

Evaluating the Impact of Brief Electronic Professional Development on Emotional Intelligence
and Burnout Among In-Service Educators

A Dissertation Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Michelle Lorraine Fast

August 2021

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge a number of individuals who have provided guidance and support through this dissertation process. Each of my committee members have shared their expertise and opinions, which have helped me along the way. A special thank you is due to Dr. R. Steve McCallum who has served as my advisor and dissertation committee chair. I have had the honor of learning so much from Dr. McCallum, and still feel there is so much more wisdom for him to impart. Thank you to Dr. Merilee McCurdy who has provided such solid advice throughout my time in the program. Thank you to Dr. Sherry Bell and Dr. Geri Landry, whose knowledge and expertise within the field of education has provided such meaningful direction in developing this dissertation. Thanks are also due to Mr. Trey Ferguson as he has been vital in my dissertation process, not only for encouraging individuals from his school system to participate in this study, but also in his overall support as a mentor and friend.

I want to thank all of my fellow School Psychology students at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville who have welcomed me into each of their cohorts at some point along the way. In particular, I would like to thank Lezli Anderson for the integral role she played in this dissertation process, as well as the friendly support she has so freely given throughout.

To my family, Art, Gloria, Dan, Chris, Brian, and Jenn Langer, thank you for setting an example and encouraging me along the way. There has never been a doubt in my mind that you supported me in my educational endeavors. To Nancy and Scott Sheldon and Mike and Tobey Rogowsky and kids, thank you for being there on long days when we needed some extra support. And most importantly, to my husband Jake, thank you so much for all the sacrifices you have made and for being so encouraging throughout this process. I could not have done this without your love and support. Now tag, you're it!

Abstract

To determine the impact of an intervention to improve emotional intelligence (EI) and reduce burnout in educators, 48 in-service educators were randomly assigned to a control or experimental group and administered the Scales of Emotional Functioning: Educators (SEF:ED; McCallum et al., 2019) and the Maslach Burnout Inventory – Educators Survey (MBI-ES; Maslach et al., 2016) before and after intervention. The control group served as a waiting control and completed these instruments again after receiving the intervention. 70% of the participants noted the intervention “helped [them] manage [their] classroom,” though repeated measures ANOVAS yielded little evidence to support this characterization. No statistically significant interaction effects from pre to posttest occurred for the SEF:ED Total EI score ($p = .92$), the Emotional Awareness scale (EA; $p = .78$), the Emotional Management scale (EM; $p = .71$), or the Interpersonal Relations scale (IR; $p = .45$). Similar results were obtained from the MBI-ES scale: Emotional Exhaustion (EE; $p = .38$), Depersonalization (DP; $p = .97$), and Personal Accomplishment (PA; $p = .49$). No statistically significant main effects occurred for time (i.e., pretest to posttest), Total EI ($p = .32$), EA ($p = .62$), or EM ($p = .71$), but a significant main effect occurred for IR, ($p < .05$); means decreased. No main effects occurred between pretest and posttest means on the MBI-ES EE scale ($p = .13$), DP scale ($p = .35$), or PA scale ($p = .32$), or for the control and experimental groups effect on the EE scale ($p = .06$) or DP scale ($p = .72$). A significant main effect did occur between the experimental and control group for the PA scale ($p < .05$); the experimental group yielded a higher mean PA score than the control group. For the waiting control participants, no significant change occurred from posttest administration to post-posttest administration on the EE ($p = .14$) or DP scales ($p = .63$). A significant mean increase occurred from posttest to post-posttest on the PA scale ($p = .05$) after intervention. Implications, limitations, and recommendations for future research are discussed.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER I Review of the Literature	1
Current Context.....	3
Emotional Intelligence Defined	3
Emotional Intelligence and Related Constructs.....	6
Emotional Intelligence and Burnout in the Field of Education	10
Measurement of EI in Educators.....	15
Improving EI in Educators.....	17
Rationale	19
Research Questions	20
CHAPTER II Methods	21
Participants and Settings.....	21
Instruments.....	23
Procedures	25
Data Analyses	26
CHAPTER III Results	28
Data Cleaning Procedures.....	28
Descriptive Statistics.....	29
Research Question 1: Evaluating Posttest SEF:ED Scores between Experimental and Waiting Control	31
Research Question 2: Posttest MBI-ES Scores between Experimental and Waiting Control	33
CHAPTER IV Discussion	35
Does EI Training Improve Performance of In-Service Educators?	35
Can Qualitative Participant Feedback Contribute to Interpretation of Results?	40
Limitations of the Study.....	41
Summary and Implications	43
REFERENCES	44
Appendix	54
Vita	84

List of Tables

Table 1. Demographic Information.....	79
Table 2. SEF:ED Descriptive Statistics – Combined.....	80
Table 3. MBI-ES Descriptive Statistics – Combined	81
Table 4. Pretest and Posttest Mean and Standard Deviation for SEF:ED and MBI-ES Total Scores.....	82
Table 5. Pretest Correlation Coefficients Between the SEF:ED and MBI-ES	83
Table 6. Posttest Correlation Coefficients Between the SEF:ED and MBI-ES.....	83

CHAPTER I

Review of the Literature

Skills that comprise emotional intelligence (EI) have been the focus of speculation and inquiry for centuries, and of interest to psychologists for approximately 100 years. Since the time of Aristotle, Socrates, and Plato, humans have contemplated the origin and nature of human knowledge, the relationship of the mind and soul to the body, and the extent to which it is possible to scientifically study such relationships (e.g., see Wertheimer, 1987). Systematic study began in the early part of the 20th century although early psychologists noted the difficulty inherent in isolating and empirically studying human capabilities, as suggested by the following quote by Edward Thorndike (1921):

It is probably unwise to spend much time in attempts to separate off sharply certain qualities of man, such as his intelligence, from such emotional and vocational qualities as his interest in mental activity, carefulness, determination to respond effectively, persistence in his effort to do so; or from his amount of knowledge; or from his moral or esthetic tastes. (p. 124)

In 1927, Thorndike postulated a multifactor theory of intelligence, which included three distinct clusters of related abilities: social intelligence (dealing with people), concrete intelligence (dealing with things), and abstract intelligence (dealing with verbal and mathematical symbols) (Thorndike, 1921). While social skills have been an important focus of inquiry in psychology since the early days of the discipline, the primary interest for studying these skills has been on operationalizing pathology. This situation began to change in the later part of the 20th century as psychologists started to focus more on studying the positive as well as the negative aspects of social/interpersonal skills and on efforts to accurately define and then

operationalize these within an overarching, cohesive construct. For example, EI has been shown to positively impact many facets of life, including mental, psychosomatic, and physical health (Martins et al., 2010); interpersonal relations (Schutte et al., 2001); job performance (Joseph et al., 2015); job satisfaction (Ilyas & Abdullah, 2016; Miao et al., 2016, 2017); and burnout (Galdona et al., 2012; Manju, 2017). Within the PreK-12 population, EI has been linked to increased academic performance, decreased problem behaviors, increased well-being, and decreased bullying (Brackett, 2018), as well as increased student engagement (Maguire et al., 2017). While most of the research has been conducted investigating the importance of developing/promoting EI in students, there is limited research addressing the potential benefits of developing EI in those responsible for teaching those students: the educators. Because there is evidence of linkages between EI of adults and their workplace performance, some experts have urged EI-related professional development be provided to teachers (Manju, 2017) and to principals (Anderson, 2017; Hebert, 2011) to enhance their performance and effectiveness. The purpose of this study is to determine the potential benefits of teaching in-service educators about EI, how it is defined, how it might be related to burnout, how it is related to facilitating classroom interactions, and specifically whether this information improves educators' knowledge of their EI and decreases burnout. The following literature review provides an introduction to the relevant research base and includes: (a) a brief history and varying definitions of emotional intelligence; (b) the relationships that have been observed between EI and other constructs, such as health and well-being, anxiety, job performance, and burnout; (c) efforts to assess EI in the educational field and the relation between EI and educator burnout; and (d) results related to attempts at improving EI in educators. A rationale for this study is then provided, as well as the

research questions addressed in this study. This section begins with a description of more recent context for studying EI, followed by efforts to define and operationalize it.

Current Context

Although there were characterizations of emotional intelligence by other names during the early part of the 20th century, there were no systematic attempts to study it. For example, the concept of emotional ability was referenced in a handful of publications, including a Jane Austen title, a science-fiction publication by Carl Lans, and some early psychoanalytic studies by Barbara Leuner (Zeidner et al., 2009). One of the first uses of the term in the scientific literature appeared in a dissertation by Wayne Payne in 1986 when Payne argued the importance of developing emotional awareness in children (Windingstad et al., 2011; Zeidner et al., 2009). But it was not until the early 1990's that scientists, and particularly psychologists, began to systematically define then assess EI. Jack Mayer and Peter Salovey were among the first to publish systematic EI research in the early 1990s, and shortly thereafter in 1995, Daniel Goleman published his international best-seller, *Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More than IQ*. Goleman cited the research of Mayer and Salovey and other relevant research findings to support his hypothesis that EI can be more predictive of success within some contexts life than cognitive intelligence (i.e., IQ), particularly in the workplace and in one's social life. Since Goleman's book, interest in and research related to EI has grown tremendously. In fact, the number of citations with the term "emotional intelligence" embedded increased from approximately 50,000 to more than 281,000 from 1995 to 2018.

Emotional Intelligence Defined

It can be somewhat difficult to find a solid and stable definition of EI, in part because test authors/researchers have established definitions based on their own individual perspectives. As

mentioned earlier, Salovey and Mayer (1990) were among the first to conduct systematic research focusing on EI and defined it as “a subset of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one's own and others' emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use the information to guide one's thinking and actions” (p. 189). They later expanded the definition, specifying that EI includes the ability to “perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotion; ... to access and/or generate feelings when they facilitate thought; ... to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; and ... to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth” (Mayer & Salovey, 1997, p. 10). Perceiving, appraising, and expressing emotions includes identifying emotions in oneself and others and accurately expressing feelings, emotions, and emotional needs. Allowing emotions to facilitate thought includes problem-solving skills, utilizing emotions to prioritize thinking and aid in judgment, and considering different viewpoints through alternating optimistic and pessimistic thinking. Understanding and analyzing emotions was also identified as an important component of EI by Mayer and Salovey, which includes recognizing and labeling emotions; interpreting the meanings of emotions; understanding complex and sometimes simultaneous, competing feelings; and recognizing transitions among emotions. Being able to reflectively regulate emotions includes being open to both positive and negative feelings, to engage or detach from emotions in an effective manner, to monitor the effectiveness of emotions in oneself and others, and to manage both positive and negative emotions.

In 1990, Salovey and Mayer argued that although EI had been researched across multiple disciplines, it had never been pulled together coherently to become its own construct. By labeling and defining it, they opened the door for others to develop EI-specific research. For example, Bar-On (2006) was motivated to examine existing perspectives of emotional-social intelligence

(ESI) and create one definition consistent with his conceptualization of EI that was more amenable to assessment: “a cross-section of interrelated emotional and social competencies, skills and facilitators that determine how effectively we understand and express ourselves, understand others and relate with them, and cope with daily demands” (p. 14). He identified five primary components of ESI which included the following:

- (a) the ability to recognize, understand and express emotions and feelings; (b) the ability to understand how others feel and relate with them; (c) the ability to manage and control emotions; (d) the ability to manage change, adapt and solve problems of a personal and interpersonal nature; and (e) the ability to generate positive affect and be self-motivated.
- (p.14)

Bar-On relied on this definition to operationalize EI into an inventory, the EQ-i, which is described in more detail later.

Others have been more concerned with how to adapt EI for the workplace. For example, Goleman and Boyatzis integrated their individual models of emotional intelligence for a focus on project management (Boyatzis et al., 1999). Their definition of EI included demonstrations of “competencies that constitute self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and social skills at appropriate times and ways in sufficient frequency to be effective in the situation” (Boyatzis et al., 1999, p. 345). They formulated a link between emotional intelligence and effective business leaders (Goleman et al., 2001), arguing that executives have to deal with their own emotions as part of being, and in order to be, successful leaders because a leader’s mood impacts the moods of those around them, and the greatest positive impact is seen when the leader’s mood is upbeat. The four components of EI identified by Goleman et al. (2001) included self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management. Self-

awareness may be the most important component of EI as it relates to recognizing one's own emotions. Self-management is related to managing one's emotions and managing them with honesty and integrity. Social awareness includes empathizing with others and demonstrating intuition. Finally, relationship management involves emotional communication, such as being clear and concise, disarming conflict, and building bonds. Efforts to link EI to other related constructs have facilitated application of EI to the workplace.

Emotional Intelligence and Related Constructs

As mentioned earlier, through the growing body of research, EI has been linked with many different constructs such as general health and well-being, interpersonal relations, job performance and satisfaction, and career burnout. The relationship between EI and each of these constructs is discussed in more detail below.

Health and Well-Being

Multiple meta-analyses have linked EI and health, finding that EI may be a good predictor of physical, psychosomatic, and mental health (Martins et al., 2010; Schutte et al., 2007). Similarly, Dimitrijević et al. (2018) emphasized the power of EI to positively affect happiness and general life satisfaction. For example, research has shown that those with higher EI tend to have greater social support, resiliency, adaptive coping skills, and stress-management skills (Sánchez-Álvarez et al., 2016). Presumably, these characteristics provide more variability within the emotional response continua, and are therefore hypothesized to lead to greater psychological health and feelings of well-being. Finally, Schutte et al, (2007) suggested that the greater reports of physical health may be in part related to having greater satisfaction with social supports, which leads to the next construct associated with EI: interpersonal relations.

Interpersonal Relations

The correlation between EI and interpersonal relations, empathy, and relationships as a whole has been supported through the literature (Klare et al., 2014; Schutte et al., 2001; Zeidner et al., 2009). Consistent with the hypothesis of Salovey and Mayer, individuals with higher EI earned higher scores on measures of empathic perspective taking and self-monitoring in social situations. In addition to empathy and self-monitoring, individuals with higher EI demonstrated greater social skills and had higher scores for close and affectionate relationships. Furthermore, couples' ratings of marital satisfaction were higher when they rated their partners as having higher EI (Schutte et al., 2001). Finally, participants anticipated greater satisfaction in relationships with individuals who were described as having greater EI suggesting that EI may likely be a desirable characteristic when considering possible romantic partners.

Job Performance and Satisfaction

Two additional areas that have been shown to be impacted by EI include job performance and job satisfaction. Joseph et al., (2015) demonstrated a correlation between EI and job performance, with high self-reported EI found to be a good predictor of job performance. Studies have also made the connection between EI and job satisfaction clear and direct (Ilyas & Abdullah, 2016), and this linkage apparently holds across age, gender, or job tenure (Miao et al., 2017). When individuals have greater EI, they are also able to access additional resources, such as support from coworkers, supervisors, or subordinates, which assists in job satisfaction. Miao et al. (2017) argued that this increased access to job resources based on greater EI may be due to greater social effectiveness. In other words, those with greater EI are better able to manage social interactions and therefore garner greater assistance from those around them. This may lead to

greater job performance and satisfaction, which has the potential to reduce the likelihood of burnout.

Burnout

Because some characteristics of EI appear to be related to job satisfaction, job stress, and employment-related communication skills, it has been linked to job performance and positive/negative elements affecting performance, such as burnout, which is one of the most negative influencing variables. Burnout has been defined as “a prolonged response to chronic emotional and interpersonal stressors on the job” (Maslach et al., 2001, p. 397). There is ample research literature targeting burnout in an attempt to define it and identify its causes. Research on burnout began in earnest in the 1970’s with the work of Freudenberger and Maslach (Heinemann & Heinemann, 2017), who focused primarily on the fields of medicine and human services. That work is continuing as medical educators struggle to reduce the effects of burnout in physicians. For example, Beierle, et al., (2019) found an inverse relationship between EI and burnout in medical residents, suggesting that targeting EI in residency curriculum may be a beneficial manner in which to target the high burnout rates in physicians. Further, researchers have identified multiple fields that have been impacted by burnout including business, social services, and helping occupations such as clinic staff, teachers, and policemen (Chen et al., 2012). The burgeoning research base demonstrates how widespread burnout really is.

Some have investigated the specific structure of burnout. For example, researchers have identified three ways in which burnout presents itself: (1) emotional exhaustion, (2) cynicism or depersonalization, and (3) reduced personal accomplishments or inefficacy (Chen et al., 2012; Larrivee, 2012; Maslach et al., 2001). The first component, exhaustion, involves feeling overextended and worn out, like all of one’s resources have been depleted (Maslach et al., 2001).

Exhaustion is the most reported and researched component of burnout. Cynicism, or depersonalization, is an interpersonal component and involves feeling detached from and negative toward one's job. Cynicism was identified as a way to detach from the stressors of one's job, thereby protecting oneself. Finally, the inefficacy component involves feeling incompetent and lacking personal accomplishments or feeling unproductive.

As is apparent, burnout has been shown to impact both job performance and health (Larrivee, 2012; Maslach et al., 2001), and poor job performance can lead to increased absenteeism, decreased productivity or effectiveness, increased intent to leave a job, and actual turnover. Further, the affect characterizing burnout can extend to and be modeled by other employees and may increase conflict and decrease work productivity. Burnout has also been shown to affect employees' mental and physical health through increased anxiety, depression, and neuroticism, and decreased self-esteem. Some have argued, based on the research, that those with greater mental health are better able to deal with chronic stressors. Because a relationship between EI and mental health has been observed (Martins et al., 2010; Schutte et al., 2007), one could argue that greater EI would also assist in dealing with these stressors, which may reduce the likelihood of burnout. In fact, just the increased awareness around EI was shown to have the potential to prevent or reduce burnout in medical residents with a moderate to strong correlation observed between EI and burnout (Beierle et al., 2019).

Burnout and emotional intelligence mirror each other in many ways, with a direct negative relationship being found between EI and depersonalization and an indirect positive relationship between EI and emotional exhaustion (Lee & Ok, 2012). Given that education is reportedly one of the fields most impacted by burnout and turnover (Larrivee, 2012), and one of the primary presentations of burnout is emotional exhaustion (Maslach et al., 2001), there is

support for the need to better understand the relationship between EI and burnout in educational settings.

Emotional Intelligence and Burnout in the Field of Education

Barbara Larrivee (2012) makes the claim that teaching is one of the most stressful professions. She goes on to state that educators experience burnout, which she describes as an extreme form of stress, when “the lack of ability to cope reaches a peak” (p. 4) and educators no longer feel they have the resources or ability to deal with the stress. In fact, Larrivee makes the claim that the term “burnout” has been connected with educators, and specifically teachers, more than any other group. She goes on to describe how this extreme stress has been shown to manifest itself through physical, psychological, and psychosomatic symptoms. Factors that have been identified to contribute to educator stress include poor working conditions and environment, student misbehavior, poor relationships with parents, inadequate training, and personal concerns. Of these, student misbehavior appears to take the greatest toll as it has been shown to be one of the most powerful factors contributing to educator burnout. Larrivee characterizes the primary reason for educators leaving the profession altogether as classroom management-induced stress (Larrivee, 2012).

According to Larrivee (2012), educators are reportedly at greater risk of burnout due to the perceived lack of a supportive workplace network. More recently, others have also emphasized this problem (Ju et al., 2015), noting that the issue is exacerbated because educators are often secluded to their classroom with minimal peer/colleague interaction throughout the day. They are therefore responsible for managing their own emotions and classrooms independently for the majority of their days.

Larrivee (2012) states, “As a frontline profession, teachers have to engage in emotional labor, or managing their emotions at work, to be successful in their multiple teaching roles” (p. 37). By its nature, teaching is an extremely emotional job, in which teachers, and other educators, are responsible for showing appropriate emotions in sometimes very trying times. They are forced in some instances to exaggerate emotions, and in others to suppress them, which takes a toll over time.

There is a growing literature reporting negative correlations between emotional intelligence and burnout in educators (Ju et al., 2015; Manju, 2017; Mérida-López & Extremera, 2017). This link has been extended to help define relationships between educators’ emotions and self-efficacy, classroom management style, job satisfaction, and burnout (Reyes et al., 2012). These findings support the need for professional development to increase emotional intelligence in educators so that educators can build a resistance to the pressures of the job (Manju, 2017; Mérida-López & Extremera, 2017).

Some of what makes teaching so stressful is inherent to the job and, unfortunately, may be unavoidable. Educators cannot control for many of the behaviors parents and students exhibit as a function of their (negative) home life. However, educators must do their best to control the environment that students enter once they get into the classroom and then how they respond to and handle situations within the school setting. By learning ways to analyze one’s own emotions and emotional responses, educators may be better armed to deal with the day-to-day stressors of the job. Educators are constantly juggling work pressures and emotions, and if unchecked, these emotions can lead to burnout and possibly departure from the field altogether.

Teamwork and the Educational Environment

When educators perceive themselves as having a negative social support system, they are more likely to experience burnout, suggesting that a more cohesive and supportive work environment may lead to a reduction in burnout (Ju et al., 2015). How educators view their work environment, and particularly the extent to which they have supportive colleagues and supervisors is related to positive EI. According to Ju et al. educators that can accurately perceive and handle emotions will be better able to manage the landscape of interpersonal relationships within the work environment, which will lead to greater support from colleagues and supervisors.

According to the literature, leaders with better EI are more likely to contribute to a supportive work environment. When leaders are emotionally intelligent, team members' sense of group identity and trust increases, thereby increasing group EI (Miao et al., 2016). Both individual and leader EI has been shown to positively impact team performance based on increased trust within the team (Chang et al., 2012). Principals are the leaders within the school and have the responsibility of fostering a cohesive school team. They too have to be able to control their own emotions to be successful (Hebert, 2011). Within their role, school leaders are often faced with difficult changes and mandates that must be implemented at the school level. Principals with greater EI are better prepared to deal with these changes and to manage educators during these processes as well (Grobler et al., 2017).

Student EI and Academic and Social Success

How educators interact with students is important. Students who are not engaged are at higher risk for drop out, especially when they perceive a lack of connection with educators and peers. On the other hand, students in emotionally supportive classrooms or who report good

relationships with educators have been shown to display greater engagement, interest, and enjoyment, perform better academically based on both classroom grades and standardized tests, and opt for more challenging cognitive tasks (Reyes et al., 2012). In addition to better academic performance, students who develop appropriate social-emotional skills tend to have higher quality relationships and social-emotional competencies (Brackett & Katulak, 2007). Conversely, low levels of EI have been linked to aggression, alcohol and tobacco use, anxiety and depression, poor physical and psychological well-being, and violence (Brackett & Katulak, 2007). By improving students' EI, one can expect to see improved communication, stress- and conflict-management, maintenance of positive school environment, and academic success.

Educators' roles no longer just involve academic skills but have shifted to include social-emotional learning (SEL) as well, which mirrors EI in many ways. As demonstrated above, EI has been shown to influence academic, personal, and social lives, in some cases more than IQ or personality (Brackett & Katulak, 2007). Considering the role that educators play in developing these skills, what can be said of the relationship between EI in educators and their job performance and satisfaction?

Educators Impact on Student EI

There is a growing literature base to support the need for social emotional instruction in the school setting, suggesting that developing these skills will help support positive student relationships (Brackett, et al., 2013; Poulou, 2017). As mentioned previously, the role of the educator in developing social-emotional skills in children appears to have grown, shifting the mindset from not only focusing on academics to incorporating multiple facets of development, including relationship building and general emotional well-being. Educators have an immense responsibility based on this relationship, as studies have shown that educators' attitudes and

behaviors can directly impact students' learning (Yildizbas, 2017). Reyes et al. (2012) point out that educators are often unaware of how their emotions impact student engagement and learning. This is an unfortunate finding given that educators' emotional intelligence plays a role in how they perceive and deal with behavioral issues within the classroom. For example, Poulou (2017) found that educators' views of EI, social-emotional learning, and self-efficacy were related to student-teacher or student-educator relationships, and their view of these relationships was related to student behavioral difficulties. In addition, emotional intelligence has been linked to *developing* competent educator behaviors and positive classroom outcomes (Hen & Sharabi-Nov, 2014). Hen and Sharabi-Nov present a number of recommendations in support of this including the need for EI training in educator preparation programs, arguing that this addition would result in "a very long-term effect on the teaching profession" (p. 376). They go on to discuss the recent push for developing emotional intelligence in educators through EI training in an effort to improve overall professional and academic performance. Educators play a significant role in establishing a positive classroom atmosphere (Ozsezer & Saban, 2016) and research suggests that classrooms that are perceived by students to be warm and respectful with emotionally supportive relationships result in greater academic performance and student engagement (Reyes et al., 2012). Additionally, classrooms that incorporate EI instruction for students, such as those methods implored in the RULER interventions (see Bracket et al., 2013), result in greater warmth and connectedness between teachers and students, a greater focus on student interests, and greater autonomy and leadership displayed by students. Further, students in RULER classrooms reported fewer incidences of bullying, greater enthusiasm for learning, and higher year-end grades than students not in a RULER classroom. Clearly, the classroom emotional climate directly impacts students' performance.

While educators' emotions and behaviors have been shown to impact the climate of the classroom, the overall school atmosphere plays a huge role in how the educators feel as well, with educators reporting feeling "frustrated, overwhelmed, and stressed" for almost 70 percent of their school days (Brackett, 2018, p. 13). Brackett argues that teaching social emotional skills to children alone is not sufficient to address the need, but that all adults in the school would benefit from EI instruction as well. When instruction in emotional awareness and management is widespread throughout the school, home-school interactions improve, achievement increases, health and well-being increases, and problems including bullying and stress decrease.

Although there appears to be support for training teachers and related educational professionals to establish emotionally supportive classroom environments, there may not be significant follow through. That is, professional development designed to improve in-service educators' EI is not systematically delivered in schools, indicating an assumption that educators have the necessary social-emotional competence to create a supportive educational environment for students (Jennings & Greenberg, 2009). In addition, educator preparation programs fall short in this regard as well (Reyes et al., 2012). For educators to sufficiently incorporate EI/SEL instruction into their routines, they too must receive training in social-emotional skills. Additionally, in order to focus on improving EI in educators, an accurate baseline of educators' EI knowledge must be obtained.

Measurement of EI in Educators

A number of instruments have been created to assess EI. Measures have varied based on how the construct of EI is viewed (and therefore how it would best be measured) and how each author conceptualized EI within their specific field. From a theoretical perspective, EI can be perceived as either a trait *or* an ability. Those who view EI as a trait believe it can be

operationalized through self-reflection, and therefore argue for measurement via self-report (Petrides, 2011). On the other hand, those who view EI as an ability argue that it develops much like cognitive ability, as a result of biological predispositions *and* environmental influences, and should be measured by asking examinees to respond to emotionally-charged stimuli such as questions, vignettes, and pictures (e.g., of faces) and rating the “emotional intelligence” of the responses. Correlations between trait-EI and ability-EI have been relatively low and results have varied depending on the population assessed (e.g., children or adults).

As examples of the use of either trait-based or ability-based measures by which EI has been operationalized, Bar-On (2006), who relied on his definition of ESI shared above, developed the Emotional Quotient Inventory, or EQ-i. It has been utilized within organizations and uses a self-report or third-party informant response style. A direct assessment instrument (the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test, or MSCEIT) was developed as an ability-based or performance-based measure of EI (see Windingstad et al., 2011). This measure requires an examinee to respond to various objective or impersonal questions and provides scores based on how examinees perform tasks or solve personal problems. So far, many of the EI instruments and training programs have been geared toward a workplace focus. For example, the Emotional and Social Competency Inventory, or ESCI, was developed by Boyatzis and Goleman (2007) to identify outstanding leaders within an organization. In fact a major proponent of EI research, assessment, and training, the Consortium for Research on Emotional Intelligence Organizations (CREIO), specifically targets research and development of EI within the workplace, including providing a list of model EI programs and assessments that meet their standards (“Emotional Intelligence Consortium - About Us,” n.d.). Most of the attempts to characterize then operationalize EI in the workplace have relied on trait-based self-report or third-party measures

similar to the instruments used in this study, in part because they are more efficient and can be adapted easily for application across different workplace settings by modifying the language of the items.

While there is an emerging corpus of research devoted to measuring EI within an organization, few measures have been identified to target EI specifically in educators. There are exceptions. For example, Wu (2004) created a brief, 25-item self-report measure of emotional intelligence for vocational high school educators, but further research surrounding development, validity, and reliability of this measure could not be found. Additional searches for educator-specific measures of EI were similarly fruitless. To address this need, researchers at the University of Tennessee have developed the Scale of Emotional Functioning: Educators, or SEF:ED (McCallum et al., 2019). An early version of this instrument contained 45 self-report items and was created to assess EI in pre-service educators and in-service educators. It was subsequently modified, and a more detailed description of its development is described below and by Anderson (n.d.), and is summarized in the Method section of this study. It consists of items placed within the context of a school setting, thereby making it relevant for educators and operationalizes EI within three scales: Emotional Awareness (EA), Emotional Management (EM), and Interpersonal Relations (IR).

Improving EI in Educators

Despite Goleman's (1995) view that EI can be increased, research does not conclusively describe the extent to which this goal may be accomplished (Pool & Qualter, 2012). Cherniss and Goleman (2001) argue evidence addressing the effectiveness of EI-like strategies can be found in the literature focusing on related constructs. When this broader view is taken, research designed to improve human relations, research/interventions created to model appropriate

leadership, and self-management skills would be considered relevant. Also, a number of studies have been conducted at the college level to target EI in students who will be entering the workforce. Pool and Qualter (2012), for example, provided intervention to college students through an undergraduate course and successfully increased self-efficacy and some aspects of emotional intelligence. Connolly and Reinicke (2016) reported EI intervention through an undergraduate course for IT Project Management students and observed increased emotional intelligence, communication, and critical thinking in participants following completion of the course. While these results have been supportive of EI-like interventions and the positive impact it can have on an individual's EI, they have not focused on PreK-12 educators or students.

Although there are admonitions in the literature to educators encouraging them to improve their EI and the EI of their students (e.g. see Torrente et al., 2016) and specifically for educator training (Zeidner & Matthews, 2017), there are few examples of how this might be accomplished. Perusal of the literature reveals one study conducted in Israel which focused on EI-based educator training and reported improvements in educators' EI and empathic concern after training (Hen & Sharabi-Nov, 2014). In this study, in-service educators received interventions that provided the opportunity to reflect upon teaching experiences, emotions, and interpersonal awareness in an attempt to create behavioral changes within themselves and with their students. The intervention included self-reflection through dialogue and journaling, and role play. Results supported an increase in emotional intelligence and perspective taking in participants. Another study, also conducted in Israel, found that following EI intervention, educators reported enhanced EI competencies and integration of these competencies into personal, professional, and group components of their lives (Dolev & Leshem, 2016). Pre- and post-test data using the EQ-i suggested modest increases in group EI after a two-year

intervention using group workshops and personal coaching, with significant changes noted in assertiveness and stress tolerance. Brackett et al. (2013) reported lower expression of frustration and anger from teachers implementing RULER (an ability-based EI intervention developed for both students and adult stakeholders in schools). While studies of the efficacy of the RULER approach to EI instruction have reported positive findings, the majority of reports are centered on student outcomes and less so on educator outcomes. Obviously, there is a need for more research into the effectiveness of EI based training, specifically on educators.

Rationale

Research demonstrates the link between EI and student academic performance, educator EI and student performance, and educator job satisfaction and burnout. However, there is little research designed to address the effect of EI training on educator knowledge of EI, perceived effect on the training of classroom management among educators, and the relationship between EI training and burnout. The minimal research that has been conducted has shown improvement in educator EI following interventions (Brackett et al., 2013; Dolev & Leshem, 2016; Hen & Sharabi-Nov, 2014). Reyes et al., (2012) argued for increased intervention and noted “[Research findings] suggest that more deliberate and explicit forms of emotion skills training for educators in the form of pre-service or in-service training might lead to greater student engagement, less educator burnout, and enhanced student performance.” (p. 709). Presumably arming educators with the necessary tools to deal with their professional environment will reduce the emotional stress of being an educator, possibly reduce burnout, and improve students’ engagement and academic performance, paving the way for better and more emotionally aware future generations. Consequently, this study was designed to address that goal. Specifically, the purpose of this study was to develop, implement, and determine the effectiveness of an educator-specific

EI intervention designed to increase educators' knowledge of EI and its application to education. A second purpose is to describe the extent to which EI training reduces educator burnout.

Research Questions

1. Will educators who participate in EI training, consisting of four electronic EI modules and one electronic workshop, earn significantly higher posttest mean scores on a self-report test of emotional functioning (i.e., SEF:ED) when compared to a control group of educators receiving no EI training? More specifically, will educators who receive this intervention earn significantly higher posttest mean scores on scales of EA, EM, and/or IR when compared to a control group of educators receiving no EI training?

2. Will educators who participate in EI training, consisting of four electronic EI modules and one electronic workshop, earn significantly lower mean scores on a self-report test of burnout (i.e., Maslach Burnout Inventory-Educator Survey; MBI-ES) when compared to a control group of educators receiving no EI training? More specifically, will educators who receive this intervention earn significantly lower mean scores on measures of emotional exhaustion (EE) and/or depersonalization (DP), and higher mean scores on a measure of personal accomplishment (PA) when compared to a control group of educators receiving no EI training?

CHAPTER II

Methods

Participants and Setting

Participants included in-service educators (i.e. teachers, aides, school psychologists, speech-language pathologists, and principals) in a rural school district in the southeastern United States. Data were collected as part of a larger data-gathering project over three administrations: initially, pretest data were gathered during the first phase, i.e., Administration One (SEF:ED, MBI-ES, and a third instrument, the PEC from both experimental and control groups); Administration Two consisted of gathering posttest data from the SEF:ED and MBI-ES from both experimental and control groups; Administration Three allowed collection of post-posttest SEF:ED and MBI-ES from the control group only. The PEC data were collected as part of another study and will not be included in analyses of data for this study, except to address the psychometrics of the SEF:ED (see the Instruments section below).

As part of the recruitment process, following initial dissemination of the pretest scales, educators within the district were given a brief explanation of the study during in-service meetings at each school and volunteers were asked to participate. Emails were also sent to all educators in the district and announcements were published on the staff social media website. Those interested in participating provided names and email addresses at in-service trainings or contacted the author via email. Those who consented to participate were randomly assigned to experimental and control groups. Prior to implementation, IRB permission was obtained from the University Office of Research and Engagement.

Demographic information was collected during Administration One along with the pretest data and included gender, age, educator title, highest degree attained, years of education

experience, grade level(s) taught, and type of classroom taught (e.g., general education, inclusion, resource, self-contained, RTI, and related service settings). These data are presented in Table 1. The sample was 91.7% female ($n = 44$) and 8.3% male ($n = 4$). Ages of participants ranged from 20 to 69 with 10.4% being 20-29 ($n = 5$), 37.5% being 30-39 ($n = 18$), 27.1% being 40-49 ($n = 13$), 20.8% being 50-59 ($n = 10$), and 4.2% being 60-69 ($n = 2$). 62.5% of participants were teachers ($n = 30$), 12.5% specialists ($n = 6$), 4.2% administrators ($n = 2$), 6.3% special education case managers ($n = 3$), 4.2% school counselors ($n = 2$), 6.3% RTI coordinators ($n = 3$), and 4.2% school psychologists ($n = 2$). 27.1% of participants reported having a bachelor's degree as the highest degree attained ($n = 13$), 39.6% reported having a master's degree ($n = 19$), 21.0% reported having an education specialist degree ($n = 10$), and 2.1% reported having a doctoral degree ($n = 1$). Participants experience within the field of education ranged from 1 to 35 years, with 16.7% having 1-5 years of education experience ($n = 8$), 29.2% having 6-10 years of education experience ($n = 14$), 14.6% having 11-15 years of education experience ($n = 7$), 10.4% having 16-20 years of education experience ($n = 5$), 12.5% having 21-25 years of education experience ($n = 6$), 12.5% having 25-30 years of education experience ($n = 6$), and 4.2% having 31-35 years of education experience ($n = 2$). 22.9% of participants reported having experience teaching preschool ($n = 11$), 37.5% reported experience teaching kindergarten ($n = 18$), 45.8% reported experience teaching 1st grade ($n = 22$), 47.9% reported experience teaching 2nd grade ($n = 23$), 41.7% reported experience teaching 3rd grade ($n = 20$), 37.5% reported experience teaching 4th grade ($n = 18$), 45.8% reported experience teaching 5th grade ($n = 22$), 41.7% reported experience teaching 6th grade ($n = 20$), 47.9% reported experience teaching 7th grade ($n = 23$), 47.9% reported experience teaching 8th grade ($n = 23$), 27.1% reported experience teaching 9th grade ($n = 13$), 25.0% reported experience teaching 10th grade ($n = 12$), 25.0% reported

experience teaching 11th grade ($n = 12$), 25.0% reported experience teaching 12th grade ($n = 12$), and 2.1% reported experience teaching college ($n = 1$). Finally, 31.3% of participants reported teaching a general education classroom ($n = 15$), 10.4% reported teaching an inclusion classroom ($n = 5$), 18.8% reported teaching a resource classroom ($n = 9$), 12.5% reported teaching a self-contained special education classroom ($n = 6$), 6.3% reported teaching an RTI classroom ($n = 3$), and 6.3% reported teaching a related service classroom ($n = 3$).

Instruments

SEF:ED

Data were collected from the SEF:ED (Appendix A). The SEF:ED is a self-report scale of emotional intelligence specific to educators that was adapted from the Scale of Emotional Functioning: Medicine (SEF:MED). The SEF:MED pilot testing completed in 2017 by researchers at the University of Tennessee revealed reliability estimates (i.e., Cronbach's Alpha's) of .85, .87, and .88 for the subscales EA, EM, and IR respectively (Kirkpatrick, 2020). Items from the SEF:MED were revised slightly to include language suitable for educators and the 45-item scale was administered to 98 participants as part of another study designed to determine its reliability and validity (Anderson, n.d.). After item analyses the final version of the SEF:ED scale was reduced to 30 items. It provides an overall measure of EI, and like the SEF:MED, also provides subscales for EA, EM, and IR. Split-half reliability estimates were derived using the Spearman-Brown formula, and values of .86, .71, and .80 were obtained for EA, EI, and IR, respectively. Evidence for the concurrent validity of the SEF:ED was established by comparing it to an established measure of Emotional Intelligence, the PEC (Appendix B), and correlation coefficients between the scales of the PEC and SEF:ED ranged from .35 to .72; a

more detailed analysis of the relationship between the two instruments is available from Anderson (n.d.).

In order to prevent item response set for both the SEF:MED and SEF:ED, the positive and negative nature of the items were counterbalanced and presented in a 5-point Likert-like format using the following options: Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Often, and Always. For the purpose of this study, the scale was delivered electronically through Qualtrics and participants were able to click on the answer that best characterized their behaviors. From these, data were collected to inform reliability (internal consistency) and validity (concurrent and construct).

MBI-ES

Data collection from the MBI-ES (Appendix C) relied on a 22-item, self-report survey designed for educators. Questions address educators' feelings about work and target the three primary areas of burnout within three scales: Emotional Exhaustion (EE), Depersonalization (DP), and Personal Accomplishment (PA). Questions are presented in a 6-point Likert-like format with the following response options: 0-Never, 1-A few times a year or less, 2-Once a month or less, 3-A few times a month, 4-Once a week, 5-A few times a week, and 6-Every day. Once again, this was provided to educators electronically through Qualtrics and educators were able to click on the answer that best fit.

The MBI-ES Manual does not provide reliability and validity data, but it was constructed as an adaptation to the Maslach Burnout Inventory – Human Services Survey (MBI-HSS). Cronbach Alpha's of .90, .79, and .71 for the EE, DP, and PA subscales respectively have been reported for that version (Maslach et al., 2016). Multiple studies have been conducted to examine the test-retest reliability of the MBI-HSS and indices have ranged from .50 to .82 (Lee & Ashforth, 1993; Leiter, 1990; Maslach et al., 2016).

Procedures

Pretest

Data were collected across three test administrations. Prior to intervention, pretest data were collected from the following scales: Scale of Emotional Functioning: Educators (SEF:ED), Profile of Emotional Competence (PEC), and Maslach Burnout Inventory-Educator Survey (MBI-ES), although the PEC data were eliminated from analyses, as described earlier. All educators within the school system were sent electronic versions of the SEF:ED, PEC, and MBI-ES presented in counter-balanced order and they were instructed to complete the scales in that order. These were sent to educators via email and consent was included in the inventory prior to actual inventory questions. All email addresses were assigned codes linked with a master list of all staff email addresses for the district and then email addresses were removed from responses to preserve anonymity and allow for later comparison between experimental and control groups. Email addresses and codes were kept in a password-protected file on the author's computer.

Intervention

After initial completion of the electronic SEF:ED, PEC, and MBI-ES, educators were offered the option to participate in EI professional development lessons, which would consist of four electronic modules, responses to vignettes, and one pre-recorded workshop. Estimated time for completion of all components was three hours (20 minutes for initial inventory completion, 20 minutes per electronic module, one hour for final workshop and 20 minutes for final inventory completion). Educators were given information about the intervention at staff development meetings and given the opportunity to sign up at that time or instructed to contact the author at a later time if they were interested in participating. They were also given the opportunity to express interest by responding to district-wide recruitment emails and social

media announcements. Following completion of the pretest, those in the experimental group were sent the four electronic EI modules (see Appendix D for module transcripts). The first module provided an overview of EI and support for why EI may be important for educators. The remaining three modules provided information pertaining to three prominent areas of EI: EA, EM, and IR. Each of these modules defined the specific area of EI, provided strategies to improve that area of EI, and ended with two vignettes specific to the content covered in the module. Educators were prompted to provide answers to two questions presented within each vignette before moving onto the next module. A final recorded workshop was offered to conclude the series and provide an opportunity to review real-world scenarios encountered in the school settings based on feedback provided by participants in the previous modules. All participating educators who completed the electronic modules and the workshop were awarded professional development points, which could be applied toward educator licensure renewal.

Posttest

After the experimental group completed the final workshop, in addition to questions pertaining to participants' perceptions of the intervention (Appendix E), participants from the experimental and control groups completed electronic versions of the SEF:ED and MBI-ES. Those in the control group, who had not received the training, served as a waiting control and were provided the intervention after completing the posttest surveys. Finally, after the waiting control group completed the interventions, they were sent a final survey containing the SEF:ED, MBI-ES and qualitative questions pertaining to their perceptions of the intervention.

Data Analyses

Following data cleaning procedures, descriptive statistics such as means, standard deviations, ranges, skewness, and kurtosis were obtained for all variables. SEF:ED pretest data

were included in a larger data gathering effort and helped inform item analyses used to select the final item pool (e.g., item-scale correlation coefficients, factor loadings from factor structure analyses), calculation of scale reliabilities (Spearman-Brown Split-Half and Coefficient Alphas), as well as correlation coefficients defining the relationship between and among scales from the SEF:ED and MBI-ES. Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance (RM-ANOVAs) were conducted to determine whether differences existed between the experimental and control group adjusted composite means at posttest, one for the SEF:ED Total, one for each of the three SEF:ED subscales (EA, EM, and IR), and one for each of the three MBI-ES scales (EE, DP, and PA).

CHAPTER III

Results

In this section, data cleaning procedures and descriptive statistics are presented first. Then data analyses addressing Research Questions one and two follow.

Data Cleaning Procedures

Prior to analyses, data were cleaned using the following processes. There were a total of 55 respondents at the end of data collection. Participants who had not completed surveys at each of the designated time periods outlined in the methods section were removed, reducing the participant pool to 53. A validity scale was constructed to determine consistency of responding, i.e., 12 item-pairs were identified by the SEF:ED authors as assessing the same or very similar content. Participants who had inconsistency scores that were two or more standard deviations above the mean on yoked item pairs at pretest or posttest were removed. Items that were identified by test authors as consistency items included: Items 1 and 4, Items 2 and 7, Items 3 and 6, Items 12 and 19, Items 22 and 28, and Items 26 and 29. To determine consistency for each participant, the absolute difference between ratings for each pair was calculated. Then these absolute differences were summed in order to obtain an overall inconsistency score. At pretest, inconsistency scores ranged from 0 to 8 ($M = 2.67$, $SD = 1.62$, mode = 3) and at posttest, inconsistency scores ranged from 0 to 5 ($M = 2.16$, $SD = 1.32$, mode = 1). At pretest, 7.3% ($n = 4$) had an inconsistency score of 0 (indicating they gave consistent responses across all item pairs), 20% ($n = 11$) had an inconsistency score of 1, 16.4% ($n = 9$) had an inconsistency score of 2, 31.0% ($n = 13$) had an inconsistency score of 3, 16.4% ($n = 9$) had an inconsistency score of 4, 7.3% ($n = 4$) had an inconsistency score of 5, 1.8% ($n = 1$) had an inconsistency score of 6, 0 had an inconsistency score of 7, and 1.8% ($n = 1$) had an inconsistency score of 8. This resulted in

the deletion of two participants. At posttest, 7.5% ($n = 4$) had an inconsistency score of 0, 26.4% ($n = 14$) had an inconsistency score of 1, 30.2% ($n = 16$) had an inconsistency score of 2, 22.6% ($n = 12$) had an inconsistency score of 3, 9.1% ($n = 5$) had an inconsistency score of 4, and 5.5% ($n = 3$) had an inconsistency score of 5. This resulted in the deletion of three more participants. After completion of the data cleaning process, a total of 48 participants remained, with 24 in the intervention group and 24 in the waiting control group.

Descriptive Statistics

Following removal of incomplete or inconsistent respondents, the adjusted totals and means for the SEF:ED Total EI score and subscales scores on the SEF:ED were obtained from the final pool of participants ($N = 48$) at pretest and posttest for both experimental and waiting control groups, and a third post-posttest administration was obtained from the waiting control group ($N = 24$). Additionally, mean scores for the three subscales of the MBI-ES were obtained at each administration time. Means, standard deviations, skewness and kurtosis are presented below in Table 2 and Table 3. Normality of data was determined based on the criteria presented by Kline (2005) suggesting that skewness greater than $|3|$ and kurtosis greater than $|10|$ would be considered abnormal.

Adjusted SEF:ED Total mean scores at pretest range from 100.00 to 134.00 with a mean of 115.38 ($SD = 7.65$) across all administrations. Mean scores on the EA subscale range from 31.72 to 44.00 with a mean of 38.72 ($SD = 2.84$). Mean scores on the EM subscale range from 27.0 to 44.00 with a mean of 35.69 ($SD = 3.98$). Finally, mean scores on the IR subscale range from 34.00 to 49.00 with a mean of 40.97 ($SD = 3.11$). Pretest scores are approximately normally distributed, with skewness ranging from $-.51$ to $.25$ and kurtosis ranging from $-.38$ to $.64$. At posttest, adjusted SEF:ED Total mean scores range from 92.00 to 131.00 with a mean of 114.31

($SD = 7.17$). Adjusted mean scores on the EA posttest subscale range from 29.00 to 43.00 with a mean of 38.54 ($SD = 2.63$). Adjusted mean scores on the posttest EM subscale range from 29.00 to 43.00 with a mean of 35.85 ($SD = 3.17$). Finally, adjusted mean scores on the posttest IR subscale range from 31.00 to 47.00 with a mean of 39.91 ($SD = 3.19$). Posttest scores are approximately normally distributed, with skewness ranging from -1.23 to -.18 and kurtosis ranging from -.51 to 3.01. A third post-posttest scale was administered to the waiting control group ($N = 24$), and adjusted SEF:ED Total mean scores from this administration range from 98.00 to 146.00 with a mean of 115.61 ($SD = 10.04$). Adjusted mean scores on the EA post-posttest subscale range from 29.00 to 46.00 with a mean score of 38.33 ($SD = 4.03$). Adjusted mean scores on the post-posttest EM subscale range from 27.00 to 50.00 with a mean of 36.74 ($SD = 4.33$). Finally, adjusted mean scores on the post-posttest IR subscale range from 33.00 to 50.00 with a mean of 40.54 ($SD = 3.65$). Post-posttest scores are approximately normally distributed, with skewness ranging from -.72 to 1.05 and kurtosis ranging from -.38 to 3.37. Although Kline offers the perspective of acceptable skewness and kurtosis scores of $|3|$ and $|10|$ respectively, the majority of skewness and kurtosis scores obtained within this study are less than $|1|$ and $|3|$ respectively. In fact, roughly 83.33% of skewness scores are less than $|1|$ and 83.33% of kurtosis scores are less than $|3|$. See Table 2 for SEF:ED descriptive statistics.

Burnout was measured using the MBI-ES. At pretest, adjusted mean scores on the EE subscale range from 5.00 to 47.00 with a mean of 23.98 ($SD = 10.23$). Mean scores on the DP subscale range from 0.00 to 20.00 with a mean of 6.77 ($SD = 4.82$). Finally, mean scores on the PA subscale range from 16.00 to 45.00 with a mean of 32.83 ($SD = 5.01$). At posttest, mean scores on the EE subscale range from 5.36 to 45.00 with a mean of 22.24 ($SD = 9.40$). Mean scores on the posttest DP subscale range from 0.00 to 19.00 with a mean of 6.21 ($SD = 4.50$).

Finally, adjusted mean scores on the posttest PA subscale range from 21.00 to 45.00 with a mean of 33.65 ($SD = 5.59$). A third post-posttest scale was administered to the waiting control group ($N = 24$), and mean scores on the EE post-posttest subscale range from 0 to 40.00 with a mean of 22.25 ($SD = 10.78$). Mean scores on the post-posttest DP subscale range from 0 to 18.00 with a mean of 5.50 ($SD = 5.10$). Finally, adjusted mean scores on the post-posttest PA subscale ranged from 24.00 to 48.00 with a mean of 35.35 ($SD = 5.77$). Scores across the three administrations are approximately normally distributed, with skewness ranging from $-.88$ to $.86$ and kurtosis ranging from $-.74$ to 1.43 . Again, these are well within the acceptable ranges posed by Kline (2005). See Table 3 for MBI-ES descriptive statistics. Results from data analyses pertaining to each research question are presented below.

Research Question 1: Evaluating Posttest SEF:ED Scores between Experimental and Waiting Control

Research question 1 addressed the following question: Did educators who participated in the EI training earn significantly higher posttest mean scores on the SEF:ED when compared to a control group of educators receiving no EI training? Additionally, did educators who received this intervention earn significantly higher posttest mean scores on EA, EM, and/or IR when compared to the control group of educators receiving no EI training? A Repeated Measures ANOVA was conducted to determine if the change in participants' EI scores from pretest to posttest differed between the experimental and control groups.

To determine the extent to which the EI intervention produced changes in mastery of EI knowledge, pre and posttest data were evaluated via repeated measures ANOVAs; the initial analysis reveals no statistically significant interaction effect, i.e., gain scores from pre to posttest for the two groups were similar for Total EI, $F(1, 46) = .01$, $p = .92$, Wilk's $\lambda = 1.00$.

Furthermore, no significant interaction effect is found between treatment groups and pre-posttest administration on the EA scale, $F(1, 46) = .08, p = .78$, Wilk's $\lambda = 1.00$, the EM scale, $F(1, 46) = .14, p = .71$, Wilk's $\lambda = 1.00$, nor the IR scale, $F(1, 46) = .59, p = .45$, Wilk's $\lambda = .99$.

To explore the extent to which both groups may have improved their EI knowledge from pre to posttest administration, the main effects F from the repeated measures ANOVAs were evaluated. No main effects are noted between pretest and posttest on Total EI, $F(1, 46) = 1.00, p = .32$, Wilk's $\lambda = .98$, EA, $F(1, 46) = .26, p = .62$, Wilk's $\lambda = .99$, nor EM, $F(1, 46) = .14, p = .71$, Wilk's $\lambda = 1.00$. However, a significant main effect is evident for IR, $F(1, 46) = 4.78, p = .03$, Wilk's $\lambda = .91$, with mean scores decreasing from pretest ($M = 40.97$) to posttest ($M = 39.91$).

No main effects are evident by group for Total EI, $F(1, 46) = .26, p = .62$, EA, $F(1, 46) = .00, p = .98$, EM, $F(1, 46) = 1.45, p = .24$, or IR, $F(1, 46) = .06, p = .80$. Because there is no interaction effect or main effect with regard to Group IR, the main effect noted with IR from pretest to posttest indicates that similar changes were produced in both the experimental and control groups.

Because the control group was a waiting control, Repeated Measures ANOVA was conducted to analyze the change in Total mean EI and mean scores on each subscale from the posttest administration to the post-posttest administration (i.e., after the waiting control group received the intervention). The Repeated Measures ANOVA shows no significant change from posttest administration to post-posttest administration on Total EI, $F(1, 23) = 1.00, p = .33$, Wilk's $\lambda = .96$. Although no significant mean difference is found between posttest and post-posttest for the waiting control group in EA, $F(1, 23) = 1.00, p = .76$, Wilk's $\lambda = 1.00$ or IR, $F(1, 23) = .81, p = .38$, Wilk's $\lambda = .97$, a significant difference is seen between the EM means from

posttest to post-posttest, $F(1, 23) = 5.33, p = .03$, Wilk's $\lambda = .81$. This change in emotional management was in the expected direction, with educators in the waiting control group reporting higher emotional management after receiving the intervention. See Table 4 for side-by-side comparison of pretest, posttest, and post-posttest means and standard deviations for the SEF:ED.

Research Question 2: Posttest MBI-ES Scores between Experimental and Waiting Control

To determine the extent to which the EI intervention produced changes in burnout pre and posttest data were evaluated via repeated measures ANOVAs. Specifically, did educators who participated in the EI training earn significantly lower posttest mean scores on the MBI-ES EE and DP scales, and significantly higher mean scores on the PA scale when compared to in-service educators who served as waiting controls?

No interaction effects are identified between treatment group and pre- to posttreatment administration time on the MBI-ES subscales. More specifically, no interaction effect is identified on the EE subscale, $F(1, 46) = .79, p = .38$, Wilk's $\lambda = .98$, DP subscale, $F(1, 46) = .00, p = .97$, Wilk's $\lambda = 1.00$, or PA subscale, $F(1, 46) = .48, p = .49$, Wilk's $\lambda = .99$. No main effects are noted between pretest and posttest means on the EE scale, $F(1, 46) = 2.43, p = .13$, Wilk's $\lambda = .95$, DP scale, $F(1, 46) = .91, p = .35$, Wilk's $\lambda = .98$, nor the PA scale, $F(1, 46) = 1.00, p = .32$, Wilk's $\lambda = .98$. Additionally, no main effects are noted for the control and experimental groups on the EE scale, $F(1, 46) = 3.69, p = .06$ or the DP scale, $F(1, 46) = .13, p = .72$. A significant main effect is noted between the experimental and control group on the PA scale $F(1, 46) = 5.09, p = .03$, with the experimental group reporting higher PA ($M = 34.65$) than the control group ($M = 31.83$). Apparently, when scores are collapsed across administrations those, in the experimental group earn higher mean scores than those in the control group.

Again, because the control group was a waiting control, a Repeated Measures ANOVA was conducted to analyze the change in rating on the MBI-ES subscales from the posttest administration to post-posttest administration (i.e., after the waiting control group received the intervention as well). The Repeated Measures ANOVA shows no significant change from posttest administration to post-posttest administration on the EE scale, $F(1, 23) = 2.34, p = .14$, Wilk's $\lambda = .91$ or the DP scale $F(1, 23) = .24, p = .63$, Wilk's $\lambda = .99$. A significant mean difference is apparent from posttest to post-posttest on the PA scale, $F(1, 23) = 4.24, p = .05$, Wilk's $\lambda = .84$. This change is in the expected direction, with Personal Accomplishment increasing from posttest ($M = 31.96$) to post-posttest ($M = 35.25$). See Table 4 for side-by-side comparison of pretest, posttest, and post-posttest means and standard deviations for the MBI-ES.

CHAPTER IV

Discussion

While emotional intelligence and related constructs have been referenced in literature for centuries, the direct links between specific operationalizations of EI and other important intrapersonal and interpersonal aspects of our lives have not been explicated until recently (see Goleman, 1995). The emerging corpus of research reveals linkages between EI and physical and mental health and wellbeing, interpersonal relations, job performance and satisfaction, and ultimately, career burnout. The role that EI plays in the field of education more specifically has become increasingly evident as well, with mounting pressure for educators to foster social-emotional growth in their students; many, if not most teachers, have not received direct training related to social-emotional learning or related EI knowledge. Additionally, with the link between EI and career burnout becoming more evident (Ju et al., 2015; Manju, 2017; Mérida-López & Extremera, 2017), and the recognition that educators experience burnout at an alarmingly high rate (Larivee, 2012), it is evident that educators need knowledge and strategies to help them combat the daily stressors of their jobs with the goal of reducing burnout (Manju, 2017; Mérida-López & Extremera, 2017). An assumption based on the limited research suggests that educators who master more effective strategies for identifying and managing their emotions and those of others may have a more positive impact on their students. More research is needed to investigate this assumption and that was the purpose of this study.

Does EI Training Improve Performance of In-Service Educators?

While some have argued for increased training and intervention opportunities related to EI for educators (Hen & Sharabi-Nov, 2014; Torrente et al., 2016; Zeidner & Matthews, 2017), current literature on such interventions has been relatively limited in scope. However, there are

promising early indicators (Brackett et al., 2013; Dolev & Leshem, 2016; Hen & Sharabi-Nov, 2014). The literature that supports the positive linkages between EI mastery and teaching performance provides the rationale for this study, which was designed to help determine whether an EI intervention can actually improve EI knowledge, then whether that mastery can help educators better handle the stressors of their jobs, and therefore reduce the likelihood of burnout and related problems. Two primary research questions guided the methodology.

Research question 1 addresses one of the basic questions raised above, i.e., can systematic EI training increase knowledge of one's own EI. Results from this study do not support the contention that training effectively improves in-service educators' mastery of their EI based on an operationalization of EI from self-report measures of their EA, EM, and IR abilities and the methodology within the study. To summarize the methodology and results briefly, following completion of pretest surveys, participants in the experimental group received electronic EI modules and a final electronic workshop that was directly linked to some of the comments and questions posed throughout the previous modules. After completion of the workshop, both the experimental and control groups completed the SEF:ED and MBI-ES again, and then the same intervention was offered to the control group. Results reveal no significant difference in EI or burnout between the experimental and control groups. More specifically, no significant change was noted in Total EI, EA, or EM. Review of the data obtained after the waiting control group received the intervention does show an increase in emotional management. However, there was no control group with which to compare these results and it is unclear whether the change in EM was related to the intervention or other factors.

While the literature is not conclusive, some previous studies do report positive effects of EI training, though others report more limited success. For example, studies conducted with

undergraduate students reported increased self-efficacy (Pool & Qualter, 2012), aspects of EI (Connolly & Reinicke, 2016; Pool & Qualter, 2012), and communication and critical thinking skills (Connolly & Reinicke, 2016). However, none of these specifically targeted EI in in-service educators. Those studies that did target educators reported increased EI (Brackett et al., 2013; Dolev & Leshem, 2016; Hen & Sharabi-Nov, 2014), increased empathic concern for students (Hen & Sharabi-Nov, 2014), and changes in assertiveness and stress tolerance (Dolev & Leshem, 2016). The results of this study are mixed at best, but in general, do not comport with the positive results from other researchers.

The studies mentioned above that do yield positive training outcomes designed for educators primarily used reflections through dialogue, journaling, role-play, workshops, and coaching (Brackett et al., 2013; Dolev & Leshem, 2016; Hen & Sharabi-Nov, 2014). The intervention developed for this study was similar to these previous studies in that opportunities for reflection were provided at numerous points within each module, i.e., participants were asked to reflect upon vignettes, share personal experiences related to the topic of each module, and/or to pose questions they may have related to EI or burnout. However, the intervention delivery in this study differed from previous studies; specifically, it was designed to be disseminated electronically in an effort to make participation easier for educators who expressed concern over finding the time to dedicate to in-person workshops. By presenting materials in this format, the opportunities for direct interaction of participants provided in previous studies through role-play and direct coaching, was eliminated. This difference in format, with minimal direct interaction between the author and the participants or among participants, may have contributed to less positive outcomes. Additionally, at least one of the previous studies was significantly longer in duration than the present study, lasting up to two years, and most were longer than the training

within the methodology of this study. For example, participants in this study could have completed the training, including the vignettes and related questions, in as little as one day. On the one hand, this delivery system allowed quick dissemination of the material and efficient completion but may have contributed to lack of internal validity.

Research question 2 addresses the extent to which EI training can impact burnout, given the evidence that the two constructs are linked. That is, data from this study and from previous research show significant correlations between the subconstructs of EI and those of burnout. For example, Beierle, et al. (2019) and Kirkpatrick (2020) reported significant correlation coefficients between EI and burnout using a related instrument, the SEF:MED, and in another population devoted to the helping professions—medical residents. The EI subconstructs of EA and EM were negatively related to EE and DP and positively related to PA among these residents. A similar pattern occurred for in-service educators assessed in this study. That is, the SEF:ED Total EI is significantly negatively correlated with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, and positively correlated with personal accomplishment. Furthermore, each of the emotional intelligence subscales, including emotional awareness, emotional management, and interpersonal relations, are negatively correlated with depersonalization and emotional exhaustion, and positively correlated with personal accomplishment (see Tables 5 and 6 for a summary of these results). Most of these relationships are statistically significant, and those that are not are still in the expected direction. These analyses were conducted again at posttest, and in every case, correlations at posttest are higher.

The stronger coefficients at posttest may be due to the fact that participants had an opportunity to see both instruments as part of the pretest, and the EI and burnout linkages may have become more apparent to them with repeated exposure. These correlations were also in the

same direction as those found between the SEF:MED and MBI-HSS, a measure of burnout in human services, and they were consistent across all three administrations. With each administration the relationship between SEF:ED Total EI, EA, EM, and IR revealed negative correlations coefficients with EE and DP, and positive coefficients with PA. Obviously, EI and burnout are linked, even though the results of this study do not provide compelling evidence that improving one (i.e., EI) improves the other (i.e., burnout). Additional research is needed to determine the nature, extent, and direction of these relationships.

Below is a description of how the methodology and outcomes from this study can be interpreted within the context of the literature base describing the relationship between the two constructs. Although there is limited data explicating the relationship between EI and burnout, as described above, previous studies reviewing the impact of EI-related interventions on educators did not address the impact of EI intervention and educator reported burnout. This study offers only limited support for the assertion that EI training can positively affect burnout. Specifically, repeated measures ANOVAs revealed no significant interactions showing pre- and posttest mean differences as a function of group (control vs. experimental) on the MBI-ES scales assessing emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, or personal accomplishment, nor were significant differences obtained for tests of main effects of group (control and experimental) and administration time (pretest to posttest), with one exception. The experimental group PA, post-posttest administration mean was higher after receiving the EI intervention than before. It is unclear if this change was related to the intervention or other influences. Given that the PA scale assesses perspectives related to job success and satisfaction, it is conceivable that learning more about EI success could have contributed positively to the score.

Can Qualitative Participant Feedback Contribute to Interpretation of Results?

A number of qualitative data were obtained within the methodology of this study, even though analyses of these results were not the primary objective. First, respondents provided written responses to six vignettes that were presented in three of the electronic modules. Future research may benefit from designing a rubric by which to analyze responses to these vignettes. For example, in response to a scenario in which a teacher receives an undesirable reaction from the principal after requesting a meeting to discuss a recent negative evaluation, one participant mentioned how the nature of the principal's body language and nonverbal behaviors may make them feel as if the principal was uninterested in helping them while another response suggested that perhaps the principal was dealing with something else more personally and was therefore distracted from the meeting. Both responses were related to emotional awareness but provided different perspectives. This and related feedback may facilitate interpretation of the results.

In addition, participants were sent a follow-up survey in which three dichotomous qualitative questions were posed as well as a fourth open-ended question requesting recommendations for how to improve the training modules; 30 participants responded. According to the responses to the four questions 70.0% of respondents acknowledged that they perceived the EI training as helpful in managing their classrooms, 83.3% acknowledged that the training helped them better relate to their students, and 86.7% acknowledged that learning about EI improved their perception of burnout; these percentages are inconsistent with the quantitative results. One possible explanation for this discrepancy is social desirability; that is, participants may have responded to items in a manner consistent with faking good. They may have provided answers that could be considered socially acceptable and that would make them appear to have better EI and less burnout than they really possess. Additionally, responses may have been

affected by participation bias. Those who responded to items more positively may have been more inclined to participate. Those with a tendency to respond in more negative fashion may have opted out. This is consistent with the low response rate obtained. A total of 83 educators expressed interest in participating in this study, but only 55 completed all of the intervention components, and only 48 were found to be usable. Over 450 invitations were sent to potential participants.

Limitations of the Study

There are a number of limitations within this study. For example, although both the SEF:ED and MBI-ES were chosen because of their item specificity (i.e., both contain items related specifically to education and teaching), both are self-report measures and are subject to social desirability/faking good (Huang et al., 1998; Holtgraves, 2004). Neither contain a Fake Good scale. The SEF:ED does contain a validity scale to flag for possible inconsistent response patterns, but no other validity scales exist to date (see the description of the SEF:ED in the Method section). Further, the MBI-ES does not contain any validity scales. Future studies may benefit from including a social desirability scale, such as the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSDS; Crowne & Marlow, 1960) to determine the effect of social desirability. Related to the criticism above, the SEF:ED and the MBI-ES, like all self-report measures, may be susceptible to other influences that contribute to inaccurate self-perceptions, such as social desirability, faking, and/or inaccurate judgments of individuals' own abilities (Brackett et al., 2013). Therefore, future research may benefit from inclusion of observer or supervisor ratings to help determine construct/concurrent validity of the two instruments.

The electronic format of the bulk of the intervention was designed for efficient administration and participation; however, the format may be insufficient to produce a robust

effect. Some previous studies demonstrated more positive results following interventions designed with a more direct face-to-face contact (e.g., direct coaching, in-person workshops, and/or role-play). However, given the tendency of journal editors to reject nonsignificant findings, it is difficult to know the actual state of affairs.

In addition to these limitations is the relatively high attrition rate, as noted above. Less than 50 participants yielded usable results out of more than 450 potential participants. There are a number of possible reasons for this high attrition rate, including school closures due to a higher-than-typical incidence of sickness, technical issues with the survey-delivery method (i.e., broken survey links through Qualtrics), or personal/family issues of the respondents (e.g., death or sickness in the family). Multiple participants reported the inability to complete the modules following school closures due to falling behind in other job responsibilities and not being able to find the time.

An additional limitation is lack of generalizability of these findings given the relatively small sample size and small, rural nature of the community from which participants were drawn. The sample consisted of only 48 participants after data cleaning was complete, 91.7% of whom were females. Further, the diversity/variability of the participants is substantial, including years of experience (ranging from 1 to 35 years), scope of job responsibilities (general education teacher, administrator, RTI coordinator, school psychologist, speech, language pathologist, etc.), and level of education (bachelors, masters, education specialist, doctorate, etc.). Future research would benefit from obtaining larger sample sizes of a more homogenous nature in order to gain a greater representation of differing educator roles and experiences.

Summary and Implications

Overall, results from this study were mixed. In general, the results provide very limited evidence to support the positive impact of EI training for in-service educators. A decrease in interpersonal relations was noted between pretest and posttest, but this change was evident across both experimental and control groups. With regard to the MBI-ES subscales, no significant changes were noted between experimental and control groups. All other changes in SEF:ED and MBI-ES subscales were not significant, and no significant differences were observed between treatment groups. However, changes were noted from posttest to post-posttest with the waiting control group. In this case, personal accomplishment increased following completion of the intervention. Given that there is no control group with which to compare these findings, it is unclear if these changes were related to the intervention or other extraneous variables.

Given the limited generalizability of this study, future studies would benefit from obtaining a larger sample size and utilizing a longer (and perhaps more robust) intervention. Additionally, because previous studies demonstrated positive results with the use of coaching, modeling, and role-play, perhaps future studies should incorporate a more hands-on or collaborative component to encourage active participation, such as an in-person workshop or virtual meeting through which participants can collaborate.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, C. J. (2017). Examining Demonstrated Emotional Intelligence and Perceptions of Inviting Schools. *Journal of Invitational Theory & Practice*, 23, 35–61. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ehh&AN=130781962&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Anderson, L. S. (n.d.) *Development and validation of the Scale of Emotional Functioning: Education (SEF:ED)* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. The University of Tennessee.
- Bar-On, R. (2006). The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence (ESI). *Psicotherma*, 18, 13–25. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-79124-9_10
- Beierle, S. P., Kirkpatrick, B. A., Heidel, R. E., Russ, A., Ramshaw, B., McCallum, R. S., & Lewis, J. M. (2019). Evaluating and Exploring Variations in Surgical Resident Emotional Intelligence and Burnout. *Journal of Surgical Education*, 76(3), 628-636. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsurg.2018.11.004>
- Boyatzis, R. E., & Goleman, D. (2007). *Emotional and social competency inventory*. Boston: Hay Group.
- Boyatzis, R. E., Goleman, D., & Rhee, K. (1999). Clustering Competence in Emotional Intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Competence Inventory. In R. Bar-On & J. DA Parker (Eds.), *Handbook of Emotional Intelligence* (pp. 343–362). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Retrieved from http://www.eiconsortium.org/pdf/eci_acticle.pdf
- Brackett, M. A. (2018). The Emotional Intelligence We Owe Students and Educators. *The Promise of Social-Emotional Learning*, 76(2), 12–18.

- Brackett, M. A., Bertoli, M., Elbertson, N., Bausseron, E., Castillo, R., & Salovey, P. (2013). Emotional intelligence: Reconceptualizing the cognition-emotion link (M. D. Robinson, E. Watkins, & E. Harmon-Jones, Eds.). In *Handbook of cognition and emotion* (pp. 365-379). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Brackett, M. A., & Katulak, N. A. (2007). Emotional Intelligence in the Classroom: Skill-Based Training for Teachers and Students. In *Improving emotional intelligence: A practitioner's guide* (pp. 1–27). <https://doi.org/10.1.1.385.4289>
- Brasseur, S., Grégoire, J., Bourdu, R., & Mikolajczak, M. (2013). The Profile of Emotional Competence (PEC): Development and Validation of a Self-Reported Measure that Fits Dimensions of Emotional Competence Theory. *PLoS One*, 8(5), e62635. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0062635>
- Chang, J. W., Sy, T., & Choi, J. N. (2012). Team emotional intelligence and performance: Interactive dynamics between leaders and members. *Small Group Research*, 43(1), 75–104. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496411415692>
- Chen, H., Wu, P., & Wei, W. (2012). New Perspective on Job Burnout: Exploring the Root Cause beyond General Antecedents Analysis. *Psychological Reports*, 110(3), 801–819. <https://doi.org/10.2466/01.09.13.PR0.110.3.801-819>
- Cherniss, C., & Goleman, D. (2001). Training for emotional intelligence: A model. In *The emotionally intelligent workplace* (pp. 209–233). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Connolly, A. J., & Reinicke, B. (2016). How to Teach Emotional Intelligence Skills in IT Project Management. *How to Teach Emotional Intelligence Skills in IT Project Management*, 15(July), 1–15.

- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of consulting psychology*, 24(4), 349.
- Dimitrijević, A. A., Marjanović, Z. J., & Dimitrijević, A. (2018). Whichever intelligence makes you happy: The role of academic, emotional, and practical abilities in predicting psychological well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 132(May), 6–13.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.05.010>
- Dolev, N., & Leshem, S. (2016). Teachers' emotional intelligence: The impact of training. *The International Journal of Emotional Education*, 8(1), 75–94.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/pubmed/fdy181>
- Emotional Intelligence Consortium - About Us. (n.d.). Retrieved February 22, 2019, from http://www.eiconsortium.org/about_us.htm
- Galdona, N., Urdaneta, E., Aldaz, E., & Etxeberria, I. (2012). Emotional Intelligence and Burnout in Health Professionals. *Gerontologist*, 52(1), 485–485.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ*. New York: Bantam Books. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-397045-9.00059-8>
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2001). Primal Leadership: The Hidden Driver of Great Performance. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(11), 42–50.
- Grobler, B., Moloi, C., & Thakhordas, S. (2017). Teachers' perceptions of the utilisation of Emotional Intelligence by their school principals to manage mandated curriculum change processes. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 45(2), 336–355.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143215608197>
- Hebert, E. B. (2011). *The Relationship between Emotional Intelligence, Transformational Leadership, and Effectiveness in School Principals*.

- Heinemann, L. V. & Heinemann, T. (2017). Burnout research: Emergence and scientific investigation of a contested diagnosis. *SAGE Open*, 7(1), 1-12.
doi:10.1177/2158244017697154
- Hen, M., & Sharabi-Nov, A. (2014). Teaching the teachers: Emotional intelligence training for teachers. *Teaching Education*, 25(4), 375–390.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2014.908838>
- Holtgraves, T. (2004). Social Desirability and Self-Reports: Testing Models of Socially Desirable Responding. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(2), 161-172.
doi:10.1177/0146167203259930
- Huang, C. Y., Liao, H. Y., & Chang, S. H. (1998). Social desirability and the Clinical Self-Report Inventory: methodological reconsideration. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 54(4), 517-528.
- Ilyas, M., & Abdullah, T. (2016). The Effect of Leadership, Organizational Culture, Emotional Intelligence, and Job Satisfaction on Performance. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 5(2), 158–164. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v5i2.4534>
- Jennings, P. A., & Greenberg, M. T. (2009). The Prosocial Classroom: Teacher Social and Emotional Competence in Relation to Student and Classroom Outcomes. In *Review of Educational Research* (Vol. 79, pp. 491–525). <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308325693>
- Joseph, D. L., Jin, J., Newman, D. A., & O’Boyle, E. H. (2015). Why does self-reported emotional intelligence predict job performance? A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(2), 298–342. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.usm.my:3755/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=ce8ab606-8451-45c3-bb72-042ee0217d70%40sessionmgr4001&vid=0&hid=4204>

- Ju, C., Lan, J., Li, Y., Feng, W., & You, X. (2015). The mediating role of workplace social support on the relationship between trait emotional intelligence and teacher burnout. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 51, 58–67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.06.001>
- Kirkpatrick, B. A. (2020). *Construction and validation of the scale of emotional functioning: Medicine (SEF: MED)*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee.
- Klare, D., Behney, M., & Kenney, B. F. (2014). Emotional intelligence in a stupid world. *Library Hi Tech News*, 31(6), 21–24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/lhtn-06-2014-0042>
- Kline, R.B. (2005). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling* (2nd Edition ed.). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Larivee, B. (2012). *Cultivating Teacher Renewal: Guarding Against Stress and Burnout*. Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Lee, J., & Ok, C. (2012). Reducing burnout and enhancing job satisfaction: Critical role of hotel employees' emotional intelligence and emotional labor. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31(4), 1101–1112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.01.007>
- Lee, R. T., & Ashforth, B. E. (1993). A Longitudinal Study of Burnout among Supervisors and Managers: Comparisons between the Leiter and Maslach (1998) and Golembiewski et al. (1986) Models.pdf. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 54, 369–398.
- Leiter, M. P. (1990). The Impact of Family Resources, Control Coping, and Skill Utilization on the Development of Burnout: A Longitudinal Study. *Human Relations*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679004301102>

- Maguire, R., Egan, A., Hyland, P., & Maguire, P. (2017). Engaging students emotionally: the role of emotional intelligence in predicting cognitive and affective engagement in higher education. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 36(2), 343–357.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2016.1185396>
- Manju, M. (2017). Relationship of emotional intelligence with secondary school teachers' burnout. *Indian Journal of Health & Wellbeing*, 8(8), 819–821. Retrieved from <https://lopes.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=125143064&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Martins, A., Ramalho, N., & Morin, E. (2010). A comprehensive meta-analysis of the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and health. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 49(6), 554–564. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.05.029>
- Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). *Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual, Fourth Edition* (Fourth Edi). Mind Garden, Inc.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job Burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 397–422. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397>
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is Emotional Intelligence. In P. Salovey & D. J. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence* (pp. 3–31). New York: Basic Books.
- McCallum, R. S., Anderson, L. S., Kirkpatrick, B. A., & Fast, M. F. (2019). *Scale of emotional functioning: Educators*. (Unpublished measure). University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee.

- Mérida-López, S., & Extremera, N. (2017). Emotional intelligence and teacher burnout: A systematic review. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 85(August), 121–130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2017.07.006>
- Miao, C., Humphrey, R. H., & Qian, S. (2016). Leader emotional intelligence and subordinate job satisfaction: A meta-analysis of main, mediator, and moderator effects. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 102, 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.06.056>
- Miao, C., Humphrey, R. H., & Qian, S. (2017). A meta-analysis of emotional intelligence effects on job satisfaction mediated by job resources, and a test of moderators. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 116, 281–288. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.04.031>
- Ozsezer, M. S. B., & Saban, A. I. (2016). An Investigation on Teacher Candidates' Perspectives about Behaviors Positively Affecting Classroom Atmosphere. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 16(66), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2016.66.8>
- Petrides, K. V. (2011). Ability and Trait Emotional Intelligence. In *The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of Individual Differences* (pp. 656–678). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444343120.ch25>
- Pool, L. D., & Qualter, P. (2012). Improving emotional intelligence and emotional self-efficacy through a teaching intervention for university students. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 22(3), 306–312. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2012.01.010>
- Poulou, M. S. (2017). An examination of the relationship among teachers' perceptions of social-emotional learning, teaching efficacy, teacher-student interactions, and students' behavioral difficulties. *International Journal of School and Educational Psychology*, 5(2), 126–136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21683603.2016.1203851>

- Reyes, M. R., Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., White, M., & Salovey, P. (2012). Classroom emotional climate, student engagement, and academic achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 104*(3), 700–712. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027268>
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional Intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality, 9*(3), 185–211. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-397045-9.00207-X>
- Sánchez-Álvarez, N., Extremera, N., & Fernández-Berrocal, P. (2016). The relation between emotional intelligence and subjective well-being: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Positive Psychology, 11*(3), 276–285. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2015.1058968>
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Bobik, C., Coston, T. D., Greeson, C., Jedlicka, C., ... Wendorf, G. (2001). Emotional intelligence and interpersonal relations. *Journal of Social Psychology, 141*(4), 523–536. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224540109600569>
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Thorsteinsson, E. B., Bhullar, N., & Rooke, S. E. (2007). A meta-analytic investigation of the relationship between emotional intelligence and health. *Personality and Individual Differences, 42*(6), 921–933. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.09.003>
- Thorndike, E. L. (1921). Intelligence and it's measurement: A symposium. *The Journal of Educational Psychology, XII*(3), 123–147.
- Torrente, C., Rivers, S. E., & Brackett, M. A. (2016). Teaching Emotional Intelligence in Schools: An Evidence-Based Approach. In A. A. Lipnevich, F. Preckel, & R. D. Roberts (Eds.), *Psychosocial Skills and School Systems in the 21st Century: Theory, Research, and Practice* (pp. 325–346). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-28606-8_13

- Wertheimer, M. (1987). *A Brief History of Psychology* (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Windingstad, S., McCallum, R. S., Bell, S., & Dunn, P. (2011). Measures of Emotional Intelligence and Social Acceptability in Children: A Concurrent Validity Study. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 26*(2), 107–126. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0829573511406510>
- Wu, S. M. (2004). Development and Application of a Brief Measure of Emotional Intelligence for Vocational High School Teachers. *Psychological Reports, 95*, 1207–1218.
- Yildizbas, F. (2017). The Relationship between Teacher Candidates' Emotional Intelligence Level, Leadership Styles and Their Academic Success. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 17*(67), 215–231. <https://doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2017.67.13>
- Zeidner, M., & Matthews, G. (2017). Emotional intelligence in gifted students. *Gifted Education International, 33*(2), 163–182. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261429417708879>
- Zeidner, M., Matthews, G., & Roberts, R. D. (2009). *What We Know About Emotional Intelligence: How it Affects Learning, Work, Relationships, and our Mental Health*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

APPENDIX

Appendix A

Scale of Emotional Functioning: Educators (SEF:ED)

Self-Report Format

R. Steve McCallum, Lezli S. Anderson, Baileigh A. Kirkpatrick & Michelle L. Fast

Date: _____ Age: _____ Date of Birth: _____

Educator Title (teacher, administrator, etc.): _____

Type of classroom (if applicable): _____ Grades: _____

Years in the field: _____ Highest degree attained: _____

Please respond to the following items by circling the response that best characterizes your behavior.

<i>I...</i>					
1. recognize the feelings of others.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
2. lack empathy for my students.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
3. express concern for my students' feelings.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
4. interact with my students reluctantly.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
5. take time to learn how others are feeling.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
6. respond appropriately to the emotions of others.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
7. recognize the feelings of others.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
8. am able to interpret the emotions of students.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
9. misinterpret nonverbal communication of students.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
10. have difficulty recognizing the emotional tone within groups.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always

11. have difficulty recognizing when I offend students.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
12. misinterpret nonverbal communication.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
13. am aware of the emotional needs of students.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
14. recognize the feelings of parents.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
15. misinterpret nonverbal communication from parents.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
16. am able to interpret the emotions of parents.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
17. express concern for my students' feelings.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
18. have difficulty remaining effective when upset.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
19. am easy-going.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
20. let stress overwhelm me.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
21. maintain a healthy attitude about negative evaluations.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
22. find it difficult to be resilient.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
23. am unable to shake pessimistic moods.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
24. am energized by change.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
25. handle upsetting situations poorly.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
26. am fun to be with.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
27. lack empathy for my students.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
28. interact with my students reluctantly.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
29. relate to students easily.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
30. lack respect for the feelings of students.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always

Note: Demographic information was changed slightly from what is presented here due to electronic delivery method.

Appendix B

The Profile of Emotional Competence (PEC)

Brasseur S, Grégoire J, Bourdu R, Mikolajczak M (2013) The Profile of Emotional Competence (PEC): Development and Validation of a Self-Reported Measure that Fits Dimensions of Emotional Competence Theory. PLoS ONE 8(5): e62635. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0062635

Scoring key : freely available on request at moira.mikolajczak@uclouvain.be

Note for the readers: items are presented in a random order

The questions below are designed to provide a better understanding of how you deal with your emotions in daily life. Please answer each question spontaneously, taking into account the way you would normally respond. There are no right or wrong answers as we are all different on this level.

For each question, you will have to give a score on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 meaning that the statement does not describe you at all or you never respond like this, and 5 meaning that the statement describes you very well or that you experience this particular response very often.

	1	2	3	4	5
1. As my emotions arise I don't understand where they come from.					
2. I don't always understand why I respond in the way I do.					
3. If I wanted, I could easily influence other people's emotions to achieve what I want.					
4. I know what to do to win people over to my cause.					
5. I am often a loss to understand other people's emotional responses.					
6. When I feel good, I can easily tell whether it is due to being proud of myself, happy or relaxed.					
7. I can tell whether a person is angry, sad or happy even if they don't talk to me.					

8. I am good at describing my feelings.					
9. I never base my personal life choices on my emotions.					
10. When I am feeling low, I easily make a link between my feelings and a situation that affected me.					
11. I can easily get what I want from others.					
12. I easily manage to calm myself down after a difficult experience.					
13. I can easily explain the emotional responses of the people around me.					
14. Most of the time I understand why people feel the way they do.					
15. When I am sad, I find it easy to cheer myself up.					
16. When I am touched by something, I immediately know what I feel.					
17. If I dislike something, I manage to say so in a calm manner.					
18. I do not understand why the people around me respond the way they do.					
19. When I see someone who is stressed or anxious, I can easily calm them down.					
20. During an argument I do not know whether I am angry or sad.					
21. I use my feelings to improve my choices in life.					
22. I try to learn from difficult situations or emotions.					
23. Other people tend to confide in me about personal issues.					
24. My emotions inform me about changes I should make in my life.					
25. I find it difficult to explain my feelings to others even if I want to.					

26. I don't always understand why I am stressed.					
27. If someone came to me in tears, I would not know what to do.					
28. I find it difficult to listen to people who are complaining.					
29. I often take the wrong attitude to people because I was not aware of their emotional state.					
30. I am good at sensing what others are feeling.					
31. I feel uncomfortable if people tell me about their problems, so I try to avoid it.					
32. I know what to do to motivate people.					
33. I am good at lifting other people's spirits.					
34. I find it difficult to establish a link between a person's response and their personal circumstances.					
35. I am usually able to influence the way other people feel.					
36. If I wanted, I could easily make someone feel uneasy.					
37. I find it difficult to handle my emotions.					
38. The people around me tell me I don't express my feelings openly.					
39. When I am angry, I find it easy to calm myself down.					
40. I am often surprised by people's responses because I was not aware they were in a bad mood.					
41. My feelings help me to focus on what is important to me.					
42. Others don't accept the way I express my emotions.					
43. When I am sad, I often don't know why.					

44. Quite often I am not aware of people's emotional state.					
45. Other people tell me I make a good confidant.					
46. I feel uneasy when other people tell me about something that is difficult for them.					
47. When I am confronted with an angry person, I can easily calm them down.					
48. I am aware of my emotions as soon as they arise.					
49. When I am feeling low, I find it difficult to know exactly what kind of emotion it is I am feeling.					
50. In a stressful situation I usually think in a way that helps me stay calm.					

Appendix C

MBI for Educators Survey

Christina Maslach, Susan E. Jackson & Richard L. Schwab

*The purpose of this survey is to discover how educators view their job
and the people with whom they work closely.*

Instructions: On the following page are 22 statements of job-related feelings. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about *your* job. If you have *never* had this feeling, write the number "0" (zero) in the space before the statement. If you have had this feeling, indicate *how often* you feel it by writing the number (from 1 to 6) that best describes how frequently you feel that way. An example is shown below.

How often:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Never	A few times a year or less	Once a month or less	A few times a month	Once a week	A few times a week	Every day

Example:

How often 0-6	Statement:
1. _____	I feel depressed at work.

If you never feel depressed at work, you would write the number "0" (zero) under the heading "How often." If you rarely feel depressed at work (a few times a year or less), you would write the number "1." If your feelings of depression are fairly frequent (a few times a week but not daily), you would write the number "5."

MBI for Educators Survey

How often:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Never	A few times a year or less	Once a month or less	A few times a month	Once a week	A few times a week	Every day

How often
0-6

Statements:

1. _____ I feel emotionally drained from my work.
2. _____ I feel used up at the end of the workday.
3. _____ I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job.
4. _____ I can easily understand how my students feel about things.
5. _____ I feel I treat some students as if they were impersonal objects.
6. _____ Working with people all day is really a strain for me.
7. _____ I deal very effectively with the problems of my students.
8. _____ I feel burned out from my work.
9. _____ I feel I'm positively influencing other people's lives through my work.
10. _____ I've become more callous toward people since I took this job.
11. _____ I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally.
12. _____ I feel very energetic.
13. _____ I feel frustrated by my job.
14. _____ I feel I'm working too hard on my job.
15. _____ I don't really care what happens to some students.
16. _____ Working with people directly puts too much stress on me.
17. _____ I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with my students.
18. _____ I feel exhilarated after working closely with my students.
19. _____ I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.
20. _____ I feel like I'm at the end of my rope.
21. _____ In my work, I deal with emotional problems very calmly.
22. _____ I feel students blame me for some of their problems.

(Administrative use only)

EE Total score: _____

DP Total score: _____

PA Total score: _____

EE Average score: _____

DP Average score: _____

PA Average score: _____

Appendix D

Emotional Intelligence Training Module Transcripts

R. Steve McCallum, Michelle L. Fast, & Lezli Anderson

Module 1

Slide 1: Emotional intelligence training by the School Psychologists from the Department of Educational Psychology and Counseling, at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville.

Slide 2: Hello and welcome to the emotional intelligence training modules, designed for teachers. Throughout this training you will receive some background information about emotional intelligence and why emotional intelligence is not only important for you but is also important for you to model for your students.

Slide 3: Through this training you will be able to complete four electronic modules. After this first module, each subsequent module will conclude with two vignettes that you will be asked to reflect upon and respond to prior to beginning the next module. After the electronic modules are completed, a one-hour in-person workshop will be held to complete the lessons and discuss vignettes and personal experiences that relate to emotional intelligence. Following the final workshop, you will receive an email containing the link to a survey on emotional intelligence.

Slide 4: At the completion of the modules, the workshop, and the completion of the emotional intelligence survey, you will receive a certificate for 2.5 professional development points for your participation. Keep in mind that in order to gain professional development credit these trainings will need to be completed outside of normal work hours. Now you know what the training will look like so let's get started.

Slide 5: Module 1: Emotional intelligence. What is it and why do we care?

Slide 6: After completion of this module, participant should have a basic understanding of what emotional intelligence is, be able to identify and define the three primary areas of emotional intelligence relevant for the training, have a better understanding of why emotional intelligence is important, and how it impacts our lives

Slide 7: There are two major types of intelligences that have been identified through current research. The first, and more commonly known, is cognitive intelligence or IQ. The second, and more recently studied version, is emotional intelligence, otherwise known as EQ or EI.

Slide 8: Cognitive Intelligence is defined by Wechsler as the global capacity to act purposefully think rationally and deal effectively with environment. Often times, cognitive intelligence is viewed as a primary indicator of how well individuals can do. It is often also used to determine the presence of possible educational disabilities. There are eight commonly recognized major components of cognitive intelligence. Short-term or working memory is usually associated with quick recall of information within just a few seconds. Sometimes, this could include manipulating information as well, perhaps by reversing or rearranging it in some way. Long-term memory is another component of cognitive intelligence and usually involves retention of information but also ability to apply information that is retained--the ability to get information in and out of memory. Fluid reasoning is the understanding of relationships, hierarchies, and categories of information. Basically, the ability to reason and solve novel problems. Visual processing is seeing positions and events in space. It is how our brains interpret what we see. Auditory processing is understanding sound-symbol relationships. It is how our brain interprets what we hear. Processing speed is the time it takes to do mental tasks. It is related to how quickly we understand and react to information. Crystallized ability is primarily verbal comprehension. It

is information that we gain through experiences and culture. Finally, quantitative reasoning is basically understanding numbers and being able to use that understanding in real world situations.

Slide 9: So, is knowing cognitive intelligence enough to predict someone's success? Apparently not! In fact, in some studies emotional intelligence has been shown to have a greater impact on academic, personal, and social lives more than IQ or personality. Traditionally, conventional IQ tests have not assessed for social or emotional intelligence, and they still don't. While cognitive intelligence is necessary, it is not sufficient for emotional intelligence. The relation between IQ and EI are actually relatively independent of each other when IQ is average or better. So, what exactly is emotional intelligence, and why we do we care?

Slide 10: There are multiple definition that have been created for emotional intelligence. Daniel Goleman defined it as the ability to recognize and manage one's own emotions and relationships and acknowledge the emotions of others. Bar-On defined emotional intelligence as an array of noncognitive capabilities, competencies, and skills that influence one's ability to succeed at coping with environmental demands and pressures. Another definition, also provided by Goleman, defined EI as the capacity for recognizing our own feelings and those of others for motivating ourselves and for managing emotions in ourselves and our relationships.

Slide 11: While various researchers have identified different components that contribute to EI, there are three primary components that are relatively consistent across fields: emotional awareness, emotional management, and interpersonal relations. As part of this training, we will discuss each of these in more detail, but we will give a broad overview of each here.

Slide 12: Emotional awareness involves recognizing and making sense of your emotions and the emotions of others. It can involve being introspective, listening for the underlying message and tone, and recognizing nonverbal communication.

Slide 13: Emotional management is the ability to be open to your feelings and modulate them in yourself and others. Emotional management can involve controlling your emotions, your inner resources, and your abilities. It can also involve understanding the emotions in yourself and others before responding to them. The art of reflection is an example of emotional management.

Slide 14: Interpersonal relations are the bonds you have with others. This involves being able to empathize, showing that you care, mirroring emotions, and asking intentional questions.

Slide 15: All of these components of EI significantly impact multiple facets of our lives. For example, EI has been shown to impact mental, physical, and psychosomatic health. It has been shown to positively affect happiness and general life satisfaction. Those with higher EI have greater social support, resiliency, adaptive coping skills, and stress-management skills. These are argued to provide greater emotional responses which could lead to greater psychological health and feelings of well-being. Those with greater EI report better social interactions, empathy, and relationships as a whole. In relation to work, EI has been shown to positively impact job performance and job satisfaction and to negatively impact burnout.

Slide 16: So how does EI related to the classroom?

Slide 17: Within education, students with better EI were more effective learners, had better mental health, and had higher achievement and retention.

Slide 18: EI impacts teachers in a number of ways as well. In general, teachers' emotions impact many areas of a teacher's life, including self-efficacy, classroom management style, job satisfaction, and burnout; and teachers with higher EI have been shown to have lower burnout.

Slide 19: EI impacts the work environment in many ways that carry over to teachers as well. More supported and cohesive workplaces have been shown to lead to a reduction in teacher burnout. More generally, those with greater EI navigate social interactions better and thereby have a greater perception of support within the workplace. Greater EI in leaders has been shown to lead to a positive impact on team performance and cohesion and perception of trust, showing the importance of EI with principals and administrators as well.

Slide 20: Our goal through this training, is that you will gain a greater understanding of EI and that in the process, you will be able to carry these lessons over into your daily lives and classrooms.

Slide 21: In the next module, we will delve into the area of emotional awareness.

Module 2

Slide 1: Module 2: Emotional Awareness

Slide 2: Just to recap, emotional intelligence is the ability to recognize and manage one's own emotions and relationships and acknowledge the emotions of others. The three primary components are emotional awareness, emotional management, and interpersonal relationships. The focus of this module will be the first of these components: emotional awareness.

Slide 3: After completion of this module, participant should be able to define emotional awareness, be able to identify three emotional awareness strategies, and be able to apply some of these strategies to real-life scenarios.

Slide 4: As was discussed earlier, emotional awareness is recognizing and making sense of your emotions and the emotions of others. It can involve being introspective, listening for the message tone, and recognizing nonverbal communication.

Slide 5: Being introspective involves observing and examining one's own mental and emotional states and mental processes, looking within oneself, and knowing when and what emotions are present. Being able to look within oneself and recognize the emotions that one is experiencing impacts how one responds to those around them. Those who are not able to recognize emotions within themselves have been shown to struggle with peer relationships and communication with others.

Slide 6: Emotional awareness involves asking “what” instead of “why.”

Slide 7: Some examples of “what” questions you could ask yourself include: What kind of person am I? What emotions am I experiencing? What's going on? What could I have done differently? What could I do to respond better?

Slide 8: Take a moment to practice some of these “what” questions. Take a slow, deep breath and note any emotions that you are currently feeling. Try to determine if there are feelings underlying the initial emotions that you have identified. For example, if you are feeling angry, is it also related to other emotions, such as jealousy?

Slide 9: Another emotional awareness technique involves listening for the underlying message or tone in communication.

Slide 10: Things to pay attention to include tone, volume, pitch, and rate of speech. More specifically, what tone is the speaker using? Does their tone sound angry, confident, defeated, or something else? How loudly or quietly is the speaker talking? The speaker's volume can convey emphasis, strong emotion, or level of uncertainty. If the speaker feels the message is important, they may speak more loudly. If the speaker feels strongly about something, whether positive or negative, the volume may also increase. Shouting may occur when angry, but also when excited. When a speaker feels confident, volume tends to increase, whereas those who feel less confident

tend to speak more quietly. Pitch can also play a role in understanding the underlying message behind communication. For example, if the speaker's voice rises at the end, this could signify a question but could also be a sign of possible uncertainty. How quickly or slowly the person is speaking can tell the listener some additional information as well. Slowing down may indicate the level of importance the speaker places on what he or she is saying. Speeding up may indicate strong emotions.

Slide 11: Paying attention to nonverbal communication is also an important component of being emotionally aware. Nonverbal communication includes body movement, gestures, facial expressions, and proximity. Body movement can involve how you sit, stand, walk, or hold your head. Gestures and hand mannerisms are often used without thinking and can communicate levels of frustration or excitement. Some gestures that are commonly used in some cultures may not be considered acceptable in others. Facial expressions are commonly used to convey underlying messages and feelings. There are universal facial expressions that have been found to be consistent across cultures. They include happiness, sadness, anger, surprise, fear, and disgust. Being aware of the facial expressions that we are making can make a difference in what message we are conveying to those around us. Eye contact plays a large role in telling others our level of interest or affection and maintains the flow of conversation. It helps in gauging the interest of others. Proximity, while dependent on the culture, can convey a number of different messages, including affection, aggression, or dominance. It can impact the level of comfort that others have around us or that we have with others.

Slide 12: Take a moment and note your body language right now. What could it be conveying to someone who enters the room or starts up a conversation with you? Is your body language

welcoming or closed off? Does it convey interest or lack of interest? Does your posture suggest confidence?

Slide 13: Being emotionally aware means recognizing your emotions and the emotions of others. This skill involves taking time to learn how others are feeling and recognizing when others are upset. Read the following scenarios, then answer the questions.

Slide 14: You call for a meeting with your principal to discuss your recent teaching evaluation. There were several points the principal made in the evaluation that seem unfair and unduly harsh. Your goal for the meeting is to better understand her perspective about your teaching, particularly her reasons for the low ratings she assigned you. You would also like to obtain recommendations from her about how you can improve your performance. To start the meeting, you explain your goals for the meeting. Immediately, you notice that the principal fails to make eye contact, looks at the window, frowns, and folds her arms across her chest. How do these gestures make you feel? How should you respond?

Question 1: How do these gestures make you feel?

Question 2: How should you respond?

Slide 15: Ashley is a friendly new student in your classroom. She is typically quiet and does not ask a lot of questions during class. However, you have noticed that she has not made any new friends and her grades on recent assignments have been low. One day while the class is supposed to be completing an assignment with their small groups, you notice that Ashley is not offering any answers, is not talking much, and it looks like she has not filled out many answers on her worksheet. You give a directive to the class: “Make sure you are all participating and completing the worksheet!” You wait 5 minutes to give Ashley time to do her work, but her behavior does not change. You then walk over to Ashley and tell her you are disappointed she has not been

working with the group, and that you will have to take away participation points. Ashley's face turns red, she throws her pencil and paper on the ground, and refuses to complete the assignment.

Question 1: How do you think Ashley felt? Question 2: How could you have been more aware of Ashley's feelings during this interaction?

Slide 16: Now, take a moment to reflect upon your experiences in the classroom. Can you think of a time or situation where you could have handled things differently and demonstrated greater emotional awareness? Write these situations down and plan to bring them to the final workshop for discussion.

Slide 17: In the next module, we will discuss emotional management.

Module 3

Slide 1: Module 3: Emotional management

Slide 2: Again, to recap, emotional intelligence is the ability to recognize and manage one's own emotions and relationships, and acknowledge the emotions of others. The three primary components are emotional awareness, emotional management, and interpersonal relationships. The focus of this module will be the second of these components: emotional management.

Slide 3: After completion of this module, participant should be able to define emotional management, be able to identify three emotional management strategies, and be able to apply some of these strategies to real-life scenarios.

Slide 4: In this module, we will be discussing emotional management, which is the ability to be open to feelings and to modulate them in yourself and others. It can involve: understanding emotions in oneself or others before responding; controlling emotions, inner resources, and abilities; and the art of reflection.

Slide 5: So, what does understanding emotions involve? One strategy that helps with understanding emotions is identifying the emotions that you are experiencing and the emotions that others are exhibiting. Take the time to not only identify the emotions but label them. Pay attention to how these emotions affect you: Is your heart rate increasing? Are you perspiring? How is your breathing: are you breathing quickly or in short breaths? These are all examples of how our bodies tell us something is going on emotionally, and by paying attention to these signs, we can develop strategies to get our emotions under control.

Slide 6: There are many ways that you can gain control over your emotions.

Slide 7: When possible, you can try to control the situation. Avoid situations that you know may cause emotional upset or make it difficult for you to control your emotions. Take a walk and distance yourself from the situation. Control your emotions by self-talk, and remain calm. Take a deep breath and reset.

Slide 8: It's obviously not always possible to control the situation, so what do you do when you can't? One technique is to use a grounding technique. When you are in a stressful situation, take a deep breath and then focus on your senses. Identify 5 things you can see, 4 things you can touch, 3 things you can hear, 2 things you can smell, and 1 thing you can taste.

Slide 9: Using an emotional gauge is a great way to bring yourself back to a desired emotion. First identify your emotions and recognize how you feel and where you are on your gauge. Then identify ways to calm yourself and get back to an ideal emotion.

Slide 10: Take some time to reflect on your experiences. Count to 10. Schedule time to think. Ask yourself what you want to achieve and track your progress. Find someone you trust with whom you can reflect and who will support you in your goals.

Slide 11: The ability to manage emotions in oneself and in others is a key aspect of emotional intelligence. This skill involves remaining effective when upset, being resilient, and managing stress so it does not affect work performance. Read the following scenarios, then answer the questions.

Slide 12: Drew has been “acting out” all class period. He has been out of his seat and talking over you and your mentor teacher. You have told him to stop and asked him to stay in his seat, but he has continued with these types of behaviors. These behaviors start to upset you, and you feel as if you do not know what else to do to decrease Drew’s disruptive behavior. It comes time for you to give a lesson to a small group that includes Drew and a few other students. Drew continues to speak over his classmates, and when you tell him to stop, he becomes angry and yells at you. You feel that this is the last straw, and you yell at Drew to “Stop talking and go to the principal’s office!” You look up to see your principal and the rest of the class watching the interaction.

Question 1: At what point in this scenario do you think you lost control of your emotions?

Question 2: How could you have handled this situation with better emotional management?

Slide 13: You have a direct observation by your principal as part of your teacher evaluation coming up and you are worried about getting a good review. You have been planning during every free moment but those have been few and far between, so you still do not feel confident or prepared. Hurriedly, you send an email to your principal requesting an absence and to reschedule the observation. You assume that she will understand; however, her response indicates that she expects you to be at the school because you did not give her enough notice and she needs to get your observation completed. Begrudgingly, you go to the school and stumble through the lesson. During the lesson, you find yourself feeling regretful for not managing your time in an effective

manner, resentful toward the principal for not allowing you to reschedule, and short-tempered with the students for being off-task and not paying attention. As soon as the lesson is over, you sit at your desk without saying a word to the principal or students.

Question 1: How is your stress affecting your work performance?

Question 2: How could you have handled this situation with more effective emotion management?

Slide 14: Now, take a moment to reflect upon your experiences in the classroom. Can you think of a time or situation where you could have handled things differently and demonstrated greater emotional management? Write these situations down and plan to bring them to the final workshop for discussion.

Slide 15: In the next module, we will discuss interpersonal relations.

Module 4

Slide 1: Module 4: Interpersonal Relations

Slide 2: Again, to recap, emotional intelligence is the ability to recognize and manage one's own emotions and relationships, and acknowledge the emotions of others. The three primary components are emotional awareness, emotional management, and interpersonal relationships.

The focus of this module will be the third of these components: interpersonal relations.

Slide 3: After completion of this module, participant should be able to define interpersonal relations, be able to identify three interpersonal relationship strategies, and be able to apply some of these strategies to real-life scenarios.

Slide 4: Interpersonal relations are the bonds you have with others. They involve being able to empathize, showing that you care, mirroring emotions, and asking intentional questions.

Slide 5: Empathizing is the ability to share and understand the feelings of others. Basically, putting yourself in someone else's shoes.

Slide 6: So how do you empathize? You can ask the other person to explain their point of view and pay attention to what they have to say. Listen to the other person's perspective and focus on the person's values. Respond encouragingly and put your own views on the back burner. Try to see things from the other person's view

Slide 7: Another way to improve interpersonal relations is to show that you care. Make time for people. Pay attention to the person. Offer to help whenever possible. Show that you care about their personal life. Produce work that you can be proud of. Respect people's space. Be appreciative.

Slide 8: One other interpersonal strategy is mirroring emotions, which is basically imitating others' gestures, speech, and attitudes. When mirroring, you may restate what the person is saying. This may also involve treating the person you are with as if they are the most interesting person on earth. Mirroring emotions can help build emotions.

Slide 9: Asking intentional questions goes a long way when building relationships. Saying things like "I see you are frustrated; can I help with that?" or "What can I do to help you?" Other questions may include "I remember you mentioning this scenario. How did that turn out?" Or "How can I support you?"

Slide 10: The ability to manage emotions in oneself and in others is a key aspect of emotional intelligence. This skill involves remaining effective when upset, being resilient, and managing stress so it does not affect work performance. Read the following scenarios, then answer the questions.

Slide 11: In your new school placement, you feel that you have been able to connect with students and have a positive relationship with many other teachers at your school. However, a couple of months into the school year, you begin to notice that you are having issues with one co-worker in particular (e.g., a more experienced teacher who has taken you under her wing). You can recall several instances in which it seemed that you and your co-worker were on different pages about planning, grading, and scheduling. It seems like this teacher assumes you should do everything just like she would, and she gets frustrated when you do not meet her expectations. Your relationship has become tense, and you have started to avoid seeing the other teacher when possible. You respect this teacher and feel uncomfortable expressing disagreement with someone who has more experience than you. Up until this point, you have not addressed the problem by talking to the other teacher or your school administration.

Question 1: How would you handle this situation?

Question 2: What could you have done differently before this point to alleviate these problems with your co-worker?

Slide 12: Johnny is a student in Mrs. Apple's classroom. He typically performs well but has recently seemed distracted. Mrs. Apple is noticing that he hardly smiles anymore, has stopped interacting with peers, and is performing poorly on assignments. He also has failed to complete the past 4 homework assignments. Johnny is a private child that does not share information about what is happening outside of school. Mrs. Apple decides it is towards the end of the school year, and Johnny's grades will not change that much. She thinks Johnny will eventually get over his slump and be himself again.

Question 1: Put yourself in Mrs. Apple's shoes. What might you have done differently to handle Johnny's situation?

Question 2: Would your priority be to have concern about Johnny's grades?

Slide 13: Now, take a moment to reflect upon your experiences in the classroom. Can you think of a time or situation where you could have handled things differently and demonstrated greater interpersonal relations? Write these situations down and plan to bring them to the final workshop for discussion.

Slide 14: The next session will be an in-person workshop. You will receive an email with the details about location and time for this workshop.

Appendix E

Professional Development Feedback

R. Steve McCallum & Michelle L. Fast

1. Do you believe your EI training has helped you manage your classroom?

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Do you believe your EI training help you better relate to your students?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Do you believe learning about EI has improved your perception of burnout?

☐ Yes ☐ No

4. What recommendations do you have for how to improve this training?

--

Appendix F

Tables

Table 1

Demographic Information

	<i>N</i>	%		<i>N</i>	%
Gender	48	--	Years of education	48	--
Male	4	8.3	experience		
Female	44	91.7	1-5	8	16.7
Age	48	--	6-10	14	29.2
20-29	5	10.4	11-15	7	14.6
30-39	18	37.5	16-20	5	10.4
40-49	13	27.1	21-25	6	12.5
50-59	10	20.8	26-30	6	12.5
60-69	2	4.2	31-35	2	4.2
Educator Title	48	--	Grades levels taught	48	--
Teacher	30	62.5	Pre-K	11	22.9
Specialist	6	12.5	K	18	37.5
Administrator	2	4.2	1	22	45.8
Special Ed. Case Manager	3	6.3	2	23	47.9
School Counselor	2	4.2	3	20	41.7
RTI Coordinator	3	6.3	4	18	37.5
School Psychologist	2	4.2	5	22	45.8
Highest degree attained	48	--	6	20	41.7
Bachelor's degree	13	27.1	7	23	47.9
Master's degree	19	39.6	8	23	47.9
Education specialist	10	21.0	9	13	27.1
Doctoral	1	2.1	10	12	25.0
Type of classroom taught	48	--	11	12	25.0
General education	15	31.3	12	12	25.0
Inclusion	5	10.4	College	1	2.1
Resource	9	18.8			
Self-contained	6	12.5			
RTI classroom	3	6.3			
Related Service classroom	3	6.3			

Table 2

SEF:ED Descriptive Statistics - Combined

	<i>N</i>	Min	Max	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Skewness	Kurtosis
Emotional Awareness							
Pretest	48	31.72	44.00	38.72	2.84	-.51	-.09
Posttest	48	29.00	43.00	38.54	2.63	-1.23	3.01
Post-Posttest	24	29.00	46.00	38.33	4.03	-.72	1.04
Emotional Management							
Pretest	48	27.00	44.00	35.69	3.98	-.19	-.31
Posttest	48	29.00	43.00	35.85	3.17	-.18	-.51
Post-Posttest	24	27.00	50.00	36.74	4.33	.73	3.37
Interpersonal Relations							
Pretest	48	34.00	49.00	40.97	3.11	.17	.64
Posttest	48	31.00	47.00	39.91	3.19	-.26	.90
Post-Posttest	24	33.00	50.00	40.54	3.65	.66	.38
SEF:ED Total EI							
Pretest	48	100.00	134.00	115.38	7.65	.25	-.38
Posttest	48	92.00	131.00	114.31	7.17	-.54	1.64
Post-Posttest	24	98.00	146.00	115.61	10.04	1.05	2.60

Table 3

MBI-ES Descriptive Statistics – Combined

	<i>N</i>	Min	Max	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Skewness	Kurtosis
Emotional Exhaustion							
Pretest	48	5.00	47.00	23.98	10.23	.14	-.55
Posttest	48	5.26	45.00	22.24	9.40	.23	-.58
Post-Posttest	24	.00	40.00	22.25	10.78	-.18	-.74
Depersonalization							
Pretest	48	.00	20.00	6.77	4.82	.67	.08
Posttest	48	.00	19.00	6.21	4.50	.59	-.27
Post-Posttest	24	.00	18.00	5.50	5.07	.86	-.14
Personal Accomplishment							
Pretest	48	16.00	40.00	32.82	5.01	-.88	1.43
Posttest	48	21.00	45.00	33.65	5.59	.25	-.20
Post-Posttest	24	24.00	48.00	35.25	5.77	.13	.73

Table 4

Pretest and Posttest Mean and Standard Deviation for SEF:ED and MBI-ES Total Scores

Variable	Pretest				Posttest				Post-Posttest	
	Experimental <i>n</i> = 24		Control <i>n</i> = 24		Experimental <i>n</i> = 24		Control <i>n</i> = 24		Control <i>n</i> = 24	
	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>
SEF:ED										
EA	38.78	3.02	38.66	2.72	38.50	2.92	38.58	2.38	38.33	4.03
EM	36.33	3.70	35.04	4.22	36.33	3.32	35.38	3.00	36.74	4.33
IR	40.68	3.22	41.25	3.04	40.00	2.89	39.82	3.53	40.54	3.65
Total EI	115.80	8.13	114.95	7.29	114.83	7.45	113.78	7.00	115.61	10.04
MBI-ES										
EE	22.04	9.37	25.91	10.86	19.31	9.66	25.17	8.33	22.25	10.78
DP	7.00	4.62	6.54	5.11	6.42	4.94	6.00	4.11	5.50	5.07
PA	33.96	4.05	31.71	5.68	35.55	5.18	31.96	5.57	35.25	5.77

Table 5

Pretest Correlation Coefficients Between the SEF:ED and MBI-ES

	SEF:ED Emotional Awareness (EA)	SEF:ED Emotional Management (EM)	SEF:ED Interpersonal Relations (IR)	SEF:ED Total EI
Emotional Exhaustion	-.09	-.42**	-.15	-.31*
Depersonalization	-.30*	-.26	-.46**	-.43**
Personal Accomplishment	.07	.37**	.34*	.36*

*Correlation Significant at .05 level (2-tailed)

**Correlation Significant at .01 level (2-tailed)

Table 6

Posttest Correlation Coefficients Between the SEF:ED and MBI-ES

	SEF:ED Emotional Awareness (EA)	SEF:ED Emotional Management (EM)	SEF:ED Interpersonal Relations (IR)	SEF:ED Total EI
Emotional Exhaustion	-.28	-.52**	-.19	-.42**
Depersonalization	-.38**	-.45**	-.53**	-.58**
Personal Accomplishment	.39**	.53**	.38**	.55**

**Correlation Significant at .01 level (2-tailed)

VITA

Michelle Fast was born in Aurora, Colorado to Art and Gloria Langer. She graduated from Geneva College in 2007 with a Bachelor of Science degree in Psychology and a minor in Chemistry. She was accepted into the School Psychology program at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga in 2010, and in 2013 Michelle completed her Education Specialist degree in School Psychology. She worked as a licensed school psychologist in South Carolina and Tennessee until being accepted into the School Psychology doctoral program at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville in August 2019. In August 2020, Michelle will begin an internship with the Tennessee Internship Consortium in Psychology and will complete her doctorate degree in August 2021.