A Leader's Emotional Self-Control and Management of Others Impacts a School's Climate

Chris James Anderson, Ed.D.
UCAN

Abstract

A quantitative study with a correlational design, analyzed responses from a target population of more than 200 teachers employed in over four dozen urban and suburban schools in the New York metropolitan area. A sample of 42 teachers completed the *Inviting School Survey-Revised and the Genos 360 EI Assessment-Concise Rater*. Subsequent simple linear regression procedures found Emotional Self-Control [$\beta = 0.486$, $t(74) = 2.016$, $p = 0.052$] and Emotional Management of Others [$\beta = 0.494$, $t(74) = 2.310$, $p = 0.027$] predict a strong relationship in the positive direction between four of the five *Inviting School Survey-Revised* (ISS-R) domains of school climate. Analysis of the leaders' demonstrated Emotional Self-Awareness [$\beta = -0.172$, $t(74) = -0.816$, $p = 0.420$] results identified a strong relationship in the negative direction between all five ISS-R dimensions of school climate. Implications suggest educational leaders seeking to improve school climate should develop and demonstrate emotional intelligence skills and tenets of Invitational Education theory.

Keywords: Leaders' Demonstrated Emotional Intelligence, Perceptions of School Climate, Invitational Education Theory, Inviting Schools Survey

Introduction

The school leader establishes the school's climate (Goleman, 2006b). To be dependably inviting, effective school leaders need to check for receipt and seek acknowledgement of their invitations for personal and professional development (Purkey & Siegel, 2013). How individuals perceive their school climate will set the foundation for their attitudes, behaviors and group norms (Loukas, 2007).

The quantitative study with a correlational design examined if and to what degree a certified teacher's rating of his or her school leader's demonstrated emotional intelligence behaviors correlated with the teacher's perceptions of that school's climate. The Genos 360 EI Assessment-Concise Rater (Palmer et al., 2009) was used to rate the school leader's demonstrated emotional intelligence behaviors. The *Inviting School Survey-Revised* (Smith, 2015) was used to measure the teacher's perceptions of school climate. Analysis of results explored the complexity of relationships between the seven demonstrated emotional intelligence sub-scales and the five domains of Invitational Education theory.

Significance of the Study

School leaders need to comprehend and understand the school's climate, requiring knowledge of how things are done and how students and teachers perceive these things (Marzano

& Waters, 2009). How the leader demonstrates emotional intelligence may directly influence teacher perceptions of school climate. A school leader contributes to a positive school climate by nourishing trusting and caring relationships and practicing empathetic social interactions. These are the behaviors exhibited by leaders with high emotional intelligence (Goleman, 2006a; McWilliam & Hatcher, 2007).

Invitational Education (IE) differs from other theories reviewed through the professional literature by encouraging stakeholders to examine the interdependent domains that impact school climate. These five domains, as assessed by the Inviting School Survey-Revised (ISS-R) are known as the 5-Ps: People, Places, Policies, Programs, and Processes (Schmidt, 2007; Smith, 2015). IE provides an overarching theoretical framework effective for a variety of educational approaches (Asbill & Gonzalez, 2000). IE theory advances five basic tenets: intentionality, care, optimism, respect, and trust [I-CORT] (Purkey & Novak, 2016) that optimize personally and professionally inviting behaviors.

Review of the Literature

Researchers and managers interested in how leadership behaviors influence other areas of the organization willingly examine the relationship between leadership behaviors and stakeholder perceptions of trustworthiness (Caldwell & Hayes, 2007). Key characteristics associated with most leadership theories include the ability to quickly assess situations, move accordingly for the benefit of the group, and to engender trust from followers (Burke, Sims, Lazzara, & Salas, 2007). Quickly assessing situations and moving accordingly for the benefit of the group is what Roach et al. (1999) called "wisdom in spontaneity" (p. 17). Emotional intelligence theorists call such abilities social awareness and relationship management (Bradberry & Greaves, 2009).

When a school leader effectively communicates a vision for success, models positive expectations, exhibits optimism, and utilizes inviting leadership practices, the teachers' behaviors become positively influenced (Asbill, 1994; Asbill & Gonzalez, 2000; Burns & Martin, 2010). Teachers' perception of respect and trust exhibited by the principal correlates with both teachers' and students' morale, commitment, and achievement (Ellis, 1988). The effectiveness of school leadership remains contingent upon teacher acceptance (Matthews & Brown, 1976).

People with high emotional intelligence are more likely to exhibit attributes perceived by others as positive (Bradberry & Greaves, 2009). A leader with high emotional intelligence optimizes the installation of trust (Bradberry & Greaves, 2009). Trustworthiness positively influences other areas, thereby increasing organizational success (Caldwell & Hayes, 2007). Leaders demonstrating emotional intelligence and those promoting the tenets of Invitational Education (IE) theory exhibit common competencies. Credibility, a synonym for trustworthiness, exhibited the most influence upon emotional intelligence (EI).

Research by Burns and Martin (2010) identified a statistically significant relationship between school climates that utilized Invitational Education practices and schools identified as effective. A meta-analysis of relevant research identified twenty-one school leadership practices that positively influence student achievement (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). These practices were also present in studies that investigated Invitational Education (IE) Theory and school climate (Asbill, 1994; Smith, 2015; Schmidt, 2007).

Educators trained to develop emotional intelligence as part of their leadership development can proactively utilize both their cognitive and metacognitive skills (Brackett & Katulak, 2007). These educators can then evoke their emotional intelligence competencies and positively influence followers' well-being as well as performance by modifying approaches to align with the given situation (Pashiardis, 2009). Emotional intelligence requires competency regarding one's own

emotions and the emotional needs of others to effectively address the complex social challenges arising within one's environment (Mumford, Zaccaro, Connelly, & Marks, 2000).

Emotional intelligence encompasses emotional, personal, and social abilities influential upon one's overall capability to effectively deal with environmental demands and pressures (McCallum & Piper, 2000). Furthermore, emotional intelligence is exhibited as the ability to adaptively recognize, express, regulate, and harness emotions (Schutte et al., 2001). Diverse cognitive or emotional intelligence skills vary by age, gender, and developmental level (Gardner, 1995). These skills influence one's level of competency or FLOW (Csikszentmihaly, 2013*).*

At least two perspectives are possible within the context of emotional intelligence: maximal emotional intelligence performance and typical emotional intelligence performance (Gignac, 2010). Typical performance is a more reliable indicator of actual behavior (Sackett et al., 1988). Gignac (2010) and Palmer et al. (2009) suggest emotional intelligence is purely relevant to the demonstration of emotional intelligence skills.

The Genos Emotional Intelligence inventories are not a mixed-model measure of emotional intelligence. In developing the Genos Emotional Intelligence inventories, the authors advanced the belief that a model of emotional intelligence should only include psychological attributes with direct relevance to the identification, utilization, and management of emotions (Gignac, 2010). Therefore, development of the Genos Emotional Intelligence inventories was based on an emotional intelligence model seeking to demonstrate emotional intelligence sub-skills across the following seven individual differences dimensions: Emotional Self-Awareness, Emotional Expression, Emotional Awareness of Others, Emotional Reasoning, Emotional Self-Management, Emotional Management of Others, and Emotional Self-Control.

School climate contributes to student achievement, success, and psychological well-being (Cohen, McCabe, Michelli, & Pickeral, 2009; Fan, Williams, & Corkin, 2011; Steyn, 2007; Zullig, Koopman, Patton, & Ubbes, 2010). School climate also influences positive youth development, effective risk prevention, and increased retention rates for teachers and students (Cohen et al., 2009; Huebner & Diener, 2008). School climate plays an important role in how stakeholders perceive the school (Curry, 2009). Since the evaluation of school climate reflects stakeholder perceptions of the social, emotional, and academic experiences of school life, stakeholders assessing the school's climate need to include students, administrators, teachers, parents, and support staff (Smith 2012).

The literature suggested leaders high in emotional intelligence may be more competent to influence, inspire, intellectually stimulate, and develop their staff to promote a culture of sustained educational success (George, 2000; Marzano, Waters and McNulty, 2005; Moore, 2009; Ross, 2000; Salovey and Mayer, 1990; Sanders, 2010; Wolff, Pescosolido, & Druskat, 2002). Inviting behaviors exhibited by the leader optimizes the school climate (Asbill, 1994; Purkey & Siegel, 2008; Schmidt, 2007; Smith, 2015). Leadership advancing Invitational Education (IE) theory encourages people to tap into their unlimited potential (Purkey & Siegel, 2013; Burns & Martin, 2010). Explicit invitations for personal and professional development need to be delivered and recognized as an opportunity (Purkey & Novak, 2016). Therefore, to be dependably inviting, school leaders need to have the skills to effectively convey and then check for receipt. Only then does acceptance become a possibility.

Methodology

Quantitative research involves counting and measuring, thereby allowing statistical analysis of numerical data (Smith, 1988). Quantitative methodology provided the best approach for identifying the relationship between this study's variables: a leader's demonstrated emotional

intelligence and a teacher's perception of school climate. For this quantitative research study, the inquiry addressed two questions and hypotheses:

> $R_{1:}$ Do the certified teachers' rating of their individual school leader's demonstrated emotional intelligence behaviors correlate with perceptions of school climate based on Invitational Education theory?
>
> $H_0$1: The certified teachers' rating of their individual school leader's demonstrated emotional intelligence behaviors do not correlate with perceptions of school climate based on Invitational Education theory.
>
> R_2: Based on teacher ratings, how does each of the seven dimensions of a school leader's typically demonstrated emotional intelligence behaviors positively or negatively change the teacher's perceptions of the school's climate based on Invitational Education theory?
>
> $H_0$2: Based on teacher ratings, there are no dimensions of a school leader's typically demonstrated emotional intelligence behaviors that positively or negatively change the teacher's perceptions of the school's climate based on Invitational Education theory.

Data was described numerically while analysis employed descriptive and inferential statistics, including correlation analysis, regression analysis, mean, mode, and median (VanderStroep & Johnson, 2010). This quantitative study investigated the relationships between variables. This study's methodology analyzed the magnitude of relationships found within the collected data to test stated hypotheses (Hopkins, 2008). The first research question investigated the relationship between variables. The second research question investigated whether the predictor (independent) variable: the seven observed emotional intelligence subscales of the Genos 360 EI Assessment (Concise) (Palmer et al., 2009) predicts the criterion (dependent) variable: the teacher's perception of school climate based on the five ISS-R Domains of Invitational Education theory known as: People, Places, Policies, Programs, and Processes (Smith, 2012).

Since a more objective look at data allows objective conclusions to be drawn, utilization of quantitative methodology for this study minimized the subjectivity of judgment (Kealey, Protheroe, MacDonald, & Vulpe, 2003). For this study, perceived school climate was rated based on the five domains explicated by Schmidt (2007) and Smith (2012) and assessed by the *Inviting School Survey-Revised (*ISS-R) (Smith, 2015). Given the school climate reflects a personal evaluation of the school (Cohen, 2006; Freiberg, 1999), school leaders seeking to analyze perceptions from the school community need reliable and valid instruments to measure school climate. As exhibited in appendix B, the *ISS-R* (Smith, 2015), is grounded in Invitational Education theory (Purkey & Novak, 2016) and provided a reliable and valid quantitative instrument to measure school climate. Results to the ISS-R addressed the study's criterion (dependent) variable whereby the responding teacher's interval-level perceptions of school climate were identified through a potential ordinal range of responses

The study's predictor (independent) variable investigated the certified teacher's rating of his or her school leader's demonstrated emotional intelligence behaviors in the workplace. Using the Genos 360 EI Assessment-Concise Rater (Palmer et al., 2009), the predictor (independent) variable provided a potential ordinal range of responses based on the certified teachers' ratings of his or her individual school leader's typically demonstrated emotional intelligence behaviors. Self-

rating of the participant's perceptions of school climate based on Invitational Education theory in relation to a third-party rating of the leaders' emotional intelligence created a unique concept for study.

A *Pearson* correlation tested the null hypothesis of the first research question. Given a relationship was found with the predictor variable, additional simple linear regression procedures then explored in-depth the responses specific to the seven subscales of the Genos 360 EI Assessment-Concise Rater (Palmer et al., 2009) and the five domains of the ISS-R (Smith 2012). The five domains of the ISS-R are known as the 5-Ps: People, Places, Policies, Programs, and Processes (Schmidt, 2007; Smith, 2015). The additional simple linear regression analyses of results demonstrated the degree to which dimensions of the predictor variable (leader's EI behaviors) positively or negatively predict the teacher's perceptions based on five domains of school's climate.

Limitations

Validated instruments such as the Genos 360 EI Assessment (Concise) (Palmer et al., 2009) and ISS-R (Smith, 2015) allowed for third-party rater and reporting of perceptions. Analysis of demonstrated emotional intelligence behaviors based on the seven subscales of the Genos 360 EI Assessment-Concise Rater (Palmer et al., 2009) provided a succinct investigation of the relationship between the demonstrated emotional intelligence subscales and the five dimensions of school climate based on IE theory. However, self-perceptions create limitations to any study. While self-report approaches are appropriate as measures of self-perceived EI, they often do not actually measure emotional intelligence ability (Mayer et al., 2004a). The evaluation of emotional intelligence with a self-report measure can create flawed results due to socially desirable responding (SDR), which is known as faking good (Downey et al., 2006). Using the Genos 360 EI Assessment-Concise Rater version mitigated problems caused by the utilization of an approach that may produce SDR. The Genos 360 EI Assessment-Concise Rater assesses typical emotional intelligence performance and requires study participants to complete a concise, third-person version of the Genos Emotional Intelligence Assessment (Palmer et al., 2009) to identify the leader's demonstrated emotional intelligence behaviors in the workplace.

Additionally, the quantitative design created limitations, including the correlational research design only allowed reporting of the relationships based on the given context. For instance, there may be greater optimism at the beginning of a school year compared to the end. While the Genos EI Assessment-Concise Rater version (Palmer et al., 2009) is a valid and reliable survey instrument, unfamiliarity with emotional intelligence, test anxiety, time of year when the survey was completed, time devoted to the survey completion, and fidelity in responding to the survey all created additional limitations. Limitations influence individual ratings and perceptions. Therefore, the overall analysis is potentially impacted. Limitations influence the ability to generalize results.

Population and Sample Selection

The target population comprised more than 200 teachers employed in over four dozen urban and suburban schools in the New York metropolitan area. A sample of 42 teachers completed the *Inviting School Survey-Revised and the Genos 360 EI Assessment-Concise Rater.* Utilizing a quantitative digital, Likert-Scale survey distributed through Qualtrics and three follow-up requests to participate, the post hoc power analysis indicated the 42 participant cases that comprised the sample achieved significant statistical results based on the *Pearson* correlation procedure.

Data Collection Procedures

As accessible through the digital Qualtrics system, the study required completion of a single, three-part, digital survey: The Genos 360 EI Assessment (Concise) (Palmer et al., 2009), the ISS-R (Smith, 2015) and a demographic profile. Utilization of a Likert scale provided interval data related to the level of agreement with behaviors described on each survey.

As found in appendix A, the first part of the single digital survey comprised the Genos 360 EI Assessment-Concise Rater (Palmer, et al., 2009). The Genos 360 EI Assessment-Concise Rater is a 31-item instrument designed to rate individual school leader's demonstrated emotional intelligence behaviors specific to the work environment. Participants were able to complete this version in fewer than 12 minutes.

As found in appendix B, the second part of the single digital survey comprised the 50-item *Inviting School Survey-Revised* (Smith, 2005). The instrument measured the participant's perception of school climate based on Invitational Education theory and practice. Therefore, this part of the digital survey provided data responsive to the criterion (dependent) variable. Participants were able to complete this part in fewer than 15 minutes.

The confidentiality and anonymity of each voluntary participant within the target population was fully protected. Only a data file of responses was provided to the researcher. While informed consent was detailed in the email that provided the link to the survey, implied informed consent to participate in the study was based on voluntary completion of the digital survey accessed through the Qualtrics system. When participants completed the survey through the digital survey accessed through Qualtrics, data became available for analysis.

Data Analysis Procedures

At the conclusion of the data collection period, the digital survey was initially saved as an Excel spreadsheet. The data was then uploaded the Statistic Program for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software (Norusis, 2011). Preparation followed a logical order for cleaning and processing the data. Analytical procedures included descriptive analysis, testing of assumptions, tests for normalcy, *Pearson* ***r*** analysis, and simple linear regression analyses.

Given satisfaction of all four test of assumptions, a *Pearson* correlation was conducted to determine the relationship between the variables. The observed relationship between the predictor variable and the criterion variable rejected the null hypothesis for the first research question. Simple linear regression analyses then tested the degree to which dimensions of the predictor (independent) variable positively or negatively change the teacher's perception of the overall school's climate. This procedure rejected the null hypothesis of the second question.

Results

Given satisfaction of the tests of assumptions, *Pearson r* analysis was apropos for testing the null hypothesis of research question one, which examined the relationship between two variables. The *Pearson r* analysis revealed a moderately strong relationship in a positive direction (.564) between the leaders' demonstrated emotional intelligence behaviors and the teacher participant's perception of school climate. *Pearson r* analysis results rejected the null hypothesis of the first research question.

Given a positive linear relationship between the variables, the data were submitted to simple linear regression analysis. Simple linear regression procedures then investigated the leaders' demonstrated emotional intelligence behaviors (predictor/independent) variable based on

the seven subscales of the Genos 360 EI Assessment-Concise Rater. These seven subscales include: Emotional Self-Awareness (ESA), Emotional Expression (EE), Emotional Awareness of Others (EAO), Emotional Reasoning (ER), Emotional Self-Management (ESM), Emotional Management of Others (EMO), and Emotional Self-Control (ESC) (Palmer et al., 2009). To test the null hypothesis of the second research question, seven simple linear regression procedures were utilized to analyze the results of the teacher's perception of the school climate based on the overall ISS-R scale. Results of the initial seven simple linear regression procedures rejected the null hypothesis of the second research question, thereby accepting the alternate.

Thirty-five additional simple linear regression procedures then identified the degree to which the seven dimensions of the leader's typically demonstrated emotional intelligence behaviors predicted the teachers' perceptions of the five measures of school climate. The additional simple linear regression analyses provided further information about the predictability of the relationship by analyzing the relationship between the leader's typically demonstrated emotional intelligence behaviors represented by the seven dimensions of the Genos 360 EI Assessment-Concise Rater instrument and the five domains of school climate represented by the Inviting School Survey-Revised instrument.

As noted below in Table 1, the *Pearson r* is .564. This demonstrates the strength and direction of the relationship as moderately strong in a positive direction. The strength and direction of the relationship suggest that as the teachers' rating of the leader's demonstrated emotional intelligence behaviors increase, so do their positive perceptions of school climate. Likewise, as their rating of the leader's demonstrated emotional intelligence behaviors decrease, so would the teachers' positive perceptions of school climate. The *Sig*. value in this analysis is 0.00 (See Table 1). Since the value is less than .05 there is arguably a statistically significant correlation between the two variables.

Table 1

Correlation Statistics for Dependent and Predictor Variables: Perceptions of School Climate and Leaders' Demonstrated Emotional Intelligence

		Mean_GenosEI_Overall_ recode	Mean_ISSR_Overall
Mean_GenosEI_Overall_ recode	Pearson Correlation	1	.564**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	42	42
Mean_ISSR_Overall	Pearson Correlation	.564**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	42	42

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression analysis procedures measured how well the overall model fits. Specifically, how well the predictor: the leader's demonstrated EI behaviors based on the Genos instrument scores, predict the teacher's perception of school climate based on the ISS-R scores. As noted in Table 1 above, a *Pearson r* of .564 indicates the strength and direction of the relationship as being moderately strong in a positive direction. Table 2 below, identifies the *R* as .693[a] and the *R square* as .480, which shows a strong positive relationship between the group of predictors and the outcome variable (R). The results of the analysis suggest that as a collective, the leader's

demonstrated EI can predict about 48% of the variance in the teacher's perception of school climate.

Table 2
Model Summary for Dependent Variable: Perceptions of School Climate and Predictors Dimensions of Leaders' Demonstrated Emotional Intelligence

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.693[a]	.480	.372	.465

a. Predictors: (Constant), Mean_ESC, Mean_ESA, Mean_ER, Mean_EE, Mean_EMO, Mean_ESM, Mean_EAO

Table 3 below details the results of the linear regression procedures designed to test the null hypothesis for research question two. In relation to overall ISS-R responses, the *Coefficients*[a], for four of the seven Genos EI subscales indicated a relationship in the positive direction. As a result of linear regression analysis procedures, for four of the seven EI subscales it can be concluded that an increase within the five-point scale of the leader's exhibited dimension of EI, results in an increase within the mean of the teacher's perception of overall school climate. Most significantly, as noted in Table 3, a point increase within the five-point scale of the leader's exhibited Emotional Management of Others (EMO) results in an increase of .329 within the mean of the teacher's perception of overall school climate. A point increase within the five-point scale of the leader's exhibited Emotional Self-Control (ESC) results in an increase of .317 within the mean of the teacher's perception of overall school climate.

Table 3
Regression Analysis for Dependent and Predictor Variables Testing Null Hypothesis 2

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	1.377	.274		5.019	.000
Mean_ESA	-.128	.156	-.172	-.816	.420
Mean_EE	.130	.143	.189	.909	.370
Mean_EAO	-.063	.162	-.105	-.388	.700
Mean_ER	.071	.117	.122	.608	.547
Mean_ESM	-.221	.155	-.333	-1.421	.165
Mean_EMO	.329	.143	.494	2.310	.027
Mean_ESC	.317	.157	.486	2.016	.052

According to the coefficients in Table 3 above, by absolute value, regardless of the positive or negative sign of the beta value, Emotional Management of Others (EMO) (.494) and Emotional Self-Control (ESC) (.486) appears to be the most important predictors for school climate. By contrast, Emotional Awareness of Others (EAO) (-.105) appears to be the weakest predictor for positive school climate. Based on the *Sig.* value shown in Table 3, of the seven potential

predictors, EMO and ESC were found to be significant predictors for positive school climate. Thus, the null hypothesis for the second research question was rejected; thereby accepting the alternate that dimensions of the school leader's typically demonstrated emotional intelligence behaviors either positively or negatively change the teacher's perceptions of overall school climate.

Analysis of the Emotional Management of Others (EMO) results predicts a strong relationship in the positive between the People, Places, Policies, and Programs, domains of the ISS-R. Analysis of the Emotional Self-Control (ESC) results predicts a strong relationship in the positive direction between the Places, Policies, Programs, and Processes, domains of the ISS-R. By contrast, analysis of the Emotional Awareness of Others (EAO) results predicts a mild to strong relationship in the negative direction between the Places, Policies, and Processes, domains of the ISS-R.

Emotional Management of Others (EMO) measures the relative frequency whereby an individual successfully manages the emotions of others at work, motivates colleagues or followers. EMO also models the modification of the emotions of others for their own personal betterment at work. These behaviors create a positive working environment for others as well as helping individuals resolve distressful issues.

Emotional Self-Control (ESC) measures the relative frequency whereby an individual appropriately controls her strong emotions in the workplace. ESC addresses demonstrated maintenance of focus or concentration upon the task-at-hand, despite emotional adversity. Emotional Self-Control is more reactive compared to Emotional Self-Management.

Implications for future practice

Related to climate, perceptions of a place contribute to a school's success or failure. Burns and Martin (2010) concluded that observers almost immediately notice the personality of a place, differentiating between a sterile, empty, and lifeless environment compared to a place seen as warm, exciting, and personable based on the people inhabiting the space. Purkey and Novak (2016) concluded the place element was the most visible factor within a school's climate. As the physical environment of an organization, places are the easiest element of the framework to change because of its visibility (Hobday-North & Smith, 2014). Given this, the leaders' demonstrated emotional self-control and emotional management of others are extremely influential upon a school's climate.

The Emotional Management of Others and one's Emotional Self-Control predict positive teacher perceptions of the place domain within a school's climate. Implementation of IE theory contributes to the growth of trust and social capital by the way in which leaders promote a climate of caring and support for the efforts of others (Purkey & Siegel, 2013). Effective leaders must seek to produce a collective, energized, collaborative commitment to the organization's clear mission, shared vision, and non-negotiable values (Marzano & Waters, 2009). Effective leaders seek to find a balance between motivating their stakeholders and minimizing negative emotions. While self-destructive schools gravitate toward fear and stress, schools making a positive difference consistently exhibit love, courage, and hope (Reason, 2010). Therefore, the leader developing an effective school climate exhibits an ability to understand and address the range of emotions exhibited by stakeholders.

While results of this investigation should influence the explicit curriculum of educational leadership programs, a top-down approach to school leadership is not the only opportunity for optimizing human potential and school climate. IE advocates and practitioners need to encourage teacher preparation programs and local educational agencies to explicitly develop the emotional

intelligence of prospective instructional leaders, thereby promoting an inclusive approach for optimizing human potential and school climate. Advocates also need to collaborate with organizations that promote IE tenets and practices. For instance, Educators for Excellence (E4E) is a teacher-led organization that ensures teachers have a leading voice in the policies that impact their students and profession. E4E advocates note that while systemic policymakers talk *about* teachers, they rarely talk *with* teachers. There should be consensus that E4E's Theory of Change, which is grounded in two linked, long-term goals: better outcomes for students and the elevation of the quality and prestige of the teaching profession, would benefit from synthesis with emotional intelligence skill development and implementation of IE tenets and practice.

Invitational Education theory seeks to promote trust, collaboration, and purposeful inclusion (Purkey & Novak, 2016; Purkey & Siegel, 2013). However, if "People cannot accept invitations they have never received" (Purkey & Novak, 1996, p.75), how does a teacher's level of emotional intelligence influence her ability to perceive an intentional invitation as an opportunity? Using Invitational Education theory to curriculum map teacher preparation and educational leadership program's curriculum would help institutionalize the need for people within an institution to collectively demonstrate Emotional Self-Control and Emotional Management of Others to create a better place for teaching, learning, and leading.

There are three needs for optimal emotional intelligence development among prospective teachers (Rojas, 2012):

1. Development of emotional intelligence beginning with a commitment to change.
2. Application of emotional intelligence learning within environments favorable to emotional intelligence development.
3. Pursuit of an ideal allowing interdependent application of all other emotional intelligence competencies.

Through explicit development of emotional intelligence skills and utilization of Invitational Education tenets, ongoing professional development will promote optimal school climate and thereby advance the learning for all mission. Intentionally advancing the competencies that increase the conveyance and receipt of personal and professional development opportunities could optimize school climate for all stakeholders (Purkey & Novak, 2016). Invitations for personal and professional development need to be explicitly intentional and recognized by the recipient as an opportunity (Purkey & Novak, 2016). Explicit course work in both emotional intelligence behaviors within the workplace and development of school climate based on Invitational Education theory could benefit teacher preparation as well as educational leadership programs.

References

Asbill, K. (1994*). Invitational leadership: Teacher perceptions of inviting principal practices.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, School of Educational Management, New Mexico State University.

Asbill, K., & Gonzalez, M. L. (2000). Invitational leadership: Teacher perceptions of inviting Principal practices. *Journal of Invitational Theory and Practice*, *7*(1), 16-27. Retrieved from: http://www.invitationaleducation.net/pdfs/journalarchives/jitpv7n1.pdf

Brackett, M. A., & Katulak, N. A. (2007). Emotional intelligence in the classroom: Skill-based training for teachers and students. In J. Ciarrochi & J. D. Mayer (Eds.), *Applying emotional intelligence: A practitioner's guide*, 1-27. New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Bradberry, T. R, & Greaves, J., (2009) *Emotional intelligence 2.0.* San Diego, CA. TalentSmart. ISBN: 1441842233

Burke, C. S., Sims, D. E., Lazzara, E. H., & Salas, E. (2007). Trust in leadership: A multi-level review and integration. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(6), 606–632. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.09.006

Burns, G. J., & Martin, B. N. (2010). Examination of the effectiveness of male and female educational leaders who made use of the invitational leadership style of leadership. *Journal of Invitational Theory and Practice*, *16*, 30-56. Retrieved from: http://www.invitationaleducation.net/pdfs/journalarchives/jitpv162010.pdf

Caldwell, C., & Hayes, L. A. (2007). Leadership, trustworthiness, and the mediating lens. *Journal of Management Development, 26*(3), 261–281. doi:10.1108/02621710710732155

Cohen, J., McCabe, E., Michelli, N., & Pickeral, T. (2009). School climate: Research, policy, practice, and teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, *111*(1), 180-213. Retrieved from: http://www.schoolclimate.org/climate/documents/policy/School-Climate-Paper-TC-Record.pdf

Cooper, R. & Sawaf, A. (1997). *Executive EQ: how to develop the four cornerstones of emotional intelligence for success in life and work*. New York: Pedigree Books ISBN 978-0752807447

Csikszentmihaly, M. (2013). Creativity: The psychology of discovery and invention *(Reprint edition.). New York: Harper Perennial.* ISBN 9780062283252.

Curry, C. C. (2009). *Correlation of emotional intelligence of school leaders to perceptions of school climate as perceived by teachers.* (Order No. 3387434, Indiana University of Pennsylvania). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, , 257. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/305061864?accountid=7374. (305061864).

Downey, L. A., Godfrey, J.-L., Hansen, K., & Stough, C. (2006). The impact of social desirability and expectation of feedback on emotional intelligence in the workplace. *E-Journal of Applied Psychology*, *2*(2). doi:10.7790/ejap.v2i2.68

Educators for Excellence (2019) *Our purpose* Retrieved from: https://e4e.org/about-us/our-purpose

Ellis, T. (1988). School climate. *Research Roundup, 4* (2), 1. Retrieved from: http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED291154.pdf

Fan, W., Williams, C., & Corkin, D. (2011). A multilevel analysis of student perceptions of school climate: The effect of social and academic risk factors. *Psychology in the schools*, *48*(6), 632-647. doi.org/10.1002/pits.20579

Freiberg, H.J. (1999). *School climate: Measuring, improving, and sustaining healthy learning environments*. London: Falmer Press. doi.org/10.4324/9780203983980

Gardner, H. (1995). Reflections on multiple intelligences: Myths and messages. *Phi Delta Kappan. 4.* 200- 209. Retrieved from: https://learnweb.harvard.edu/WIDE/courses/files/Reflections.pdf

George, J. M. (2000). Emotions and leadership: The role of emotional leadership. *Human Relations, 53* (8), 1027-1055 doi.org/10.1177/0018726700538001

Gignac, G. E. (2010). Seven-Factor model of emotional intelligence as measured by Genos EI: A confirmatory factor analytic investigation based on self- and rater-report data. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment,* 26(4), 309-316 doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000041

Goleman, D. (2006b). The socially intelligent leader. *Educational Leadership*, *64*(1), 76–81. Retrieved from: http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/sept06/vol64/num01/toc.aspx

Hobday-North, S., & Smith, K. (2014). Improving School Climate: The Essential Role of "Place" in Invitational Theory and Practice. Learn Teach, 7(2), 23–32. doi:10.7459/lt/7.2.03

IBM SPSS Statistics 19 Made Simple (2011). doi:10.4324/9780203723524

Kealey, D. J., Protheroe, D. R., Macdonald, D., & Vulpe, T. (2003). Instituting a competency-based training design and evaluation system. *Performance Improvement 42(*5), 28–33. doi:10.1002/pfi.4930420507

Loukas, A. (2007). What is school climate? *Leadership Compass*, *5*(1). Retrieved from: https://www.naesp.org/resources/2/Leadership_Compass/2007/LC2007v5n1a4.pdf

Marzano, R. & Waters, T. (2009). *District leadership that works.* Bloomington, In: Solution Tree Press

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Retrieved from: http://marzanoresearch.com/products/catalog.aspx?product=13

Matthews, K. M., & Brown, C. L. (1976). The principal's influence on student achievement. *NASSP Bulletin, 67,* 11. doi.org/10.1177/019263657606040201

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso D. R. (2004a). Emotional intelligence: theory findings and implications. *Psychological Inquiry, 15 (3),* 197-215. doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli1503_02

McCallum, M., & Piper, W. (2000). Psychological mindedness and emotional intelligence. In R.Bar-On & J. Parker (Ed.), *The Handbook of Emotional Intelligence: Theory, Development, Assessment, and Application at Home, School, and in the Workplace* (pp. 118-135). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. ISBN: 0-7879-4984-1

McWilliam, E., & Hatcher, C. (2007). Killing me softly: the 'making up' of the educational leader. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 10*(3), 233-246. doi.org/10.1080/13603120701303489

Moore, B. (2009). Emotional intelligence for school administrators: A priority for school reform? *American Secondary Education, 37*(3), 20-28. Retrieved from http://www.eiconsortium.org/members/moore.htm

Mumford, M. D., Zaccaro, S. J., Connelly, M. S., & Marks, M. A. (2000). Leadership skills. *The Leadership Quarterly, 11*(1), 155–170. doi:10.1016/s1048-9843(99)00047-8

Norusis, M. (2011). *IBM SPSS statistics 19 guide to data analysis* (1st ed). New York, NY: Pearson Education. ISBN: 0321748417

Novak, J.M. (Ed.) (1992). *Advancing invitational thinking*. San Francisco: Caddo Gap Press. Retrieved from: http://bookdir.info/?p=844445

Novak, J.M. (2009). Invitational Leadership. *The Essentials of School Leadership,* 53–73. doi:10.4135/9781446288290.n4

Palmer, B. R., Stough, C., Harmer, R., & Gignac, G. E. (2009). The Genos Emotional Intelligence Inventory: A measure designed specifically for the workplace. In C. Stough, D. Saklofske, & J. Parker (Ed.), *Assessing emotional intelligence: Theory, research & applications* (pp. 103-118). New York: Springer. doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-88370-0_6

Pashiardis, P., (2009).Educational leadership and management: Blending Greek philosophy, myth and current thinking', *International Journal of Leadership in Education,* 12 (1), 1-12. doi.org/10.1080/13603120802357269

Purkey, W. W., & Novak, J. M. (1996). *Inviting school success: A self-concept approach to teaching, learning, and democratic practice* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company. Retrieved from: http://invitationaleducation.net/featuredbooks.html

Purkey, W. W., & Novak, J. M. (2016). *Fundamentals of invitational education*. (2nd Ed) International Alliance for Invitational Education. Retrieved from: http://invitationaleducation.net/product/category/books

Purkey, W. W., Schmidt, J. J., & Novak, J. M. (2010). *From conflict to conciliation: How to defuse difficult situations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press. ISBN: 9787452212104

Purkey, W. W., & Siegel, B. L. (2013). *Becoming an invitational leader: A new approach to professional and personal success*. Atlanta, GA: Humanics. Retrieved from: http://invitationaleducation.net/featuredbooks.html

Roach, A. A., Wyman, L. T., Brookes, H., Chavez, C., Heath, S. B., & Valdes, G. (1999). Leadership giftedness: Models revisited. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 43(1*), 13–24. doi:10.1177/001698629904300103

Rojas, M. (2012). *The missing link: Emotional intelligence in teacher preparation.* (Order No. 3495309, Arizona State University). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses,* 220. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/ (923616326).

Ross. M.R. (2000) *An assessment of the professional development needs of middle school principals around social and emotional learning issues in schools*. Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (9958665)

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, 9 (3), 185-211. doi.org/10.2190/dugg-p24e-52wk-6cdg

Sanders, S.C. (2010) Emotional intelligence, a necessary component of educational leadership programs, as perceived by professors of educational leadership (Doctoral Dissertation).

Schmidt, J. J. (2007). Elements of diversity in invitational practice and research. *Journal of Invitational Theory & Practice, 13*, 16-23. Retrieved from: http://www.invitationaleducation.net/pdfs/journalarchives/jitpv13.pdf

Schutte, N.S., Malouff, J.M., Bobik, C., Coston, T.D., Greeson, C., Jedlicka, C., et al. (2001). Emotional intelligence and interpersonal relations. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 141(4), 523-536. doi.org/10.1080/00224540109600569

Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D. J., Cooper, J. T., Golden, C. J., et al. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 25 (2),* 167–177. doi.org/10.1016/s0191-8869(98)00001-4

Smith, K. H. (2005). The inviting school survey-revised (ISS-R): A survey for measuring the invitational qualities (I.Q.) of the total school climate. *Journal of Invitational Theory & Practice, 11,* 35-53. Retrieved from: http://www.invitationaleducation.net/pdfs/journalarchives/jitpv11.pdf

Smith, K. H. (2012). The History and Development of the Inviting School Survey: 1995-2012. *Journal of Invitational Theory & Practice, 18,* 57-64. Retrieved from: http://www.invitationaleducation.net/pdfs/journalarchives/jitpv182011.pdf

Smith, K. H. (2015). Inviting School Survey-Revised--Traditional Chinese Version. PsycTESTS Dataset. doi:10.1037/t15393-000

Steyn, T. (2007). Adhering to the assumptions of Invitational Education: A case study. *South African Journal of Education, 27(2),* 265-281. Retrieved from: http://www.ajol.info/index.php/saje/article/viewFile/44144/27659

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). *Digest of education statistics, 2013.* NCES 2015-011. Retrieved from: http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=28

VanderStroep, S.W & Johnson, D.D. (2010). *Research methods for everyday life: Blending qualitative and quantitative approaches.* New York: John Wiley & Sons

Wolff, S.B., Pescosolido, A.T., & Druskat, V. (2002). Emotional intelligence as the basis of leadership emergence in self-managing teams. *The Leadership Quarterly, 13*(5), 505-522.

Zullig, K.J., Koopman, T., Patton, J., & Ubbes, V. (2010). School climate: Historical review, instrument development, & school assessment. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 28(2),* 139-152. doi.org/10.1177/0734282909344205

To contact the author:

Chris James Anderson, Ed.D.
ucan@rcn.com

Appendix A: The Genos 360 EI Assessment (Concise) Instructions

The Genos 360 EI Assessment (Concise) has been designed to measure how often you observe your school's principal or director demonstrating emotionally intelligent behaviors. There are no right or wrong answers to the questions. However, it is essential that your responses truly reflect the extent to which you believe the person you are rating typically demonstrates the behavior in question. If unsure, provide the answer that best describes how you generally feel.

Example:
Q. My school's principal displays appropriate emotional responses in difficult situations.

You are required to indicate on the response scale the extent to which you believe the person you are rating typically demonstrates the behavior in question. There are five possible responses to each question (shown below). You are required to select the response/number that corresponds to your answer:
1 = Almost Never
2 = Seldom
3 = Sometimes
4 = Usually
5 = Almost Always

When considering a response, it is important not to think of the way the individual you are rating behaved in any one situation. Rather your responses should be based on the person's typical behavior observed over the last 6 months. If you are not sure, choose a response that feels most likely. Some of the statements may not give all the information you would like to receive. In this case, please choose a response that seems most likely. There is no time limit, however, this section usually takes between 5-7 minutes to complete.

Statements	1 = Almost Never/2 = Seldom/3 = Sometimes/4 = Usually/5 = Almost Always
My school's principal:	
1. Demonstrates to others that s/he has considered their feelings in decisions s/he makes at work.	1 2 3 4 5
2. Fails to recognize how his/her feelings drive his/her behavior at work.	1 2 3 4 5
3. Responds to events that frustrate him/her appropriately.	1 2 3 4 5
4. Finds it difficult to identify his/her feelings on issues at work.	1 2 3 4 5
5. Expresses how s/he feels to the wrong people at work.	1 2 3 4 5
6. Fails to handle stressful situations at work effectively.	1 2 3 4 5
7. When someone upsets him/her at work, s/he expresses his/her feelings effectively.	1 2 3 4 5
8. Considers the way others may react to decisions when communicating those decisions.	1 2 3 4 5
9. When s/he gets frustrated with something at work, s/he discusses his/her frustration appropriately.	1 2 3 4 5
10. When s/he is under stress, s/he becomes impulsive.	1 2 3 4 5

Statements 1 = Almost Never/2 = Seldom/3 = Sometimes/4 = Usually/5 = Almost Always

My school's principal:

11. Fails to identify the way people respond to him/her when building rapport.	1 2 3 4 5
12. Understands the things that make people feel optimistic at work.	1 2 3 4 5
13. Takes criticism from colleagues personally.	1 2 3 4 5
14. Is effective at helping others feel positive at work.	1 2 3 4 5
15. Communicates decisions at work in a way that captures others' attention.	1 2 3 4 5
16. Gains stakeholders' commitment to decisions s/he makes at work.	1 2 3 4 5
17. Appropriately communicates decisions to stakeholders.	1 2 3 4 5
18. Expresses how s/he feels at the appropriate time at work.	1 2 3 4 5
19. Understands what makes people feel valued at work.	1 2 3 4 5
20. Effectively deals with things that annoy him/her at work.	1 2 3 4 5

Statements 1 = Almost Never/2 = Seldom/3 = Sometimes/4 = Usually/5 = Almost Always

My school's principal:

21. Appropriately responds to colleagues who frustrate him/her at work.	1 2 3 4 5
22. Finds it difficult to identify the things that motivates people at work.	1 2 3 4 5
23. Fails to keep calm during difficult situations at work.	1 2 3 4 5
24. Is aware of his/her mood state at work.	1 2 3 4 5
25. Helps people deal with issues that cause them frustration at work.	1 2 3 4 5
26. Remains focused when anxious about something at work.	1 2 3 4 5
27. Fails to resolve emotional situations at work effectively.	1 2 3 4 5
28. Is aware of how his/her feelings influence the decisions s/he makes at work.	1 2 3 4 5
29. Has trouble finding the right words to express how s/he feels at work.	1 2 3 4 5
30. When upset at work, s/he still thinks clearly.	1 2 3 4 5
31. Does not know what to do or say when colleagues get upset at work.	1 2 3 4 5

Appendix B: Inviting School Survey – Revised (ISS-R)

DIRECTIONS

Following are a series of 50 statements concerning **YOUR SCHOOL**.
Please use the five-point response scale and select how much you agree or disagree for each item.

SA=*Strongly Agree* A=*Agree* U=*Undecided* D=*Disagree* SD=*Strongly Disagree*
Select 'N/A' only if the question does not apply to your school

Statements	SA	A	U	D	SD	N/A
1. Student discipline is approached from a positive standpoint.						
2. Everyone is encouraged to participate in athletic (sports) programs.						
3. The principal involves everyone in the decision-making process.						
4. Furniture is pleasant and comfortable.						
5. Teachers are willing to help students who have special problems.						
6. Teachers in this school show respect for students.						
7. Grades are assigned by means of fair and comprehensive assessment of work and effort.						
8. The air smells fresh in this school.						
9. Teachers are easy to talk with.						
10. There is a wellness (health) program in this school.						
11. Students have the opportunity to talk to one another during class activities.						
12. Teachers take time to talk with students about students' out-of-class activities.						
13. The school grounds are clean and well-maintained.						
14. All telephone calls to this school are answered promptly and politely.						
15. Teachers are generally prepared for class.						
16. The restrooms in this school are clean and properly maintained.						
17. School programs involve out of school experience.						
18. Teachers exhibit a sense of humor.						
19. School policy encourages freedom of expression by everyone.						
20. The principal's office is attractive.						
21. People in this school are polite to one another.						
22. Everyone arrives on time for school.						
23. Good health practices are encouraged in this school.						
24. Teachers work to encourage students' self-confidence.						
25. Bulletin boards are attractive and up-to-date.						

Statements	SA	A	U	D	SD	N/A
26. The messages and notes sent home are positive.						
27. The principal treats people as though they are responsible.						
28. Space is available for student independent study.						
29. People often feel welcome when they enter the school.						
30. Students work cooperatively with each other.						
31. Interruptions to classroom academic activities are kept to a minimum.						
32. Fire alarm instructions are well posted and seem reasonable.						
33. People in this school want to be here.						
34. A high percentage of students pass in this school.						
35. Many people in this school are involved in making decisions.						
36. People in this school try to stop vandalism when they see it happening.						
37. Classrooms offer a variety of furniture arrangements.						
38. The school sponsors extracurricular activities apart from sports.						
39. Teachers appear to enjoy life.						
40. Clocks and water fountains are in good repair.						
41. School buses wait for late students.						
42. School pride is evident among students.						
43. Daily attendance by students and staff is high.						
44. There are comfortable chairs for visitors.						
45. Teachers share out-of-class experiences with students.						
46. Mini courses are available to students.						
47. The grading practices in this school are fair.						
48. Teachers spend time after school with those who need extra help.						
49. The lighting in this school is more than adequate.						
50. Classes get started quickly.						

JITP Guidelines for Author Submissions

The Journal for Invitational Theory and Practice (JITP) (ISSN-1060-6041) publishes once a year and promotes the tenets of invitational theory and practice, self-concept theory, and perceptual psychology. First published in 1992, the JITP is currently indexed in the ERIC and EBSCO databases.

The JITP seeks to publish articles under two priorities: research and practice. First, manuscripts are encouraged that report research that examines and expands the theory and practice of invitational learning and development, investigates the efficacy of invitational practices, relates invitational theory to other theories of human development and behavior, or focuses on theories that are compatible with invitational theory and practice. Second, manuscripts will be considered that are more focused on the practice of invitational theory. These articles are less data-oriented and could describe authors' attempts to apply invitational theory to a variety of settings or activities related to invitational theory. The editorial board will also consider book reviews of professional books related to invitational or other related theories.

The JITP accepts articles for submission year-round. However, the ideal submission deadline for each issue is October 1st. The Journal uses a blind peer review of articles with final publication decisions made by the editor. Upon publication, authors will receive an electronic copy of the JITP. Manuscripts submitted to or under consideration for publication by other journals are not accepted. Authors must follow specific guidelines when submitting manuscripts for publication consideration:

1. Prepare manuscripts in APA style. Refer to the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 6th Edition (2010).
2. Submit manuscripts as email attachments to: JITPeditor@invitationaleducation.net
    a. All submissions will be acknowledged by return email to the originating email address.
    b. Questions about submissions should be emailed to the editor, Chris James Anderson: JITPeditor@invitationaleducation.net; ucan@rcn.com
3. Include your home and business phone numbers.
    a. This will allow the editor to quickly contact you if necessary.
4. Create all manuscripts as Microsoft Word® documents.
    a. Please remove embedded comments, tracked changes, and hidden personal data in the file.
5. Submit two copies of the manuscript – one with your identifying information and one without your identifying information
    a. The anonymous copy is sent for blind review.
6. Limit manuscripts to less than 10,000 words, double spaced (including references and quotations)
    a. Use Times New Roman, 12-point font, with one-inch margins on each side, top, and bottom.
7. Format (APA, 2010) the cover page with the author's or authors' names, institutional affiliation(s), and title of the manuscript.
8. On the second page, include the title and an abstract of 150 - 250 words.

9. For the blind copy, do not include authors' names on this or subsequent pages. The author(s)' name(s) should not appear anywhere in the blind copy of the manuscript.
    a. If the author(s)' own research is used, insert the word Author for all within manuscript citations and all References. For the Reference Page, include only Author (year) for each citation – do not include the name of the article/book, etc.
10. Include tables: created with MS Word table function only, and figures sparingly. These must be formatted per APA (2010) style.
    a. All tables and figures should be placed (embedded) within the document.
    b. Any artwork and diagrams should be included as separate digital graphic files, .tif, .gif, or .jpg.
11. Quotations must follow APA (2010) style.
    a. Lengthy quotations require written permission from the copyright holder for reproduction.
    b. Authors are responsible for obtaining permissions and providing documentation of permission to the JITP editor.
12. Reviews of manuscripts typically take approximately eight weeks.
    a. Manuscripts are reviewed by two members of the Editorial Review Board
    b. Manuscripts are rubric-scored.
    c. Patience is appreciated but author(s) can contact the JITP editor at any time for a status report.
13. Notification regarding publication will presented to the author(s) from the editor.
    a. If the manuscript is accepted, details about the issue for publication will be conveyed at that time.
14. For accepted manuscripts requiring revisions, the author(s) MUST use the Review>Track Changes function within MS Word.
15. Members can access previous JITP publications at: https://www.invitationaleducation.org/jitp-publications/