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Abstract

This study explores head teachers’ use of emotional intelligence (EI) in the context of three Cypriot primary schools. EI is a controversial issue because so many different models explain it and the literature includes heated discussions regarding the impact of leaders’ EI on leadership activity. A case study approach was chosen to gain a close understanding of both head teachers’ and staff’s perceptions of EI and leadership. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with head teachers to gather detailed evidence about school leadership and emotion. Semi-structured interviews were also conducted with deputy head teachers, while teachers were asked to complete a questionnaire. The interview schedule for deputy head teachers and the questionnaire for teachers were derived from the Leadership Questionnaire developed by Pashiardis and Brauckmann (2009). Policy documents, such as those concerning the school’s goals and the allocation of responsibilities to staff, students and parents (where applicable) as well as the schools’ timetables were carefully examined. Data were collected and analysed in Greek. Once the data were gathered, themes were generated from the EI ability model which consists of four abilities (Mayer and Salovey, 1997), and their impact on teamworking and/or shared vision with staff, parents and local authorities was evaluated. Key findings from the study indicate that the head teachers who participated in the study perceived and used EI differently. Their different EI perceptions do have an impact on teamworking and shared vision. The findings also demonstrate that shared vision is accomplished through teamworking, but the strict centralised educational system in Cyprus may restrict the effect of leaders’ EI on teamworking and vision sharing. Moreover, the findings show that teachers perceive EI differently than head teachers. These findings are the first in the Cypriot context. They are not generalisable but offer useful suggestions for further research in educational leadership.
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</tr>
</tbody>
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Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Overview

This study explores head teachers’ use of emotional intelligence (EI) in the context of three Cypriot primary schools. This chapter presents the following aspects of this study: i) its purpose and design; ii) the definition of key terms; iii) its rationale; iv) information about the educational context in Cyprus; v) the aims of the present research and vi) an overview of the thesis chapters.

1.2 Research purpose and design

The purpose of this research is to evaluate if leaders’ emotional intelligence (EI) impacts on vision sharing and teamworking by exploring the perceptions of three Cypriot school head teachers and their staff. I focused on the ability model of EI (Mayer and Salovey, 1997) which has been recommended by other researchers (Kafetsios and Zampetakis, 2008; Taliadorou and Pashiardis, 2015) because it provides a narrow explanation of EI, based on only four cognitive abilities, as described in chapter 2, and excludes any personality dimensions.

The research purpose was pursued by means of two major research questions:

**RQ1**: Does the EI of a leader affect teamworking in schools?

**RQ2**: Does the EI of a leader influence shared vision?

I selected a case study approach in order to take a close look at situations and events at a given time (Opie, 2004; Stake, 2010) regarding leadership and EI. Using a case study
approach provided the opportunity to explore thoroughly any relationship between EI and leadership, as well as to identify interactions between the two factors, which large-scale studies have so far failed to do (Bell, 2005). The ‘unique features’ that case studies can reveal can provide precise explanations and an accurate understanding of a particular situation (Cohen et al., 2005, p. 184).

In order to gather data about leaders’ EI and leadership I used qualitative methods that involved:

a) conducting semi-structured interviews with head teachers and deputy head teachers;

b) collecting data from 30 teachers via questionnaires and

c) analysing school policy documents.

In chapter 3 I set out the reasons why these methods were chosen.

1.3 Defining key terms

To provide clarity it is necessary to define key terms related to this research. The main concepts investigated in this study are:

a) EI;

b) leadership;

c) teamworking and

d) shared vision.
EI is a concept that triggers a great deal of discussion as there are multiple approaches that attempt to explain it (Chang et al., 2012). Similarly, leadership is not a straightforward conceptual term to define (Bush, 2011). The development of my thinking and the decisions I made with regards to what leadership might be are explored in the literature review (chapter 2). In this section (1.3) emotional intelligence (EI), leadership, teamworking and shared vision are briefly introduced.

EI is a psychological term that describes, as Mayer and Salovey’s (1997) extensive study demonstrates, people’s ability to perceive, use, and regulate emotions in themselves and in others. EI is a mental ability separate from any personality characteristics and is presented in a four-branch ability model (Mayer and Salovey, 1997). According to Mayer and Salovey (1997) these EI abilities are: i) appraisal and recognition of emotions in self, ii) appraisal and recognition of emotions in others, iii) regulation of emotions in self, and iv) use of emotions to facilitate performance. EI is a concept evaluated in many psychological research studies but leadership research, and especially educational leadership, also assesses EI (Kafetsios and Zampetakis, 2008; Platsidou, 2010; Dellatolas, 2013; Taliadorou and Pashiardis, 2015).

Leadership, and specifically for the purpose of this study educational leadership, has a central aim which is to influence others in a purposeful way (Bush and Glover, 2003). Bush (2011) further explained that leadership has three dimensions. The first is vision, the second is values that influence vision creation, and the third is the process of influence or the communication of the vision to others. Regarding these three dimensions one understands that leadership involves a vision that is based on values and that a leader influences and communicates his/her vision to others (Bush and Glover, 2003).
‘Shared vision’ is an agreeable future state of an organisation that is shared and communicated with all its members. It is also a contested term in leadership literature (Berson et al, 2016). Do leaders have a vision, or more than one vision, and do those leaders then share their visions?

Teamworking as characterised by Day et al. (2004) is a set of interrelated cognitions, behaviours and attitudes used to achieve collective desired goals. Furthermore, Tarricone and Luca (2002) indicated among other attributes needed for effective teamwork:

- **Interdependence**, the collective feeling that brings the best of each team member.
- **Interpersonal skills**, the ability to communicate with others honestly and respectfully (Kets de Vries, 1999), creating a trustworthy and caring environment.
- **Commitment to team processes, leadership and accountability**, effective leadership distribution (Kets de Vries, 1999), through shared decision-making and problem solving, which are essential for team members to feel accountable for their contribution.

In this study teamworking is explored through the lenses of a broader context of leadership, distributed leadership, where participants are involved in decision-making (Scribner et al., 2007) and teamworking and a shared vision co-exist.

### 1.4 Research rationale

My research interest in EI and leadership stems from my postgraduate studies in educational leadership at the Open University, UK. In addition, given my experience as a teacher in Cypriot primary schools over the course of 15 years, I have realised that understanding and
managing emotions is necessary for people who daily associate with each other (Stavrou, 2017). My research interest connects with studies about emotions and leadership (George, 2000; Crawford, 2004; Crawford, 2007) but goes beyond the field of emotions. The focus is on EI because understanding and managing emotions may have an impact on leadership.

Leadership has existed since the first interactions of humankind (Nienaber, 2010). Its central aim is to influence others (Bush and Glover, 2003) and therefore involves a relationship process (Rodd, 2005). Emotions are considered to be the “language of relationships” (Crawford, 2007, p. 88) and to be related to leadership. Leaders are emotional beings and their feelings are connected with their leadership (Goleman, 1998; Beatty, 2002). In addition, organisations can also be described as arenas where emotions are in conflict (Fineman, 2000); thus emotions are tied in with the life of organisations and are vital components of leadership (George, 2000; Crawford, 2007).

However, Crawford (2007) argued that people have to act out, or play, a particular role when they hold leadership positions. Therefore, leaders often hide or suppress their own feelings in order to achieve organisational aims. Moreover, George (2000) suggested that emotions are connected to decision making, choice making and having options, while intense emotions may lead to irrational decisions: those made ‘in the heat of the moment’. Consequently, emotion regulation is an important ability for leaders to have and may be used for decision making and building a vision. Emotions thus have an important role in leadership, but it seems to me that emotional abilities, which the term EI suggests, such as emotional awareness and regulation are especially significant in leadership.

In this study, leaders’ EI was of interest because EI explains how emotions are perceived, used and regulated. Head teachers’ and staff’s perceptions about EI offered information about
leadership from different perspectives, especially about teamworking and vision sharing. Also leaders’ EI needed further exploration in research, as there is little existing empirical research that focuses on this issue, especially in the Cypriot educational context (Taliadorou and Pashiardis, 2015; Stavrou, 2017).

Antonakis (2004) criticised EI research that is based only on self-reported tests, a point which this researcher considered and which resulted in the gathering of data from different sources; so providing evidence and allowing for triangulation (Antonakis et al., 2009). However, I was aware that these individual respondents might also have potentially divergent interpretations of the questions I asked them. Therefore, instead of measuring EI and providing numerical data of research participants’ EI scores, as other researchers have done (Kafetsios and Zampetakis, 2008; Taliadorou and Pashiardis, 2015), my research aimed to provide insights of research participants’ perceptions and behaviours of EI in order to evaluate its impact on leadership: especially teamworking and shared vision. The findings are a comprehensive source of information about EI and leadership as explored through the perspectives of head teachers and their staff. The study is based on sources other than self-reported tests and therefore data triangulation has been made possible.

1.5 The Cypriot educational context

As this research was conducted in Cyprus, it is essential to refer to this case study’s context, the Cypriot educational system, in order to understand the research more fully. In this section a summary of the main aspects of this educational system is provided and more details are given in appendix 1.
The Cypriot educational system is characterised as highly conservative, centralised and state-controlled (Kyriakides and Campbell, 2003; Pashiardis, 2004; Kambouri, 2012). Each school has to follow the regulations of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports and Youth (MOEC), which is responsible for implementing laws and legislation. Moreover MOEC prescribes the curricula, syllabi and textbooks that schools are required to use, as well as setting the nation’s educational policies. However, each school has the right to adjust these to facilitate and meet its own aims and policies and to take into account the specific needs of its local communities and/or students.

Inspectors appointed by the MOEC monitor schools in five separate districts of the country (Pashiardis et al., 2012). A chief inspector is assigned to each district and is responsible for all inspectors and schools in that area. The inspectorate’s duties are to monitor, consult and evaluate the schools’ staff (Kyriakides and Campbell, 2003); educational laws prescribe when and how often staff are evaluated (House of Parliament, 1976). Also, inspectors frequently communicate with head teachers and are informed of any problems or issues arising in a school.

The Cypriot education system is hierarchical. Teachers must report to head teachers; head teachers are obliged to inform inspectors; after discussions with the chief inspector, inspectors subsequently contact the MOEC. This procedure is followed for such simple issues as leave for staff, whether one day or longer, as well as for more complicated matters such as school events, problems or accidents. These procedures involve a lot of bureaucratic processes and therefore, as in many small countries, keep a lot of people ‘in work’.

For the professional development of staff, the Cyprus Pedagogical Institute (CPI) is the only official department (Eurydice, 2018). This is a government department and thus no payment
by participants is needed. It organises seminars and short training programmes at its own premises or in schools for the professional development of staff (Pashiardis et al., 2011). The seminars organised in schools are the results of head teachers’ requests. Some seminars organised in the CPI’s premises are obligatory: a group of teachers selected by the MOEC, because of their teaching subjects, is obliged to participate if or when summoned to attend. However, other sessions are voluntary and educators sign up according to their preferences. Training offered by the CPI is usually of a short duration and rarely lasts more than three working days; a point worth noting as no supply teachers are sent to schools when teachers undergo CPI training. In order for teachers to attend such a programme they need to be nominated by their respective head teachers. The CPI also offers optional seminars which can be attended by any teacher in his/her free time.

Free compulsory training in the first year of their promotion is offered by the CPI to newly-promoted head teachers. This training is held in the CPI buildings and involves weekly meetings. During these meetings it is mainly administrative issues that are discussed (CPI, 2019).

Except for these seminars, schools do not have any other funds given from MOEC for organising seminars, conferences, workshops or any other learning opportunities for staff. Since 2004, the year Cyprus joined the European Union, some funds for professional development are given only from European programmes (Kambouri, 2012; Eurydice, 2018).

One of the CPI’s departments is the Cypriot Educational Research and Evaluation (CERE) unit that is responsible for any research that occurs in Cypriot schools. Any researchers who want to conduct research in Cypriot schools have to apply to CERE for permission to do so. CERE examines the ethical considerations of the research, its originality and its contribution
to the educational system. If the research satisfies all three criteria, CERE gives its consent for research to be conducted with the condition that findings will be shared with CERE to inform educational change in Cyprus.

Another government department associated with the MOEC is the Educational Service Commission (ESC), which consists of five members who are appointed by the President of the Cypriot Republic to serve for six years (Kyriakides and Campbell, 2003). The ESC is responsible for the appointment, promotion and transfer of school staff and for the school inspectorate (Karagiorgi and Nicolaidou, 2009). The commission requires teachers and head teachers to change schools frequently due to educational needs so all schools have almost equal numbers of staff, in order to have equitable staff-pupil ratios. True to the top-down hierarchical format head teachers are not consulted about staff transfers (Pashiardis et al., 2011) and in all Cypriot schools staff changes occur every year. The relevant legislation states that head teachers should apply for a transfer if they have stayed in the same school for more than six years, but this does not occur often as teachers often move, or are required to move, after completing between two and five years of service in a particular school.

Teachers in Cyprus have tenure; once they are appointed their contracts are not terminated unless a serious legal or grave disciplinary infringement has occurred. They can be promoted to deputy head teacher according to seniority in the education service; deputy head teachers in Cypriot schools are therefore perceived as head teachers in waiting. Professional qualifications and excellence in service are only considered when the seniority of candidates is on the same level. The same criteria are used for all promotions and hierarchical principles are always followed. Teachers who have shown extraordinary service and have higher degrees and qualifications cannot be promoted to head teacher or inspector ahead of longer-
serving colleagues because of that hierarchical system (Kyriakides and Campbell, 2003). Almost all teachers participating in the research were aware that they will not get promoted during their career as there have been few promotional opportunities in the last decade and this unmotivating situation appears likely to continue. This lack of opportunities is due to: a) the reductions of funds in education because of the economic crisis that the government had to deal with in 2013 and b) the increase in the age of a teacher’s retirement from 58 to 63 years. Currently, there is a discussion in Cyprus between the MOEC and the teachers’ associations about making educational changes, which include improvements in staff evaluation and promotion systems.

Because of the centralised system, head teachers’ responsibilities are characterised as administrative (Pashiardis et al., 2001), according to the educational law of Cyprus. Head teachers are expected to guide deputy head teachers and to distribute responsibilities throughout the school staff; they also supervise teaching and promote teachers’ professional development. In collaboration with the inspectorate they write the ‘end of year’ report for staff members that have been assessed by the inspectorate. In addition, head teachers maintain healthy relationships with the church, community, local authorities and parents’ associations. Furthermore, the head will also have teaching duties in their school, a load that depends on the size of the school’s population. All the head teachers participating in my research have approximately ten hours of teaching every week.

Furthermore, the local community is responsible for sharing funds which are allocated to the school each year by the government according to need (Eurydice, 2018). Head teachers are not asked about these funds and only the local community manages the allocation of annual funds allocated to each school from MOEC for their needs in maintenance of the school
building and stationery. Also, parents’ associations can and do help schools financially. The head teachers’ lack of power, in contrast to the power of the MOEC over schools, creates both tension and frustration in the head teachers’ attempts to exercise of leadership in their schools (Pashiardis, 2004).

1.6 The participant schools

In my research there were three participant primary schools that had similar staff and student populations but were located in different areas: a) a town centre, b) an urban area and c) a rural village school. All participant head teachers were experienced in their specific positions and they had been placed in their particular school for at least two years, as indicated in table 1.1 below.

Table 1.1 The participant schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonyms of participant schools</th>
<th>School head teachers’ pseudonyms</th>
<th>Years been head teachers in the specific school</th>
<th>Schools’ locations</th>
<th>Students’ Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronus school</td>
<td>Leto</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>City centre</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poseidon school</td>
<td>Daphne</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Urban school</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeus school</td>
<td>Apollo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rural village</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this study there were two female head teachers and one male head teacher. Daphne was the most experienced head teacher; she reported that she had been five years in her current post and had an MA in Educational Leadership. Moreover, Apollo and Leto had similar experience in headships but only Apollo held an MA in Educational Leadership.
Furthermore, Daphne and Leto noted that the biggest challenge in their school was dealing with the multilingualism and multicultural backgrounds of the students, as both their schools contained large percentages of students from different countries (see appendix 1). These schools were located in the city centre or in the area next to the city.

Apollo, however, was the head teacher of a school situated in a village. Regarding its population his school was the smallest of the three in this study, with the students all being located in areas next to the school. Despite its low population, this school still had two deputy head teachers allocated to it.

These schools may not be representative of all fifty schools located in the same district. If this study had the time and resources to extent the number of research participant schools, more experienced and well educated head teachers and staff might have participated to enlighten more the influence of leaders’ EI into leadership and especially teamworking and shared vision. Nevertheless the three participant schools did enable me, the researcher, to collect rich data about leadership and EI.

The previous sections gave a summary of the Cypriot educational context and the participant schools. More detail information about education in Cyprus can be found in appendix 1.

1.7 Research aims

This research aimed to explore whether leaders’ EI impacts on teamworking and shared vision in a highly centralised educational system, such as that existing in Cyprus. Leaders’ EI was evaluated according to the perceptions of three head teachers and their staff. This is the first study in Cyprus to explore head teachers’, deputy head teachers’ and teachers’ perceptions about EI and leadership using a case study approach.
Specifically, detailed data were also provided about teamworking and vision sharing in this strictly centralised educational system. The small number of case studies, comprising of three schools, cannot provide generalisations, but they do provide useful recommendations for further research in the Cypriot educational system and worldwide. Also, detailed information was also provided about shared vision creation and implementation.

Furthermore, findings may advise and inform theory and practice in education. At the moment these findings may inform the ongoing discussion about possible changes in the Cypriot educational system. This study’s findings may also influence future training programmes for head teachers and newly promoted head teachers that will focus on emotional understanding, regulation and usage in addition to administrative matters.

1.8 Overview of chapters

The following chapters provide an insight into my research journey as a doctoral student interested in exploring whether leaders’ EI impacts on teamworking and shared vision. In these chapters, I discuss theoretical approaches that influenced my decisions and shaped this study.

Chapter 2 presents a review of the literature relevant to leadership and EI. Specifically, the topics of: a) leadership, b) shared vision, c) teamworking, d) EI and e) the impact of leaders’ EI on teamworking and shared vision are discussed.

Chapter 3 justifies the approach and methods selected for this research. It outlines the rationale of the methodology used and shows the value of a case study approach for conducting this particular research initiative. Ethical issues, as well as the reflections of the pilot study conducted during the first year of my studies, are explored.
Chapters 4 and 5 demonstrate the findings of the research while discussing and applying them to the literature. The decision to split the findings into two chapters was taken in order to separately explore the impact of leaders’ EI on ‘teamworking’ separately from their impact on ‘shared vision’, as these two terms are treated independently of one another in the literature. Chapter 4 addresses the first research question and presents the perceptions of head teachers and staff regarding the impact of leaders’ EI on teamworking. Chapter 5 focuses on the second research question and evaluates the impact of leaders’ EI on vision sharing as expressed through the perceptions of the research participants.

Finally, the thesis ends with chapter 6, the conclusions and recommendations, which presents this study’s findings regarding the impact of leaders’ EI on teamworking and shared vision in the three selected schools in Cyprus. Furthermore, the contributions of this research are highlighted and suggestions for further research are discussed.
Chapter 2 Literature review

2.1 Introduction

The five main aspects of literature pertinent to this study are: i) leadership, ii) distributed leadership, iii) shared vision, iv) emotional intelligence (EI) and v) the impact of leaders’ EI on leadership and specifically on shared vision and on teamworking.

There were many potential areas of literature to explore. These included the elements chosen, but there were other possibilities, such as role-theory (Solomon et al., 1985) and conceptualisation of emotions (Smith and Lazarus, 1990). However, the literature review did not explore these aspects as the research focus (see section 1.2) was to explore the leadership activity in Cyprus through the lens of EI. A literature review has to be focused on research purpose and questions; any potential sources should be sufficiently specific to the topic (Creswell, 2009). Another consideration when conducting a literature review is the time space available for a researcher to conduct it (Bell, 2005). All the above-mentioned aspects influence my decision to choose to focus on the five main aspects of literature presented earlier. My decisions enabled me to explore fully the research questions outlined in section 1.2 of chapter 1.

Creswell (2009) suggested taking some essential steps when a researcher conducts a literature review. The first step is to identifying key words for your search. In this study the key words emerged from the research questions and were as follows: leadership, shared vision, teamwork and emotional intelligence (EI). Having these words in mind, I searched the OU library including its databases of online education journals. Also, I created a search alert in Google Scholar and Zetoc. I chose to read first the most recent reviewed articles and books,
while taking notes consistently (Bell, 2005) and creating a literature map, which enabled me to visualise my study (Creswell, 2009). The mind map, as well as the initial reading of literature, enabled me to follow up the references from those sources to find more. Thereafter, the literature review was continually updated throughout my years of study, and especially after data collection.

2.2 Leadership

In the literature there are numerous definitions of leadership (Bush and Glover, 2003; Bush, 2011) because as Yukl (2010) suggested, the concept of leadership is defined according to personal beliefs. It is therefore not easy to offer a universally acceptable definition of leadership.

Some definitions emphasise the charismatic nature of leadership, which is used to describe the gifted one, the extraordinary individual who can communicate their vision to others because (s)he is an excellent public speaker, takes personal risks and has unconventional behaviour in order to succeed in his/her purpose (Levay, 2010; Conger, 2012; Vlachos et al., 2013). In contrast, others emphasise motivation as a key component of leadership, necessary to engage followers in the working process and align them with the direction of that leader (Bryant, 1998; MacBeath, 1999; Sergiovanni, 2000). Then, Brauckman and Pashiardis (2010) introduce a common leadership framework, the holistic model, which consists of five leadership styles; each one describes a leader’s behaviour and practice in order to influence others.

As my research evaluates the impact of leaders’ EI on their leadership activities and performance, I explore leadership from an emotional rather than logical perspective where
values, motives and emotions are pre-requisites. Bush (2011) defines three main characteristics of leadership, as already mentioned in section 1.3. First leadership is a process of influence; second leadership has values; and finally leadership has vision. I chose to use Bush (2011) because his definition stresses three dimensions which fit with my research interest in vision. Therefore, in the context of this study I define leadership as ‘a process of influence’. Specifically, I use Bush and Glover (2003, p. 8) who demonstrate a working definition of leadership within an education context:

- Leadership is a process of influence leading to the achievement of desired purposes.
- Successful leaders develop a vision for their schools based on their personal and professional values.
- They articulate this vision at every opportunity and influence their staff and other stakeholders to share the vision.
- The philosophy, structures and activities of the school are geared towards the achievement of this shared vision.

According to the definition above leadership involves influencing others in ways which lead to desired achievements and changes. Leaders should act as role models and sources of inspiration for others (Potter et al., 2018). Also Bush (2011) explains leadership as a process of influence to achieve desired purposes. This influence may be exercised by groups as well as by individuals. Yukl (2010) further postulates that leadership is considered to be the result of an influential role of a certain person or a group of individuals to maintain an organisation’s aims. Leaders influence individuals or teams to achieve set targets (Leithwood and Riehl, 2003) without employing or reverting to any force, coercion or manipulation. Leaders manage to achieve objectives through active participation of subordinates who are inspired by their leaders’ passion, vision and direction (Fry, 2003). A successful leader influences, inspires and motivates others to share his or her vision.
A leader should use a variety of ways to influence and motivate followers to succeed in meeting set goals. Motivation is an important aspect in leadership and is also connected to the concept of EI, especially a person’s ability to use emotions (see section 2.3.3) that this research explores. I agree with Riley and MacBeath (1999), who assert that good leaders are those who can maximise the several leadership abilities of others with motivation and inspiration. Sergiovanni (2000) also agrees and further suggests that leadership should create an environment in which people are motivated to produce and become involved in leadership activity. Motivation is a key factor for effective leadership because it strengthens the performance of staff (Porter et al., 2003), so it is important for a leader to provide both extrinsic and intrinsic motivation to their staff.

Extrinsic, collectively offered motivation involves rewards; it is focused on approval from others and it relates to relationships with colleagues and feelings of being valued by ‘significant others’ (Ryan and Deci, 2000). In educational leadership ‘significant others’ are usually other staff members, parents, head teachers and local authorities (Pashiardis et al., 2004). Alternatively, intrinsic individually offered motivation could include the joy of participation, trust and feelings of personal worth and value. Intrinsic motivation involves feelings of enjoyment and challenge to do something (Ryan and Deci, 2000). Intrinsic motivation is more important than extrinsic because it is activated from birth without the need of any rewards or approval from others (Ryan and Deci, 2000; Steers and Porter, 2003).

It can be assumed that motivation is an essential element of this influential role of leaders. Furthermore, values are also an important component in leadership because, as Bush (2011) argues, leaders’ actions are based on their personal and professional values. Fink (2005) adds
that leadership is a personal activity and emphasises that “leadership reflects ‘who’ you are, ‘what’ you are, and ‘where’ you are in space and time” (p. xiv). Leaders:

“have moved beyond a narrow rational, managerial view of their role to a more holistic, value-led approach guided by personal experience and professional preferences” (Day et al, 2000, p.176).

Leaders’ personal and professional values are also important aspects of leadership. Values usually form what is right or proper practice because leaders' values and beliefs influence the way they exercise their leadership. Values not only shape leadership activities but they are also components of an organisation’s vision.

In addition, this study is aligned with Day et al. (2000), who emphasised that effective leaders are reflective, caring and highly principled people who give emphasis to the human dimension and who esteem personal values. Examples of these values can be honesty, justice, or modesty and they are prioritised according to a leader’s personality. James and Connolly (2000) also indicated honesty and justice are among the characteristics of admired leaders. Additionally, Glatter and Kydd (2003) emphasised that among the best practices in leadership are: a) promotion of truth, b) modesty and c) fairness; all being qualities that can turn an organisation from good to great. Moreover, Potter et al. (2018) agree that leaders should be supportive and create relationships based on trust, honesty and openness among staff in order to maximise performance and progress towards project goals. Similarly, Thomas et al. (2019) add that when people feel that they work in a democratic, fair environment where they can trust others they tend to work harder. Likewise, it is essential for leaders to value human interaction above all and give great significance to relationships. The better those relationships are, the higher is the degree of leadership success that will be achieved. The
quality of leadership activity can be affected by the emotions and values that a leader reflects and models to his or her staff.

\[2.2.1 \textit{Distributed leadership}\]

Leadership, as extensively discussed previously, is a process of influence; leaders have vision and communicate their vision to all stakeholders. Leadership is not always one person’s activity but it may be “an emergent property of a group or network of interacting individuals” (Bennett et al., 2003, p. 7). The impact of leaders’ EI on teamworking is another concept that this research seeks to evaluate. Therefore, it is important to consider a broader approach to leadership: distributed leadership.

Moreover, caution is required in order to avoid simplifying the term to mean teamworking, shared leadership or collaborative leadership (Harris and Spillane, 2008; Parker, 2015). Instead, teamworking is considered as part of a broader movement towards a higher degree of involvement and autonomy of participants in organisational decision-making (Sinclair, 1992; Procter and Benders, 2014). In addition, distributed leadership needs caution when aspects of power, such as the power that a person owns in an organisation, are involved. This power might also have an impact on teamworking and shared vision. Studies that explored distributed leadership showed little evidence concerning power issues (Crawford, 2012). Bolden’s (2011) review of UK and US distributed leadership literature emphasised inconsistencies about the issues of power and influence, especially in the school contexts that this study explores. However, if power is dispersed and democratic procedures are followed, power does not constitute a problem for distributed leadership (Bolden, 2011). Leadership as a social and relational process with values and emotional components can be fluid and emergent and not fixed, opening the boundaries of leadership where expertise in organisation
can work together with a higher degree of autonomy (Crawford, 2012). For this reason, I chose to explore teamworking through distributed leadership, even though this study was conducted in a strictly centralised education system, which appears to limit the power of head teachers. Head teachers worldwide may still hold this kind of power in a school (Crawford, 2012) and especially head teachers in Cyprus, as explained in section 1.5, as an ideal approach to leadership, where teamworking and shared vision can coexist.

Moreover fear is another aspect which requires consideration when exploring distributed leadership, because leaders and followers may both be inhibited from taking action if they are fearful of possible consequences. Edmondson (2018) evaluated the degree to which fear influences teamwork, creativity and innovation. According, to her a workplace without fear is one where employees feel that their opinion counts. In the Cypriot highly centralised system, Pashiardis (2004) asserted that it is time for head teachers to follow a courageous and more democratic leadership activity, to give emphasis on emotions and feelings and delegate responsibilities to teachers, students, parents and local authorities.

Distributed leadership expands beyond a restrictive idea of a leader since leadership is exercised by interacting individuals and not just by a single person. It is a broader leadership model and a product of conjoined activity (Bennett et al., 2003). Spillane et al. (2004) also argued that leadership activity is not an individual privilege and can be best understood as a shared responsibility taken by leaders, staff and other contexts. Further, Spillane (2005) explained that “leadership is an organisational quality, rather than an individual attribute” (p. 144).

In addition, the extensive literature review by Leithwood and Riehl (2003) demonstrated that exercising leadership as a set of functions that can be performed by many people is one of the
characteristics of successful leaders. Varieties of expertise, individuals or groups can take part and contribute to leadership activities (Gronn, 2002). Individuals with different skills work together in a state of productive and problem-solving collaboration; the individuals’ combined skills and perspectives can produce more than their independent contributions (Bennett et al., 2003). Consequently, it could be argued that distributed leadership is exploiting individuals’ capacities as well as maximising the strength of leadership activity.

In education, leadership practice is shared out across a school’s framework (Gronn, 2002). Teachers, students, parents and local authorities should, and mostly do, cooperate to facilitate a school’s welfare (Bennett et al., 2003). Additionally, Bolam et al. (2005) stated that leaders need to develop new roles and responsibilities within a school through the use of distributed leadership. Some of these new actions might be: a) distributing responsibilities according to individuals’ interests and capabilities, b) organising meetings for collaboration, c) giving time to individuals for professional development and d) many other shared decision making processes. Therefore, a shared mission and vision and a shared sense of responsibility are important because they help to ensure shared ownership of organisational goals, processes and practices among all of an organisation’s stakeholders. Head teachers are the mediators of this cooperation and should create conditions whereby teachers have time available for collaborating and sharing knowledge, with each other with the goal of reducing teacher isolation.

Furthermore, according to Somech (2005), among the potential benefits of distributed leadership is its contribution to the quality of teachers' work lives through the creation of increased motivation and job satisfaction. Lumby (2013) also agrees and adds that distributed leadership increases teachers’ satisfaction, frequently resulting in teachers voluntarily taking
on increased workloads. Likewise, Diamond and Spillane (2016) argued that activities through distributed leadership influence an organisation’s members’ motivation as well as highlighting the prevalence of co-performance.

Values are also an important component of distributed leadership, as is trust which is acknowledged as a prerequisite for effective distributed leadership, since collaboration cannot succeed without it. Reeves (2006) explained this point by adding that distributed leadership not only relies on trust, but also depends on the knowledge that no leader can lead an organisation on their own. Trust is necessary for team members to cooperate with others and develop networks. A person cannot share ideas, take part in responsibilities and cooperate with others if she or he does not feel trusted.

Justice is another core value in distributed leadership. As Woods and Roberts (2016) asserted, justice is important for encouraging participation which enables anyone to suggest innovations and discuss them with others; it is a value that is associated with respect. If someone respects and trusts others and perceives that everyone has ideas that might be worthy of consideration, then equal opportunities are to be had (Woods and Roberts, 2016). Values such as trust, respect and justice are components of distributed leadership, but they are also components of leadership in general, as explained in section 2.2.

To conclude, distributed leadership defines leadership as not being an individual privilege. It represents an important shift in leadership perspective by recognising that leaders are not unique sources of change and vision. Furthermore, they do not necessarily act as simple figures coaxing, persuading, inspiring or directing followers towards organisational success (Woods et al., 2004).
2.2.2 Shared vision

Vision is a very important characteristic of leadership (Bush, 2011), but emotions and values can also be essential components of an organisation’s vision. This study also explores the impact of leaders’ EI on vision sharing. The idea of vision, and especially shared vision, is explored in the following section.

Vision is a substantial component of leadership because it sets the goals and aims of an organisation. Leaders must have a vision that leads to change (Bush and Glover, 2003). There are different views about the formation of a vision and how it can be shared with others. Therefore, it is critical to consider what shared vision is because it relates to this study’s research questions.

Rogers and Reynolds (2003, p. 71) proposed that “vision is a picture of results you want to create, an ideal sense of what is possible, a statement of destination”. Moreover, vision is not only an ideal image of a future state of an organisation or state of affairs but it can merge planning and goal setting (Pearce and Ensley, 2004). This thinking explains that vision is an essential component of effective leadership because it sets a direction and focus. However, it should be noted that the formation of a vision can be challenging since there are different views about who should form or contribute to it.

Vision might be formed by leaders and be articulated to other participants in an organisation, or it might be shaped by leaders and their staff working together in collaboration. Berson et al. (2016) argued that vision is formed by leaders and followers together and emphasised that vision building is a shared process in which followers can play an active role. The collective creation of vision is a process that needs time but one that can be beneficial because, if

39
individuals have an active role in problem-solving, then strong team relationships can be built (Rogers and Reynolds, 2003).

Alternatively, Leithwood and Riehl (2003) suggested direction-setting as a characteristic of successful leaders. Leadership not only has a vision and inspires change but effective leaders also promote commitment and collaboration and have excellent communication skills (Moyles, 2006; Kouzes and Posner, 2012). However, vision should be embraced by all participants of an organisation, regardless of the way it is formed, in order to facilitate an organisation’s progress.

This view about participants’ embracement of vision agrees with Huffman’s (2003) argument that having a vision and imposing it on staff does not necessarily attract energy and commitment to that idea. However, Leithwood et al. (2008) emphasised that when successful leaders develop a vision they make sure it is communicated to all stakeholders of an organisation. In educational leadership these stakeholders are teachers, students, parents, local communities and local authorities (Pashiardis et al., 2004). The role of “a school principal is like an ‘orchestrator’, who involves staff in processes of participatory decision making” (Pashiardis, 1993, p. 10). Likewise in an orchestra, each instrument has its part to play, similarly in a school context, each stakeholder knows her/his importance and responsibility in a vision and a school’s head teacher is the person who creates and motivates all participants until the vision is implemented.

The impact of leaders’ EI on vision sharing is the focus of one of the research questions. For this study’s purposes, I adopted the definition of shared vision from Berson et al. (2016, p. 175) which fitted my research interest in the issue of shared vision.
“Shared vision:
(a) provides an agreed-upon image or understanding of a collective’s future-oriented direction that is ambitious but acceptable on the part of followers; and
(b) implies wide-spread emotional commitment and enthusiasm for carrying it out.”

Bearing in mind the significance of stakeholders’ participation in creating or implementing shared vision, as well as the importance of teamworking, I will now discuss emotional intelligence (EI) as the second main concept in this research.

2.3 Emotional intelligence

EI is a contested term because of the multiple theories that address and attempt to explain it. Also, there are multiple discussions in leadership and human resources literature (Brinia et al., 2014) regarding EI’s impact on leadership. The following sections of this literature review discuss the theories of EI and debate whether leaders’ EI exerts any impact on vision sharing and teamworking; a research question which this study explores.

EI was conceptualised when the term of intelligence evolved in a broader array of mental abilities (Brackett et al, 2011) thereby leaving the narrow confines of cognition. Thorndike (1920) first introduces the term social intelligence defining it as the ability to communicate with others and perform in social relationships. Sixty years later, emotions and intelligence were for the first time linked and established in Gardner’s (1983) multiple intelligence theory. In his theory Gardner (1983) identifies both ‘interpersonal intelligence’ and ‘intrapersonal intelligence’ (p.6). Gardner (1983) claims that ‘interpersonal intelligence’ characterises people who are good at understanding and interacting with others; whereas
individuals who understand their own emotions and motivations are endowed with ‘intrapersonal intelligence’.

Since Gardner’s (1983) multiple intelligence theory, EI has been transformed into a controversial issue because there are three major theories attempting to explain the concept:

i) first is the ability model of EI that explains it as a set of abilities (Salovey and Mayer, 1990);

ii) second is the emotional-social intelligent model, which explores EI as a competence connected with personality (Bar-On, 1997);

iii) third is the mixed model (Goleman et al., 2001).

A more recent model, trait EI (Petrides and Furnham, 2001), was identified by Cherniss (2010). Trait EI was recommended as a second generation model (Cherniss, 2010) but as Petrides and Furnham (2001) and Petrides et al. (2007) claimed trait EI theory derived from content analysis of existing EI models and did not provide a completely novel approach to EI. This reasoning justifies that only the three major EI models (Salovey and Mayer, 1990; Bar-On, 1997; Goleman et al., 2001) should be further explained below. Furthermore, Goleman (2001a) argues that all EI models share a basic core of concepts informed by the idea that EI is a person’s ability to recognise and regulate emotions in self and others.

2.3.1 The emotional-social intelligence

Bar-On (1997a) conceptualises EI as a set of personality traits because EI is thought of as a function of personality. He describes EI as ‘emotional-social intelligence’ (ESI) and further
develops Gardner’s (1983) theory about interpersonal and intrapersonal competencies (Bar-On, 2005). Bar-On (2005, p.3) explains ESI 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 with them, and cope with daily demands”

Bar-On (2006) further develops ESI and adds three more competences: i) a person’s ability to adapt to change, ii) a person’s ability to solve problems and iii) a person’s ability to cope efficiently with daily demands (see below Figure2-1).

However, ESI not only combines emotional-social competencies, it also includes personality competencies as it emphasises psychological well-being (Stellmach, 2018), a fact that differentiates it from any other model of EI. Moreover, this model is criticised because Bar-On (2006) emphasised that ESI impacts on school, workplace and clinical setting, as well as maintaining that ESI can be taught and learnt so its impact on self-actualisation and wellbeing can be improved.

Bar-On (1997b) measured ESI intelligence using the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i). The EQ-I is a self-reported test, based on five behavioural competencies: i) interpersonal skills, ii) intrapersonal skills, iii) adaptability, iv) stress management and v) general mood, which are further explored in fifteen subscales as described in Figure 2-1 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ-i scales</th>
<th>The EI competencies and skills assessed by each subscale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrapersonal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) self-awareness and</td>
<td>Self-Regard <em>To accurately perceive, understand and accept oneself.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) self-expression:</td>
<td>Emotional Self-Awareness <em>To be aware of and understand one’s emotions.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assertiveness <em>To effectively and constructively express one’s emotions and oneself.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independence <em>To be self-reliant and free of emotional dependency on others.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Actualization <em>To strive to achieve personal goals and actualize one’s potential.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) social awareness and</td>
<td>Empathy <em>To be aware of and understand how others feel.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) interpersonal relationship:</td>
<td>Social Responsibility <em>To identify with one’s social group and cooperate with others.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal Relationship <em>To establish mutually satisfying relationships and relate well with others.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stress Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(emotional management and regulation)</td>
<td>Stress Tolerance <em>To effectively and constructively manage emotions.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impulse Control <em>To effectively and constructively control emotions.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adaptability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(change management)</td>
<td>Reality-Testing <em>To objectively validate one’s feelings and thinking with external reality.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility <em>To adapt and adjust one’s feelings and thinking to new situations.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem-Solving <em>To effectively solve problems of a personal and interpersonal nature.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Mood</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(self-motivation)</td>
<td>Optimism <em>To be positive and look at the brighter side of life.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Happiness <em>To feel content with oneself, others and life in general</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bar-On’s ESI model has been adopted by many researchers, with proponents of this approach asking people to judge and report how good they are at perceiving others’ emotions (Brackett et al., 2011). Although self-reported tests may be desirable to use in research, because they cost less and are easy to administer, they are also problematic because respondents may provide socially acceptable answers rather than honest and truthful answers (Brackett et al., 2011).

2.3.2 The mixed model of EI

Goleman (2001b) also connects EI with personality and social competence but in addition considers that EI involves cognitive skills. According to him EI determines an individual’s potential for learning competencies based on four elements: i) self-awareness, ii) self-management, iii) social awareness and iv) relationship management. These elements are used at appropriate times and in appropriate ways in order to be effective (Boyatzis et al., 1999). Also, these skills are related to job performance and are considered essential strengths that individuals must be taught (Goleman, 2001b).

Goleman’s (2001b) argument that EI should be measured by the Emotional Competence Inventory has also been criticised (Boyatzis et al., 2000). The main critical concern is that this kind of measurement is self-reported; as with the ESI respondents are asked to rate statements about their EI related behaviour. These self-reported tests are problematic because as discussed in section 2.3.1 above, respondents may offer socially acceptable responses that do not necessarily represent the truth.

Furthermore, critical opponents of this EI mixed model suggest that Goleman (1998; 2001a; 2001b) and Goleman et al. (2001) represent EI as a theory of performance, which is related to
job success, as well as a substantial component of successful leadership. Their justification rests on Goleman’s (1998) claims that leaders should develop three abilities: a) cognitive skills, b) technical skills and c) EI, which will facilitate the ability to work with others and effectively lead to change. EI is considered to have direct applicability to the work domain and organisational effectiveness, as well as predicting excellence in performance of all kinds, from sales to leadership.

In addition, Goleman’s (2000) illustrated the impact of EI upon six different leadership styles, inspired by McClelland’s (1961) extensive work on sociology and economics. Each springs from the leaders’ EI levels, as presented in Figure 2-2 below, but is also criticised because the concepts are not based on empirical evidence (Antonakis, 2004; Mayer et al., 2004). In addition, critical argument concerns Goleman’s (2001a) claims that EI and IQ are interrelated. However, it is reasonable to suggest that in some circumstances EI may matter more than IQ, especially when significant workplace decisions must be taken.

To conclude, the mixed model developed by Goleman (1998, 2000) is considered to have certain weaknesses because it measures EI on self-reported tests and includes personality aspects (Antonakis, 2004). Furthermore, some of the claims about the significance of EI made by Goleman (1998) have not been supported by empirical evidence (Mayer et al., 2004).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership styles</th>
<th>Levels of EI used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coercive</td>
<td>Demands obedience to the leader. People’s feelings are suppressed, and they are obliged to follow the rules and structures. Extrinsic motivation is used for the most qualified staff. Despite its disadvantages in climate cultivation and organizational commitment, it is proven to be very beneficial in crisis situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>Mobilises people towards the organisation’s vision. The leader emphasises the importance of the staff to organisational vision. It maximises the staff commitment to organisational goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliative</td>
<td>Creates harmony and builds in emotional bonds. People are valued. It is characterised with trustworthiness and flexibility to schedule. The staff get a positive feedback for a well-done job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Promotes participation. Decisions are made collectively and there is a shared goal. People take up their responsibilities. A democratic leader listens to employees, is concerned about them and keeps the morale high.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace-setting</td>
<td>Sets standards of performance. The leader seeks to task fulfilment with excellent and in timing. Usually the staff feel overwhelmed and frustrated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>Maximizes people’s talents and gifts. The leader acts more like a counsellor. The staff set long term development goals and the leader helps them with the needed process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.3 The EI ability model

The EI ability model was first introduced by Salovey and Mayer (1990), to be updated by Mayer and Salovey (1997) to present a four-branch ability model. These abilities are mental abilities and are separated from the variables of personality or learning competence (Mayer et al., 2016). The definition of EI offered by Mayer and Salovey (1997, p. 10) in the form of four cognitive abilities, is set out below together with acronyms:

1. Appraisal and recognition of emotion in others (others’ emotional appraisal: OEA).
2. Use of emotion to facilitate performance (use of emotion: UOE).

This four-branch model is hierarchical in structure (Brackett et al., 2011). The first level shows a person’s ability to understand others’ emotions. The second ability reveals a person’s ability to use emotions to facilitate performance. The third ability acknowledges the ability of a person to understand and express emotions. Lastly, the fourth ability demonstrates the ability of a person to manage their own emotions (Mayer et al., 2016).

In this model, EI is conceptualised in two areas: i) experiential and ii) strategic, as presented in figure 2.3 below (Mayer et al., 2004; Fiori and Vesely-Maillefer, 2017). Each area involves two branches out of the four that make up the EI ability model. The ‘experiential’ area concerns the EI abilities related to perceiving emotions in others and using emotions; abilities that involve the rapid processing of emotions. The ‘strategic’ area concerns the abilities related to understanding emotions in self and managing those emotions; abilities that involve higher order cognitive processes. In addition, both areas are used in sequence before progression to the next area (Mayer et al. 2004), as Figure 2-3 below shows.
The first area of EI is experiential, consisting of a person’s ability to perceive or appraise others’ emotions (OEA). This ability concerns an individual’s capacity to perceive and understand the emotions experienced by other people. As Mayer and Salovey (1997) claimed, this ability enables someone to understand non-verbal feelings and body-language, as well as to promote and express empathy. The more responsive someone is to other people’s feelings, the better choices she or he makes about appropriate reactions to other people’s feelings. This ability, this non-verbal perception of emotions is important because it promotes better cooperation and caring relationships; being related to, and associated with, empathy.

Empathy is a necessary facilitator for providing help to others’ personal development. It can be concluded that others emotional appraisal (OEA) influences our cooperation with other people, because feelings of mutual understanding are necessary to collaborate effectively with other individuals.
The experiential component of the EI ability model also includes a person’s ability to use emotions to facilitate performance (UOE). This ability uses emotions to facilitate thinking and direct them towards productive activities. Emotions and moods are perceived to have an influence on decision making and strategy implementation (Mayer and Salovey, 1997). Regulation of emotions (ROE) and use of emotions (UOE) are dependable because as Mayer and Salovey (1997) claimed, individuals who are capable of shifting moods can lead one to consider more possibilities, which is an advantage in conditions of uncertainty. If a person can think of possible solutions in the middle of a crisis situation this valuable skill will depend on a person’s ability to stop being anxious or negative, and to start thinking of possible solutions that can infect others as well. Optimism and determination can be spread to other people through our open-loop limbic system (Goleman et al., 2001). This ability progresses as the person matures and facilitates thinking. People can use positive feelings to inspire and motivate others, but other factors such as persistence and ambition might be needed as well.

The strategic area focus concerns the model’s remaining two EI abilities. The first ability, self-emotional appraisal and expression (SEA), relates to a person understanding their emotions and constructively expressing them. The individual appraises, communicates emotions verbally or by using facial expressions and is able to use them to problem-solve (Salovey and Mayer, 1990). The better a person understands their emotions, the quicker she/he responds to them and expresses them to others. Further to this, an individual is also able to express feelings accurately and to express needs surrounding those feelings. Also this ability is associated with self-awareness, because individuals who can understand how they feel in certain circumstances are able to understand themselves. It can be argued that this ability enables a person to know their strengths, limits and weaknesses.
The second ability involved in the strategic area of EI, is the regulation of emotion in oneself (ROE). It consists of a person’s ability to regulate or manage their emotions and recover rapidly from distress. The feelings that we experience for varying periods of time are called moods (Crawford, 2009). This regulatory ability enables a person to control negative moods and to maximise positive moods (Mayer and Salovey, 1997). A negative long-lasting mood can be devastating for a person and can cause both mental and physical health problems. In addition, Goleman (1998) emphasised the importance of recognising a problem and overcoming it by creating a solution. This ability can also influence decision-making; whether to be positive and seek for a solution or remain pessimistic and resigned to one’s fate. ROE is associated with the individual’s potential to adopt a positive stance about life, the world and the challenges they present.

Mayer et al. (2016) claimed that a person’s EI abilities are best measured as by posing problems to people to solve and examining the results. Fiori and Vesely-Maillefer (2017) agree that EI, as a cognitive process, is best measured through performance tests that require respondents to solve specific problems. The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) is one instrument designed to measure an individual’s EI abilities. The test is specifically designed to explore all four abilities of EI. Mayer et al. (2016) distinguish MSCEIT from other self-reported tests that measure EI, as this is an ability-problem oriented test.

2.3.4 The preference in EI ability model

The Mayer and Salovey (1997) ability model is considered the most reliable model of EI (Zeidner et al., 2004; Antonakis et al., 2009; Taliadorou and Pashiardis, 2015). Their reasoning is based on the fact that the two researchers (Salovey and Mayer, 1990) provided a
narrow ability-based model, which connects emotions only with intelligence. This perspective is counter to the other models that have been criticised for providing broader and more complex explanations of EI. The fact that the ability model of EI is distinct from models connected with personality or other characteristic traits (Weinberger, 2009) suggests that its measurements are more precise than the alternative personality or mixed models. In addition, ESI and the mixed models, as explained in sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2, examine EI using self-reported tests which make the trustworthiness of the data they yield questionable (Antonakis, 2004). Consequently, this study prefers the Mayer and Salovey (1997) EI ability model because of the above-mentioned justifications.

However, Fiori and Vesely-Maillefer (2017) question the hierarchical activation of the four EI abilities but do little to demonstrate their position. As this study explores the impact of EI on leadership, publications relating to the hierarchical activation of these abilities were not assessed in the literature search, because this study concerned only about how these abilities are used and influence leadership.

### 2.4 Emotional intelligence and leadership

Organisations are characterised as ‘emotional arenas’ (Fineman, 2000, p.2) where members can be bound or divided. As discussed in section 1.4, emotions are vital components in organisations that involve humans. Emotions acquire their value from the way we talk about them, share them and understand others from them (Fineman, 2008). Leadership in an organisation, as discussed earlier in section 2.2, is a way of delivering best practice through others (Gronn, 2002; Bennett et al., 2003; Lambersky, 2016); as a relationship process it deals with emotions every day. Therefore, it is important to have available contextual rich emotional data of an organisation (Fineman, 2000). This data about emotions can provide
valuable information regarding an organisation’s leadership activity that logic might
overlook.

In educational contexts, leadership can also be explored from an emotional approach. Frosi
and Panta (2017) argued that schools are work places that are traditionally constructed with
logic but a daily variety of positive and negative emotions impacts on educators’ decisions.
Educational leadership can also be characterised as a social process that depends on
relationships that exist or are built in a school or a community (Crawford, 2007). According
to Crawford (2018) a head teacher’s role involves not only building relationships but helping
others to build relationships as well. Therefore, EI can have a significant impact on
educational leadership and especially the Greek educational system as practised in Cyprus
(Kafetsios and Zampetakis, 2008; Platsidou, 2010; Dellatolas, 2013). Taliadorou and
Pashiardis (2015) also demonstrate that the EI of leaders influences their leadership in the
Cypriot primary school context but these researchers did not explore those leaders’ EI impact
on teamworking and vision sharing.

The following section considers leaders’ EI, teamworking and vision sharing according to
related literature.

2.4.1 Teamworking and EI

EI is considered an essential element in establishing teamworking (Clark, 2010b; Chang et
al., 2012). In the following section EI and teamworking are assessed according to the
literature and each one of the four abilities associated with EI, as set out above, is explored in
relation to its impact (Mayer and Salovey, 1997). In addition, as there do not appear to be any
other studies that explore a strictly centralised educational system such as the model existing
in Cyprus, elements of EI abilities that influence teamworking in such systems are discussed in this study’s findings (section 4.2 below).

Self-emotional appraisal may enable a leader to realise the significance of teamworking in leadership. Beatty (2002) explained that leaders’ self-awareness can empower them to see leadership in a broader context of distributed leadership. Also, Moore (2009) emphasised the impact of leaders’ self-awareness on teamworking and collaboration between members. Consequently, self-emotional appraisal enables leaders to promote teamworking.

In addition, self-emotional appraisal may influence team performance (Jordan and Lawrence, 2009). As Chang et al. (2012) explained, team performance depends on self-emotional appraisal because it can both affect the intra-team process and establish good relationships between members. Furthermore, it was suggested that self-emotional appraisal can also promote intra-team trust; a concept which consists of the belief that each member can offer resources to establish a shared direction. This explanation depicts self-emotional appraisal as the ability to cultivate feelings of trust between and within team members. These feelings also promote the belief that each member can depend on the others in the team.

Furthermore regulation of emotions, which refers to a person’s ability to self-regulate their emotions, is an essential component in sustaining teamworking (Moore, 2009). Similarly, Luo and Hsueh-Liang (2017) demonstrated with their empirical study that regulation of emotions facilitates the unity of individuals to work towards their common team goals. The main reason for this focus is that regulation of emotions limits the possibility of losses in teamworking caused by negative affective events. The authors explained that if negative events occur, people with the ability of self-regulation reduce the likelihood of misattributions or other negative issues.
Team members also respond better when others emotional appraisal is involved because they perceive their feelings are respected. Smollan and Parry (2011) argued that whenever followers feel that their leader responds positively to their emotions, they feel supported and in turn adopt positive attitudes towards that leader. Also, Kafetsios et al. (2011) noted the importance of the social-interaction perspective on emotions at work, which attributes to a multilevel understanding of the effects of leaders' emotions, both intrapersonally and interpersonally. Likewise Potter et al. (2018) agreed that awareness of others’ emotions is also important in order to understand team members’ concerns, motives and goals. Feelings of respect also relate to trust, because if individuals feel respected, they tend to develop easier feelings of trust; one of the main strengths of others emotional appraisal is that it helps to stimulate feelings of respect and trust. The issue of trust is both an essential element and a prerequisite for distributed leadership, as it is not realist to expect to cooperate, share ideas and/or collaborate with others if one cannot trust them; such bonds will simply not develop. Trust is “the central issue in human relationships both within and outside organisations” (Kouzes and Posner, 2006, p.7).

In the case of education, teachers must trust their co-workers and head teachers (Downey et al., 2011). Head teachers particularly need to be trusted when they are trying to help teachers to see possibilities, their mistakes or when the school needs to move forwards (Kohm and Nance, 2007). Trust is a core value that is an essential component of teamworking; therefore OEA is an essential component of the educational leadership that this study evaluates.

In addition, team performance is maximised when tasks, timescales and goals are implemented with consideration for others’ feelings. Hulpia and Devos (2010) explained that team quality can positively affect organisational commitment if and when participants feel
secure and trusted. Therefore, the ability to appraise and recognise emotions in others (Mayer and Salovey, 1997) affects team cohesiveness and target success (Jordan and Lawrence, 2009). If team participants are to adopt willingly the positive attitudes to vision and teamworking which are central ingredients for organisational success, they need to feel that their leaders value and respect them.

2.4.2 Shared vision and EI

A team is successful when commitment to a shared vision is accomplished because shared vision inspires team members to cooperate (Luo and Hsueh-Liang, 2017). The authors also suggested that a leader’s EI is the glue for both team cohesiveness and shared vision. Leaders’ emotions and values are joined with their leadership activities and vision (Crawford, 2004). Self-emotional appraisal accurately enables a leader to act on this knowledge to take decisions (Clarke, 2010a). It could be argued that self-emotional appraisal also enables a leader to take decisions to facilitate the shared creation of their vision.

Additionally the use of emotions influences vision creation and implementation. The use of emotions is an ability that eases thinking, nurtures positive activities and strengthens the influential role of a leader. Enthusiasm and optimism can be spread in order to influence vision sharing (George, 2000). In an educational context Pashiardis et al. (2012) argued that leaders should be passionate about school life. Their passion and their positive emotions are contagious because, as Goleman et al. (2001) explained, due to the open-loop limbic system we depend on our communications with others to determine our mood or moods. So, use of emotions might be an essential ingredient that leaders’ need for creating and implementing a shared vision.
Regulation of emotions is also of great significance for vision sharing. Leaders and team members should understand and regulate their emotions so that shared decisions and actions are agreed. A leader or team member who manages emotions and recovers rapidly from anger or distress, influences and inspires feelings of trust in followers far more effectively than individuals who easily lose their temper or are unable to control their stress (Chang et al., 2012). Fineman (2000) also argued that failure to control your emotions can lead to organisational failure. Regulation of emotions is essential for leaders and team members in order to control their emotions and inspire trust in others for vision sharing.

In the educational context, regulation of emotions is also significant for the establishing of a shared vision because it inspires feelings of trust. Frosi and Panta (2017) noted that anger is among the negative emotions that head teachers experience. Crawford (2007; 2009) claims that many head teachers struggle to manage the inner conflict when attempting to distinguish between being professional and being able to show their feelings, especially when anger and stress arise. This ‘emotional labour’ (Hochschild, 1983, cited in Crawford, 2009, p.21) is evident in jobs that have to do with relationships and communication such as doctors, teachers and nurses. Fineman (2000) explained that those holding positions and jobs that are involved with people, such as educators, must present an appropriate behaviour and emotional state to their recipients. Regulation of emotions is necessary to inspire trust among team members and influence shared vision.

Care and understanding for students’ and staff’s well-being may influence vision sharing. Others emotional appraisal is essential for developing empathy for others, as it has the potential to promote organisational culture, collectivism and shared vision (George, 2000; Jordan and Lawrence, 2009). Similarly, in educational leadership others emotional appraisal
is significant. Lambersky (2016) proposed that key leadership behaviour can influence teachers’ emotions and performance, allowing such followers to communicate, have a voice and a shared vision. It is therefore arguable that others emotional appraisal might be a key aspect of the leadership activities of engaging others in educational culture, collectivism and shared vision.

However, there must be a balance between self-emotional appraisal and others emotional appraisal in order to facilitate the taking of right or correct decisions. Antonakis (2004) justified the necessity for such balance by arguing that leaders should not be too sensitive about or unjustifiably biased towards others’ feelings. So, self-emotional appraisal and others emotional appraisal are connected and dependent upon each other, especially when decision making about shared vision is involved.

2.5 Conclusion

Leadership depends on people and their relationships. Lambersky (2016) depicted leadership as ‘a way of best practice through others’. Leadership depends on relationships and emotions are the language that explains these relationships (Crawford, 2007). A leader must influence others to embrace their vision. Mittal and Sindhu (2012) suggested that effective leaders are aware of their impact on others and use it to their advantage. Vision is essential in leadership and leaders should influence others for its implementation; a process that might well include teamworking (Bush, 2003). Although leadership must have a vision, it does not always promote teamworking (Huffman, 2003). Leadership might be an individual privilege, but it can also be distributed to different expertises, as explained in section 2.2.1.
As leadership and human resource literature reveals, leaders’ EI may influence shared vision and/or teamworking. George (2000) asserted that leaders’ EI influences organisations’ cultural forms such as symbols, language, narratives and practices. Cultural forms are a way that an organisation’s culture is promoted. Through their organisational culture members create collectively shared ideologies. In addition Beatty (2007) emphasised that relationships between leaders and followers are stronger when they are related to issues of emotions themselves or that are emotion heavy. In addition, Dua (2016) declared that leaders’ EI not only inspires leaders to create a vision but also influences them to share it with others. It is my opinion that leadership is related to people, their emotions and social relationships. Therefore, a leader’s EI might well influence teamworking and vision sharing.

However, as Smollan and Parry (2011) affirm, caution is needed when making judgements about the relationship of EI to leaders’ effectiveness. Although literature reveals an impact of EI on leadership, the competing ideas of EI and the self-reported tests that were used in research to evaluate EI and leadership (Antonakis, 2004) make me sceptical. I sense that it is still unclear whether EI actually impacts on leadership activity and, if so, how it does so. Similarly, Rubin et al. (2005) and Clarke (2010b) linked only some EI abilities to leadership practice. Moreover, Mittal and Sindhu (2012) affirmed that EI by itself does not guarantee good leadership and that wisdom gained from experience is also important. Therefore, there is a need for more studies, such as this one, to evaluate the impact of leaders’ EI on vision sharing and teamworking. Evaluation of these elements in three Cypriot schools is presented in chapters 4 and 5.
The following chapter presents a critical discussion of the methodological approaches that were employed in this research. Methods, ethical considerations and data analysis are also addressed.
Chapter 3 Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This study aimed to understand and interpret the impact of leaders’ EI on shared vision and teamworking explored through the perceptions of three Cypriot head teachers and their staff. It emphasised interpretive paradigms of research which concentrate on the human aspect and was designed to understand the human experience from an inside perspective (Cohen et al., 2005). This chapter explores the qualitative methods appropriate for gaining this understanding.

In order to present a comprehensive methodological framework for this project, the following sections present the different research paradigms and the judgements that led me to choose the interpretive paradigm, the research approach and methods selected, as well as ethical considerations taken into account. Also, reflections from the pilot study, data gathering and data analysis are discussed in the sections that follow.

3.2 Ontology and epistemology

A research paradigm is a set of common beliefs, agreements and world views, which researchers use to support or understand problems (Blaxter et al., 2010). These variables are delineated by several core assumptions concerning: a) ontology: what is reality?; b) epistemology: how do you know reality?; c) human nature: predetermined or otherwise? and d) methodology: how do you go about finding data? (Guba and Lincoln, 1998). These assumptions are related to each other. Therefore, the view of ontology unavoidably affects the epistemological dimension, which consequently influences the choice of methodology.
and in turn impacts on issues of data collection (Hitchcock and Hughes, 1995; Twining et al., 2017).

Regarding this study, the ontological purpose was to explore the impact of leaders’ EI on teamworking and shared vision according to the perceptions of three Cypriot head teachers and their staff. The impact of leaders’ EI on leadership activity has been explored before in other contexts (Kafetsios and Zampetakis, 2008; Smollan and Parry, 2011; Kafetsios et al., 2011) but there is little empirical research concerning the strictly centralised Cypriot educational system (Taliadorou and Pashiardis, 2015; Stavrou, 2017).

The researcher should consider the research paradigm as this paradigm will influence the methodology and methods to be used (Cohen et al., 2005; Twining et al., 2017; Ryan, 2018). In each research paradigm presented below, different frameworks are used to offer explanations of social phenomena.

### 3.3 The research paradigms

According to Cohen et al. (2005, p. 3) research can be explored through three significant lenses: (a) scientific and positivistic methodologies; (b) naturalistic and interpretive methodologies; (c) methodologies from critical theory. However, these lenses must not be seen as opposites but rather as different sections along a continuum because they do not exist as discrete entities (Creswell, 2009).

#### 3.3.1 Interpretive approach

An interpretive research paradigm seeks to interpret behaviours as well as provide meaning, reasons for and understanding of participants’ actions (Denzin and Lincoln, 2003). This
emphasis explains that interpretivism maintains attempts to understand phenomena in order
to provide enriched and in-depth detail about a situation. Interpretivist approaches aim to
provide interpretations and understanding of social phenomena (Blaxter et al., 2010).

Interpretivism is correlated to qualitative approaches which aim to explore and understand
meanings and individuals (Creswell, 2009). The approach relies on research participants’
views and therefore questions used in this kind of enquiry are broad and open-ended so that
participants can discuss their own meanings of any specific situations.

3.3.2 Preference for the interpretive paradigm

For the purposes of this study the interpretive paradigm was selected as this research aimed to
explore the impact of leaders’ EI on teamworking and shared vision in order to evaluate the
experiences of school leaders (Cohen et al., 2005). In addition, Denzin and Lincoln (2003)
suggested the interpretive paradigm is appropriate for use with research that explores given
social phenomena such as this current initiative. This present study explored primary school
leadership and the impact of leaders’ EI on teamworking and shared vision. It is therefore
argued that these kinds of studies should reside within an interpretive research paradigm.
Additionally, as Denzin and Lincoln (2003) emphasised, within an interpretive paradigm
research questions seek to explore the interpretations, meanings and reasons associated with
participants’ perspectives.

This research employs a qualitative methodology strongly associated with the interpretive
paradigm as such methodology is perceived to be most relevant for a detailed description of,
and a rich insight into, school-based leaders’ EI and their actual leadership performance. A
qualitative design can be the most effective at capturing the richness associated with EI, as it
is extremely able to provide detailed data (Fineman, 2000). In addition, participants in research are usually conceptualised differently when applying methods qualitatively, as they act more as volunteers and active shapers of the situation being investigated (Bell, 2005). Interpretivism constructs knowledge and meanings about the phenomenon or phenomena of interest. Qualitative research seeks to understand how things happen and how they are related. I decided to use the interpretive paradigm because I wanted to gather rich and in-depth data about the influence of leaders’ EI on shared vision and teamworking.

However, Rex (1974) argued about a limitation aligned to interpretative research that concerns the truth and accuracy of human behaviour; based on the premise that researchers can never be sure that what is observed or explained is ‘the truth’. This sceptical point of view links to insider-outsider perspectives. As Hellawell (2006), Atkins and Wallace (2015) and Lee (2016) argued, insider and outsider research should be thought as two different ends in a continuum. Furthermore, Lee (2016) explained that a researcher can be both partially insider and outsider. Additionally, as Workman (2007) identified there is also possibility of being positive biased and offered a better understanding (Clifton, 2011) when in the position of an insider researcher. In this study, I had no familiarity, personal engagement with my research participants and I had never worked at the participant schools or co-worked with my participant population. However, it should be understood that I am familiar with the Cypriot education system as I am a fulltime primary school teacher employed by the MOEC. I feel that my research benefited from my familiarity with the Cypriot educational context, as I know the procedures, rules and structure present in and informing that educational system. As a result of my background I was able to critically judge the data collected, as I was not involved in the leadership activity.
In addition, the fact that I had no familiarity, personal or professional engagement with research participants minimised in some degree power relations between participants and researcher. Also, I hold a lower position, I am only a teacher, in the Cypriot educational system’s hierarchy than my research participants especially deputy head teachers and head teachers minimised the power relationships even more. Moreover, teachers’ responses were also protected from being influenced from any power relations because of the nature of data gathering from teachers explained in section 3.6.3 and 3.7.1. Bernstein (1974) advised that power relations and perceptions of inequality between participant and researcher could adversely impact the views held by participants because participants may adopt the views of the researcher based upon their subject expertise. However, as a ‘low ranked’ teacher it would seem highly unlikely that I could influence or bias the responses of the three participating school principals.

Other sources were also used so that the different perspectives of head teachers’ EI would be also assessed. The use of other sources provided triangulation and strengthens reliability and validity of findings (Yin, 2013; Hancock and Algozzine, 2013). Triangulation synthesises data from multiple sources and reinforces the consistency or accuracy of research findings (Drew et al., 2008). Furthermore, triangulation reduced the possibility of potential bias of the findings. As Miller and Fox (2004) claimed, triangulation can increase the accuracy in findings. Scandura and Williams (2000) also suggested that triangulation adds in terms of value in drawing more credible conclusions from findings.

To conclude, the choice of a research paradigm will affect the research approach and data collection. Research can be carried out by selecting from of a range of approaches; different kinds of approaches use different kinds of methods (Opie, 2004; Bell, 2005). The choice of
approach might be influenced by actual, practical, feasible reasons and personal preferences (Opie, 2004). Whatever information gathering approach is selected, the researcher must remember that the chosen model will have both strengths and limitations (Bell, 2005). Caution is needed for the researcher to recognise both characteristics and as a result make appropriate judgements and choices.

3.4 Research design

3.4.1 Case study

In this research a case study approach has been selected within an overall qualitative approach. A case study with a qualitative approach was considered to be an optimal productive design that would collect enriched information (Clifton, 2011) about leadership and EI. A case study approach can consist of a variety of methods that are suitable for a particular inquiry (Bell, 2005). I conducted semi-structured interviews with head teachers and deputy head teachers, I collected a small number of questionnaires, 30 from teachers, and I analysed schools’ policy documents. Three Cypriot primary schools formed this case study’s participant population.

A multi-site case study approach was selected as it affords an intimate and in-depth look at situations and events at a given time (Opie, 2004). Using a case study approach increased the opportunity to explore in depth EI and leadership but I also aimed to identify unique features within interactions of factors and events that large-scale studies may fail to acknowledge (Bell, 2005). These unique features that case studies can reveal might explain the impact of leaders’ EI on leadership more precisely and give a more accurate understanding of the situation being evaluated (Cohen et al., 2005) as they are suitable for addressing questions
such as ‘how’ and ‘why’ (Yin, 1981). Furthermore, a case study approach can provide certain features, social relations and behaviour in a specific setting as well as the reasons that influence it (Opie, 2004; Bell, 2005). I aspired to analyse EI and leadership in three schools as well as to evaluating whether head teachers’ and their staff find that their leaders’ EI positively or negatively affects teamworking and sharing of vision.

3.4.2 Relatability and trustworthiness

I selected three schools to explore the research subject thoroughly but also to make comparisons between the schools. I aimed to provide relatability (Bassey, 1981; Opie, 2004), a concept which can be understood as the findings offering useful insights that can be used again in similar contexts. This is one of the strengths of a case study approach because as Rowley (2002) argued, a case study represents analytical approach to generalisation, which provides useful insights and interpretations. Furthermore, Yin (2013) and Thomas and Myers (2017) stressed that analytic generalisation also means that ideas from a set of case study findings can be used again in newer situations.

Furthermore, as Cohen et al. (2011) suggested, trustworthiness of the study is determined by the extent to which research findings are transferrable and allow comparisons to be made. The multi-site case study used in this research allowed me to make comparisons between the participant head teachers. Within the context of my small scale research the findings cannot be generalised (Schostak, 2002; Denzin and Lincoln, 2003) as the data have come from only a very limited number of participants, only 39 as explained in section 3.5. However, this study offers in-depth data about leadership and EI that others larger studies may fail to do.
3.5 Sample selection

The critical issue of sample selection is related to the research focus. I used a purposeful sampling strategy (Silverman, 2005) that allowed me to select a process that illustrated some features in which I was interested. It was convenient for my research to use my reflections on the year 1 pilot study, discussed in section 3.8. Also helpful were the pilot research participants’ recommendations about which schools to use in the main study, because they were involved in my research and knew its implications. The pilot research participants suggested fifteen schools with head teachers that might be willing to share their perceptions about the impact of EI on leadership. These schools were located in different areas in Cyprus. The extensive study by Crawford (2004; 2007; 2009) into emotions and leadership in the UK, also selected research participants following recommendations or head teachers that were familiar to her.

My sample included the head teachers (N=3), deputy head teachers (N=6) and full-time teachers (N=30) of three Cypriot primary schools. I selected following selection criteria that are presented below, among those recommended to me by the pilot research participants only three schools in order to gain a deeper understanding of the leadership process. Focusing on a single school would not allow me to make comparisons, whereas having a multi-site case study enabled me to do so. Equally it should be acknowledged that including more than three schools in my research would have yielded richer data than were obtained from this study. However, the decision to limit the study to three school sites was a pragmatic one informed by the issues of time and resources that would be needed to collect and analyse data; further time could not possibly have been found given I was working full-time through my study programme.
My criteria for selecting the schools were known only to me and concerned: a) their size; b) the area where they were situated; and c) the need for at least two deputy head teachers to be appointed in the school. The decision for choosing a school with two appointed deputy head teachers was crucial as I could protect their anonymity because their views about leadership and EI could not be traceable from others (Bell, 2005). Their confidentiality in interviews is also protected because by using two deputy head teachers, who were interviewed individually others would not know which views were expressed by which deputy head teacher.

To evaluate EI and shared vision, head teachers need to be on post for some time. Rogers and Reynolds (2003) stated that creating a shared vision can be time consuming. Therefore, I decided to look for schools where head teachers had been ‘in post’ for at least two years. It was difficult to find a head teacher that had been responsible for the school at least for a two-year period because, as discussed in section 1.5, the CEC makes staff transfers according to educational needs and not according to a school's stability and growth (Pashiardis et al., 2011). However, I was able to find five schools that met my criteria. I contacted them all but only in three, medium-sized schools all research participants groups were willing to participate in research. These three were all recommended to me by the pilot research participants. The schools were situated in different areas but located in the same district where I lived and worked which allowed me, as the researcher, to have easy access to my research sites.

3.6 Data collection methods

In terms of gathering data about leaders’ EI and leadership, I used qualitative methods for this case study. I conducted 3 semi-structured interviews with head teachers and 6 semi-structured interviews with deputy head teachers; I collected data from 30 out of a possible total
teachers via questionnaires, and I analysed school policy documents. The data collection methods used are summarised in Table 3.1 below. In the sections that follow, I argue for the selection of these methods of data collection.

**Table 3.1 Data collection methods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Data type</th>
<th>Purpose of collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured interviews with 3 head teachers</td>
<td>80-minute tape-recorded interview (appendix 2)</td>
<td>To identify head teachers’ perceptions about the impact of leaders’ EI on teamworking and shared vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured interviews with six deputy head teachers</td>
<td>40-minute tape-recorded interview (appendix 3)</td>
<td>To triangulate data from head teachers’ interviews; to explore deputy head teachers’ perceptions about the impact of leaders’ EI on teamworking and shared vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires from 30 teachers</td>
<td>15-minute paper-based questionnaire (appendix 4)</td>
<td>To further triangulate data from head teachers’ and deputy head teachers’ interviews; to explore teachers’ perceptions about the impact of leaders’ EI on teamworking and shared vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School policy documents</td>
<td>Documents pertaining to the school vision; documents that concern allocation of responsibilities to staff and external stakeholders. The school’s timetable (Appendices 12-14)</td>
<td>To further triangulate other data sources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.6.1 Interviews**

Kvale (2007) asserted that interviews can provide an intimate look into other people’s lives, emotions and interactions. Interviews are considered as discussions of issues that can give valuable information about an interviewee’s motives and feelings: the tone of voice, facial expression and hesitations are all clues that questionnaires or observations might fail to
provide (Bell, 2005; Blaxter et al., 2010). The types of information obtained from an interactive interview are different from what might be obtained via a quantitative structured questionnaire (Blaxter et al., 2010). Kvale (2007) noted that interviews are considered as a robust method for researchers wishing to provide understanding of human experiences and thoughts. Information yielded from interviewees can explain causal and factual meanings; they allow for a detailed focus on a specific topic or issue and for complex responses that questionnaires fail to elicit.

Interviewing was chosen as the information gathering method of choice for head teachers and deputy head teachers. I opted to use that particular method because my aim was to collect detailed data for the impact of leaders’ EI on teamworking and shared vision. I interviewed two groups of participants, head teachers and deputy head teachers, as they were responsible for the leadership activity in schools, according to their position in the school’s hierarchy. It was preferable to conduct interviews with head teachers and deputy head teachers as their thoughts and experience could offer useful reflections on leadership activity, which other research methods might fail to do or simply overlook. Also, interviews with head teachers allowed those interviewees to explain in detail how they perceived and used EI in their schools.

I chose interviews, instead of self-reported tests that measure EI, in order to achieve in-depth data, so that I could evaluate and explain how head teachers’ perceive and use EI and also to analyse how their deputy head teachers perceived the use of EI by head teachers into teamworking and shared vision. This study agrees with Mittal and Sindhu (2012) whose extensive empirical study suggested that it is more important for research to evaluate leaders’ EI through their perceptions, rather than by measuring leaders’ EI, because with the former
approach data can reveal information about how those leaders use EI to think and act effectively.

The complexity of self-reported tests of EI is also due to the numerous and contradictory approaches that attempted to explain the idea (Salovey and Mayer, 1990; Bar-On, 1997; Coleman et al., 2001). Each of these approaches has produced different tests to explore the concept. Many studies used them (Kafetsios and Zampetakis, 2008; Plastidou, 2010; Chang et al., 2012; Taliadorou and Pashiardis, 2015) after justifying their preference for the ability model of Salovey and Mayer (1990), Bar-On’s ESI (1997), or Goleman’s (1998) mixed model. However, these tests are criticised for their lack of validity, as they are based on self reported measures and many of them measured also personality constructs (Antonakis, 2004). Although it is easier for a leader to complete a self-reported questionnaire about EI than being interviewed, caution is needed because these tests are self-reported and therefore their value depends on each respondent’s levels of self-awareness and honesty (Chang et al., 2012; Smollan and Parry, 2011; Goleman, 1998).

In addition, I chose interviews instead of self-reported questionnaires because, as Fineman (2003; 2004) argued, tests can be restrictive instruments when measuring EI with statistical approaches; therefore interviews or observations are suggested. Fineman (2003; 2004) also claimed that in the stories we tell feelings are enclosed; these stories might not be the objective truth but they mirror our emotions. Therefore, I chose interviews instead of tests in order to achieve an insider’s perspective as well as to evaluate and explain the impact of leaders’ EI upon teamwork and shared vision (Neil et al., 2016).
3.6.2 **Semi-structured interviews**

The format of interviews can vary from structured to unstructured, reflecting the purpose of the interview (Kvale, 2007). Structured interviews have a series of questions that are set in advance but this form of interview may limit the relevance, scope and naturalness of responses (Cohen et al., 2005). While unstructured interviews focus on a topic and can provide valuable in-depth data, they might be less systematic or complex than what is required for this study, as different information is collected from different people (Bell, 2005). Semi-structured interviews are midway along the format continuum because such interviews have some areas or topics for discussion that need to be covered but they are also sufficiently flexible to elicit and embrace interviewees’ stories. In this way, semi-structured interviews minimise the risk of junior researchers failing to identify all topics related to the research questions (Rabionet, 2011).

As this current research initiative aims to find precise information about the impact of school-based leaders’ EI on teamworking and shared vision, semi-structured interviews were selected. This kind of interview enabled me to gather enriched information about specific issues. In addition, semi-structured interviews are flexible, allowing the interviewer to rephrase and investigate a question in-depth (Opie, 2004; Kvale, 2007). In my research semi-structured interviews were conducted with schools’ head teachers and deputy head teachers.

3.6.2.1 **Head teachers’ interviews**

Opie (2004) asserted that the first step for developing an interview schedule is translating the research questions into interview questions and then deciding the degree of structure in both the questions and their order. The aims of the study influence the formation and structure of
the interview questions (Kvale, 2007). I drew on literature that concerns EI and leadership but also upon reflections regarding the Year 1 pilot study, further discussed in section 3.8, which enabled me to construct the interview protocol for the participating head teachers.

My interview protocol started with questions that sought to explore the professional and academic background of the participants, as well as a brief description of the school. The purpose of these early questions was to ‘warm up’ the interviewee and establish a relationship between participant and interviewer (Crawford, 2004). Afterwards, I asked questions about leadership and emotions. Some questions were taken from the Wong and Law questionnaire (2002), some from the work by Crawford (2004; 2009) and Goleman et al. (2001) on emotions and EI, while other questions were derived from leadership literature. For the latter perspective, especially regarding distributed leadership, I explored teamworking through the work of Bennett et al. (2003) as well as Hulpia and Devos (2010). Explicit information about the influence of these researchers upon the construction of my interview protocol can be found in appendix 2.

3.6.2.2 Deputy head teachers’ interviews

Deputy head teachers were interviewed using a semi-structured format. The deputy head teachers’ interview protocol was derived from the Leadership Questionnaire developed by Pashiardis and Brauckmann (2009). I chose to use questions from this questionnaire as it can provide useful data for the leadership activity being investigated in my study. The questionnaire is formed from a long-term study by the researchers (Brauckmann and Pashiardis, 2010, 2011) and has been used in other studies of leadership and EI (Taliadorou and Pashiardis, 2015). Also, the questionnaire is structured in Greek and English too, so the possibility of misunderstanding questions set with direct translation is limited (Sopromadze...
and Moorosi, 2016). However, I transformed the questions from a closed to an open-ended format in order to collect enriched information. For instance, in the interview protocol I asked: “How are decisions made in your school?” instead of indicating the extent to which the head teacher “Implements participative decision-making processes”, as was the original wording in the questionnaire. I included only the questions that concerned shared vision and teamworking because these were the focus of my research (appendix 3).

To conclude, it was preferable to conduct semi-structured interviews with head teachers and deputy head teachers of schools, as their thoughts and experience might offer useful reflections about leadership activity.

### 3.6.2.3 Piloting

Piloting is considered essential in research as the process provides the chance for researchers to reassess the proposed investigatory process and try out information gathering techniques. Also, piloting assists researchers to check that interview schedule is practicable in time available to carry out the necessary interview, to assess that questions are clear and secure that the collected data can be analysed to answer the research questions (Bell, 2005). All research items should be pilot to decide how well they work in practice and if necessary, modify their plans (Blaxter et al., 2010). I tested the first version of the language used in the questions with the help of a reliable academic friend. My friend’s recommendations concerned the Greek version of the interview schedule. My tutors gave recommendations for the English version of questions. I considered their comments, reformed the issues and sent them again the developed protocol. For instance, I had to rephrase Q.1 at Section B in the head teachers interview protocol (appendix 2), after having my tutors’ feedback in order to collect precise information about participants’ feelings. Furthermore, reflections on the year
1 pilot research enabled me to further develop the interview schedule and I deleted questions that were investigating similar issues, on order to control for duplication and avoid redundancy.

3.6.2.4 Transcription

Interviews were tape-recorded and then transcribed by me. It was useful to have tape recordings which allowed me to check the exact wording when producing transcriptions (Bell, 2005). Audio-recording interviews and transcriptions improved the reliability of this research by allowing me to study responses as often and as frequently as I wished. Transcripts not only benefit researchers because they can return to original data in order to reflect on methods, but also because they can compare data from different sources and with literature (Duranti, 2007).

Head teachers’ interview transcripts were given back to each interviewee to allow them to add anything that might have been overlooked during the interview. Only head teachers’ transcripts were given back because it was their perceptions about the impact of their EI on leadership that were being gathered. In addition, I chose to give the transcripts back to head teachers because during the interviews they had to express what they have learned from their emotional experience in headship; when presented with the interview ‘evidence’ the interviewees would be able to trust the interviewer.

In this way, two benefits were accrued. Firstly, the transcriptions were cross-referenced; Flick (1998), Zembylas (2010), and Neil et al. (2016) recommended that verbatim transcriptions should be cross-referenced where possible. Secondly, Crawford (2004; 2007; 2009) demonstrated that in the kind of interviews that explore emotional appraisal of participants,
trust should be established and maintained between the interviewer and the interviewee. Consequently, if anything was overlooked during the interview, the participant had the opportunity to note it down when reading the transcription again. However, in this study, head teachers did not make any further additions to their interview transcripts.

Deputy head teachers’ interviews transcripts were checked on each other because deputy head teachers were interviewed individually which provided further triangulation in research.

3.6.3 Questionnaires

Questionnaires are data gathering instruments that are widely used in research initiatives. They are formulated by precise written questions (Blaxter et al., 2010). Questionnaires are very efficient in terms of the researcher's time and effort because they are the easiest way of providing large amounts of information (Robson, 1993). They can be distributed in various ways, for instance post, internet, face-to-face, which have both advantages and disadvantages (Bell, 2005).

I opted to use a questionnaire with the teachers who were working in the case study schools because as Opie (2004) argued questionnaires have questions that can be explored with specific themes. Also, my decision was in favour of Opie’s (2004) claim that anonymity and validity are assured when a researcher uses a standardised questionnaire. Furthermore, using standardised questionnaires is a preferred research option because they could be administered without my presence and can be quite straightforward to analyse (Cohen et al., 2005).

Teachers were selected to complete a questionnaire as they are also everyday co-workers with school head teachers and their views about their head teachers’ leadership and EI are of significant value. Goleman (1998) declares that there might be different correlations if you
ask someone “how empathetic are you?” and then compare the answers with what friends and associates answer. Therefore, using this rationale, teachers’ views about leadership must be considered. Teachers’ views are also important because, as Antonakis et al. (2009) claimed, research about EI and leadership should provide data from a range of sources that can provide other perspectives on the subject under investigation. Smollan and Parry (2011) also noted that there are few studies that have investigated leaders’ and followers’ perceptions on EI and leadership ability.

Designing a good questionnaire is not an easy process (Opie, 2004; Bell, 2005). For the purposes of this research the Greek version of a questionnaire that is based on the Leadership Questionnaire developed by Pashardis and Brauckmann (2009) was used (appendix 4). I chose to use that specific questionnaire because it has been employed in many other studies, so the trustworthiness of the questionnaire is generally accepted. Also, the questionnaire was appropriate for my research interest in teamworking and vision sharing. Only questions that concern shared vision and teamworking were selected from the Leadership Questionnaire (Pashardis and Brauckmann, 2009), as these were relevant to my research initiative. The questions used were identical to the relevant questions in the chosen leadership instrument.

I tested the questions with a reliable friend, but also had my tutors’ approval, before seeking ethical approval from the HREC and CERE. Advice from my reliable friend confirmed that the questionnaire did not need longer than fifteen minutes to be completed and that instructions and questions were clear. My tutors also suggested I should separate into three shorter questions the original question that asked about “values and vision are evident through the things he/she does, the way he/she spends his/her time, and what he/she considers important”.
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Furthermore, this questionnaire uses a five-level Likert-type scale. This scale ranges from value 1: *strongly disagree* and moves equally through 2: *disagree*, 3: *neither agree nor disagree*, 4: *agree*, 5: *strongly agree*. In this way symmetry in answers is provided because equal points of negative and positive views are provided for. Additionally, by using this five-point scale respondents have more opportunities to express their views rather than using a reduced three-point odd-numbered scale (1: strongly disagree, 3: neither agree nor disagree, 5: strongly agree) or the bipolar even-numbered scale (2: agree or 4: disagree). The five-point scale of this questionnaire agrees with and complements the qualitative approach that this study used (Blaxter et al, 2010). It also allows respondents to choose the middle way and number 3 in items.

The small number of participant teachers, mentioned in section 3.5, allowed me to infer the use of questionnaire as a method appropriate for this qualitative study. Also, the way data from the questionnaires was analysed (as explained in section 3.11) strengthens the fact that small amounts of data from a questionnaire or questionnaires can be used in research that employs a qualitative approach (Blaxter et al, 2010).

### 3.6.4 Analysis of documents

Research that involves analysis of documents requires the researcher to read, understand and analyse other authors’ writings (Blaxter et al., 2010). Analysis of documents is widely used in projects that need to supplement information obtained by other methods; in this case interviews and questionnaires (Bell, 2005).

Analysis of documents is considered an invaluable methodology because it enables researchers to search what is not spoken (Blaxter et al., 2010); documents support evidence
that other methods reveal (Bell, 2005). Also, these documents are “inadvertent sources” (Bell, 2005, p. 126), because they were used by the researcher in other ways than those they were created for. Furthermore, analysis of documents can give a different reflection on leadership activity because one can trace someone’s steps before approaching them. I collected the documents before interviewing head teachers. The reason for doing so, was that I wanted to gain a glimpse into school leadership before the interview. I consider it important to have these documents in advance to raise more questions during the interviews, if appropriate or necessary. Bell (2005) expressed this approach as ‘problem-oriented’ (p. 107), which is about formulating any questions or focusing the study before going into primary sources. In this current study those primary sources were the interviews and questionnaires.

Different kinds of documents exist in a school (Pashiardis, 2004). Documents may be national from the MOEC such as student registration forms or might be locally constructed for and by the school personnel, such as policy documents (Appendices 12-14). I collected, examined and compared the same kind of documents from each school. The documentation that I used is considered necessary for the school’s function but each school head teacher develops the structure of the documents differently. I considered the choice of examining certain documents to be crucial, as I should balance the documents selected in order to include all categories that were involved, or alluded to, in the research questions (bearing in mind time constraints) (Bell, 2005). Also, my reflections on the Year 1 pilot research, discussed in section 3.8, supported the value of selecting appropriate documentation for the purposes of this research. Therefore, among the multi-school documentation, I chose to use only policy documents of the specific year, 2018, in order to evaluate the school’s vision. In addition, I collected documents of the current year, 2018, that concern the staff’s and
students’ responsibilities and the school’s timetable that includes specific times and dates of meetings for collaboration with teachers, students and parents to assess teamworking.

I used a critical method of content analysis. Both internal and external criticisms were applied so that “witting and unwitting” evidence was revealed (Bell, 2005, p. 127). “Witting” evidence involves what is said in the text, whereas “unwitting” evidence concerns underlying assumptions that might be revealed. The purpose of this research is to evaluate the impact of leaders’ EI upon teamworking and shared vision. Therefore the critical method, and especially applying the “internal criticism” (Bell, 2005, p. 131) of the document to indicate prejudice or bias in the documentation, is important. As documents were collected before head teachers interviews as presented in section 3.10, they provided a glimpse into schools’ leadership activity, but also after data collection they were used in data analysis, section 3.11, to provide further triangulation to other data sources (see table 3.5).

3.6.5 Translation

Translation is considered a challenge for any research that wants to ensure its trustworthiness and reliability but with the below-mentioned appropriate precautions and procedures it was intended that the risks associated with translation should be reduced as much as possible (Sopromadze and Moorosi, 2016). There are difficulties with translation and cultural adaptation; especially the translation of expression or idioms. These difficulties motivated me to transcribe interviews in the spoken language of the interviews themselves and implement the methodological procedures explained below, which concerned: i) the questions’ construction, ii) the quality of translation and iii) respect for the cultural context (Bassnett, 2002; Sopromadze and Moorosi, 2016).
Interviews were conducted in Standardised Greek and transcribed into the Standardised Greek language as this was the language that respondents, as a well educated group of people, mainly used. There were a handful of expressions used with the local form of Greek: these expressions were translated into Standardised Greek. To ensure accuracy, these translations were all checked by Athena, a Cypriot friend with a first and higher degree in linguistic background who also speaks fluently both forms of Greek.

Athena also speaks English fluently because her higher degree in linguistics was awarded by a British University, so I enlisted her help also to check my translations into English. In order to translate interview extracts into English, so that my English readers could understand them, I translated important parts of the transcriptions into English. However, if the researcher and the translator are the same person then the translation may be influenced and limited by biographical, cultural and knowledgeable issues of the translator (Birbili, 2000). For this reason, I asked Athena to check all quotations translated from Standardised Greek into English and she confirmed the accuracy of translation.

For the purpose of analysis, all interviews and transcriptions were analysed in the original Standardised Greek I have translated into English only exemplar material essential for clarifying the purposes of my study (appendix 16) (Sopomadze and Moorosi, 2016). If I had worked on translations of the interview transcripts for the purposes of analysis, despite every effort to ensure accurate translation, there would be the risk of failing to draw on the exact meanings they contained.

The questionnaire was chosen because it had already been translated into Standardised Greek. The instrument had been used in another study exploring EI in the Cypriot context (Taliadorou and Pashiardis, 2015), so there was less danger of my respondents
misunderstanding a question because of inaccurate or inappropriate translation. Documents were not translated completely into English because they were policy documents of each school and were used, as discussed in section 3.6.4, to support data collected from other sources. The data analysis was in Standardised Greek and document translation would not further clarify the study’s findings. Again I translated only some parts used in the thesis as examples.

3.7 Ethical issues

Completing my interview protocols and the questionnaire, as well as being very well prepared and believing that the interview form would be appropriate to answer the research questions (Kvale, 2007), I took the following actions. I approached the Human Research Ethical Committee (HREC) on behalf of the Open University and the Centre of Educational Research and Evaluation (CERE) on behalf of the MOEC in Cyprus in order to obtain their ethical approval to conduct the current study. The HREC approved the English version of this research (appendix 5) while CERE approved the Greek version (CERE, 2017).

Both CERE (2017) and HREC asked me, as the researcher, to provide three different information leaflets and consent forms for every group of my research participants. In addition, only the HREC asked for further clarification relating to question F1 (appendix 2) because of the potential translation risk discussed in section 3.6.5. Apart from these minor changes or clarifications, there were no tensions between the two institutions.

After I gained permission from both from the HREC and CERE to carry out my study, I conducted the research in three primary schools in Cyprus. The following discussion identifies good ethical practices in relation to this study.
3.7.1 *Gaining access*

The research participants in this research were head teachers, deputy head teachers and teachers in three Cypriot primary schools. It was essential for the participants to give informed consent and for me to have their prior approval before I could carry out the research (Eatough and Smith, 2007; BERA, 2018). I made changes to all documentation given to research participants, as the HREC recommended and which are described in section 3.7. HREC and CERE suggested I should create three different research information sheets (Appendices 6-8) and consent forms (Appendices 9-11), one for each group of participants. These documents used simplified language and they did not use the abbreviation EI without explanation as CERE and HREC suggested.

All participants were honestly informed of the research purpose, methodology and methods. They were assured that their participation is voluntary and that no harm would arise from it (BERA, 2018). I asked them to sign an informed consent agreement for participating in the research and head teachers and deputy head teachers consented also about being willing to be tape-recorded during interviews. All consent forms were returned in sealed envelopes so that only I knew their decision and no one forced them to participate. As I mentioned earlier in section 3.5, among the five schools that fitted my selection criteria three only gave consent all research participants groups.

3.7.2 *Ethical issues*

At the beginning of each interview, I again reminded each interviewee about the informed consent agreement and about being tape-recorded during interviews. Also, I repeated that they can refuse to answer a question if they felt uncomfortable (BERA, 2018).
I conducted all interviews at the school in quiet places. I attempted to do the interviews during a teacher’s free class time. I also tried to create a friendly atmosphere during interviews to make each participant feel relaxed and comfortable (Moustakas, 1994; Hubbard et al., 2001), though aware that the interviews were taking place in the interviewees own workplace. The HREC also approved the time and place that interviews were conducted, as I considered the lone worker policy carefully, which suggested conducting the interviews at noon or in the afternoon as the school’s cleaning services still work.

As a researcher, I kept the confidentiality of the research. I clarified the intentions for the data collected and stressed that all research participants were anonymous and not traceable (Cohen et al., 2005; BERA, 2018). I had taken steps to ensure that all research participants were anonymous and not traceable. These steps included giving a pseudonym to each school head teacher that participated and I allocated an identity number to other school members. I explained to the participants that their participation in the research is voluntary and that they could withdraw before the process of data anonymity was secured. I gave each participant a specific date for this withdrawal deadline, written in all documentation. The HREC suggested giving a specific date for the possibility of a research participant withdrawing so that there would be no delay in research timelines (Appendices 6-11). All data files are password protected and stored in the Open’s University secure network. Any research files will be deleted after a five year period or when this thesis is published.

Considering the confidentiality of head teachers’ and deputy head teachers’ responses, all participants were informed that their responses to questions would remain confidential and that any direct quotations used from interview transcripts would be anonymised. For this reason, pseudonyms were used. Also, I was careful for the quotations I used to keep
participants anonymity. Findings presented in chapters 4 and 5 are focused on broad agreements and collective statements. In addition, I chose to use schools that had two deputy head teachers in order to protect their confidentiality and anonymity because their views about EI and leadership could not be traceable as they were interviewed individually in time convenient for each of them that only me and the participant knew. As discussed in section 3.5, the deputy head teachers’ confidentiality in interviews was protected because no one would know which of the two deputy head teachers expressed which views.

Moreover, transfers made each year by ESC, discussed in section 1.5, changed the personnel who work in the participant schools which of itself protects participants’ anonymity and traceability.

### 3.8 Reflections from the pilot study

Prior to conducting this study, a pilot study was carried out, the role of which was to test the research methods and resolve any potential problems revealed by the proposed methods when put into practice (Holloway, 1997). This pilot study proved to be a very valuable part of the research process because as Hellawell (2006) emphasised, it is important to be reflexive in qualitative research.

During the pilot study, I worked in the case study school (Hellawell, 2006). Workman (2007) proposes that an insider researcher has a dual role; the employee in the organisation and also the researcher. In the actual study, though I was not working as a primary teacher in any of the schools that participated, I was familiar with the Cypriot educational context as I am employed as a primary school teacher. Furthermore, the pilot study revealed significant information for the head teachers’ interview protocol. As discussed in section 3.6.2.1, there
were questions in the interview protocol that were not relevant to the research questions and some others that repeated the same issues and were therefore redundant.

At the head teachers’ interview protocol (appendix 2) there are two questions that were supposed to collect data concerning the first EI ability of Mayer and Salovey (1997). However, only the first question: “Can you describe in detail your feelings about your current position in the specific school?” was related to this. The second question in that section was moved to the shared vision section because it asked “Do you have any future goals for the school improvement?” Moreover, I realised that there were two duplicated questions in different sections of the protocol that needed to be removed. Specifically, question one in section C of the interview protocol asked “How are decisions made?” and afterwards in section E there was a question asking “How important is the participation of teachers in decision making?” I initially included them both in the protocol, as Kvale (2007) asserts that with open questions, like the aforementioned, is up to the respondents to discuss issues that are important to them. But the answers from the pilot study exposed that the questions are, in effect, duplicates.

Alterations were also made at the time of conducting the interviews as Opie (2004) stressed an interview’s structure is importance for its success, but also he advised the interviewer to choose a venue that can both provide privacy and be free from interruptions. At the pilot study, interviews were held at the school during working hours, therefore interruptions were inevitable. These interruptions did not last long but I had to remind the participants the questions again and certainly some answers were repeated. Also, these interruptions influenced the “social interaction” (Kvale, 2007, p. 65) created from the beginning of the interview so allowing the interviewee to feel comfortable and relaxed and able to provide
enriched answers. Therefore, the HREC committee and the CERE approved the conduct of interviews during non-working hours; however, I should consider the lone working policy discussed in section 3.7.2.

In addition, at the pilot study I collected a lot of documents to analyse: a) documents from staff meetings, b) correspondence letters to the MOEC, c) school goals and policies (such as environmental policy documents), d) the school’s timetable, and e) documents detailing the allocation of staff responsibilities. However, time constraints did not allow me to use all of them for analysis. In this way, after realising the difficulties of having to analyse so many documents for three different schools, but also the irrelevance of some with the research questions, I changed my previous decisions. For the actual research, as discussed in section 3.6.4, I only collected documents that concerned the allocation of responsibilities to the staff, students (and parents if applicable), as well as a school’s timetable and policy documents that concerned a school’s vision (see list, appendix 12).

Furthermore, the pilot study enabled me to ensure that the questions of the interview protocol and the Leadership Questionnaire (Pashiardis and Brauckmann, 2009) were clarified and comprehensible. At the end of the interviews and at the end of questionnaire I asked if there were any questions that were unclear or confusing to the respondents. All of the participants answered that the meaning was clear to them in all of the questions in the questionnaire. Bell (2005) stated that each researcher should pilot the questions used in order to check that their meanings are clear.

Even more, the pilot study strengthened my knowledge about the selection criteria for the participant schools used in the actual study. As discussed in section 3.5, I used the pilot study participants’ multiple recommendations about head teachers that might be willing to talk
about leadership and emotions. These multiple recommendations made by colleagues and especially the participants in the pilot that were informed about the study were useful because among those I selected my research participants using the criteria mentioned in section 3.5, who were willing to share their perceptions about the impact of EI on leadership.

3.9 Data collection

This study was conducted between January and March 2018 in three Cypriot primary schools. I did not have any personal connection with the participant schools. The study was conducted as scheduled. The head teachers and staff were willing to participate and all procedures were followed as prescribed.

I followed all the ethical considerations mentioned in section 3.7 but also all those points described in the HREC proforma. I informed all the participants about the research and its methodology. I asked for a signed informed consent form from each member of the research population (Opie, 2004) and all those contacted were eager to participate. Table 3.2 below contains information about research participants and gender variation. Male participants were fewer than female because the teaching profession in Cyprus is mainly staffed by females. However, in this study gender variation between deputy head teachers and teachers was not considered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position of participants in a school</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy head teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Not consider</td>
<td>Not consider</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the study, I conducted three semi-structured interviews with the head teachers; six semi-structured interviews with deputy head teachers and collected 30 out of 34 questionnaires from teachers. Three questionnaires were returned but they were not completed at all and the other one was not returned. I also collected policy documents which concerned the allocation of responsibilities to staff, the school’s programme and documents that concerned the school’s vision. These documents were collected before the interviews with the head teachers were carried out.

The head teachers’ interview protocol (appendix 2) was divided in seven parts and contained seventeen questions. Interviews with head teachers lasted one hour and thirty minutes and all were conducted in the head teachers’ office at noon. The deputy head teachers’ interview protocol (appendix 3) was divided in three sections and consisted of fourteen questions. Interviewing deputy head teachers lasted forty minutes. Interviews were conducted individually in quiet rooms in schools during the deputy head teachers non-teaching time. The times and places for the interviews were chosen by the research participants for convenience, so allowing them to feel relaxed during their interviews. Only I and the interviewer knew about the interview time set.

The questionnaires were presented to the teacher respondents in open envelopes. I discussed this mode with the teachers and they proposed this format whereby I could collect the questionnaires in closed envelopes so only I, as the researcher, could see their answers. The questionnaires took no longer than fifteen minutes to complete. All teachers were asked to complete the questionnaires in a place convenient for them, and not to discuss the contents of the questions with each other so that respondents did not elicit a high degree of same responses.
3.10 Data analysis

Decisions about data analysis should be made well before data collection begins. Also, the pilot process discussed in section 3.8, enabled me to practise in analysis of data. Analysis of data is a procedure that enables a researcher to control, organise and structure knowledge; however, there are times when the researcher may doubt the existence of this reassuring construct (Blaxter et al., 2010).

The data from the interviews, the questionnaire and documentation were thematically analysed and coded (Floyd, 2012). Thematic analysis is simply explained by Maguire and Delahunt (2017) as the process to identify patterns within qualitative data and to interpret them. This method of analysis was chosen as it can describe in detail the information collected, as well as interpreting various aspects of the research purpose (Attride-Stirling, 2001; Braun and Clarke, 2006). Gray (2014) explained that the coding system allows for greater levels of analysis to be applied to the text. For this reason I preferred to manually analyse data within the transcripts, documents and questionnaires as I wanted to reflect upon the interviewee’s responses. As a result I was able to begin to relate the findings back to the research questions discussed in chapter 1. I followed the “six-phase guide” of thematic analysis proposed by Braun and Clarke (2006, p. 5), which is explained and justified in the following section.

Firstly, I began with familiarising myself with the data that had been collected. I transcribed all the interviews and then read them again several times. At this stage I made many notes in my learning diary about any impressions or thoughts I had come across at this point (Braun and Clarke, 2006).
Secondly, familiarisation with the data enabled me to reduce data by separating it into different sections: the codes (Attride-Stirling, 2001). Coding is considered an essential activity for data analysis because it structures all data collected and gives meaning to it (Maxwell and Chmiel, 2014). This study’s codes were related to the research questions (Braun and Clarke, 2012).

Ayres (2008) claims codes can come from the literature review that is appropriate to the research questions. Similarly, I considered the four abilities of EI and the two aspects of leadership activity: i) teamworking developed in distributed leadership and ii) shared vision as discussed in literature review sections 2.2.1, 2.2.2 and 2.3.3, as six codes. Specifically, the first four codes concerned the four cognitive abilities that Mayer and Salovey (1997) used to describe EI. The last two codes concerned leadership activity and especially teamworking and shared vision.

Teamworking was divided into two subcategories: a) teamworking between staff and b) teamworking with external stakeholders. Also, shared vision was divided into four subcategories: i) vision that is promoted by the leader’s actions and words, ii) vision implementation, iii) communicating vision to teachers and iv) communicating vision to others. I decided on these categories because they fit with Berson’s et al. (2016, p.175) definition of shared vision and Pashiardis and Brauckmann (2009) also used these subcategories in their research data analysis. However, I could not use all of the categories and subcategories Pashiardis and Brauckmann (2009) used in their research because the purpose of their research and their questions were different. I employed an Excel sheet to code data (Maguire and Delahunt, 2017) which enabled me to identify the patterns between the codes.
As a next stage, after I had identified certain patterns, I was able to generate some themes. Attride-Stirling (2001) also postulated that themes should be introduced once data are coded. A theme is a pattern that explains and relates to the research questions (Maguire and Delahunt, 2017). I related each theme to the research questions (Ayres, 2008). This study’s themes evaluated the impact of leaders’ EI on teamworking and/or shared vision within the context of primary schools in Cyprus. Specifically, research themes explored the impact of each of the four EI abilities on teamworking and/or shared vision. I drew on the literature to be able to correlate these themes. Last, I provided sufficient evidence of the themes in the data (see table 3.3, below).

Table 3.3 Codes and themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leaders’ EI</strong></td>
<td>Self-emotional appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teamworking</strong></td>
<td>Teamworking between staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared vision</strong></td>
<td>Vision that is promoted by the leader’s actions and words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others emotional appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regulation of emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teamworking with external stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication of vision to teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication of vision to others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Themes

1. Self-emotional appraisal impacts on shared vision and/or teamworking?
2. Regulation of emotions impacts on shared vision and/or teamworking?
3. Others emotional appraisal impacts on shared vision and/or teamworking?
4. Use of emotions impacts on shared vision and/or teamworking?

After providing sufficient evidence of data for my themes I used tables (see table 3.4 below) to make assessments between the three participant head teachers. Smollan and Parry (2011) suggested this approach, making it easier for the researcher to make any comparisons. Table
3.4 below is an example of the tables created for each theme and is presented here to provide clarity about data analysis.

When data were analysed, Apollo got the lowest rate in teachers’ questionnaires (see sections 4.3 and 5.3) despite cautions taken for clarity of questions (see sections 3.6.3 and 3.8) and for data balance because respondents’ answers were not biased and elicit similar answers as presented in section 3.10. For these reasons, Apollo’s lower rate in all questions of the questionnaire than the other two participant head teachers does not imply researcher bias but further cautions were also made during data analysis to ensure research trustworthiness.

In this way I checked that there is not any bias in questionnaires answers by making random sample of questions to declare normal distribution of answers. As Blaxter et al. (2010) argued random sampling of questions can be used to compare measurements from a sample to another sample and justified the extent of their similarity or dissimilarity. Lastly, I wrote findings chapters.
### Table 3.4 Example of data related to themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant name</th>
<th>Quotations from interviews with head teachers</th>
<th>Quotations from interviews with deputy head teachers</th>
<th>Document analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leto</td>
<td>“I valued teamworking. My biggest fear is that I might have to lead a school on my own...”</td>
<td>“She is a head teacher that values teamworking. Responsibilities are shared between staff and authorities involved...”</td>
<td>Document concerning allocation of responsibilities: Documentation showed and proved the allocation of responsibilities to staff, students and other authorities. School programme: There is provisional time for team members to meet and collaborate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Even students are organised in small clubs...”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daphne</td>
<td>“I acknowledge the value of teamworking and I try to promote teamworking between members. But in there are times that decisions demand my judgement as the school head teacher...”</td>
<td>“She promotes teamworking between staff and authorities...”</td>
<td>Document concerning allocation of responsibilities: Documentation showed and proved the allocation of responsibilities to staff, students and other authorities. School programme: There is provisional time for team members to meet and collaborate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“An example of teamworking between school and authorities is the planning of all day event for fundraising.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollo</td>
<td>“I value teamworking and it’s my belief that there is teamworking in my school. But teamworking is typical between school staff, local authorities and parents...this is due to the village culture”</td>
<td>“There is teamworking between members of the staff, but this is due to the good relationships between the staff...”</td>
<td>Document concerning allocation of responsibilities: Documentation showed and proved the allocation of responsibilities to staff, students. School programme: There is provisional time for team members to meet and collaborate but parents and local authorities are not involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The local authorities are not involved in teamworking. Their presence is just typical...”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.11 Conclusions

To conclude, this study aims to understand and interpret the impact of leaders’ EI on shared vision and teamworking explored through the perceptions of three Cypriot primary school head teachers and their staff. The research emphasised the interpretive paradigms of research, which concentrate on the human aspects, as well as aiming to understand the human experience from an inside perspective (Cohen et al., 2005). There were three groups of participants: i) head teachers, ii) deputy head teachers and iii) teachers. Head teachers and deputy head teachers were interviewed, whilst the teachers completed a questionnaire; school documents were also analysed to yield relevant data.

Using different sources or collection methods is defined as triangulation and is used in order to consistently assess research conclusions (Drew et al., 2008). Examining information collected through different methods or groups can enhance findings and reduce the impact of potential bias. Triangulation can provide comprehensive knowledge about the research questions (Miller and Fox, 2004). Triangulation is also expected to provide enriched information and improve the reliability of a single research method. In addition, technique increases the trustworthiness of the research findings (Johnson and Christensen, 2008).

This chapter justifies my choice of an interpretivist paradigm to address the research questions, which in turn influenced the methodology and methods used in my study. This chapter has also considered research related ethical issues and has revealed any difficulties associated with these. Additionally, sampling and data analysis have also been discussed.

The following chapters present the findings and discuss the impact of leaders’ EI on teamworking and shared vision respectively. The data collected are interpreted in relation to
the two research questions presented and discussed in section 1.2, which evaluate leaders’ EI impact on teamworking and or shared vision according to the perceptions of three Cypriot head teachers and their staff.
Chapter 4 Findings I

4.1 Introduction

Chapters 4 and 5 present the findings of my study. My research questions discussed in section 1.2 concerned the impact of leaders’ EI on teamworking and/or shared vision. These questions are explored separately in chapters 4 and 5 as they are two independent variables and each one formed unconnectedly my research questions. Therefore, the impact of leaders’ EI on teamworking is discussed in this chapter, with the impact of leaders’ EI on vision sharing being discussed in the following chapter. The data presented in both chapters were obtained through semi-structured interviews, a small number of questionnaires and documentary analysis, as detailed in chapter 3.

In the following sections I present the findings which are related to the impact of leaders’ EI on teamworking. The findings are presented according to the themes. These themes were explored, as discussed in section 3.11, according to Mayer and Salovey’s (1997) four branch ability model of EI. These abilities are my research themes and are presented below:

1) the ability to understand and express emotion in self (SEA),

2) the ability to understand and recognise emotions in others (OEA),

3) the ability to regulate emotions in self (ROE) and

4) the ability to use emotions to facilitate performance (UOE).

Each of these abilities was analysed in reference to its impact on teamworking as perceived by my research participants.
In section 4.2 I present the findings from interviews that set out head teachers’ and deputy head teachers’ perceptions and document analysis. Further, section 4.3 offers the small number of quantitative data drawn from the teachers’ questionnaires for all three schools presented in tables to make comparisons. Finally, common findings and conclusions are presented.

4.2 Heads’ perceptions about leaders’ EI and teamworking

In the following sections, I discuss the findings and interpretations regarding the impact of leaders’ EI on teamworking according to three Cypriot primary school head teachers’ perceptions; the views of their staff are also included. I explored teamworking between staff and teamworking with the schools’ external stakeholders.

Teamworking, as defined in chapter 2, section 2.2.1, should be a product of a concerted action where people with different expertise work together for an organisation’s welfare, so that a variety of skilful individuals or groups can take part (Gronn, 2002; Bennett et al., 2003; Spillane et al., 2004). Many researchers assert that leaders’ EI may positively influence teamworking and build strong relationships between team members (Clarke, 2010a; Chang et al., 2012) but these findings offer further contribution because the findings explore the Cypriot centralised educational system, which no previous EI focused studies have done. Furthermore, the tensions between power relationships that a rigid hierarchical education system creates, as well as the issue of teamworking, are also evaluated.
4.2.1 The impact of self-emotional appraisal on teamworking

Perceptions of head teachers and deputy head teachers, as well as document analysis, revealed that leaders’ EI ability to understand and express emotions (SEA) does affect the quality of teamworking. These findings are similar to quantitative research by Rozell and Scroggins (2010) involving American university undergraduate students, which evaluated that self-emotional appraisal is important for teamworking. However, the current study’s findings added that self-emotional appraisal is perceived and used differently by each head teacher. Subsequently, teamworking is promoted to the extent that leaders not only perceive self-emotional appraisal but actually use it. These perceptions explain the different enactments in teamworking at each of the three schools.

4.2.1.1 Head teachers’ perceptions

Leaders’ ability to understand and express their emotions enables them to value teamworking. The three participant head teachers: Leto, Daphne and Apollo (discussed in section 3.9) perceived that the variety of emotions that each individual has will influence the taking of different decisions and actions that concern teamworking. All head teachers expressed that they held a stressful position, they used words such as “anxiety, stress, challenge” (Q1, appendix 17) to describe their feelings that headship emerged. They admitted that were at times fearful that they would not have the support they needed. In addition, they expressed that they felt challenged to manage, evolve and create a teamworking environment between all school stakeholders. However, head teachers perceived their EI ability differently, so their decisions and actions that concerned teamworking varied.
Head teachers’ perceptions about EI enable them to act differently. For example, Leto expressed that she valued teamworking because she felt that she could not lead the school on her own. She added that the stressful feelings of responsibility enabled her to consider teamworking as something especially important. Leto indicated that teams emerged *ad hoc* at the beginning of the school year without any extra effort needed. She believed that the engagement of all stakeholders in a problem triggered and inspired teamworking at school. Her perceptions are related to the conclusions of George (2000), who asserted that followers must be aware of a school’s issues and problems, and that the confidence of those followers should be boosted to deal with such challenges.

Daphne also valued teamworking, but the different perceptions she had about EI and accountability in a strict centralised system explained the different actions she took to promote that activity. Daphne emphasised that she felt stress as the only person responsible for the school; she also felt the only person accountable for the school’s safety and educational responsibilities, so she did not distribute responsibilities concerning safety issues and had the final word in every decision. She added that teams were formally constructed and explained that some of them were inevitable to be created for the school’s management whilst others were created because of the Ministry’s bureaucracy. Also, she argued that all school’s activities were organised in an annual school programme and that provision was made so that team members could meet.

Despite the fact that Apollo also valued teamworking, he expressed that he felt discouraged about the less than optimal level of teamworking with parents and local authorities. However, he was satisfied with the level of teamworking between his staff. He explained that parents and local authorities, due to the village culture, were not interested in being allocated, or
taking on, any responsibilities in the school. But he asserted that he would keep his patience and determination until teamworking was created between all of the school’s stakeholders. As with Daphne, Apollo claimed that teams were formally created between staff and students. He explained that staff and students chose the team that they would like to work with, or be in, but he decided eventually so that all teams are equal in numbers. He claimed that he felt accountable, as the one person responsible for the school’s management and wellbeing, having been formally assigned from the Ministry of Education; also in this way, according to his view, he would maintain justice between the staff. Furthermore, he indicated that there was provision within the school’s programme for team members to meet.

4.2.1.2 Deputy head teachers’ perceptions

The deputy head teachers’ interviews revealed that all head teachers shared responsibilities and promoted teamworking. Leto’s deputy head teachers stated that everyone was accountable and co-worked in different teams in school. The school’s staff during staff meetings formed small teams according to personal preferences, skills and expertise. These teams were responsible to take action in order to address a specific problem of the school. Examples of such issues included: a) the improvement of the school’s environment, b) teaching polite manners to students, and c) promotion of reading books to students. Similarly, Daphne’s deputy head teachers reported that teams were constructed during staff meetings; staff preferences and expertise were taken into consideration but Daphne effectively formed and approved the teams. They agreed with Daphne saying that some teams were obliged from MOEC’s bureaucracy to be created; for example teams dealing with safety and health in school or teams responsible for the prevention of violence in schools. In this way, Daphne allocated staff into different teams during staff meetings according to each
member’s preference. Daphne’s deputy head teachers both agreed “that teams are formed according to each member’s preference” (Q2, appendix 17).

Apollo’s deputy head teachers agreed that he shared responsibilities. They noted that distribution of staff in teams was made during staff meetings. But they both emphasised that teamworking in their school was also due to good relationships between the staff members because they had known each other for many years. This affective aspect is not further explored in this study because investigating the impact of team members’ EI on teamworking is not this study’s purpose. It is however a suggestion for further research in the Cypriot educational context, as discussed in section 6.6.

4.2.1.3 Document analysis

Furthermore, document analysis agreed with head teachers’ and deputy head teachers’ perceptions. Specifically, I used the participant schools’ timetables and documentation that concerned the allocation of responsibilities and policy documents to evaluate how teamworking was implemented in each school.

Documentation analysis showed two similarities between Leto’s and Daphne’s schools. First, all requirements needed for teamworking to be implemented were taken into consideration. As Grainger (2010) indicated these requirements include the need for teams to have regular meetings, as well as a clear understanding of their team’s objectives and purpose. Similarly, in these two schools there was provision in the schools’ programmes for teams to meet and collaborate. Furthermore, teams had clearly defined targets and responsibilities in these schools, as was explained in their policy documents.
In contrast, document analysis showed a more restricted approach for the teams at Apollo’s school, because teams were formed only from staff and students as opposed to teams in the other two schools. Also, despite the fact that provision was made for staff and students to collaborate in the school timetable, there was no provision for parents and local authorities to meet and discuss relevant school and/or community-related issues.

These similarities and differences between schools suggest that head teachers’ perceptions about the impact of leaders’ EI on teamworking are different. These different perceptions explain their enactment in teamworking.

4.2.2 The impact of others emotional appraisal on teamworking

This study’s findings suggest that if leaders understand and respond to their staff’s emotions (OEA), then staff feel supported and hence adopt positive attitudes. Data analysis showed that this responsive ability is involved in promoting empathy; a development that encourages relationships of trust which are essential for teamworking and motivation. These findings are similar to those from the Cypriot empirical study about EI by Taliadorou and Pashiardis (2015) which demonstrated that head teachers who show honest concern for others are capable of building effective teamworking in the workplace.

4.2.2.1 Head teachers’ perceptions

Leaders’ ability to understand emotions in others is important to teamworking according to my research participant head teachers because such an ability relates to empathy and promotes trust that is necessary for teamworking. They stressed that having an understanding of other people’s emotions cultivates feelings of trust between team members. Also the
respondents described their efforts to build relationships of empathy and trust with staff, as such relationships were essential for teamworking.

They all agreed that understanding others’ emotions is the most difficult part of being a leader and it takes time to develop and manage such a skill. They used phrases such as “it is very hard to know... time is needed to develop this kind of understanding” (Q3, appendix 17). Daphne added that she used her sense of humour to make fellow members feel comfortable and express freely their feelings and opinions. She said that she knew her staff well as they worked together to plan school activities, to prepare lessons and they even taught together. However, she admitted that this quality relationship could not be accomplished in one year and it takes time to understand and recognise others’ emotions.

Leto said that she used to spend most of her time at school in the staff room because she wanted staff to perceive her as a member of the staff and not as a superior member. She added that she preferred to walk around school’s corridors in the mornings and welcome students and teachers at school. Further, she explained these actions helped her being familiar with students and staff. Moreover, Leto was the only head teacher participant who was interrupted several times while being interviewed, even though the interviews were conducted after school’s working hours. Interruptions were made by teachers and parents who were working together voluntarily for improving the school environment. Leto left the room several times to help them and to guide them and came back apologising, but she said this was not a rare phenomenon because a lot of school activities demanded voluntary and extra working hours. She said that she tried to work hard and be a role model for the school’s students, teachers and other stakeholders and that she believed that this was the best way to engage others in teamworking.
Leto’s perceptions are in line with what Beatty (2007), that asserted relationships between leaders and followers are stronger when they relate to issues of emotion. Leto admitted that she never closed her office door; to be more precise she worked very little in her office. Furthermore, during our interview she never used the word “staff”, but she continuously used the word ‘colleagues’ because as she said: “we are all teachers who cooperate for the students’ welfare” (Q4, appendix 17).

Apollo also claimed that he knew staff from previous years because they had been his colleagues before his promotion to head teacher. This coincidental familiarity with staff sensitised him towards an awareness of their needs. He did not make any further efforts to get to know his staff. He argued that he was aware of the students because he used to teach them.

4.2.2.2 Deputy head teachers’ perceptions

All deputy head teachers described their head teachers as empathetic, they used words such as

listens carefully others... cares about others’ opinion... discusses with others before making a decision (Q5, appendix 17).

It seemed that deputy head teachers valued this more humane side in a head teacher which, as the deputy head teachers stressed, is important for teamworking. They claimed that the head teachers had good relationships with the schools’ staff, and so others feel free to share their feelings or needs.

Daphne’s deputy head teachers claimed that she was aware of her staff’s needs and made regular efforts to promote their professional development. They explained that she regularly invited experts from CPI or other organisation to staff meetings for her staff’s professional
development. Also, they assured me that the staff felt able to talk to her about any personal issue they may have. Furthermore, Apollo’s and Leto’s deputy head teachers depicted their head teachers as kind and humane and asserted that from their point of view all staff felt comfortable to talk to them. Leto and Apollo, though, had fewer years of service in the specific schools than Daphne, as indicated in section 3.9. This difference in the years of co-working with staff supports Daphne’s perception, discussed in section 4.2.2.1, that time is needed for a head teacher to become aware of his/her staff’s emotions and needs.

4.2.2.3 Document analysis

Equally, document analysis showed that there is provision in the schools’ programme for meetings not only with other team members, but also with head teachers. Also, in all three schools’ programmes there was provision for teachers that teach similar subjects to meet and exchange helpful ideas and resources. In addition, the school programme included weekly staff meetings where staff could raise any issues or problems that may concern them. Moreover, the participant schools’ policy documents showed that all schools had made provisions for activities in their schools that promoted empathy. For example, all schools had a “communication box”, as it was named in each school’s policy documents, where students and parents could share anything they wanted with the school’s staff. This practice is not obligatory from the Ministry of Education; however, it was an initiative established in all participantschools which emphasised that OEA is an important EI ability for teamworking, according to documentation exploration.
4.2.3 The impact of regulation of emotions on teamworking

The participant head teachers were asked to recall strong emotional incidents that occurred while they were on post at their specific schools. During the narration of these emotional incidents, each head teacher noted that feelings of trust between staff, which are necessary for teamworking, arose from their ability to regulate emotions (ROE). These findings suggest similar perceptions to those from an extensive empirical study in the UK (Crawford, 2009, p.21) which emphasised the “emotional strain” evident in a head teacher’s frustrating situations, when she or he must regulate their or others’ emotions to perform his/her role. Indeed, my research participant head teachers shared their “emotional strain” (ibid) during their interviews. It seems that EI competence about the regulation of one’s emotions in self can empower feelings of trust between team members that are essential for teamworking.

4.2.3.1 Head teachers’ perceptions

As indicated in section 4.2.3, all head teachers said that a leader’s ability to regulate their emotions promotes feelings of trust in others, which are necessary to facilitate teamworking. The three head teachers all gave examples of controlling intense emotions to establish or preserve teamworking. The participant head teachers stated that they would never allow themselves to be carried away and reveal feelings of anger, stress or disappointment because they believed that their role was supportive to others and that they should spread positive emotions. The head teachers described different incidents that caused them to experience strong negative feelings that they had to deal with. Furthermore, all of them admitted that these feelings were negative and intense, but they managed to hide them for sake of the continuation of their school’s working climate and teamworking. All of them recalled strong emotional incidents in which parents were involved.
Specifically, Daphne claimed that she never lost control in her workplace. She admitted that it was important for a leader to spread only positive feelings to others. She also claimed that a leader should not be carried away by his/her emotions. For example, she recalled a strong emotional incident that occurred in the school and she had to regulate her own emotions, to create trust feelings and achieve cooperation with the people involved. This incident involved a student and his/her parents who could not realise and accept the needs of his/her child. Daphne remembered that she persisted so much until parents understood and accepted that their child should receive special treatment. She stated that she could understand how the parents felt but as an educator she owned a duty to protect the child’s right to have special treatment. So she held back her feelings and made all the appropriate arrangements to protect the child against its parents’ determination, initially against the parents’ wishes.

Similarly, Leto also declared that she would never allow herself to lose control. She argued that anger did not allow people to make the right decisions, so it was crucial to keep calm and think clearly before you act. She remembered and described a very strong emotional incident with a group of parents that caused her emotions of anger, disappointment and frustration. This incident was intense; the school inspector was informed. Eventually parents withdraw their irrational demands after she showed a great deal of patience and persistence, so that the Parents’ Association learnt the appropriate way to be involved in school negotiations. Leto admitted that the negative feelings for those parents had never ceased to exist, but she needed to suppress them for the school’s benefit.

In contrast, Apollo stated that he was lucky during his career because he never had to deal with strong emotional incidents in his workplace. However, he described an incident that involved parents and a teacher of the school. He remembered that parents and local
authorities were against a specific teacher because they thought that s/he was incapable of
being a teacher. Apollo was extremely upset after the parents came into his office to accuse a
specific teacher. He remembered the frustration he felt but he finally managed to hide his
feelings and he listened carefully. He assured them that the school inspector was responsible
for evaluating teachers and that if any of the school staff was incapable of teaching only the
school inspector could make such a decision. In addition, he supported the teacher as well as
he could, without any reduction in status, giving her/him duties that would reduce her/his
workload, as in that specific year the teacher was facing personal problems. He also
encouraged her/him to participate in educational seminars to promote her/his professional
development. He admitted that the teacher never learned about the parents’ and local
authorities’ accusations / involvement, but his staff member was grateful to Apollo because
he showed empathy and caring in a difficult period of that teacher’s life.

4.2.3.2 Deputy head teachers’ perceptions

Deputy head teachers were not asked to express their views on any emotional incidents
because this study explored followers perceptions on how leaders used their EI and what
impact this had on teamworking and shared vision (see Smollan and Parry, 2011). They were
asked to describe if there is clarity about procedures and if all activities are organised as
scheduled. They all agreed and characterised their head teachers to be

very well organised, who follow all necessary procedures and planned and
implement carefully school’s activities (Q6, appendix 17)

that activities are organised as scheduled and that their school’s timetable is always followed.
Any changes that may occur in the school programme are approved by each school’s head
teacher.
4.2.3.3 Document analysis

Document exploration did not offer any further data for regulation of emotions. However, the existence of the schools’ timetables (appendix 13), documentation about allocation of responsibilities (appendix 14) and policy documents showed that there is clarity in the schools and good management. As explained in section 3.6.4, these documents are locally constructed from the school’s personnel, so in one sense are ‘owned’ by the staff.

4.2.4 The impact of use of emotions on teamworking

4.2.4.1 Head teachers’ perceptions

All head teachers agreed that the way the Cypriot educational system is structured lacks extrinsic motivation (raise of salary, promotion through skill or effort). Further, they reported that the lack of extrinsic rewards intensifies the needs for a reliance on intrinsic motivation (emotions of self-need to do something or pride in one’s performance) in order to promote teamworking. Daphne and Apollo agreed that there are very few extrinsic rewards to give to staff. They emphasised that they praise their staff during staff meetings; they used to commend teachers to the school inspector, and they write excellent end of year reports for as many teachers as they can. However, Leto pointed out that motivating adults is different from motivating children. Moreover, she explained that adults do not need extrinsic motivation; it is their personal need and emotions (intrinsic motivation) that urge them to promote teamworking. Finally, she suggested that because she is a very optimistic and enthusiastic person, her enthusiasm and optimism is contagious; the others that follow her encourage and promote teamworking.
4.2.4.2 Deputy head teachers’ perceptions

Deputy head teachers stated that Daphne and Apollo congratulated staff for their hard work and talked about staff using a range of complimentary words. They used the words “always uses complimentary words for teachers during staff meetings” (Q7, appendix 17). Whilst for Leto, her deputy head teachers claimed that she was always using understanding and kind words for others. She was optimistic and spread hope and offered inspiration to others. One of the two deputy head teachers argued about Leto that “it was her positive vibes that influence all in the school” (Q8, appendix 17).

4.2.4.3 Document analysis

Document analysis showed that Leto’s policy documents agree with giving motivation to students, such as praise for their improvement in their behaviour. Policy document exploration also demonstrated that in Leto’s school teachers not only gave motivation to students but each teacher had the autonomy to select appropriate motives to use, an aspect that activates teachers’ motivation as well, as discussed in section 5.3.2.

Each teacher can give individual or group motivation to students to improve their individual behaviour first and then the behaviour of the whole class (Q1, appendix 15)

While Daphne and Apollo talked about giving motivation to staff, policy documents did not show any motivational strategies designed to encourage staff. This significant lack in policy documents is likely to be due to the educational system in Cyprus that does not promote any kind of motivation to staff.

However, policy documents exploration in Daphne’s multicultural school showed that teachers used to invite parents with special talents or professions in classroom to contribute
with their special knowledge during teaching in order to promote students’ but also parents’ self esteem and cultivate feelings of acceptance. This strategy of involvement parents in students’ teaching is extremely motivational and beneficial for students, parents and teachers as well.

4.3 Teachers’ perceptions about leaders’ EI and teamworking

4.3.1 Introduction

In this section, I present teachers’ perceptions about the impact of leaders’ EI on teamworking. I decided to present this kind of data separately because as explained in chapter 3, section 3.6.3, using staff perceptions gained through self-report questionnaires to evaluate the impact of leaders’ EI on teamworking, may provide a different perspective on the subject (Antonakis et al., 2009) when compared to the information gained from the interviews of the headship team or via documentary analysis.

Teachers’ views are important because they provide data about EI from a different perspective: the followers’ perceptions (Smollan and Parry, 2011). The teachers were asked to fill in questions that concern teamworking and vision sharing from the Leadership Questionnaire (Pashiardis and Brauckmann, 2009). Data from questionnaires that concern teamworking is presented below in tables. Thirty questionnaires were completed and they were thematically analysed to provide yet more in-depth data about leaders’ EI and teamworking.
4.3.2 *Teachers’ perceptions*

Table 4.1 below presents the extent to which head teachers promote teamworking between staff. In this table the items that concerned teamworking between staff were divided in two groups. First, items 1 to 4 provide information about the extent to which head teachers promote and facilitate teamworking between staff. Second, items 5 to 7 present data that explores the extent to which head teachers implement teamworking between staff.

*Table 4.1 Teachers’ perceptions about the extent to which head teachers promote teamworking between staff*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cronus school-Leto</th>
<th>Poseidon school-Daphne</th>
<th>Zeus school-Apollo</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Promotes open communication and flexibility in relations with the staff</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Solves problems in cooperative way with teachers</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Listens carefully to the ideas and suggestions of the teachers</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Facilitates decision-making by consensus among staff</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Implements participative decision-making processes</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Creates possibilities for teachers to meet and collaborate</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents | 10 | 13 | 7 | Total: 30
The mean number in items 1 to 4 presents all teachers’ views about the extent to which teamworking was promoted at the three schools. The number was more than 4 but still less than 4.5 which was a very high score in a 5-point scale, explained in section 3.6.3.

Furthermore, the average scores for items 5 to 7 which concerned the extent to which head teachers facilitate and implement procedures of teamworking are lower than the first four items. The mean number in these last items of table 4.1 is much closer to 4 which showed that teachers perceived that their head teachers: a) used to promote participative decision-making processes, b) used to listen carefully to ideas and suggestions from teachers, c) used to discuss school affairs with them, and d) created possibilities to meet and collaborate in aspects that promote teamworking, but e) did not take action that could implement teamworking. The lowest rate was in item 5 which evaluated the extent to which head teachers facilitate participative decision-making by forming consensus among staff. It is likely that the low score in items 5 to 7 chimes with the findings at section 4.2, which suggest that because head teachers perceived EI differently, their actions towards facilitating teamworking are different. This low rate also identifies that leaders’ EI in a centralised educational system may not influence teamworking in an ideal level as distributed leadership explains.

Table 4.2 below presents teachers’ perceptions about the extent which collaboration is promoted and implemented with the external community, parents, local authorities, organisations and businesses. Teachers’ average responses to the specific questions here are lower than for questions about promotion and implementation of teamworking between staff, as shown in table 4.1. These response levels may reveal the difficulty of having to promote
and establish teamworking with external stakeholders such as students’ parents and other members of the local community.

Table 4.2 Teachers’ perceptions about the extent to which head teachers promote teamworking between external stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cronus school-Leto</th>
<th>Poseidon school-Daphne</th>
<th>Zeus school-Apollo</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.Encourages relations with the school on one hand and the community and parents on the other.</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Promotes cooperation with other organisations and businesses from the community so that students’ needs are addressed.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.Demonstrates the use of appropriate and effective techniques for community and parent involvement.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.Emphasises and nurtures two-way communication between the school and community.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Total:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, teachers’ average responses in item 1 are higher than those in item 3. This difference suggests that head teachers may encourage relations with parents, local authorities and school, but they might misuse, or not use at all, appropriate techniques to foster the external stakeholders’ involvement. The reason for this apparent lack of liaison skills, as discussed in section 4.2.3, is that all head teachers described incidents that caused them to experience negative feelings, which they were obliged to manage and which involved
parents. In Apollo’s case, though, there was not a specific time on the school’s timetable for meeting with parents or local community members. In addition, during his interview Apollo claimed that

they (parents) do not invite me to their meetings, but I have stressed to them my disappointment about this and I intend to participate at their next meeting (Q9, appendix 17).

Apollo may still have some of the negative feelings mentioned in section 4.2.3, about parents, despite the fact that according to his interview this incident occurred during the first year he was posted to the specific school. These feelings may also explain why the level of teamworking with parents and local authorities was the lowest of the three schools.

4.3.3 Comparison of the three head teachers through teachers’ perceptions

Comparing the three head teachers through 30 teachers’ perceptions, all head teachers got an average close to 4 in items that relate to promotion and implementation of teamworking between staff (table 4.1).

In addition, Leto scored more than 4 in all items. She may have received the highest scores because teams, as she mentioned during her interviews, emerged unplanned and all team members were involved in problem solving. This aspect might have boosted her staff’s confidence and engaged them in teamworking (George, 2000; Lambersky, 2016). Also, Leto was the only head teacher who used participative decision-making processes, while Daphne declared that she had the final word in every school’s decision.

Furthermore, when I continued comparing the three head teachers regarding the extent to which they promoted and established teamworking between external stakeholders, Apollo again achieved the lowest close-to-three score in all items (table 4.2). Leto and Daphne had
similar rates in items 1 and 2 that concerned promotion of collaboration between parents, local community, organisations, and businesses but Leto had the highest rate in all four items (table 4.2).

It is possible that Leto might have gained the highest rating because she shared responsibilities with all stakeholders. Leto was the only head teacher who stated she attended the Parents Association meetings as a member. Further to what is mentioned in section 4.2.2, she admitted that she preferred to work in the staff room and when working in her own office her door was ‘always open’, both literally and metaphorically. To me these findings demonstrate that Leto perceived and used EI to apply effective techniques to encourage and support staff, community and parents involvement in teamworking (Mittal and Sindhu, 2012; Taliadorou and Pashiardis, 2015)

On the other hand, Daphne scored less than Leto, because Daphne insisted that she feels the responsibility of managing a school; an obligation assigned to the head teacher by the Ministry of Education. Daphne may be suppressing her EI abilities when she behaves in this way, because of the exclusive accountability for her school which the strictly centralised education system of Cyprus imposes on her.

In contrast, Apollo and his deputy head teachers claimed during their interviews that Apollo used participative decision-making processes but Apollo expressed while being interviewed that

I will take the final decision in cases where there is no agreement between staff to maintain the school’s working climate (Q10, appendix 17).

His perceptions explain the score of 3.28, table 4.1: an item that concerned collective decisions. This low average in addition with the discussion made in section 5.3.3 serves to
illustrate the difference in how a person perceives and uses EI, as well as what other people think about it.

Having examined the impact of EI abilities on teamworking, in the final section I discuss conclusions arising from comparison of the sources.

4.4 Conclusions on teamworking

All participant head teachers acknowledged the value of leaders’ EI impact on teamworking. Leaders’ EI can empower them to distribute responsibilities to others, to be empathetic and promote feelings of trust by regulating their emotions. Finally, the head teachers criticised the lack of motives in the Cypriot educational system and expressed their opinion of using emotions to motivate teamworking. These findings are aligned with Clark’s (2010b) study on two national organisations, which stressed the influence of leaders’ EI on effective teamworking. Similarly, Chang et al.’s (2012) extensive study in the USA emphasised the importance of EI abilities in teamworking. Chang et al. (2012), like Taliadorou and Pashiardis’ (2015) study in the educational Cypriot context, claimed that leaders’ ability to appraise other people’s emotions has an impact on teamworking. Crawford (2012) also suggested that leaders who consider others’ emotions can limit power relations and inspire others to be involved with a greater degree of autonomy. Likewise, this study’s findings suggest that headteachers who use their EI take actions to promote teamworking, and make efforts to involve others in decision making (see section 4.3.2, table 4.1).

To sum up, head teachers and their staff judged that EI abilities do positively impact teamworking, as George (2000) suggested, though these abilities are perceived differently by each individual so actions towards and influence upon teamworking vary. To conclude, leaders’ EI significantly and positively influences teamworking in a school context according this study’s head teachers and staff perceptions.
The following chapter explores the second research question that concerns the impact of leaders’ EI on vision sharing in the three case study schools.
Chapter 5 Findings II

5.1 Introduction

Chapter 5 gives an account of the data related to the evaluation of whether leaders’ EI influences shared vision, according to the perceptions offered by the head teachers and their staff. Leadership, as discussed in chapter 2, can be defined in many ways and with various levels of success. However, effective leadership requires a vision that is shared and embraced by all members of an organisation. From the definitions offered of shared vision (Rogers and Reynolds, 2003; Pearce and Ensley, 2004), I decided to adopt the definition suggested by Berson et al. (2016, p. 175) because my research explores the impact of leaders’ EI on vision sharing and this definition both fits and complements my research interest. The definition of shared vision from Berson et al. (2016) was used to develop themes and codes so enabling analysis of the data.

First, I assessed the EI abilities for their impact on vision sharing according to the head teachers’ perceptions and in relation to deputy head teachers’ perceptions. Further information was revealed via an exploration of each school’s documentation. Later I present a small amount of quantitative data gathered from 30 teachers’ questionnaires, to be followed by conclusions about the findings.

5.2 Heads’ perceptions about leaders’ EI and vision sharing

In this section I explore the impact of EI (Mayer and Salovey, 1997) on shared vision. Shared vision according to Berson et al. (2016) is as an agreed state or collectively future-oriented direction that is ambitious but acceptable to followers and implies enthusiasm and commitment to that vision.
EI competences are evaluated regarding the extent of their impact on shared vision according to the head teachers’, deputy head teachers’ and teachers’ perceptions, together with the documentary analysis.

5.2.1 The impact of self-emotional appraisal on vision sharing

This study’s findings suggest that the ability of leaders to understand and express their emotions (Self-emotional appraisal) does impact on their decisions about vision creation and implementation. These findings are consistent with the framework from George (2000) which addressed the issue of how feelings affect leadership. It was argued that self-emotional appraisal may enable a leader to act wisely, make priorities and take decisions that influence others. Similarly, Dua (2016) stated that emotional self-awareness and self-emotion management influence our decisions. Likewise, this study demonstrates that leaders’ EI ability impacts on decisions that concern vision creation and implementation.

5.2.1.1 Head teachers’ perceptions

All head teachers participating in my research agreed that forming vision should be a shared process involving all school staff members, students, parents and local authorities. They used words such as “shared, collective created, democratic and humane vision” (Q11, appendix 17). They also agreed that regardless of how their vision was created leaders must communicate that vision to all stakeholders of an organisation. In educational leadership, these stakeholders are teachers, students, parents, and local authorities (Pashiardis et al., 2011). However, respondents disagreed on how each school’s vision was eventually formed, as the ability to understand and express emotion by each head teacher affected their vision creation in a unique way. Furthermore, data presented below provides strong evidence that
the ability of leaders to understand and express their emotions impacts on their decisions. In turn, these decisions impact on how vision is created and articulated to others.

Leto was aware of her emotions and acknowledged that one person cannot take decisions for every occasion. She expressed fear about leading without having the staff’s support. She was wary of taking decisions regarding issues about which she was not fully briefed and decided that in such situations it was better to discuss and co-work with experts. Leto’s elevated level of emotion awareness enabled her to engage all her stakeholders in vision creation. She demonstrated that the majority of staff meetings at the beginning of the school’s year were devoted to vision planning. She further explained that all team members had contributed during those meetings. Leto was the only research participant who engaged all stakeholders in vision creation and implementation.

Daphne stated that she, her staff and the students all worked together to create their vision. She acknowledged that parents and local authorities should also be involved, but she excused their omission by saying that she informed them about all school’s decisions and needs. Daphne realised how important the collective creation of a vision was, but she also felt that she was the one person responsible for the school. Her feelings were ambivalent as she was aware that creating a vision collectively was important, but she stressed during her interview that she also felt responsible as she held a hierarchical position in a centralised educational system. So she let staff and students share their ideas on school vision, but she had the final say on every occasion. She was aware that the decision made might not have satisfied all team members but she said that she would eventually find a way to persuade others of its usefulness.
Apollo reported that vision was formed between him, his staff, and students. Local authorities and parents were not involved. He explained that local authorities and parents were unwilling to collaborate with the school because of village culture; the school being the only one in this research located in a small rural village. He expressed his frustration about the parents’ and local authorities’ attitudes, but he was persistently optimistic that with challenging efforts from his part eventually this attitude of non-involvement might be improved. Despite the fact that he claimed that vision is collectively planned in his school, he admitted that he had the final say when disagreement between members occurred. In addition, it was noted that Apollo did not mention any particular strategy or initiative to engage parents or local authorities with the school’s vision planning or its implementation; merely that he would persist in his efforts.

5.2.1.2 Deputy head teachers’ perceptions

All deputy head teachers agreed with their head teachers’ perceptions that there is involvement of staff in vision creation and implantation. They added that vision is created after collective discussions and decisions. They all used the phrase “vision is created collectively using democratic procedures during staff meetings” (Q12, appendix 17).

Daphne’s and Leto’s deputy head teachers pointed out there was involvement of all stakeholders, staff, local authorities and parents in vision creation and enactment. However, Apollo’s deputy head teachers’ confirmed that parents and local authorities did not participate in developing the school’s vision. They also confirmed that Apollo tried unsuccessfully to involve parents and local authorities in vision creation; a vision which was therefore created collectively during staff meetings.
5.2.1.3 Document analysis

Policy documents showed that all three schools had a school vision. Those visions were implemented through a series of targets and activities that were prioritised and scheduled through the schools’ timetables.

The involvement of school staff, local authorities and parents was evident in policy documents that concerned Leto’s and Daphne’s schools. However, at Apollo’s school socio-cultural traditions acted as barriers so local authorities and parents were not involved in vision formation, as document analysis revealed, an outcome clearly confirmed during the interviews.

5.2.2 The impact of others emotional appraisal on vision sharing

This study suggests that the second EI ability, that of leaders’ ability to understand emotion in others (OEA) (Mayer and Salovey, 1997) impacts on vision creation and influences others in embracing their vision (George, 2000; Smollan and Parry, 2011). Each participant head teacher stressed how important it is for a leader to be empathetic to others, but they also explained how they used empathy to help them take decisions and actions.

5.2.2.1 Head teachers’ perceptions

The ability of school leaders to understand emotions in others enables such leaders to show empathy for staff and students’ needs so that they can plan and implement vision according to their educational needs. In addition, the community’s needs should also be considered in vision planning.

Leto clarified this issue by saying that showing care and understanding for others influences vision creation. She explained that vision was created collectively at her school because she
believed that this was the best way to engage others in the vision. She also claimed that all stakeholders should be involved in the vision so that they feel it as theirs. She felt that her efforts should be focused on being fair, polite to everyone and empathetic so that others can follow and become involved in the vision. Some of these values were underpinned in the school’s vision, according to my exploration of the policy documents. For example, an annual target in school vision was “promoting gentle behaviour among students” (Q2, appendix 15)

Similarly, Apollo agreed that a leader should support his or her staff’s involvement in vision creation. Apollo engaged staff in vision creation and implementation and supported them in order to maximise their knowledge and capabilities for the school’s benefit. Apollo stressed that it was important for each team member to feel capable and equally significant as all other members, so he promoted his staff’s professional development in every way he could.

However, he asserted that in times of disagreement, he would take the final decision because he was the school’s head teacher assigned by the MOEC.

In contrast, Daphne stressed that she had the final saying in vision creation. She emphasised that even if vision is created by her eventually, as a leader she must influence and persuade others to accept it. It was central to Daphne’s EI that each person should be handled differently. Also, she declared, as mentioned in section 4.4, that she used compliments and rewards to motivate her staff, but she admitted that the centralised educational system in Cyprus did not permit head teachers to give extrinsic rewards to staff. She clarified that she used to praise staff for their dedication and hard work at weekly staff meetings. Also, she gave compliments for staff to the school inspector from the MOEC and finally she wrote good end-of-year reports, as discussed in section 1.5, for staff that showed dedication to and engagement in the school’s vision.
5.2.2.2 Deputy head teachers’ perceptions

Leto’s deputy head teachers characterised her as an empathetic person who was dedicated to her work and concluded that others appreciated her dedication and wanted to work as hard as her. They assessed that it was easier for her to engage someone in vision by involving him/her in vision creation and implementation. One of them further explained that

we (school staff) worked in small groups to create vision. Each group identifies first any issues or problems that need improvement, then the group set the goals and design appropriate activities. The head teacher works equally as a team member (Q13, appendix 17).

Similarly, Daphne’s deputy head teachers confirmed that she used to make regularly efforts to involve staff in vision with compliments at staff meetings, or at meetings with parents. They also claimed that teachers like nothing better than the moment when good words were said for their work. They explained that in this way teachers felt that they were appreciated, and they tended to work harder towards vision implementation.

Apollo’s deputy head teachers added that Apollo tried as much as possible to maximise staff abilities and promote their professional development. They explained that he used to invite specialists to the school’s staff meetings and he was willing to make all the appropriate arrangements in the school’s programme for staff to participate in seminars, because no substitute teachers were sent, as discussed in section 1.5.

5.2.2.3 Document analysis

Policy document exploration showed that in schools’ vision humans come first. In all three schools’ policy documents it was evident that their main target was to educate students in a democratic and pleasant environment. Each school used different strategies to succeed in this
according to their students’ needs. For instance, in Apollo’s school among others it was suggested to teachers to use a daily routine, which concentrates on the ten last minutes before classes finish that each student can express his/her feelings during the school day. These strategies are not implied by the MOEC.

5.2.3 The impact of regulation of emotions on vision sharing

The findings imply that the third EI competence, regulation of emotions (Mayer and Salovey, 1997) impacts on establishing a working environment where all procedures are followed in any matter and which promotes the creation of trusting relationships that enable those involved to embrace a collective vision. These findings are compatible with the claim by Smollan and Parry (2011) that a lack of a leader’s self-control may result in followers’ inappropriate behaviour and ultimately lead to chaos.

5.2.3.1 Head teachers’ perceptions

The ability of leaders to regulate emotions in themselves promotes trust between staff and empowers leaders to vision-plan collectively. All participant head teachers avowed that they would never lose control of their emotions. They evaluated that losing control would negatively impact on their school’s working climate. Finally, they stressed that this self-control ability is essential for keeping in order the school’s activities towards vision creation and implementation.

Daphne claimed that even when a strong emotional incident occurred at school, she should be calm and follow procedures needed for that situation. She insisted that she never lost control at school, because she has to represent the image of “keeping order in school”. Leto agreed that a head teacher should take care that at school there was always clarity about policies and
procedures to be implemented. All her efforts were fundamental to regulating all her negative emotions and promoting feelings of trust between staff. Regardless of any crisis, staff should rely on the school’s positive emotional atmosphere and operation. Also, Apollo emphasised that vision should be created and implemented regardless of any obstacles that may occur. He believed that it was his responsibility to protect staff from a crisis, although he felt lucky because during his career he did not have any incidents that had caused him to lose control. As far as he could remember, all incidents could be resolved with dialogue and patience.

5.2.3.2  **Deputy head teachers’ perceptions**

All deputy head teachers in the participant schools clarified that their head teachers aimed to follow all procedures and keep to their school’s prescribed programme. They stressed that regardless of any problems that may occur, the participant head teachers always remained calm and followed regulations. Similarly, the schools’ policy documents showed that all schools’ activities were followed as scheduled. All of them used words such as

the head teacher keeps clarity and follows procedures, the school’s timetable is always followed, (s)he manages to remain calm and knows how to control his/her temper (Q14, appendix 17).

5.2.3.3  **Document analysis**

The document analysis from all three participant schools revealed that all three have compelling and ambitious visions. The school activities programme was followed as scheduled; if any changes in dates were made these were noted in a separate sheet. Also, absences by members of the staff were noted and arrangements were made so that other staff members provided substitute lessons in their officially ‘non-teaching time’ so that the
The school’s programme was followed and any activities about vision were implemented as scheduled regardless any issues raised.

5.2.4 The impact of use of emotions on vision sharing

5.2.4.1 Head teachers’ perceptions

The leaders’ ability to use emotions to facilitate performance (UOE) also impacts on shared vision. Participant head teachers said that leaders should: a) spread only positive emotions, b) articulate their personal values to others and c) inspire them to plan collectively in order to implement their vision.

All participant head teachers expressed that they were aware of their staff’s personal and professional needs. Apollo mentioned that coincidentally he knew his staff because they had been colleagues for a long time. Daphne claimed that she used her sense of humour to get to know staff. She believed that being friendly and approachable made staff more open to her and therefore willing and able to share their needs with her. Similarly, Leto demonstrated that she made efforts to learn about her staff’s needs. She explained that she used to spend most of her time in the staff room and when working in her office the door was ‘always open’.

In addition, all three head teachers agreed that a vision was better formed collectively, because staff were engaged and showed more commitment to its implementation. Leto and Apollo stated in section 5.2.1 that they used to plan their vision collectively, but Apollo clarified that in times of disagreement he would take the final decision. He further explained that he believed that he was the person responsible to take the decision as he was in the headship post. Similarly, Daphne also claimed that she had the final say in decisions concerning vision creation. Moreover, the head teachers stressed that decisions may be taken
according to staff needs; however, Daphne clarified that the procedure depended on the kind of decision. Moreover, all agreed that they would take any risk if this were an action for the school’s welfare, regardless of the strict centralised Cypriot educational system as discussed in section 1.5.

In addition, they all expressed common views that justice, empathy and democracy were some of the core values informing them in their leadership roles. Specifically, Apollo specified that

> justice is the most important value that we, head teachers, should have always in mind because people appreciate others when justice and transparency are applied (Q15, appendix 17).

Similarly, Daphne stressed the issue of democracy:

> democratic procedures are inevitable to be followed in a school because you cannot pressure anyone to participate or get involved in a vision, but... (Q16, appendix 17).

Leto was the one head teacher that firstly highlighted empathy above other values mentioned. She clarified that

> a head teacher should be empathetic because (s)he is associated daily with people that have feelings and need their feelings to be respected by others (Q17, appendix 17).

These values were underpinned by their actions and ways of thinking. All three head teachers tried to inspire their staff through their actions as leaders.

### 5.2.4.2 Deputy head teachers’ perceptions

All participant deputy head teachers explained that head teachers showed empathy and compassion for others; they asserted that their head teachers followed democratic procedures.
They confirmed that their head teachers are fair with all members and show persistence in achieving their school’s progress and success targets. Democracy and justice are also two values revealed by the exploration of the three schools’ policy documents. All schools emphasised democratic decisions should be a goal in all school activities.

Examples of democratic procedures followed were elections in both students’ and parents’ associations. In addition, all deputy head teachers agreed that their head teachers discussed issues or problems that occurred in their school with staff during the weekly staff meetings and their views were asked for. Also, in cases where concluding decisions cannot be taken from the discussion, then the staff vote in favour of, or against, a decision. Furthermore, all head teachers stated that the staff can also raise topics, issues or problems for discussion during the weekly staff meetings.

These values were essential in school vision planning and implementation according to my policy document exploration. Finally, these findings are in line with research by Jordan and Lawrence (2009) which noted that being aware of others’ emotions and using them may positively affect target success.

5.2.4.3 Document analysis

These values underpinned the policy documents examination. Each participant school included in its vision the promotion of justice, democracy and mutual respect between all members of the school community. For example, in Daphne’s school among other goals they aimed during school year “to develop (to students) a sense of solidarity and volunteering to people who faced financial problems and dealt with poor living conditions” (Q3, appendix
Similarly, in Apollo’s school “the promotion of mutual respect and learning in an enjoyable and democratic school” (Q4, appendix 15) characterised the school’s vision.

5.3 Teachers’ perceptions about leaders’ EI and vision sharing

5.3.1 Introduction

Teachers in all three participant schools answered questions from Leadership Questionnaire (Pashiardis and Brauckmann, 2009). The questionnaire explored their perceptions regarding a shared vision; the questions being related to the definition offered by Berson et al. (2016). In the following sections I analyse data from teachers’ responses to the questionnaire, I make comparisons about the head teachers and conclusions are drawn. As discussed in sections 3.6.3 and 4.3, teachers’ responses allowed me to make comparisons regarding the participant head teachers, but not generalisations.

5.3.2 Teachers’ perceptions

In table 5.1 below, the extent to which head teachers’ values influence schools’ visions is presented. Teachers’ answers scored an average of more than 4 out of 5 in all items that were related to values and vision. It could be suggested from these high scores that head teachers had values that were evident in vision creation and implementation.

Furthermore, head teachers in section 5.2.4 argued that they have some core values in their leadership activity. Teachers’ responses implied that these values may underpin their way of thinking and acting. Also, teachers’ responses indicated that these values also influenced the school’s vision and head teachers aimed to encourage teachers and students to follow these values.
Table 5.1 Teachers’ perceptions about values that underpinned school’s vision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cronus school- Leto</th>
<th>Poseidon school- Daphne</th>
<th>Zeus school- Apollo</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Values and vision are evident through the things he/she does.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Values and vision are evident through the way he/she spends his/her time.</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Values and vision are evident through what he/she considers important.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Total:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, in table 5.2 below, the extent to which head teachers communicate vision to teachers is assessed. All teachers agreed that their head teachers had a vision for their schools’ improvement and that their head teachers involved others in vision creation and implementation; or that they communicated vision to teachers, influenced them and enacted them in vision implementation. Teachers’ responses on the questions that concerned the extent to which head teachers discuss, articulate or communicate their visions were high. However, the first item that concerned creation of vision with the staff cooperation got the lowest average and showed the difference in each head teacher’s approach about the way their school’s vision was created. Head teachers’ perceptions discussed in section 5.2 also advocate that head teachers’ EI perceptions impact on vision creation.
Furthermore, Table 5.2 below presents the extent to which head teachers articulated and communicated vision to external stakeholders. The average in all three items was close to 4 out of 5. The average in these items was lower than the average for items in Table 5.2, which pointed out the difficulty of vision communication to external stakeholders such as parents or members of the local community. The lowest average was in items 1 and 5 which explored the extent to which head teachers discussed goals or articulated and communicated school vision with relevant external stakeholders. This is a comparatively low average emphasised the belief that communication between schools and external stakeholders is problematic. However, the high rating in item 2, which evaluated the extent to which head teachers demonstrated awareness of school’s community’s needs, and then initiated activities to meet those needs, did not imply that the rate concerned only the community. This rate in the case of Apollo may show that Apollo was aware of the school’s needs and activities were initiated to meet those needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cronus school-Leto</th>
<th>Poseidon school-Daphne</th>
<th>Zeus school-Apollo</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Creates a common vision for school improvement with the staff’s cooperation.</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Encourages staff to be actively involved in the planning and implementation of this vision.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Articulates discusses and communicates the school vision to all members of the school.</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Total:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronus school-Leto - Leto Poseidon school-Daphne - Daphne Zeus school-Apollo - Apollo
To continue, table 5.4 below evaluates motivation given by head teachers. Pearce and Ensley (2004) declared that vision forms a basis for motivation, planning, and goal implementation.

Regarding motivation, all teachers seemed to be satisfied by the grade of autonomy that their head teachers allowed them to organise and programme their teaching. The average score for this issue (question 1) was closer to five; the highest rate and impressive considering the lack of motivation coming from the centralised educational system of Cyprus. This high rate implies that showing trust to teachers and giving them enough autonomy in their teaching may be a motivator. This point, concerning team members’ EI, was not mentioned by head teachers and deputy head teachers in their interviews, but teachers declared its importance for them.
Moreover with item 1, her teachers noted that Daphne left enough autonomy for the teachers to organise and programme their teaching. Leto and Apollo received lower scores than Daphne. Daphne declared during her interview that she felt stressed by the responsibility that her hierarchical position gave to her. She had the final say in everything, but it seems that her teachers are satisfied because she trusted them and left them with the autonomy they wanted. Daphne’s teachers’ perceptions could be explained by the fact the Daphne’s ability to ROE was very high, so that her stress could not be communicated to others. Equally her ratings could be because Daphne knew her staff well and trusted them as she had been assigned to that school for six years.

Table 5.4 Teachers’ perceptions about motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cronus school-Leo</th>
<th>Poseidon school-Daphne</th>
<th>Zeus school-Apollo</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Leaves enough autonomy to teachers in order to organise and programme their teaching.</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rewards teachers for special contributions to the school.</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Compliments teachers who contribute exceptionally to school activities.</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Total:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5 presents vision implementation. All three schools achieved an average higher than 4 out of 5 in questions that concerned the critical issue of vision implementation which emphasised head teachers’ views on how important it is to keep a school’s operation going, regardless of any crisis. In addition to the crisis issue Fineman (2000) emphasised leaders’
abilities to understand, express and manage their emotions. He asserted that failure of leaders to manage their emotions may negatively influence their organisations’ progress.

Likewise with table 5.4, Daphne gained the highest score in items two and three that are related to the matters of clarity and priority in school activities. These high rates in all three items strengthen the claim that Daphne’s ability to regulate emotions enabled her a) to ensure clarity about the roles and core activities of the staff as well as b) their work priorities.

Table 5.5 Teachers’ perceptions about vision implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cronus school-Leto</th>
<th>Poseidon school-Daphne</th>
<th>Zeus school-Apollo</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Holds a vision for the school that creates new opportunities for progress.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ensures that there is clarity about the roles and core activities of the staff.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ensures that there is clarity about work priorities.</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Works on creating an orderly atmosphere.</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Takes care of the fact that there is clarity regarding policies and procedures to be implemented.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Total:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5.3.3 Comparisons of the three head teachers

As Clarke (2010a) asserted leaders’ ability to understand emotions in themselves enables them to act on this knowledge and take decisions. These decisions may concern vision sharing. Specifically, Leto received the highest score in questions that concerned encouragement of staff to be involved in vision creation, but Leto got a lower rate than Daphne in items that concerned teachers’ autonomy. Daphne said that she preferred to have the final approval in all decisions, but her staff believed that she gave them enough autonomy as she got the highest score in that item. In contrast, Apollo got the lowest rate in this section, but Apollo himself seemed to believe that his staff were involved in vision creation. However, the low average score revealed that there are teachers who disagreed with that perspective.

Moreover, Mittal and Sindhu (2012) add that effective leaders are aware of their impact on others and use it to their advantage. Leto also thought that when all members of an organisation are cooperating to find solutions and solve a problem then dedication is maximised. This opinion may clarify the high scores in questions that explore the extent of vision communication to external stakeholders. Daphne also scored a remarkably high average in all questions, while Apollo got the lowest ratings in this section. But as discussed in section 5.2.1, during his interview Apollo clarified that

they (parents and local authorities) did not show up even when I invited them to come. They constantly found excuses to justify their absences (Q18, appendix 17).

Apollo’s teachers’ perceptions also revealed a low score in items that concerned vision creation between staff (table 5.1). This low average but also judgements discussed previously, in section 4.3.3 may explain that there is a difference between the extent a person
perceives and uses EI and the extent to which other people think that EI is being used. The low averages in these questions might be explained by lower EI competence or less familiarity with staff’s, the school’s and community’s needs, and not only because of the village culture referred to in section 5.2.1. This explanation cannot be generalised because of the small number of case studies, but it provides explicit information about the dimension of how EI is perceived and used by a person and what other people think about it. This tension is an area for wider research as explained in section 6.6.

Furthermore, Leto again received the highest scores in questions about motivation for teachers and giving compliments for their special contributions. Leto explained in her interview that she prefers using herself as a role model for motivating others, in addition to using compliments. Her rating levels demonstrated that leaders’ EI influences intrinsic motivation that promotes collective vision creation or vision acceptance. Daphne scored the second highest rate while Apollo got the lowest.

Although Apollo, as a head teacher in a small rural school in Cyprus, suggested in his interview that staff needed motivation to be involved in the school’s vision, teachers in his school offered the lowest average rate in questions that concerned motivation. The small average score in questions concerning motivation implied that there were different views between Apollo and his staff. This low average also suggested that Apollo’s ability to understand other people’s emotions was not as advanced as Leto’s and Daphne’s. Gender variance might explain this difference, as Apollo was the only male participant head teacher in this research. Furthermore, gender variance was also present between staff, as teaching is mainly a female profession in Cyprus. Moreover, gender variance between staff may explain the difference in EI perceptions between Apollo and his staff but this research did not
examine gender as a factor. From the staff’s perceptions it seems that he was not particularly aware of his staff’s needs and emotions. His perceived lack of awareness made him less able to provide his staff with satisfactory, intrinsic individual motivation than the two female head teachers. However, as already mentioned, it is not possible to generalise regarding any variables or findings given the small numbers of schools involved in this research but gender as a factor in EI is an area for further research, as discussed in section 6.6.

5.4 Conclusions on vision sharing

Taking into consideration the data analysis mentioned in this chapter, it can be concluded that leaders’ EI impacts on sharing of vision. This study’s findings showed that head teachers’ EI influences them to involve others in planning and implementing vision, which aligns with George (2000), who claimed that leaders’ EI inspires members to create collectively and share ideologies.

Although Rubin et al. (2005) and Clarke (2010b) indicated that some EI abilities impact on some leadership practices, from my research findings I argue that leaders’ EI may and almost certainly does impact on vision sharing. However, there seems to be evidence that leaders’ capacity to use EI for vision sharing might be constrained by the centralised educational system in Cyprus.

From the data, it can be concluded that all participant head teachers have characteristics that are representative of the four abilities of EI (Mayer and Salovey, 1997). These EI abilities seem to enable them: a) to create their school’s vision, b) to communicate it to their staff and other stakeholders and c) to promote its implementation.
The participant headteachers also experience negative emotions, which they aim to regulate so that schools can function as scheduled. This finding supports Frosi & Panta’s (2017) findings in the Greek educational context, and Crawford’s (2009) extensive study in the UK educational context also mentioned that leaders do experience negative emotions, which they aim to regulate so that schools can function as well as possible. Leaders’ ability to regulate emotions may promote feelings of trust, as well as leaders’ ability to appraise other people’s emotions (Jordan and Lawrence, 2009). Likewise, Lambersky (2016) stated that key leadership behaviour may influence teachers’ performance, allowing them to be actively involved in shared vision. In the Cypriot educational system, as Pashiardis (2004) indicated and this study’s findings support, key leadership activity embraces a movement towards the emotional aspects of leadership, where followers’ opinion is valued and relationships between team members are fearless (Edmondson, 2018).

However, Mittal and Sindhu (2012) stressed that, apart from EI, strong cognitive capacities such as interpersonal and communication skills, as well as wisdom gained from experience, are equally important. In this research all head teachers were chosen as they had experience in their headship role for more than two years. This was intentionally decided as shared vision cannot be accomplished in a single school year. Because the research questions explored only the impact of leaders’ EI on shared vision and teamworking, provisions were made to exclude other variables such as social skills. Further research may consider these variables and their links to EI.

Presentation and discussion of findings were discussed in chapters 4 and 5. In the last chapter, chapter 6, the main conclusions of my research and important implications are presented.
Chapter 6 Conclusions and recommendations

6.1 Introduction

This study has explored the impact of leaders’ EI on teamworking and shared vision through the perceptions of three Cypriot primary school head teachers and their staff. There is little empirical research about the impact of EI on leadership in the context of the Cypriot educational system and none of these research initiatives used a case study approach as this study has done. Although it is not possible to generalise from three case studies, they have offered the opportunity to take an in-depth look at the relationship between leadership and EI.

This study is the first in the Cypriot educational system that explores EI according to head teachers’ and their staff’s perceptions using qualitative methods. Data were collected using semi-structured interviews with head teachers and deputy head teachers. Classroom teachers were asked to complete a questionnaire and school-based policy documents were also analysed. Findings were thematically analysed in order to provide explicit information about the perceptions of the research participants regarding whether leaders’ EI influences teamworking and shared vision.

This chapter revisits the key findings emerging from the study in relation to the research questions. The chapter also considers this study’s contributions as well as presenting this researcher’s reflections. This chapter ends with an agenda detailing suggestions for further research.
6.2 Summary of key findings

6.2.1 Does leaders’ EI impact on teamworking?

The four EI abilities (Mayer and Salovey, 1997) all impact teamworking, according to the research participants’ perceptions.

First, all school head teachers evaluated that the ability to understand and express their emotions (Self Emotional Appraisal) enables them to take decisions that add value on teamwork. The three participant head teachers perceived differently the variety of the emotions each one of them experienced; such as stress and fear, as well as the implications of accountability. The differences in how each individual perceived Self Emotional Appraisal had varied impacts on the decisions and actions that concern teamworking. These findings are consistent with Lee et al. (2018) who recently claimed that a significant portion of teamwork skills required perceptions of emotions in self.

Second, the leaders’ ability to understand emotions in others (OEA) impacts on teamworking because it is also related to empathy, which is necessary for teamworking. This finding is similar to Blackmore’s (2010) findings in an Australian context and to Taliadorou and Pashiardis (2015) in Cyprus. Both sources indicated the necessity for leaders to create emotional bonds so that teamworking is promoted. All head teachers agreed that understanding other peoples’ emotions is the most difficult part of being a leader. In addition, they all used their EI abilities differently to try to understand and access other people’s feelings. For instance, head teacher Daphne claimed certainty of her awareness about her staff’s educational needs because as she said she and her staff used to teach together and afterwards they had long discussions about those lessons. Apollo declared that weekly staff
meetings were also helpful for him because he could discuss issues with the staff and identify their needs. Lastly, Leto said that she tried to observe and identify her staff needs in their daily routines and during unofficial discussions with them during break or in the afternoon.

Third, all participant head teachers gave examples of controlling intense emotions, as discussed in section 4.2.3; a constraint considered essential to establish or preserve teamworking. Likewise, Frosi and Panta (2017) demonstrated that head teachers feel intense negative emotions that they have to suppress for the benefit of their schools’ operation. Crawford (2007; 2009) also described this complex and challenging need for head teachers to suppress their emotions in the workplace. This study builds on the above arguments of these previous studies because, according to my research participants, regulation of emotions (ROE) impacts on trust-based relationships that are needed for teamworking. All head teachers avowed that they would never allow themselves to lose control of their emotions because they have a duty to protect both the staff and students regardless of any crisis.

Lastly, the head teachers pointed out that a leader’s ability to use emotions to facilitate performance (UOE) is important in the Cypriot school system because of the lack of extrinsic rewards (promotions, salary increases, etc). Such a structure necessitates a reliance on intrinsic motivation (emotions of self-need to do something) to promote teamworking. The participant head teachers stressed the necessity in the Cypriot context for ‘emotional’ motivation to promote teamworking by appealing to each of the team’s members. Taliadorou and Pashiardis (2015) also demonstrated that leaders’ EI affects teachers’ job satisfaction in the Cypriot educational context. This study’s findings explained that use of emotions may be the one EI ability that influences teachers’ motivation and probably their job satisfaction. Also, this study extends the findings from Taliadorou and Pashiardis (2015) because it adds
that UOE and further EI are essential not only for teachers’ job satisfaction, but also for teamworking in the Cypriot educational context.

As can be seen, this study’s findings illustrate that leaders’ EI influences teamworking. These findings agree with and expand upon the findings by Anari (2012) which indicated a positive relationship between emotional intelligence and organisational commitment. Furthermore, from the thirty participating teachers’ perceptions the difference in the way teachers perceived EI, and the way their head teachers used it to promote teamworking, was evident. These findings implied that there is variation not only in the way EI is perceived and used by people, but also in the way associates perceived others’ EI. This variation affected their teamworking skills as in Apollo’s case external stakeholders such as parents and local authorities were not involved in teamworking.

6.2.2 Does leaders’ EI impact on vision sharing?

According to the head teachers’ and staff’s perceptions the four EI abilities (Mayer and Salovey, 199) do impact vision sharing.

All head teachers agreed that they valued a collective creation of their school’s vision. However, as they perceived their emotions (Self Emotional Appraisal) differently, they acted differently in relation to vision creation. Leto was the only participant head teacher who used to plan vision collectively. Daphne and Apollo expressed that they valued collective vision creation but their posts implied they were the one person ultimately responsible for the running of their schools. In this way, Apollo took the final decision in disagreements, while Daphne had the last say in the school’s vision. Findings showed that head teachers had an
individual vision which they communicated to others, so that it could be shared and embraced by all those involved.

Moreover, understanding other people’s emotions (OEA) is considered vitally important for vision creation and implementation, because the way head teachers perceive other people’s emotions relates to the decisions they take regarding vision creation and implementation. When people feel that their feelings are respected, they tend to engage in vision sharing and feelings of trust and mutual respect are created and shared (George, 2000; Smollan and Parry, 2011). Leto’s EI and especially others emotional appraisal enabled her to involve others in building a collective vision because, as she claimed, the best way to engage others in a vision is by involving them in its planning.

Furthermore, leaders’ ability to regulate emotions (ROE) is considered important because that skill is related to the creation of feelings of trust, which is an important component in the collective creation of vision. Regulation of emotions, according to this study’s participants, is necessary for both head teachers and team members in order to keep order and effectively maintain a school’s operation. These findings are in line with Smollan and Parry’s (2011) extensive series of qualitative studies in New Zealand, which demonstrated that followers perceive leaders’ ROE to be essential, in essence because a leader’s lack of ROE may well lead to organisational chaos.

Last, the head teachers’ ability to use emotions (UOE) impacted on vision creation and implementation because that ability is connected with motivation. The participant head teachers stressed the importance of this EI ability for the Cypriot educational system, as it lacks any provision to take advantage of or implement extrinsic motivation. They explained that head teachers rely on intrinsic, emotional motivation to plan vision collectively and then
implement it. Motivation is important not only for vision planning but also to spread enthusiasm and willingness for that vision’s implementation. Similar to the framework suggested by George (2000), this study’s findings also agree that leaders can and do influence their followers’ enthusiasm and optimism towards vision creation and implementation.

6.3 Conclusions about the findings

These findings, which are discussed in detail in chapters 4 and 5, allow me to draw the following conclusions.

Firstly, the data analysis emphasised that the different perceptions each head teacher had about EI can explain the different approaches used by each one to promote teamworking and create and implement a shared vision. Thus, leaders’ EI impacts differently, positively or negatively, on their decisions and actions on teamworking and shared vision. This study’s finding is aligned with Crawford’s (2009) extensive study on emotions and leadership in which emotions are signalled not only as influential parts of leadership but also argued as the “heart of leadership” (Crawford, 2009).

Secondly, this study suggests that there is a different dimension in how someone perceives and uses EI and what other people think about it. In this study, teachers’ answers in some items of the questionnaire showed this difference in perceptions of EI evident in the behaviour of the head teachers and deputy head teachers. This finding chimes with Antonakis et al. (2009) who argued that there is a variation between a person’s assumption on how she or he uses EI and what other people think about them.

Thirdly, leaders’ EI may be affected by the centralised system in Cyprus. The strictly centralised educational system considers the head teacher as the staff member responsible for
all aspects of school safety and the daily-to-day effective implementation of the prescribed educational system. This responsibility may affect head teachers’ EI and urge them to follow procedures according to MOEC regulations rather than selecting choices that their EI suggests.

Lastly, this study illustrates that it is a challenge to involve successfully all of a school’s stakeholders in vision sharing and teamworking. Leaders’ EI may be the necessary component for engaging stakeholders to establish both of these important goals. These assumptions are left unexplored in this study, but they prompt thinking about future research which is further discussed in section 6.6.

6.4 Research contribution

6.4.1 The originality of leaders’ EI evaluation using a case study approach in the Cypriot context

This research is the first in the Cypriot context to use a case study approach to explore the impact of leaders’ EI on teamworking and shared vision, as evaluated through head teachers’ and their staff’s perceptions. Due to the small numbers of respondents involved findings may not be generalised but it can be concluded that the data gathered did not show any significant relationship between teamworking and shared vision.

Findings showed that teamworking in a school is associated with a collegial and egalitarian approach to the staff by the head teacher when that school leader believes fully in collaborative decision-making and is very accessible to the staff.
Head teachers, even in such a rigid and centralised school system as found in Cyprus, can develop an individual vision for the school in such a way that the vision is shared among their staff.

6.4.2 The contribution of findings to CERE

This study contributes to the Cypriot educational leadership field as it provides in depth information about the complexity of EI conceptualisation and its impact on leadership activity. In addition, the study is the first to have explored how Cypriot head teachers and staff perceive EI and how EI abilities impact on leadership activities. Furthermore, this study's findings are shared with CERE because it is a condition that in order to obtain their permission to conduct research in Cypriot primary schools any research findings should be shared. CERE does not give permission for studies to be conducted if they do not show sufficient originality and sufficient addition to the field of education. Also, this study’s findings may inform theory and practice in education, as currently there is a discussion between the MOEC and teachers’ association(s) about changes in the educational system. Further to this study’s findings about EI, CERE could further explore Daphne’s point that it takes time to generate teamworking in a school. Currently Cyprus might miss out on the benefits of generating teamworking because of frequent transfers, as explained in section 1.5. This aspect needs further exploration and evaluation, see section 6.6.

6.4.3 The leadership context

Moreover, this study contributes to educational leadership research because of the case study approach, which gives an inner and in-depth look (Opie, 2004) into the impact of leaders’ EI on shared vision and teamworking. Blaxter et al. (2010) also claimed that case studies can
link research, practice and action, so this analysis may inform policies that concern head teachers’ or other staff members’ promotion or educative programmes (Smollan and Parry, 2011; Taliadorou and Pashiardis, 2015).

The following summaries of the ways of each head teacher understood, articulated and used EI can be used in head teachers’ educative programmes. They can generate discussion about the emotional challenges of leadership and the way head teachers deal with them.

Finally, Spillane et al. (2011) mentioned the need for a detailed analysis of school leaders’ activity to be able to understand the reasons that led them to take certain leadership actions. It is my belief that this thesis provides useful suggestions for further research towards that direction, as set out in section 6.6. The fact that this research was conducted in Cyprus, where few studies has explored a similar context, also adds to knowledge in this field.

6.4.3.1 Apollo’s case

Apollo is an experienced head teacher of a village school as discussed in section 1.6.

He accurately expressed the emotions caused by the high-level position in school hierarchy, as explained in section 1.5. He stated that despite the highly centralised system in Cyprus (see section 1.5), some decisions were taken in a democratic way but when there was a conflict of views, he felt that he had to give the solution.

His EI enabled him to care and want to be aware of the needs and feelings of his colleagues because as he believed this would promote empathy and develop a climate of cooperation. He also said that he felt lucky because he worked with people he knew from previous years and that was very helpful to him. Conversely, the assistant principals at the school, while confirming the atmosphere of cooperation at the school, attributed it to the good relations
between the staff. Concerning the design and implementation of a common vision, Apollo said he was disappointed with the involvement of parents and the community in school activities. He even attributed their attitude to the culture of the community but he stressed that he would continue to try.

6.4.3.2 Leto’s case

Leto is also an experienced head teacher of an elementary school situated in the centre of a town (see section 1.6).

She felt strong emotions of stress and accountability because of the hierarchical and centralized education system (see section 1.5). Because of these feelings, her EI abilities enabled her to share decisions and responsibilities with her colleagues. She also suggested that the best way to achieve co-operation and a shared vision is to involve all stakeholders.

Furthermore, Leto claimed that head teachers act as role models for others, so her aim is to encourage others to participate. She stressed that empathy is also important for teamworking but she admitted that is difficult for head teachers to know the needs and feelings of their colleagues. That is why she used to spend most of her time working in the teachers’ office to get to know them more easily. Her deputy head teachers confirmed that it was her positive energy that encouraged others to get involved.

6.4.3.3 Daphne’s case

Daphne was the female head teacher with the most experience in headship (section 1.6). She was the head teacher of a school in the suburbs of the city with a large percentage of students from different countries (see section 1.6 and appendix 1).
Daphne also had a strong sense of accountability reasoning from the highly centralised system as explained in section 1.5, so her EI prompted her to want to have the final say on every decision she made at school. However, the school’s teachers did not seem to experience her need of having control of everything. All her school’s teachers rated Daphne’s actions with the highest score of 5 (see section 5.3.2, table 5.4) in the question in the questionnaire used that concerned the degree of autonomy given by the school head teacher.

Additionally, her sense of accountability and her EI influenced her to be bold about issues of self-control by typically saying "I never let myself lose control". Moreover, she sensed that empathy is crucial for team working so she used her sense of humour that characterises her to get to know her colleagues better. Her deputy head teachers confirmed that her effort is to engage others in shared vision and motivate teachers, students, parents and local authorities by using encouraging words and compliments where applicable.

**6.4.4 The relation of teamworking and shared vision**

This study showed that a strong commitment to teamworking and vision sharing among the staff may inhibit autonomy and agency on the part of the individual teacher. All head teachers scored a rate higher than average in questions that concerned teachers’ autonomy but the same high rate was also scored in areas of the questionnaire filled in by the thirty classroom teachers.

It remains unclear, though, how distributed leadership can work in a context where the EI of the head teacher has significant impact on vision sharing among the staff. This finding needs further exploration as discussed in section 6.6.
6.4.5 The choice of Mayer and Salovey (1997) EI model

In this study I chose to use the Mayer and Salovey (1997) EI ability model, which is not related to personality and which has been successfully used by other researchers (Kafetsios and Zampetakis, 2008; Taliadorou and Pashiardis, 2015). Also the model only explains EI as a mental ability by using performances tests (Smollan and Parry, 2011).

The four distinct mental EI abilities proposed by Mayer and Salovey enabled me, as explained in section 3.11, to use them as part of codes and themes for my data analysis and evaluate data gathered from different sources. Consequently, this study’s findings also chime with Kafetsios and Zampetakis (2008) and Taliadorou and Pashiardis (2015) who also recommended the ability EI model and further validated the trustworthiness of the Mayer and Salovey (1997) model of scrutinising EI.

6.4.6 The qualitative approach

The preference in qualitative approach gave useful insights into EI and leadership that none quantitative approach would offer and agreed with Clifton (2011) that demonstrated case study with qualitative approach as the optimum way for gathering data in-depth.

Despite the small scale of this current study, epitomised in terms of the number of schools and participants, this research provided in-depth information about the impact of leaders’ EI on shared vision and teamworking. In light of the scarcity of existing research relating to this specific context, the study has not only provided greater insights into EI and leadership, but it has also given voice to a group of people whose EI perceptions have not been explored extensively in the published leadership literature.
Moreover, the choice of semi-structured interviews gave participant head teachers the chance to reflect on their perceptions and talk about their daily, emotional, social interaction in their workplace. Furthermore, this research has also given the opportunity to followers to express their views about EI and leadership.

These are findings which no large scale, quantitative research would be likely to provide.

6.5 Reflections of the researcher

As a reflective researcher, I find it necessary to acknowledge the issues that might have either supported or undermined the research process and the reported results. Such a procedure will allow the reader to conclude with confidence that these issues have been considered. The points raised relate to the complexity of EI and the translation implications.

6.5.1 The complexity of EI

EI is a controversial issue that triggers lots of discussion because of the three strands that explain it, as discussed in section 2.4. Due to the controversies about EI and its measurements, discussed in section 2.3, EI is evaluated in this study using an interview protocol, as Smollan and Parry (2011) suggested. These EI controversies were critical for this study’s purpose as this study did not measure leaders’ EI but assessed how head teachers perceived EI and how those head teachers used their EI. The perceptions of each school’s staff were also considered.

Data from other sources were used so that the different perspectives of head teachers’ EI would also be assessed. The use of other sources provided triangulation, as discussed in section 3.3.4, and strengthened the reliability of the study’s findings. Moreover, the fact that I
was not involved in these schools as a staff member and I have not as yet been involved in a headship position, allowed me to remain emotionally uninvolved with the research participants, in order to make critical and accurate statements about the findings.

6.5.2 The complexity of translation

This study was conducted in Standardised Greek; data were also analysed in Standardised Greek. Cautions were taken to ensure the accuracy of translation and minimised the danger of misunderstanding due to translation from Standardised Greek into English as I am a student in a UK university. Every possible effort was made to ensure accuracy of translation, so that the author’s inevitable concern of conveying the participants’ exact meanings is limited (Holland and Ramazanoglu, 1994).

Having in mind the risk of translation as Bassnett(2002) and Sopromadze and Moorosi, (2016) avowed, methodological procedures explained in section 3.6.5 were followed. These procedures concerned: i) the questions’ construction, ii) the quality of translation and iii) respect for the cultural context. A further ‘quality control’ measure that Sopromadze and Moorosi (2016) added, is to translate only small parts and straightforward sentences of an interview transcript. Taking in mind all these methodological cautions for translation I translated into English only the parts of the interviews and of the policy documents that should be included in my data analysis chapters. Furthermore, Athena, my Cypriot friend specialist in linguistics checked the accuracy of translation.
6.6 Suggestions for further research

This study has identified several areas suitable for further research. An agenda with suggestions for such research is presented below. This agenda does not concentrate solely on the Cypriot education system, as leaders’ EI is an unexplored area in general; my findings can provide insightful suggestions for research in general as those findings identified other areas for further exploration.

My first suggestion for further exploration concerns the impact of team members’ EI on teamworking. As discussed in section 4.2.1, Apollo’s deputy head teachers argued that the success of teamworking in their school was not due to their head teacher’s EI but to the good relationships between the staff. Grainger (2010) also claimed that among other characteristics of successful teams was the necessity for mutual respect among team members, as well as the willingness to work together and learn from each other; aspects related to EI as this study demonstrated. This statement could not be further explored in this study but can be investigated in future research in the Cypriot education system context, as there is little empirical research concerning any aspect of EI in Cyprus (Taliadorou and Pashiardis, 2015; Stavrou, 2017).

A second suggestion for further exploration relates to the impact of leaders’ EI on team members’ EI. There is little research on the effects of leaders’ emotional skills on employees’ emotions and work attitudes. Taliadorou and Pashiardis (2015) explored the impact of leaders’ EI on teachers’ job satisfaction, but further exploration is needed to clarify the impact of leaders’ EI on team members’ EI.
A third suggestion that needs further exploration concerns the frequent staff transfers that occur from ESC and how they affect EI and teamworking. These transfers may significantly impact on teachers’ EI chances of generating teamworking as according to this study’s research participants it takes time to generate teamworking.

A further and more wide-ranging suggestion for more research is how distributed leadership can work in an environment where head teachers’ EI has significant influence on vision sharing among the staff. Further exploration may provide useful data about the limits of centralisation in the Cypriot educational system.

Another suggestion that needs further exploration is gender variance. Gender variance in terms of head teachers’ perceptions of EI needs wider consideration as this study had only one male head teacher and conclusions cannot be drawn on this basis. Larger-scale exploration may offer the chance to make comparisons based on gender in Cyprus.

Additionally, gender variance may also be explored between teachers’ perceptions about head teachers’ EI. This study’s findings emphasised differences between the way head teachers and deputy head teachers perceived and used EI and the perceptions of teachers. As this study considered only gender variance between participant head teachers, gender variance between staff could be evaluated by future research. Primary education in Cyprus has large proportion of female staff but the male head teachers own larger proportion than the female cohort so a study that explores gender variance of EI and perceptions about it is particular important.

Moreover, the tension between head teachers’ self perception of EI and staff’s perceptions on head teachers’ EI is an area that needs further exploration. This study’s findings as it is discussed in section 4.3.3 and 5.3.3 show that there is difference between how head teachers
perceive and use EI and what staff think. This study’s findings cannot be generalised but further research would provide greater insight into this area.

Additionally, as it is presented in section 6.2.1 use of emotions is an EI ability that triggers motivation and job satisfaction. This finding needs further exploration especially in the Cypriot educational context which is according to these research participants lacks extrinsic motivation. This finding is important for CERE because if future larger-scale research were to produce similar findings this could provide a basis for reforming the selection criteria for head teachers or reforming head teachers’ educative programmes.

Furthermore, the impact of leaders’ EI on teamworking and shared vision is an unexplored area in other educational contexts in Cyprus; for instance pre-primary education or higher education. Such an omission offers an ideal opportunity for further research. In addition, the limited studies exploring leaders’ EI impact on teamworking and vision sharing imply the benefit of repeating this current study on a larger scale, in order to be able to provide valid generalisations.

Finally, the study’s findings are context-related, since it was conducted in a single culture (primary education in Cyprus), so there is potential for exploring this field of research in other contexts. Exploration and further research can be made in secondary education but also in various forms of post-compulsory education. Additionally, possible comparisons could be made between centralised and non-centralised educational systems.

6.7 Conclusions

This study has evaluated the impact of leaders’ EI on teamworking and shared vision explored through the perceptions of three Cypriot primary school head teachers’ and their
staff. It provided in-depth knowledge about teamworking and shared vision. Moreover, it has contributed to new knowledge and identified areas appropriate for further research. Furthermore, it identified aspects that may inform educational change that is currently occurring in the educational context of Cyprus.

The study also revealed a difference between how people perceive and use EI and what other people think about it. This apparent difference questions all those studies that measure the impact of leaders’ EI on leadership and yet do not provide triangulation in their research methodology in order to validate their findings.

To conclude, this study has added to my knowledge as a researcher. During this three and a half-year journey I learned to reflect critically on my own work as well as on other people’s work. I also learnt to justify my decisions and I feel that I gained much more resilience and stamina to cope with my multi-identifications. Above all, from my research I gained valuable knowledge and developed competences that will benefit me in my professional life as a primary school teacher and a potential headteacher.
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Appendices

Appendix 1–The Cypriot educational context

The Cypriot Republic’s ethnic partition consists of the Greek-Cypriot majority and the Turkish-Cypriot minority. These two communities have not lived together since 20 July 1974. In 1974 a Turkish military operation resulted in extensive relocations and in the island’s de facto partition into two ethnically homogenized parts: the Cyprus Republic, which controls the southern part and is practically dominated by the Greek-Cypriots and the occupied part, the “Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus,” 1983, a formation that has been declared illegal by the United Nations and is recognised only by Turkey. Despite the ongoing negotiations for a settlement and the opening of a few check points in the buffer zone in 2003 that has allowed relative freedom of movement across the dividing line, the divider still remains.

Immigration to Cyprus has grown over the last few decades, consisting of immigrants and labour workers from mainly five countries, Romania, Georgia, Greece, Bulgaria and Syria (MOEC, 2017). Some internal movement of Turkish Cypriots from the north to the south of Cyprus has been made after the partial lifting of restrictions of movement in 2003.

According to the latest survey in 2011 of the current inhabitants 21.4% are non-Cypriots. The changing profile of the population in Cyprus has affected the schools and the educational system. While in the school year 1995–1996, the percentage of foreign students was 4.41%, in 2016–2017 this percentage has risen to 16.25% (MOEC, 2017). At the moment there is a
growing number of “multicultural schools”, i.e. schools with cultural, religious, ethnic or language diversity within the student population (Zembylas, 2010).

Finally, the recent economic crisis in Cyprus in 2013 has affected large numbers of both resident and non-resident populations, with the impact being also felt in schools. Strict measures left thousands of people without a job. An increasing number of families with children at school were in need of basic food and financial aid (provided mainly by social organisations and the church) to make it through their everyday lives.
Appendix 2–Head teachers’ interview protocol

Interviewee (Title and number):

Interviewer:

Stella Stavrou

Survey sections used:

_____ A. Interviewee Background

_____ B. Appraisal and expression of emotion in the self

_____ C. Decision Making- School vision

_____ D. Appraisal and recognition of emotions in others

_____ E. Teamworking

_____ F. Regulation of emotion in the self

_____ G. Use of emotions to facilitate performance

Other topics discussed:

Documents obtained:

Policy documents (e.g. Environmental school policy document, students’ welfare school policy documents, etc.), documents with staff responsibilities, the school’s timetable.

Documents will be received before the interview with the principal.
Introductory Protocol

To facilitate our note-taking, I would like to audio tape our conversations today. For your information, only I will have access to the recordings which will be kept for six years. I will send you the transcript interviews back to you if you would like complete something else too. This document states that: (1) all information will be held confidential, (2) your participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time if you feel uncomfortable, and (3) I do not intend to do any harm.

Introduction

You are asked to speak with us today to share your experience as a head teacher. Our research project focuses on evaluating if EI of a head teacher influences vision sharing and teamworking.

A. Interviewee Background

1. How long have you been...?

_______ in your present position?

_______ at this institution?

2. What is your highest degree? ________________________________

3. Give us a brief description about you (i.e. aims, ambitions, job satisfaction, etc.) Question from Wong and Law questionnaire (2002); Crawford (2009)

4. Give us a brief description of the school (i.e. position, number of teachers, student population, bilingual students etc.)
B. Appraisal and expression of emotion in the self:

1. Can you describe in detail what are your feelings about your current position in the specific school?

2. Do you have any future goals for the school improvement? **Question from Wong and Law questionnaire (2002)**

C. Decision making-School Vision:

1. How are decisions made in your school?

2. Describe the way you handle staff meetings (i.e. ministry reports, subjects to discuss, educational issues)

D. Appraisal and recognition of emotions in others

1. Can you name two major values that underpinned your leadership activity? How do you manage to inspire them? **Bennett et al (2003)** claim that values such as truth and trust are important social and cultural context of organisation.

2. Are you aware of your teachers, educational or personal needs? How do you provide support for your teachers’ needs?

E. Teamworking

1. How important is the participation of teachers in decision making? **Hulpia and Devos (2010)** support the organizational commitment is enhanced when decision making is participative.
2. How do you manage the implementation of goals (annual goals of the Ministry of Education, or other school improvement goals)?

3. How are students, parents and local authorities involved in the school vision?

F. Regulation of emotion in the self

1. Can you describe a strong emotional incident that you had to have handled? Crawford (2004)

G. Use of emotions to facilitate performance

1. How do you motivate your followers? Goleman et al. (2001) supported that positive emotions can be contagious. Inspirational leader can influence others can motivate through emotions.
Appendix 3–Deputy head teachers’ interview protocol

Interviewee (Title and number):

__________________________________________________________________________

Interviewer:

Stella Stavrou

__________________________________________________________________________

Survey sections used:

_____ A. Interviewee Background

_____ B. Decision Making - motivation

_____ C. Teamworking

Introductory Protocol

To facilitate our note-taking, I would like to audio tape our conversations today. For your information, only I will have access to the recordings which will be kept for six years. This document states that: (1) all information will be held confidential, (2) your participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time if you feel uncomfortable, and (3) I do not intend to do any harm.

Introduction

You are asked to speak with us today to share your experience as a deputy head teacher. Our research project focuses on evaluating if EI of a leader influences vision sharing and teamworking explored through your perspectives and your colleagues.

A. Interviewee Background

How long have you been …?

_______ in your present position?
______ at this institution?

What is your highest degree? ____________________________________________

Give us a brief description of your head teacher (i.e. leadership style, collaboration, vision etc.)

___________________________________________________________

B. Decision making AND motivation:

1. Does your head teacher dream of a school improvement vision? What is he/she doing for its implementation?

2. How are decisions made in the school?

3. Does the head teacher distribute responsibilities to others?

4. How does the head teacher manage the implementation of goals?

5. Does your head teacher give intrinsic or extrinsic motivation for goals implementation?

C. Teamworking

1. How are teachers, students and other authorities involved in the school vision?

2. How does your head teacher manage the cooperation between school and parents’ association?

3. How does your head teacher manage the cooperation between school and local authorities?

4. Does your head teacher give opportunities to the staff for collaboration? Please explain.

5. Does your head teacher discuss with you and the staff about solutions to school problems?

6. Are you aware of all the current school affairs and activities?
Appendix 4–Questionnaire

School Leadership Questionnaire

(Aspects of teamworking and shared vision)

Pashiardis and Brauckmann (2009)

Below you will find a list of statements about the leadership behaviour of school principals. Please indicate the extent to which your school principal’s behaviour matches each of the statements.

The numbers correspond to the following:

1= Strongly Disagree

2= Disagree

3= Neither agree or disagree

4= Agree

5= Strongly agree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The School Principal</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Promotes open communication and flexibility in relations with the staff.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leaves enough autonomy to teachers in order to organize and program their teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Creates a common vision for school improvement with the staff’s cooperation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Encourages staff to be actively involved in the planning and implementation of this vision.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Solves problems in cooperative way with teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Implements participative decision-making processes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Listens carefully to the ideas and suggestions of the teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Facilitates decision-making by consensus among staff.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Discusses school affairs with teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Creates possibilities for teachers to meet and collaborate.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Rewards teachers for special contribution to the school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Compliments teachers who contribute exceptionally to school activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Encourages relations between the school on one hand and the community and parents on the other.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Promotes cooperation with other organizations and businesses from the community so that students' needs are addressed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Discusses school goals with relevant stakeholders (school board, parent, municipality etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Demonstrates awareness of school/community needs and initiate activities to meet those identified needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Demonstrates the use of appropriate and effective techniques for community and parent involvement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Emphasizes and nurtures two-way communication between the school and community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Projects a positive image to the community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Builds trust within the local community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Articulates, discusses and communicates the school vision to all members of the school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Articulates, discusses and communicates the school vision to all in the external community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Values and vision are evident through the things he/she does.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Values and vision are evident through the way he/she spends his/her time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Values and vision are evident through what he/she considers important.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Holds a vision for the school that creates new opportunities for progress.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Ensures that there is clarity about the roles and core activities of the staff.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Ensures that there is clarity about work priorities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Works on creating an orderly atmosphere.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Takes care of the fact that there is clarity regarding policies and procedures to be implemented.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5–HREC favourable opinion memorandum

Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC)

From  Dr Louise Westmarland
The Open University Human Research Ethics Committee

Email  louise.westmarland@open.ac.uk
Extension  (6) 52462

To  Stella Stavrou

Project title: Does E. I of a head teacher influence vision sharing and teamworking? (The perspectives of three Cypriot head teachers and their colleagues)

HREC ref  HREC/2267/Stavrou

Memorandum

Date application submitted: 28/08/17
Date of HREC response: 20/10/17

This memorandum is to confirm that the research protocol for the above-named research project, as submitted for ethics review, has been given a favourable opinion by the Open University Human Research Ethics Committee.

Please note the following:

1. You are responsible for notifying the HREC immediately of any information received by you, or of which you become aware which would cast doubt on, or alter, any information contained in the original application, or a later amendment which would
raise questions about the safety and/or continued conduct of the research.

2. It is essential that any proposed amendments to the research are sent to the HREC for review so they can be recorded and where required, a favourable opinion given prior to any changes being implemented (except only in cases of emergency when the welfare of the participant or researcher is or may be effected).

3. Please include your HREC reference number in any documents or correspondence. It is essential that it is included in any publicity related to your research, e.g. when seeking participants or advertising your research so it is clear that it has been reviewed by HREC and adheres to OU ethics review processes.

4. You are authorised to present this memorandum to outside bodies such as NHS Research Ethics Committees in support of any application for future research clearance. Also, where there is an external ethics review, a copy of the application and outcome should be sent to the HREC.

5. OU research ethics review procedures are fully compliant with the majority of grant awarding bodies and where they exist, their frameworks for research ethics.

6. At the end of your project, you are required to assess your research for ethics related issues and/or major changes. Where these have occurred you will need to provide the Committee with a HREC final report to reflect how these were dealt with using the final report template on the research ethics website - http://www.open.ac.uk/research/ethics/human-research/full-review-process-and-proforma#final_report

Best regards

Dr Louise Westmarland

The Open University Human Research Ethics Committee
Appendix 6–Information leaflet- Head teachers

Stella Stavrou
5 Arktou str., Limassol
stella.stavrou@open.ac.uk.
Tel. no. 99897654
Doctoral researcher, student
The Open University

To the school head teacher

What is the aim of this research?

This research aim is to evaluate if leaders’ emotional intelligence (EI) influences vision sharing and teamworking explored through the perceptions of three primary school Cypriot head teachers and their colleagues. A case study approach has been chosen. It will be an in-depth examination of three Cypriot schools. In the research, there are three groups of participants, the school head teachers, deputy head teachers and teachers. Semi-structured interviews will be conducted with head teachers. Also, semi-structured interviews will be carried out with deputy head teachers and questionnaires will be answered by teachers. In addition, policy documents, such as environmental policy documents, other documents which concern the allocation of responsibilities to staff, students and parents if applicable, and a full school programme and activities will be carefully examined.

Who is conducting the research and who is it for?

This research is undertaken by Stavrou Stella, who is registered for a Doctorate in Education at the Open University. The researcher has received training in carrying out research on RESEARCH COMPETENCIES.
Why am I being invited to participate in this research?

The research will be held in three primary Cypriot schools. For this reason, as a head teacher of a Cypriot primary school, we would like to invite you to participate in our research.

If I take part in this research, what will be involved?

This research chooses to use case study approach. Three case studies in elementary schools in Cyprus will be undertaken to evaluate if emotional intelligence (EI) of leaders influences shared vision and teamworking explored through the perceptions of three head teachers and their colleagues. The research questions are:

- Does emotional intelligence (EI) of a leader affect teamworking in school?
- Does emotional intelligence (EI) of a leader influence shared vision?

Semi structured interviews will be conducted with head teachers. The head teachers will be asked to answer questions that concern their leadership and narrate emotional incidents that occurred during their position. Transcript interviews will return back to the interviewee to complete only any information overlooked.

In addition, I will collect only documents that concern the allocation of responsibilities to the staff, students and parents, if applicable, a detail school programme and school action plans or policies. I will collect these documents before the interview with the school principal.

*Documents will be received before the interview with the principal.*

Participation in research

It is estimated that interviews with the head teacher will not last more than one and a half hour for each interviewee. The principal of the school will be invited to read the transcribed interview and complete just anything overlooked, but this is expected to take no more than half an hour. All interviews will be conducted at your school place during operation hours that is best suitable for you.

Is it confidential?
Your participation will be treated in **strict confidence** in accordance with the EU Data Protection Act. No personal information will be passed to anyone apart from the researcher. All information will be kept in password-protected files saved on OU secure server.

**There is anonymity?**

All data will be anonymised. The research doesn’t require the names or any other personal information about individuals. Numbers will be given to the consent forms that will refer to an interview protocol or questionnaire I will write a report about the findings from this study, and it might include parts from the interviews or questionnaires, but no individual will be identifiable in the published results of the research.

**What happens now?**

Over the next few weeks, I will come back to collect **in sealed envelopes the consent forms**. As the consent forms received will be in sealed envelopes no other individual will know your decision to participate or not. Although you might want to participate, I have to inform you that you might not be selected. My criteria for choosing schools are the school position and its population. I need to make sure that schools with approximately the same population are included in the study and for this reason, I cannot guarantee that I will see everyone who volunteers to take part. Your participation is entirely voluntary and you can withdraw at any time before the 2nd April 2018, when the data will be anonymised.

What if I have other questions?

If you have any other questions about the study, I would be very happy to answer them.

Please contact Stella Stavrou, tel. 99897654 or by email to stella.stavrou@open.ac.uk.

You can also contact Dr Janet Harvey by email to janet.harvey@open.ac.uk or Dr Jane Cullen by email to jane.cullen@open.ac.uk for further information.
Appendix 7–Information leaflet- Deputy head teachers

Stella Stavrou
5 Arktou str., Limassol
stella.stavrou@open.ac.uk.
Tel. no. 99897654
Doctoral researcher, student
The Open University

To the school deputy head teacher

What is the aim of this research?
This research aim is to evaluate if leaders’ emotional intelligence (EI) influences vision sharing and teamworking explored through the perceptions of three primary school Cypriot head teachers and their colleagues. A case study approach has been chosen. It will be an in-depth examination of three Cypriot schools. In the research, there are three groups of participants, the school head teachers, deputy head teachers and teachers. Semi-structured interviews will be conducted with head teachers. Also, semi-structured interviews will be carried out with deputy head teachers and questionnaires will be answered by teachers. In addition, policy documents, such as environmental policy documents, other documents which
concern the allocation of responsibilities to staff, students and parents if applicable, and a full school programme and activities will be carefully examined.

**Who is conducting the research and who is it for?**

This research is undertaken by Stavrou Stella, who is registered for a Doctorate in Education at the Open University. The researcher has received training in carrying out research on RESEARCH COMPETENCIES.

**Why am I being invited to participate in this research?**

The research will be held in three primary Cypriot schools. For this reason, as a deputy head teacher of a Cypriot primary school, we would like to invite you to participate in our research.

**If I take part in this research, what will be involved?**

This research chooses to use case study approach. Three case studies in elementary schools in Cyprus will be undertaken to evaluate if emotional intelligence of leaders influences shared vision and teamworking explored through the perceptions of three head teachers and their colleagues. The research questions are:

- Does emotional intelligence of a leader affect teamworking in school?
- Does emotional intelligence of a leader influence shared vision?

Semi-structured interviews will be undertaken with deputy head teachers. The interviews will ask the participants to answer questions that concern their principal leadership activities.

**Participation in research**

It is estimated that interviews with the deputy head teacher will not last more than one and a half hour for each interviewee. All interviews will be conducted at your school place during operation hours that is best suitable for you.

**Is it confidential?**

Your participation will be treated in **strict confidence** in accordance with the EU Data Protection Act. No personal information will be passed to anyone apart from the researcher.

All information will be kept in password-protected files saved on OU secure server.
There is anonymity?

All data will be anonymised. The research doesn’t require the names or any other personal information about individuals. Numbers will be given to the consent forms that will refer to an interview protocol or questionnaire I will write a report about the findings from this study, and it might include parts from the interviews or questionnaires, but no individual will be identifiable in the published results of the research.

What happens now?

Over the next few weeks, I will come back to collect in sealed envelopes the consent forms. As the consent forms received will be in sealed envelopes no other individual will know your decision to participate or not. Although you might want to participate, I have to inform you that you might not be selected. My criteria for choosing schools are the school position and its population. I need to make sure that schools with approximately the same population are included in the study and for this reason, I cannot guarantee that I will see everyone who volunteers to take part. Your participation is entirely voluntary and you can withdraw at any time before the 2nd April 2018, when the data will be anonymised.

What if I have other questions?

If you have any other questions about the study, I would be very happy to answer them.

Please contact Stella Stavrou, tel. 99897654 or by email to stella.stavrou@open.ac.uk.

You can also contact Dr Janet Harvey by email to janet.harvey@open.ac.uk or Dr Jane Cullen by email to jane.cullen@open.ac.uk for further information.
To the school teachers

What is the aim of this research?

This research aim is to evaluate if leaders’ emotional intelligence influences vision sharing and teamworking explored through the perceptions of three primary school Cypriot head teachers and their colleagues. A case study approach has been chosen. It will be an in-depth examination of three Cypriot schools. In the research, there are three groups of participants, the school head teachers, deputy head teachers and teachers. Semi-structured interviews will be conducted with head teachers. Also, semi-structured interviews will be carried out with deputy head teachers and questionnaires will be answered by teachers. In addition, policy documents, such as environmental policy documents, other documents which concern the
allocation of responsibilities to staff, students and parents if applicable, and a full school programme and activities will be carefully examined.

Who is conducting the research and who is it for?

This research is undertaken by Stavrou Stella, who is registered for a Doctorate in Education at the Open University. The researcher has received training in carrying out research on RESEARCH COMPETENCIES.

Why am I being invited to participate in this research?

The research will be held in three primary Cypriot schools. For this reason, as a teacher of a Cypriot primary school, we would like to invite you to participate in our research.

If I take part in this research, what will be involved?

This research chooses to use case study approach. Three case studies in elementary schools in Cyprus will be undertaken to evaluate if emotional intelligence of leaders influences shared vision and teamworking explored through the perceptions of three head teachers and their colleagues. The research questions are:

- Does emotional intelligence of a leader affect teamworking in school?
- Does emotional intelligence of a leader influence shared vision?

Questionnaires will be answered by teachers. The questionnaire will ask the participants to answer questions that concern their principal leadership activities.

Participation in research

Teachers will have to complete a questionnaire about leadership. The completion of the questionnaire will not take longer than half an hour.

Is it confidential?

Your participation will be treated in strict confidence in accordance with the EU Data Protection Act. No personal information will be passed to anyone apart from the researcher.

All information will be kept in password-protected files saved on OU secure server.
There is anonymity?

All data will be anonymised. The research doesn’t require the names or any other personal information about individuals. Numbers will be given to the consent forms that will refer to an interview protocol or questionnaire I will write a report about the findings from this study, and it might include parts from the interviews or questionnaires, but no individual will be identifiable in the published results of the research.

What happens now?

Over the next few weeks, I will come back to collect in sealed envelopes the consent forms. As the consent forms received will be in sealed envelopes no other individual will know your decision to participate or not. Although you might want to participate, I have to inform you that you might not be selected. My criteria for choosing schools are the school position and its population. I need to make sure that schools with approximately the same population are included in the study and for this reason, I cannot guarantee that I will see everyone who volunteers to take part. Your participation is entirely voluntary and you can withdraw at any time before the 2nd April 2018, when the data will be anonymised.

What if I have other questions?

If you have any other questions about the study, I would be very happy to answer them.

Please contact Stella Stavrou, tel. 99897654 or by email to stella.stavrou@open.ac.uk.

You can also contact Dr Janet Harvey by email to janet.harvey@open.ac.uk or Dr Jane Cullen by email to jane.cullen@open.ac.uk for further information.
Appendix 9–Consent form- Head teachers

Consent form for persons participating in a research project

CONTACT DETAILS

Stella Stavrou
5 Arktou str., Limassol, Cyprus

stella.stavrou@open.ac.uk.

Tel. no. 99897654

Doctoral researcher, student
The Open University

Number of participant:

Name of principal investigator: Stella Stavrou

1. I consent to participate in this project, the details of which have been explained to me, and I have been provided with a written statement in plain language to keep.

2. I understand that my participation will involve interview and I agree that the researcher may use anonymised quotations of the results in published material, this is also described in the plain language statement.

3. I acknowledge that:
a. the possible effects of participating in this research have been explained to my satisfaction;

b. I have been informed that I am free to withdraw from the project without explanation or prejudice and to request the destruction of any data that have been gathered from me until it is anonymised at the point of transcription on the 2nd April 2018. After this point data will have been processed and it will not be possible to withdraw any unprocessed data I have provided;

c. the project is for the purpose of research;

d. I have been informed that the confidentiality of the information I provide will be safeguarded subject to any legal requirements;

e. I have been informed that with my consent the data generated will be stored in OU secure server and all files will be password protected and will be destroyed after six years;

f. If necessary, any data from me will be referred to by a pseudonym in any publications arising from the research;

g. I have been informed that a summary copy of the research findings will be forwarded to me, should I request this.

I consent to this interview □ yes □ no

(please tick)

I consent to this interview being audio-taped □ yes □ no

(please tick)

I wish to receive a copy of the summary project report on research findings □ yes □ no

(please tick)

Participant signature: ____________________________ Date: ____________________________
Appendix 10–Consent form- Deputy head teachers

Doctorate in Education

Consent form for persons participating in a research project

CONTACT DETAILS

Stella Stavrou
5 Arktou str., Limassol, Cyprus
stella.stavrou@open.ac.uk.
Tel. no. 99897654
Doctoral researcher, student
The Open University

Number of participant:

Name of principal investigator: Stella Stavrou

1. I consent to participate in this project, the details of which have been explained to me, and I have been provided with a written statement in plain language to keep.

2. I understand that my participation will involve interview and I agree that the researcher may use anonymised quotations of the results in published material, this is also described in the plain language statement.

3. I acknowledge that:
a. the possible effects of participating in this research have been explained to my satisfaction;

b. I have been informed that I am free to withdraw from the project without explanation or prejudice and to request the destruction of any data that have been gathered from me until it is anonymised at the point of transcription point on the 2nd April 2018. After this point data will have been processed and it will not be possible to withdraw any unprocessed data I have provided;

c. the project is for the purpose of research;

d. I have been informed that the confidentiality of the information I provide will be safeguarded subject to any legal requirements;

e. I have been informed that with my consent the data generated will be stored in OU secure server and all files will be password protected and will be destroyed after six years;

f. If necessary, any data from me will be referred to by a pseudonym in any publications arising from the research;

g. I have been informed that a summary copy of the research findings will be forwarded to me, should I request this.

I consent to this interview □ yes □ no
(please tick)

I consent to this interview being audio-taped □ yes □ no
(please tick)

I wish to receive a copy of the summary project report on research findings □ yes □ no
(please tick)

Participant signature: ____________________________  Date: ____________________________
Appendix 11—Consent form- Teachers

Doctorate in Education

Consent form for persons participating in a research project

CONTACT DETAILS

Stella Stavrou
5 Arktou str., Limassol, Cyprus
stella.stavrou@open.ac.uk.
Tel. no. 99897654
Doctoral researcher, student
The Open University

Number of participant:

Name of principal investigator: Stella Stavrou

1. I consent to participate in this project, the details of which have been explained to me, and I have been provided with a written statement in plain language to keep.

2. I understand that my participation will involve questionnaire and I agree that the researcher may use the anonymised results in published material, as described in the plain language statement.

3. I acknowledge that:
a. the possible effects of participating in this research have been explained to my satisfaction;

b. I have been informed that I am free to withdraw from the project without explanation or prejudice and to request the destruction of any data that have been gathered from me until it is anonymised at the point of transcription point on the 2nd April 2018. After this point data will have been processed and it will not be possible to withdraw any unprocessed data I have provided;

c. the project is for the purpose of research;

d. I have been informed that the confidentiality of the information I provide will be safeguarded subject to any legal requirements;

e. I have been informed that with my consent the data generated will be stored in OU secure server and all files will be password protected and will be destroyed after six years;

f. If necessary, any data from me will be referred to by a pseudonym in any publications arising from the research;

g. I have been informed that a summary copy of the research findings will be forwarded to me, should I request this.

I consent to this questionnaire □ yes □ no

(please tick)

I wish to receive a copy of the summary project report on research findings □ yes □ no

(please tick)

Participant signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
## Appendix 12–List of policy documents collected in each participant school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of participant school</th>
<th>Title of document in Greek</th>
<th>Title of document in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronus school (Leto)</td>
<td>Ορολόγιο πρόγραμμα</td>
<td>Timetable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Υπευθυνότητες</td>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Βελτιωτικό σχέδιο δράσης</td>
<td>Improvement action plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poseidon school (Daphne)</td>
<td>Συνολικό ωρολόγιο εκπαιδευτικών</td>
<td>Total teachers’ timetable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Κατανομή υπευθυνοτήτων</td>
<td>Allocation of responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Εκπαιδευτική πολιτική σχολείου</td>
<td>School’s educational policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeus school (Apollo)</td>
<td>Κατανομή διδακτικού και μη διδακτικού χρόνου</td>
<td>Allocation of teaching and non-teaching time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Υπευθυνότητες</td>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Σχέδιο δράσης εκπαιδευτικής μονάδας</td>
<td>School action plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 13—Example of a participant school’s timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ΔΕΥΤΕΡΑ</th>
<th>ΤΡΙΤΗ</th>
<th>ΤΕΤΑΡΤΗ</th>
<th>ΗΜΗΡΗ</th>
<th>ΒΑΡΑΣΚΕΥH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Image of the timetable]
Appendix 14—Example of a participant school’s document about allocation of responsibilities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ΣΧΕΣΕΙΣ ΜΑΘΗΜΑΤΩΝ, ΕΠΟΠΤΙΚΩΝ ΜΑΘΗΜΑΤΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΑΙΣΘΗΣΗΣ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Μαθηματικά (άθορο, ευεφικτικά μέσα και υλικά)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τέχνη (ευεφικτικά μέσα και υλικά)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φυσική Αγωγή (άργια γυμναστικής, ασκήσεις)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Οικ. Οικονομία (άθορο, ευεφικτικά μέσα και υλικά)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σχεδ. &amp; Τεχνολ. (άθορο, ευεφικτικά μέσα και υλικά)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Επιστήμη (ευεφικτικά μέσα και υλικά)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αγγλικά (ευεφικτικά μέσα και υλικά)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μαθηματικά (ευεφικτικά μέσα και υλικά)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ετική Εκπαιδεύση (άθορο, ευεφικτικά μέσα και υλικά)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βιοτεχνία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αναδιάμ. Γραφικής Άλας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Γραφείο Δασκάλων - Ενημέρωση πινακίδων - Προθήκες</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χάρτες (ιστορίας, γεωγραφίας, θρησκευτικών)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Εικόνες (επίσημα)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χοροί</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μνημείο ενημερωτικό δελτίο στους γονείς</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

220
Εικονικό (Τ.Ε.Β.Ε.)
Πλευρά 2
(Εκπαίδευση Προπολεμικών Συλλόγων) - Μέλος
(Εκπαίδευση Ευημερίας Γυναικών) - Δήμος
(Εκπ. Εκπαιδευτ. Υπηρεσιών) - Μέλος
(Εκπ. Εκπαιδευτ. Παιδ. Συνδέσμων Εκπαιδευτ.) - Μέλος
(Εκπ. Εκπαιδευτ. Κεντρικού Μαθηματικού Συμβουλίου) - Μέλος

Ομάδα Πράσινος και Αντιπρόσωπος της Βίας στην Οικονομία και στη Σωματική
(ΒΔ) - Υποψήφιος Ομίλος
Εκπαιδευτικός
Εκπαιδευτικής Υπηρεσίας
Επικεφαλής Υπηρεσίας
Σχολικοί

Σχολικακτική Επιτροπή
(Διευθυντής Σχολείων) - Πρόεδρος
(Εκπαίδευση Δημαρχείων Συλλόγων) - Μέλος
(Α’: εκπαιδευτ. Συνδέσμων Γυναικών) - Μέλος
(Β’: εκπαιδευτ. Συνδέσμων Γονέων) - Μέλος
(Επιμέλειας Σχολικής Εφαρμογής) - Μέλος

Επιτροπή Αγωγής Υγείας και Πρόληψης της Παραπατδότησης

Βασικά Διευθυντής
Εκπαίδευση Δημαρχείων συλλόγων (εν είναι δικτύων να είναι επιμελείος η θήματα
Αγωγής Υγείας)
Α’ Εκπαιδευτικού Συνδέσμων Γονέων
Β’ εκπαιδευτικού Συνδέσμων Γονέων
(Α’: Εκπ. Επιμελείας Κεντρικού Μαθηματικού Συμβουλίου)
(Β': Εκπ. Επιμελείας Κεντρικού Μαθηματικού Συμβουλίου)
Συνεργασία με την Επικεφαλής Υγείας
# Appendix 15–List of translated policy documents’ quotes used

and the quotation in Standardised Greek language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy document quote</th>
<th>Translation in English</th>
<th>Quotation in Standardised Greek</th>
<th>Page in the thesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>“Each teacher can give individual or group motivation to students to improve their individual behaviour first and then the behaviour of the whole class”</td>
<td>«Ο κάθε εκπαιδευτικός μπορεί να δώσει ατομικά ή ομαδικά κίνητρα στους μαθητές της τάξης του ώστε να βελτιώσουν πρώτα την ατομική τους συμπεριφορά και έπειτα τη συμπεριφορά ολόκληρης της τάξης»</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>“promoting gentle behaviour among students”</td>
<td>«Καλλιέργεια της ευγένειας μεταξύ των μαθητών»</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>“to develop (to students) a sense of solidarity and volunteering to people who faced financial problems and dealt with poor living conditions”</td>
<td>«να αναπτύξουν (οι μαθητές) αίσθημα αλληλεγγύης και εθελοντισμού προς τους ανθρώπους που αντιμετωπίζουν οικονομικά προβλήματα και άσχημες συνθήκες διαβίωσης»</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>“the promotion of mutual respect and learning in an enjoyable and democratic school”</td>
<td>«η καλλιέργεια του αλληλοσεβασμού και η μάθηση σε ένα ευχάριστο και δημοκρατικό σχολικό περιβάλλον»</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 16–Example of a participant head teacher’s interview

**parts of transcription and translation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parts of interview transcript in Standardised Greek</th>
<th>Translation into English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Είναι μια δημιουργική θέση, η θέση του διευθυντή αλλά και ταυτόχρονα μια θέση πρόκληση. Από την πρώτη στιγμή που ανέλαβα καθήκοντα στο συγκεκριμένο σχολείο η έννοια μου ήταν το μεγάλο ποσοστό αλλόγλωσσων μαθητών και η πιθανότητα για περιστατικά ρατσισμού. Κάτι τέτοιο δεν υφίσταται όσο είμαι διευθύντρια σε αυτό το σχολείο. Επίσης έχω ανησυχία ώστε να πάρει ο κάθε μαθητής όσες γνώσεις χρειάζεται, έτσι ώστε να προωθηθεί και ο προικισμένος αλλά και ο αδύνατος μαθητής. Ακόμη, ανησυχώ και εργάζομαι σκληρά ώστε να το σχολείο να έχει μια καλή φήμη και να μην θεωρείται σχολείο χαμηλού επιπέδου λόγω του μεγάλου ποσοστού αλλόγλωσσων μαθητών. Για το σκοπό αυτό γίνονται δράσεις και λαμβάνουμε μέρος σε διάφορα προγράμματα. Θεωρώ πως έμαθα πολλά πράγματα και πήρα πολλά πράγματα από τους δασκάλους μου και τους μαθητές από τη θέση μου σε αυτό το σχολείο. Γι’ αυτό νιώθω ευγνωμοσύνη.</td>
<td>The head teacher position is a creative position but also a challenging position. From the very first moment I took up duties in this school my challenge to lead a school with high percentage of immigrant students and to deal and prevent any incidents of racism. Such kind of incidents had not occurred since I was the head teacher in this school. Also, I have anxiety because I want each student to get as much knowledge as possible so that the gifted but also the weak student can be promoted. I also worry and work hard so that the school has a good reputation and is not considered a low-level school due to the high percentage of immigrant students. To do this, we take actions and take part in various programs. I think I learned a lot of things and I got a lot of things from my teachers and students from my place in this school. That's why I feel grateful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Όλα τα θέματα συζητούνται στη συνεδρία προσωπικού και λαμβάνονται οι αποφάσεις συλλογικά. Φυσικά κάποιες αποφάσεις που αφορούν θέματα ξεκάθαρα για την οργάνωση και λειτουργία του σχολείου και δεν επηρεάζουν το</td>
<td>All issues are discussed in the weekly staff meetings and decisions are taken collectively. Of course, some decisions that deal with issues that are clear about the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and operation of the school and do not affect the staff are taken by me alone. These issues may concern a purchase of school equipment and announce them to my staff at the meeting...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first is justice. I think I am inspiring justice for others with my example and the way I handle the situations. That is, I will not offend anyone, nor will I defend someone without deserving it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know the needs of my school's teachers because most of us are known for many years. I have followed their teachings, I know their educational background, their strengths and weaknesses, and I try to evolve their talents and reduce their weaknesses. This is accomplished through teaching together, attending lessons and discussing them extensively and with the training from the various counselors we call at school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Student Committee is involved in various actions taken at school. The Parents Association has a supportive role in organizing various events; also this is the case with local authorities. But in terms of learning outcomes, parents cannot help because of insufficient knowledge of the language. Of course,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
αποσκοπεί στην εκμάθηση της ελληνικής γλώσσας σε ξένους γονείς. Ακόμη, κάποιες πολύ σημαντικές ανακοινώσεις αποστέλλονται στα αγγλικά στους γονείς.

teachers are given informative meetings and sample lessons to involve parents in the learning process. This year our school is involved in a European program (DRASE) that aims to learn the Greek language in foreign parents. Also, some very important announcements are translated into English for parents.

Θεωρώ πως αυτό (η παρότρυνση) είναι το πιο δύσκολο κομμάτι αφού τα κίνητρα είναι περιορισμένα. Δίνω επιβράβευση στους εκπαιδευτικούς μου συχνά, μετά από κάποια δραστηριότητα που οργάνωσαν ή πρόοδο που παρατήρησα στους μαθητές τους. Προσπαθώ να προβάλω κάποιο θετικό στοιχείο που βλέπω σε ένα εκπαιδευτικό και το αναγνωρίζω μέσω της συνεδρίας. Ακόμη, επιβραβεύω τους εκπαιδευτικούς μου σε συζήτησεις που έχουμε κατ’ ιδίαν με τον επιθεωρητή και φυσικά με τις εκθέσεις που κάνουμε στο τέλος της χρονιάς.

I think this (motivation) is the hardest part since the incentives are limited. I reward my teachers often after some activity they organized or the progress I noticed to their students. I try to emphasise on the positive things I see in an educator and I recognise and communicate them to others through the weekly staff meetings. I also reward my teachers in discussions we have with the inspector and of course with the reports we make at the end of the year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent source quote</th>
<th>Translation in English</th>
<th>Quotation in Standardised Greek</th>
<th>Page in the thesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>“anxiety, stress, challenge”</td>
<td>“ανησυχία, άγχος, πρόκληση”</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>“that teams are formed according to each member’s preference”</td>
<td>“οι ομάδες σχηματίζονται ανάλογα με τις προτιμήσεις των εκπαιδευτικών”</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>“it is very hard to know... time is needed to develop this kind of understanding”</td>
<td>“είναι πολύ δύσκολο να τις καταλαβαίνεις...θέλεις χρόνο για να το πετύχεις”</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>“we are all teachers who cooperate for the students’ welfare”</td>
<td>“είμαστε όλοι εκπαιδευτικοί που συνεργάζονται για την ευημερία των μαθητών ”</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>“listens carefully others... cares about others’ opinion... discusses with others before making a decision”</td>
<td>“ακούει με προσοχή τους άλλους... νοιάζεται για τη γνώμη τους... συζητά μαζί μας για τα διάφορα θέματα πριν τη λήψη κάποιας απόφασης”</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>&quot;very well organised, who follow all necessary procedures and planned and implement carefully school’s activities&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;πολύ καλά οργανωμένοι, που ακολουθούν όλες τις απαραίτητες διαδικασίες και σχεδιάζουν και εφαρμόζουν με προσοχή όλες τις σχολικές δραστηριότητες&quot;</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>“always uses complimentary words for teachers during staff meetings”</td>
<td>“πάντα επαινεί τους εκπαιδευτικούς κατά τη διάρκεια της συνεδρίας προσωπικού”</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>“it was her positive vibes that influence all in the school”</td>
<td>“η θετική της αύρα μπορούσε να επηρεάσει όλους στο σχολείο.”</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>“they (parents) do not invite me to their meetings, but I have stressed to them my disappointment about this and I intend to participate at their next meeting”</td>
<td>“αυτοί (οι γονείς) δεν με προσκαλούν στις συναντήσεις τους, αλλά τους τόνισα την απογοήτευσή μου γι’ αυτό και σκοπεύω να συμμετάσχω στην επόμενη συνάντησή τους”</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>“I will take the final decision in cases where there is no agreement between staff to maintain the school’s working climate”</td>
<td>“έχω τον τελικό λόγο σε μια απόφαση όταν υπάρχει διαφωνία και πρέπει να διασφαλίσω την ομαλή λειτουργία του σχολείου”</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>“shared, collective created, democratic and humane vision”</td>
<td>“κοινό, συλλογικά φτιαγμένο, δημοκρατικό και ανθρώπινο όραμα”</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>“vision is created collectively using democratic procedures during staff meetings”</td>
<td>“το όραμα σχεδιάζεται ομαδικά χρησιμοποιώντας δημοκρατικές διαδικασίες κατά τη διάρκεια της συνεδρίας προσωπικού”</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>“we (school staff) worked in small groups to create vision. Each group identifies first any issues or problems that need improvement, then the group set the goals and design appropriate activities. The head teacher works equally as a team member”</td>
<td>“εμείς (το προσωπικό του σχολείου) εργαζόμαστε σε μικρές ομάδες για να σχεδιάσουμε το όραμα του σχολείου. Κάθε ομάδα εντοπίζει τα θέματα προς βελτίωση, μετά θέτει στόχους και σχεδιάζει ανάλογες δραστηριότητες για την υλοποίηση των στόχων. Ο/Η διευθυντής δουλεύει εξίσου σαν μέλος μιας ομάδας”</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>“the head teachers keeps clarity and follows procedures, the school’s timetable is always followed, (s)he manages to remain calm and knows how to control his/her temper”</td>
<td>“ο διευθυντής διατηρεί τη διαφάνεια και ακολουθεί τις διαδικασίες που χρειάζονται, το σχολικό ωρολόγιο πρόγραμμα πάντοτε τηρείται, αυτός/ή καταφέρνει να</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>“justice is the most important value that we, head teachers, should have always in mind because people appreciate others when justice and transparency are applied”</td>
<td>“η δικαιοσύνη είναι η πιο σημαντική αξία που πρέπει να έχουμε πάντα στο μυαλό μας, οι διευθυντές, επειδή οι άνθρωποι εκτιμούν τους άλλους όταν εφαρμόζεται η δικαιοσύνη και η διαφάνεια”</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>“democratic procedures are inevitable to be followed in a school because you cannot pressure anyone to participate or get involved in a vision, but...”</td>
<td>“οι δημοκρατικές διαδικασίες που πρέπει να ακολουθηθούν σε ένα σχολείο είναι αναπόφευκτες επειδή δεν μπορείς να πιέσεις κανέναν να συμμετάσχει ή να εμπλακεί σε ένα όραμα, αλλά ...”</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>“a head teacher should be empathetic because (s)he is associated daily with people that have feelings and need their feelings to be respected by others”</td>
<td>“ο διευθυντής πρέπει να επιδεικνύει ενσυναίσθηση επειδή καθημερινά σχέτιζεται με ανθρώπους που έχουν συναισθήματα και θέλουν οι άλλοι να σέβονται τα συναισθήματά τους”</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>“they (parents and local authorities) did not show up even when I invited them to come. They constantly found excuses to justify their absences”</td>
<td>“(οι γονείς και οι τοπικές αρχές) δεν εμφανίστηκαν ακόμη και όταν τους κάλεσα να έρθουν. Βρίσκουν συνεχώς δικαιολογίες για τις απουσίες τους”</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>