opportunity to be actively involved in creative decision-making strategies rather than be subjected to an autocratic style of control was clearly indicated in their responses. The link between collegiality and meaningful interpersonal and intrapersonal EIBs is significant and directly related to a sense of job satisfaction amongst all educators. The EIBs that were identified and the characteristics of each of the EIBs further cement the link between emotionally intelligent leadership strategies and an educator's sense of job satisfaction. Furthermore, the responses indicated that educators have expectations of empowerment and collaboration that would enhance their level of job satisfaction at schools and these expectations are supported by their belief that they would feel satisfied at school if their principals gave them the opportunity to develop their skills in an environment that nurtures effective communication, healthy relationships, empathy and trust. In order to be satisfied at school the findings clearly indicated that educators need to be led by school principals who are confident in their leadership role, who send out clear unambiguous messages, who maintain self-control, who are adaptable and flexible, who believe in shared leadership, and who face the future with optimism.

The Triumvirate Leadership Grid (TLG)

The findings of this study recommend that principals need to be made aware that in order for a school to reach its full potential, educators need to be exposed to a collegial environment, be satisfied in their jobs and be nurtured by the principal's and team leader's appropriate EIBs. This recommendation can be demonstrated by an adaptation of the Sergiovanni, Starrat, Blake and Mouton leadership grids, which, as Van der Westhuizen (1991:100) explains, propagates the notion that effective leadership is identified by those who concentrate on people and the task at hand in such a way that the task is completed and the people remain motivated and happy. The adapted grid (see Figure 1) uses a similar analogy but refers to a triumvirate of job satisfaction, a collegial environment and EIBs and suggests that, as this study has shown, in a functional collegial environment where the principal displays a high degree of EIBs, educators would be satisfied at work. Evidently, the principals' EIBs are considered to be one of the key factors influencing the job satisfaction of educators. The development of the TLG is based on collegiality and the EIBs of leaders as discussed here.

A functional collegial environment

In terms of the findings of this study a functional collegial environment is apparent when the six foundations of collegiality underpin the core purpose of the school. According to Singh and Manser (2002:58), and Singh (2005:12), there are six underlying principles or foundations that determine whether or not a collegial environment exists in a school and these foundations are: accountability, shared core values, shared vision, shared decision-making, shared leadership, and empowerment. Accountability is shared and educators are happy to be held accountable for leadership roles that they have chosen. There is shared empowerment and shared leadership, which indicate that educators have been given the opportunity to take on leadership roles and be accountable for decisions that they make without the interference of those in more powerful hierarchical positions.

The school's core values, the shared vision and shared mission statements have been established through the participation of all members of the school community that include parents, learners, members of staff, and the governing body. There is a sense of commitment and organization that abounds.

A non-functional collegial environment

A non-functional collegial environment present in a school could indicate that the principal supports the concept of collegiality, but that the foundations have been poorly implemented. Opportunities for shared accountability exist and the principal is willing to empower educators and share leadership positions. In terms of the research findings, this could be a fledgling collegial environment which may indicate that a change in the previous leadership structure has taken place or that an attempt has been made to shift away from a different leadership approach.

A non-existent collegial environment

In terms of the findings of this study, a non-existent collegial environment could suggest two scenarios that can be described as being opposite to a functional collegial environment. The first one depicts a leadership structure in the school that is largely autocratic. Accountability is not shared, leadership is regarded as a position of pre-ordained hierarchical power and the principal by choice holds himself/herself accountable for all that happens in the school. The principal determines the core values and the school's vision (if it exists) and educators are told to abide by them. An executive committee headed by the principal makes decisions and educators are informed of them when and if it is deemed necessary. The focus is on getting the job done in the most efficient way possible regardless of personal sacrifices that will need to be made. It is a cold, impersonal well-oiled machine.

The second scenario depicts a sense of disarray and chaos in a school. There is a very poor or non-existent work ethic. Educators are unsure of where the school is going and have lost faith in the principal's ability to lead. There is a high rate of staff absenteeism, academic results are poor and the school is clearly rudderless. There are no core values in place, there is no vision for the school and empowerment amplifies feelings of desperation to get things done by the few committed educators that may be present.

The presence of appropriate EIBs in a leadership team

The findings in this study therefore suggest that the presence of appropriate EIBs in the leadership structure of the school indicates the following:

- The principal and other leaders in the school make use of appropriate collegial leadership strategies and they know their staff well.
- They communicate effectively and are able to handle conflict situations.
- They build healthy relationships based on trust with members of their staff.
- They show compassion and understanding through their demonstration of empathy.
- They are trustworthy and sincere.
- They are able to recognize their own strengths and weaknesses through their own self-awareness.
- They are confident in their roles as leaders.
- Their feelings are clearly recognizable.
- They are in control of their emotions and they do not vacillate between emotional extremes.
- They are adaptable and flexible in their thinking and actions.
- They remain optimistic.

The presence of inappropriate EIBs in a leadership team

The findings in this study also suggest that the presence of inappropriate EIBs in the leadership structure of the school indicates the following about the leaders' behaviour:

- They do not inspire or motivate others. There is no encouragement given

and interpersonal contact is kept to a minimum.

- They are difficult to talk to, and they don't seem to listen. They are often preoccupied and as a result they are poor communicators.
- They do not handle conflict well, will not ask for help and will not apologise if in the wrong.
- Relationships are avoided and they do not seem to be concerned with others' problems.
- They do not seem to understand the staff's needs and as a result do not show empathy towards them.
- It seems as if they doubt the abilities of staff and therefore constantly supervise others. There seems to be a mutual feeling of distrust.
- They do not seem to be happy, they don't handle pressure well and they are not committed to the school.
- They do not inspire confidence and cannot be relied upon to serve the best interests of the school in the face of adversity.
- There is, however, a desire to be in the limelight and to receive the kudos for work that has been well done.
- There are often examples of erratic behaviour and noticeable mood-swings and they are sometimes unpredictable and irrational.
- It is also noticeable that they do not like change and find it difficult to adapt to new innovations.
- They are openly critical of changes in education and the Department of Education, negative about the future and seem to be despondent and unhappy.

Clearly a leader who demonstrates appropriate levels of EIBs will either create a functional collegial environment or thrive in one. A functional collegial environment will be nurtured under the leadership of a leader who displays appropriate EIBs. Functional collegial environments and appropriate levels of EIBs create educators who are satisfied in their schools.

The creation of a G4 environment

The TLG in Figure 1 depicts the relationship between collegiality, appropriate emotionally intelligent behaviours and job satisfaction. The main characteristics of the TLG are the following:

- Grid one (G1) suggests that the foundations for collegiality are supported but have not been effectively implemented. The principal could either be in a process of change and development at the school or newly appointed. The principal demonstrates appropriate EIBs; therefore the educators have a high sense of job satisfaction. Grid one suggests that there is every possibility that the foundations of collegiality will be effectively implemented because of the principal's appropriate EIBs and the educators' sense of job satisfaction.
- Grid two (G2) indicates that when educators rate their principals' EIBs as being inappropriate they will feel dissatisfied at work. It is also apparent that a collegial environment is non-existent. Grid two represents a school that is either firmly entrenched under an autocratic leader or in a dys-

functional environment that has very little chance of reaching optimum levels of achievement.

- Grid three (G3) reflects a situation where a functional collegial environment is present, therefore the necessary foundations are in place in order to facilitate meaningful participation from educators. The principal's inappropriate EIBs and predictably the educators' dissatisfaction at work make it highly likely that the school is not functioning as efficiently as it could because the educators are demotivated. In such a situation the principal would need to identify those EIBs that need attention and then improve on them in order to increase the educators' sense of job satisfaction and hence their commitment to the leadership roles they have been given.
- Grid four (G4) is the ideal. It shows a principal who has managed to establish a functional collegial environment that is enhanced by the utilisation and demonstration of appropriate EIBs that have resulted in the development of an educator staff that is satisfied at work. This should be the outcome that all principals need to strive to achieve.

In order to establish a G4 environment at their schools, principals will need to be aware of the importance of the triumvirate of EIBs, job satisfaction and a functional collegial environment. For a principal to develop a meaningful triumvirate relationship at a school there needs to be a high level of understanding of individual needs and abilities which will become apparent through the principal's display of appropriate EIBs. Integral to the success and development of the collegial process will be that individuals are happy and motivated and that they feel that they are being nurtured rather than watched in an open, warm and sincere environment. A principal's effective demonstration of EIBs is therefore crucial to the meaningful utilisation of happy, motivated people and the establishment of a functional G4 collegial environment.

The EIB job satisfaction grid

The findings of the study further suggest that a principal's ability to display predictable and appropriate interpersonal and intrapersonal EIBs can be described as a process that does more than positively influence the job satisfaction of educators. It also allows educators to understand their principal more and makes them feel more at ease because they know how their principal will behave or react and that the EIBs displayed will be appropriate and acceptable. Also principals become more aware of how they will act and react and therefore they begin to learn more about themselves. The EIB job satisfaction grid (Figure 3) indicates this clearly. The EIB job satisfaction grid is based on an extension of the original Johari grid (see Figure 2) that was designed by Hersey and Blanchard (Van der Westhuizen, 1991:104). The Johari grid and the need for its adaptation are explained here.

According to Van der Westhuizen (1991:104), the Johari grid represents a relationship between what the education leader and other educators know about himself/herself. The four quadrants of the grid represent the following:

- Quadrant 1: Certain behaviours are known to the leader and are observed by others. In other words the leader's intentions and actions are clear and they are observed and understood by others.
- Quadrant 2: Others observe behaviours on the leader's part of which s/he is unaware.
- Quadrant 3: There are behaviours (of the leader) that go by unnoticed by everyone.
- Quadrant 4: There are feelings that the leader has of which others are unaware.

According to Van der Westhuizen (1991:104), the ideal situation is that the known quadrant (1) should extend as indicated by the arrows (Figure 2) and that the other three quadrants should become smaller and smaller until a situation develops in which everyone knows what to expect from the educational leader in different situations within the educational environment. The educational leader will therefore, also be able to predict how s/he will react or what s/he would do but if the subordinates seldom know what to expect, then this could lead to uncertainty as denoted by quadrants 2, 3, and 4.

Based on the findings of this research, the Johari model is therefore considered to be unsuitable for the prediction of job satisfaction, as the principal's EIBs need to be both appropriate and predictable; therefore the Johari model needs to be modified to accommodate this requirement. To merely understand or expect a certain type of behaviour from one's principal may do little to improve one's feeling of job satisfaction. The behaviours, although predictable, may be inappropriate and the inappropriateness of the principal's behaviour may create a sense of dissatisfaction. A principal's predictable but inappropriate behaviour may be debilitating and restrictive rather than beneficial. Educators may be fearful and feel demotivated and dissatisfied if their principals' predictable behaviour is often perceived as being inappropriate.

The Johari Grid is therefore further adapted to accommodate the observable EIBs that a leader should demonstrate in order for educators to experience a sense of job satisfaction. This (EIB) grid (Figure 3) no longer refers to general behaviours but refers specifically to the EIBs that have been identified in this study. They comprise the six interpersonal (leadership, communication, conflict management, relationships, empathy, and trust) and six intrapersonal EIBs (self-awareness, confidence, self-expression, self-control, adaptability, and optimism). The adapted grid is entitled the EIB job satisfaction grid and is presented in Figure 3. The grid is explained as follows:

- Quadrant 1: The educational leader displays appropriate interpersonal and intrapersonal EIBs that suit the situation and the individual. The educators are aware that the principal will behave and act appropriately. In other words the leader's intentions and behaviours are clear and they are observed and accepted by others as being emotionally intelligent and appropriate. This quadrant represents an environment that will enhance an educator's sense of job satisfaction.
- Quadrant 2: The educational leader displays inappropriate interpersonal EIBs that do not suit the situation or the individual. The educators are

not aware that the principal will behave and act appropriately. In other words, although the leader's intentions and actions are clear they are observed and accepted by others as being inappropriate and lacking EI. According to the findings of this study, this quadrant will bring about job dissatisfaction.

- Quadrant 3: The educators do not know what to expect from the principal. They do not know what emotions will be displayed and they do not know whether they will be appropriate EIBs or not. This is the uncertain, unknown zone, which promotes a sense of job dissatisfaction.
- Quadrant 4: The educational leader displays inappropriate intrapersonal EIBs that should not be forthcoming from a principal and leader. The educators are not aware that the principal will behave and act appropriately. In other words, although the leader's intentions and actions are clear, they are observed and accepted by others as being inappropriate and lacking EI. According to the research findings, this quadrant will also bring about job dissatisfaction.

The ideal situation is that the principal becomes a more emotionally intelligent leader in that s/he displays the appropriate interpersonal and intrapersonal EIBs. In order to achieve this goal, the leader should be aware of the followers' perceptions of himself/herself. Lack of this awareness leads to dissonance. Quadrant 1 should therefore extend as shown by the arrows in Figure 3 and the other three quadrants should become smaller and smaller until a situation develops in which everyone knows that the principal's EIBs will be appropriate. The findings reveal that in such a situation, educators experience a sense of confidence, interest, achievement, and job satisfaction.

If the G4 collegial environment from the triumvirate leadership grid is combined with grid 1 from the EIB job satisfaction grid, the creation of a process of development towards the ideal becomes more meaningful. In other words as the principal's EIBs improve so will the collegial environment of the school become more functional. This will create a school where all will know that the principal's EIBs will be appropriate, that a functional collegial environment will be established and that there will be a sense of job satisfaction that abounds. This ideal G4 triumvirate leadership grid is presented in Figure 4.

The G4 TLG denotes that a personal and emotional accountability system is essential for positive human development within the learning environment. Unchecked emotional stress, ineffective and poor relationships, and personal stagnation can be costly in terms of the quality of education that the school leaders provide to its learners. It is imperative for leaders to become aware of how his/her followers perceive him/her. Honest self-assessment by leaders is requisite to positive and intentional personal change. Self-awareness is an essential attribute of any leader seeing that it is the ability to recognize a feeling as it happens, to accurately perform self-assessments and have self-confidence. It is the keystone of emotional intelligence (Goleman, 2004). Self-management or self-regulation on the other hand, is the leader's ability to keep disruptive emotions and impulses in check (self-control), maintain

standards of honesty and integrity (trustworthiness), take responsibility for one's performance (conscientiousness), handle change (adaptability), and be comfortable with novel ideas and approaches (innovation). Motivation is the emotional tendency guiding or facilitating the attainment of goals shared by the leader with his followers (Bliss, 2006). It consists of achievement drive (meeting a standard of excellence), commitment (alignment of goals with the group or organization), initiative (acting on opportunities), and optimism (persistence reaching goals despite set backs). Leaders cannot function without empathy seeing that it is the understanding of others by being aware of their needs, perspectives, feelings, concerns, and sensing the developmental needs of others (Goleman, 1998; Bliss, 2006; Kouzes & Posner, 1997; Northouse 2004).

Conclusion

Research (Manser, 2005; Northouse, 2004) strongly supports the notion that a leader requires a high level of EI in addition to IQ to achieve the goals of the organisation. On the other hand, managers require cognitive abilities to get the work done. As pointed out by Northouse (2004), to manage means to accomplish activities and master routines while to lead means to influence others and create visions for change. Researchers argue that managers and leaders are different types of people, managers being more reactive and less emotionally involved, and leaders being more proactive and more emotionally involved. Education and learning require the perspective of balance between academic achievement and becoming emotionally intelligent.

Kouzes and Posner (1997:15) observed why people are reluctant to answer the cry for leadership. They believe that his cautiousness results not from a lack of courage or competence but from outdated notions about leadership. Just about everything we were taught by traditional management prevents us from being effective leaders. According to Manz and Sims (2001:68-69), a fundamental reason for shifting employees from dependence to independence "is to improve bottom-line indicators such as productivity and quality while the follower benefits as well. Clearly, this would not be possible unless every employee was considered a true self-leader". Being a leader requires the person to promote an organisational passion for quality. It is a myth that principals are entrusted with absolute power to manage all the resources of the school (Singh, 2005).

Educators support a leadership style enriched by a demonstration of appropriate EIBs that offer them the opportunity to be actively involved in creative decision-making strategies rather than be subjected to an autocratic style of control that is emotionally sterile (Singh & Manser, 2006). EI contributes extensively to the success of a school because of its influence on leadership and its focus on people. The findings of the study revealed that EI is a driving force behind educator motivation and productivity through the satisfaction of emotional needs (Manser, 2005). The findings of the study made it also clear that the interpersonal and intrapersonal EIBs of principals are integral to an educator's attainment of job satisfaction and ultimately crucial to the deve-

lopment of a sustainable and effective culture of collegiality in our schools. The G4 TLG denotes that a personal and emotional accountability system is a prerequisite for all educational leaders to be able to create a collegial environment in which educators experience job satisfaction.

As aptly pointed out by Kochan and Reed (2005:80), leaders of democratic schools must be equipped with the knowledge, skills, abilities, beliefs, and dispositions that will allow them to succeed. The abilities should not only focus on cognition alone but also, equally, on the emotional intelligence of the leader. Naturally, this would require that they become part of professional development and mentoring networks that would provide support whilst they serve in their capacity as educational leaders. It would also require a change in their educational preparation programmes and in the organisational structures in which they operate (Kochan & Reed, 2005:80). Collegial leadership and community building beget collegial leadership and community building (Kochan & Reed, 2005:81). It is our responsibility to ensure that public education remains a central, respected and treasured part of our hard fought African democracy. We must neither expect nor do anything less.

EI begets collegial leadership!

References

- Bazerghi E 2003a. *Emotionally intelligent leadership*. Available at www.humanperformancestrategies.com
- Bazerghi E 2003b. *Organizational effectiveness*. Available at www.humanperformancestrategies.com
- Belasco JA & Stayer RC 1993. *Flight of the buffalo: Soaring to excellence, learning to let employees lead*. New York: Warner.
- Bennis WG 1994. *On becoming a leader*. Massachusetts: Perseus.
- Bennis WG & Nanus B 1985. *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bliss SE 2006. *The affect of emotional intelligence on a modern organizational leader's ability to make effective decisions*. Available at <http://eqi.org/mgtpaper.htm>
- Bush T 1993. *Exploring collegiality: theory, process and structure in managing schools*. Milton Keynes: Open University.
- Bush T 1995. *Theories of educational management*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Bush T 2003. Organisational structure. In: Thurlow M, Bush T & Coleman M (eds). *Leadership and strategic management in South African schools*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.
- Caruso D & Salovey P 2003. *The emotionally intelligent manager*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cherniss C 2000. Social and emotional competence in the workplace. In: Bar-On R & Parker JDA (eds). *The handbook of emotional intelligence*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Childs R 2004. *Emotional intelligence and leadership*. Available at <http://www.teamtechnology.co.uk/emotional-intelligence.html>
- Dantley ME 2005. Moral leadership: Shifting the management paradigm. In: English FW (ed.). *The Sage handbook of educational leadership*. London: Sage.
- Day C 2000. Effective leadership and reflective practice. *Educational leadership*, 1: 113-127.
- Department of Education 1996. *The South African Schools' Act, No 84*. Pretoria:

Government Printer.

- Fullan M 2001. *Leading in a culture of change*. Available at <http://administration.ucok.edu/booksummaries/pdf/LeadinginaCultureofChange.pdf>
- Gardner L & Stough C 2002. Examining the relationship between leadership and emotional intelligence in senior level managers. *Leadership and Organisation Development Journal*, 23:68-78.
- Goleman D 1996. *Emotional intelligence*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Goleman D 1998. *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman D 2004. *Emotional intelligence & working with emotional intelligence*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Hellriegel D, Jackson SE, Slocum J, Staude G, Amos T, Klopper HB, Louw L & Oosthuizen T 2006. *Management*. Oxford: Cape Town.
- Human Performance Strategies 2006. *Emotional intelligence*. Available at <http://humanperformancestrategies.com/ei.htm>
- Kochan FK & Reed CJ 2005. Collaborative leadership, community building, and democracy in public education. In: Fenwick WE (ed.). *The Sage handbook of educational leadership*. London: Sage.
- Kotter JP 1990. *A force for change: How leadership differs from management*. New York: Free Press.
- Kouzes JM & Posner BZ 1997. *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes JM & Posner BZ 2001. Bringing leadership lessons from the past into the future. In: Bennis W, Spreitzer GM & Cummings TG (eds). *The future of leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lofthouse M 1994. Managing learning. In: Bush T & West-Burnham J (eds). *The principles of educational management*. London: Pitman.
- Manser PG 2005. The influence of school principals' emotionally intelligent behaviours on the job satisfaction of educators in the Eastern Cape. PhD thesis. Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, Port Elizabeth.
- Manz CC & Sims HP 2001. *The new super leadership*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Mayer JD & Salovey P 1997. What is emotional intelligence. In: Salovey P & Sluyter D (eds). *Emotional development and emotional intelligence*. New York: Basic Books.
- Merkowitz RF & Earnest GW 2006. *Emotional intelligence: a pathway to self-understanding and improved leadership capacities*. Available at <http://www.joe.org/joe/2006august/iw3.shtml>
- Msila VT 2002. Teachers as managers of change. PhD thesis. Vista University, Port Elizabeth.
- Northouse PG 2004. *Leadership: theory and practice*. London: Sage.
- Retallick J & Fink D 2002. Framing leadership: Contributions and impediments to educational change. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 5:91-104.
- Richmond SL, Rollin PF & Brown JM 2004. *What makes a successful leader*. Available at <http://www.ideashape.com/documents/what-makes-a-successful-leader-report.pdf>
- Saarni C 2000. Emotional competence: A developmental perspective. In: Bar-On R & Parker JDA (eds). *The handbook of emotional intelligence*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Seitsinger RM & Zera DA 2002. The demise of parental involvement in school governance. *Journal of School Leadership*, 12:340-367.
- Senge P 1990. *The fifth discipline: the art and practice of the learning organization*. Perth: Random House.

- Sergiovanni, T.J. 1991. *The principalship: a reflective practice perspective*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Singh P 2005. Use of the collegial leadership model of emancipation to transform traditional management practices in secondary schools. *South African Journal of Education*, 25:1-18.
- Singh P & Manser P 2002. Collegiality in education: a case study. *South African Journal of Education*, 22:56-64.
- Singh P & Manser P 2006. Effects of school principals emotionally intelligent behaviours on the job satisfaction of educators in the Eastern Cape. Unpublished.
- Singh P, Mbokodi S & Msila VT 2004. Black parental involvement in education. *South African Journal of Education*, 24:301-307.
- Stein SJ & Book HE 2001. *The EQ edge: Emotional intelligence and your success*. New York: Stoddart.
- Sternberg R 1996. *Successful intelligence*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Thilo JL 2004. Emotional intelligence and leadership in the ASC. *American Association of Ambulatory Surgery Centers*. Available at http://www.aaasc.org/features/monitor2003/FEA_030903_EmotionalIntelligenceLeadership.
- Van der Westhuizen PC 1991. *Effective educational management*. Pretoria: HAUM Tertiary.
- Veugelers W & Zijlstra H 2002. What goes on in a network? Some Dutch experiences. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 5:175-186.
- Yukl G 1998. *Leadership in organisations*. Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

Prakash Singh is Professor of Education in the Research, Technology and Innovation Unit at the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University. He is widely published and his research focus is on educational leadership, fear management, and curriculum development.

Peter Manser is Principal of Alexander Road High School in Port Elizabeth. His research focus is on the emotionally intelligent behaviours of school principals, collegial leadership, and the emotional intelligence of educators.

Raj Mestry is Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Management at the University of Johannesburg, specialising in financial and human resource management. He has 30 years experience as educator and principal and serves on the national Standards Generating Body (SAQA).