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ABSTRACT

As education in the United States becomes more complex to provide for increasingly diverse students, it is extremely challenging to develop, recruit, and hire administrators to effectively lead 21st century schools. Many school districts all over the country are counting on their principals to successfully transition their schools to full implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). The purpose of the research was to explore whether there was a correlation between emotional intelligence (EQ), generational status and principals’ leadership abilities for the successful implementation of the CCSS.

Participants of this study included ten principals (two from the Baby Boom Generation, five from Generation X and three from Generation Y (also referred to as Millennials) in various school districts in Lake and Cook counties in Illinois. To better examine whether there was a correlation between emotional intelligence (EQ), generational status and principals’ leadership abilities for the successful implementation of the CCSS, these participants were asked to complete the Common Core Implementation Inventory as well as the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal ®. Additionally, and they participated in a 45-60-minute interview.

The findings in the study revealed a modest connection between EQ (especially relationship management) and generation in relation to the successful implementation of CCSS, and potentially important and helpful findings regarding
consistently preferred and consistently implemented leadership strategies that contribute to the successful implementation of CCSS.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

Many school districts all over the country are counting on their principals to successfully transition their schools to full implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). This researcher explored whether there was a correlation between emotional intelligence (EQ), generational status and principals’ leadership abilities for the successful implementation of the CCSS. The researcher compared and contrasted the emotional intelligences of current principals with the leadership behaviors displayed in an effort to link them to the successful implementation of the CCSS in schools, as identified by ten principals (two from the Baby Boom Generation, five from Generation X and three from Generation Y also referred to as Millennials) in various school districts in Lake and Cook counties in Illinois. The intent was that, studying the relationship among these three areas – leadership behaviors for implementing the Common Core State Standards, emotional intelligence, and generational status – would contribute to better understanding of principal leadership behaviors that support implementation of the Common Core State Standards, and suggest possible avenues for professional development and coaching of current and aspiring school leaders.
Problem Statement

As education in the United States becomes more complex to provide for increasingly diverse students, it is extremely challenging to develop, recruit, and hire administrators to effectively lead 21st century schools. The next wave of high stakes tests, coupled with the rigor associated with the CCSS, and the emergence of three distinct generations in the school workplace all contribute to the foundational pieces to be taken into account for instructional leadership in the current school setting. For years, the federal government delegated the right to states to create and adopt standards to address the curriculum needed for students to develop academically. Nonetheless, countless failed efforts with respect to increasing reading, writing and math proficiency scores all over the country created the perfect scenario to warrant a serious public educational intervention. The goal is for students to acquire the skills needed for college and all other careers. To address this goal, the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness of College and Careers (PARCC) and Common Core State Standards (CCSS) have burst onto the educational scene much like Hurricane Joaquin in the fall of 2015. While many people who are informed about the framework and theory of the CCSS agree that the standards can help more students in the long run, most educators—especially school leaders, have struggled with how to implement these rigorous standards in an era where the workforce is evolving before their eyes. Jamie Notter and Maddie Grant (2015) explained the real challenge when they said, “This new era goes beyond generations - and requires leaders from every generation to learn new ways of working, leading and managing.” Moreover,
Without looking more closely at generational DNA inside the schoolhouse, it will be difficult to achieve and sustain coalescence. After all, to bridge the age gap and manage the friction, employees’ needs, assumptions, hopes and fears have to be noticed and appreciated. (Lovely, 2005, p. 30)

With this in mind this study explored practicing principals from 3 generations to determine whether there were specific leadership practices that facilitate the successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in schools.

**Background**

With respect to what all students are expected to know after the 12th grade, the CCSS have set the stage for the highest universal standards that have ever existed in the history of the United States.

A recent study examined the likelihood that the new standards would improve student achievement…this comparison revealed an overlap of about 90 percent. If the standards of the world’s top-achieving nations are any guide, the new standards are of high quality. (Schmidt & Burroughs, 2012, p. 55)

It is clear that the intention, rigor and application of the CCSS are consistent with most of the best countries across the globe and without question that is positive information for students, parents and educators.

However, now that we have invested a tremendous amount of time and resources on figuring out the “what” of education, it is imperative that we start to focus the same amount of energy on effectively determining strategies that assist with developing the “how” or implementation of these standards in all classrooms. A second study that
examined the preparedness of practicing teachers for the CCSS found that many math teachers need to be exposed to more meaningful and specific professional development, as “fewer than half of the elementary teachers [that were surveyed] felt prepared to teach Common Core math topics at their grade level, compared with 60 percent of middle school teacher and 70 percent of high school mathematic teachers” (Schmidt & Burroughs, 2012, p. 58). The same study explained that a number of teachers don’t have a clear grasp of what’s in the new standards or how the standards are different from the old standards, as approximately 80% of the participants in the study reported that they believed that the standards are pretty much the same as the old ones (p. 58).

Another misconception about the CCSS is that they require teachers to add a lot of new material to the curriculums of the past. However, what is clear about the CCSS is that they require educators to have a greater focus on fewer topics at each specific grade level (Schmidt & Burroughs, 2012, p. 58).

The vision of CCSS is for teachers to cooperate across classrooms and grades in determining exactly how to teach math and English language arts using a coherent, logical and natural progression as students move from kindergarten through 12th grade. While this need is clear to many K-12 researchers and individuals with an extensive background in curriculum development there is a huge gap between theory and practice for current teachers with respect to implementation in classrooms. In order for states to maximize their ability to improve students’ academic development in a manner consistent with the rigor associated with CCSS, there will need to be many radical changes in the
approaches utilized with respect to implementing curriculum (Schmidt & Burroughs, 2012, p. 55).

Though teachers are a critical piece to the successful implementation of the CCSS, it is essential to examine the role that the principal plays in the process as well. “A growing body of evidence suggests [that] not only does leadership matter, it is second only to teaching among school-related factors that contribute to student achievement” (Lovely, 2005, p. 31). It is important to note that a large body of studies of the past found evidence that school leaders contribute in school effectiveness through indirect measures, like influencing schools’ missions and purposes (Cai, 2015, p. 158). However, many recent scholars have determined that principals play an important role in influencing nearly all areas of the school setting (p. 151). DuFour and Marzano (2011) said it best when he explained that, “Research now supports what practitioners have known for decades that powerful school leadership on the part of the principal has a positive effect on student achievement” (p. 48). In fact, Labby, Lunenburg, and Slate (2012) conducted a study that focused on examining if there is a link between effective leadership skills, best practices and student achievement. The research specifically analyzed the role that principals assume with respect to improving student achievement (p. 2). The study concluded that the total direct and indirect effect that leadership can have on student achievement is upwards of about one quarter of the total school effect (p. 5). As implied in the CCSS it is clear that “a really good [school leader must give] employees new things to do that will force them to get out and learn from others—to stretch their skills” (Nicholson, 2008, p. 17). Similarly, it has become more paramount than ever to explore
effective ways to adapt, communicate and connect with staff members in the school setting from all generations. “The generations represented in the current workforce have very different preferences across all aspects of communication. It is clear that communication preferences have changed and we need to adapt to engage diverse audiences” (Reynolds, Bush, & Geist, 2008, p. 20). Being able to understand generational underpinnings that authentically bind teachers and other staff members together or set them apart will be a necessary skill for principals to develop in order to build capacity, establish teams and bring out the best in people (Lovely, 2005, p. 31). Making the appropriate transition to CCSS in schools “requires a fundamental shift in how [schools] think strategically about communication with all generations, in terms of style, content, context, attitude, tactics, speed and frequency” (Reynolds, p. 20). In light of the factors highlighted above, this study will be based on the following research questions.

**Research Questions**

1. How does principals’ emotional intelligence contribute to the context of the successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards in their schools?

2. How does principals’ generational status contribute to the context of successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards in their schools?

3. What other principal leadership behaviors and strategies if any contribute to the process of successfully implementing the Common Core State Standards in schools?
Conceptual Rationale

Current and future administrators must be prepared for the challenges associated with implementing the CCSS in schools. The next wave of high stakes tests, combined with the rigor associated with the CCSS, and the emergence of the distinct generations (Baby Boomers, Generation X and Generation Y) in the workplace all contribute to the foundational pieces of instructional leadership in the school setting. Labby et al. (2012) conducted a study that focused on examining if there was a link between effective leadership skills, best practices and student achievement. The research specifically analyzed the role that principals assume with respect to improving student achievement (p. 2). The study concluded that the total direct and indirect effect that leadership can have on improving student achievement is upwards of about one quarter of the total school effect (p. 5). It is clear that the principal’s leadership is a strong contributor to student achievement and school success. Similarly, research suggests that principal leadership is an important factor in successfully implementing CCSS in schools (Nagel, 2012). Research also suggests generational status affects principal leadership decisions and approaches.

Further, there is a growing amount of studies that suggest that the leader’s Emotional Intelligence can significantly shape leadership choices. Daniel Goleman spent a large amount of time researching the various components of leadership and his research determined that “the most effective leaders are alike in one crucial way: They all have a high degree of what has come to be known as emotional intelligence” (Harvard Business Review, 2011, p. 1). Emotional intelligence is the ability to manage a person’s own
emotions in an effort to be directly sensitive to the needs of others. The essential elements of emotional intelligence include: self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills. Mayer and others’ research suggested that there is a direct correlation to age and emotional intelligence, as emotional intelligence increases as one gets older (Labby et al., 2012, p. 8). Without emotional intelligence, “a person can have the best training in the world, an incisive analytical mind, and an endless supply of smart ideas, but still won’t make a great leader” (Harvard Business Review, 2011, p. 2). “Emotional intelligence is the path [where when] we start it we are to move towards personal, team, and whole school excellence” (Brearley, 2006, p. 30). Presently, in the field of education the principal’s ability to effectively display social awareness, empathic behavior, strong decision making skills, and exert a positive influence over others is essential. Emotional intelligence can lead to increased creative thoughts, decreased stress, and improved morale in the school or organizational setting. “Emotional intelligence is the cornerstone of every decision a principal makes; solving problems and making judgments are part of a leader’s system of values and beliefs” (Gray, 2009, p. 2).

**Significance of the Study**

When considering the shift that has taken place in education from the era before standards-based education, to the time period of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and the establishment of standards-based education, and finally to the emergence of the CCSS and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) it is important, compelling and a high priority to consider the most effective ways to successfully implement the CCSS in public schools. The ESSA seeks to enhance the authority that states and school districts
will have on education beginning during the academic school year of 2017-18. The implications associated with the ESSA as well the rigor encompassed in the CCSS suggest that there is no question that the transition to the CCSS is going to become a paramount part of school leadership for at least the next decade. Leaders have to understand that,

Transition needs to build on the cultures you have built at your school and the [studying that] you have all done together as a staff. Teachers need to see this transition as continuing their work, not blowing up their previous efforts and starting over. (Groth & Bennett-Schmidt, 2013, p. 11)

Moore (2009) explained that “emotional intelligence is important to the process of leading and should be considered an essential component of effective leadership” (p. 21). In addition, a large body of research asserts that the total direct and indirect effect that leadership can have on student achievement is upwards of about one quarter of the total school effect (Labby et al., 2012, p. 5). It was useful to study the interrelationship of these components in regard to uncovering more effective ways to implement the CCSS. This research can present a powerful rationale in reference to the importance that emotional intelligence can have in terms of increasing professional practice for both present and future principals. This research could help inform practices relative to professional development for principals, in an effort to effectively transition schools to the successful implementation of the CCSS. The study helped determine if there are specific leadership practices related to emotional intelligence that principals could develop to aid in the successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards.
Principals can benefit from being able to efficiently gauge the emotions of others as well as their own to effectively transition their schools academically. Additionally, studying generational status could be an important factor to take into account in examining principal leadership. Research shows the presence of three generations in current school leadership affects the complexity of the current scene. Recent studies suggest that attention to generational status can yield fruitful insights regarding leadership approaches and communication factors.

Without looking more closely at generational DNA inside the schoolhouse, it will be difficult to achieve and sustain coalescence. After all, to bridge the age gap and manage the friction, employees’ needs, assumptions, hopes and fears have to be noticed and appreciated. (Lovely, 2005, p. 30)

Also, the study could assist with exploring opportunities for coaching for current principals and it could aid in the enhancement of assessments, feedback and coaching for aspiring administrators.

**Methodology**

The study consisted of mixed research methods. The quantitative and qualitative data came from four different sources. The first source was the Common Core Implementation Inventory Survey (quantitative), which was used to determine eligibility for the study. The second source was used to determine eligibility, as it built off of the first and it was the 2015 PARCC scores as measured by the Illinois Interactive (on-line) Report Card (quantitative). The third source was a standardized emotional intelligence assessment instrument (quantitative) for those selected to the full study. The fourth
source was semi-structured interviews informed by the emotional intelligence scores to identify leadership behaviors associated with emotional intelligence, generational status and the successful implementation of the CCSS.

For this study the successful implementation of the CCSS specifically referred to the readiness of teachers to teach CCSS according to best practice research and the school’s scores on the 2015 Illinois PARCC assessment. Principals that were presently in K-8 schools in Lake and Cook counties in the state of Illinois first completed an on-line survey to determine eligibility based on whether their school achieved the status of successful implementation of the CCSS. The survey was sent on-line via email. Additionally, the researcher compiled the 2015 PARCC scores for schools to support the data on the Common Core Implementation Inventory (CCII) survey. The third component of the research consisted of an on-line emotional intelligence appraisal. Finally, the strengths as determined by the emotional intelligence appraisal informed the semi-structured interviews of ten principals that included two from Generation Baby Boom, five from Generation X and three from Generation Y (Millennials), which represented the current generations of people that made up the work force.

For each principal, the researcher used the interview to gather perceptions of the most important or successful leadership practices and strategies that were used to implement the Common Core State Standards in schools. As previously referenced, the successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards referred to a given school’s readiness with respect to having specific curriculum in place for English language arts and math instruction. For a school to be considered successful, it had to
have a score of at least 70% with respect to having the five following areas in place at the school level: (1) Math Curriculum: The math curriculum must be aligned to Common Core State Standards. It should specifically address the 8 mathematical practices. (2) English Language Arts Curriculum: The English language arts curriculum must be aligned to Common Core State Standards. It should have specifically addressed the three key literacy shifts. (3) Curriculum Map and Scope and Sequence: The curriculum should have a common curriculum map and a scope and sequence in place that teachers at a given grade level follow from K-8. (4) Professional Development: There should have been on-going professional development supports in place at the school level that kept teachers informed about best practice teaching strategies that correspond with the Common Core State Standards, specifically as it relates to the curriculum that was implemented at the school level. (5) Performance on PARCC: The score that a given school had on PARCC represented the initial performance level with respect to the implementation of the CCSS. The measure was determined from the score that the school received on the 2015 administration of PARCC. Each school’s score was public record on the Illinois Interactive Report Card (IIRC) site. Arthur and Waring (2012) pointed out that “The interview provides a way for the researcher to journey into [another person’s] perspective about a circumstance or event, so meaning can be learned and significance shared…they offer a path to discovery and greater understanding” (p. 171). As a result, this aided in determining the value of the final component of the study, which consisted of a 45-60-minute interview.
Definitions

Common Core State Standards (CCSS): The CCSS are national standards that were designed to allow for teachers to have a common and consistent understanding of what students need to learn in order to be successful in the next grade, subject or class. “Whether it is through tackling math problems or analyzing text, the [CCSS] encourages students to show evidence for their solutions and articulate how they think, with the overall goal of promoting more critical thinking at earlier ages “(Baker, 2014, p. 2). These standards “universalize” the body of content knowledge that teachers are expected to have in order to impact student learning (Kendall, 2011, p. 32).

8 Standards of Mathematical Practice: “These practice standards describe the expertise that mathematics educators in all levels should seek to develop in their students—that is, the ways we want students to engage with the mathematics they are learning” (Burns, 2012, p. 43). The point of the standards is to provide a framework for teachers to be able to assist students with effectively learning as well as retaining the conceptual components of math. The Eight Standards of Mathematical Practice include: (1) making sense of problems and applying knowledge in solving them,(2) demonstrating the ability to display creative reasoning with quantitative figures, (3) creating sensible arguments and analyzing the reasoning of alternate perspectives, (4) modeling with math, (5) utilizing resources and tools with coherent strategies, (6) accounting for precision, (7) identifying and using structure, and (8) locating and expressing patterns in reasoning (Kendall, 2011, p. 24).
3 Key English Language Arts/Literacy Shifts: The three literacy shifts in English Language Arts include: (1) building knowledge through content-rich nonfiction, (2) reading and writing grounded in evidence from literary and informational text, and (3) regular practice with complex texts and its syntax and vocabulary. “These shifts require curriculum and instruction focused on texts worth reading, tasks worth engaging in, and integrated teaching and learning. Integrated teaching and learning includes integration across the areas of language arts” (Valencia & Wixson, 2013, p. 184).

PARCC: The Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers is an assessment aligned to the Common Core State Standards. It is designed to test where students are with respect to various achievement levels in an effort to prepare them for college and career readiness. The PARCC score is an objective means for documenting student achievement, specifically with regard to the measurement of students’ Common Core proficiency in English language arts and math at the national level.

Standards Based Education: An educational approach that started in the 1980s, which focuses on instruction, assessment and grading to enable students to demonstrate mastery with respect to the skills that they need to appropriately progress through the educational system (Kendall, 2011, p. 4).

Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA): A bill signed into law on December 10, 2015 by President Obama. The law seeks to build on the key areas of progress in recent years related to No Child Left Behind (U.S. Department of Education, 2015, p. 1). It is designed to enhance the authority that states and school districts will have on education beginning during the academic school year of 2017-18. ESSA will in essence restore
some aspects of local education control that in a sense was lost with No Child Left Behind.

*Generational Status:* A generation shares a common set of experiences relative to the times, and those experiences shape the values of the generation. A generation is essentially defined by common values and experiences in formative years, which could be anchored by music or other ceremonial experiences of the time. In any event, Gross (2012) explained that, “Each generation is different and demands a slightly different approach…but the differences are usually more a matter of context than content” (p. 19).

*Baby Boom:* The Baby Boomer generation is born approximately between 1943-1964 (Gross, 2012, p. 18).

*Generation X:* Generation X also “known as the Sandwich Generation because of its position between the largest two groups” spans approximately from 1965-1979 (Gesell, 2010, p. 22).

*Generation Y:* The Millennials or Generation Y spans approximately between 1980-2003 (Gross, 2012, p. 11)

*Emotional Intelligence (EQ):* Emotional intelligence is the ability to manage a person’s own emotions in an effort to be directly sensitive to the needs of others. EQ is rooted in two of Howard Gardner’s intelligences, specifically inter and intra personal intelligence (Brearley, 2006, p. 31). The essential elements of emotional intelligence include: self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills. Mayer and others’ research suggested that there is a direct correlation to age and emotional
intelligence, as emotional intelligence increases as one gets older (Labby et al., 2012, p. 8).

**Limitations of the Study**

The study had several limitations: (1) The sample size of the research was small (included ten participants). (2) The sample in the study represented principals from two counties in Illinois and all of the participants were in K-8 schools (as opposed to 9-12). (3) While the test scores represented an important objective piece of the research, the other four out of five criteria of the study were based on data gathered from the self-reporting of principals’ leadership decisions and behaviors (rather than teachers or other school level stakeholders). While we cannot use the data from this study to generalize to some schools (specifically high schools) with respect to implementing the exact standards and curriculum that are highlighted in the research, there are a few interesting observations to make regarding previous research and future study with respect to best practices for the successfully implementation of high quality standards.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter is a discussion of research directly related to the emergence of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), the top ten popular 21st century leadership theories as determined by the Harvard Business Review, emotional intelligence (EQ) data as it relates to principal leadership, and an analysis of the characteristics displayed by the current generations that are employed by public schools in the United States (i.e., Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Generation Y).

It should be noted that lack of research regarding current practicing principals and whether there are specific patterns and themes of emotional intelligence that principals display that are correlated to the successful implementation of CCSS in their schools supports the need for this study.

While a great deal of this section will focus on leadership theories and studies, it is important to note that the recent emergence of the CCSS over the past few years has radically impacted the framework of what leadership looks like in public schools all across the country. In fact, research confirmed that the CCSS will contribute to the focus of schools and leaders for the next decade. This particular portion of the Literature Review will highlight what the CCSS are, where they came from, and why the CCSS are such a high priority for public schools.
Common Core State Standards Overview and Importance

Since “A Nation at Risk” was released over 30 years ago, there has been a strong calling to develop a public education system that truly provides quality education to all students in America, regardless of community location, socioeconomic status, culture, or creed. For years, the federal government delegated the right to states to create and adopt standards to address the curriculum needed for students to develop academically. Nonetheless, countless failed efforts with respect to increasing reading, writing and math proficiency scores all over the country created the perfect scenario to warrant a serious public educational intervention. Thus,

In the spring of 2009…governors and state commissioners from all across the United States formed the Common Core State Standards Initiative…to develop a set of shared national standards ensuring that students in every state are held to the same level of expectations that students in the world’s highest-performing countries are. (Kendall, 2011, p. 1)

The goal was for students to acquire the skills needed for college and all other careers. While many people who are informed about the framework and theory of the CCSS agree that the standards can help more students in the long run, most educators—especially leaders, have struggled with how to implement these rigorous standards in an era where the workforce is evolving before our eyes. Jamie Notter and Maddie Grant (2015) explained the real challenge when they said, “This new era goes beyond generations - and requires leaders from every generation to learn new ways of working, leading and managing.”
Historical Perspective of Educational Standards:

What are the Common Core State Standards?

The foundational goal of education in America has been simply to teach children what they need to know to be productive in society. The concept of what productivity looks like, however, has changed dramatically over the course of decades that have seen education submit to the needs of an ever-changing society. Where it was once important for most children to know how to farm and cultivate crops because that was what was needed for basic survival, now most students need to know business, technical writing, applied mathematics, and advanced technology skills in order to survive in the 21st century. The fact still remains that the primary purpose for education is to prepare students for the world that they will encounter as adults. In education, there has always been some sort of standard that students had to work towards, whether it was implied or stated. There was always something to achieve and always a way to measure that achievement even if it were something as simple as judging the work that a student was able to eventually produce as an adult.

This history of what one would call “Standards Based Education” can be documented to a time in the early 1980’s when America found itself needing to reassess its place in the world of education. America, at the time was not prepared for the battle of education as best said in A Nation at Risk:

If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, one could argue that it could be viewed as a justifiable reason to declare war. As it stands, we have allowed this to happen
to ourselves. We have even squandered the gains in student achievement made in the wake of the Sputnik challenge. Moreover, we have dismantled essential support systems which helped make those gains possible. We have, in effect, been committing an act of unthinking, unilateral educational disarmament. (A Nation at Risk Report, p. 1)

The Secretary of Education at the time, T.H. Bell created the National Commission on Excellence designed to look at the state of our educational system. On August 26, 1981, he stated “widespread public perception is that something is seriously missing in our educational system.” Trying to harness the “support of all who care about our future,” the Secretary indicated that he was establishing a commission based on his “responsibility to provide leadership, constructive criticism, and effective assistance to schools and universities” (A Nation at Risk Report, p. 7). As a result, the National Commission on Excellence in Education was birthed.

Shortly thereafter “A Nation at Risk” was written in 1983 that exposed our educational system at its core stating that

Our society and its educational institutions seem to have lost sight of the basic purposes of schooling, and of the high expectations and disciplined effort needed to attain them. This report, the result of 18 months of study, [sought] to generate reform of our educational system in fundamental ways and to renew the Nation's commitment to schools and colleges of high quality throughout the length and breadth of our land. (Nation at Risk Archived, p. 1)
In summary, this scathing report exposed how the American education system was exactly the opposite of what America was known for: the American system of education was weak, feeble, inefficient, and very simply, behind many other foreign powers.

Years later, Bell created a “Wall Chart” which allowed for the ranking of states by their educational attainments (Vinovskis, 1999, p. 13) to assist with identifying states’ strengths and weakness. Eventually Secretary of Education William Bennet created the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) study group in 1986 (p. 14). Following an educational summit in 1989 that involved then President George Bush and representatives from all 50 states came the birth of the “Goals for Education: Challenge 2000” and eventually the adoption of national goals. George Bush, stated before his election, that he wanted “to be the Education President” as he intended “to lead a renaissance of quality in our schools,” and publicly embraced the challenge to improve American education (Walker, 2016, p. 1). From the 1989 Summit, six priority areas were created as focal points that included:

- High school dropout and completion rates;
- Reading, language and literacy skills;
- Mathematical, scientific and technological competence;
- International education and foreign languages;
- Readiness to begin kindergarten;
- Quality and composition of the teaching force

Ultimately, The President and the nation’s Governors agreed to four major commitments:

- Establish a process for setting national education goals;
■ Seek greater flexibility and enhanced accountability in the use of Federal resources to meet the goals, through both regulatory and legislative changes;

■ Undertake a major state-by-state effort to restructure our education system;

and

■ Report annually on progress in achieving our goals.

From this agreement the stage was being set for an official set of national standards that all states at the time were willing to work towards (Vinovski, 1999, p. 39).

Once Clinton took over as president, a furtherance of a standards based vision came to pass in 1994 with the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Act, now known as the Improving America’s Schools Act, which was passed to ensure that all states had rigorous standards for all subjects and all grades. This is where we see the emergence of Title 1 incorporated to support the funding of the resources that schools would need to meet standards that were being set. By 1996, the National Education Summit was created and committed to the following:

■ Set clear academic standards…in core subject areas.

■ Assist schools in accurately measuring student progress.

■ Make changes to curriculum, teaching techniques, and technology uses based on the results.

■ Assist schools in overcoming the barriers to using new technology.

■ Hold schools and students accountable for demonstrating real improvement.

(Eakin, 1996, p. 13).
By 1998 the majority of the states in America were working to have attained these goals, which then paved the way for No Child Left Behind in 2001, under President George W. Bush, on January 2, 2002. This was an attempt to have all children at the same, or equal level of proficiency by 2014. The children would be assessed against state created standards by standardized tests to regularly measure student achievement (NCLB Act, 2007). Every school was required to meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), in other words show progress towards getting all students to meet or exceed the state standards, which varied from state to state. For schools to be considered AYP schools they were encouraged to get parents to become active in their child’s education, use technology-based instruction, and offer after school programs to assist the students (Simpson, LaCava, & Graner, 2004). In the article “Time to Kill No Child Left Behind,” Diane Ravitch (2009) described what happened for schools that failed to meet AYP:

Schools that do not make progress toward the goal of 100% proficiency for every group are subject to increasingly, stringent sanctions. In their second year of failing to make “adequate yearly progress” for any group, failing schools have their students given the choice of leaving to enroll in a better public school. In the third year of a school’s failure, students are entitled to free tutoring after school. In the subsequent years, the failing school may be converted to private management, turned into a charter school, have its entire staff dismissed, or be handed over to the state. (p. 5)
For years during the period of NCLB districts struggled to either make safe harbor or to make AYP with specific subgroups. The gap never closed, as many districts never managed to make AYP (Ravitch, 2009, p. 5). The goal of incorporating standards and having high levels of accountability was lofty, and unfortunately America did not meet this goal by the designated timelines. As a result, it was clear to many that a part of this failure had to do with inconsistencies from state to state in what the standard of achievement actually looked like. States standards were, in fact, not resulting in standards-based high achievement.

When considering the demands initially documented in the 1980’s and the need for national standards so to speak during the early 2000’s, we came full circle back to the drawing board in 2009 with the decision by the National Governors’ Conference to draft CCSS across states. This time the standards would become just that, true national standards where every state has to follow the same standards as defined by Common Core State Standards, each state is held to the same level of accountability, and where students from Illinois are now competing with students from California and New York. With CCSS, the bar has been raised for every teacher and every school across America to teach with the same exact standards to drive their instruction because of:

- Disparate standards across states (there is strong evidence of significant differences in academic expectations set by states);
- Student mobility, which exacerbates the problem of disparate standards across states;
- Changes in the set of skills required for current and emerging jobs; and
Increasing global competition for existing jobs. (National Governors Association, 2010)

The CCSS allow teachers to have a common and consistent understanding of what students need to learn in order to be successful in the next grade, subject or class. “In a sense [Common Core State Standards] ‘universalizes’ a body of knowledge that is expected of all teachers. With the increased commonality comes the opportunity for an unprecedented level of discourse” (Kendall, 2011, p. 32). Common Core State Standards have now changed the scenery of the landscape of American education. What started as a goal to improve education for students has become a collaborative effort to expect the same outcome from every American student, based on the same expectation of teaching, because for once, every teacher is following the same standards. “The greatest beneficiary of the [Common Core State Standards] is the one [for] whom education is designed: the student” (p. 33).

The Common Core State Standards have come onto the American scene in a rather rapid manner as a result of the 2001 No Child Left Behind law and the claims that many have made with respect to the standards possibly being too low. 45 states and the District of Columbia have adopted the Common Core State Standards since their publication in 2010. In addition, in Illinois about 80% of the respondents reported that their school or districts had a Common Core implementation plan in place (Baker, 2014).

A number of people were excited with the level of content and rigor that was intertwined in the standards. Many researchers have asserted that the CCSS are a direct result of standards-based education and the lessons learned from it. Kendall (2011)
explained a very distinct perspective about how radically education has evolved in his comparison of education before standards-based education (before the 1990s), during the standards movement (from 2001 until 2011) and under CCSS (2012 to present). Prior to standards-based education instructional time was viewed in the light of the prevailing wisdom that the time available was synonymous with the time needed. The curriculum was set by textbooks and publishers. Student outcomes were often described as seat time and in terms of traditional units. The source of expectations was often the textbook providers, history and societal influences. Assessments were generally inconsistent and often compared students at the national level with respect to minimum competency exams. Any reforms efforts that were taken often originated at the school, community or district level (p. 4).

During the standards-based education period (approximately 2001 to 2011), the appropriateness of instructional time varied rather drastically from state to state and didn’t always take into account the nature of the standards. While the standards were the focus of instruction, many researchers explained that textbook publishers struggled to produce curriculum that could keep up with the standards. The student outcomes shifted to being criterion-based according to state standards. The expectations for students varied slightly from state to state, as they became more traditional but focused on college and career readiness. The primary assessment purposes were for accountability with respect to No Child Left Behind (NCLB) which hit the scene in 2001. The reform efforts expanded but often varied by state and often within states (Kendall, 2011, p. 4).
With the publication of the CCSS, for the first time in the modern era America has made a concerted effort to the establishment of a national educational curriculum. Common Core State Standards specifically outline a set of competencies for students to master over the course of their educational careers and these competencies are rigorous, leading to higher learning. For example, in a study, Baker (2014) reported that a large number of teachers in New York City indicated, “Their students were doing higher quality work than they had ever seen and were talking aloud more often” (p. 1). Under CCSS (approximately 2012 to present), the standards were designed to take up approximately 85% of the instructional time provided. It is clear that setting high standards and holding students to them ultimately allows for students to learn more and make larger academic gains. The standards are expected to be followed up with appropriate curriculum development. The overall success of the standards is based on the school’s and teacher’s ability to understand and implement the foundation of the standards with fidelity. This must be done in a natural way that supports instruction as well as the needs of students (Valencia & Wixson, 2013, p. 184).

While the quality of the standards are high and appropriate for 21st century learning, it is imperative to consider the direct implications of the standards at the school level. One of the essential elements of implementing the CCSS is stressing to schools the importance of creating cultures that promote and support professional growth as well as collaboration with educators and students alike (Karge & Moore, 2015, p. 47). The student outcomes are based on cross-state standards. The expectations for students are centered around international benchmarks, college and career readiness, and state
standards. While the primary purpose of assessments is directly related to accountability, there is a more authentic focus on teaching and learning. The reform efforts include the reality that curriculum, standards, and assessment are shared with other states (Kendall, 2011, p. 4).

In addition to establishing cultures that promote and support professional growth as well as collaboration at the school level, it is perhaps equally important that schools start to implement through various capacities the foundational pieces of the CCSS at each grade level. A substantial piece of the CCSS includes the three literacy shifts. The three literacy shifts in English Language Arts include: 1. building knowledge through content-rich nonfiction, 2. reading and writing grounded in evidence from literacy and informational text, and 3. regular practice with complex texts and its syntax and vocabulary. “Complexity is defined as regular practice with complex text and its academic language. Evidence consists of reading and writing grounded in information from literacy and informational text, knowledge refers to building knowledge through engagement with content rich text” (Valencia & Wixson, 2013, p. 183). Building knowledge through content-rich nonfiction is a response to a large body of research that indicates that students need to wrestle with texts that are grounded in “information about the world around them in order to develop a strong general knowledge and vocabulary that is necessary for becoming a successful reader” (Coleman, 2012, p. 1). Reading and writing grounded in evidence from literary and informational text refers to teaching students to “answer a range of questions using evidence and inferences drawn from the text itself” (p. 2). Regular practice with complex texts and its syntax and vocabulary
refers to assisting students with building “a staircase of increasing complexity in the texts that students are expected to read” (p. 2). There must be a focus on academic vocabulary that shows up consistently among various content areas in a manner that increases students’ authentic understanding. “These shifts require curriculum and instruction focused on texts worth reading, tasks worth engaging in, and integrated teaching and learning. Integrated teaching and learning includes integration across the areas of language arts” (Valencia & Wixson, 2013, p. 184).

As with the three literacy shifts, the Eight Standards of Mathematical Practice are another necessary component of the CCSS that need to be implemented in schools. The math standards for the CCSS are split into math practices and math concepts. “Math Practice describes areas of expertise in mathematics that students must develop and practice from kindergarten through 12th grade” (Kendall, 2011, p. 20). One of the foundational pieces of the CCSS with respect to math is the Eight Standards of Mathematical Practice. “These practice standards describe the expertise that mathematics educators in all levels should seek to develop in their students—that is, the ways we want students to engage with the mathematics they are learning” (Burns, 2012, p. 43). The point of the standards is to provide a framework for teachers to be able to assist students with effectively learning as well as retaining the conceptual components of math. Teachers are expected to utilize the Standards for Mathematical Practice as the foundation in instruction, especially when teaching the basics of arithmetic (p. 44). The goal for the standards is to lead to a deeper understanding of the material. The Eight Standards of Mathematical Practice include: (1) making sense of problems and applying
knowledge in solving them, (2) demonstrating the ability to display creative reasoning with quantitative figures, (3) creating sensible arguments and analyzing the reasoning of alternate perspectives, (4) modeling with math, (5) utilizing resources and tools with coherent strategies, (6) accounting for precision, (7) identifying and using structure, and (8) locating and expressing patterns in reasoning (Kendall, 2011, p. 24). For a better picture of how states are transforming to implement the CCSS, one can take some urban districts efforts in preparation as examples.

**Common Core State Standards, an Urban Perspective**

With the introduction of Common Core State Standards, one of the most critical elements to consider now that we have a common set of standards is how do we get all students to meet the standards? Districts across the country have to find ways to engage and build students’ capacity through unprecedented strategies and approaches. Additionally, districts must come up with a realistic and fair way to level the playing field while considering the fact that the team members (students) will come from various degrees of ability. In years past, closing the achievement gap, particularly in the urban environment has always been a struggle when students were just being ranked against students from their own state. Now, though, with the introduction of Common Core State Standards, students are being compared to students from across the United States, not just their own home state. This adds additional pressure particularly to urban districts that have to find a way to cross an even bigger achievement gap, the one that exists from the southernmost part of the United States of America to the northern and from the Eastern most part, to the Western, and everything in between. An examination of how urban
districts have been preparing for this, in an effort to predict performance levels and thereby design units, teaching, and professional development series to address these predictions is paramount in understanding the early implications of implementing the Common Core State Standards.

A survey done by the Council of Great City Schools in 2012 which produced summative findings in a document titled “Implementing the Common Core State Standards in Urban Public Schools” gives us a picture of how urban districts prepared for Common Core based on the percentage of students at or above proficient on NAEP and meeting ACT college Readiness Benchmarks in 2011. The survey was administered to all 67 members of the Council of Great City schools, which encompasses the totality of the largest urban school districts in America in an effort to measure the state of implementation that the districts were in with respect to Common Core across a range of instructional and managerial factors. The survey covers a wide range of implementation areas including questions regarding districts’ long term CCSS implementation plans, professional development activities in both English Arts and Literacy and Mathematics, strategies on measuring and collecting data on the implementation of the CCSS and communication strategies to inform key community and education stakeholders of their district common core initiative. (Implementing, p. 4)

The survey closed in October of 2012, and at that point 36 (54%) of the districts responded (Implementing, p. 4).

The data in the report includes the predictions of students being able to meet college and career readiness benchmarks. Prediction levels of achievement in the college
readiness benchmarks are important in that they guide the preparation process for the implementation period. Since Common Core is believed to hold “immense promise to elevate the quality of public education in urban school districts - which serve large numbers of low-income and underserved students” it is important to note the predictive rankings of students on the Common Core assessment based off of early results from 8th grade NAEP test takers and 11th grade ACT test takers (Implementing, p. 5). The results of the predictions are as follows:

- ACT projects that roughly one fourth (25%) of students in large cities will be able to meet College Readiness Benchmarks (Implementation, p. 4).

- Also, there were specific predictions with respect to student performance released for some of the major cities in the country. For example:
  - Detroit predicts 7% meeting reading and 4% meeting math based on NAEP.
  - Detroit predicts 10% meeting reading and 9% meeting in math based on ACT.
  - Milwaukee predicts 10% meeting in reading and 10% meeting in math based on NAEP.
  - Milwaukee predicts 9% meeting in reading and 8% meeting in math based on ACT.
  - Cleveland predicts 11% meeting in reading and 10% meeting in math based on NAEP.
- Cleveland predicts 11% meeting in reading and 9% meeting in math based on ACT.
- The district with the highest predictors in this sampling, Charlotte, had 34% meeting in reading and 37% meeting in math based on NAEP and 38% meeting in reading and 32% meeting in math based on ACT.
  (Implementation, p. 5)

With these staggering results it became evident that large urban districts needed proper plans in place to address implementing the Common Core State Standards in order for students to meet the college and career readiness benchmarks. The findings from these plans indicate the following:

- Approximately 58 percent of respondents indicated that they had developed a multi-year written plan to implement the Common Core State Standards by the 2014-2015 school year while 39 percent were developing such plans. Only 3 percent indicated that they had not developed a written implementation plan.
- Half of all respondents (50 percent) indicated that their districts began implementing the English Language Arts & Literacy CCSS during the 2011-2012 school year. Another 44 percent planned to begin implementation during the 2012-2013 school year at the time of the survey. Only 6 percent of all respondents began implementing the English Language Arts standards during the 2010-2011 school year.
- In regards to the Mathematics CCSS, a majority of respondents (51 percent) had already begun implementing these standards during the 2011-2012 school
year. Another 40 percent plan to begin during the 2012-2013 school year while 6 percent of respondents do not plan to adopt the Math CCSS at all.

■ Urban public school districts showed variation in rollout plans for implementing the English language arts CCSS but nearly all responding districts planned to have all grades implemented by the 2014-2015 school year. Most districts planned to implement earlier grade levels (K-3) by the 2013-2014 school year.

■ Over 93 percent of responding districts planned to have the Math CCSS implemented in K-3 by the 2013-2014 school year. Additionally, nearly all respondents indicated that they had plans to have all grades implemented by the 2014-2015 school year.

■ Approximately 87 percent of respondents planned to have the CCSS fully implemented by the 2014-2015 school year while 12 percent expect to have full implementation during the 2015-2016 school year or later.

■ Approximately 41 percent of respondents had integrated Student Achievement Partners’ “Publishers Criteria for the Common Core State Standards in English Language Arts & Literacy” into recent textbook purchasing opportunities. Meanwhile, another 53 percent of respondents had not pursued any new textbook purchasing opportunities.

■ According to respondents, among the stakeholder groups most involved in shaping their district’s implementation plan were teachers, state departments of education, principals and union leaders. Meanwhile, among the stakeholder
groups least involved were elected city officials, business leaders, chamber of commerce, faith based organizations, local community leaders, and parent organizations. (Implementation, p. 6)

The evidence referenced above highlights the wide variance in how many districts were addressing the need for devising implementation plans with regard to the CCSS. In fact, many districts produced plans that didn’t account for the full implementation of the CCSS. This speaks directly to the need and importance of this study, as it is essential to fully implement the CCSS in order to prepare students that are college and career ready.

Another key component going into the Common Core initiative separate from score predictions and roll out plans includes those plans for professional development. The results from the survey indicated that:

- Approximately 69 percent of respondents estimated that more than 61 percent of central office curriculum staff had sufficient knowledge of the CCSS to discuss the implications to classroom instruction.

- Furthermore, approximately two-fifths (40 percent) of respondents estimated that less than 40 percent of school-level staff had sufficient knowledge about the CCSS to discuss the implications to classroom instruction.

- According to respondents, among the most emphasized professional development activities related to the English Language Arts & Literacy CCSS include: building a shared understanding of the CCSS among staff; using informational text to build background knowledge; and building students’ academic vocabulary. Conversely, the least emphasized activities include
integrating technology into the classroom, linking writing across content areas, and differentiating instruction for students with disabilities.

- In regards to the Mathematics CCSS, respondents indicated that the most emphasized professional development activities included: building a shared understanding of the CCSS among staff; building students’ deep understanding of math concepts; and understanding learning progressions across grade levels.

- Compared to districts with low percentages of school level staff with sufficient knowledge of the CCSS to discuss the implications to classroom instruction, districts where 61 percent or more of teachers were knowledgeable of the classroom instructional implications of the CCSS were more engaged in professional development activities in ELA and Math.

- Over half of respondents indicated that their school district had already assessed the extent of alignment between the district’s existing curriculum and the CCSS in both Reading and Math (55 percent and 58 percent, respectively). Another two-fifths of responding districts had either conducted an alignment study or planned to in the future in Reading (42 percent) and Math (36 percent).

- For the 2012-2013 school year, the majority of responding school districts had plans to revise their curriculum in both English Language Arts & Literacy and Mathematics in nearly all grade levels. In English Language Arts, grades K-3 were the most likely to be revised; for Math, grades K-2 and 6-9 were among the most likely to be revised during the 2012-2013 school year.
Compared to districts with low percentages of school level staff with sufficient knowledge of the CCSS to discuss implications to classroom instruction, districts where 61 percent or more of school level staff could discuss classroom implications reported higher percentages of schools with organizational structures in place to implement the CCSS. (Implementation, p. 11)

Districts were also asked about their ability to monitor the process of implementation and work towards teacher observation instruments, the findings were as follows:

- In 2012, approximately 68 percent of respondents indicated that their districts were currently in the process of developing a system for monitoring the implementation of the CCSS.
- Thirteen percent of respondents had already developed a system and another 19 percent did not have a measurement system in place at all.
- Urban public school districts were asked whether formal/informal teacher observation instruments have been aligned with criteria that demonstrate changes in teacher knowledge and practice embedded in the CCSS. 61 percent of respondents indicated that their districts were in the process of developing such criteria; 23 percent had already developed these criteria; and 16 percent had not developed any criteria.
- Approximately 29 percent of respondents reported that their district had developed interim assessments aligned with the CCSS while another 55 percent of respondents are currently in the process of doing so. Only 16
percent reported that they had not developed any interim assessments aligned with the CCSS.

- Approximately 61 percent of respondents strongly agreed that tracking implementation of the CCSS was a high priority for their district.

- Approximately 29 percent of respondents either somewhat disagreed or disagreed that their district had established a regular timetable for collecting implementation data. (Implementation, p. 17)

These findings clearly indicate the uphill battle that urban districts have had to climb based on score predictions, along with the levels of preparedness that urban districts had planned for as they approached full implementation of Common Core Standards. Because urban districts are often a reflection of our greatest challenges in education, a lens into how they approach CCSS provides a better understanding of the effects of CCSS as districts are expected to implement these standards. The reality is that the Common Core State Standards establish an expectation that all students, no matter where they live or what their background is, will have access to high-quality instruction. Yet setting higher academic standards alone will not result in better student achievement. Some students will be further along than others and some will require additional time and support. (Gamm et al., 2012, p. 19)

The aforementioned data supports the reality that all stakeholders related to schools including school leaders must effectively implement the CCSS in order to be successful with respect to raising student achievement across states and districts. This adds to the timeliness and significance of this study.
Every Student Succeeds Act and Its Implications

On December 10, 2015 President Obama signed every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The bipartisan bill has been articulated as the fix to No Child Left Behind. “The law builds on key areas of progress in recent years” (U.S. Department of Education, 2015, p. 1). ESSA highlights how Congress redefined the role of the federal government regarding elementary and secondary education in the United States. The law seeks to enhance the authority that states and school districts will have on education beginning during the academic school year of 2017-18. ESSA will in essence restore some aspects of local education control. “Schools will still be held accountable for student performance, but states can determine the nuances of how that will take place” (Wong, 2015, p. 2). In other words, “The bill affirms the path taken by 48 states and the District of Columbia to hold all students to challenging academic content standards that will prepare them to graduate from high school prepared for success in college and the workforce” (Executive Office of the President, 2015, p. 9). While the CCSS were all but required from states that were issued waivers and that took part in the Race to the Top grant, ESSA makes it clear that the federal government cannot mandate these standards (Wong, 2015, p. 5).

Nonetheless,

ESSA requires that states include a broader set of factors in school accountability systems rather than just test scores; [the law] provides funding for states and districts to audit and streamline their testing regimes, and allows states to cap the amount of instructional time devoted to testing. (Brown & Boser, 2016, p. 1)
It is important to note that for the first time there is an explicit public mandate that all students in United States be taught rigorous academic standards that will prepare them to succeed in college and careers (Korte, 2015, p. 6). “[Additionally], it maintains an expectation that there will be accountability and action to effect positive change in our lowest performing schools, where groups of students are not making progress” (U.S. Department of Education, 2015, p. 4). In fact, “Schools at the bottom 5% of assessment scores (as defined by the state) …or schools where subgroups are consistently underperforming would be considered failing and could be subject to state takeover” (Korte, 2015, p. 2).

In summary, ESSA is designed to hold all students to unprecedented high academic standards and prepare all students in America for success in college and careers. It aims to expand access to high quality early childhood instruction, promote innovation at that local and state level that works, and reduce the burden and frequency of testing at the school level (U.S. Department of Education, 2015, p. 5). ESSA calls for strong teachers in every classroom in the United States. One goal is to assist states and local districts in “creating comprehensive systems to support great teaching and school leadership that integrate pre-service preparation, recruitment, induction, multi-measure evaluation systems, personalized development and feedback, and career advancement for all educators” (Executive Office of the President, 2015, p. 6). Another goal is to identify “innovative approaches to teaching and learning, based on evidence of what works and what can work better for schools” (Executive Office of the President, 2015, p. 6). A third goal is for schools and districts to “conduct alignment studies” to ensure that assessments
that are utilized support and encourage effective teaching and learning. All the same, a central premise of ESSA is to “build local capacity to support teachers’ understanding of assessment design and administration” (Brown & Boser, 2016, p. 6).

When considering all of the facts related to this law and its timing, it is clear that there are many implications for school leaders. This type of law shifts a lot of the accountability that was assumed by the federal government under No Child Left Behind to the state and local levels, which means that the principal will now have significantly increased responsibilities at the school level. As the research highlighted, school leaders and district leaders at the national, state and local levels must come together to seize this opportunity to design coherent, aligned assessment systems that are based on rigorous standards (Brown & Boser, 2016, p. 2). This is a great time to restart what is going on in many districts, as district and school leaders can “capitalize on the flexibility in the new law to make changes in the short and long run to develop a system of better, fairer, and fewer tests” (p. 3). While this new law conveys many new implications for the field of public education, it really doesn’t change the fact that principals’ work will still largely be focused on implementing the CCSS. ESSA specifically requires that schools have rigorous standards implemented at school level. This portion of the Literature Review supports even more the need to study effective leadership behaviors regarding implementing the CCSS.

**The Harvard Business Review’s Popular 21st Century Leadership Theories**

This portion of the Literature Review will highlight the reality that it makes sense to focus on principal leadership as a major factor to implementing the CCSS effectively.
As a result, the researcher analyzed best practices with respect to popular 21st century theories and strategies. In 2011, the Harvard Business Review (HBR) compiled a book of articles that focused on classic ideas and unique advice from what they considered some of the best thinkers with respect to leadership. The book is a resource of best practices and ideas that can be used by experienced and novice leaders. The top ten 21st century leadership theories include: Daniel Goleman’s Emotional Intelligence, Peter Drucker’s Effective Executives, John Kotter’s What Leaders Really Do, Ronald Heifetz’s Adaptive Leadership, Robert Goffee’s Introspective Leadership, Warren Bennis’ Crucibles of Leadership, Jim Collins’ Level 5 Leadership, David Rooke’s Seven Transformations of Leadership, Bill George’s Authentic Leadership, and Debra Ancona’s Incomplete Leader.

Of the ten leadership theories that the HBR highlighted, three have become popular in the K-12 public school arena with respect to school leaders in the United States. The three leadership theories include: Goleman’s Emotional Intelligence (EQ), Heifetz’s Adaptive Leadership and Collins’ Level 5 Leadership.

Emotional intelligence is the ability to manage a person’s own emotions in an effort to be directly sensitive to the needs of others. EQ is rooted in two of Howard Gardner’s multiple intelligences, specifically inter and intra personal intelligence (Brearley, 2006, p. 31). The essential elements of emotional intelligence include: self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills.

Adaptive leaders know how to assist everyone with recognizing that they must take new roles, foster new and meaningful relationships, expand values and adjust behaviors with respect to work. Rather than providing solutions, the “adaptive leader” is
able to ask tough questions and leverage employees’ collective intelligence. Instead of maintaining norms, the adaptive leader can challenge the “way we do business” mentality to shift to a perspective more reflective of reality (Harvard Business Review, 2011, p. 59).

The Level 5 leader sits on top of a hierarchy of capabilities and is, according to our research, a necessary requirement for transforming an organization from good to great… [and they] blend the paradoxical combination of deep personal humility with intense professional will. (Harvard Business Review, 2011, p. 117)

Collins’ research, “exposed Level 5 as a key component inside the black box of what it takes to shift a company from good to great” (p. 135). Level 5 leaders know how to display personal humility through crediting others, recognizing outside factors, and acknowledging pure luck contributing to their organization’s success. When things go badly, these same leaders take full responsibility.

After reviewing all of the leadership theories identified by the HBR specifically with respect to educational leadership, it was clear that for the intents and purposes of this study Goleman’s Emotional Intelligence was the most promising leadership theory. Research showed that Emotional Intelligence, among other prominent leadership theories, offered an important lens for observing and interpreting effectiveness of principal leadership behaviors and choices (Benson, Fearon, McLaughlin, & Garratt, 2014). Unlike many of the other leadership theories, EQ started as a result of the issues that measures like IQ left as they were unable to predict effective school and corporate leadership indicators. In addition, it considers age with regard to generational factors.
Also, it combines a number of the other effective leadership theories into the central premise of the theory. Last but not least, EQ has developed a significant amount of creditability in both the national and international scenes of leadership research. Similarly, it is clear that the total direct and indirect effect that the principal can have on improving student achievement through implementing best practices (CCSS) is upwards of about one quarter of the total school effect (Labby et al., 2012). When compared to the other prominent leadership theories, Emotional Intelligence is the most appropriate for this study as it is the only leadership theory that accounts for the delicate factors that are being researched (i.e., Generational Status and leadership behaviors related to successfully implementing the CCSS in schools).

**A Closer Look at Daniel Goleman and Emotional Intelligence (EQ)**

Daniel Goleman spent a large amount of time researching the various components of a leader. His research conveyed that “the most effective leaders are alike in one crucial way: They all have a high degree of what has come to be known as emotional intelligence” (Harvard Business Review, 2011, p. 1).

Goleman wrote, “My research, along with other recent studies, clearly shows that emotional intelligence is the *sine qua non* of leadership. Without it, a person can have the best training in the world, an incisive analytical mind, and an endless supply of smart ideas, but still won’t make a great leader” (Harvard Business Review, 2011, p. 2).

Emotional intelligence is born largely in the neurotransmitters of the brain. This specific portion governs feelings and impulses. Research indicates that the limbic system learns most efficiently through motivation, extended practice, and consistent feedback. It
is important to note that emotional intelligence is rooted in two of Howard Gardner’s intelligences, specifically inter and intra personal intelligence (Brearley, 2006, p. 31).

“Scientific inquiry strongly suggests that there is a genetic component of emotional intelligence. Psychological and developmental research indicates that nurture plays a role as well…research and practice clearly demonstrate that emotional intelligence can be learned” (Harvard Business Review, 2011, p. 8). Goleman’s Emotional Intelligence significantly questions the longstanding views that many had about Intellectual Intelligence (IQ) and how it is often seen as the sole predictor of success in the field of educational leadership (Benson et al., 2014, p. 202). Mayer and others’ research suggested that there is a direct correlation to age and emotional intelligence, as emotional intelligence increases as one gets older (Labby et al., 2012, p. 8).
Personal Competence | Social Competence
---|---
**Self-Awareness**
* Self-confidence
* Emotional Awareness
* Accurate Self-Assessment

**Social Awareness**
* Service
* Empathy
* Organizational Awareness

**Self-Management**
* Self-control
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* Achievement
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**Relationship Management**
* Inspirational Leadership
* Developing Others
* Influence
* Change Catalyst
* Conflict Management
* Building bonds
* Collaboration and Teamwork

Adapted from Primal Leadership: Learning to lead with Emotional Intelligence (Goleman, Boytazis, & McKee, 2002, p. 39)

*Figure 1. Emotional Intelligence Framework*

Figure 1 outlines the essential elements of Emotional Intelligence include: self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills. “The first components of emotional intelligence are [specific types of] self-management skills. The last two are empathy and social [awareness], [and] concern a person’s ability to manage relationships with others” (Harvard Business Review, 2011, p. 19). Self-awareness is described as being informed of one’s own strengths, weaknesses, values and overall impact on others, which manifests itself in the form of self-confidence and self-assessment. Self-regulation specifically is summarized as redirecting or adjusting unproductive moods or impulses, this area is often grounded in trustworthiness and integrity. Motivation is referenced as a process focused on the positive energy needed to achieve things for the sake of success, which often is rooted in the optimistic passion for the work itself and the challenges that it entails. Empathy is conveyed as the ability to be able to understand the emotional
composition of people other than one’s self. This area is a foundation that is based on developing others through placing a huge emphasis on embracing cross cultural differences. Social skill is outlined as the ability to build meaningful rapport with other people to assist them in meeting desired results, which is conveyed through relentless networking and the capacity to effectively lead and build teams (p. 5). As referenced above, Emotional Intelligence aligns with this study the most because it not only is grounded in research from Goleman but other popular researchers concluded that intelligence (IQ) and training are not the only factors that solidify great leadership, but it is the balance of Emotional Intelligence that enables many great leaders to be successful in leading diverse groups of people (p. 2).

Goleman’s (2000) research also indicated that there are “six distinct leadership styles, each springing from different components of emotional intelligence…most important the research indicates that leaders with the best results do not rely on only one leadership style” (p. 78). The leadership styles include coercive, authoritative, affiliative, democratic, pacesetting, and coaching. Coercive leaders tend require complete compliance and have a “Do what I say” mentality that seems to work well in a crisis situation. Authoritative leaders tend to inspire people toward a vision through a “Come with me” approach that works well when clarity is needed with regard to direction. Affiliative leaders place a huge emphasis on improving the climate by establishing strong emotional bonds. They truly function under the premise that “People come first.” This style works best to motivate subordinates during adversity. Democratic leaders prefer to build consensus through including everyone and apply a “What do you think” strategy to
many changes and adjustments. This style is most productive to garner buy-in. Pacesetting leaders seek to establish standards that are rooted in excellence and they use a “Do as I do, now” approach. This style works best to increase the timeline of getting results from a highly qualified team. Finally, coaching leaders tend to place a lot of energy on development for the future and they implore a “Try this” process. This style works best to improve performance and establish sustainability (p. 83).

Overall, Goleman’s (2000) research indicated that leaders who used the styles that positively affected the climate (democratic, affiliative, coaching and authoritative styles) had significantly better results than their counterparts who did not. Goleman explained, The business environment is continually changing, and a leader must respond in kind. Hour to hour, day to day, week to week, executives must play their leadership styles like a pro—using the right one at just the right time and in the right measure. The payoff is in the results. (p. 90)

Also, the research suggests that “climate accounts for nearly a third of results” (p. 82). There also appeared to be a direct correlation between leaders that mastered at least four styles (specifically democratic, affiliative, coaching and authoritative styles) and healthy climate and positive business performance. “Many studies, including this one, have shown that the more styles a leader exhibits, the better…The most effective leaders switch flexibly among the leadership styles as needed” (p. 87). The goal for these leaders is to adjust their styles so that they can get the best results out of their employees, as they are aware of the overall impact that their decisions can have on their subordinates.
Emotional Intelligence (EQ) and Principal Leadership

How and why some principals are able to exert a positive influence on their schools continue to be unanswered questions (Gray, 2009, p. 1). However, “The new field of social neuroscience suggests why [emotionally intelligent leaders are valuable]. The person to person climate created by positive interactions can make principals more effective leaders—which in turn helps both teachers and students learn better” (Goleman, 2000, p. 76). Emotionally intelligent school leaders care about everyone’s well-being and constantly evaluate how their habits and decisions will benefit others. These leaders create a genuine following of people and are engaged with their needs. They often see academic gains as a direct result of the value of the cultural well-being of staff members in the school. They know how to get the most from their current employees and attract top talent in areas that lack (Lloyd, p. 1). In a qualitative study of high achieving and average individuals in leadership positions, Potter (2011) found that “the concept of [emotional intelligence can serve as] a useful and practical model for utilization with the education administration and leadership arena” (p. 1). The study provided support for the concept that there is a clear relationship between professionals in high achieving positions and high scores with respect to emotional intelligence. Potter went on to reference Patti and Tobin when he explained how imperative it is for leaders to develop socially and emotionally in order to maximize the opportunity to lead learning focused schools (p. 2).

Until recently, only limited research existed that studied the emotional intelligence of principals in schools. Labby and others (2012) conducted a study that
focused on examining if there was a link between effective school leadership skills, best practices and student achievement. The research specifically analyzed the role that principals assume with respect to improving student achievement (p. 2). The study concluded that the total direct and indirect effect that leadership can have on improving student achievement is upwards of about one quarter of the total school effect (p. 5). This research presented a powerful rationale in reference to the importance that emotional intelligence can have in terms of increasing professional practice (p. 9). Emotional intelligence is currently recognized as an essential component of leadership that makes up the components needed in order for school leaders to effectively manage schools in the 21st century (Benson et al., 2014, p. 201). “The relationship between [EQ] and leadership has been studied, which yields much information indicating that emotionally intelligent leaders are more likely to demonstrate certain leadership behavior or styles beneficial to [schools]” (Cai, 2015, p. 163). In addition, there was a study that assessed the EQ and professional achievement of 464 school administrators and found that the above-average school leaders scored significantly higher with respect to EQ than the below-average leaders (p. 165). Similarly, in a study conducted with about 21% of the public school principals in Maryland the researchers found that “the principal’s [EQ] was a significant predictor of the school’s success in meeting AYP” (p. 166). In summary, “in most instances where a school made real gains, a strong principal was part of the effort” and the principals’ efforts were shaped by their emotional intelligence (p. 169).

It is important to note that measuring EQ was largely born out of the inability for tradition measures like IQ to predict what skills were necessary to be successful in life,
specifically in leadership positions (Benson et al., 2014, p. 202). Goleman’s research eventually highlighted how and why emotional intelligence was more important than long-established IQ measurements. Based on personal and social competence, Goleman developed a framework of social competencies, and he demonstrated how specific emotional skills were developed and learned (Labby et al., 2012, p. 4). Goleman’s research indicated that highly effective leaders possess emotional intelligence skills that enable them to function successfully in a myriad of situations with a number of people. “These competencies are an integral part of the principal’s charisma in developing and maintaining a positive academic climate where teachers and students were successful…these competencies may be learned” (p. 5).

Labby and others (2012) outlined how Covey published findings related to his research that connect human performance and emotional intelligence. His work served as a template for maximizing optimal performance at work and in one’s personal life through the use and development of emotional skills (p. 4).

“[Emotional intelligence] is the path [where when] we start it we are to move towards personal, team and whole school excellence” (Brearley, 2006, p. 30). A study of school leaders in Great Britain found that each principal’s leadership style directly related to the climate established in terms of student achievement. “The British study found that the [more positive leadership styles related to emotional intelligence] a school leader could exhibit as needed, the better achievement scores of the schools they led” (Goleman, 2000, p. 79). In addition, the results indicated that a given leader’s style of interactions with staff and students can inspire or demotivate their staff members.
“Studies on emotional intelligence suggest that our moods and feelings are connected to our thought processes and behaviors” (Gray, 2009, p. 2). The true essence of emotional intelligence is the ability to manage a person’s own emotions in an effort to be directly sensitive to the needs of others. It includes the mood and feelings that we display in any form during personal interactions with others. Emotional intelligence isn’t merely the notion that the educational leader should be meek and pleasant all of the time. In fact, there are some situations where the most effective response for the leader is to deal with confrontation head on. It is equally important to note that emotional intelligence is not an unfiltered expression of a person’s emotions in the professional decision making process. Gray cited Nelson and Low’s perspective of emotional intelligence serving as a guide to constructively evaluate problems, find the purpose and maximize the opportunity for participation (p. 2). “Leaders are humans with a full range of feelings and emotions…Careful practice, empathy and concern for others enable them to use emotional intelligence to manage their own and others’ emotions and to express their feelings in helpful ways” (p. 2). The principal’s ability to effectively display social awareness, empathic behavior, strong decision making skills, and exert a positive influence over others is essential. Emotional intelligence can lead to increased creative thoughts, decreased stress, and improved morale in the school or organizational setting. “Emotional intelligence is the cornerstone of every decision a principal makes; solving problems and making judgments are part of a leader’s system of values and beliefs” (p. 2).
International Research Related to EQ and School Leaders

The researcher also explored the international context that EQ has had in the field of school leadership and noted that many countries all around the globe have taken it upon themselves to study how EQ is correlated to leadership effectiveness, specifically in the school setting. A study of two African schools noted substantial differences in the behavior of two principals who had different levels of EQ. The researchers eventually concluded that the leader with the higher EQ was clearly more aware of the importance of leadership and was able to successfully get his staff to work cohesively as a team through his emphasis on authentic relationship building while the other principal was not able to accomplish the same results, as a result of his deficits in self-awareness and self-management (Cai, 2015, p. 164). Similarly, an Australian study determined that EQ was significantly associated with leadership effectiveness (p. 164). This study’s results further the notion that there is a clear value to developing emotional intelligence, and in many instances where schools were successful in Australia, the leader’s emotional intelligence played a key role. Additionally, a study conducted in China investigated the impact that school leaders have on schools and concluded that leaders with higher EQ have a positive impact on school improvement (Benson et al., 2014, p. 205). Last but not least, an exploratory research study in South East England focused on the emotional intelligence of school leaders at two grammar schools, including 51 voluntary participants.

The exploratory results suggested that [EQ] was affected by age within this study. It was also found that older participants had significantly higher [EQ] scores than mid-age-range participants. High scores for [EQ] were also found to be more
prevalent in senior leaders than with middle leaders. This was similarly evident for self-control and sociability. (p. 213)

There was substantial evidence to support the notion that EQ can enhance a principal’s ability to improve the academic development of a school. Additionally, what was apparent in the international scene as well as in the United States, was the lack of research specifically regarding EQ, generational status and student achievement.

**Generational Characteristics for Baby Boomers, Generation X and Generation Y**

Generational status is an important factor to take into account in examining principal leadership. Research shows the presence of three generations in current school leadership affects the complexity of the current scene. Further, recent studies suggest that attention to generational status can yield fruitful insights regarding leadership approaches and communication factors.

Without looking more closely at generational DNA inside the schoolhouse, it will be difficult to achieve and sustain coalescence. After all, to bridge the age gap and manage the friction, employees’ needs, assumptions, hopes and fears have to be noticed and appreciated. (Lovely, 2005, p. 30)

The current workforce is comprised of individuals that fall into three specific generational groups including Baby Boomers, Generation X and Generation Y. According to Renee Taylor, chief of staff for AT&T (a company that had a similar generational make up of that as public schools in America), in 2010, “Millennials [made] up 11 percent of the company’s workforce. The remainder [was made up of] 39 percent Gen X and 50 percent Baby Boomers” (Gesell, 2010, p. 31). Jamie Notter and Maddie
Grant (2015) explained that while many people are unaware of this, Generation X has now surpassed Baby Boomers as the largest group in the workforce. However, the Catalyst organization’s research (2015) indicated that there are about 73 million people that represent Generation Y (Millennials) in the United States. By 2020, Millennials are expected to account for about one in three adults. Presently, one-third of all working people in America are Millennials. As Millennials continue to graduate from universities the number is expected to increase significantly. In fact, it is predicted that “by 2025, Millennials will account for three-quarters of working age people” (p. 1).

Cathy Sandeen (2008) described generation as “a cohort of people born within a particular period of time” (p. 11). She goes on to point out that generally generations tend to span over about a 20-year period, as this represents the average amount of time between being born and childbearing (p. 11). Sandeen explained that Howe and Strauss coined a term referred to as “peer personality” or view of the world to describe the fabric or frame of a typical person in a given generation. “Every generation turns a corner, and in some critical respect, changes fundamentally the direction of whatever trends they inherit from the last generation” (p. 13). In his article about leading members of different generations, Izzy Gesell (2010) referenced sociologist Morris Massey who believed that, “the influence of events [people] lived through creates a collective personality of sorts” (p. 22).

T. Scott Gross (2012) pointed out that, “A generation is determined by the values and experiences of your most formative years…We connect and we group, based on shared values and shared experiences” (p. 16). He went on to explain that a generation is
essentially defined by common values and experiences in formative years, which could
be anchored by music or other ceremonial experiences of the time. In any event, Gross
believes that, “Each generation is different and demands a slightly different
approach…but the differences are usually more a matter of context than content” (p. 19).
A cohort [or generation] shares the experiences of its times, and those experiences
shape its values. The behavior of the cohort [generation] will reflect the
experiences and values its members share, but membership in a cohort is not
determined by behavior. It’s also not determined solely by age. (Gross, 2012, p. 20)
A dissertation by Gage (2005) highlighted that “leadership theory becomes a bit deeper
and [more] applicable when studied in relationship to [generations]” (p. 1). Also, Smith
and Cluman (1997) asserted that many theorists believe that people who have
experienced the same types of political events, economic conditions, and technological
advancements will have very similar outlooks on things. Similarly, Kuhn (2012) pointed
out that generations can be referenced with respect to other sociological schemata, which
assists in framing one’s behavior (p. 7). He went on to explain that generations are like
trees, as “they carry within them a unique signature of history’s bygone moments’ (p. 10).
Making a similar point, Ryder (1965) explained that the connection to historical
events and activities shape generations, not one’s specific age or birth date. In many
cases, people born at the end of one generation or at the beginning of another often
exhibit characteristics from the generation on both sides (Kuhn, 2012, p. 11). Roscow
(1978) was one of the first to document what he called “social cohorts” or generations
with specific components including: (1) individuals with shared life events, (2) experiences and events that have a social, historical and political context, (3) events and experiences have a shared generational foundation, (4) effects of events and experiences that help separate one generation from another, (5) the effects of the events and experiences remain relatively constant over a cohort’s lifetime (p. 67).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>Values hard work, success, teamwork, anti-rules, &amp; anti-regulation</td>
<td>Values balance between work &amp; life, self-motivated, not loyal to a single employer &amp; family-oriented</td>
<td>Values diversity, multitasking, digital consumers, fast thinkers, open-minded, loyal to themselves, will change jobs &amp; careers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important Events</td>
<td>Polio Vaccine and US Space Program</td>
<td>Internet, coined “latchkey” term, US birthrate declined, crime &amp; suicide rates increased, &amp; divorce rates increased</td>
<td>Coined “soccer mom” term, cellular phones, interactive whiteboards, email, and social networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Preferences</td>
<td>Appreciates visibility &amp; recognition, nonverbal cues &amp; prefers meetings</td>
<td>Appreciates having opinions heard, consistent feedback &amp; prefers email</td>
<td>Appreciates instant feedback, electronic communication, &amp; adaptable with different communication styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Traits</td>
<td>Prefers consensus building, avoids conflict, struggles with delegation &amp; conveying empathy</td>
<td>Prefers casual &amp; friendly workplaces, leadership seen as power, prestige &amp; authority</td>
<td>Prefers collaboration, tolerance, hierarchies, organizational charts, exudes confidence, little patience for meetings and structured gatherings, &amp; lacks experience with handling conflict</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Summary of Generations

Figure 2 presents a summary of generational traits and characteristics. The Baby Boomer generation is born approximately between 1943-1964. Many studies indicate that because the Baby Boomer generation spanned over such a great period of time many of
the experiences within this generation can vary significantly. Baby Boomers “value competition that declares winners and losers. [They] value hard work, success, teamwork, and for the most part are anti-rules and regulations” (Gross, 2012, p. 18). This group is the first to be referred to as “workaholics.” These folks are often described as optimistic during youth and team oriented, as they grew up in the post-World War II era when the United States became extremely powerful. When compared to their parents, Baby Boomers “enjoyed affluent and nurtured lifestyles… [and] children became the central focus of the family” (Sandeen, 2008, p. 14). They can be rather individualistic and tend to oppose leadership, but value instant personal gratification (p. 15). Many of these folks seek personal gratification and growth, as they went to school when the television and phone were the major luxuries in the home. With respect to science, the polio vaccine was discovered and there were many notable enhancements in the United States’ space program during the Baby Boomer’s formative years. They tend to require two incomes in the household and they don’t shy away from working long hours at work (p. 15). Many assert that the Baby Boomer generation is the wealthiest generation to date in the United States and they are very career oriented (Walmsley, 2011, p. 25). “Funding and effectiveness of US public schools increased during Boomer youth” (Sandeen, 2008, p. 14). Walmsley (2011) points out that Baby Boomers rely heavily on reading body language and reading nonverbal communication cues to complement spoken language and if they have a question they tend to prefer to go to others that have perspectives similar to theirs for answers (p. 25). Baby Boomers “value visibility and recognition…are known in the workplace for preferring meetings as a mode of communication” (Sandmen,
With respect to leadership, research indicates that Baby Boomers tend to avoid conflict, prefer leading through establishing a consensus, and they sometimes struggle with delegation and conveying empathy. They are known to embrace personal and professional development opportunities and shifts in leadership trends. However, they often struggle with flexibility during radical change situations (Lovely, 2005, p. 33).

Sherry Penney (2011) pointed out that “very few books on leadership solicit and report the views of emerging leaders—Generation X and Y. These generations are the leaders of the future, and their voices need to be heard” (p. 55). Generation X also “known as the Sandwich Generation because of its position between the largest two groups” spans approximately from 1965-1979 (Gesell, 2010, p. 22). This is the first generation to “have other technology exposure, such as personal computers and the internet, as they matured” (Walmsley, 2011, p. 26). It is important to note that people from Generation X born between 1975 and 1979 are often grouped in to the beginning of Generation Y (Gross, 2012, p. 11). Similarly, other researchers have explained that folks from Generation X are part of a unique group with respect to standing alone. In fact, “Many Gen Xs think of themselves as younger Boomers or early Millennials. In many ways, Gen X could rightfully be called the Bridge Generation” (p.18).

Nonetheless, people from Generation X value a balance between work and life, they prefer communication through email, they appreciate being asked about their opinions, and they enjoy consistent feedback (Gross, 2012, p. 18). Although members of Generation X are known for being cynical and seemingly pessimistic at times, they are often referred to as self-motivated survivors, as Generation X “children saw their fathers
lose well-established positions and high wage earning jobs through plant closures and workforce reductions” (Sandeen, 2008, p. 15). Many assert that economic status decreased, the United States’ birthrate declined, crime and suicide rates increased; incarceration rates increased and the divorce rate increased significantly for this generation (p. 15). Sociologists typically referenced this generation when they describe the “latchkey” children who spent a great deal of time at home by themselves and they grew up in a time where childcare and after school programs weren’t prevalent. Members of Generation X are often considered “global thinkers who value balance, fun, and informality” (Gesell, 2012, p. 22). They are likely to prefer to utilize the internet and email to improve the efficiency of their personal lives. With respect to finding information to a question, Generation X is more likely to search the internet for answers (p. 26). This generation is the first to experience an emergence of blended families and “was less college educated than the previous generations and they tended to be more politically and financially conservative” (Sandeen, 2008, p. 16). This generation has spent a lot more time single when compared to previous generations and as a result marry later in life. Sandeen referenced an article titled Decoding Generational Differences by Smith when she explained, “Generation X is not loyal to a single employer and sees job changing as necessary and advantageous. Because they are so family oriented, they value and protect their leisure time, eighty-hour work hours are not the norm” (p. 17). With respect to leadership, research indicates that members of Generation X tend to go into leadership roles for reasons other than power, prestige and authority. They prefer a casual and friendly atmosphere in the workplace. They don’t always consider diplomacy when
interacting with subordinates, but they are able to naturally create and adjust to new systems and structures in the workplace. Additionally, members of Generation X are not afraid to challenge supervisors or people in authority (Lovely, 2005, p. 33).

The Millennials or Generation Y spans approximately between 1980-2003. Generation Y represents a high percent of those entering the workforce today, especially with respect to those that are traditionally completing college. Millennials have been recently referred to as the digital consumers.

They’re the ones who will exert the greatest influence on the direction this world is going to go—but they are not the only players, not by a long shot. The other customers are still around: Generation X, the Boomers. (Gross, 2012, p. 11)

Folks in Generation Y have all grown up in a time where digital information is a source of power. Millennials are often described as fast thinkers, great with multitasking, able to adapt easily with respect to change, decisive in terms of separating what is important to them and loyal to themselves. This group genuinely values diversity when compared to other generations.

This generation has “never known a world without technology and have spent their entire lives exposed to higher-level communication devices, such as video conferencing, cellular phones, interactive white boards, email and social networking” (Walmsley, 2011, p. 26). Similarly, they tend to prefer using electronic means to communicate over in person interactions. They also are accustomed to instant responses with respect to communication, as this has been a prevalent feature of their development. “Millennials seem to have little patience for meetings, discussions, or other structured
gatherings; this is especially true if they cannot see the relevance of the meeting or the need to participate” (Gesell, 2012, p. 22). When Generation Y has a question, it is likely to result in a Google search to retrieve an answer (p. 26). Millennials come from a time period that represents one of the lowest child-to-parent ratios in United States history. Terms like “soccer mom” emerged in this generation’s youth. Also, the amount of children living in poverty peaked during this time period, along with the divorce rate. “Millennial children began building their resumes in preschool, attending the best schools and participating in a plethora of extracurricular activities…and they can take in 20 hours’ worth of information in seven hours” (Sandeen, 2008, p. 18). They tend to be very focused with respect to career advancements, appreciate instant feedback and value their parents’ involvement in their lives. Multi-tasking is certainly in their nature and as a result, Millennials don’t shy away from building multiple careers or changing jobs. Additionally, Millennials are a part of a generation that exudes great confidence, civic duty, street smarts, collaboration and open-mindedness (Gesell, 2012, p. 22). “They are motivated by helping others, improving the environment and making the world a better place” (Sandeen, 2008, p. 19). In terms of leadership, research indicates that members of Generation Y are more susceptible to display tolerance and they embrace new challenges relatively easily. They are typically able to adapt to the diversity of learning styles and needs in the workplace. Similarly, this generation prefers flattened hierarchies or organizational charts and they tend to lack experience with respect to dealing directly with conflict and difficult people (Lovely, 2005, p. 33). The specific generational characteristics impact the nature of this study with respect to the approaches that can be
utilized to successfully implement the CCSS in various schools. Having insight into the ways that any of the current generations (that are present in the school) might approach a situation could inform how to increase practices that ultimately enhance the quality of education directly provided to students in the school setting.

Summary

The review of literature showed that no one has studied the relationship between all three pieces—specifically emotional intelligence, generational status, and principal leadership behaviors—in regard to implementing the CCSS in public schools in Illinois. It also confirmed the importance and possible interrelationship between the three components: school leadership for implementing the CCSS, EQ and generational status.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This researcher explored whether there was a correlation between emotional intelligence (EQ), generational status and principals’ leadership abilities for the successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). The researcher compared and contrasted the emotional intelligences of current principals with the leadership behaviors displayed in an effort to link them to the successful implementation of the CCSS in schools. The research questions for this study include:

1. How does principals’ emotional intelligence (EQ) contribute to the context of the successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards in their schools?

2. How does principals’ generational status contribute to the context of the successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards in their schools?

3. What other principal leadership behaviors and strategies if any contribute to the process of successfully implementing the Common Core State Standards in schools?

This study utilized the mixed methods research approach. This method has emerged as a viable alternative to the dichotomy of quantitative and qualitative traditional research in the social and behavioral sciences fields (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2010). It is
important to note that there has been some debate on how to precisely define mixed methods research. Arthur and Waring (2012) argued that in its simplest form, mixed methods combines qualitative and quantitative research approaches with the goal to develop a more accurate and authentic understanding of social phenomena that would not be possible if a researcher only used one of the approaches (p. 147). However, Tashakkori and Teddlie (2010) explained that mixed methods research is based on the researcher combining elements of qualitative and quantitative research approaches (quantitative and qualitative perspectives, data collection and inference techniques) in order to garner further depth and breadth of understanding (p. 51). Mixed methods can also refer to the use of quantitative and qualitative methods to answer research questions in a single study (Mertens, 2015, p. 304). “Mixed methods requires considering assumptions, premises, values, and ways of seeing that may be at odds with one another—but that often may only seem to be” (Calfee & Sperling, 2010, p. 9). Mixed methods holds greater potential to address complex research questions by acknowledging the unique interconnections that traditional research approaches have fallen short on addressing. One of the major objectives of this approach is for words, pictures and narrative to add meaning to numbers (Hesse-Biber, 2010, p. 3). The specific approach that the researcher utilized for this study is described as explanatory sequential mixed methods. The explanatory sequential mixed methods approach consists of the researcher collecting quantitative data, analyzing the results (which was the case in this study with the Common Core Implementation Inventory Survey, PARCC scores and the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal), and using the results to inform the qualitative portion of the study
(i.e. the portion of the study, which consisted of semi-structured interviews). It is important to note that in an explanatory sequential mixed methods approach “the quantitative results typically inform the types of participants to be purposefully selected for the qualitative phase and the types of questions that will be asked of the participants” (Creswell, 2014, p. 224). As alluded to above, the research subjects were recruited through initially accessing the PARCC scores of all public schools in Lake and Cook counties that reached 27% proficiency or higher (this metric represented a score within the range of the average school performance during the first year of PARCC administration in the state of Illinois) via the Illinois Interactive Report Card (IIRC). The research participants that were deemed eligible via the IIRC, took part in phase one of the study that was the Common Core Implementation Inventory Survey (see Appendix C). The scores from the Common Core Implementation Inventory Survey were used to determine the participants that were selected for the full study (phase two and phase three). The participants that took in the full study took the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal (phase two) and their scores from this assessment informed the semi-structured interview (phase three) portion (see Appendix D).

Creswell (2014) pointed out that with mixed methods, there in part is an assumption that both forms of data provide different types of information. Similarly, one can naturally assume that both forms of data collection have inherent strengths and limitations. Furthermore, one can project that “mixing” or blending the data can provide “a stronger understanding of the problem or question than either by itself” (p. 215). Mixed methods research involves the collection of closed-ended (quantitative) and open-
ended (qualitative) data with regard to the research questions. It also involves the thorough analysis of both types of data. It is imperative to consider the timing of the data collection (p. 217).

Tashakkori and Teddlie (2010) pointed out how mixed methods research has become more synergistic for educational leadership studies because of its focus on the premise that “two or more options [can interact] so that their combined effect [is] greater than the sum of the individual parts” (p. 59). In other words, the combination of quantitative and qualitative research methods is greater than either approach can serve alone. “The flexibility of mixed methods research in simultaneously addressing multiple and diverse research questions through integrated qualitative and quantitative techniques is one of its attractions” (p. 699).

Five common advantages for using mixed methods research includes the fact that this approach allows for more effective triangulation, complementarity, development, initiation and expansion. The triangulation allows for the researcher to be able to compare findings between qualitative and quantitative results. The complementarity enables the researcher to be able to seek enhancement and clarification of the findings. The development gives the researcher the objective leverage to be able to use the results from one portion of the study to assist with informing the other. The initiation aspect allows for the researcher to be able to unpack and discover patterns or contradictions that may emerge with regard to the findings from multiple components of the study. This can inform specific comparisons within the study. Last but not least, expansion gives the
researcher the latitude to be able to expand the range of the study through using multiple strands for different study phases (Mertens, 2015, p. 305).

The purpose for utilizing mixed methods in this study was to allow for more efficient triangulation of data to address the research questions. With mixed methods research, data is collected and analyzed using both the deductive (top-down) or quantitative approach, as well as the inductive (bottom-up) or qualitative approach (Watkins & Gioia, 2015). The research questions for the study include: (1) How does principals’ emotional intelligence (EQ) contribute to the context of the successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards in their schools? (2) How does principals’ generational status contribute to the context of the successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards in their schools? (3) What other principal leadership behaviors and strategies if any contribute to the process of successfully implementing the Common Core State Standards in schools? Quantitative research methods were used to study the relationship between student achievement and CCSS implementation levels with the emotional intelligence of principals - by means of the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal, the student performance data from each of the schools, and the Common Core Implementation Inventory on-line survey. Qualitative research methods were used to investigate in-depth whether generational status influenced the emotional intelligence of principals or the implementation of the CCSS in schools- by means of a semi-structured interview with each principal. It is important to note that the mixed method approach utilizes the results generated from quantitative and qualitative data in tandem, as the goal is to explore and investigate the research questions within the
research study (Creswell, 2007). As a result of the combination of quantitative and qualitative nature of the research methods, the research was considered a mixed method study and as alluded to above, examined whether the generational status and emotional intelligence of principals influenced the decisions that were made with respect to successfully implementing the CCSS in schools.

As described above, the data for this study came from four different sources. The first instrument was the Common Core Implementation Inventory (CCII) on-line survey (see Appendix C) to measure the successful implementation of the CCSS in each school (as measured by the Implementation of the Eight Standards of Mathematical Practice of CCSS and Implementation of Three Key Language Arts/Literacy Shifts of CCSS). Mertens (2015) explained that “surveys can [be incorporated into] methods [and] used for descriptive research or as data collection” (p. 181). Surveys are a great way to allow for the collection of data “from a larger number of people than is generally possible when using an experimental design” (p. 182). They rely heavily on the self-reporting of participants regarding their knowledge, behaviors and perspectives towards things. In fact, 21st century technological advancements allow for more convenient and yet efficient options for conducting surveys in order to collect data, including email, video based, Survey Monkey (web-based) and mobile phone surveys (p. 186). One of the central elements for the study was to measure for the specific levels of implementation of the CCSS in order to determine eligibility to participate in the full study. This tool served as one of the objective means in determining whether schools were successful. The second data point for the study was the student achievement data as measured by the
2015 Illinois PARCC scores (Illinois Interactive Report Card) from each participant’s school of service. The student achievement data was used to explicitly measure one component of each school’s ability to successfully implement the CCSS. The third data point was the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal®. This generated a score for each participant and each participant was provided with a breakdown of their score with respect to the four domains (and two competencies) that serve as the framework for emotional intelligence. The specific strengths regarding the participants’ scores aided in the qualitative component of the research study. The fourth and final data point of the research study was the 45-60-minute interview (see Appendix D) with each of the participants. The overall goal of this component of the study was to allow for each participant to reflect on their respective emotional intelligences to determine if there was a relationship between their emotional intelligence, generational status and their ability to successfully lead the implementation of the CCSS in their respective schools.

As referenced above, in the first phase of the study principals completed the Common Core Implementation Inventory on-line survey to determine eligibility to participate in the full study based on whether their school achieved the status of successful implementation of the CCSS. The survey was sent on-line via email to principals of all K-8 schools in Cook County and Lake County.

For this study, the successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards was determined on the basis of two broad criteria supported by research. (1) A school’s readiness to implement the CCSS by having specific curriculum in place for English language arts and math instruction along with on-going professional
development. (2) A school’s score on the recently released 2015 PARCC assessment of the CCSS. For the purpose of this study, the first criteria were operationalized in to four measures, which will be described below.

The researcher reviewed a number of studies in order to determine the different categories of how successful implementation of the CCSS can be quantified. Overall, the research indicated that there were two general categories related to professional practice that are extremely important to successfully implement the CCSS in public schools. They include curriculum (that encompasses the three English Language Arts/Literacy Shifts, the Eight Standards of Mathematical Practice of the CCSS and clear and consistent curriculum maps for each grade level) and differentiated professional development for teachers. “Professional learning should focus on practices that help students meet the [CCSS], such as teaching them to conduct close reading of complex texts, publicly struggle with difficult mathematics problems and communicate their learning through speaking or writing” (Aspen Institute, 2013, p. 5).

Martin (2015) cited schools all over the country in urban, suburban and rural areas that experienced what many have described as a “seamless” transition with respect to the CCSS in teaching and learning. One of the areas that all of the schools had in common was related to how they created “systems for embedded teacher professional development” (p. 2). The Aspen Institute (2013) conducted research on schools that effectively implemented the CCSS and determined what they called indicators of high quality transition to the Common Core State Standards. Of the indicators highlighted, one was directly related to on-going professional development and it focused on high quality
content, multiple delivery modes, collaboration and reflection. Similarly, Miller (2015) conducted a study related to lessons learned from schools that have implemented the CCSS and reported that schools that were successful with regard to implementing the standards had teachers that received the standards “the right way” as the schools allowed for teachers to receive on-going, embedded professional development (p. 2). Nagel (2012) published a report that highlighted recommendations for the effective implementation of the CCSS “including the need for school leaders to ensure that educators have a ‘deep’ understanding of the new standards and, in particular, the key instructional shifts required within them” (p. 4). Other recommendations highlighted by the report included the need for differentiated professional development and instructional resources that encompass quality and that are aligned with the CCSS. Yettick (2014) highlighted a study that tested New York City educators on knowledge of the CCSS. Ultimately, the study found that teachers who were exposed to differentiated professional development, specifically in the form of support from colleagues had higher levels of knowledge of the CCSS (p. 1).

Another indicator highlighted by the schools that were discussed in the Aspen Institute’s (2013) study was based on the need for instructional resources that are aligned to the CCSS.

Effective implementation of the CCSS will require the instructional resources used by teachers and students that closely align with the goals and expectations of the CCSS. The school [must develop] or [implement] a comprehensive
curriculum that includes instructional materials that are content-rich and build knowledge and academic vocabulary coherently. (p. 8)

Additionally, Miller’s (2015) study determined the most effective schools utilized instructional tools that included the three shifts in English Language Arts/Literacy (p. 2). In the same vein, the Washington State Superintendent’s office (2013) published a document that outlined their expectations of the specific components that schools will need to have established in order to effectively implement the CCSS. Two of the foundational components that were referred to as “The ‘What’ Key Content Shifts in CCSS” were the Three Shifts in English Language Arts/Literacy and the Eight Standards of Mathematical Practice (p. 3).

As mentioned earlier, Martin (2014) wrote an article that focused on CCSS implementation best practices and it explained the importance of school leaders investing in professional development and enriching curriculum that is based on the CCSS. With respect to professional development, there was huge emphasis placed on varying the types of workshops provided, specifically in the form of having teachers train other teachers and embrace leadership roles (p. 5). The article also called for the need to translate the CCSS standards into instruction, as it emphasized the importance of implementing curriculum based on the Eight Standards of Mathematical Practice and the Three ELA/Literacy Shifts, which are some of the most important areas of the CCSS (p. 9).

Thus, the research clearly indicated that curriculum development and professional development are the two major factors that are integral to successfully implement the
CCSS in schools. In this study these were operationalized into four distinct measures to quantify a school’s successful implementation of the CCSS: (1) Math Curriculum in place: The math curriculum must be aligned to Common Core State Standards. It should specifically address the eight mathematical practices. (2) English Language Arts Curriculum in place: The English Language Arts curriculum must be aligned to Common Core State Standards. It should specifically address the three key literacy shifts. (3) Curriculum Map and Scope and Sequence: The curriculum should have a common curriculum map and a scope and sequence in place that teachers at a given grade level follow from K-8. (4) Professional Development: There should be on-going professional development supports in place at the school level that keep teachers informed about best practice teaching strategies that correspond with the Common Core State Standards, specifically as it relates to the curriculum that is implemented at the school level.

A fifth measure of a school’s successful implementation of the CCSS is 5. Performance on PARCC: The score that a given school had on PARCC represented the initial performance level with respect to the implementation of the CCSS in 2015. PARCC was designed to test where students are with respect to various achievement levels in an effort to prepare them for college and career readiness. The PARCC score was an objective means for documenting student achievement, specifically with regard to the measurement of students’ Common Core State Standards proficiency in English language arts and math at the national level. This score also served as another source that contributed to the first phase of the study that was used to determine whether a school had achieved the successful implementation of the CCSS status. Also, a school’s PARCC
score served as a measure to verify the principal’s self-reporting of the first four measures. A PARCC score of lower than 27% proficiency for a given school was considered unsuccessful, as it was 6% or more below the state average in Illinois. A PARCC score of 27% to 39% proficiency for a given school was considered moderately successful, as this score was within close range (less than 6%) or statistically the same as the average school’s proficiency on the first benchmark of PARCC in the state of Illinois, which was 33% proficiency in the spring of 2015. A PARCC score of 40% to 45% proficiency for a given school was considered successful, as this score was more than 6% higher (between 6% and 12% above) than the average school’s score in the state of Illinois. A PARCC score of 46% proficiency or higher for a given school was considered highly successful, as the score was more than 12% higher than the average school’s score of 33% proficiency in the state of Illinois.

For a school to be considered successful in implementing the CCSS for this study, it had to have a score of 70% or higher with respect to having the five measures described in place at the school level, as measured by the Common Core Implementation Inventory on-line survey and the school’s 2015 Composite PARCC score (which helped determine initial eligibility for the study). Each of the four categories of the Common Core Implementation Inventory and the school’s PARCC score represented one indicator of the components measured to represent successful implementation of the CCSS in schools. The categories were selected based on the current research regarding the CCSS as well as the data gathered from the state of Illinois’ spring of 2015 PARCC scores. Each category was allocated a weight or percent that accounted for the level of importance with respect
to the progression of successful implementation of the CCSS, which totaled a maximum of 100%. For the first four categories, if a school had the area implemented or in place, then the school received the full percent for that particular area (i.e., three Shifts in English Language Arts/Literacy, the Eight Standards of Mathematical Practice, on-going differentiated professional development for teachers, and common curriculum maps and scope and sequences for math and English Language Arts). If the school had the area partially implemented or in place, then the school received half credit (50%) for that specific area. If the school didn’t have the area implemented or in place, then they received no credit (0%) for the given area. For the categories related to the English Language Arts Shifts, Eight Standards of Mathematical Practices, and on-going differentiated professional development for teachers each was worth a total of 20%, as they were the primary components directly related to the research based indicators of successful implementation of the CCSS. The category regarding the curriculum map and scope and sequences were allocated 10% in the weighted score, as it was essential to the successful implementation of the CCSS but was secondary to the three categories highlighted above. The final category regarding a school’s proficiency score on the 2015 PARCC was perhaps the most important component, as it was the most objective measure and cumulative indicator of a school’s performance with respect to the successful implementation of the CCSS. As a result, this category was worth a total of 30%. In addition, the category was split into four different performance levels. If a school scored 26% or lower on PARCC, it is considered unsuccessful, would receive a score of 0% and would not be eligible to take part in the study. If a school’s PARCC score was
between 27% to 39% proficiency, the school would receive 10% for placing into the moderately successful performance level. If a school’s PARCC proficiency was between 40% to 45%, the school was rated at the successful performance level and allocated 20% in this area. Last but not least, if a school’s PARCC proficiency was 46% or higher, the school was rated at the highly successful performance level and allocated the maximum of 30% in this area.

The study had principals in each generation (Baby Boom, Generation X and Generation Y) participate in the second phase of the study. There were a total of ten principals (two from Baby Boom, five from Generation X and three from Generation Y). Participants that received scores of 70% or better were eligible for this portion of the study and they were selected according to the highest scores in sequential order by generation. In other words, the two to five principals that received the highest ratings on the Common Core Implementation Inventory (see Appendix C) and 2015 PARCC score from each generation were selected for this portion of the study and invited to participate in the second and third phases of the study. Consent for the second phase of the study was obtained through email from participants of schools that have successfully implemented the CCSS from phase one. In order to determine the eligible pool of possible participants, the scores from phase one (Common Core Implementation Inventory and 2015 PARCC scores) were organized in ranked order for principals by generation. If a principal with a top score was selected for the second and third phases of the study from one of the generations but did not consent, the person with the next highest score (in the same generation) was invited to participate in the second and third phases of the study. This
process was repeated until a total of nine to 15 principals (two to five from Baby Boom, two to five from Generation X, and two to five from Generation Y) that successfully implemented the CCSS consent to participate in the second portion of the study.

Once the principals were identified and agreed to participate, the goal of the second portion of the study was to investigate the significant similarities and differences among the responses provided from each generation. The other goal was to study specifically whether generational status affected EQ and decisions made by leaders for implementing Common Core State Standards and whether there were practices or strategies that leaders from one generation could learn from the others. To do this the second instrument, the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal® developed by Drs. Travis Bradberry and Jean Greaves (2007) was administered to measure the emotional intelligence of each principal that consented to participate in this portion of the study. The instrument was based on the Emotional Intelligence framework of Daniel Goleman and it specifically sought to measure an individual’s emotional behaviors based on four core domains (two competencies) as highlighted in Figure 3 below.

1. **Self-awareness**—the ability to understand one’s own strengths, weaknesses, values and overall impact on others, which manifests itself in the form of self-confidence and self-assessment.

2. **Self-management (regulation)**—the ability to redirect or adjust unproductive moods or impulses.
3. Social awareness—the ability to build meaningful rapport with other people to assist them in meeting desired results, which is conveyed through relentless networking and the capacity to effectively lead and build teams.

4. Relationship management—the ability to motivate, influence, and build capacity in others while managing conflict. (Harvard Business Review, 2011, p. 5)

Adapted from Primal Leadership: Learning to lead with Emotional Intelligence (Goleman, Boytazis, & McKee, 2002, p. 39)

**Figure 3. Emotional Intelligence Framework**

The semi-structured interview portion of the study was based on the first two phases. The first instrument, the CCSS Implementation Inventory and the PARCC score, represented the first data source. All composite scores for each principal were sorted by generation and ranked from highest to lowest. In order for a participant to be considered for the full study, the school needed to receive a score of 70% or better on the Common Core Implementation Inventory based on the responses of the principal and the school’s
2015 Composite PARCC score. The eligibility of the participants to move on to the full study was determined after the data from the Common Core Implementation Inventory and the schools’ 2015 PARCC scores were analyzed. The scores were specifically disaggregated by generation. The second phase, Emotional Intelligence Appraisal®, represented one data source for this portion of the full study. This portion of the study included consent. The participants were invited in ranked order. Once the researcher had two to five participants in each generation to complete the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal®, this phase was complete. Finally, this research study referenced the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal data of the research study to inform – a 45-60-minute interview with each of the participants from the full study. “Interviewing is the original form of social science research” and this specific approach is one of the best ways to communicate with respect to obtaining qualitative data (Vogt & Vogt, 2014, p. 40). Interviews are designed for purposeful interactions that allow the researcher to investigate and learn what the participant knows about a given set of topics, to discover and document what the person has experienced, what the person feels or thinks about it, and what meaning or significance it might have on the participant. Interviews can specifically enable one to learn about the world through human experience. The researcher collects data that can allow for a meaningful analysis and produce defensible results (Arthur & Waring, 2012, p. 170). One of the goals of the semi-structured interview portion of this study was to allow for each participant to convey their self-perceptions of their emotional intelligence, particularly in its relationship to the decisions that they made in the role of the principal with respect to successfully implementing the
CCSS in their schools. This specific approach allowed for the researcher and the participant to engage in a more in-depth discussion related to the principal’s emotional intelligence and the strategies that were reflected in the decisions that were made in the process of implementing the CCSS. The researcher tried to identify commonalities related to personal and social competence with respect to the participants within the study. One of the many benefits of qualitative research is to give credence to or provide clarity about a given subject’s truth through valid and transferable means. Willis (2007) explained that one of the central premises of qualitative research is to embrace multiple sources of influence directly related to the study and analyze them through appropriate means with an accurate and realistic context (p. 192). Qualitative methods rely on text and image data. They have “unique steps in data analysis and draw on diverse designs” (Creswell, 2014, p. 183). Different than a standard questionnaire, test or survey, in the qualitative component of a study the researcher is considered to be the instrument that collects the data. The qualitative component of the study allows for the researcher to get a richer and more descriptive picture of the phenomenon being studied (Mertens, 2015, p. 277). The research intended to achieve this through immersion in the context and lenses of the research with respect to the participants and their specific circumstances. In addition, the research combined information gathered from the participants with the researcher’s experiences. The goal of this research was to understand the practices of current principals from different generations in public schools that have successfully implemented CCSS for which their emotional intelligence might have played a role. This supported the use of a qualitative research method, specifically the individual interviews
with the principals, which focused on how each principal’s emotional intelligence influenced their decisions, which consequently contributed to how their schools successfully implemented the CCSS.

Another component of the study that aligns with qualitative research was its view that the values, philosophies and beliefs of groups of people are directly related to interactions in the group, in this case – there are multiple groups including the various generational groups of the participants as well as the general group of principals (Willis, 2007, p. 194). Moreover, the character of public school principals along with their particular generational cohort can be determined by the attributes of the individuals that influence the groups that the participants belong to. This was especially important to potential revelations of this research and its implications to the successful implementation of CCSS in schools. While the quantitative data from the Common Core Implementation Inventory (see Appendix C), 2015 PARCC scores and the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal informed the semi-structured interviews (See Appendix D), there was an emphasis placed on the potential patterns that emerged from the interviews (qualitative component), as it provided authentic and detailed data related to the research study and provided specific information in response to the research questions. The results from the Common Core Implementation Inventory, 2015 PARCC scores, Emotional Intelligence Appraisal, and the semi-structured interviews were combined and analyzed when the researcher interpreted the results of this study.
CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

The purpose of the research was to explore whether there was a correlation between emotional intelligence (EQ), generational status and principals’ leadership abilities for the successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards in schools.

The study was conducted in two phases. In order to be eligible to take part in the first phase of the study, the research participants needed to be a current principal in a public, K-8 school in Lake or Cook Counties in Illinois and their respective school of service needed to have a composite score of 27% proficiency or higher on the 2015 administration of PARCC. The score of 27% was selected as a result of the fact that it is within six percentage points of the 2015 state average of 33% in Illinois. During this first phase of the study, the research participants completed the Common Core Implementation Inventory Survey. A total of 107 surveys were originally sent out; 11 participants returned completed surveys.

In order to gain eligibility to the full study participants were initially expected to receive scores of 80% or higher on the Common Core Implementation Inventory Survey to be deemed successful. However, after administering the survey and consulting with current superintendents and principals in public schools it became apparent the metric of
80% or higher on the Common Core Implementation Inventory Survey was slightly too high to serve as means for measuring for the successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards. As a result, this measure was adjusted to 70% or higher to more accurately account for the various indicators of successful implementation relevant to best practices (i.e., professional development, curriculum etc.). To determine eligibility for the full study, the participants were ranked according to the highest scores in sequential order by generation. In other words, the two to five principals that received the highest ratings on the Common Core Implementation Inventory and 2015 PARCC score from each generation were selected for this portion of the study and invited to participate. There were a total of 10 participants that were eligible and invited to the full study. The full study consisted of each participant taking part in the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal® (on-line) and a semi-structured in-person interview. The semi-structured in-person interview portion of the study was based on the Common Core Implementation Inventory Survey and the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal® results.

For the context of this study the research was based on the following questions:

1. How does principals’ emotional intelligence contribute to the context of the successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards in their schools?

2. How does principals’ generational status contribute to the context of successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards in their schools?
3. What other principal leadership behaviors and strategies if any contribute to the process of successfully implementing the Common Core State Standards in schools?

To better examine these questions, this research study utilized a triangulation of data to determine common themes that emerged from multiple sources of data as described by Figure 4. Additionally, Figure 5 displays the components that comprised the quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis of this research.

*Figure 4. Triangulation of Data*
Figure 5. Components of Qualitative and Quantitative Data Collection

Description of Participants and School Demographics

The tables below display demographic information about these participants. There were a total 11 potential full study participants based on the completed CCII survey and the 2015 PARCC administration. Only one participant (Participant G) from the 11 potential participants was excluded from the full study, as the score that he received on the Common Core Implementation Inventory Survey (39%) fell below the standard deemed necessary to qualify as successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards. This left a total of 10 participants that moved on to the full study.

Each participant in the full study was assigned a letter from A to K and a number of 1 to 11 to correspond to the school for which they presently served as principal. Participant G (School 7) was originally included in the numbers but was later excluded.
based on the score on the Common Core Implementation Inventory (CCII). Of the ten principals eligible for the full study, three were Millennials (Generation Y), five were Generation X and two were Baby Boomers. Four of the participants were male and six were female. The participants’ years of experience ranged from 1 to 9+ years. The schools ranged in size from 160 students to 953 students. The schools also ranged in grades serviced from Pre-Kindergarten to 8th grade. The schools ranged in their students’ Limited English Proficiency from 1% to 27% and in the students that received Special Education Services (SPED) from 12% to 100%. The schools also varied in the percent of students that received free or reduced lunch from 1% to 98%. Even though the sample for this study is small, there is sufficient variety of characteristics among principals and schools to support that this study’s participants relate to a great majority of schools in rural, urban, suburban and metropolitan areas. Similarly, with respect to the study participants’ generation, gender and years in the principal position were accounted for. This further supports how the study can be generalized to a maximum number of schools and principals.
Table 1

Demographic Data of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>School #</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th># of Students</th>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Low Income</th>
<th>Racial Diversity</th>
<th>LEP</th>
<th>SPED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lake County, IL.</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>80% White 11% Asian 8% Hispanic</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lake County, IL.</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>48% White 40% Asian 9% Hispanic 2% Mixed</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lake County, IL.</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>83% White 7% Hispanic 6% Asian 4% Mixed</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cook County, IL.</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>PK-4</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>71% Black 15% Hispanic 6% White 1% Asian</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cook County, IL.</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>72% Black 24% Hispanic 3% Mixed 1% White</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cook County, IL.</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>93% Black 6% Hispanic 1% Asian</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cook County, IL.</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>62% Hispanic 32% Black 4% White 2% Mixed</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cook County, IL.</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>92% Black 6% Hispanic 1% Mixed</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cook County, IL.</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>90% White 4% Mixed 3% Asian 2% Hispanic</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lake County, IL.</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>59% Hispanic 30% White 9% Asian 2% Black</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Generation, Gender and Years in Position Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>School #</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years in Position</th>
<th>2015 PARCC Score (% of students meet or exceed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Millennial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boom</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boom</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9+</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The research data will be presented and analyzed around the findings for each of the three research questions. Chapter 5 will discuss implications.

**Research Question #1**

How does principals’ emotional intelligence contribute to the context of the successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards?

To better examine the first research question relative to how Emotional Intelligence (EQ) can contribute to the context of the successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards in schools, the researcher analyzed the scores from the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal of the participants from the study as well as their responses from the Common Core Implementation Inventory Survey and the participants’ responses to questions 5, 6, 9, and 10 from the in-person interview.
Common Core Implementation Scoring and Data

In regards to the participants’ responses to the Common Core Implementation Inventory Survey, the score for the area of the Three Key Literacy Shifts in English Language Arts was calculated on a three-point scale for each Shift. In other words, for each of the Three Key Literacy Shifts a participant was issued 6.67 for full implementation, 3.33 for partial implementation and 0 for not in place. Each participant could earn a total of 20 points for the Three Key Literacy Shifts. After each shift was scored, all three numbers were added together for a total score that was rounded to the nearest whole number.

The score for the area of the Eight Standards of Math Practice was calculated on a three-point scale for each Practice. In other words, for each of the Eight Standards of Math Practice a participant was issued 2.5 for full implementation, 1.25 for partial implementation and 0 for not in place. Each participant could earn a total of 20 points for Eight Standards of Math Practice. After each practice standard was scored, all eight numbers were added together for a total score that was rounded to the nearest whole number.

Similarly, the score for the curriculum maps and scope and sequences for English Language Arts and Math was calculated on a three-point scale. For each of the four components related to curriculum maps and scope and sequences for English Language Arts and Math a participant was issued 2.5 for full implementation, 1.25 for partial implementation and 0 for not in place. Each participant could earn a total of 10 points for the curriculum maps and scope and sequences. After each component was scored, all four
numbers were added together for a total score that was rounded to the nearest whole number.

Finally, the score for ongoing differentiated professional development was calculated on a three-point scale. For each of the four components related to professional development a participant was issued 5 for full implementation, 2.5 for partial implementation and 0 for not in place. Each participant could earn a total of 20 points for professional development. After each component was scored, all four numbers were added together for a total score that was rounded to the nearest whole number.

A PARCC score of 27% to 39% proficiency for a given school was considered moderately successful and awarded 10 points on the CCII, as the score was within close range (less than 6%) or statistically the same as the average school’s proficiency on the first benchmark of PARCC in the state of Illinois, which was 33% proficiency in the spring of 2015. A PARCC score of 40% to 45% proficiency for a given school was considered successful and awarded 20 points on the CCII, as the score was more than 6% higher (between 6% and 12% above) than the average school’s score in the state of Illinois. A PARCC score of 46% proficiency or higher for a given school was considered highly successful and awarded the full 30 points on the CCII, as the score was more than 12% higher than the average school’s score of 33% proficiency in the state of Illinois.

Table 3 represents how the participants fared regarding the five most important areas relative to school success in implementing the CCSS. The areas include: (1) The Three Key Literacy Shifts (English Language Arts), (2) The Eight Standards of Math Practice, (3) Common curriculum maps and scope and sequences for each grade level, (4)
The quality and variation of professional development offered to teachers, and (5) The official PARCC scores of the schools. These five areas were combined to form the composite score for each school/participant. It is important to note that all schools included in the study had at least one area where they had full (100%) implementation regardless of the composite score. Thus, examining the five areas allowed the researcher to dig deeper and see the documented individual strengths of each school whereas the composite score represents a general measure that allowed for comparison between the schools included in the study.

Table 3

*Common Core Implementation Inventory Survey Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCSS Implementation Level</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>ELA Shifts % (20)</th>
<th>Math Standards % (20)</th>
<th>Curriculum % (10)</th>
<th>PD % (20)</th>
<th>PARCC Scores % (30)</th>
<th>Composite Score %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100% (20)</td>
<td>80% (16)</td>
<td>60% (6)</td>
<td>90% (18)</td>
<td>100% (30)</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>87% (17)</td>
<td>100% (20)</td>
<td>50% (5)</td>
<td>75% (15)</td>
<td>100% (30)</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100% (20)</td>
<td>100% (20)</td>
<td>100% (10)</td>
<td>65% (13)</td>
<td>67% (20)</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100% (20)</td>
<td>90% (18)</td>
<td>100% (10)</td>
<td>65% (13)</td>
<td>67% (20)</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100% (20)</td>
<td>50% (10)</td>
<td>80% (8)</td>
<td>50% (10)</td>
<td>100% (30)</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100% (20)</td>
<td>100% (20)</td>
<td>100% (10)</td>
<td>75% (15)</td>
<td>33% (10)</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100% (20)</td>
<td>50% (10)</td>
<td>100% (10)</td>
<td>65% (13)</td>
<td>67% (20)</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100% (20)</td>
<td>50% (10)</td>
<td>100% (10)</td>
<td>100% (20)</td>
<td>33% (10)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100% (20)</td>
<td>100% (20)</td>
<td>100% (10)</td>
<td>50% (10)</td>
<td>33% (10)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50% (10)</td>
<td>75% (15)</td>
<td>100% (10)</td>
<td>75% (15)</td>
<td>67% (20)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data from the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal

Another component of this study was the data from the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal®. All ten participants from the full study took this self-assessment, which was designed to identify an individual’s strengths and weaknesses in four domains grouped in two competencies including: self-awareness domain, self-management domain (personal competence), social awareness domain, and relationship management domain (social competence). The Emotional Intelligence Appraisal® was designed based on extensive research that yielded the premise that emotional intelligence is more than one skill. As a result, the structure of the actual Emotional Intelligence Appraisal avoids specific behavioral questions that document only a single skill. Instead, the questions were designed to measure the sufficient behavioral outcome needed to accurately assess specific skills.

The questions on the survey describe critical attributes of each skill that indicate the clear presence of the skill in relation to the behaviors of the person taking the assessment. Consequently, the frequency that a person can demonstrate behaviors directly related to a given skill becomes the most accurate measure of that skill. The scores of the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal ® are what are often referred to as norm converted (on a 1 to 100-point scale), with a mean of 75 and standard deviation of 10. A score of 79 or below indicates an area of relative growth (or improvement needed for mastery), 80 and above indicate an area of strength (general mastery established), and a score of 90 and above indicate exceptional strength in that particular area (distinguished or superior
mastery). Table 4 provides a guide in interpreting the scores of the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal®.

Table 4

A Guide to Interpreting Emotional Intelligence Appraisal Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-100</td>
<td><strong>A STRENGTH TO CAPITALIZE ON</strong>&lt;br&gt;These scores are much higher than average and indicate a noteworthy strength. These strengths probably come naturally to you or exist because you have worked hard to develop them. Seize every opportunity to use these emotionally intelligent behaviors to maximize your success. You are highly competent in this skill, so work to capitalize on it and achieve your potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td><strong>A STRENGTH TO BUILD ON</strong>&lt;br&gt;This score is above average. However, there are a few situations where you don't demonstrate emotionally intelligent behavior. There are many things you've done well to receive this score and a few that could be better with some practice. Study the behaviors for which you received this score and consider how you can polish your skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td><strong>WITH A LITTLE IMPROVEMENT, THIS COULD BE A STRENGTH</strong>&lt;br&gt;You are aware of some of the behaviors for which you received this score, and you are doing well with them. Other emotionally intelligent behaviors in this group are holding you back. Lots of people start here and see a big improvement in their emotional intelligence once it's brought to their attention. Use this opportunity to discover the difference and improve in the areas where you don't do as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td><strong>SOMETHING YOU SHOULD WORK ON</strong>&lt;br&gt;This is an area where you sometimes demonstrate emotionally intelligent behavior but not usually. You may be starting to let people down. Perhaps this is a skill area that doesn't always come naturally for you or that you don't make use of. With a little improvement in this skill, your credibility will go way up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 and Below</td>
<td><strong>A CONCERN YOU MUST ADDRESS</strong>&lt;br&gt;This skill area is either a problem for you, you don't value it, or you didn't know it was important. The bad news is your skills in this area are limiting your effectiveness. The good news is this discovery and choosing to do something about it will go a long way in improving your emotionally intelligent behavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next two charts represent a comprehensive analysis of the Emotional Intelligence (EQ) data from the participants in the full portion of the study. The first chart (see Figure 6) generally outlines the EQ results of the participants from the full study, including the raw scores for the four competencies (self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management) as well as each participant’s composite score. The second chart (see Table 5) specifically provides a comprehensive comparison of all of the EQ data for the participants in the full study, including the raw scores for the four domains (self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management), the two competence scores (personal and social competence) as well as the composite scores of the participants in the study. Collectively, both charts provide a context to be able to interpret all aspects of each participant’s score as well as a baseline understanding of how each score compares with respect to generation, cohort (all participants in the study) and layman’s terms (i.e., below average, average and above average).

**Correlation between EQ and Successful Implementation of CCSS**

During the analysis portion of the study, the scores of the participants from the full study were first ranked in order (highest to lowest) according to composite scores on the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal. Then the researcher compared the documented Emotional Intelligent (EQ) strengths of each participant in an effort to link their strengths with specific practices that they utilized during the process of implementing the Common State Standards. The four parts of the EQ scores were based on what participants were able to see or recognize and what they were able to do with respect to themselves and
others. The areas included: self-awareness and self-management that make up personal competence as well as social awareness and relationship management that comprise social competence. In addition to the ranking, all participants’ composite scores were interpreted on a three-point standard scale (i.e., below average, average, above average etc.). Next, the researcher analyzed the scores of the participants from the Common Core Implementation Inventory Survey and the participants’ responses to questions 5, 6, 9, and 10 from the in-person interview, in an effort to further understand the EQ strengths that were entwined into the principals’ leadership styles/practices to promote the implementation of CCSS.

Analysis of the EQ data summarized in Figure 6 and Table 5 indicated that overall, Millennials had the highest EQ score, as this generation had an average Emotional Appraisal score of 78 (out of 100). Generation X was second with respect to EQ, as this generation had an average Emotional Intelligence Appraisal score of 75 (out of 100). Baby Boomers had the lowest EQ score, as this generation had an average Emotional Intelligence Appraisal score of 73 (out of 100). It is important to note that the difference in the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal scores was not statistically significant, as all three generations had scores that fell within the average range and were within 5 points of each other.
Figure 6. Emotional Intelligence Appraisal Results for Participants
Table 5

*Participant EQ Comprehensive Data Comparison*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Millennial</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Millennial</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Baby Boom</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Millennial</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Baby Boom</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of participants in this study scored within the average range of the sample population that Talent Smart used to determine their benchmark, which ranges from 72-79). However, Principals B, D, E and I had scores that fell in the “Above Average” range.

Looking at those in the “above average” range, Participant I had the highest Emotional Intelligence Appraisal with a composite EQ score of 86, and self-awareness was a strength to capitalize on, as she had a score of 91 in this area. Participant D had an Emotional Intelligence Appraisal composite EQ score of 83, and relationship
management was a clear strength to capitalize on an area of strength, as she had a score of 93 in this area. Participant B had an Emotional Intelligence Appraisal composite EQ score of 81, and self-management was an area of strength, as he had a score of 87 in this area. Participant E had an Emotional Intelligence Appraisal composite EQ score of 80, and relationship management was an area of strength, as she had a score of 85 in this area. As highlighted above, principals with “above average” EQ scores tended to have high scores in the self-awareness, self-management and/or relationship management domain.

Looking at the Common Core Implementation Survey data, composite scores were grouped into three levels of successful implementation: (1) Highest (80% implementation or above), (2) Medium (73% -78% implementation), and (3) Standard (70% implementation). Interestingly, there was no connection between above average EQ scores and high implementation scores. Two of the participants with above average EQ scores (B and I) scored above 80% (High) on the CCII; the other two high scoring EQ participants (D and E) scored only 70% (Standard) on the CCII. Participant A, who had the highest implementation score, ranked below average on the EQ Appraisal. Participant C, with an implementation score of 78% (Medium) also ranked below average on the EQ.

As noted earlier, all of the participants in the study had at least one area on the CCII fully implemented and thus received 100% of the points allowed for that area. This highlights the fact that all of the participants in the study had specific strengths directly related to the implementation of the CCSS in their respective schools.
All principals (Participants A, B, I and J) that had composite scores above 80% on the Common Core Implementation Inventory also received scores of 80% or above in the areas of the Three Key Literacy Shifts related to English Language Arts and the Eight Standards of Math Practice. While these participants weren’t the only participants in the study that scored high in these two areas, there appeared to be a small relationship with principals having curriculum in place for both the Three Key Literacy Shifts and the Eight Standards of Math Practice in order to achieve the highest level of CCSS implementation.

**Data from In-Person Interviews**

The third piece of the data used in the study was from the in-person interviews. The researcher referred to the process described by Zhang and Wildemuth (2009) to prepare and code the data gathered from the interview. This process is outlined below in Table 6.

Each participant’s interview was recorded and later transcribed. Then each participant’s transcription was sent to each participant via email for what is known as member checking. This was an opportunity for the principals to review their transcribed responses to the interview questions and make changes, clarify etc. Next, the researcher determined the unit of analysis. It was determined that key words, phrases or ideas would be analyzed in order to allow for the maximum number of participant responses to be compared. Then the researcher developed categories, and a coding scheme, and tested the scheme to ensure that it authentically represented each participant’s responses. The text from the transcriptions was coded and assessed for consistency. Eventually, the
researcher reviewed the themes and codes that emerged and made sense of them in order to draw conclusions. Finally, the qualitative portion of the research ended with reporting the findings with respect to the codes and themes.

Table 6

*Process for Analysis of Qualitative Data Used by Researcher to Generate Coding*

*Categories*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prepare the data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Define the unit of analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Develop Categories and Coding Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Test Coding Scheme on Sample Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Code All the Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Assess Coding Consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Draw Conclusions from the Coded Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Report Methods and Findings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from *Qualitative analysis of content* (Zhang & Wildemuth, 2009).
The in-person interview (qualitative portion of the study) consisted of the following questions:

**In-Person Interview Questions for Research**

1. Tell me how your school went about implementing the Common Core State Standards.

2. What evidence might show that you have created a positive climate or culture that has aided in your school’s implementation of the Common Core State Standards?

3. Are there any specific successes that your school experienced while implementing the Common Core State Standards that are important to highlight?

4. Are there any specific barriers that your school experienced while implementing the Common Core State Standards that are important to highlight?

5. Describe how you would handle a conversation with a teacher that has a deficit that is impacting his/her ability to instruct students at the classroom level with respect to the Common Core State Standards.

6. Specifically with respect to the Common Core State Standards, describe a time when you were able to get members of the faculty to follow you around an unpopular issue.

7. What are your impressions of your Emotional Intelligence Appraisal results?

8. What do you think is your strongest leadership trait?
9. Self-awareness, self-management, social awareness and relationship management are the domains that comprise emotional intelligence. Which one, in your opinion, has had the most effect in your success as a leader?

10. Which one domain do you think contributed most to your school’s ability to implement the Common Core State Standards?

11. If you had to take the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal when you first started in your role as a principal, do you think your score would have been the same? Why or why not?

12. What type of training or professional development has influenced your emotional intelligence?

13. Describe your leadership style.

14. In your opinion, how might emotional intelligence contribute to the preparation of K-12 principals?

Table 7 represents a chart listing all of the codes and themes that emerged from the participants’ responses to the interview questions from the research through using the process as described above. It is important to note that each code represented the authentic responses of each participant in relation the specific educational concepts that were referenced during the interviews. The process consisted of two steps: (1) Explicitly listing verbatim the concept that the participant conveyed or (2) Summarizing sentences or paragraphs to convey the concept. For example, in response to interview question #13 (Describe your leadership style) Participant C stated, “[My] instructional leadership. And so, the instructional piece come easily to me and working at relationships is something
that I work on every day.” In this case, the participant explicitly identified instructional leadership as his leadership style. On the other hand, for the same question Participant H stated, “I’ll support you. I’ll give you the information. I’ll check on you. I’m going to provide opportunities. I’ll even jump in and I’ll do it with you.” In this case, while the participant does not explicitly say instructional leadership the response directly aligns with the definition of the “instructional leadership” code/theme.
Table 7

*Codes and Themes from Qualitative Portion of Research*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code/Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affiliative Leadership (AL)</td>
<td>the broad empathic process of listening through the use of collaboration, empathy and listening as a leadership style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Growth (AG)</td>
<td>improvement on a standardized assessment, as measured by student achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Research Study (BRS)</td>
<td>a formal process of exchanging information with colleagues from a book or a research study centered on best practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Approach (CA)</td>
<td>the supportive process of combining inquiry with instruction, and using mentors (or others not including the principal) to provide support to teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration (Collab)</td>
<td>works collaboratively with teachers and other staff members to improve student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Approach (CA)</td>
<td>a heavily content based focused strategy used for the purpose of providing instructional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction (CI)</td>
<td>best practices strategies relative to curriculum or classroom instructional supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence Workshop (EQW)</td>
<td>an in person workshop devoted to studying the components and use of the emotional intelligence framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy (EM)</td>
<td>the conscious effort to understand the perspective of teachers or other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathetic Listening (EML)</td>
<td>the empathic process of listening as a leadership trait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Workshop (HW)</td>
<td>an in person workshop devoted to studying leadership or instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry Approach (IA)</td>
<td>a positive direct or indirect use of specific skills and questioning strategies to support teacher development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Leadership (IL)</td>
<td>leadership rooted in best practices like active modeling and other strategies relevant to classroom and school wide instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Plans (LP)</td>
<td>instructional lessons administered at the classroom level that trace back to the broad curriculum and instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening (L)</td>
<td>the keen ability to authentically allow someone to share a his/her thoughts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindsets (MS)</td>
<td>a predetermined perspective about a given issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacesetting (P)</td>
<td>A leadership approach based on the principal modeling and setting the pace for staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development (PD)</td>
<td>a conference or workshop designed to increase professional knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving (PS)</td>
<td>the ability to find a solution in an adverse situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources (R)</td>
<td>instructional supports or materials that aid in facilitating learning specifically with respect to the Common Core State Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Management (RM)</td>
<td>one’s ability to be aware of as well as manage his/her relationship with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope and Sequence (SS)</td>
<td>an instructional support that specifically outlines what is to taught as well as the order of the teaching for an educational unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Leadership (SL)</td>
<td>the practice of leading through providing opportunities for a number of stakeholders to be actively engaged in the school decision making process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Emotional Learning Workshop (SELW)</td>
<td>a conference or workshop designed to increase professional knowledge in the area of social emotional learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self- Development for Connection (SDC)</td>
<td>Developing or enhancing one’s social skills for the sake of connecting with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Constraints (TC)</td>
<td>the identification of time as barrier in implementing the Common Core State Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togetherness (T)</td>
<td>the identification of unity and/or team as a value or philosophy in leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpacking (U)</td>
<td>Unpacking refers to the process of identifying what students will need to know and be able to do in order to master a given Common Core State Standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpacking and Alignment (UA)</td>
<td>Unpacking refers to the process of identifying what students will need to know and be able to do in order to master a given Common Core State Standard. Alignment refers to the idea of aligning the instructional supports and resources to the Common Core State Standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of In-Person Interview Data Related to CCSS and EQ**

Interview questions 5, 6, 9, and 10 were each related to areas of how the participants’ EQ strengths were carried out or applied in practical situations directly and indirectly relative to the implementation of the CCSS in their respective schools.
5. Describe how you would handle a conversation with a teacher that has a
deficit that is impacting his/her ability to instruct students at the classroom
level with respect to the Common Core State Standards.

6. Specifically with respect to the Common Core State Standards, describe a
time when you were able to get members of the faculty to follow you around
an unpopular issue.

9. Self-awareness, self-management, social awareness and relationship
management are the domains that comprise emotional intelligence. Which
one, in your opinion, has had the most effect in your success as a leader?

10. Which one domain do you think contributed most to your school’s ability to
implement the Common Core State Standards?

Question 5 was selected as a result of the fact that whether known or unknown a
person’s natural preferences with how to approach improving another person’s deficit is
directly connected to EQ skills. Similarly, question 6 was selected as a result of the fact
that inherent EQ skills that a person possesses will certainly manifest themselves in the
process of getting people to follow that person around an unpopular issue. Questions 9
and 10 were selected because they both directly refer to EQ domains. As a result, the
responses to these questions were coded and analyzed with respect research question #1,
How does principals’ Emotional Intelligence (EQ) contribute to the context of the
successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards in their schools? Table
8 presents a summary of significant codes/themes related to research question #1.
Table 8

Significant Codes/Themes for Research Question #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question #1: How does principals’ Emotional Intelligence (EQ) contribute to the context of the successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards in their schools?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview Question</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9 EQ area that effected success as a leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10 EQ area that most contributed to school’s ability to implement the CCSS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Analysis of Responses for Question #5 from the Research

As referenced above, question #5 was selected as a result of the fact that whether known or unknown a person’s natural preferences with how to approach improving another person’s deficit is directly connected to EQ skills. After coding the participants’ responses to question #5, it became apparent that the most common themes that principals stated included the Inquiry Approach (IA) and the Coaching Approach (CA). The Inquiry Approach can be defined as the direct or indirect use of specific skills and strategies to support teacher development. The Coaching Approach can be defined as the supportive process of combining inquiry with active modeling and instruction, and using mentors (or others) to provide support. It is important to note that the Inquiry Approach and Coaching Approach are both considered leadership strategies and skills that principals used to implement CCSS in their schools. A principal’s ability to access either
of these approaches could be related to their particular EQ strengths. The use of both the Inquiry Approach and the Coaching Approach seem to be connected to EQ in the following ways: (1) Whether the principal is aware of his/her emotions and feelings about the teacher’s deficit (self-awareness), (2) Whether the principal is able to manage his/her own emotions relative to the teacher’s underperformance (self-management), and (3) Whether the principal is able to authentically create a relationship with the teacher to work with them in an effort to improve the deficit (relationship management).

Six out of the 10 principals (Participants A, F, H, I, J and K) from the study described how they would handle a conversation with a teacher that has a deficit that is impacting his/her ability to instruct students at the classroom level with respect to the Common Core State Standards with the Inquiry Approach (IA) theme. Three of these six scored high in relationship management (F, I, and K), and two scored high in self-awareness (H and I) and social awareness (F and I). It is important to note Principal I’s particular strengths in the self-management (87), self-awareness (91) and relationship management (81) areas which seemed to contribute to her level of success as she scored in the top three composite scores with respect to her level of successful implementation on the Common Core Implementation Inventory. To get more insight into Principal I’s perspective the individual response for question #5 from Principal I is included below:

Participant I said, “You always want to give them the positives, but you have to be honest about where they need to improve. But, not only be honest with where they need to improve, you have to give them specifics, I think suggestions or
strategies that they could try to implement to help them to become more successful.”

Similarly, while four out of the 10 principals (Participants B, C, D and F) from the study described how they would handle a conversation with a teacher that has a deficit that is impacting his/her ability to instruct students at the classroom level with respect to the Common Core State Standards with the Coaching Approach (CA) theme it is important to note that Principal B’s strengths in the self-management (87), self-awareness (85) and relationship management (85) also seemed to contribute to his level of success as he scored in the top three composite scores on the Common Core Implementation Inventory. To get more insight into Principal B’s perspective the individual response for question #5 from Principal B is included below:

Participant B stated, “I think those are direct conversations to have…when we do a pre-conference part of that is talking how the alignment…have their lesson plans and addressing those with them directly. There needs to be a purpose behind your lesson, there needs to be a line with Common Core, what we’re planning on. But then also helping coach them saying, ‘Alright, we need to get this aligned. What things could you add to, what things could you do a little bit differently? Let’s work together to help them.’ If it continues to be a deficit the that is reflected in their overall evaluation where we use the Danielson Model.”

While both leadership strategies and approaches (Inquiry Approach and Coaching Approach) can be a powerful way to accelerate teachers’ professional growth and thus student achievement, these strategies and approaches may be most effective when
combined with EQ skills that entail the principal taking time to reflect on his/her own feelings towards the deficits (self-awareness), taking steps to manage those feelings (self-management) and finally taking meaningful actions to foster a relationship with the teacher (relationship management). In summary, while it wasn’t the case for all participants in the study it is clear that strengths in three of the EQ domains (self-awareness, self-management and relationship management) seemed to aid in the level of success that some principals (Participants B, I and to some extent J) in the research study experienced while implementing the CCSS in their schools specifically with regard to supporting teachers that had deficits.

**Qualitative Analysis of Responses for Question #6 from the Research**

After coding the participants’ responses to question #6 (Specifically with respect to the Common Core State Standards, describe a time when you were able to get members of the faculty to follow you around an unpopular issue), it became apparent that the most common themes that principals stated included coaching approach (CA), togetherness (T), and content approach (Con A). The Togetherness approach particularly appears to have a positive relationship with high scores for implementing the 3 Key Literacy Shifts and high EQ composite scores overall.

Six out of the 10 principals (Participants B, D, H, I, J and K) from the study indicated that they were able to get members of the faculty to follow them around an unpopular issue with the Togetherness (T) theme (the identification of unity and/or team as a value or philosophy in leadership) and five of those same principals (Participants B, D, I, J and K) also had the highest level of implementation on the Common Core
Implementation Inventory in the area of the Three Key Literacy Shifts (87% or higher), suggesting that “Togetherness” may be a useful strategy for implementing ELA curriculum related to the CCSS. Participants B, D, and I also had above average EQ scores; moreover, Participants B, D, I, J, and K scored particularly high in relationship management, underscoring again the relationship between relationship management and successful implementation.

To get more insight into the participants’ perspectives the individual responses for question #6 from Principal’s B, D, I, J and K are included below:

Participant B stated, “I think more so looking back on previous experiences I think that would be the idea of ‘All right, we’re doing this’ was the unpopular choice…but we are going to do this together. By putting myself in there with them and saying, ‘We’re in this together…so your struggles are my struggles but we have to do this.’ I think that lightened the load a little bit.”

Participant D stated, “[Together] we had to redo all of our assessments. Not just add, not just take the book one, but we had to redo all of them to align them with Common Core, and then we had to do all of the extended responses for reading and math, and it was a tremendous amount of work.”

Participant I stated, “I have been fortunate enough to build relationships with my staff that even when I know they don’t want to do it, we get it done and have full participation…and do an awesome job. Even if some of them really don’t want to do it and walk away with winning all of the prizes because they pushed their kids that hard…they really do come together and ensure that we are successful.”
Participant J stated, “We have to develop it. We have to give them time to experience it. We have to work with the kids to really have multiple situations that they can experience the standards.”

Participant K stated, “I also believe that it’s that shared responsibility portion and it doesn’t rest on the shoulders of just language arts teachers, but it is shared among science and social studies…and I think another facet that really is interesting that comes in is where does digital resources come in now with the traditional sense of reading and annotating and note taking…so we’re seeing that dynamic change, and it’s hard to grasp it while balancing everything else.”

This data suggests that Togetherness was an important strategy principals used for getting teachers to follow them in unpopular implementation tasks, and that relationship management was a contributing EQ strength.

**Qualitative Analysis of Responses for Questions #9 and #10 from the Research**

Question #9 from the in-person interview was, which one domain (from the Emotional Intelligence framework) do you think contributed most to your success as a leader? Question #10 from the in-person interview was, which one domain (from the Emotional Intelligence framework) do you think contributed most to your school’s ability to implement the Common Core State Standards? The goal was to connect to the heart of principals and the intentional strategies that were employed (regarding Emotional Intelligence) as they implemented the Common Core State Standards in their respective schools. With respect to questions #9 and #10, EQ was somewhat linked to the successful implementation of curriculum maps and scope and sequences as eight out of the 10
principals (Participants B, C, D, E, F, H, J and K) from the research study indicated that relationship management was the EQ domain that contributed most to their success, and five of those same principals (Participants D, E, F, J and K) also had the highest level of implementation on the Common Core Implementation Inventory in the area of the curriculum maps and scope and sequences (80% or higher) and had EQ appraisal results in the relationship management domain that indicated that this same domain was an area to capitalize on (80 or higher).

To get more insight into the participants’ perspectives the individual responses for question #9 from Principal’s D, E, F, J and K are included below:

Participant D stated, “I would say relationship management…the relationships that I’ve had has really helped me personally, because I was a teacher in the district before I was an administrator, so I had already formed positive relationships, and was always a team player and always trying to help out…building those positive relationships is key to making all other positive things happen, and change occur. If you have positive relationship with people I think you can get them to pretty much be onboard, for the most part, with anything that comes their way.”

Participant E stated, “Relationship management. I will say relationship management.”

Participant F stated, “Relationship management…Building rapport with staff, building trust, comfortable relations in an environment if you don’t feel comfortable coming to me and working in an environment that I’m helping to
build, that’s going to present problems not only for them coming to work, but for student achievement, and there’s a lot of impacts.”

Participant J stated, “I have to be aware of my emotions. I have to be able to manage them. So I’m feeling like the first two (self-awareness and self-management) but I have to be able to manage that. So the first two along with the fourth one (relationship management).”

Participant K stated, “I think when I take a look at relationships, I think as I’ve gotten older and as everything else, that’s become more and more important and more of a priority.”

As highlighted above, the relationship management domain was somewhat related to the successful implementation of the CCSS, specifically in the area of curriculum maps and scope and sequences in the following ways: (1) Principals who scored 80% or higher on the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal in the relationship management domain also identified this same domain (relationship management) in the in person interview as having contributed most to their success as a leader and the domain that contributed most to their school’s ability to implement the CCSS, and (2) Scored the highest level of implementation on the Common Core Implementation Inventory (80% or above) in the area of curriculum maps and scope and sequences.

**Findings for Research Question #1**

With one notable exception (Participant A), EQ strengths in the self-awareness, self-management and relationship management domains were linked to the highest composite scores on the Common Core Implementation Inventory.
While it wasn’t the case for all participants in the study it is clear that strengths in three of the EQ domains (self-awareness, self-management and relationship management) seem to aid in the level of success that some principals (most notably Participants B and I) in the research study experienced while implementing the CCSS in their schools specifically with regard to supporting teachers that had deficits.

EQ composite scores were somewhat linked to Togetherness code/theme and the level of success in the area of the Three Key Literacy Shifts.

The most common strategy that the participants of the research study used to get members of their faculty to follow them around an unpopular issue was Togetherness (the identification of unity and/or team as a value or philosophy in leadership). Five out six of the participants that identified Togetherness had at least “Average” to “Above Average” composite scores on the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal and all scored high in relationship management. These same five participants achieved the highest level of implementation of the Common Core Implementation Inventory in the area of the 3 Key Literacy Shifts (87% or higher).

The EQ relationship management domain was somewhat related to the successful implementation of CCSS in the area of curriculum maps and scope and sequences.

While it wasn’t the case for all, five out of seven principals (Participants D, E, F, J and K) in the study identified the relationship management domain as contributing to their success as a leader and their school’s success. These same principals scored high on the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal in the relationship management domain and scored
the highest level of implementation on the Common Core Implementation Inventory in
the area of curriculum maps and scope and sequences.

In summary, the data from this study seemed to underscore a clear connection
between relationship management and successful implementation of the Common Core
State Standards. Participants strong in relationship management tend to use Togetherness
as a strategy for implementation. Further, eight of the 10 participants in the study named
relationship management as a significant factor in their leadership and the school’s
success in implementing the Common Core State Standards.

**Research Question #2**

How does principals’ generational status contribute to the context of successful
implementation of the Common Core State Standards in their schools?

**Generational Analysis of CCSS Implementation**

In order to specifically address the research question highlighted above, the
researcher analyzed the data regarding the principals’ generation, compared to and
contrasted with the scores from the Common Core Implementation Inventory (survey) as
well as the participants’ responses to questions 8 and 13 from the in-person interview
(that directly correlated to generation).

The following data represents the principals’ composite score with respect to the
successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards in their respective
schools as indicated below in Figure 7:
Figure 7. Generational Common Core State Standards Implementation Comparison

Common Core State Standards Implementation Participant Analysis

It is important to note that the metric (cut score) on the Common Core Implementation Inventory that was used to determine whether a school was considered successful was 70% or higher. Generation X principals on average scored about 11% higher, Baby Boomers scored about 7% higher and Millennials scored 2% higher. Overall, Generation X had the highest composite scores with respect to implementing the Common Core State Standards, as this generation had an average score of 81% (out of 100%). Baby Boomers had the second highest composite scores with respect to implementing the Common Core State Standards, as this generation had an average score of 77% (out of 100%). Millennials had the lowest composite scores with respect to
implementing the Common Core State Standards, as this generation had an average score of 72% (out of 100%).

Generation seemed to be somewhat connected to the level of success that the participants of the study achieved in terms of composite scores, as four out of the five highest ranking schools with respect to implementing the Common Core State Standards (according to composite scores of the Common Core Implementation Inventory) were led by principals (Participants A, B, I and C) from Generation X. The fact that the composite score represents the most comprehensive measure of the implementation with respect to the CCSS suggests that Generation X experienced the greatest overall success.

Generation X on average scored 4% higher than Baby Boomers and 9% higher than Millennials.

When the researcher examined sub-scores on the Common Core Implementation Inventory, (CCII) some generational relationships/connections also appeared. Table 9 groups participants’ CCII sub-scores by generation.

Table 9

*Generation Common Core Implementation Inventory Comparison*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>ELA Sub-score</th>
<th>Math Sub-score</th>
<th>Curriculum Sub-score</th>
<th>PD Sub-score</th>
<th>PARCC Sub-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Millennial</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With respect to implementing the Common Core State Standards in the area of English Language Arts, Baby Boomers scored the highest with 100% of the indicators in place, Generation X was second with 97% of the indicators in place, and Millennials were last with 83% of the indicators in place.

With respect to implementing the Common Core State Standards in the area of Math, Generation X scored the highest with 86% of the indicators in place, Millennials were second with 75% of the indicators in place, and Baby Boomers were last with 70% of the indicators in place.

With respect to implementing the Common Core State Standards in the area of curriculum maps and scope and sequences, Millennials and Baby Boomers scored the highest with 100% of the indicators in place, and Generation X had 78% of the indicators in place.

With respect to implementing the Common Core State Standards in the area of professional development, Millennials scored the highest with 83% of the indicators in place, Generation X was second with 66% of the indicators in place, and Baby Boomers were last with 65% of the indicators in place.

With respect to implementing the Common Core State Standards as measured by the 2015 PARCC scores, Generation X scored the highest with 80% of the total points for this area, Baby Boomers were second with 67% of the total points, and Millennials were last with 44% of the total points.

This suggests that each generation had inherent strengths that directly contributed to the specific type of success that they experienced with respect to implementing the
CCSS, which were related to leadership activities and traits. Further, when we combine generational data with CCII scores and leadership activities and traits identified in the in-person interviews, we find there are some specific strategies and approaches according to generation that principals can use in the school setting to accelerate the successful implementation of the CCSS.

**Analysis of In-Person Interview Data Related to CCSS and Generational Status**

The responses to questions 8 and 13 from the in-person interview were analyzed for this portion of the research, as a result of their connection to research question #2 (How does principals’ generation contribute to the context of the successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards in their schools).

8. What do you think is your strongest leadership trait?

13. Describe your leadership style.

Since interview questions 8 and 13 directly correlate to leadership styles and traits, and they were determined to be related to areas of how the participants’ generational strengths were carried out or applied in practical situations with respect to the implementation of the CCSS in their respective schools. The responses to these questions were coded and analyzed with respect to research question #2, How does principals’ generation contribute to the context of the successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards in their schools? Table 10 summarizes the significant themes related to research question #2.
Table 10

Significant Themes for Research Question #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Question</th>
<th>Significant Themes and Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#8 Strongest Leadership Trait</td>
<td>Shared Leadership A, B, H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13 Leadership Style</td>
<td>Shared Leadership B, C, D, F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generational Analysis of Interview Responses Related to Common Core

After coding the responses to Question #8 (What is your strongest leadership trait) in the in-person interviews, it became apparent that the most common general themes that principals stated included Shared Leadership (SL) and Empathetic Listening (EM L).

Generational status appeared to be related to the Empathetic Listening (the process of utilizing empathy and collaboration in listening) code/theme and level of success in implementing the CCSS in the area curriculum maps and scope and sequences.

All of the Millennial (Principals D, F and H) and both Baby Boomer participants (Principals J and K) in the study indicated that the strongest leadership trait that they used to successfully implement CCSS was Empathetic Listening. This also related to the level of success that Millennials and Baby Boomers experienced with respect to implementing the Common Core State Standards in the area of curriculum maps and scope and sequences. In fact, Millennials and Baby Boomers scored the highest with 100% of the indicators in place, suggesting that Empathetic Listening may be a particularly useful leadership strategy for putting in place the curriculum needed for successful
implementation of CCSS at schools. The fact that EM L was the strongest leadership trait named by Millennials and Baby Boomers was consistent with the research from the literature review, which indicated that Baby Boomers tend to prefer consensus building and Millennials tend to prefer collaboration and tolerance. To get more insight into the participants’ perspectives the individual responses for question #8 from Principals D, F, H, J and K are included below:

Participant D stated, “I think just really having collaboration too is so key and so important, and I know that people feel 100 percent comfortable collaborating with me. I think that I really, really collaborate well…with administrators, the teachers, and then of course the kids too, and the parents of course.”

Participant F stated, “I think I’m very diligent, punctilious. I pay attention to details a lot. I communicate well. I work well with others. I’m very collaborative.”

Participant H stated, “I’m good at listening. I’m good at hearing what people are saying and what they’re not saying. I’m good at asking the tough questions, and then I’m good at being objective.”

Participant J stated, “I think the first thing when you ask the staff…is that I listen. I listen well. I can listen for long periods of time. I can make sure I ask the questions that I understand as I’m hearing a story or a problem. I actually love listening to people…I feel that everybody, no matter what, has something to teach me.”
Participant K stated, “I think empathy and caring for my staff, looking at the whole picture and not trivializing or minimizing the task and the awesome responsibility our staff has. It’s a tough job, and it’s tougher now than it’s ever been.”

**Qualitative Analysis of Responses for Question #13 from the Research**

After coding the participants’ responses to Question #13 (Describe your leadership style), it became apparent that the most common general themes that principals stated included shared leadership (SL), instructional leadership, and affiliative leadership (AL).

Generation seemed to be somewhat related to affiliative leadership (the broad empathic process of listening through the use of collaboration, empathy and listening as a leadership style) and the successful implementation of the CCSS in the areas of the 8 Standards of Math Practice and professional development. With respect to implementing the Common Core State Standards in the area of professional development, Millennials scored the highest with 83% of indicators in place. With respect to implementing the CCSS in the area of Math Practice Standards, Generation X scored highest with 86% of the indicators in place. Two out of 3 Millennial principals using Affiliative Leadership (D and F) scored 75% of higher in PD, and three out of five Generation X principals using Affiliative Leadership (A, B, and I) scored 80% or higher in the Eight Standards of Math Practice.

To get more insight into the participants’ perspectives the individual responses for question #13 from Principals B, D, and F are included below:
Participant B stated, “I’m a big believer [in] the whole shared leadership approach and making sure that we’re all working together on projects and taking ownership of it.”

Participant D stated, “We like to come up with solutions and move forward…I’m not afraid to think outside of the box.”

Participant F stated, “[I’m] very participatory. I don’t like to make decisions by myself, so a lot of shared decision making going on.”

Generation also seemed to be somewhat related to the affiliative leadership code/theme, which contributed to the level of success that Baby Boomers experienced with respect to implementing the CCSS in the area of the Three Key Literacy Shifts. Baby Boomer participants (Principals J and K) scored the highest in ELA Shifts with 100% of the indicators in place. Additionally, both of the members of the Baby Boomer generation (Participants J and K) in the study subscribed to the Affiliative Leadership style. One other key finding is that both participants from the Baby Boomer generation responded virtually the same for question #8 and 13 indicating Empathetic Listening (and Affiliative Leadership) as a leader trait and style that most contributed to their success in implementing the CCSS. This suggests that Baby Boomers from the study saw both the style and trait that they used to implement the CCSS as one and the same. In addition, it further suggests that these Baby Boomers tend to prefer a specific leadership style and trait with respect to leading. This is somewhat consistent with the research from the literature review of the study that indicated that Baby Boomers tend to prefer consensus building and avoiding conflict as the common leadership traits to utilize with respect to
leading. To get more insight into the participants’ perspectives the individual responses for question #13 from Principals J and K are included below:

Participant J stated, “I think the best way to sum up my leadership style is that I am very, very present in all of their educational lives…no matter who it is…I could tell that I could connect with [my technology guy] on a level that most people don’t see in him.”

Participant K stated, “I think, again, dedicated and hardworking, collaborative, collegial…I think that it's more focused on the good of the all rather than the importance of a few.”

Similarly, it is important to note that 80% of Generation X (Participants A, B, C and I) also scored 100% in the area of the Three Key Literacy Shifts and three of those principals (Participants A, B and I) indicated AL as their top leadership style.

Summary of Findings for Research Question #2

The research indicates a few modest connections between generational status and successful implementation of the CCSS. Overall, Generation X participants scored highest on the CCII, as four out of the five top composite scores belonged to Generation X participants. Additionally, all of those who scored the full 30 points (100%) on the PARCC assessment were members of Generation X. Millennials scored highest on average in regard to PD; Generation X in regard to Math Practice Standards; Baby Boomers in regard to ELA Literacy Shifts; and Millennials and Baby Boomers scored highest in regard to Curriculum Maps and Scope and Sequences.
Further, the level of success that Millennials and Baby Boomers experienced with respect to implementing the CCSS in the area of curriculum maps and scope and sequences seemed to related to their use of Empathetic Listening (EM L) as a key approach. The level of success that Generation X and Millennials experienced with respect to implementing the CCSS in the areas of the Eight Standards of Math Practice and Professional Development had a connection with their use of Affiliative Leadership (AL). Affiliative Leadership also somewhat connected with the level of success that Baby Boomers experienced with respect to implementing the CCSS in the area the Three Key Literacy Shifts.

These findings suggest that while each generation seem to have some notable natural strengths regarding implementing the CCSS, it may be more valuable for each principal at the school level to assess their deficits in order to figure out what colleagues, members on staff or outside professional development opportunities they may need to tap to assist with developing specific areas. For example, since Millennials tended to score the highest with respect to implementing professional development then it may be advantageous to lean on these leaders or staff members for support in this area.

Perhaps more interesting for future practice is to consider apparent connections between leadership traits and style and generation in regard to the successful implementation of the CCSS in schools. Most Generation X and all Millennial participants cite Shared Leadership (SL) as the leadership trait and/or leadership style most significant for their implementation of the CCSS; no Baby Boomers cited SL. On the other hand, those with the highest curriculum scores on average – Millennials and
Baby Boomers – all cited Empathetic Listening (EM L) as a significant trait that contributed to how their schools went about successfully implementing this area of the CCSS.

**Research Question #3**

What other leadership strategies and behaviors if any contributed to the context of the successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards in their schools?

To better examine the third research question relevant to other leadership strategies and behaviors if any that can contribute to the context of the successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards in schools, the researcher analyzed the research participants' responses from the Common Core Implementation Inventory Survey as well as their responses from questions 1, 3, and 14 from the in-person interview.

Interview questions 1, 3, and 14 were each determined to be generally unrelated to generation, or only indirectly related to EQ as examined in research questions #1 and #2 but were clearly related to the successful implementation of the CCSS in the participants’ respective schools. The responses to these questions were coded and analyzed with respect to research question #3, What other principal leadership behaviors and strategies if any contribute to the process of successfully implementing the Common Core State Standards in schools?

1. Tell me how your school went about implementing the Common Core State Standards.
3. Are there any specific successes that your school experienced while implementing the Common Core State Standards that are important to highlight?

14. In your opinion, how might emotional intelligence contribute to the preparation of K-12 principals?

Table 11 summarizes significant coded themes related to research question #3.

Table 11

Significant Themes for Research Question #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Question</th>
<th>Significant Themes and Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 Process for Implementing CCSS</td>
<td>Unpacking &amp; Alignment A, B, C, D, E, F, H, I, J, K, Professional Development C, D, I, Collaboration E, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Successes school experienced while implementing CCSS</td>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction A, B, D, E, F, H, J, K, Assessment Growth C, I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Other Leadership Behaviors Related to CCSS Implementation

The goal in addressing research question #3 was to document whether other leadership behaviors and strategies (outside of emotional intelligence and generation) of the principals in the research contributed to the context of how they successfully implemented the Common Core State Standards in their schools. After coding the participant responses to question #1 (Tell me how your school went about implementing the Common Core State Standards) it became apparent that the most common themes that
principals stated included unpacking and alignment (UA), professional development (PD), and collaboration (Collab).

**Qualitative Analysis of Responses for Question #1 from the Research**

Clearly, the Unpacking and Alignment code/theme (Unpacking refers to the process of identifying what students will need to know and be able to do in order to master a given Common Core State Standard and Alignment refers to the idea of aligning the instructional supports and resources to the Common Core State Standards) was a strategy that principals utilized that directly contributed to the successful implementation of the CCSS.

All 10 principals (Participants A, B, C, D, E, F, H, I, J, and K) from the study indicated that Unpacking and Alignment was the most common approach utilized in the process of how their schools successfully implemented the Common Core State Standards. In other words, this data suggests that regardless of generation or EQ strengths, in order to successfully implement the CCSS principals will need to effectively facilitate the Unpacking and Alignment code/theme at the school level. This included pertinent activities related to best practices at the school level like evaluating current curriculum, realigning curriculum to address updated standards, creating engaging and meaningful lesson plans, and developing powerful units for both English Language Arts and Math that have continuity at each grade level. This is especially important to note for practicing principals as many of these strategies not only ensure that high quality instruction takes place in the maximum number of classrooms at various grade and skill levels, but many of these strategies are the most cost effective approaches that are
available to schools. Some of the individual responses from the participants in the study (that highlight how each of them utilized this strategy) are listed below.

Participant B stated, “We started off with looking at literacy…it’s coming more from a district level of re-aligning everything and school-wide…realigning everything and curriculum-wise relating it o Common Core and then implementing it more…all these different pieces and presented the alignment portion of how much of this curriculum is truly aligned to Common Core.”

Participant I stated, “All of the administrators were on this black belt team and we got together pretty regularly…and went over lessons about implementing the Common Core Standards…we also had teachers that were on the black belt team and they did the same thing.”

Participant J stated, “My teaching staff and I got together and basically just took the standards and then applied them to the curriculum we had. And then supplemented the curriculum we needed in order to make the curriculum align with the common core.”

Participant K stated, “We unpacked them…we powered them, and then started to formulate our modules for implementation primarily in the areas of language arts and math.”

**Qualitative Analysis of Responses for Question #3 from the Research**

After coding the participant responses to interview question #3 (Are there any specific successes that your school experienced while implementing the Common Core State Standards that are important to highlight) it became apparent that the most common
general themes that principals stated included curriculum and instruction (CI) and assessment growth (AG). However, it is important to note that within the curriculum and instruction (CI) theme there were four sub categories that more accurately represented the authenticity of the principals’ responses (i.e. collaboration, unpacking, scope and sequence, and lesson plans).

Cleary, for the participants in the study, successful implementation of the CCSS was linked to principals’ ability to focus on implementing curriculum and instruction.

With respect to implementing the CCSS, the specific success that the participants and the schools from the study identified the most was related to curriculum and instruction (best practice strategies related to curriculum or classroom instructional supports). Eight out of the 10 principals (Participants A, B, D, E, F, H, J, and K) from the study indicated that the general curriculum and instruction (CI) theme was one of the specific successes that they believed was important to highlight with respect to how their schools implemented the Common Core State Standards. This suggests that perhaps a focus on curriculum and instruction could have a direct connection to some level of success that the participants highlighted above experienced. While ensuring that high quality curriculum is adopted and implemented at the school level has been a tremendous focus for schools for quite some time, it is perhaps more compelling to highlight how the principals in this study consistently identified the importance of instruction. This area of implementation is essential, as it accounts for the expertise of teachers with respect to content knowledge and pedagogy as well as the specific types of instructional strategies and supports that are vital to maximizing learning at the classroom level. Some of the
individual responses from the participants in the study (that highlight how each principal utilized this approach) are listed below.

Participant D stated, “We were able to create smart board lessons and share them with the group. Very intense smart board lessons that would last for one to two weeks. Then we would kind of divvy up the work and share it amongst the grade level. Because we have five or six teachers per team, so it really alleviated a lot of the work load…”

Participant F stated, “Just unpacking the documents…each team had a series of documents that they were looking for. Some of the standards can be somewhat ambiguous, so each team developed rubrics and documents, and things like that…that they could use in the classroom to help measure not only if their teaching the standards appropriately, but if they are assessing it appropriately as well.”

Participant J stated, “Probably one of the greatest things that we did in implementing the Common Core was we really came up with really detailed, very focused, very magical scope and sequence…when you make it that organized for them, then you give them materials that they need and you give them what’s expected, they take off. And that’s when the creativity can happen.”

Participant H stated, “To me, that’s a success, lesson plans used to be a mess…so being able to see teachers say I’m going to focus on this with these students or I’m going to focus on that with those students during this time…giving it more direction.”
Qualitative Analysis of Responses for Question #14 from the Research

After coding the responses to Question #14 (How might emotional intelligence contribute to the preparation of K-12 principals) in the in-person interviews with the participants in the research study it became apparent that the most common themes that principals stated included self-development for connection (SDC) and problem solving (PS).

Based on the data in the study, there was a positive relationship between self-development for connection (developing or enhancing one’s social skills for the sake of connecting with others), research participants identifying the democratic and/or affiliative leadership styles, and EQ strengths to capitalize on in the domains of self-awareness, self-management and/or relationship management.

Eight out of the 10 principals (Participants B, C, D, F, H, I, J and K) from the study indicated that the self-development for connection (SDC) theme reflected how emotional intelligence could contribute to the preparation of K-12 principals. In addition, all eight of the same principals had either the democratic and/or affiliative leadership style. Principals I, J and K subscribed to the affiliative leadership style. Principals B and C identified the democratic leadership style. Principals D, F and H identified both the affiliative and democratic leadership styles. Similarly, five out of the eight principals (Participants B, C, H, I and J) had EQ strengths to capitalize on in the self-awareness and/or self-management domains. Four out of the eight principals (Participants B, D, J and K) had EQ strengths in the relationship management domain to capitalize on. Last but not least, five out of the eight principals (Participants B, D, F, H, and K) identified
relationship management and two of the eight (Participants I and J) selected self-management as most contributing to their success. What was clear was that there was a connection between the self-development for connection theme, research participants identifying the democratic and/or affiliative leadership styles, and EQ strengths to capitalize on in the domains of self-awareness, self-management and/or relationship management.

In summary, it was apparent that most principals hadn’t consciously decided to take the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal or to attend workshops that would aid in using EQ or generational patterns to their school’s advantage as they sought to implement the CCSS. However, it was notably clear that principals from all generations seemed to be conscious (during the process of implementing the CCSS) of the fact that knowing one’s own thoughts and feelings, regulating those same thoughts and feelings and being authentically aware of the value of building meaningful relationships with staff members was crucial to their respective school’s success. To gain further insight into the thoughts of the participants from the research some of their responses are listed below:

Participant B stated, “In order to try to help other people and have an understanding of kids and have an understanding of these things you yourself have to have a better understanding about all of the different ideas and different domains and where they’re at and the impacts they have…It’s the same concept and framing teachers’ understanding of all of that as well as your own so you have to develop yourself and develop an understanding before you can share with anybody else.”
Participant D stated, “You have to think about your inner actions. You could be very, very intelligent…but you have to be able to work with [people]…you could be the smartest person in the world, but you’re not going to be effective, especially in that role of a principal…It’s really key to be able to establish relationships, to be socially aware, and then to be able to self-manage and have self-awareness…the kids pick up on that so easily, but so do the adults.”

Participant H stated, “If you don’t do a soul search about being this person or being in this position or being a leader…you might as well walk the plank because you’re committing suicide if you don’t have it in your heart. You have to have it in your heart and you have to have it in your heart to want to help other people because being a leader is about servitude.”

Participant J stated, “I think it’s huge. I think it’s absolutely larger than it’s ever been…principals are now asked to do something very different. We are now asked to be educational leaders…of not only the students but the faculty, the curriculum, all of the behavioral needs. We are asked to make these buildings cohesive, alive entities that are ever changing…If we don’t have a connection to the people that are in our buildings, it has to be a positive emotional connection…to have a positive connection…you have to be able to read situations…to know when a teacher needs some help [even when] they’re not saying it to you…without having an understanding of the emotional intelligence, without knowing what all of that is, a principal would be severely handicapped because they would just be able to manage a building.”
Findings for Research Question #3

The Unpacking and Alignment code/theme was a strategy that principals utilized that directly contributed to the successful implementation of the CCSS. All 10 principals (Participants A, B, C, D, E, F, H, I, J, and K) from the study indicated that Unpacking and Alignment was the most common approach utilized in the process of how their schools successfully implemented the Common Core State Standards. This was important because the principals explicitly identified crucial activities related to best practices for administrators at the school level like evaluating current curriculum, realigning curriculum to address updated standards, creating engaging and meaningful lesson plans, and developing powerful units for both English Language Arts and Math that have continuity at each grade level.

Successful implementation of the CCSS was linked to principals’ ability to focus on implementing curriculum and instruction. Eight out of the 10 principals (Participants A, B, D, E, F, H, J, and K) from the study indicated that the general curriculum and instruction (CI) code/theme was one of the specific successes that they believed was important to highlight with respect to how their schools implemented the Common Core State Standards. In particular, the identification of practical best practice strategies with respect to instruction is paramount for current practicing principals.

There was a connection between self-development for connection (developing or enhancing one’s social skills for the sake of connecting with others), research participants identifying the democratic and/or affiliative leadership styles, and EQ strengths to capitalize on in the domains of self-awareness, self-management and/or relationship
management. Principals from all generations seemed to be conscious (during the process of implementing the CCSS) of the fact that knowing one’s own thoughts and feelings, regulating those same thoughts and feelings and being authentically aware of the value of building meaningful relationships with staff members was crucial to their respective school’s success.

**A Final Note on Data**

The responses for interview question number 2 were not included in the research analysis as a result of the fact that they closely mirrored the responses from questions 1 and 3, which were included in the research analysis. The responses for question 4 were not included in the research analysis due to the fact that the participants simply named barriers regarding implementing the CCSS and didn’t provide details as to how to inform practices. The responses for interview questions number 7, 11 and 12 were not included in the research analysis as a result of the fact that they did not directly relate to or support the research study.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

The purpose of the research was to explore whether there was a correlation between Emotional Intelligence (EQ), generational status and principals’ leadership abilities for the successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards in schools. As noted above, this research points to the fact that there is a modest connection between EQ (especially relationship management) and the successful implementation of CCSS, a modest connection between generation and the successful implementation of CCSS, and potentially important and helpful findings regarding consistently preferred and consistently implemented leadership strategies that contribute to the successful implementation of CCSS.

The study had limitations due to the sample size of the research participants and the fact that all of the participants were in K-8 schools (as opposed to 9-12). Also, while the PARCC test scores represented an important objective piece of the research, the other four out of five criteria of the study were based on data gathered from the self-reporting of principals’ leadership decisions and behaviors (rather than teachers or other school level stakeholders). While we cannot use the data from this study to generalize to some schools (specifically high schools) with respect to implementing the exact standards and curriculum that are highlighted in the research, there are a few interesting observations to
make regarding previous research and future study with respect to best practices for the successful implementation of high quality standards.

As noted in the Literature Review, there was an extensive international study of two African schools that found substantial differences in the behaviors of two principals who had different levels of EQ. The researchers eventually concluded that the leader with the higher EQ was clearly able to successfully get his staff to work cohesively as a team through his emphasis on authentic relationship building while the other principal was not able to accomplish the same results, as a result of his deficits in self-awareness and self-management (Cai, 2015, p. 164). With the previous study’s findings in mind, the researcher analyzed the data of the current study and compared it to the findings of previous study. The research participants in the current study were first ranked in order according to the levels of Common Core State Standards Implementation in an effort to identify emergent themes and patterns. It was determined that out of the principals that had the highest four scores on the Common Core Implementation Inventory Survey, three of them (Participants B, I, and J) had a common Emotional Intelligence strength (as measured by the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal), which was self-management. This was consistent with the previous study’s findings. In addition, these same principals (Participants B, I, and J) either had no determined weakness with respect to the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal or had a weakness in an area other than self-awareness or self-management, which was also consistent with the previous study’s findings. Similarly, it was determined that out of the principals that had the lowest four scores on the Common Core Implementation Inventory Survey, three of them (Participants D, E,
and K) had an Emotional Intelligence weakness (as measured by the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal) similar to the principal referenced in the study that wasn’t as successful as the leader with the higher EQ, which was either self-management or self-awareness.

However, there were a few other notable findings that were not consistent with the previous study’s findings. First and foremost, it is important to note that EQ scores were not a predictor of the levels of Common Core State Standards Implementation in the study. In other words, the principals that had the lowest EQ scores (Participants A, C, H, and K) didn’t necessarily have the lowest levels of Common Core Implementation scores. For example, Participant A had the lowest EQ score but scored the highest score on the Common Core Implementation Inventory Survey. Also, out of the principals that had the lowest four EQ scores, three of them (Participants A, H, and K) had a common Emotional Intelligence weakness (as measured by the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal) in the area of social awareness. In addition, two of the four principals that had the lowest EQ scores (Participants C and K) had a common Emotional Intelligence weakness (as measured by the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal) in the area of self-awareness.

Table 12 summarizes the relationship of the current study to the previous study. The elements in bold are consistent with the other study and the elements not bolded were not consistent.
### Table 12

*Generation, EQ, School Success and Connection to Literature Review*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>EQ Composite Score</th>
<th>EQ Leadership Style (Qual.)</th>
<th>EQ Strength (Quan.)</th>
<th>EQ Weakness (Quan.)</th>
<th>Domain Related to Success (Qual.)</th>
<th>CCSS Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Affiliative</td>
<td>Self-Aware &amp; Self-Man.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Self-Man.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Millennial</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Democratic &amp; Affiliative</td>
<td>Rel.-Man.</td>
<td>Self-Aware</td>
<td>Rel.-Man.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Self-Man. &amp; Rel.-Man.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Rel.-Man.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>Rel.-Man.</td>
<td>Self-Man.</td>
<td>Rel.-Man.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Millennial</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Affiliative &amp; Democratic</td>
<td>Social-Aware</td>
<td>Self-Aware</td>
<td>Rel.-Man.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Baby Boom</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Affiliative</td>
<td>Rel.-Man. &amp; Self-Man.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Rel.-Man. &amp; Self-Man.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Millennial</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Coaching, Democratic &amp; Affiliative</td>
<td>Self-Aware</td>
<td>Social-Aware</td>
<td>Rel.-Man.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Baby Boom</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Affiliative</td>
<td>Rel.-Man.</td>
<td>Self-Aware &amp; Social Aware</td>
<td>Rel.-Man.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Democratic &amp; Coaching</td>
<td>Self-Man.</td>
<td>Self-Aware</td>
<td>Social-Aware</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Affiliative &amp; Democratic</td>
<td>Social-Aware</td>
<td>Social Man. &amp; Social Aware</td>
<td>Social Man.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Literature Review also yielded some other information regarding the role that a principal’s leadership style can have on student achievement. In fact, Goleman’s (2000) research indicated that leaders who used the styles that positively affected the school climate (democratic, affiliative, coaching and authoritative styles) had significantly better results than their counterparts who did not (p. 90). As a result, the researcher organized each principal’s self-identified leadership style from the in-person interview portion of the study to analyze whether the data was consistent with Goleman’s findings. To do so...
each participant’s leadership style was determined by combining the coded responses to
the following questions: (8) What is your strongest leadership trait? (13) Describe your
leadership style. The coded responses were then categorized and paired up with the
leadership style that they aligned with the most, relevant to those identified by Daniel
Goleman (i.e., democratic, affiliative, coaching and authoritative styles). The coded
responses were eventually grouped accordingly: Shared Leadership (SL) = Democratic;
Instructional Leadership (IL) = Coaching; Empathetic Listening (EM L) = Affiliative;
and Pacesetting (PS) = Authoritative.

Consistent with Goleman’s (2000) research the four principals (Participants A, B, I and J) that had the highest four scores on the Common Core Implementation Inventory Survey exhibited one or two of the four leadership styles deemed most effective in Goleman’s research: affiliative and/or democratic. On the other hand, there were a few other notable findings that were not consistent with Goleman’s findings. For example, Participants C, D, F, H, and K had virtually the same leadership style as the highest scoring principals, and yet their CCII scores were lower. In this study, principal’s leadership style did not appear to be a predictor of the participant’s level of Common Core State Standards Implementation. Also, Goleman’s findings assert that the more leadership styles that a leader exhibits the higher performance one can expect. However, this study’s data was not consistent with that finding, as one principal (Participant H) identified with three leadership styles (coaching, democratic and affiliative) but had one of the lowest scores on the Common Core Implementation Inventory Survey. Similarly, three principals (Participants B, I and J) with three of the top four scores on the Common
Core Implementation Inventory Survey only identified with one leadership style, which was dissimilar to Goleman’s findings.

The principals that were Millennials (Participants D, F and H) had very similar leadership styles, as all three principals had affiliative and democratic styles. Similarly, the Baby Boom principals (Participants J and K) had identical leadership styles, as both principals had affiliative leadership styles. The leadership styles for Generation X were not as consistent, as only three of the five principals (Participants A, B and C) shared the democratic leadership style and two (Participants A and I) of the five shared the affiliative leadership style.

**Outlier of the Study: Principal I**

Analysis of the data revealed other patterns involving variables not directly related to the three research questions, but potentially useful to school practices and/or leadership formation. Income is one such factor. Data from the research study showed that the income level of the student population of service at the school seemed to be a predictor of success with respect to implementing the CCSS. For example, four out of five of the highest scoring participants (Principals A, B, C, and J) on the CCII were from schools with a low income population of less than 5%. Conversely, all five of the participants (Principals D, E, F, H and K) that scored the lowest were principals from schools with a low income population of greater than 50%. However, somehow despite having a low income population of 98%, Principal I scored in the top three on the CCII. As a result, the researcher determined that it would be very helpful to analyze the specific data regarding this research participant in order to make sense of how this principal
managed to be the only outlier in the study. The pertinent data regarding Principal I can be found below.

**Qualitative Analysis of Principal I**

Interview Question #1: How did Principal I go about implementing the CCSS at School 9?

Principal I stated, “When the conversation began I started going to [a lot of the trainings] about the Common Core…All of the administrators were on this black belt team [at the district level] and we got together pretty regularly…and went over lessons about implementing the Common Core Standards…we also had teachers that were on the black belt team and they did the same thing.”

Interview Question #6: Principal I’s description of getting members of the faculty to follow her around an unpopular issue related to implementing the CCSS. Principal I used one of the most common themes, which was Togetherness (the identification of unity and/or team as a value or philosophy in leadership).

Principal I stated, “I have been fortunate enough to build relationships with my staff that even when I know they don’t want to do it, we get it done and have full participation…and do an awesome job. Even if some of them really don’t want to do it and walk away with winning all of the prizes because they pushed their kids that hard…they really do come together and ensure that we are successful.”

Interview Question #7: What were Participant I’s impressions of her emotional intelligence appraisal results?
The researcher did not code the responses for question #7, as nearly all of the participants in the study indicated that they hadn’t taken the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal before the study. However, Participant I was the only principal from the study that indicated taking the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal before taking part in the study. As a result, her response is listed below.

Participant I stated, “This is actually not new to me because I read the book a while back…I actually had taken that before. The first time I took it there were some areas that I’ve been working on since that I know that I’ve improved in.”

Interview Question #8: What is Participant I’s strongest leadership trait? Participant I’s strongest leadership trait was Empathetic Listening (the broad empathic process of listening sub categories include focuses on: collaboration, empathy and listening). Her individual response is listed below.

Participant I stated, “My staff knows that I am not ever going to ask them to do something that I am not willing to do myself…I never send them out to do a task and not stand by their side in the process…I think that garners a level of trust between us…”

Interview Question # 13: What describes Participant I’s leadership style? Participant I stated, “I am a collaborator when I can be and directive when I need to be, and a listener for my staff.”

The researcher did not code the responses for question #12, as it didn’t directly correlate to the research questions. However, as noted above Participant I was the only
principal from the study that indicated taking the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal before taking part in the study. As a result, her response is listed below.

Interview Question #12: What training or professional development influenced Participant I’s EQ?

Participant I stated, “We spent a lot of time in our district in book studies for the administrative team…they most deal with leadership and building capacity.”

Question #14: How did Principal I think EQ might contribute to the preparation of K-12 principals?

Principal I indicated that one of the ways that EQ might contribute to the preparation of principals was through Self-Development for Connection (developing or enhancing one’s social skills for the sake of connecting with others).

Principal I stated, “I don’t think people spend enough time with that self-awareness part, which might make the actual role as principal a little bit easier for people who are beginning a new principalship for the first time, because you have that awareness of self. It [makes it] easier for you to learn how to work with others. I think a lot times we’re not aware of [our] strengths and deficiencies. These are things that hold [us] back from working with and motivating others.”

Table 13 provides an EQ profile for Principal I.
Principal I had the highest composite EQ score (86), self-awareness score (91), personal competence average (89) and second highest self-management of all of the participants in this study (87). As noted in the Literature Review, there was an extensive international study of two African schools that found substantial differences in the behaviors of two principals who had different levels of EQ. The researchers eventually concluded that the leader with the higher EQ was clearly able to successfully get his staff to work cohesively as a team through his emphasis on authentic relationship building while the other principal was not able to accomplish the same results, as a result of his deficits in self-awareness and self-management (Cai, 2015, p. 164). In other words, strengths in the self-management and self-awareness domains increase the likelihood of success at the school level. Based on the current study, Principal I had Emotional Intelligence strengths (as measured by the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal) in the self-management and self-awareness domains. Similarly, during the interview portion of this research Principal I indicated her level of detail to authentic relationship building with her staff specifically when she stated,
“I have been fortunate enough to build relationships with my staff that even when I know they don’t want to do it, we get it done and have full participation…I never send them out to do a task and not stand by their side in the process…I think that garners a level of trust between us…”

This was consistent with the previous study’s findings. Additionally, Principal I had no determined weakness with respect to the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal, which was also consistent with the previous study’s findings.

In addition to Principal I’s EQ strengths in relation to the literature review, it is important to note that School 9 had the third highest level of CCSS implementation with 100% of the components in place for the Three Key Literacy Shifts, Eight Standards of Math Practice as well as curriculum maps and scope and sequences (see Table 14).

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELA Shifts (% in place)</th>
<th>Math Standards (% in place)</th>
<th>Curriculum (% in place)</th>
<th>PD (% in place)</th>
<th>PARCC (% in place)</th>
<th>Composite (% in place)</th>
<th>CCSS Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the findings of the study included that there was some connection with income between the schools that performed the highest on PARCC as well as with respect to overall CCSS implementation. In other words, low income seemed to have a negative relationship with school performance on PARCC and overall CCSS implementation as four of the five top scoring schools in these areas were schools in
areas with minimal low income students. However, School 9 was the exception regarding these two measures. Despite having a low income population of 98%, School 9 was the only low income school that had scores in the top five on both PARCC performance as well as overall CCSS implementation. Perhaps, Principal I’s EQ strengths and leadership style may have had a significant impact on beating the odds.

When considering the data gathered from the research, it is clear that there are modest connections between EQ and generational status with respect to implementing the CCSS in schools. However, there were some very important key leadership traits, styles and behaviors that were identified in this study (in some cases unrelated to EQ or generational status) that could prove to be beneficial to principals in schools. Despite the structure and focus of the study, what was apparent during the research was that most principals were not conscious of their precise generation or their EQ strengths or weaknesses when they took part during the CCSS implementation process, but almost all principals could universally articulate in their own words the value of knowing one’s self, how that impacts others and the importance of relationship building to establish success.

**What Did We Learn?**

Based on the findings of the study, the researcher learned that when considering the complicated nature of implementing the CCSS, it was very difficult to try to isolate one variable to explain directly how success was accomplished. Nonetheless, there were notable pieces of information that were gathered from the study.

There were some modest connections between EQ and the successful implementation of CCSS. This study’s findings, consistent with the data from the
Literature Review, certainly suggest that strengths in the EQ domains of self-management, self-awareness and particularly relationship management seem to contribute to some principals’ ability to reach the highest levels of success in terms of implementing the CCSS. Thus, principals seeking to utilize EQ with respect to accelerating their success in implementing high quality standards could be served well by focusing on developing strengths in these particular domains.

Another takeaway from the study was that there was a connection/relationship between the principals that focused on togetherness and unity, achieving the highest level of CCSS implementation in the Three Key Literacy and possessing “average” to “above average” EQ overall as well as a strength in relationship management. This is important because it asserts that higher EQ could influence a direct consciousness or focus on being explicitly aware of the value of unity and togetherness during the process of implementing the CCSS, which could prove to be very valuable in the area of the Three Key Literacy Shifts. Since literacy is a subject that has skills that are valuable in almost every other subject, this finding is very promising for current and future principals because it could help inform where to start curriculum focuses and professional development.

Another lesson from the study was that there was a modest connection between generation and the successful implementation of CCSS. However, each generation seemed to have some notable natural strengths regarding implementing the CCSS. Hence, rather than seek to employ principals from a particular generation, it may be more valuable at the school level for each principal to assess their deficits in order to figure out
what colleagues, members on staff or outside professional development opportunities they may need to tap into to assist with developing specific leadership skills and areas of practice.

Perhaps the most important and helpful findings from the study were regarding consistently preferred and consistently implemented leadership strategies that contribute to the successful implementation of CCSS.

In terms of strategies for implementation, we learned that the most common strategy that all principals in the study utilized to successfully implement the CCSS was unpacking and alignment. While this finding may not be a surprise to the current educators, this knowledge is crucial for new and aspiring principals or educators as this could certainly maximize the types of professional development that they attend and facilitate at the building level with their staff.

Similarly, we learned that both at the grade level and building level a focus on curriculum and instruction is crucial, and the most effective way to implement high quality curriculum is through authentically focusing on building meaningful relationships with staff members.

Finally, we learned that there was a clear relationship between self-development for connection (developing or enhancing one’s social skills for the sake of connecting with others), research participants identifying the democratic and/or affiliative leadership styles as most important, and EQ strengths to capitalize on in the domains of self-awareness, self-management and/or relationship management. Principals from all generations seemed to be conscious (during the process of implementing the CCSS) of
the fact that knowing one’s own thoughts and feelings, regulating those same thoughts and feelings and being authentically aware of the value of building meaningful relationships with staff members was crucial to their respective school’s success.

**Where Do We Go Next?**

In order to study EQ more fully in relation to the CCSS, it may be beneficial to interview or survey teachers at the building level to get their perceptions regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the principal.

While the PARCC assessment was a good measure (for Illinois) to validate the various levels of CCSS implementation, it may prove to be valuable if other forms of assessment scores were utilized that generalize to other states about successful implementation at the national level. This could include state standardized assessment scores like Smarter Balance or local benchmark assessments like NWEA.

**Was the Study Valuable and Why?**

The study was very valuable because it contributed a number of notable pieces of information to the education leadership body of research. The study not only noted aspects of how generation and EQ contributed to explicit components of school success with respect to implementing the CCSS, it also yielded a very meaningful tool (Common Core Implementation Inventory Survey). The CCII measured many of the accessible best practices research strategies and information at the international level that correlated to success with respect to the CCSS at the school level; with refinement it could be a useful tool for correlating school level practices to varying levels of performance on the PARCC assessment. Last but not least, the study was valuable as a result of the fact that it was
able to identify various leadership styles, behaviors and strategies that current and future administrators can utilize to accelerate their ability to successfully implement the CCSS in schools.
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CONSENT LETTER FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH
Researcher: Michael Allen  
Faculty Sponsor: Dr. Lorraine Ozar

Introduction
You are invited to participate in a research study being conducted by Michael Allen, a Doctoral student at Loyola University Chicago under the supervision of Dr. Lorraine Ozar, a faculty member in the School of Education.

You were selected as a possible participant in this research because you are a current principal at a public school located in Lake and Cook counties in Illinois and your school had a successful score on the 2015 administration of PARCC.

Please read this form and ask questions before you agree to be in this section of the study.

Background Information
This study is a part of the dissertation consists of 3 sections but will be conducted in two parts. This study aims to examine whether there is a correlation between emotional intelligence (EQ), generational status and principals’ leadership skills for the successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards.

The components of the study include: 1. Common Core Implementation Inventory (section 1) as well as 2. Emotional Intelligence Appraisal (section 2) and a 45-60-minute interview (section 3).

Procedures
It is important to note that the full study has three sections that essentially build off of one another. This consent letter specifically relates to the first section of the study. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to complete the first section of the study that is an online version of the Common Core Implementation Inventory Survey. The survey will take about 5 minutes to complete and it can be accessed via Survey Monkey once you agree to participate in the study. This section is specifically designed to gather baseline data about the implementation of the Common Core State Standards at your school. Should you be deemed eligible for the full study, you will be asked to complete a consent letter for part two as well as an on-line emotional intelligence appraisal and a 45-60 minute in-person interview. Rest assured that all of your answers will be used only for scholarly purposes and will be kept completely confidential and anonymous to the researcher.

Risks and Benefits of being in the study
The study has minimal risks to you as the participant. Your Common Core Implementation Inventory results will be kept confidential and anonymous to the researcher. Although the re-searcher will have access to the results, no linkage will be
made between participants and their individual scores. Your identity, as a research participant, will not be used.

Indirectly, your participation adds to the body of research in education, leadership and the principalship. The study may specifically assist current and future principals with successfully implementing the Common Core State Standards in an efficient manner. It is hoped the information cited in this study will benefit current and future leaders and researchers.

Compensation
You will not receive direct compensation for your participation in this portion of the study.

Confidentiality
Any information obtained in connection with this research study that can be identified with you will be disclosed only with your permission; your results will be kept confidential. In any written reports or publications, no one will be identified or identifiable and only group data will be presented.

At that time, they will be deleted. Research results will be kept in a locked file cabinet in the researcher’s home and only the researcher and my advisor will have access to the records while working on this project. Upon completion of the dissertation the researcher will destroy all original reports and identifying information that can be linked back to you.

Voluntary nature of the study
Participation in this research study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your future relations with Loyola University Chicago. If you decide to participate, you are free to stop at any time without affecting these relationships or penalty.

Contacts and questions
If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me, Michael Allen, at mallen10@luc.edu or my faculty advisor, Dr. Lorraine Ozar, at lozar@luc.edu. If you have other questions or concerns regarding the study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher(s), you may also contact the Loyola University Office of Research Services at (773) 508-2689. You may keep a copy of this form for your records.

Statement of Consent
You are making a decision whether or not to participate in the first section of this study. Your initials and you checking the box below indicate that you have read this information, your questions have been answered and you would like to participate in the
first section of the study. Even after completing this form, please know that you may withdraw from the study at any time. You may keep a copy of this form for your records.

[ ] I consent to participate to Part One of the study.

[ ] I do not consent to participate in Part One of the study.

_______________________________________________________
Initials of Participant          Date
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CONSENT LETTER FOR PHASE TWO OF RESEARCH
Researcher: Michael Allen
Faculty Sponsor: Dr. Lorraine Ozar

Introduction
You are invited to participate in Part Two of a research study being conducted by Michael Allen, a Doctoral student at Loyola University Chicago under the supervision of Dr. Lorraine Ozar, a faculty member in the School of Education.

You were selected as a possible participant in this portion of the research study because you are a current principal at a public school located in Lake and Cook counties in Illinois, and your results on the Common Core Implementation Inventory Survey (Section 1) indicate that your school has successfully implemented the Common Core State Standards. Please read this form and ask questions before you agree to this portion of the study.

Background Information
This study consists of 3 sections but will be conducted in two parts. This study aims to examine whether there is a correlation between emotional intelligence (EQ), generational status and principals’ leadership skills for the successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards.

The full study includes: 1) Common Core Implementation Inventory (which you have completed) as well as 2) the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal (EIA) and 3) a 45-60-minute interview.

Procedures
The full study has three sections that essentially build off of one another. This consent letter specifically relates to the Second and Third Sections of the study. Should you decide to participate, you will be asked to complete the Second Section (on-line Emotional Intelligence Appraisal) and the Third Section (a 45-60 minute in-person interview). The goal of the First Section (that you have already completed) was to specifically gather baseline data about the implementation of the Common Core State Standards at your school. Your school’s performance levels qualified you to be eligible for the full study. The Emotional Intelligence Appraisal (Section 2) as well as the responses from the Common Core Implementation Inventory Survey (Section 1) will specifically inform the 45-60-minute interview (Section 3).

As alluded to above, if you decide to participate in this portion of the study you will be asked to complete the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal (EIA). The appraisal will take approximately 7-10 minutes to complete. It can be accessed online through a unique password that you will receive once you agree to participate in the study.
Upon completing the EIA, you will receive your score, which will include an overall emotional intelligence score as well as a score for each of the competencies that comprise the emotional intelligence framework. Rest assured that all of your answers will be used only for scholarly purposes and will be kept completely confidential.

You will also be asked to participate in an interview with the researcher. The interview should take approximately 45-60 minutes. The Emotional Intelligence Appraisal (Section 2) as well as the responses from the Common Core Implementation Inventory Survey (Section 1) will specifically inform the interview (Section 3). While it will incorporate the results from your EIA and the Common Core Implementation Inventory Survey, you will also be asked to reflect regarding its possible relationship to your practices and professional growth as a leader.

Risks and Benefits of being in the study:

This portion of the study has minimal risks to you as the participant. Your Common Core Implementation Inventory and EIA results will be kept confidential and anonymous to the researcher. Your identity, as a research participant, will not be used.

You may directly benefit from this study by completing the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal. The EIA is a psychometric assessment that identifies a person’s emotional intelligence within the various competencies that comprise the emotional intelligence framework. Indirectly, your participation also adds to the body of research in education, leadership and the principalship. It is hoped the information cited in this study will benefit current and future leaders and researchers.

Compensation
If you decide to take part in this portion of the study, you will receive a $25 VISA gift card at the start of the interview (phase three) for your participation. Also, if you participate you will receive the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal at no cost to you, and an individual score of your emotional intelligence at no cost.

Confidentiality
Any information obtained in connection with this research study that can be identified with you will be disclosed only with your permission; your results will be kept confidential. In any written reports or publications, no one will be identified or identifiable and only group data will be presented.

Research results will be kept in a locked file cabinet in the researcher’s home and only the re-searcher and advisor will have access to the records while working on this project. Upon completion of the dissertation the researcher will destroy all original reports and identifying information that can be linked back to you.
Voluntary nature of the study
Participation in this research study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your future relations with Loyola University Chicago. If you decide to participate, you are free to stop at any time without affecting these relationships or penalty.

Contacts and questions
If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me, Michael Allen, at mallen10@luc.edu or my faculty advisor, Dr. Lorraine Ozar, at lozar@luc.edu. If you have other questions or concerns regarding the study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher(s), you may also contact the Loyola University Office of Research Services at (773) 508-2689.
You may keep a copy of this form for your records.

Statement of Consent
You are making a decision whether or not to participate. Your signature indicates that you have read this information and your questions have been answered. Even after signing this form, please know that you may withdraw from the study at any time. You may keep a copy of this form for your records.

I consent to participate to Part Two of the study.

__________________________________________  __________________________
Signature of Participant                  Date

__________________________________________  __________________________
Signature of Researcher                   Date
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COMMON CORE IMPLEMENTATION INVENTORY
1. Please select the generation that you belong to according to your birthdate from the options listed below:
   A. Baby Boom (1943 - 1964)
   B. Generation X (1965 - 1979)

2. What year did you begin as an administrator in your current school?

3. What year did you assume the principalship of your current school?

4. The Common Core State Standards call for 3 Key Literacy Shifts. Does the school where you serve as principal have a curriculum in place for Language Arts that explicitly addresses Common Core Literacy Shift 1: Regular Practice with Complex Text & Academic Language?
   A. Yes, in place
   B. Partially in place
   C. No, not in place

5. The Common Core State Standards call for 3 Key Literacy Shifts. Does the school where you serve as principal have a curriculum in place for Language Arts that explicitly addresses Common Core Literacy Shift 2: Reading, Writing & Speaking grounded in evidence from text, both literary & informational?
   A. Yes, in place
   B. Partially in place
   C. No, not in place

6. The Common Core State Standards call for 3 Key Literacy Shifts. Does the school where you serve as principal have a curriculum in place for Language Arts that explicitly addresses Common Core Literacy Shift 3: Building Knowledge through Content-Rich Nonfiction Texts?
   A. Yes, in place
   B. Partially in place
   C. No, not in place

7. The Common Core State Standards call for 8 Standards of Mathematical Practice. Does your school have a curriculum in place for Math that explicitly addresses Standard 1 of Mathematical Practice: Make Sense of Problems and Persevere in Solving Them?
   A. Yes, in place
   B. Partially in place
   C. No, not in place
8. The Common Core State Standards call for 8 Standards of Mathematical Practice. Does your school have a curriculum in place for Math that explicitly addresses Standard 2 of Mathematical Practice: Reason Abstractly and Quantitatively?
A. Yes, in place
B. Partially in place
C. No, not in place

9. The Common Core State Standards call for 8 Standards of Mathematical Practice. Does your school have a curriculum in place for Math that explicitly addresses Standard 3 of Mathematical Practice: Construct Viable Arguments and Critique the Reasoning of Others?
A. Yes, in place
B. Partially in place
C. No, not in place

10. The Common Core State Standards call for 8 Standards of Mathematical Practice. Does your school have a curriculum in place for Math that explicitly addresses Standard 4 of Mathematical Practice: Model with Mathematics?
A. Yes, in place
B. Partially in place
C. No, not in place

11. The Common Core State Standards call for 8 Standards of Mathematical Practice. Does your school have a curriculum in place for Math that explicitly addresses Standard 5 of Mathematical Practice: Use Appropriate Tools Strategically?
A. Yes, in place
B. Partially in place
C. No, not in place

12. The Common Core State Standards call for 8 Standards of Mathematical Practice. Does your school have a curriculum in place for Math that explicitly addresses Standard 6 of Mathematical Practice: Attend to Precision?
A. Yes, in place
B. Partially in place
C. No, not in place

13. The Common Core State Standards call for 8 Standards of Mathematical Practice. Does your school have a curriculum in place for Math that explicitly addresses Standard 7 of Mathematical Practice: Look for and Make Use of Structure?
A. Yes, in place
B. Partially in place
C. No, not in place
14. The Common Core State Standards call for 8 Standards of Mathematical Practice. Does your school have a curriculum in place for Math that explicitly addresses Standard 8 of Mathematical Practice: Look for and Express Regularity in Repeated Reasoning?
A. Yes, in place
B. Partially in place
C. No, not in place

15. Does your school have a curriculum map and scope and sequence in place in Math for teachers in grades K-3?
A. Yes, in place
B. Partially in place
C. No, not in place
D. N/A

16. Does your school have a curriculum map and scope and sequence in place in Math for teachers in grades 4-8?
A. Yes, in place
B. Partially in place
C. No, not in place
D. N/A

17. Does your school have a curriculum map and scope and sequence in place in Language Arts for teachers in grades K-3?
A. Yes, in place
B. Partially in place
C. No, not in place
D. N/A

18. Does your school have a curriculum map and scope and sequence in place in Language Arts for teachers in grades 4-8?
A. Yes, in place
B. Partially in place
C. No, not in place
D. N/A

19. Does your school have an on-going differentiated professional development model that focuses on High Quality Content?
A. Yes, in place
B. Partially in place
C. No, not in place
20. Does your school have an on-going differentiated professional development model that focuses on Multiple Delivery Modes?
   A. Yes, in place
   B. Partially in place
   C. No, not in place

21. Does your school have an on-going differentiated professional development model that focuses on Collaboration?
   A. Yes, in place
   B. Partially in place
   C. No, not in place

22. Does your school have an on-going differentiated professional development model that focuses on Reflection?
   A. Yes, in place
   B. Partially in place
   C. No, not in place
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INTERVIEW PROTOCOL
Directions: Please answer these questions to the best of your ability. I will be recording this interview audiotape and transcript after the data analysis portion of the study. Before I begin writing results from the interview, I will send you the transcript for what’s called member checking, it’s an opportunity for you to remove, alter, or augment your own words so you’re comfortable with the work. No identifying information for you or your school will be included in the transcript and if you do say your school name, I will remove that from the transcript prior to the data analysis. During the interview, you might feel that information is sensitive and you can request us to turn off the recorder so you can be candid in your response. In this case, I’ll manually record the response. You also have the option to not answer any questions you feel uncomfortable with. The voices of principals are missing in the research and I appreciate your willingness to contribute to the profession. Do you have any questions before we begin?

**Interview Questions**

1. Tell me how your school went about implementing the Common Core State Standards.

2. What evidence might show that you have created a positive climate or culture that has aided in your school’s implementation of the Common Core State Standards?

3. Are there any specific successes that your school experienced while implementing the Common Core State Standards that are important to highlight?

4. Are there any specific barriers that your school experienced while implementing the Common Core State Standards that are important to highlight?

5. Describe how you would handle a conversation with a teacher that has a deficit that is impacting his/her ability to instruct students at the classroom level with respect to the Common Core State Standards.

6. Specifically, with respect to the Common Core State Standards, describe a time when you were able to get members of the faculty to follow you around an unpopular issue.

7. What are your impressions of your Emotional Intelligence Appraisal ® results?

8. What do you think is your strongest leadership trait?

9. Self-awareness, self-management, social awareness and relationship management are the domains that comprise emotional intelligence. Which one, in your opinion, has had the most effect in your success as a leader?
10. Which one domain do you think contributed most to your school’s ability to implement the Common Core State Standards?

11. If you had to take the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal ® when you first started in your role as a principal, do you think your score would have been the same? Why or why not?

12. What type of training or professional development has influenced your emotional intelligence?

13. Describe your leadership style.

14. In your opinion, how might emotional intelligence contribute to the preparation of K-12 principals?
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EMAIL FOR PHASE ONE OF RESEARCH
Dear [Participant],

Thank you for your willingness to participate in the research study being conducted by Michael Allen, a Doctoral student at Loyola University Chicago under the supervision of Dr. Lorraine Ozar, a faculty member in the School of Education.

As was explained to you during previous correspondence, the study consists of 3 phases but will be conducted in two parts. This study aims to examine whether there is a correlation between emotional intelligence (EQ), generational status and principals’ leadership skills for the successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards. The components of the study include: 1. Common Core Implementation Survey (takes about 3-5 mins.) as well as 2. Emotional Intelligence Appraisal (takes about 5 mins.) and a 40 minute in-person interview.

At this time, I would like to invite you to complete the Common Core Implementation Survey. The Common Core Implementation Survey will take about 3-5 minutes and it will be sent to you via Survey Monkey. In order to complete the survey, you will need to click on the first question located in the email (Subject: Common Core Survey - M. Allen Research Study).

It will take you to the entire survey, which takes about 3-5 minutes to complete. Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you again for your time.

Regards,

Enclosures:
1. Invitation Letter
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EMAIL FOR PHASE TWO OF RESEARCH
Dear [Participant],

Thank you for your willingness to participate in the research study being conducted by Michael Allen, a Doctoral student at Loyola University Chicago under the supervision of Dr. Lorraine Ozar, a faculty member in the School of Education.

As was explained to you during previous correspondence, the study consists of 3 phases but will be conducted in two parts. This study aims to examine whether there is a correlation between emotional intelligence (EQ), generational status and principals’ leadership skills for the successful implementation of the Common Core State Standards. The components of the study include: 1. Common Core Implementation Survey (takes about 3-5 mins.) as well as 2. Emotional Intelligence Appraisal (takes about 5 mins.) and a 40 minute in-person interview.

At this time, I would like to invite you to complete the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal as well as take part in an in-person interview.

The Emotional Intelligence Appraisal can be accessed online through clicking on the link listed below and entering the unique password also listed below. Please check your schedule when you have a moment and let me know when it will be best to interview you over the next 2-3 weeks for the interview portion of the study. Please know that I really appreciate you assisting me, especially with all that you have going on. Thank you again for your time.

Sincerely,

Emotional Intelligence Website: www.TalentSmart.com/me/welcome
Password: **********JK******
Enclosures:
1. Consent Letter for Phase Two
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PERMISSION TO USE EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE APPRAISAL
Date: 1/23/2017
Name: Michael Allen, Loyola University Chicago
Address:
Email:
Phone:

Thank you for your request for permission to use Emotional Intelligence Appraisal - Me Edition survey in your research study. We are willing to allow you to use the instrument, on-line, as indicated in our conversation with a 50% reduction in normal charge with the following understanding:

• You will use these assessments only for your research study and will not sell or use them with any compensated management/curriculum development activities.
• You will purchase one assessment per survey participant. The assessment, scoring, and report will not be reproduced in any way, as in agreement with intellectual property laws.
• You will send your completed research study and one copy of reports, articles, and the like that make use of this assessment data promptly to our attention, once complete.
• You will include no more than three sample items in the written copy.

If these are acceptable terms and conditions, please indicate so by signing one copy of this letter and returning it to us.

Best wishes with your study.

Lac D. Su
TalentSmart
Research Committee
858-509-0582
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