International Journal of Educational Research and Development
www.journalofeducation.in
Online ISSN: 2664-7095; Print ISSN: 2664-7087
Received: 05-08-2019; Accepted: 07-09-2019; Published: 14-09-2019
Volume 1; Issue 4; 2019; Page No. 29-36

Emotional intelligence and locus of control as predictors of teachers' instructional leadership model in public secondary schools in Enugu state

Idoko Eberechukwu Joy Obetta[1], Shaibu Leonard[2], Ogechi Nnamani[3]
[1-3] Ph. D, Department of Educational Foundations, Kogi State University, Anyigba, Nigeria

Abstract
The study determined emotional intelligence and locus of control as predictors of teachers' instructional leadership models in public secondary schools in Enugu State, Nigeria. Two research questions were answered while two null hypotheses were tested at $p \leq 0.05$ level of probability. The design was a correlation design. The population of the study is 4,516 teachers consisting of 1,407 males and 3,109 females in the public junior secondary schools in Enugu State. The sample for the study was 903. Proportionate stratified random sampling technique was used for the study. Three instruments: Teachers' Instructional Leadership Rating Scale (TILRS), Teachers' Emotional Intelligence Rating Scale (TEIRS) and Teachers' Locus of Control Rating Scale (TLCRS) were developed and used for the study. The TILRS, TEIRS and TLCRS were face validated by three specialists in the field of study. Cronbach Alpha method was used to determine the internal consistency reliability of the items which yielded a reliability estimate of 0.81, 0.83 and 0.79 respectively. Mean and standard deviation were used to answer research question one, whereas Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson r) was used to answer the research questions two. Linear and multiple regressions analysis and t-test statistic were used to test the hypotheses at 0.05 level of probability. Results indicated that emotional intelligence significantly predicted teachers' instructional leadership models and Locus of control significantly predicted teachers' instructional leadership models. It was recommended that school administrators should organize workshops or seminars for teachers on the relationship among emotional intelligence, locus of control and teachers' instructional leadership models.

Keywords: emotional intelligence, locus of control, teachers, instructional model

Introduction

Emotional intelligence is individuals' ability to understand and regulate their own emotional responses as well as adapt and respond to others (Mayer, 2002) [26]. Salovey (2002) [37] perceived emotional intelligence more specifically as the ability to perceive emotions, to access knowledge and to reflectively regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth. The most recent definition that attempts to cover the whole construct of emotional intelligence describes it as the ability, skill or potential to feel, use, communicate, recognize, remember, describe, identify, learn from, manage, understand and explain emotions (Hein, 2007). Emotional intelligence addresses the emotional, personal, social and survival needs important for daily functioning. It is concerned with understanding oneself and others, relating to people and adapting to and coping with the immediate surroundings to be more successful in dealing with environmental demands (Shook, 2004) [39]. According to Bass (2005) [4] emotional intelligence is tactical. It helps to predict success because it reflects how an individual applies knowledge to the immediate situation. It governs a person's use and control of coping strategies with certain situation.

In the submission of Mayer and Salovey (1995) [27] emotional intelligence has emerged as a salient concept for describing a person's ability to manage intrapersonal as well as interpersonal processes. Exterma (2005) observed that emotional intelligence is a significant predictor of individual's social and personal functioning. Exterma further said that emotional intelligence pertains to emotional and social competencies of students that involve the ability to monitor one's own and others' feelings and emotions to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions.

In a further inquiry into the concept, Nikolaous (2002) [32] defined emotional intelligence as the ability to perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotions; the ability to access and/or generate feelings when they facilitate thought; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge and ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional intellectual growth. Emotional intelligence governs the person's use and control of coping strategies within certain situation (Zeidner, 2007) [51].

Emotional intelligence was seen by Bar-On (2000) as an array of non-cognitive capacities, competencies and skills that influence one's ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands. Emotional intelligence as Bar-On framed it is composed of emotional, personal, social and survival dimensions of intelligence. Bar-On further states that individuals who are emotionally intelligent will be competent at understanding themselves and others, relating to people and adapting to and coping with the immediate surroundings. This in turn, will increase their ability to be successful in dealing with environmental demands. For Bar-On, emotional intelligence relates to immediate functioning.

Emotional intelligence according to Goleman (2002) [12] is the ability to recognize and manage one's emotions and the emotions of others. Goleman further highlighted that individuals, groups and organizations high in emotional intelligence are presumed to

be more capable of utilizing emotion to adapt and capitalize on environmental demands. Similarly, Caruso (2002) opined that emotional intelligence is the ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions, to assist thought, to understand emotions and emotional knowledge and to reflectively regulate emotions so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth.

In the view of Mayer and Cobb (2000) [26], emotional intelligence is the emotional information as it relates to the perception, assimilation, expression, regulation and management. It is believed to encompass social and cognitive functions. Mayer and Cobb opined that emotionally intelligent persons have been described as well adjusted, warm, genuine, persistent and optimistic.

In this study, it is clear that emotional intelligence is the ability of the teacher to recognize, perceive or be aware of his/her feelings or dispositions and accommodate, appreciate or tolerate student's actions and behaviour with a view to achieving the set educational objectives. It determines the teacher's response to students' problems, responsibilities and opportunities. Hence, when students are allowed to express their feelings or opinions (emotions) in the classroom through avenues like asking or answering questions with the teacher moderating and guiding them, it creates a conducive environment for learning. Conducive environment creates better opportunity for students to explore which improves students' academic achievement.

Concept of Locus of Control

Locus of control refers to the extent to which individuals believe that they can control events that affect them (Rotter, 1954) [36]. Individuals with high internal locus of control believe that events result primarily from their own behaviour and actions. Those with high external locus of control believe that powerful others, fate or chance primarily determine events. Continuing, Rotter opined that those with internal locus of control have better control of their behaviour and tend to exhibit high achievement than externals. They are more likely to assume that their efforts will be successful.

In the opinion of Lefcourt (1999) [22], locus of control is generalized expectancy for internal as opposed to external control of reinforcements. Lefcourt further asserts that internals are more likely to work for achievements, tolerate delays in rewards and plan for long-term goals than externals. After failing a task, externals re-evaluate future performances and lower their expectations of achievements while internals may raise their expectations. According to Jansen and Wallace (1999) [19], locus of control is a personality variable that concerns people's generalized expectancies that they can or cannot control reinforcements in their lives. People who hold expectancies that they control reinforcements are considered to be internals and those who hold expectancies that outside forces or luck control reinforcements are said to be externals. In a similar way, Carton (2000) [6] asserted that locus of control is grounded in expectancy-value theory, which described human behaviour as determined by the perceived likelihood of an event or outcome occurring contingent upon the behaviour in question, and the value placed on that event or outcome.

The conceptualization of locus of control by Maltby, Day and Macaskill (2007) was that it refers to an individual's generalized expectations concerning where control over subsequent events resides. In other words, who or what is responsible for what happens. They continued that locus of control is an individual's belief system regarding the causes of his or her experiences and the factors to which that person attributes success or failure. Bailer (1991) [2] perceived locus of control as the perception of the extent to which individuals can control events in their lives. Individuals with an internal locus of control judge outcomes of events to be internally controllable. That is, they believe that their own personal efforts, behaviours or skills will influence and determine outcomes, and they take responsibility for their actions. According to Bailer, individuals with an external locus of control attribute events to external sources. They believe and behave as if forces beyond their control such as chance, luck, fate or others with greater power represent the important factors in determining the occurrence of reinforcing events. As such, their own effort or abilities are perceived to have little effect on how events play out.

Locus of control in this study is a complex psychological concept which explains innate ability, power or authority over circumstantial events around an individual. In other words, the individual's realization of his powers to check or control certain interfering or extraneous factors or variables is a huge step forward towards achievement of any set goals, educational endeavour inclusive. Thus, the teacher's discovery of himself and his potential abilities is a key to understanding self and others including his students and this determine the methods, strategies and procedures to be employed in the classroom. Therefore, one may reason that teachers' locus of control refers to the extent to which the teacher believes that he/she can control events in the classroom. This implies that the teacher in the classroom may have internal or external locus of control. If the teacher believes that he/she can control the students in the classroom by making them to be hardworking as an instructional leader, the teacher is classified as having internal locus of control but if he/she cannot exercise his/her authority over the students in the classroom, then the teacher is said to have an external locus of control especially when the teacher believes that success comes by chance, fate or luck.

Concept of Instructional Leadership

Instructional leadership according to Smith (2002) [40] is conceived of as a blend of supervision, staff and curriculum development that facilities school improvement. Fisk (2000) perceived instructional leadership as interactions between leaders and followers where in the followers' belief and perceptions are viewed as important. According to Kennedy (2002) [21], instructional leadership has been expanded to include deeper involvement in the core business of schooling, which is teaching and learning. As emphasis shifts from teaching to learning, Rowe and Bouglarides (1998) have proposed the term "learning teacher" over "instructional teacher.

The conceptualization of instructional leadership by Harris (2001) was that it is leading learning communities, in which staff members meet on a regular basis to discuss their work, collaborate to solve problems, reflect on their jobs and take responsibility for what students learn. Varela (2006) [41] opined that instructional leadership reflects those actions a principal takes to promote growth in students learning. Lings (2000) [23] cited specific behaviours of instructional leadership, such as making suggestions, giving feed-back, modeling, effective instruction, soliciting opinions, supporting collaboration,

providing professional development opportunities and giving praise for effective teaching. In a learning community, instructional leaders make adult learning a priority, set high expectations for performance, create a culture of continuous learning for adults and get the country's support for school success. In furtherance, Lings posits that inherent in the concept of instructional leadership is the notion that learning should be given priority while everything else revolves around the enhancement of learning. Instructional leaders need to know what is going on in the classroom.

To Lux (2004) [24], instructional leadership is a process where a person directs or controls others in order to achieve the goals of a group and authority is bestowed on him by his fellow group members so as to carry out various tasks. Instructional leadership is the ability in assuming responsibility for getting a group to take collective or individual purposeful action (Morrison, 2006). According to Kasper (2004) [20], instructional leadership connotes guiding, conducting, preceding or being fore-most. Caruna (2005) [7] defined instructional leadership as the ability to influence the behaviour of others. Conduit (2002) [8] in his own view saw leadership as the ability to persuade others to seek defined objectives enthusiastically. Instructional leadership according to Niepoth (2000) is a complex process by which a person influences the decision and direction of others in an organization. Sen (2005) summarized instructional leadership as a focus of group process, a set of personality characteristics; the act including compliance; the exercise of influences, an act or behaviour; an effect or interaction; a differential role; and the initiation of structure. According to Nanus (2001) [30], instructional leadership involves taking initiative to achieve group purpose, initiating new structures or procedures for the accomplishment of organizational goals and objectives; the possession of some power or personal attributes that are usually normative in nature, directing and co-ordinating the activities of others towards goal achievement; the interrelationship between the leader over the behaviour of one or more people in the organization. Instructional leadership involves the dynamic and interpersonal process of planning, organizing, controlling, directing and co-ordinating as one integrates the organizational or institutional needs and the needs of the members in a way that will be productive and individually fulfilling (Hartline, 1999) [15]. Gray (2002) [13] pointed out that instructional leadership involves the management of both human and material resources of any programme. Hauser (2005) [16] noted that instructional leadership is tenable in many settings such as homes, churches, schools, villages, towns, local governments, states, nations and even at international levels.

However, instructional leadership in this study is a situation where the teacher in the classroom exercises his/her skill and ability in making reasonable decisions, providing the students the opportunities for creativity and exploration, maintaining friendly relationship and engendering performance as well as maintaining proper communication channels. Instructional leadership could be referred to the authority styles and strategies employed by the teacher in administering classroom activities. In order words, it is the ability of the teacher to organize, co-ordinate and deliver his duties effectively in the classroom for the achievement of the set objectives.

Relationship among Teachers' Emotional Intelligence, Locus of Control and Instructional Leadership

Emotional intelligence and locus of control tend to predict the leadership teachers display in the classroom as instructional leaders. Emotional intelligence refers to one's ability to control one's own emotional responses and the emotions of others. It is an integral part of teacher's personality. Locus of control is the belief individuals have over the events that affect them. Emotional intelligence and locus of control are leadership qualities every teacher needs for effective performance in the classroom. Whereas instructional leadership is the blend of supervision, staff and curriculum development that facilitates school improvement.

In Enugu State, the academic achievement of secondary school students has been observed to be generally poor. A look at the West African Senior Secondary School Certificate Examination results in the past eight years (2005-2012) shows clearly the declining state of secondary school students' achievements in external examinations in the state. The West African Certificate Examinations Councils' (WAEC) result analysis has it that in 2005, only 27.53% of candidates who sat for the senior secondary school certificate exanimation had five credit passes and above including English Language and Mathematics (WAEC, 2010). The same trend continued in 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011and 2012 [42-50] where only 15.56%, 25.54%, 13.76%, 25.99%, 24.94%, 30.99% and 25.76% of candidates respectively obtained five credit passes including English Language and Mathematics, which are the minimum entry requirement for admission into Nigerian Universities.

It is believed that many factors could be responsible for the poor achievements of the students in external examinations in the State. Such factors may range from the nature of school administration, environment, to the qualification and teachers' characteristics such as emotional intelligence and locus of control. Ali (2004) observed that there was statistically significant relationship between teacher characteristics and students' academic achievement. The author further explained that teachers' characteristics are strong determinants of students' achievement in secondary schools. Teachers have a lot of influence on the classroom practices. Teachers are expected to apply specific abilities without which their influence may not be reflected on their students' achievement in the subject. These characteristics are very influential in students' learning experiences and critical in determining the extent of students' achievement. This means that teachers' emotional intelligence and locus of control may predict teachers' instructional leadership model which in turn determines students' achievement since teachers provide the vital human connection between the content, environment and learner. It becomes necessary to examine such teacher characteristics as emotional intelligence and locus of control to determine the extent they predict teachers' instructional leadership model in secondary schools.

Statement of the Problem

The decline trend in students' achievements in external examinations has become a worrisome nightmare to all the stakeholders in education in Nigeria. It is believed that if the

achievements of students continue to decline unabated, it may affect both the economic and technological growth of Nigeria. However, many factors are observed to be responsible for the poor achievements of the students in external examinations. Such factors range from the school administration, environment to teacher factor such as leadership models, emotional intelligence and locus of control.

It has been observed by the researchers that teachers' instructional leadership models contribute a lot to the academic achievements of students. This is because students in the class usually avoid the class and lessons of an authoritarian while they attend to the classes of a permissive instructional teacher to play away their time. Besides, studies on educational functions have shown that having qualified teachers in a school do not automatically translate to students' scores without good instructional leadership model. This is because, the success of students in a class to an extent depends on motivations and instructional leadership models of the teachers. On by the enquiry by the researchers on what could be responsible for adopting different instructional leadership models by teachers, they suggested that factors such as stress, job satisfaction, emotional intelligence and locus of control determine ones instructional leadership model in a class. Educational researchers and psychologists have carried out research to ascertain the possible influence of training needs, of teachers, teachers' reinforcement, job satisfaction and teachers' retention on the instructional leadership model of teachers in secondary schools in an attempt to encourage authoritative leadership model yet the variation in teachers' instructional leadership model and the poor results of students persists. This gap in instructional leadership model makes it necessary to determine the extent emotional intelligence and locus of control predict teachers' instructional leadership model with regards to improving the achievement of students in external examinations. Therefore, the problem of the study put in a question form is, to what extent do teachers' emotional intelligence and locus of control predict teachers' instructional leadership?

Purpose of the Study

The major purpose of this study was to determine the extent emotional intelligence and locus of control predict teachers' instructional leadership in secondary schools in Enugu State, Nigeria. Specifically, the study sought to:

1. Determine the extent emotional intelligence predicts teachers' instructional leadership model.
2. Ascertain the extent locus of control predicts teachers' instructional leadership model.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

1. To what extent does emotional intelligence predict teachers' instructional leadership model?
2. What is the extent locus of control predicts teachers' instructional leadership model?

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses (Ho) were tested at 0.05 levels of significance:

HO_1: emotional intelligence does not significantly predict teachers' instructional leadership model.

HO_2: locus of control does not significantly predict teachers' instructional leadership model.

Research Methods

This study adopted a correlational research design. According to Gall, Gall and Borg (2007) [11], a co relational design is a form of research design that involves collecting data on two or more variables for each individual in the sample and computing a correlation coefficient. Co relational research design is therefore suitable for this study in that it enabled the researcher to determine the relationship between emotional intelligence and locus of control on teachers' instructional leadership models.

The study was carried out in Enugu State of Nigeria. Enugu State has six Education Zones namely: Nsukka, Agbani, Awgu, Enugu, Obollo- Afor and Udi with 285 public secondary schools (Planning, Research and Statistics (PRS) Units, Post Primary Schools Management Board, Enugu-2012). The rationale for choosing this state is to find out the extent to which leadership models of teachers contribute to poor achievement of the students in order to suggest ways of enhancement.

The population of the study consisted of 4,516 teachers in the public junior secondary schools in Enugu State made up of 1,407 males and 3,109 females and 285 secondary schools (Planning, Research and Statistics (PRS) Units, Post Primary Schools Management Board, Enugu-2013). The choice of junior secondary school teachers was guided by the fact that they form the educational foundations of secondary school students and their effectiveness and efficiency determine the academic achievement of the students in external examination.

The sample for the study was 903 teachers consisting of 281males and 622 females that were purposively selected from the entire population of 4,516 in the study area. The sample of the study 903 represents 20% of the entire population as recommended by Gall, Gall and Borg (2007) [11]. They recommended that if the population is between 2000 to 5000, 10% should be used. When the population is between 1000 to 2000, 20% should be used. If the population is in hundreds, it is 50% and in tents the whole population may be used. Therefore, when modified a population of 2000 to 5000 then 20% could be used. This study adopted the modified version and so 20% of the population was used.

Proportionate stratified random sampling technique was used in sampling 281 (20%) proportion from 1407 males and 622 (20%) proportion from 3109 females. This technique was possible because the researcher had the entire population of the teachers with their sex and schools when each teacher was employed. This figure represents more than 50% of the population of teachers in the schools sampled for the study.

Two instruments were developed for the study. They are: Teachers' Emotional Intelligence Rating Scale (TEIRS) and Teachers' Locus of Control Rating Scale (TLCRS).

Teachers' Emotional Intelligence Rating Scale (TEIRS): This is a rating scale meant to determine the emotional intelligence of teachers. TEIRS has four clusters which include the following: cluster A: Emotional perception consisting of 6 item statements, cluster B: Facilitating thought which consists of 8 items, cluster C: Understanding emotions with 6 items and cluster D: Managing emotions which consists of 6 item statements. It is a four-point rating scale structured as follows: Strongly Agree (SA) (4), Agree (A) (3), Disagree (D) (2), and Strongly Disagree (SD) (1).

Negative item statements were reverse scored. Teachers' Locus of Control Rating Scale (TLCRS): This is another instrument for the study designed to measure the locus of control of teachers. The items were generated by the researcher with the help of experts in Educational Psychology after the review of relevant literature. The instrument has only one cluster consisting of 20 items. The items were rated on 4-point response format of Strongly Agree (SA=4), Agree (A=3), Disagree (D=2), and Strongly Disagree (SD=1). Negative item statements were reverse scored.

The instruments (Teachers' Instructional Leadership Rating Scale, Teachers' Emotional Intelligence Rating Scale and Teachers' Instructional Leadership Rating Scale) were face validated by two specialists in Educational Psychology and one specialist in Educational Measurement and Evaluation. These specialists were assessed the instrument with regards to the suitability of the language and the extent to which the items represent the instructional leadership used in the study. They suggested that some of the items should be reframed or removed which the researcher adhered to. The questionnaire had 84 item statements in the initial draft which was reduced to 63 after effecting the corrections and suggestions of the experts. Therefore, their comments and suggestions were used in improving the instrument.

Teachers' Emotional Intelligence Rating Scale was trial tested using 30 teachers taken from schools in Anambra State which is outside the study area. The internal consistency reliability of the items of Teachers' Emotional Intelligence Rating Scale was determined using Cronbach's Alpha. Cronbach's Alpha is applied to instruments that are not scored dichotomously. An internal consistency reliability estimate of .83 was obtained for TEIRS.

To determine the reliability of Teachers' Locus of Control Rating Scale, The instrument was trial tested using 30 teachers taken from schools in Anambra State which is outside the study area. The internal consistency of the instrument was computed using Cronbach's Alpha. The internal consistency reliability index of .79 was obtained.

The researcher administered the instruments with the help of six research assistants to facilitate the study and cover the scope. The instruments were administered to the sampled secondary school teachers in their various schools and collection was made on the spot after their completion.

The data collected for the study were analyzed using mean and standard deviation to answer research questions one whereas Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson r) was used to answer research questions two. Linear and multiple regressions analysis and t-test statistic were used to test the hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. Using the four response options, a mean value of 2.50 was obtained for research questions one. A respondent with a mean value of 2.50 and also above was regarded as having high emotional intelligence or internal locus of control while a respondent with a mean value below 2.50 was regarded as having low emotional intelligence or external locus of control for research questions one. For research question two, a respondent with a mean value of 2.50 or above was agreed to be authoritarian or authoritative in leadership model respectively whereas a respondent with a mean value below 2.50 was agreed to be permissive in leadership model. In research questions, when the value of r is +1.00, it shows a perfect positive correlation while -1.00 indicates a perfect negative correlation. The null hypothesis of no significant difference was accepted if the t-calculated value is less than the t-table value at 0.05 level of significance and appropriate degrees of freedom and rejected if otherwise.

Results and Discussion

The results of this study were presented in line with the research questions and hypotheses that guided the study.

Research Question One

To what extent does emotional intelligence predict teachers' instructional leadership model?

Data for answering research question one was presented in Table 1.

Table 1: The extent emotional intelligence predicts teachers' instructional leadership model

Model	r	R Squared	Adjusted R Squared
1	.217	.047	.046

Data in Table 1 indicated a positive relationship between emotional intelligence and teachers' instructional leadership model. This is shown by the calculated r of .217 and the calculated R^2 of .047 indicating that 5% of the variance observed on the teachers' instructional leadership model was accounted for by their emotional intelligence.

Table 2: The extent emotional intelligence predict Authoritative instructional leadership model

Model	r	R Squared	Adjusted R Squared
1	.366	.134	.133

Data in the Table 2 showed a positive relationship between emotional intelligence and authoritative instructional leadership of teachers. The calculated r value of .336 indicated this. The R square value of .134 showed that 13% of the variance observed on authoritative instructional leadership model occurred due teachers' emotional intelligence.

Table 3: The extent emotional intelligence predicts Authoritarian instructional leadership model

Model	r	R Squared	Adjusted R Squared
1	- .651	.424	.424

Data in the Table 3 showed a negative relationship between emotional intelligence and authoritarian instructional leadership model of teachers. The calculated r value of -.651 showed this relationship. The R square value of .424 showed that 42% of the variance observed on authoritarian instructional leadership model occurred due teachers' emotional intelligence.

Table 4: The extent emotional intelligence predicts Permissive instructional leadership model

Model	r	R Squared	Adjusted R Squared
1	- .445	.198	.197

Data in the Table 4 indicated a negative relationship between emotional intelligence and permissive instructional leadership

model of teachers. The calculated r value of -.445 showed this relationship. The R square value of .198 showed that 20% of the variance observed on permissive instructional leadership model occurred due to teachers' emotional intelligence.

Hypothesis One: Emotional intelligence does not significantly predict teachers' instructional leadership

The data required for testing hypothesis one are as presented in

Table 5: Linear and Multiple Regression Analysis on Emotional Intelligence as Predictor of Teachers' Instructional Leadership

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	t-cal	Sig.	
1	Regression	16.463	1	16.463	44.427	-6.665	.000
	Residual	333.878	901	.371			
	Total	350.341	902				

Data in Table 5 revealed that emotional intelligence significantly predicts teachers' instructional leadership model. This is shown by the F- value of 44.427 which is significant at 0.000 level and also significant at 0.05 level of probability. This is further shown by the calculated t value of -6.665 which is also significant at .000 and at 0.05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis that teachers' emotional intelligence does not significantly predict their instructional leadership is rejected and the alternate hypothesis upheld. Thus, emotional intelligence is a significant predictor of teachers' instructional leadership. The findings of this study revealed that emotional intelligence significantly predicts teachers' instructional leadership. Teachers with high emotional intelligence frequently adopt authoritative leadership model in the classroom whereas teachers with low emotional intelligence appear to be more authoritarian and permissive in their instructional leadership.

The findings of this study on emotional intelligence were in line with the findings of some similar research in other cultures on the relationship between emotional intelligence and instructional leadership. Pashiardis (2006) [35], Brauckmann (2009) [5], Schmidt (2002) and Fleishman (2004) found significant relationship between emotional intelligence and instructional leadership. Pashiardis (2006) [35] conducted a study on the relationship between emotional intelligence and instructional leadership of school leaders and found out that emotional intelligence is a significant factor in instructional leadership of school leaders. Brauckmann (2009) [5] investigated the relationship between emotional intelligence and instructional leadership of school administrators where it was found that there was significant relationship between emotional intelligence and instructional leadership. Schmidt (2000) also conducted a study to investigate the relationship between emotional intelligence and instructional leadership of Head of Departments. The findings of the study indicated that emotional intelligence was correlated to instructional leadership of the head of departments of the university. Fleishman (2004) [10] also conducted a study on the relationship between emotional intelligence and instructional leadership of primary school teachers. The findings of the study showed that emotional intelligence predicts instructional leadership of primary school teachers.

Research Question Two: What is the extent to which teachers' locus of control predicts their instructional leadership model?

Data for answering research question two are as presented in Table 9.

Table 6: The extent locus of control predicts teachers' instructional leadership model

Model	r	R Squared	Adjusted R Squared
1	.207	.043	.042

Data in Table 6 indicated a positive relationship between locus of control and teachers' instructional leadership model. This is shown by the calculated R of .207. The calculated R2 of .043 which is the coefficient of determination indicated that 4% of the variance observed on the teachers' instructional leadership is as a result of teachers' locus of control.

Table 7: The extent locus of control predicts Authoritative instructional leadership model

Model	r	R Squared	Adjusted R Squared
1	.220	.048	.047

Data in Table 7 showed a positive relationship between locus of control and authoritative instructional leadership model of teachers. This is shown by the calculated r value of .336. The R square value of .048 showed that 5% of the variance observed on authoritative instructional leadership model occurred due to teachers' locus of control.

Table 8: The extent locus of control predicts Authoritarian instructional leadership model

Model	r	R Squared	Adjusted R Squared
1	- .381	.145	.144

Data in the Table 8 showed a negative relationship between locus of control and authoritarian instructional leadership model of teachers. The calculated r value of -.381 showed this relationship. The R square value of .144 shows that 14% of the variance observed on authoritarian instructional leadership model occurred due to teachers' locus of control.

Table 9: The extent locus of control predicts Permissive instructional leadership model

Model	r	R Squared	Adjusted R Squared
1	- .288	.083	.082

Data in the Table 9 indicated a negative relationship between locus of control and permissive instructional leadership model of teachers. The calculated r value of -.288 showed this relationship. The R square value of .082 showed that 8% of the variance observed on permissive instructional leadership model occurred due to teachers' locus of control.

Hypothesis Two: Locus of control does not significantly predict teachers' instructional leadership model.

Table 10: Linear and Multiple Regression Analysis on Locus of Control as Predictor of Teachers' Instructional Leadership model

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	t-cal	Sig.	
1	Regression	14.994	1	14.994	40.285	-6.347	.000
	Residual	335.347	901	.372			
	Total	350.341	902				

Data presented in Table 10 revealed that teachers' locus of control is a significant predictor of their instructional leadership model in the classroom. This is shown by the calculated F- value of 40.285 which is significant at 0.000 and also significant at 0.05 level. The t value of -6.347 which is significant at 0.05 level further indicated that the locus of control of teachers is a significant predictor of their instructional leadership model in the classroom. Therefore, the null hypothesis which states that locus does not significantly predict teachers' instructional leadership model is rejected. The findings of this study showed that locus of control significantly predict teachers' instructional leadership. This means that teachers with internal locus of control adopt more of authoritative leadership than authoritarian and permissive instructional leadership options whereas teachers with external locus of control appear to be more authoritarian or permissive.

The findings of this study on locus of control were in line with similar findings of (Johnson, 2004, Nowicki, 2005; Norman & Bernett 1995; and Hocheich, 2007) [34, 33]. Norman and Berneth (1995) [33] carried out a longitudinal study to investigate pupils' locus of control and academic achievement in United States and Canada. They found out that pupils with internal locus of control are more likely to work for achievement. They also observed that internals tolerate delay in rewards more and plan for long term goals than externals. They pointed out that after failing a task, externals re-evaluate further achievement and lower their expectations of success; whereas internals raise their expectations. These differences relate to variations in academic achievement. They therefore concluded that locus of control influences academic achievement. Johnson (2004) also carried out a study on the relationship between locus of control and leadership of students in Ohio State University. The research findings showed that there was relationship between locus of control and student leadership. The researcher observed that the internals were more likely to be achievers in leadership. Nowicki (2005) [34] studied leadership behaviour and locus of control. The study examined the managerial behaviour on several variables, reflecting constructs felt to have relationship with locus of control. The results were found to support the role of locus of control on leaders with regard to influencing effort, expenditure, and perception of the organizational contingencies and mostly on the facets of job satisfaction. Hocheich (2007) also investigated the influence of locus of control on students' leadership and the degree of internality. The findings of the study showed significant differences among the variable. The possible interactions with the respondents showed that locus of control had a significant influence on leadership and the degree of internality. The findings of the present study were not surprising as teachers who had internal locus of control are able to manage situations better than the externals and could adopt more appropriate leadership model than teachers with external locus of control. Therefore, a teacher with internal locus of control is more likely to adopt authoritative instructional leadership model while a teacher with external locus of control may adopt authoritarian and permissive leadership models.

Conclusions

From the findings of the study and discussion that followed, the following conclusions were made:

1. Emotional intelligence predicts teachers' instructional leadership model because there is a positive relationship between emotional intelligence and instructional leadership which reflects in achievements of students.
2. There is a positive relationship between locus of control and teachers' instructional leadership. Locus of control minimally predicts teachers' instructional leadership model which influences the academic achievements of students.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study and their educational implications, the following recommendations are made:

The school administrators should use the findings of this study to organize workshops or seminars for teachers on the relationship among emotional intelligence, locus of control and teachers' instructional leadership. This will equip teachers with skills in changing their emotional intelligence to adopt the best instructional leadership models as the need arises.

1. Teacher preparation institutions should incorporate instructional leadership in the relevant areas of their curriculum units to expose both the pre-service and in-service teachers to the predictive effect of emotional intelligence and locus of control on teachers' instructional leadership. This exposure will help to develop in the teachers the competencies necessary for teacher-student interaction in the classroom.

References

1. Ali A. Motivation and Learning of Senior Secondary School Physics. Journal of Research in Learning and Teaching. 2004; 37(2):114-115. Orlando: Academic Press.
2. Bailer I. Conceptualization of success and failure in mentally retarded and normal children. Journal of Personality. 1991; 3:482-490.
3. Bar-On R. Emotional and social intelligence. In Bar-On, R and Parker J.D. A. (Eds), The Handbook of Emotional Intelligence, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco. CA, 2000.
4. Bass BM. Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, 2005.
5. Brauckmann PF. Is Emotional Intelligence an Advantage? An Exploration of the Impact of Emotional and General intelligence on Individual Performance. Journal of Social Psychology. 2009; 142(1):133-143.
6. Carton MH. The moderator-mediator enviable distinction in social psychological research: conceptual, strategic and statistical considerations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 2000; 51:1173-1182.
7. Caruna A. Assessing advantage: A framework for diagnosing competitive superiority. Journal of marketing Research. 2005; 19:14-31.
8. Conduit J. Factors affecting the use of market research information: A path analysis. Journal of marketing research. 2002; 19:11-24.
9. Extremera N. Spanish version of the Mayer-Slovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MS-CEIT) Version 2.0: reliabilities, age and gender differences. Psicothema. 2005; 18(Supl):42-48.
10. Fleishman E. Perceived emotional intelligence, stress reactivity, and symptom reports: Further expirations using the trait meta-mood scale. Psychology and Health. 2004; 17:611-627.

11. Gall MD, Gall JP, Borg WR. Education research, An introduction (8th edition). New York: Pearson Education Inc, 2007.
12. Goleman D. Emotional intelligence. New York: Bantam Books, 2002.
13. Gray BM. Transformational leadership: Beyond initiation and consideration. Journal of Management. 2002; 16:693-703.
14. Harris LC. Leadership style and market orientation: An empirical study. European Journal of Marketing. 2001; 35(5):744-764.
15. Hartline DA. A review of studies in the first 10 volumes of the journal curriculum and supervision, Journal of Curriculum and Supervision. 1999; 11(1):87-105.
16. Hauser DH. Primal leadership: learning to lead with emotional intelligence. Water down, M. A: Haveard Business School Press, 2005.
17. Hein S. Emotional intelligence, tests. (Electronic Version). Retrieved on 5/5/2011 from htt://www.egi.org.
18. Hochich PN. Internal Versus External Control of Reinforcement; A case history of a variable. American Psychologist. 2007; 45:489-493.
19. Jensen E, Wallace JE. Teaching with the brain in mind. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1999.
20. Kasper H. Leadership in the twenty-first century: A speculative inquiry. In A. Howard (ed), the changing nature of work, Sam Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004.
21. Kennedy KN. Reinventing government: Does leadership make the difference? Public Administration Review. 2002; 58(6):552-532.
22. Lefcourt H. Locus of control: Current trends in theory and research, 2nded.Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1999.
23. Lings IN. Internal market orientation: Constructs and consequences, Journal of Business Research, Forthcoming Akinsola, 2000.
24. Lux D. Broademing the marketing orientation: An added focus on internal customers. Human Resource Management. 2004; 30(4):455-467.
25. Mayer JP. Human abilities emotional intelligence. Annual review of psychology. 2002; 59:507-536.
26. Mayer J, Cobb C. Educational policy on emotional intelligence: Does it make sense? Educational Psychology Review. 2002; 12(2):163-183.
27. Mayer JD, Salovey P. Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational Implications New York: Basic Books, 1995.
28. Mayer JD, Salovey P. What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salorey & D. Sluyter (eds.), Emotional Development and Emotional Intelligence: Educational Implications, 3-31. New York: Basic Books, 1997.
29. Morrison GR. Designing Effective Instruction. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc, 2010.
30. Nanus B. Exploring the transformational nature of instructional leadership, the Alberta Journal of Educational Research. 2001; 42(4):325-344.
31. Nieopoth LP. Emotion, intelligence, emotional intelligence. In T.P. Forgas (Ed.), The Handbook of Affect and Social Cognition. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaumy Associates, 2000.
32. Nikolaous A. When the show must go on: Surface acting and deep acting as determinants of emotional exhaustion and peer-rated services delivery. Academy of Management Journal, 2002, 86-93.
33. Norman P, Benneth P. Health locus of control. In M. Conner & P. Norman (Eds). Predicting students' behaviour. Buckingham Open University Press. Chapter three, 1995, 62-94.
34. Nowicki S. Some problems and misconception related to the construct of internal versus external control of reinforcement. Journal of Clinical and Consulting Psychology. 2005; 43:56-67.
35. Pashiardis PN. Educational Leadership and Management: blending Greek philosophy, myth and current thinking. Journal of Leadership in Education. 2006; 12(6):76-87.
36. Rotter JB. Cited in Kirchner MJ. The relationship between locus of control and academic achievement among at risk student. M.A. Research Psychology. The University of Pretoria, 1954-2003.
37. Salovey P. Perceived emotional intelligence, reactionary, and symptom reports further explorations using the trait meta-mood scale psychology and health. Review of personality and social psychology. 2002; 17:611-627.
38. Sen W. Teacher and classroom context effects on student achievement. Implications for teacher evaluation. Journal of personnel evaluation in education. 2005; 4(1):3-4.
39. Shook NS. Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. Personality and Individual Differences. 2004; 25:167-177.
40. Smith W. Instructional leadership: How principals make a difference. Alexandria, V. A: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2002.
41. Varela D. Teacher evaluation: A review of the literature with implications for educators. Unpublished Seminar Paper, California State University at Long Beach, 2006.
42. WAEC. Chief Examiners' Report. Lagos: WAEC, 2005.
43. WAEC. Chief Examiners' Report. Lagos: WAEC, 2006.
44. WAEC. Chief Examiners' Report. Lagos: WAEC, 2007.
45. WAEC, Chief Examiners' Report. Lagos: WAEC, 2008.
46. WAEC. Chief Examiners' Report. Lagos: WAEC, 2008.
47. WAEC. Chief Examiners' Report. Lagos: WAEC, 2009.
48. WAEC. Chief Examiners' Report. Lagos: WAEC, 2010.
49. WAEC. Chief Examiners' Report. Lagos: WAEC, 2011.
50. WAEC, Chief Examiners' Report. Lagos: WAEC, 2012.
51. Zeidner M. Emotional intelligence in the work place: A critical review, Applied Psychology: An International Review. 2007; 53(3):371-399.