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Abstract

This study sought to describe selected “beat the odds” schools in Washington state based on the levels of emotional intelligence of classroom teachers. In total 5 schools were selected to participate, and 3rd-5th grade teachers were invited to complete the EQ-i 2.0, a validated emotional intelligence assessment. Participants also completed the validated School Culture Triage survey to assess teachers’ perspectives of school culture. In total, 20 teachers participated in the study, completing both survey instruments. A descriptive analysis of the EQ-i 2.0 results found that this sample of teachers had a mid-to high mean level of emotional intelligence on all subscales, composites, and total emotional intelligence scores. Significantly, 70% of the sample scored in the high range for social responsibility, and a majority of the sample scored within the high range for self-actualization and self-perception. 30% of the sample scored in the low range for assertiveness. A correlational analysis was also conducted to determine the linear relationship between each of the 5 composites of the EQ-i 2.0 and the 3 categories of the School Culture Triage. No significant relationships were found. There was a weak to moderate relationship between the stress management composite of the EQ-i 2.0 and the affiliative collegiality and self-determination/efficacy categories of the School Culture Triage.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Introduction to the Problem

Daniel Goleman, one of the foremost authors and researchers with regard to emotional intelligence, recently spoke to an audience of educators as part of the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) 2016 National Conference. As part of his keynote address, Goleman (as cited by Sommers, 2016) described the impact of emotional intelligence (EI) in the school and classroom on learners’ development. Within the classroom setting, when a teacher acts without EI, this can cause a student and/or students to feel emotionally “hijacked,” negatively impacting their ability to learn (Sommers, 2016).

A school setting is a social setting in which teachers and other school staff interact with children in various contexts. Especially important in the learning and academic growth experienced by each student is the interaction between teacher and pupil. Even more complex and important is the ability to establish emotional stability and security for students who may be experiencing the negative effects of poverty (Jensen, 2009), such as chronic stress or other social/emotional deficiencies. This is all foundational to a person’s ability to learn effectively. This assumption is based in Maslow’s (1943) theory of needs and motivation: before one can extend oneself and reach our full potential in academic or other pursuits, the need for physical and psychological safety, as well as of quality relationships must first be met.

Background, Context, History, and Conceptual Framework

Numerous schools within the United States experience great challenges due to the demographic nature of the student population, especially with regard to poverty and language acquisition. Despite these challenges, some of these challenged schools rise above the others in terms of student achievement. These schools are said to “beat the odds,” and have occasionally
been the focus of descriptive studies seeking to determine what constitutes their success (Berkley & Dow, 2008; Cunningham, 2006; Denton, Foorman, & Mathes, 2003; Johnson & Rose, 2009).

These studies have described these successful schools in terms of their attributes, such as having a commitment to closing the achievement gap, effective and focused leadership, and effective instruction and curriculum, among others. In addition, researchers with a different focus have shown the overall impact on student academic and social/emotional growth that emotions can play within the classroom between teacher and student, as well as among teaching staff in a collaborative culture (Curby, Brock, & Hamre, 2013; Goddard, Goddard, & Tschannen-Moran, 2007; Jennings & Greenberg, 2009; Meyer & Turner, 2006). All of these studies combined suggest that certain attributes are consistent among successful schools that rise above challenges, and that the social and emotional realm has an important role to play.

Emotional intelligence is a fairly new construct of intelligence, receiving relevance and acknowledgment with the work of scholars such as Bar-On (1997), Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (1995), and Goleman (1995). Emotional intelligence has been shown to be more directly responsible for job success than cognitive intelligence (Goleman, 1995; Stein & Book 2011), otherwise known as IQ (Weschler, 1939). Emotional intelligence, as defined by Multi-Health Systems (2016a), the producer of the emotional quotient inventory tool EQ-i 2.0, is “a set of emotional and social skills that influence the way we perceive and express ourselves, develop and maintain social relationships, cope with challenges, and use emotional information in an effective and meaningful way.”

As mentioned earlier, studies show that both a positive and trusting classroom environment, as well as a collaborative work environment built on elements of respect and trust, are attributes found in teaching environments of successful schools. The competencies necessary
to build this type of environment are encompassed in emotional intelligence. The work environment is also a reflection of the culture within an organization. For these reasons, this study will seek to describe successful “at-risk” schools in terms of levels of teacher emotional intelligence, as well as with relation to staff culture within these organizations.

Statement of the Problem

What is the level of emotional intelligence found among 3rd through 5th grade classroom teachers working at selected “beat the odds” schools within the state of Washington? In addition, what is the correlation between emotional intelligence of teachers and staff culture, including elements of collaboration, collegiality, and self-determination/efficacy?

Purpose of the Proposed Study

The purpose of this study is to describe a selection of successful Washington state schools that scored above others with similar demographic characteristics in terms of the level of emotional intelligence found among 3rd through 5th grade classroom teachers. These schools consist of at least 65% of their school population who qualify for free and reduced-price meals, as well as 60% who are Hispanic, and with 35% who are in the Transitional Bilingual program. Compared to similar schools, selected schools for the study outperformed their peers on the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium state assessment at the conclusion of the 2014–2015 school year.

In addition to being a descriptive study in terms of levels of teacher emotional intelligence within these “beat the odds” schools, another purpose of this study will be to provide additional insight into the staff culture found in these schools, and how this relates to levels of teacher emotional intelligence. Staff culture will be assessed as it relates to collaboration,
collegiality, and self-determination/efficacy, all of which are elements related to components of emotional intelligence.

An overarching purpose of this proposed study will be to add an important component to the discussion of what helps some schools succeed while others struggle. There are many variables inherent in school success, a great many of which have been observed and described through the efforts of researchers looking to provide a guide for others to aspire to become and to achieve (Berkley & Dow, 2008; Cunningham, 2006; Denton et al., 2003; Johnson & Asera, 2009). With this being said, Wilder & Jacobsen (2010) discuss and show the difficulties in replicating the successes made by stand-out, “beat the odds” schools, indicating the time commitment to implementing best practices, and the importance of maintaining a positive work environment. This study’s purpose is to shed great lighter on the possible influence emotional intelligence may have on maintaining a positive work and classroom environment.

**Research Questions**

Research has supported the notion that students perform better in a positive, prosocial classroom environment (Arghode, 2013; Jennings & Greenberg, 2009; Zinsser, Denham, Curby, Shewark, 2015), as well as in schools in which teachers collaborate well together and work through problems effectively (Goddard et al., 2007; Johnson & Asera, 1999). Both in the classroom and among the staff, this ability to create positive relationships and work through conflicts effectively can be related directly to the competencies associated with emotional intelligence. Although research supports these concepts, there is very little literature surrounding schools that “beat the odds” regarding emotional intelligence directly, with only slightly more addressing its associated competencies. Thus, the first and foremost question to be addressed is:

(1) What is the presence of emotional intelligence among 3rd–5th grade classroom teachers
within successful Washington state schools that outperform others with similar challenging student demographics of at least 65% rate of poverty, 60% Hispanic population, and 35% bilingual?

Related to this question is the query regarding staff culture and emotional intelligence, and how this may add to the description of successful “beat the odds” schools. As mentioned previously, there is research asserting the importance of school culture in the school improvement effort, as well as in schools that overcome demographic odds (Johnson & Asera, 1999; Wagner, 2009). Staff culture relates to teacher collaboration, solving problems together, existent leadership, and trust within a school organization. Thus, for this study, sub-questions are: (2) What level of staff and school culture exists in these successful “beat the odds” schools? And: (3) How do teachers’ perspectives of professional collaboration, affiliative collegiality, and self-determination/efficacy compare to teachers’ emotional intelligence composite assessment scores?

**Hypotheses**

1. There is a significant presence of emotional intelligence as determined among 3rd–5th grade classroom teachers in schools that outperform others with similar demographics.

2. Schools that outperform others with similar challenging demographics will have a high level of collaboration, collegiality, and self-determination/efficacy as determined by the School Culture Triage survey.

3. There is a significant correlational relationship between teachers’ emotional intelligence assessment composite scores on the EQ-i 2.0 as it relates to perspectives of professional collaboration, as determined by the School Culture Triage survey.
4. There is a significant correlational relationship between teachers’ emotional intelligence assessment composite scores on the EQ-i 2.0 as it relates to perspectives of affiliative collegiality, as determined by the School Culture Triage survey.

5. There is a significant correlational relationship between teachers’ emotional intelligence assessment composite scores on the EQ-i 2.0 as it relates to perspectives of self-determination/efficacy, as determined by the School Culture Triage survey.

Rationale, Relevance, and Significance

As an elementary school principal in a school with a high percentage of the population of students who qualify for free and reduced-price lunch, as well as a large bilingual population, my staff and I have struggled to meet standards that at times seem unrealistic and out of reach. However, studies show that these challenges can be overcome, seemingly with just the right ingredients and a lot of work. Perhaps this is a perfect testament to Nelson Mandela’s famous quote: “It always seems impossible until it’s done” (Durando, 2013). I have found that the work presents two main challenges: implementing effective practices, and having the energy and focus to implement the practices. The second issue becomes a challenge when attention is diverted to addressing and resolving the myriad problems and conflicts that arise naturally each day as many individuals interact with one another in various social settings. Some of these issues are routine and require normal attention, while others have required a great deal of energy to resolve and overcome.

Previous to this study I have researched best practices in education, including research describing schools that overcome demographic challenges. Through personal experience and observation, and with additional understanding regarding emotional intelligence, it seems that there may be a relevant connection, a foundational piece in collaboratively overcoming such
difficult challenges as a school staff and the competencies that are associated with emotional intelligence. The significance of this study is that there are great practical applications for educational practitioners seeking school improvement. In the case that emotional intelligence is shown to be a prevalent characteristic among teachers in these successful schools, there would be an implication that emotional intelligence plays at least some part of this success story.

The practical application of EI exists in the explicit competencies associated within the various subscales comprising emotional intelligence (Multi-Health Systems, 2016d). In other words, instead of coaching staff to create norms and treat each other with respect—although these are good strategies—training can go deeper and be more specific. In contrast to IQ, which is relatively static, an individual can develop higher levels of EI through training and practice (Stein & Book, 2011).

In addition to the practical application that could be possible for educational practitioners, this study will inevitably add to the literature surrounding “beat the odds” schools, and will hopefully encourage further research on the relationships between emotional intelligence and school success. The implications of this study will be a description of these schools from a unique perspective, but will not have the power to draw causal conclusions with regard to the influence of EI in the classroom and student success, although the relationship between EI and school culture will add an important addition to the analysis of results and conclusions drawn.

**Definition of Terms**

*Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) 2.0*: A validated assessment of emotional intelligence based on the Bar-On (1997) model of EI, featuring a total EI score, 5 composite scores, and 15 individual subscale scores (Multi-Health Systems, 2016d).
School Culture Triage Survey: A validated survey instrument that assesses the culture within a school organization, focusing primarily on professional collaboration, affiliative collegiality, and self-determination/efficacy (Philips & Wagner, 2003).

Descriptive Study: A study that examines the prevalence of a phenomenon among a particular population (Adams & Lawrence, 2015).

Emotional Intelligence: “A set of emotional and social skills that influence the way we perceive and express ourselves, develop and maintain social relationships, cope with challenges, and use emotional information in an effective and meaningful way” (Multi-Health Systems, 2016a).

Beat the Odds: A term coined to represent schools that rise above challenges such as poverty and a high number of English Language Learners and achieve a high level of student achievement on state assessments (Denton et al., 2003).

Free and Reduced-Price Lunch: A benefit available as part of the National School Lunch Program for students who qualify for assistance based on income eligibility guidelines (United States Department of Agriculture, 2016).

Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program (TBIP): A Washington state program with the goal of developing language proficiency

Title I: Part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which provides financial assistance to schools with high percentages of children from low-income families, helping schools in their work to ensure children meet state standards (U.S. Department of Education, 2016a).

Learning Assistance Program (LAP): A Washington state program intended to provide funding for academic support through supplemental services in reading, writing and math,
particularly in the area of reading literacy in the early grades (Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, 2016)

*English Language Learner:* “An active learner of the English language who may benefit from various types of language support programs,” whose primary language is other than the English language (National Council of Teachers of English, 2008, p. 2)

*Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) state assessment:* The standardized test utilized by Washington state, along with other states and territories belonging to the Consortium, designed to measure student performance on the Washington state standards (Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium, 2016).

**Limitations and Delimitations**

This study is intended to describe the level of emotional intelligence and its relationship to school culture within successful, demographically-challenged schools. Because of the framework of the study, delimitations existing inherent in the design of the study include the selection of Washington state schools for the study based on the criteria of having at least 65% student poverty, 60% of the student population with Hispanic descent, and at least 35% of students considered bilingual. Also, because the determination for the success of the schools is based in the 2014-2015 school year’s Spring state assessment results, only teachers who were teaching during this school year will be invited to participate in the study. Related to the state test, further refining of participant selection will narrow the teachers invited to include only 3rd through 5th grade classroom teachers since these are the teachers in direct contact with students taking the state assessments.

One limitation of the study includes the uncertainty of whether teachers will voluntarily participate in the study. Also, a limitation may arise if teachers participate, but refuse to answer
enough questions on the survey assessments, which would render the surveys invalid. In any case, the risk of insufficient participation could jeopardize validity. To address this concern, the purpose of the study will be communicated to participating schools, and teachers will receive invitations through email, including reminders, to complete the assessments. An incentive of a $15 Amazon gift card will be offered to all participants who complete both assessments.

Another possible limitation is that the study will be conducted at the beginning of the school year. Although the EQ-i 2.0 assessment and the School Culture Triage survey are validated instruments, teachers coming back to begin a new school year after a summer break often are more energized than in the cold, perhaps dreary, winter months when school has been in session for some time. This may impact emotions, and should be considered when discussing results.

Chapter 1 Summary

This study is designed to describe successful, “beat the odds,” schools through the unique lens of classroom teacher emotional intelligence, with the inclusion of how the levels of emotional intelligence relate to the culture of these schools. Chapter 1 presented an introduction to the problem, the background and conceptual framework of the problem, a statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, research questions, the rationale, relevance, and significance of the study, a definition of terms, and limitations and delimitations. Chapter 2 includes more depth with regard to the context and conceptual framework, as well as a review of literature surrounding schools that have beaten the odds, emotional intelligence, and emotions and emotional intelligence in the classroom and education organization. Chapter 2 also includes an analysis of methodological issues, a synthesis of research findings, and a critique of previous research. Chapter 3 describes the methodology of the study, including a description of the
purpose, research questions, hypotheses, research design, target population, instrumentation, data collection procedures, operationalization of variables, data analysis procedures, limitation and delimitations, internal and external validity issues, expected findings, and ethical issues of the study. Chapter 4 will report the findings of the study. Chapter 5 will discuss the findings, conclusions, and any recommendations for further study.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

Opening.

It is not uncommon for school administrators across America to be called upon during the day to assist with a student who is having an emotional outburst of some form or another. A typical elementary school scenario might include the following report: one child cut in front of the other in line, eliciting an emotional response of anger and frustration. The child who received a personal affront to their dignity and sense of fairness responds by kicking the offender in the leg and giving a push for good measure. It is with intentional purpose of teaching children to appropriately handle situations such as these that the three big expectations taught and emphasized throughout the school where I work are “Show Respect, Make Good Decisions, and Solve Problems.”

Adults experience strong emotions as well. Patterson, Grenny, McMillan, and Switzler (2012) state that: “Our research has shown that strong relationships, careers, organizations, and communities all draw from the same source of power—the ability to talk openly about high-stakes, emotional, controversial topics” (p. 9). The ability of staff to navigate through emotional issues in a healthy and productive manner at a minimum creates an environment that is more enjoyable to work. This in itself is a worthy goal to strive for, to create a positive work environment where individuals spend a significant amount of their life. Beyond, or perhaps related to, a healthy and happy work environment, this study seeks to discover the relationship between these emotional abilities among staff members and the overall success of schools, specifically schools in which there are high percentages of students learning English as a second language, as well as students in poverty status.
Study topic

The focus of this study is on the emotional intelligence (EI) and associated competencies of teachers within the classroom and school organizational setting, and how this relates to organizational success as measured by student state test scores. Emotional intelligence refers to the ability of an individual to accurately perceive and understand emotions of others and self, to self-regulate one’s own emotions and emotional responses, and to utilize emotions within the process of reasoned thought and analysis (Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, & Sitarenios, 2001).

Teachers selected to participate in the assessment of emotional intelligence are associated with successful school organizations which have overcome the additional challenges presented by poverty and learning English as a second language. These types of schools are referred to as having “beat the odds” (Cunningham, 2006; Denton et al., 2003). Organizational and classroom strategies will not be studied in this context. A focus on the emotional intelligence of the teaching staff will be assessed to determine what correlation, if any, exists between teacher emotional intelligence and school achievement.

Context

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) has been a long-standing measure of federal legislation which has sought to provide equal opportunity for all students across the United States (U.S. Department of Education, 2016b). With the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act in 2001, schools across the country were provided with funding tied to demographic variables such as bilingual status, and migrant status, among others (No Child Left Behind Act of 2001), providing additional resources for schools to implement intervention and support programs for struggling students. This funding was also tied to accountability measures and a system of top-down approaches to improving schools who failed to make adequate yearly growth
on state assessments (No Child Left Behind Act of 2001). With this additional pressure for students to meet state standards as measured on state assessments, schools that found success and stood above the rest in terms of student scores have become increasingly interesting to researchers and practitioners alike.

Schools are settings in which strong emotions are common due to the social nature of the organization. A typical elementary school may have up to 60 staff members, 500 students, and the associated parents and guardians of the students. Each stakeholder is a unique individual with a diversity of perspectives, needs, expectations and so forth. The ability to understand, trust, and work with others in such a social setting is crucial for success in an educational organization.

**Significance**

As a current school administrator, much of the researcher’s daily schedule involves the resolution of concerns and problems involving various individuals within the school organization. From the researcher’s vantage point, multiple stakeholders are seen engaging in various types of social interactions throughout the day. This could include teachers instructing classes of students, teachers meeting with colleagues in grade level teams or as a whole staff, students working in collaborative groups, students engaging in recess activities, parents meeting with teachers and/or students, among many other interpersonal and social contacts. For the most part, things run smoothly, but with approximately 500 individuals in one building at a given time throughout the school day, the likelihood of a conflict arising becomes fairly predictable.

If poor decisions have been made by an individual that has resulted in someone being hurt physically and/or emotionally, the poor decision and resultant behavior is nearly always predicated upon feelings of anger, fear, frustration, or other negative emotions. When this
happens, especially when it involves an adult, tension and stress is felt by the involved parties and those who are close to the situation, and a great deal of effort is spent in finding resolution to the situation. Similarly, sometimes an enormous amount of energy, in terms of thought, problem solving strategies, meetings, etc., is spent in the resolution of problems within the organization. This is exacerbated when individuals become frustrated with one another and lash out or engage in other negative behaviors.

Based on experience, it appears likely that where a multitude of individuals interact with each other so frequently in the school environment, conflicts will arise. This may occur by nothing more than just an occurrence of miscommunication. This may be especially true in schools with the challenges of working with students who come from a background of poverty, as well as students who are learning English as a second language. The intrigue exists with regard to schools that experience success despite these challenges. As will be demonstrated, research studies have described a number of these schools and their effective practices. But are these schools just really good at performing the craft of teaching, or is there something more? Studies also show the link between positive emotions and a supportive, caring environment in the classroom and student success, as well as the impact of effective teaming of teachers for student achievement.

Emotional intelligence and its associated competencies are crucial for individuals to effectively navigate the complex social terrain in which they must work and function every day. It is implied that the higher the emotional intelligence of an individual, the more successful they will be in working through the conflicts and challenges associated with everyday life, without these issues becoming major issues or obstacles. With regard to successful schools, it is the desire of this study to determine if there is a relationship between the emotional intelligence of
teachers and how well students are able to perform on state tests. This is with the assumption that with less emotional turmoil and stress within an organization, more focus and energy will be available for developing strong instructional practices that lead to student achievement.

**Problem statement.**

What is the presence of emotional intelligence among 3rd–5th grade classroom teachers in successful Washington state schools that outperform others with similar demographics of at least 65% of students qualifying for free and reduced-price meals, 60% Hispanic population, and 35% in the Transitional Bilingual program? Also, what correlation, if any, exists between emotional intelligence of these classroom teachers and teachers’ perspectives on professional collaboration, affiliative collegiality, and self-determination/efficacy within the school?

**Organization**

The Chapter 2 literature review provides an overview of the conceptual framework upon which the study is founded. A review of literature is then presented with regard to effective schools that have beaten the odds, emotional intelligence, and emotions and emotional intelligence in the classroom and educational organization. An analysis of methodological issues is examined, especially with regard to the use of the EQ-i 2.0 as an assessment of emotional intelligence, as well as methodologies surrounding studies that describe schools that “beat the odds.” A synthesis of research findings is included, followed by a critique of previous research surrounding schools that “beat the odds,” along with research involving emotional intelligence. Finally, a summary concludes the review of literature.

**Conceptual Framework**

As an elementary school principal, the researcher has worked with staff in a school where nearly 80% of the student population qualify for free -or reduced-priced meals at school,
indicating that these students are from families with incomes that qualify for either reduced-price meals or free meals for standards of poverty, as determined by household size and income as part of the National School Lunch Program (Income Eligibility Guidelines, 2016). According to 2014–2015 school year data, 77.7% of students were of Hispanic descent, and 41.7% of students in the school were considered Transitional Bilingual, meaning that they were in the process of showing a fluent level of English proficiency and had not yet exited this bilingual status. This is not a true reflection of the percentage of students who speak English as a second language, however, as students progressively exit out of this status as they develop English fluency and score well enough to pass the state language proficiency exam. Because of my experience working in a school with a high Hispanic population, with a high rate of poverty and second-language learners, my interest and focus of this study will be on schools with similar demographics and challenges who seem to rise above the odds, primarily in the state of Washington.

It has been my foundational belief that to overcome these challenges, school staff must first lead the way through a unified and purposeful manner. Two major obstacles have come in this exercise: first, discovering which direction to take and what strategies to employ, and second, working past individual differences to galvanize into an effective team with a unified vision and effort. The first hurdle has been a process of discovering what others have done well in order to be successful. This has led to the concept of schools beating the odds.

Since the early 1990s researchers have sought to describe practices of effective schools and literacy practices that lead some public schools to beat the odds (Cunningham, 2006; Langer, 2001; Taylor, Pearson, Clark, & Walpole, 2000; Taylor, Pearson, Peterson, & Rodriguez, 2003; Wilder & Jacobsen, 2010). The focus of this research is to identify the strategies which these
schools have employed to “beat the odds,” overcoming the effects of poverty, and a high proportion of minority students and/or second language learners. From these studies, various common characteristics and key factors have been found (Cunningham, 2006; Denton et al., 2003).

Among the common threads found typifying these successful schools involved leadership surrounding literacy, in which leaders had clear goals and monitored progress consistently, and who showed a strong priority and interest in literacy achievement (Cunningham, 2006; Denton et al., 2003). These schools also have shown elements such as high levels of student engagement (Cunningham, 2006), staff perseverance (Cunningham, 2006), professional development activities that support staff learning (Cunningham, 2006; Denton et al., 2003), assessment and monitoring of student progress (Cunningham, 2006; Denton et al., 2003), and instruction and intervention that is targeted for student needs (Cunningham, 2006; Denton et al, 2003).

The second challenge has been to overcome various individual differences to accomplish this work. It has been my experience that the more energy is expended in resolving conflicts, frustrations, offenses, and differences of opinion, the less energy is available for producing a high quality instructional and student support program as an organization. When these issues rob time and energy that can be placed in planning, instruction, and assessment and monitoring, students lose out on what could be a more effective program.

Emotional intelligence may play an important role in the ability to effectively move past these conflicts to focus on the more important work illustrated by effective-schools research (Cunningham, 2006; Denton et al., 2003). Goleman (1998b) found that emotional competencies were more important with regard to professional success than cognitive intelligence or professional expertise. While the research regarding strategies for overcoming the demographic
difficulties described previously is informative and crucial in its own right, an element that escapes the discussion of schools overcoming the odds is the role of the emotional intelligence of teachers within these schools. Wilder and Jacobsen (2010) state:

Although the identification of such practices is important, little attention has been paid to the actual work it takes to implement these practices and whether simply asking other schools that do not beat the odds to adopt these practices is a realistic strategy for closing the reading achievement gap (p. 238).

The ability for school staff to be able to accomplish this work is an important topic, and an underlying, perhaps imperceptible, foundation in this capacity may very well be based in emotions and emotional intelligence.

In addition to staff working well together and managing interpersonal difficulties, studies also show the positive impact on student achievement that emotionally supportive, consistent classrooms in which teachers relate well with students have (Curby, Brock, & Hamre, 2013; Jennings & Greenberg, 2009; Klassen, Perry, & Frenzel, 2011; Zinsser et al., 2015). Research has also shown that schools where teachers effectively work and learn together with their colleagues have greater student success, and that emotional intelligence is related to better team performance and trust among individuals (Chang, Sy, & Choi, 2012; Goddard et al., 2007).

The purpose of this study is to analyze the level of emotional intelligence of teachers within schools that have challenging demographics of high poverty and high levels of students learning English as a second language, and where despite these difficulties, the schools perform better than their peers on state assessments. State assessment and demographic information for each school will be retrieved from the public domain. Teachers will participate in an emotional intelligence assessment using the BarOn Emotional Quotient-Inventory 2.0 (EQ-i 2.0), an
assessment designed to take approximately 20-30 minutes to complete. The EQ-i 2.0 measures the 5 composite scales and 15 subscales of emotional intelligence as described by Bar-On (1997). Teachers will also complete the School Culture Triage Survey (Wagner, 2006) to assess perceptions of levels of professional collaboration, collegiality, and self-determination and self-efficacy. These can be regarded as being connected to emotional intelligence, thereby providing a triangulation of data points. These surveys will be analyzed as they relate to the results of teachers’ EQ-i 2.0 assessments.

There will be several implications for both teachers and site leaders. A strong presence of emotional intelligence among teachers in these successful schools would lead to the discussion of the underlying impact that emotional intelligence may have in a school setting. This may be valuable to administrators involved in the hiring process for new teachers. The results of the study will also inform staff development options and priorities when seeking methods of school improvement. The development of emotional intelligence and emotional competencies among school staff will become a professional development item to be included with strategies for overcoming the difficulties associated with poverty and learning English as a second language.

**Review of Research Literature and Methodological Literature**

**Schools that “beat the odds.”**

Since the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) (2001), schools have been held accountable for meeting each state’s definition of “Adequate Yearly Progress” (AYP) (Paige, 2002). State education departments have used state assessments to identify Title I schools in need for school improvement based on the standards set (Paige, 2002). Many efforts have been made to examine successful schools in an attempt to determine what practices have a
direct influence on this success. This is especially true of schools that experience difficulties associated with a high population of English language learners, as well as schools with a high number of students in poverty situations. When students speak English as their second language, the challenges of meeting state standards in reading proficiency are multiplied in comparison with students who speak English as a primary language (Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2006). Students who enter elementary school in kindergarten with limited English proficiency have been shown to struggle more, and achieve academic lower levels by the 5th grade in comparison to students who enter kindergarten with English as a native language (Kieffer, 2008). Even in schools that have been traditionally very successful at supporting the educational needs of language minority students, it is clear that developing oral proficiency in the English language take 3–5 years, and that academic English proficiency can require up to 4–7 years (Hakuta, 2000).

An additional challenge that many public schools—both urban and rural—face is the impact of poverty situations. Jensen (2009) explains that students who live in poverty face challenges that students in more affluent situations do not. He explains that it is normal for everyone to experience stressors as a normal part of life, but the typical pattern is for the stressor to be resolved, and the resultant stress to level off to more comfortable levels (Jensen, 2009). For students in poverty, who may be wondering what they will eat that day, where they will sleep, or a variety of other worries, these stressors can become chronic. Resultant behaviors influenced by this chronic high stress may range from apathy to acting-out (Jensen, 2009). These are challenges that are not uncommon to many schools across the nation. When some schools overcome these barriers to success, they attract attention for their ability to “beat the odds.”
Many researchers have sought to evaluate and describe the practices common to schools that overcome poverty and language barriers to academic success (Charles A. Dana Center, 1999; Chenowith, 2009; Cunningham, 2006; Langer, 2001; Taylor, Pearson, Clark, & Walpole, 2000; Taylor, Pearson, Peterson, & Rodriguez, 2003; Waits et al., 2006; Wilder & Jacobsen, 2010). These schools have served as a model for instructional and school organizational reform strategies (Stringfield, Millsap, & Herman, 1997; Taylor, Pearson, Clark, & Walpole, 2000).

Many common themes have been delineated in regard to these schools that beat language and poverty hurdles. One common theme includes strong instructional leadership (Cunningham, 2006; Denton et al., 2003; Wilder & Jacobsen, 2010). Cunningham (2006) describes this leadership as coming from “passionate, committed, ‘hands-on’ principals who expected much from their teachers and students and gave them daily support and encouragement” (p. 384). These are principals who interact frequently with teachers in terms of instructional support, coaching and encouraging teachers in their effort to help each student make growth. There is also an emphasis in leadership that provides a clear, focused instructional vision based on student success and that monitors closely the progress being made by individual students (Denton et al., 2003; Waits et al., 2006). Waits et al. (2006) describe these types of principals as being “strong and steady”, not “flashy superstars” (p. 7) but people who will continue moving forward despite the difficulties.

Other critical factors include regular assessment practices and the monitoring of student progress towards grade level standards (Denton et al., 2003). This could include classroom-based assessments that occur as part of the regular curriculum taught in the classroom, as well as other measures of academic proficiency that are norm-based and/or utilized by other districts and schools. The practice of regularly assessing students and monitoring their growth towards a set
goal is a practice typical of purposeful and masterful teaching. This requires great diligence and an organized, competent approach to the instruction of students with the goal of meeting individual needs.

Associated with this purposeful assessment, monitoring, and planning for differentiated and individualized instruction are research-based, high quality instructional practices surrounding literacy (Cunningham, 2006; Denton et al., 2003; Langer, 2001). These form a system of interventions to support struggling readers (Denton et al., 2003), meaning an organized system in which students are provided additional support with regard to their deficiencies in reading. This usually occurs with additional support staff to allow smaller groups of students. Because of the complexity and difficulty of teaching in this manner, a system of ongoing professional development for teachers (Cunningham, 2006; Denton et al., 2003; Taylor et al., 2000) was also a common factor of these schools, as well as parent support and participation in the school and in literacy practices at home (Cunningham, 2006).

Another factor of “beat the odds” schools is a unified sense of commitment to persistence despite challenges (Cunningham, 2006; Denton et al., 2003; Waits et al., 2006), which speaks to the effort and difficulty of struggling to meet students’ individual needs when they can be extensive and seemingly insurmountable. Johnson and Asera (1999) found many of these same characteristics of successful schools in their study of nine high-performing, high-poverty urban schools, but include additional insights into the culture of these high-performing schools. They found that leaders channeled time and energy spent on adult conflicts to a unified focus on student learning (Johnson & Asera, 1999). Teachers were provided ample opportunities to work, plan, and learn together collaboratively. It was also noted that school staff were resilient in the face of difficulties and failures (Johnson & Asera, 1999). As will be shown later, each of these
items are directly tied to emotional competencies within the realm of emotional intelligence, showing the foundational relationship the emotional intelligence plays with regard to the culture of a school organization.

Chenowith’s (2007, 2009) work has been primarily among high-poverty, high-minority schools which have closed achievement gaps and seen exceptional student achievement results. She calls these schools “It’s Being Done” schools. She originally derived a list of 25 characteristics of these schools from her study of various schools across the United States (Chenowith, 2007), similar to studies of other “beat the odds” schools. Subsequently, through further study, Chenowith (2009) in summary concluded that these schools had five overarching essential elements in common: “Teacher collaboration, a laserlike focus on what students need to learn, formative assessments, data-driven instruction, and personal relationship-building” (p. 181). There is an interplay between the science of teaching through assessment, instructional focus, and data to drive instructional decision-making, and the art of relationships, both with students and colleagues. It is in this second arena in which emotional competencies would be most likely to surface as an important factor.

**Emotional intelligence.**

The quest for organizational success and effectiveness is not limited to the field of education and public schools, but extends to other fields as well. It is this drive that has encouraged research surrounding competencies and applications, initially focusing attention on cognitive intelligence (Boyatzis, 2009; Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, & Weick, 1970). McClelland (1975) initially proposed that a person’s competence was a distinguishing factor between being an average or an outstanding performer at work. He later found that a range of competencies based on emotional intelligence, along with narrow range of cognitive
competencies, were the distinguishing factors for outstanding performers in the workplace (Cherniss & Goleman, 2001; McClelland, 1998). Goleman (1998a) found that, of the various competencies that set apart the best performers, 67% were emotional competencies. Further, he found that emotional competencies were twice as important with regard to IQ and expertise. This is an influential claim which has led to an increase in interest within the professional realm with regard to emotional competencies.

Emotional competence is directly linked to emotional intelligence. As explained by Goleman (1998a), emotional competence is a capability that one learns that is based on one of the fundamental dimensions of emotional intelligence. There are various theories of emotional intelligence, the three most commonly known and referenced being Mayer & Salovey (1997), Bar-On (2000), and Goleman (1995).

Mayer et al. (2001) define emotions as “an organized mental response to an event that include physiological, experiential, and cognitive aspects, among others” (pp. 234–235). Emotions are based in the context of relationships, both with other people as well as objects (Mayer et al., 2001). Thus, emotions are derived from what experiences one has with regard to a person or object. If there is a change in the relationship with the person or object, then the emotions in relation to the object or person changes with it (Mayer et al., 2001). For example, if someone falls and is hurt from a tall object, the emotion with regard to objects high off of the ground may possibly elicit an emotion of anxiety and fear. New experiences, such as swinging on a playground swing or flying in an airplane, for example, could result in new emotions, such as exhilaration or pleasure, thus modifying the emotional relationship with the concept of being high off the ground.
Emotional intelligence refers to the capability to recognize and understand the meanings of the emotions felt with regard to their relationships, and to use this meaning as a process of reasoning and solving problems (Mayer et al., 2001). This implies that emotions are linked to the experiences that we encounter on a daily basis, and emotions may be felt with regard to objects, people, and/or concepts. For example, at an elementary school, a child recently expressed to me that they did not want to play basketball anymore in the morning when students occasionally come in to shoot baskets. With further prompting, it was discovered that they were hit in the top of the head by an errant basketball, and it hurt. The experience created a negative emotion of fear and pain, and possibly anger, directed towards the basketball. On a deeper level the child also categorized basketball as a negative experience based upon those emotions.

More specifically, Mayer and Salovey (1997) define EI as the ability to perceive emotions from others as well as to express emotions appropriately, use emotions within reasoning practices, to integrate emotions into thoughts, and to regulate emotions within the self. An important contribution of Mayer, Caruso, and Salovey (1999) is in establishing emotional intelligence as a traditional standard of intelligence. The attempt here is to place emotional intelligence within the same realm as standard intelligence, a construct that is widely acknowledged throughout society.

In public schools, most of the emphasis of testing is based on cognitive intelligence. Often, as a part of referrals to receive special education services, or for other special services offered, school psychologists will perform assessments to determine a student’s intelligence quotient, or IQ. This helps to determine, in coordination with other academic assessments, appropriate placement and determination of services. BarOn (2007) was a primary influence in establishing emotional intelligence as an intelligence construct, along with Mayer, Salovey, and
Caruso, coining the term *emotional quotient* in relation to the emotional and social intelligence assessment he developed called the Emotional Quotient Inventory, or EQ-I (Bar-On, 1997).

The establishment of emotional intelligence as a true intelligence which can be assessed and identified is an important construct to establish. The concept of emotional intelligence as a measurable, definable standard intelligence is contested by some as it is compared to cognitive intelligence and personality measures (Roberts, Zeidner, & Matthews, 2001). Mayer, Caruso, and Salovey (1999) initially developed a scale of EI, the Multi-Factor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS), based on the argument that EI was similar in nature to traditional intelligence, and could be assessment empirically. This assessment is based on the convergence between expert-and consensus-scored dimensions, the lack of which, at least for the initial MEIS assessment, was a “severe psychometric difficulty” (Roberts et al., 2001, p. 224). The MEIS assessment transformed into the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT), in an attempt to improve on these psychometric difficulties (Mayer et al., 2001). This scale is now based on general consensus criterion, as well as a further-developed expert consensus score. This grants an opportunity to more thoroughly understand an individual and their unique competencies. Similar to an assessment of cognitive intelligence, such as the Weschler Adult Intelligence Scale–Fourth Edition (WAIS–IV) (Weschler, 2008)—which assesses skills such as verbal comprehension, perceptual reasoning, processing speed, among others, and provides an intelligence score—the assessment of emotional intelligence using the MSCEIT provides a standardized score with regard to this category of intelligence.

Their model of EI is based in an analysis of emotion-related abilities, and is divided into four skill areas (Mayer & Salovey, 1995, 1997). The skill areas, or branches, include the ability to (Branch A) perceive emotions, (B) use emotions within thought processes, (C) understand
emotions, and (D) manage emotions (Mayer et al., 2001). Perceiving emotions, understanding emotions, and managing emotions are related in that they involve reasoning about emotions, whereas Branch B, using emotions to facilitate thought, involves using emotions to inform and enhance reasoning (Mayer et al., 2001). Further, there is a hierarchy between the branches of EI, with the ability to perceive emotions at the bottom, and the ability to manage emotions at the top (Mayer et al., 2001).

The ability to perceive emotions constitutes the first branch of emotional intelligence, and includes such skills as deciphering emotions in various objects, such as a face, picture, or voice (Salovey & Grewal, 2005). The second branch of emotional intelligence is the ability to use emotions, which means that one can utilize emotions as part of the process of thinking and problem solving, adapting to different cognitive tasks by changing emotions or moods (Salovey & Grewal, 2005). Understanding emotions, the third branch, involves the comprehension of emotion language, with its complicated relationships, nuances, and variations (Salovey & Grewal, 2005). The fourth and highest level of emotional intelligence is the ability to manage emotions, both maintaining control of one’s own emotions and emotional reactions, as well as the ability to use emotions to manage and influence others or situations (Salovey & Grewal, 2005).

All of these abilities are important with regard to relating to other individuals. The ability to understand, recognize, and manage emotions is especially important when participating in life events requiring rationality. Individuals who fail to manage emotions have a higher likelihood of making poor, irrational choices, leading to undesirable results. Although difficult to prove, this could be a strong reason for emotional intelligence being such a highly regarded attribute when considering an individual’s professional capacity and propensity towards success (Goleman,
1998b). In the field of education where a teacher is interacting with multiple students and various colleagues throughout the day, understanding and managing emotions is a crucial skill for making and maintaining positive relationships. This will be developed further, however especially in order for teachers to be able to manage a classroom in a positive, consistent manner, they must first be able to manage their emotions, consistently responding to behaviors and maintaining relationships of caring and trust.

Bar-On (2000) adds an important element to the discussion of emotional intelligence, linking it to social intelligence and social competencies that serve as a determining factor in how well we understand ourselves and others, how well we are able to express ourselves and relate with others, and how well we cope with daily demands and challenges. Bar-On (2002) developed the Emotional Quotient Inventory-EQi to measure EI, being the first to use the term EQ as a link to traditional intelligence IQ. The model of emotional intelligence developed by Bar-On is composed of interrelated emotional and social competencies, and includes 5 scales and 15 subscales (Bar-On, 2000). The 5 scales include intrapersonal awareness and reflective capacity, interpersonal relationship capabilities, the ability to manage stress and stressful situations, the ability to adapt, and general mood, with the 15 subscales including: “self-regard, emotional awareness, assertiveness, independence, self-actualization, empathy, social responsibility, interpersonal relationships, stress tolerance, impulse control, reality testing, flexibility, problem solving, optimism and happiness” (Dickey, 2012, p. 18).

According to the social and emotional framework for intelligence described by Bar-On (2007), people who exhibit these competencies are better able to function in the various vicissitudes and struggles of life, especially with regard to situations that involve other people. The interpersonal realm, which is such a crucial factor in so many of life’s experiences, is largely
influenced by the ability of people to competently interact with one another in such a way that effective communication occurs, individuals are validated and respected, and relationships are enhanced and established. The various subscales presented by Bar-On (2007) reflect the social and emotional competencies necessary for success in this realm.

To elaborate further, the subscales comprised in Bar-On’s original EQ-i (Bar-On, 1997) each test for a specific emotional competency. For example, within the intrapersonal composite scale:

- Self-regard assesses the ability to accurately understand and accept oneself.
- Emotional self-awareness is similar to self-regard but specific to one’s emotions and feelings.
- Assertiveness is the ability to express oneself and one’s feelings.
- Independence means to have the ability to be emotionally self-reliant.
- Self-actualization means that a person has the drive and capacity to make goals and then follow through to see them come to fruition.

The interpersonal composite scale of the EQ-i includes empathy, considered one of the key factors of emotional intelligence (Bar-On, 2000), and meaning the ability to have an awareness of and understanding of how others may feel. Interestingly, studies have shown that a fairly strong negative correlation exists between EQ-i empathy subscale scores and the antisocial features and aggression scales on the Personality Assessment Inventory (PAI) (Morey, 1991). Also included in the interpersonal scale is social responsibility, which refers to the ability to integrate into one’s social group and cooperate within this group. Related to these is the subscale of interpersonal relationships, focusing on the ability to establish mutually satisfying relationships with other individuals (Bar-On, 2007).
Another composite scale of the EQ-i is founded in stress, namely stress management. Its subscales include stress tolerance and impulse control, the ability to effectively manage emotions in such a way that they do not produce excessive anxiety and resultant stress (Bar-On, 2000). Another subscale is impulse control, which is similar to stress tolerance, except that instead of managing situations and alleviating stress and anxiety, this is more a measure of a person’s ability to control one’s own emotional reactions (Bar-On, 2007). In short, this refers to self-control. This is often a what people think of when considering emotional intelligence, this ability to control emotional reactions to environmental situations and stimuli. Truly, this is one of the more observable features of emotional intelligence, an easily recognizable feature of EI. Compared to cognitive intelligence, this would be similar to a person considered wise—a sage—who shows control and deliberate attention in the articulation of thought.

The fourth scale of the EQ-i is adaptability, and contains the subscales of reality testing, flexibility, and problem-solving (Bar-On, 2007). These three subscales are especially important in the ability to work with others, as well as to learn and grow as an individual. Reality testing refers to the ability accurately assess reality, looking past one’s own perspective and being able to assess and validate what others may be thinking and feeling. Bar-On (2000) refers to this subscale as a possible “rudder” that directs cognition into the realm of emotions. This is a very important skill for successful individuals to possess, especially in leadership positions. Flexibility refers to one’s ability to change one’s feeling or perspectives on a given situation, especially with new insights that may be obtained. Problem-solving is the ability to solve problems of both a personal and interpersonal nature in effective and constructive ways (Bar-On, 2007).
Finally, general mood comprises the fifth composite scale of the EQ-i. This includes optimism, referring to a positive attitude and outlook. Happiness was also included in the original assessment, however, with the recent updates made to the EQ-i assessment, it was cut out of the realm of contributing factors of emotional intelligence (Multi-Health Systems, 2016). Happiness is now considered a product of overall emotional intelligence, stemming from successful relationships and the ability to alleviate and manage stress and anxiety.

Additional changes have been made to the original EQ-i assessment as part of the new EQ-i 2.0 (Multi-Health Systems, 2016). The composite scales have experienced some change, now instead of an intrapersonal composite scales, it has been divided into two separate scales, namely the self-perception and self-expression composite scales. The reason for this delineation is that the previous subscale of emotional self-awareness included items that tested for both self-perception and self-expression of emotions (Multi-Health Systems, 2016). Thus, the self-expression items were placed into their own subscale and a divide made between these different intrapersonal categories. The self-perception composite scale includes the subscales of self-regard, self-actualization, and emotional self-awareness, which have each been briefly described earlier. The self-expression composite scale includes independence and assertiveness, both previously described and part of the original EQ-i, as well as the new subscale of emotional expression. This new subscale refers to the ability to express one’s feelings through verbal and non-verbal means in such a way that they can be accurately understood by others (Multi-Health Systems, 2016).

Other changes include a new composite scale, decision making, which takes the place of the adaptability composite scale. With the exclusion of the happiness subscale, the general mood composite scale was also terminated. The resultant shuffle of subscales places flexibility, stress
tolerance, and optimism within the stress management composite scale. Problem solving, reality
testing and impulse control now all fit within the new decision making composite scale. Each of
these subscales are the same as the original EQ-i assessment model, and were described
previously.

Goleman’s (1998b) framework for EI is based in the premise that the mastering of the
skills of self-awareness, social awareness, self-management, and relationship management
translates into success in the workplace. Originally, Goleman’s (1995) model was comprised of
200 competencies organized into five dimensions of EI, including self-awareness, self-
regulation, self-motivation, social awareness, and social skills. This was later revised reflect the
current model with 4 dimensions and 18 associated emotional competencies (Goleman, Boyatzis,
& McKee, 2002). Bradberry and Greaves (2009) explain that personal competence is composed
of the “self” competencies self-awareness and self-management. This personal competence is
related to the ability to manage emotions (Salovey & Grewal, 2005), and includes the ability to
recognize and have an awareness of one’s emotional state, as well as being able to manage one’s
actions and behavior (Bradberry & Greaves, 2009). Social competence is based in social
awareness and relationship management, and although similar to personal competence, relates to
how a person is capable of understanding others, including moods, behaviors and the motives
that drive their behavior. Further, relationship management involves using this knowledge to
develop quality relationships with a variety of people and personalities (Bradberry & Greaves,
2009).

Cherniss and Goleman (2001) explain that job skills are synonymous with emotional
competencies that must be learned in order to productively and effectively perform the various
duties inherent in the workplace. Similarly, Goleman (1997) found that EI finds a place in the
performance of schools because of the relative confidence, self-control, communication skills, and cooperative behavior of students (Jeloudar, Yunus, Roslan, & Nor, 2011).

With regard to gender, some studies have shown that there is no significant difference between males and females (Birol, Atamturka, & Sensoy, 2009; Jeloudar et. al, 2011). However, while no significant differences has been shown between males and females in terms of overall emotional and social competence, Bar-On (2000) refers to small gender differences that do exist regarding certain aspects of emotional intelligence. According to the sample studied, females tended to have greater interpersonal skills while males tended to have greater intrapersonal competency (American Psychiatric Association, 1994).

Also, there do appear to be familial, environmental differences with regard to emotional intelligence levels (Cote & Miners, 2006). Individuals raised in familial environments that promote the development of emotional abilities, such as emotional control and understanding, may have a greater likelihood of developing higher emotional intelligence than an individual in a contrasting situation (Cote & Miners, 2006). This speaks not only to environmental factors in the development of individual attributes and competencies, but to the notion that emotional abilities can be developed given certain conditions and situations.

**Emotional intelligence in the workplace.**

Although a direct application or causal relationship between emotional intelligence and an organization’s performance may be unattainable (Turnipsee & Vandewaa, 2012), various studies link emotional intelligence with various positive organizational outcomes. Among these are abilities and traits such as developing good working relationships (Rosete & Ciarrochi, 2005). High emotional intelligence has been shown to compensate for low cognitive intelligence to produce high levels of job performance ratings for most jobs, due to the contribution of social
interactions, emotionally informed decisions, and motivation (Cote & Miners, 2006). A safe, productive, and healthy work environment is crucial for the productivity and continual development of individuals. The profession of public educators is a highly social enterprise, including the work of collaborating with colleagues. The social nature of the education profession requires elements of emotional competencies at its foundation.

Teachers in a public school setting are generally expected to collaborate together. Teacher collaboration as an organizational practice is a predictor of higher student achievement as compared to schools where teachers do not collaborate with a focus on school improvement (Goddard et al., 2007). This practice of sharing ideas and learning together has become common practice (Tschannen-Moran, 2001), although the quality of collaborative work is variable (DuFour, 2007). Effective practices for collaborative learning include an element of social norms (DuFour & DuFour, 2012) and trusting relationships between teachers (Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Tschannen-Moran (2001) further explains that teachers require trust to be willing to expose themselves and their work to a collaborative group.

It has been my experience that trust is a valuable entity that is earned through mutual accountability of acceptable norms of behavior. Effective collaborative practice includes elements of mutual accountability and professional exposure as teachers discuss student growth measures based on collaboratively developed goals (DuFour & DuFour, 2012), as well as the opportunity to reflect and critique their own practice in a collaborative setting (Tscannen-Moran, 2001). This is made possible by individuals within a collaborative team proving their trustworthiness by developing relationships, and knowing and managing their words and actions in response to emotional perceptions and understandings. For example, if a member of the team is reticent to share student scores on a test, and shows signs of embarrassment, an emotionally
intelligent colleague will accurately recognize this and use care in the response given. A skilled colleague will be able to address the poor scores respectfully and reflectively, managing the emotions of the moment in the direction of productivity and encouragement.

In their study of effective schools, Newmann, King, and Young (2000) place professional community as one of the five components of school capacity. This capacity consists of what each individual contributes to the whole of the organization, including any skills, knowledge, attributes, or other valuable competencies that are utilized for the betterment of the whole (Newmann et al., 2000). These resources are collectively organized and shared through professional collaborative communities in which staff share goals for student learning and achievement, collaborative responsibility and effort to attain goals, and professional inquiry and dialogue surrounding challenges and current practices (Newman et al., 2000). Fullan (2001) states that, “the outcome, as we have seen time and again in our own work, is that purposeful collaboration continuously contributes two interrelated powerful change forces – knowledge of ideas and practices, and identity or allegiance to one’s peers and the organization” (p. 93). The shared expertise and capacity of the school staff as a whole is much greater than the individual capacity of just one person. Being able to galvanize and utilize this shared capacity through collaborative work is a goal worth striving for.

The development of trusting, professional relationships is crucial in the collaborative environment in which teachers are placed. A change expert, Fullan (2001) explains that relationships make all the difference with regard to successful enterprises. The impact of the emotional intelligence of team members is a mediating factor on intrateam trust among colleagues in a work setting in terms of team performance (Chang et al., 2012). This is due to the nature of collaborative work consisting of social, communicative types of interactions in
which members exhibited attributes of dependability and caring about the team. Beyond the act
of completing assignments in a timely manner, this includes actions of loyalty and friendliness,
and finding humor and encouragement while holding each other accountable for the work being
done. When teams showed these characteristics, greater intrateam trust was developed, leading
to a significantly positive effect on team performance (Chang et al., 2012).

The association between emotional intelligence and interpersonal relations is strongly
correlated. Research confirms that higher scores of emotional intelligence correlated with higher
scores for empathic perspective taking, social self-monitoring, and social skills, and that people
with a higher EI were more cooperative with colleagues, and scored higher with regard to close
and affectionate relationships (Schutte et al., 2001). As Schutte et al. (2001) explain, empathic
perspective taking is a crucial social skill in quality relationships, and is related to emotional
intelligence. Empathic perspective taking involves the ability to see a matter from another
person’s perspective, allowing an individual to better understand and more effectively interact
with that person.

Empathy is an especially crucial skill to acquire when working with individuals from a
diversity of backgrounds and experiences. Each individual develops their own set of meaning
perspectives through which life events are interpreted and understood (Mezirow, 1991). A
meaning perspective is comprised of the many assumptions that have been developed as a person
experiences life events. These various assumptions and perspectives in turn shape and inform
the way in which new experiences are interpreted and assimilated into new understanding
(Mezirow, 1991). Adding to the importance of emotional intelligence, these experiences are
related to various emotions (Mayer et al., 2001) that add further complexity and richness to the
schema. Diversity of perspectives and understandings can lead to occasional conflicts and the
need to communicate effectively. This process of communication and alignment of thinking is a much simpler and more enjoyable experience within a trusting, safe relationship. Emotional competence is necessary for this type of relationship to exist.

**Emotional intelligence in the classroom.**

Emotions are present in classroom settings with regard to teachers and students as well. Emotions can either help or hinder the performance of both teachers and students. Some emotions, such as an interest or amusement, can help to promote student engagement and interest in a lesson, while boredom, fear, anxiety, or anger can disrupt the ability to give attention to the lesson and the ability to learn (Brackett & Simmons, 2015). Further, when students experience emotions of chronic stress, resulting from consistent trauma or sense of insecurity and danger—symptoms related to poverty among other factors—neurons are diminished, and a student’s ability to learn is threatened (Bracket & Simmons, 2015; Jensen, 2009). When considering students as complex beings, emotions are important considerations with regard to classroom learning outcomes.

It has been my personal experience as a teacher and as a school administrator that when students are in a positive frame of mind, they are much more likely to do well in class, and to behave appropriately. For example, there are currently some students in the school where I work who require more attention to promote appropriate school behaviors, and who are on our “check-in, check-out” system. These students check-in at the office a few times each school day to see how their day is going, receive encouragement from principals, and praise and rewards when they reach their goals. The opportunity for positive, caring interactions with these students has a positive impact on their ability to manage their performance and behavior in class and on the
playground. The positive emotions felt through caring relationships has been successful in
turning around what was once disruptive and delinquent behaviors for these students.

Studies of the various influences for students dropping out of school has shown that, even
when controlling for variables such as student background characteristics and attitudes, when
students report that their teachers care about them, they have 16% lower chance of dropping out
(Rumberger, 1995). In their studies on emotions and motivation in the classroom setting, Meyer
and Turner (2006) have found not only that emotions are ubiquitous in this setting, but
motivating instruction is correlated with supportive teaching and the development of a positive
classroom environment. This happens as teachers demonstrate positive emotional support
through caring actions and statements. When students sense that their teacher cares about them,
they are more likely to be motivated to learn from that teacher, and this manifests itself both
academically and behaviorally within the classroom.

Jennings and Greenberg (2009) make it clear that teachers who are both socially and
emotionally competent are the crucial element in setting the tone of the classroom in ways that
support not only student academic performance, but their overall development in socially,
emotionally, healthy ways. In connection with the concept of motivation, Jennings and
Greenberg (2009) explain that one of the ways in which this happens is through the designing of
a classroom environment that promotes intrinsic motivation, in addition to encouraging
cooperation among students, and teaching students how to respectfully resolve conflicts and hold
productive classroom dialogue. This is accomplished as the teacher models “respectful and
appropriate communication and exhibitions of prosocial behavior” (Jennings & Greenberg,
2009).
Similarly, Marzano and Marzano (2015) describe the importance of teachers understanding and managing their emotions, using cognition to control actions through the analysis of interpretations of events. This inner world is presented as a crucial aspect of effective teaching in which students are treated with fairness, dignity, kindness, and in a manner that inspires the same motivation that Jennings and Greenberg (2009) speak of. Students are strongly influenced by the social environment which the teacher creates within the classroom. The model described by Marzano and Marzano (2015) represents the interplay between emotions and cognition, and how this leads to emotional competencies.

Jennings and Greenberg’s (2009) prosocial model for teaching is also closely related to concepts of emotional intelligence, incorporating social and emotional competence (SEC) and well-being as a framework. They explain that socially and emotionally competent teachers exhibit characteristics such as having high self-awareness, being aware of their emotions, and able to use emotions to motivate themselves and their students to learn (Jennings & Greenberg, 2009). This ability to use emotions productively is related to the ability to manage emotions, the highest level of emotional intelligence (Salovey & Grewal, 2005). Jennings and Greenberg (2009) describe this as teachers setting firm but reasonable limitations, regulating their emotions, and being able to find a level of comfort with a sense of ambiguity and discomfort as students are allowed to work through problems. They are able to share ownership in the learning environment with students. Similarly, teachers high in SEC have high social awareness, an ability to understand and recognize emotions of others, and can effectively navigate through and resolve conflicts (Jennings & Greenberg, 2009). They also exhibit prosocial values, making decisions based on how their decisions may impact others. The negative impacts of teachers with limited abilities in social and emotional competencies include a burnout effect, leading
teachers to become negative and cynical, and to be more prone to use overly punitive measures to maintain an environment of order and stability (Jennings & Greenberg, 2009). Having a positive classroom environment is something that has been shown to be inversely related to emotional exhaustion (Williams, Childers, & Kemp, 2013), or emotional burnout. This can be especially important for teachers working in schools dealing with the challenges associated with poverty, which are typically associated with a wider and more severe range of behaviors that can be emotionally taxing on the teacher.

Curby, Brock, and Hamre (2013) provide a crucial element in the discussion of an emotionally supportive classroom, indicating that the consistency of emotional support and management of emotions is an important predictor of both achievement outcomes and social outcomes. This refers to the teachers’ emotional competence over time, consistently exhibiting patterns of patience, self-control, the development of positive classroom relationships, and the use of emotions to motivate students towards positive academic and social goals. Curby, Brock, and Hamre (2013) explain that the element of consistency may be significant in the amount of energy and attention that students must utilize in order to navigate their classroom setting.

In contrast to consistency, an unpredictable emotional environment, as established by the teacher, will require more attention as students struggle to manage their own behaviors and actions as they monitor the teacher’s emotional state (Curby, Brock, & Hamre, 2013). If a teacher tries to ignore irritating or disruptive behaviors, and then finally explodes and sends a student to the office, or uses some other form of punitive measure, students will have a much more difficult time feeling safe and navigating the classroom environment as compared to a firm set of consistent expectations. Emotional competence and intelligence in the classroom then
does not seem to imply simply trying to ignore and mask emotions, but is the act of recognizing and managing emotions in a way that promotes a healthy and productive learning environment.

Review of Methodological issues

**Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i 2.0).**

There are now a variety of emotional, social, and personality assessments available. The three most prominent are Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT), an ability-based assessment of EI, and the self-appraisal assessments the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) (Bar-On, 2002), and the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal (Bradberry & Greaves, 2011). The EQ-i 2.0 is a self-report test of EI that has been normed across the United States and Canada, and has been shown to be both scientifically valid and reliable (Stein & Book, 2011). The EQ-i 2.0 consists of 133 brief test items, and takes between 20–40 minutes to complete. The test produces a total EI score, as well as a score for each of the 5 composite scales, including self-perception, self-expression, interpersonal, decision making, and stress management (Multi-Health Systems, 2011). It also provides scores for each of the 15 subscales, allowing for a very detailed report on the various attributes of emotional intelligence.

As has been stated, the Emotional Quotient Inventory 2.0 (Multi-Health Systems, 2011)—like its predecessor, the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) (Bar-On, 2002)—is a self-report assessment of emotional intelligence. Concern has been raised with regard to the validity of self-report assessments due to research that has shown that participants may be susceptible of social desirability bias (Adams & Lawrence, 2015) and the faking of answers. Hartman and Grubb (2011) showed that participants in their study responded differently with regard to the honest and the faking response conditions. Salovey and Grewal (2005) posit that emotional intelligence self-report tests raise two important questions: “Whether people are sufficiently aware of their
own emotional abilities to report upon them accurately, and whether people answer the questions truthfully instead of reporting in a socially desirable manner” (p. 282).

Despite the concern with regard to the subjective nature of a self-report assessment of emotional intelligence factors, the EQ-i 2.0 has sufficient scientific and psychometric qualities to be deemed trustworthy for research purposes. First, the EQ-i 2.0 has been established as an APA-standard test through vigorous validity and reliability testing over several years, which has shown it to be both valid and reliable through factor analysis and norming practices (Stein & Book, 2011). Also, because of the possibility of faking EQ-i answers both in a positive and negative direction (Grubb & McDaniel, 2007), updates have been made on the EQ-i 2.0 assessment which detect positive and negative exaggerations, resulting in either positive or negative impression scores.

There are shorter tests for EI when compared to the EQ-i 2.0, which could possibly be more feasible when attempting to retrieve completed test results from already very busy teachers. A teacher’s preparation time is precious, as well as their time when they are home. Asking them to take 20–40 minutes to complete an assessment of this nature is a significant request. However, due to the proven empirical soundness of the EQ-i 2.0, and the researcher’s certification in administering and interpreting EQ-i 2.0 assessment results, it will be the assessment of choice.

**Effective schools and practices.**

Studies that have examined the effectiveness of schools and school programs, particularly with regard to literacy and overcoming the detrimental effects of poverty and challenges of learning English as a second language, generally seek to describe the strategies and practices that have been observed and analyzed as part of the descriptive (Adams & Lawrence, 2015) research
study. Interviews and observations (Cunningham, 2006; Langer, 2001; Taylor, Pearson, Clark, & Walpole, 2000; Taylor, Pearson, Peterson, & Rodriguez, 2003) were the common methods for gathering qualitative school descriptive data. Some studies referred to the attempt made to reduce the possibility of interviewer and observer bias (Adams & Lawrence, 2015) through training and rater reliability exercises (Taylor, Pearson, Clark, Walpole, 2000; Taylor, Pearson, Peterson, Rodriguez, 2003), requiring observer proficiency.

This research study will include elements of survey data, including an emotional intelligence assessment and a survey to determine elements of teacher collaboration and teacher attitude. Studies with regard to emotions and emotional intelligence in the classroom setting utilize a variety of methodologies to assess the impact of emotions on the school environment. An important consideration with regard to the use of teacher responses to questionnaires and EQ-i 2.0 scores is that they will require great care in safeguarding confidentiality.

A common theme in the methodology of studies that evaluate effectiveness of schools, whether considering literacy instruction or classroom environment, is that they typically utilize a mixed-method, or multi-method approach. Researchers conduct observations of classrooms and teachers with an analysis of instructional discourse, use self-reported survey data retrieved from students and/or teachers, log books compiled by teachers, interviews, and student achievement data (Curby, Brock, Hamre, 2013; Jennings & Greenberg, 2009; Meyer & Turner, 2006; Taylor, Pearson, Peterson, & Rodriguez, 2003; Williams, Childers, & Kemp, 2013;). The variety of assessments helps to strengthen the validity of the research, considering multiple vantage points. Conducting research that incorporates observations and interviews, among other methods of gathering research data, is labor intensive, requiring a great deal of time on the part of the researcher.
Synthesis of Research Findings

Much of this discussion of successful schools and of successful people is based on the attempt by researchers to observe and describe what is often tacitly known and practiced by these organizations and individuals in order to transform this knowledge into something explicit and replicable (Hislop, 2013). Thus, research on schools that “beat the odds” has sought to describe effective practices consistent with these organizations, translating the tacit knowledge inherent in these schools into explicit, articulable knowledge that could theoretically be adopted in other schools seeking similar results. Wilder & Jacobsen (2010) speak to the difficulty of putting these strategies and structures into practice, describing the work and perseverance necessary. It is the acknowledgment of this difficulty of replication, and the inquiry into what else it might take to achieve this lauded school status that drives this study. The influence of emotional intelligence as an underlying capacity is the focus of the study’s inquiry.

Research studying effective schools, particularly with regard to schools that have overcome challenges associated with poverty and English language learners, has provided a great deal of practical information for schools working to improve student academic achievement. Some of the research has sought to distinguish between effective and less-effective school and classroom practices (Kennedy, 2010; Taylor, Pearson, Clark, & Walpole, 2000; Taylor, Pearson, Peterson, & Rodriguez, 2003) showing that practices such as professional development (Kennedy, 2010), small group instruction, independent reading, student engagement (Taylor et al., 2000), among others result in better achievement. “Beat the odds” research has primarily consisted of descriptive research, studying and describing the practices—especially commonalities—among schools identified as having above average results with regard to schools with at-risk populations (Cunningham, 2006; Denton et al., 2003).
The current study seeks to connect the research of effective schools and school practices and the body of research concerning emotions and emotional intelligence in the work and classroom setting. This is under the supposition that emotional intelligence serves as an underlying competency that is essential when working with people in a social setting. For teachers this includes the daily interaction with students in a classroom setting, as well as a collaborative work environment with colleagues. As has been discussed, both a positive classroom environment, and a positive, trusting working environment relate to better performance. The ability to create these situations is based primarily on a teacher’s competencies in emotions and social interactions. The ability to form and maintain quality relationships is largely determined by how well someone can understand emotions, and use self-control in emotional situations. Thus, the intrigue of this study is to determine a level of relationship between EI and success that schools who “beat the odds” experience in terms of student academic performance.

Critique of Previous Research

Dickey (2012) conducted a similar research study as part of a doctoral dissertation. Dickey’s study sought to find the correlation between emotional intelligence and 3rd graders’ academic performance on the North Carolina state assessment from six selected elementary schools. The six schools were selected based on Title I status, a federal designation for schools with disadvantaged students because of poverty levels, which qualifies these schools for federal grants in the attempt to provide extra support and services. Third grade teachers in these six schools were invited voluntarily to participate in the study by performing the Bradberry and Greaves’ (2011) Emotional Intelligence Appraisal. This appraisal is a self-reported survey asking participants to rate themselves on various components of emotional intelligence. This
appraisal is based in the four quadrants of emotional intelligence as explained by Goleman (1998b). Of note, Dickey’s (2012) study also measured classroom management style as it correlates with EI, finding that there were no significant relationships between EI scores for the four quadrants, nor the overall score of EI for teachers and their classroom management styles. Also, there was no significant relationship found between classroom management style and student scores on their state test.

Dickey (2012) describes the limitations of the study as including the selective nature of the schools instead of a random sampling. This may have expanded the reliability of the measure to other Title I schools with varying demographics and environmental setting. The study I am proposing will also utilize a selection of schools who meet specific criteria of academic performance and socio-economic status. Dickey’s (2012) study provides insight into the importance of attempting to select schools from differing locations and demographics in order to improve the reliability.

While Dickey (2012) used the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal (Bradberry & Greaves, 2011) the prevalence of the Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) (Bar-On, 1997), and its psychometric properties lead to this study using the updated version of this assessment, namely the EQ-i 2.0. This assessment is used widely in various professional fields for the use of consulting and individual growth in areas of emotional intelligence. The researcher is also qualified to administer this assessment and interpret results.

Chapter 2 Summary

Research has shown that there are some schools that “beat the odds” to achieve high levels of student success despite the extra challenges to student achievement posed by poverty and low levels of English language proficiency. It is also apparent that teacher EI has an impact
on the learning environment within a classroom, including the abilities to relate with students, motivate them to learn at high levels, and to set up an emotionally positive and safe atmosphere. Emotional intelligence has also been linked with the ability to collaborate in a trusting relationship with colleagues and peers in a professional work setting. Collaboration of teachers in ways that support student learning, including a focus on strategies and solutions for student learning based on student data, has been shown to have a positive effect on student achievement in schools.

This study seeks to bring these factors together in the attempt to determine the relationship between emotional intelligence, emotionally safe and productive classrooms and work settings, and beat the odds schools. Because of the social-emotional nature of the typical classroom setting, as well as the professional setting of collaboration with grade-level or department colleagues, there seems to be an implication that in schools where great difficulties have been overcome, there should be an element of teamwork, trust, connectedness, and social and emotional appropriateness that can only be obtained by an emotionally competent teaching force. This is not to imply that EI is the only reason for school success, but if a correlation is found, there will be reason to place EI as an important foundational pillar in the quest for school excellence, alongside other elements of school success such as effective instruction, monitoring of student progress and achievement, instructional leadership, and so forth.
Chapter 3: Methodology

Introduction

Schools are social settings in which there are various interpersonal and social interactions. These include the interactions and relationships between students and other students, students and the teacher, teachers and other teachers and staff members, and between parents and teachers. The importance of establishing a classroom and work environment in which individuals feel safe and valued is a crucial foundational step in setting up an optimal learning environment. The quality of these relationships and interactions plays a direct role in the establishment of this type of environment (Garner, 2010; Meyer & Turner, 2006), and emotional intelligences and competencies have a direct impact in one’s ability to establish such relationships (Multi-Health Systems, 2011; Stein & Book, 2011).

It is upon this understanding that the current study is built. The logic suggests a teaching staff better equipped with emotional intelligence and emotional competencies is better able to establish this foundational environment for student learning, and thus support student academic achievement. This study, however, seeks only to determine at what level emotional intelligence exists at these selected elementary schools in Washington state that have challenging demographics and still find a way to succeed, in comparison to schools with similar demographics, yet lesser achievement. The teaching and learning scenario is much more complex than relationships alone, including other factors such as teaching competency in delivering instruction, assessing student needs, addressing these various needs individually, as well as the materials used and a number of other contributing factors (Marzano, 2007; Taylor, Pearson, Clark, & Wadpole, 2000). Thus, although emotional intelligence could possibly be an important factor in the equation, it cannot stand alone as a cause for student achievement.
Purpose of the Proposed Study

The purpose of this study is to determine whether a notable level of emotional intelligence exists among 3rd–5th grade teachers of successful schools within Washington state that qualify for Title I, Learning Assistance Programs (LAP), and Bilingual assistance and that score well on the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) state standardized assessment, particularly those with high Hispanic populations. After having compiled a list of schools with at least 65% rate of poverty, 60% Hispanic population, and 35% bilingual, these schools’ 2014-2015 SBAC scores were compiled and assessed. The top 5% of these schools, with reference to their combined 3rd–5th grade percentages of students passing the state assessment, were invited to participate in the study. The results of emotional intelligence testing have been compared against survey results with regard to teacher work climate, level of collaborative practices, and persistence in working with students who struggle, all of which are elements that coincide with schools that achieve academic success, and which are influenced by teacher emotional intelligence.

This study is important because it seeks to link a teacher’s emotional competencies to any impact these have on students that they instruct and interact with. With the explosion of interest in EI within the professional world, a great deal of emphasis is placed on the individual professional, and their personal success and ability to grow in their respective profession (Stein & Book, 2011). This study takes the directional arrow of focus and swings it from the impact EI may have on a teacher’s profession to how their EI may impact students. The true importance of schools is in helping students succeed, and research has shown that teachers are the single most important school-based factor for student achievement (Stronge & Hindman, 2003; Stronge & Tucker, 2000). Finding that teacher emotional intelligence is an important factor would provide
educational practitioners—including teachers, coaches, and administrators—a practical and strategic way to help improve student achievement in schools. And the exciting aspect is that EI is not fixed and can be improved upon throughout life (Bar-On, 2007; Stein & Book, 2011).

Another important purpose of this study is to increase the understanding of what makes some schools perform better than others. If emotional intelligence is shown to be generally higher in successful schools than in lower achieving schools, and this corresponds with a healthy school culture, there will be evidence of the importance of the underlying emotional competencies of teaching staff in creating this environment for success. As has been shown by research, a positive classroom environment and a collaborative culture are hallmarks of productive and successful schools (Curby, Brock, & Hamre, 2013; DuFour, 2007; DuFour, & DuFour, 2012; Goddard et al., 2007; Jennings, & Greenberg, 2009; Jensen, 2009; Meyer, & Turner, 2006; Taylor, Pearson, Peterson, & Rodriguez, 2003; Zinsser et al., 2015). Emotional intelligence, with its specific components, provides a transformational leader in a school setting an avenue to lead for growth and learning, a practical approach to experience meaningful change that could ultimately be an important factor in “beating the odds.”

**Research Questions**

The literature surrounding emotional intelligence and its influence in schools indicates that there is something to be considered with regard to a teacher’s ability to develop positive relations with students, and to create a positive, prosocial classroom environment as it relates to a productive learning environment (Arghode, 2013; Jennings & Greenberg, 2009; Zinsser et al., 2015). The literature also supports the institutional practice of collaboration of teachers within schools, showing that when teachers work and learn together, student achievement is positively affected (DuFour, 2007; Goddard et al., 2007), which are interpersonal skills that are directly
related to social and emotional competencies (Stein & Book, 2011). Finally, it is clear that there are schools that, despite difficult challenges resulting from extraneous demographic factors, outperform their peers. The literature describing practices found amongst these “beat the odds” schools offers little discussion surrounding emotional intelligence, its associated competencies, and the impact this may have on highly functioning schools. This leads to the first and foundational question of this study: (1) What is the presence of emotional intelligence among 3rd–5th grade classroom teachers within successful Washington state schools that outperform others with similar student demographics of at least 65% rate of poverty, 60% Hispanic population, and 35% bilingual?

Secondly, the social and emotional competencies of emotional intelligence measured by the EQ-i 2.0 are similar in nature to various aspects of a school climate as measured by the School Culture Triage survey. As has been discussed in the literature review, elements of school climate with regard to “beat the odds” schools shows that high-performing schools have staff that work well together where there is an emphasis in a unified vision and effort for student achievement, and of working through problems and difficulties in a productive manner (Cunningham, 2006; Denton et al., 2003; Johnson & Asera, 1999). Thus, this study also seeks to address the second question, (2) How do teachers’ perspectives of professional collaboration, affiliative collegiality, and self-determination/efficacy compare to teachers’ emotional intelligence assessment scores?

**Hypotheses**

1. There is a significant presence of emotional intelligence as determined among 3rd–5th grade classroom teachers in schools that outperform others with similar demographics.
2. Schools that outperform others with similar challenging demographics will have a high level of collaboration, collegiality, and self-determination/efficacy as determined by the School Culture Triage survey.

3. There is a significant correlational relationship between teachers’ emotional intelligence assessment composite scores on the EQ-i 2.0 as it relates to perspectives of professional collaboration, as determined by the School Culture Triage survey.

4. There is a significant correlational relationship between teachers’ emotional intelligence assessment composite scores on the EQ-i 2.0 as it relates to perspectives of affiliative collegiality, as determined by the School Culture Triage survey.

5. There is a significant correlational relationship between teachers’ emotional intelligence assessment composite scores on the EQ-i 2.0 as it relates to perspectives of self-determination/efficacy, as determined by the School Culture Triage survey.

**Research Design**

The design of this study is based in a quantitative form of descriptive research study approach. Adams and Lawrence (2015) explain that descriptive research examines prevalence of phenomenon among a particular population. This study seeks to determine the prevalence of emotional intelligence among teachers whose work in a particular subset of successful schools, specifically those whose students overcome high poverty and language needs and score well on state assessments. For the purpose of this study, successful schools are identified as those within the top 5% with regard to percentage of students passing the state assessment in 3rd–5th grades,
as compared to other schools with similar demographic challenges. These demographic challenges are specified in this study as including a student population with at least a 65% rate of poverty, 60% Hispanic population, and 35% bilingual. The method of inquiry for this descriptive study will be through the use of a questionnaire, the EQ-i 2.0. Participating teachers will also complete the School Culture Triage Survey. Fowler (2014) states that there are, “numerous facts about the behaviors and situations of people that can only be obtained by asking a sample of people about themselves,” and that “survey research is aimed primarily at tapping the subjective feelings of the public” (p. 2). Based on this statement, the survey method also fits nicely into the descriptive approach to this study, and while there are other methods of acquiring this subjective knowledge from selected teachers, the survey has been used as the most practical and feasible method for the researcher.

Various studies have been made which attempt to find a correlation between emotional intelligence and another variable, such as classroom management, attrition, teaching effectiveness, among others (Dickey, 2012; Jennings & Greenberg, 2009; Khodadady, 2012; Murray, 2013). As part of the process of describing a particular population of teachers, this study will also contain a component of correlational study design. Adams and Lawrence (2015) state that, “correlation means that we can find a pattern or relationship between variables such that scores on the variables move in an identifiable pattern together” (p. 225). The variables to be analyzed with regard to correlational relationship are the emotional intelligence scores from the EQ-i 2.0 and the mean results from the School Culture Triage Survey.

**Target Population, Sampling Method, and Power Analysis**

This study is intended to focus on the teachers within successful schools with particular demographics. The sampling process for determining which schools to study included first a
search for schools within Washington State that had at least 25% of the student population who fell within the student poverty range according to U.S. Census data from 2013 as presented in Edbuild’s map of school district boundaries in the United States (Edbuild, 2016). Districts identified as having at least 25% student poverty according to this map were then further analyzed to identify schools with at least 65% student poverty, 60% of the student population with Hispanic descent, and at least 35% of students considered bilingual based on information from the Washington State Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction school and district report card website (Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, 2016b). Because of the researcher’s personal interest and to narrow the field of study, schools with high Hispanic populations were the primary focus.

One further step was taken in the selection process to find potential “beat the odds” schools within Washington state. State test scores from the previous school year, shown as a grade level percentage, were researched using school report cards found on the state department of education’s website. From this search, five schools were identified as potential sites for this research study. These five schools scored higher than 90 percent of other schools in Washington state with similar demographics. School principals at each of the schools were contacted about the purpose of the study, and permission was sought to conduct the research study at their school.

**Instrumentation**

Instruments for data collection in this study include the EQ-i 2.0, an assessment of emotional and social competence based on Bar-On’s model of emotional intelligence (Bar-On, 2000). This assessment is commonly used in the business and consulting world to determine strengths and weaknesses with regard to emotional and social intelligence, as well as to provide coaching points for improved leadership and performance. This assessment has also been
validated, having been normed using sample data from more than 4,000 individual assessments from across the United States, Canada, United Kingdom, Ireland, South Africa, Australia, Sweden, and Denmark (Multi-Health Systems, 2016b; Stein & Book, 2011), as well as having undergone various tests for validity. For the purpose of this study, the EQ-i 2.0 provides an overall EI score, 5 composite scores (self-perception, self-expression, interpersonal, decision making, and stress management), and 15 subscale scores, each of which coincide with composite categories. Within the self-expression category, the subscales include emotional expression, assertiveness, and independence. These have all been outlined in the earlier section on Emotional Intelligence (Multi-Health Systems, 2016a). See Appendix A for further information regarding the EQ-i 2.0.

In addition to the EQ-i 2.0 assessment for teacher EI, the School Culture Triage Survey (Phillips & Wagner, 2003) has been employed to assess teacher perceptions of professional collaboration, affiliative collegiality, and self-determination/efficacy. This school culture survey tool has been used extensively across the United States and Canada by schools in their attempt to assess the current state of staff culture and climate (Wagner, 2006). The data retrieved from these surveys have been triangulated with EQ-i 2.0 assessment scores, followed by the researcher’s discussion and analysis of results. Responses to questions are given on a 5 point Likert scale, including 1= Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often, and 5 = Always or Almost Always. The School Triage Survey consists of 17 questions, and is broken into 3 categories, namely Professional Collaboration, Affiliative Collegiality, and Self-Determination/Efficacy. For the specific details of the survey, see Appendix B.
Data Collection

Teachers within the intended sample were provided access to the EQ-i 2.0 assessment. Upon completion, the researcher received access to individual scores in an online account, based on the researcher’s EQ-i 2.0 certification and access to materials and reports. The EQ-i 2.0 offers five different types of reports, including a workplace report, leadership report, group report, 360, and higher education report. For the purpose of this study, the researcher will utilize the workplace report (Multi-Health Systems, 2016c).

For the School Culture Triage Survey, surveys were sent via email through Google Forms. Teachers received a link in their email, which opened to the survey, which surveys were then completed online. Results were automatically tabulated in an Excel spreadsheet, as well a summary provided in pie-graph format, and accessible (by the researcher only) through the online document collaboration site Google Docs. Scoring of the School Culture Triage Survey was based on the mean of total scores. The lowest score possible for the survey is 17, and the highest score is 85. According to Wagner (2006), who reported using this survey for multiple program evaluations, there are four main categories of scores with recommendations for action/improvement. A score of 17–40 would indicate a need for immediate attention to school culture issues, and to “invest all available resources in repairing and healing the culture” (Wagner, 2006, p. 43). A score of 41–59 would suggest that improvements are necessary, and to conduct a more thorough investigation of where areas of need exist. A score of 60–75 is satisfactory, but requires monitoring and possible minor adjustments. Any portion of scores that lie between 76–85 would be outstanding. It is predicted that high functioning schools wherein student assessment scores are outperforming their peers will have moderate to high scores on this survey, indicating a highly functioning staff.
Participants’ scores for both the EQ-i 2.0 and the School Culture Triage survey were received online. The EQ-i 2.0 results were collected in a data-base provided through the High Performance Systems, Inc. company, through which the researcher is certified to administer and access the assessment and interpretation of results. There was no identifying information collected beyond participant names, such as grade level, gender, or race, as this study is not concerned with these factors, the only important factor is that participants must have taught in 3rd–5th grade during the 2014-2015 school year. With regard to the School Culture Triage survey, surveys were delivered and results received through the Google Forms survey tool available through Google Docs. For both surveys, results were transcribed from the online database onto the researcher’s personal computer into Excel format in preparation for data analysis. This data was also copied onto a backup flash drive. Upon completion of this transfer of data, the data and forms that exist online have been erased. Data collected on the researcher’s computer will be deleted after no more than three years.

**Operationalization of Variables**

Variables assessed with regard to emotional intelligence are comprised in the Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) 2.0, including 15 specific subscale components fit into one of the 5 composite scales, as has been outlined in the earlier section on Emotional Intelligence (Multi-Health Systems, 2016d). With regard to the additional survey teachers have taken as an opportunity for additional insight into teachers’ perspectives, the School Culture Triage variables assessed relate to the construct of overall EI, and relate to various subscales of the EQ-i 2.0. These variables include the openness to new ideas and learning, acceptance of individualism within a social group, attributes of respect, the development of trusting and quality interpersonal relationships with staff and students, and the ability to solve problems effectively.
Data Analysis and Procedures

EQ-i 2.0 data have been tabulated and a mean recorded for overall EI, composite scores, and individual subscale scores, all on an individual basis. Standard and raw scores have been collected, which serve as a basis for descriptive analysis of these schools. Patterns and trends seen in this sample of respondents form the analytical foundation for this section of the study. Individual scores have been identified by name only in order to create an ordered pair for Pearson’s correlation coefficient \((r)\) calculation of correlational significance.

School Culture Triage survey responses have been scored according to the survey scoring guide as discussed earlier. These scores have been identified similarly to EQ-i 2.0 scores with the participant name. The Pearson’s correlation coefficient \((r)\) has been used to determine correlational strength between responses to the School Culture Triage Survey and the EQ-i 2.0 scores. Analysis includes a discussion on the EQ-i 2.0 individual results, and how they compare to teacher perspectives with regard to the variables included in the School Culture Triage Survey.

Limitations and Delimitations

The framework of this study is based in the knowledge that some schools are more successful at overcoming difficult challenges associated with poverty and language acquisition, as well as the interplay between emotional intelligence and successful professional performance. With this conceptual framework, this study is designed to focus primarily on schools within Washington state that have high populations of English language learners, along with a high percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced-priced meals. The researcher is a current practitioner in the Washington state public education system, in a school with these similar demographics, and particularly with a population high in students of Hispanic descent. For these
reasons, five Washington state public schools have been selected according to this criteria, and who score above other schools with similar characteristics.

Only 3rd through 5th grade teachers were chosen to take part in the study. Washington State administers the state assessment, currently the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium assessment, to students in these grades. Only teachers with direct contact with these students throughout the school year have been chosen to participate in this study to determine the level of emotional intelligence among teachers in these schools. While it may be interesting to include Kindergarten through 2nd grade teachers in the study, and the results may find some application, because of proximity to students in the same year they were tested, only 3rd through 5th grade teachers have been assessed.

Further, data that has been used to identify schools for participation in this study comes from the results of the 2014–2015 school year state assessment results. At the time of preparing this study, the 2015–2016 results were not available. For this reason, an additional limitation with regard to 3rd–5th grade teachers has been the requirement that a teacher in these schools must have taught during the 2014–2015 school year to participate in this study. Those teachers who are new to the school and did not teach during the 2014–2015 school year have been excluded from the study. This limitation acknowledges the reality that a teaching staff within any school will experience mobility due to various factors. While no attempt has been made to contact teachers who may have retired or moved to a different location, this limitation reduces the threat to validity that would be caused by including teachers who did not take part in the success experienced during the previous school year.

One of the possible limitations of the study may be in teacher participation. Teachers are busy, and their time is precious. Some may not be interested in taking the time to complete a
30–40 minute emotional intelligence survey, nor a school climate survey. With this in mind, the researcher described the purpose of the study, including the reason why their school has been selected as a subject of interest due to their success, as well as offered a small incentive for completing the self-reported surveys. The incentive was in the form of a $15 Amazon.com gift card. Also, participating teachers received email reminders on their school email each week until completion of the surveys.

Another limitation of the study involves the time of year in which the study was conducted. The beginning of the school year, typically mid-August or the beginning of September, is often marked with energy and interest, but for some this energy can wane through the winter months. Although the EQ-i 2.0 assessment and the School Culture Triage survey are validated instruments, teachers coming back to begin a new school year after a summer break often are more energized than later in the school year. Would a teacher’s results look different in September than in February? Perhaps, and since this possibility exists, it should be considered when interpreting results.

**Internal and External Validity**

Validity is a crucial aspect of any research study. One of the major issues with regard to the EQ-i 2.0 assessment of emotional intelligence is whether it is a valid instrument. The EQ-i 2.0 meets the guidelines for establishing validity set forth by the American Psychological Association (APA) (American Psychological Association, 1985). One of the requirements upon developing an instrument is to test a large sample that is representative of diverse socioeconomic groups and across varying regions, and the EQ-i 2.0, including the original EQ-i, has been normed using sample data from more than 4,000 individual assessments from across the United
States, Canada, United Kingdom, Ireland, South Africa, Australia, Sweden, and Denmark (Multi-Health Systems, 2016b; Stein & Book, 2011).

The EQ-i 2.0 has also undergone various tests for validity. To establish content validity, developers examined and refined more than 1,000 questions to establish the final 133 questions, ensuring that each question only represented one subscale (Stein & Book, 2011). It has also been exposed to factor analysis testing, helping to determine if it measures what it is intended to measure. Based on a comparison between the EQ-i 2.0 and other personality and mood assessments, there was some small overlap, but small enough to establish construct validity, meaning that this assessment does not just duplicate other assessments and constructs (Stein & Book, 2011).

Specific concerns have been presented with regard to the EQ-i and the potential for faking responses. This is especially noted with regard to the practice of using the EQ-i for hiring practices (Grubb & McDaniel, 2007). This is due to the self-report nature of the assessment, and the natural inclination of individuals to score themselves well based on social desirability (Adams & Lawrence, 2015). In response, developers of the EQ-i 2.0 included a Positive Impression (PI) and Negative Impression (NI) index to detect respondents who may be selecting answers to create an exaggerate positive or negative impression of themselves (Multi-Health Systems, 2016b). A response of a 1 (Never/Almost Never) or 5 (Always/Almost Always) receives one point towards the PI or NI scale. A score of 3 on this scale flags the assessment for a potentially inflated or deflated score. However, this would only invalidate results if it was found through a follow-up discussion that the participant was intentionally inflating or deflating their responses. There will be no follow-up discussion with participants in this study, however, should participant scores indicate a positive or negative impression index, it will be noted in the
analysis and discussion of results as a total, with no identifying information, and will be discussed as a possible impact on the overall validity of the results.

Similarly, with regard to the School Culture Triage survey, teachers are generally aware of what the ideal response should be for school culture. It would probably be best if people worked together well, were friendly one with another, celebrated successes, and had ample opportunities for their voice to be heard. For this reason, the potential for social desirability bias (Adams & Lawrence, 2015) could be high. Participants have been encouraged to be honest in their responses, emphasizing that responses are anonymous and that no identifying information will accompany them. Participants have also been encouraged to reflect honestly as they respond to the questionnaire to ensure validity in the study.

As mentioned previously, one of the limitations of the study was to include only those 3rd–5th grade teachers who taught during the 2014-2015 school year. This is due to the access to state assessment scores from the spring of 2015. This is a limitation placed on the study to protect the internal validity of the study from the inclusion of teachers in the data who did not have an impact on the 2015 scores during the 2014-2015 school year. This is also with the understanding that some of the teachers who were participants during the 2014-2015 school year may now be retired or have moved to another school/district. Finally, this study was strictly voluntary, which also includes the possibility of teachers opting out of participation. Thus, while attempting to create a complete and accurate set of data, it would be ideal if each teacher who taught in 3rd–5th grade in one of these schools during the 2014-2015 school participated in the study—and every effort has been made to accomplish this—however, there is a possibility of some teachers not being including in the data set that should be. With that being said, at a minimum there at least have been no teachers in the data set who should not be included.
Finally, with regard to external validity, or the ability to apply the findings of this study outside the parameters set forth within the study, it is important to note that the sample data is specifically targeted to schools that are generally rural, with high levels of poverty, Hispanic students, and ELL students. It is the researcher’s experience that schools with these demographics often tend to differ from other schools from varying regions and demographics in terms of instructional approaches, priorities, funding, and other variables, but many similarities also exist in structures and challenges faced by schools.

**Expected Findings**

As a current school principal, the researcher has personally witnessed the distraction and energy spent in resolving conflicts and problems among staff, which can often be attributed to issues of emotional intelligence. In other words, these issues usually involve people being able to get along, work with each other effectively, show flexibility, communicate effectively, be positive, etc. Some issues affect just a couple of people, others are disrupting to many, depending on the nature of the problem. Because of the energy and focus directed towards resolving problems, it seems that the fewer problems experienced within a school organization, the higher functioning it can achieve because the focus and energy are instead on practices that lead to student achievement.

Schmoker (2011) writes about focus and the essentials for school improvement. Especially for schools that face demographic challenges, school improvement is very often a frequent topic of conversation. Schmoker (2011) explains that we know what to do to improve schools and help students learn, but it is more that there is a lack of persistent, intentional diligence in implementing and sustaining these practices in every classroom, all the time.
Perhaps this lack of effort in the essentials occurs in some part because of the energy already spent in solving problems that have to do with emotional intelligence, or the lack thereof.

With this said, the connection between teacher emotional intelligence and student achievement on academic assessments is nebulous. Dickey (2012) found that there was not a significant relationship between 3rd grade teachers’ EI and success on the state assessment. Perhaps there are too many variables along the chain of logic linking EI to student achievement to have a significant correlational relationship. The data retrieved from the study may provide an interesting addition to the literature on this topic. Looking at “beat the odds” schools through the lens of emotional intelligence is a unique perspective. A confirmation of this study’s hypotheses could prompt further investigation into the value of emotional intelligence and its development in the school setting.

While EI and student achievement is uncertain, EI is integral in the ability to establish relationships and to navigate successfully within the social realm (Goleman, 1998b; Stein & Book, 2011). In Hallowell’s (2011) book about helping employees shine in their efforts, and improving the organization with every individual and personal improvement, one of the first steps in his “Cycle of Excellence” is to help people connect meaningfully with each other. He explains that this is a process of overcoming “the potent forces that disconnect people in the workplace both from each other and from the mission of the organization, and how to restore the force of positive connection which is the most powerful fuel for peak performance” (Hallowell, 2011, p. 6).

The School Culture Triage survey asks questions about collaboration, collegiality and self-determination and self-efficacy. These questions are related to the concept of connection among staff members, the level to which members in the school organization are engaging in this
“force of positive connection” (Hallowell, 2011, p. 6) to further the mission of the school as a joint and interdependent enterprise. Because of the foundational relationship that emotional competencies play in relationships, problem solving, and social settings, it is presumed that there may be a positive correlation between EQ-i 2.0 results and results from the School Culture Triage survey.

**Ethical Issues**

One of the general principles of the APA psychologists’ code of conduct is the expectation of ensuring confidentiality, privacy, and self-determination (American Psychological Association, 2010). Teachers who participate voluntarily in this study will complete an informed consent form (Appendix C) before completing the EQ-i 2.0 or the School Culture Triage survey. There is no necessity of deception inherent in the design of the research study, therefore participating teachers and schools will be completely informed of the purpose and procedures of the data collection and interpretation of results. Confidentiality of participants’ results and scores will be accomplished through the data collection procedures of the study. Completed EQ-i 2.0 and School Culture Triage surveys were organized by the successive order in which they are received, with no identifying information beyond participants’ names recorded. Data was strictly safeguarded and kept confidential. As soon as data was transferred from the online databases onto a personal computer and backup flash drive, these online forms and data sets were destroyed.

With regard to any personal or financial connection to the study that may be deemed as a possible conflict of interest, it is worthy of note that the researcher as principal investigator is a current elementary school principal in a rural school with high levels of poverty and English language learners, who has a passion for establishing a unified school culture and for closing the
achievement gap. There is a personal belief that an important element for this to happen is for staff to become galvanized around a common objective, and to work productively as a team towards that end. It is with this bias that the study is approached, with a hope of sharing strategies and knowledge with current and future colleagues, as well as the broader field of education, should the research confirm the positive influence of emotional intelligence. Despite a bias for the importance of emotional intelligence and its influence in the workplace, results have been recorded, analyzed, and presented objectively, upholding the principle of fidelity and responsibility to an accurate representation of results (American Psychological Association, 2010).

**Chapter 3 Summary**

This is a descriptive research study with the purpose of describing “beat the odds” schools with regard to levels of emotional intelligence and perceptions of school climate. The literature supports the notion and importance of emotional intelligence in the classroom and school organization, as well as the impact that school culture has on school achievement. In order to answer the questions of what the level of emotional intelligence is among teachers within successful, “beat the odds” schools, as well as how that relates to perceptions of school climate, this study will utilize the EQ-i 2.0 as an emotional intelligence assessment, and the School Culture Triage survey as an assessment of school culture. The procedures for informing participants and collecting data will ensure privacy and confidentiality.
Chapter 4: Data Analysis and Results

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to examine a selection of “beat the odds” schools in Washington state through the lens of emotional intelligence of classroom teachers, and to determine whether there exists a relationship between teacher emotional intelligence and school culture. This descriptive study seeks to bring more insight into what makes some schools more capable of overcoming demographic odds to experience academic success. Participants were selected from five different schools that had a student population of at least 60% Hispanic, 65% qualifying for free- and reduced-price lunch, and at least 35% bilingual. These five schools were selected from the top 10 achieving schools across Washington state with similar demographics, and which agreed to participate in the study.

The level of teacher emotional intelligence in these five successful schools has been assessed primarily through the use of an emotional intelligence self-report assessment, the EQ-i 2.0. The EQ-i 2.0 assessment has been validated through the process of numerous statistical analyses and validity studies—including an analysis of content validity—factor structure, the relationship of the EQ-i 2.0 to other measures, all suggesting that the EQ-i 2.0 represents all relevant facets of Bar-On’s conceptualization of EI, and that the EQ-i 2.0 is a valid tool for assessing EI (Multi-Health Systems, 2011). Along with the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2002), the EQ-i 2.0 is one of the foremost assessments currently used for emotional intelligence. The School Culture Triage survey was also used to assess the current state of the staff and school culture and how it might relate to teacher emotional intelligence. This survey has been developed and validated by Philips and Wagner (2003) over the process of thousands of administrations. Research has shown the link between scores on the School Culture Triage and student achievement (Wagner, 2006).
Data collected includes the raw scores (see Appendix D) and standard scores (see Appendix E) for the EQ-i 2.0 assessment for total emotional intelligence (EI), the 5 composite scales, as well as for the 15 subscales. Data from the School Culture Triage survey was organized into individual scores for each of the three school culture categories, Professional Development, Affiliative Collegiality, and Self-Determination/Efficacy, as well as an overall score for each individual (see Appendix F). Data collected from the EQ-i 2.0 was analyzed both at a group and individual level to examine the levels of emotional intelligence existence among teachers within these successful schools. This analysis also examines possible patterns that may or may not exist among teacher colleagues in these schools.

As a companion analysis of EQ-i 2.0 data, the data retrieved through the School Culture Triage adds a layer of understanding of levels of emotional intelligence as it relates to staff culture. This goes back to research that has shown the positive impact of teacher collaboration in student achievement, particularly in “beat the odds” schools (Goddard et al., 2007; Johnson & Asera, 1999). Data pairings were organized to determine the linear correlational relationship between participants’ scores on the three School Culture Triage categories with each of the five composites of the EQ-i 2.0. Correlational significance was based on the Pearson’s $r$ correlation coefficient, and based on the probability of committing a Type 1 error of $p < 0.05$.

**Description of the Sample**

For this study, five public K-5 Washington State elementary schools were invited and agreed to participate. These participating schools met student demographics and student achievement criteria previously explained. The five schools are located in various regions across the state of Washington, including on the east and west side of the Cascades. These schools reflect both urban and rural communities, though all five schools are located in areas that have
agricultural opportunities. The focus of this study is emotional intelligence and its potential impact on and relationship with staff culture. For this reason, no data was collected about school programs, curricula used, professional development offered to teachers, or other attributes of successful schools reflected in the literature surrounding “beat the odds” schools (Cunningham, 2006; Denton et al., 2003; Johnson & Asera, 1999).

Data collection began in September, 2016, by first collecting signed informed consents, with all consents and surveys completed by December, 2016. Of the 37 3rd–5th grade teachers invited to participate in the study, 28 teachers signed the informed consent, and were subsequently sent both surveys, the School Culture Triage and the EQ-i 2.0. Of these 28 teachers, 20 completed both the EQ-i 2.0 and the School Culture Triage. Two other teachers only completed the School Culture Triage. Their results were therefore not used in computing the Pearson r for correlation significance between the EQ-i 2.0 results and the School Culture Triage. Table 1 shows the age distribution of teachers completing the EQ-i 2.0. Three respondents did not indicate their age. As can be seen, the majority of participants were between the ages of 26–40, with a fairly high number also between the ages of 51–55.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Distribution</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of the Results

Participating schools within this study were first identified by demographic characteristics described earlier, namely 60% Hispanic, 65% free-and reduced-price lunch qualifiers, and 35% bilingual. Second, sites were selected among these schools based on 2014–2015 spring state test results. Upon receiving approval from school principals to invite teachers within their school to participate, it was made clear that only those 3rd–5th grade teachers who had taught during the 2014-2015 school year were being asked to participate in the study. This is a delimitation based upon the premise that students in 3rd–5th grade are assessed by the state, and not those in lower grades, as well as the importance of only including those teachers who were involved directly in the student achievement results during that academic school year.

One issue arising in the collection and analysis of data was in the matching of data pairs with regard to the School Culture Triage surveys and the EQ-i 2.0 assessments. Originally, the School Culture Triage surveys were collected without identification. Participants were asked to submit the survey a second time with identification. All but one of the participants resubmitted with identification. This one was matched to a set of data based on original submissions and those later resubmitted. This must be considered when evaluating the correlational relationships between the EQ-i 2.0 and the School Culture Triage using the Pearson $r$ correlation coefficient, as some of the data could be different if the pairing is incorrect. With that being said, the data will be presented and discussed, with a note of the threat to internal validity with regard to Hypothesis 3 concerning the relationship between the EQ-i 2.0 and School Culture Triage. With the size of the sample in mind, it is recognized that even one participant’s score could serve as an outlier and impact the data substantially more than if the sample size were greater.
The EQ-i 2.0 is a self-report assessment, which includes the possibility of overinflating responses or of doing the opposite in a negative manner. The EQ-i 2.0 includes a function that detects an overly positive or negative tendency, which is used especially within the realm of consulting, where it becomes a discussion point with a client. For the purpose of this research, a concern of a Positive Impression, Negative Impression, or Inconsistency Index would be noted as a possible threat to the validity of the study. In this study, all participants responded to the final question of the assessment with 5 – Always/Almost Always. This question asks if they were open and honest when responding to the preceding questions. Also, all participants had valid scores for Positive Impression, Negative Impression, and Inconsistency Index, indicating that the data was neither likely to be overly positive or negative, and that respondents were consistent in their responses to questions of a similar nature.

Trends and patterns of the EQ-i 2.0 are sought in this study through a process of analysis of descriptive statistics. The data is discussed as it reveals sample characteristics and variations, seeking to describe the sample in terms of the various levels of emotional intelligence displayed through the total EI score, as well as the composite and subscale scores of the EQ-i 2.0. Similarly, the School Culture Triage data is used in much the same way to describe the sample in terms of staff culture. In addition, this data is utilized in computing correlational significance between the EQ-i 2.0 composite scores and the three categories of staff culture examined within the School Culture Triage. This is based in the attempt to determine whether a significant linear relationship might exist between emotional intelligence and responses to elements of staff culture, including professional collaboration, affiliative collegiality, and self-determination/efficacy.
Presentation of Data and Results

Hypothesis 1: There is a significant presence of emotional intelligence as determined among 3rd–5th grade classroom teachers in schools that outperform others with similar demographics.

The levels of emotional intelligence as derived from the EQ-i 2.0 for 3rd–5th grade teachers are reported in Table 2. A standard range established for levels of emotional intelligence related to the EQ-i 2.0 assessment tool considers standard scores between 70–90 as being in the low range, 91–110 as mid-range, and 111–130 as high range. As a mean, this sample of classroom teachers had an overall total standard score within the mid-range of emotional intelligence. More specifically, as shown in Table 3, 45% of teachers had a total score in the high range, 45% in the mid-range, and 10% in the low range. All mean scores for this sample of teachers lie within the mid-range, except for the subscales empathy and social responsibility, which are within the high range for emotional intelligence.
Table 2.

Levels of emotional intelligence of 3rd–5th grade teachers – descriptive statistics based on standard scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ-i 2.0 Composites and Subscales</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>106.80</td>
<td>85-128</td>
<td>12.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Perception Composite</td>
<td>107.45</td>
<td>79-126</td>
<td>11.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-Regard</td>
<td>104.55</td>
<td>74-121</td>
<td>11.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-Actualization</td>
<td>109.40</td>
<td>81-127</td>
<td>12.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Emotional Self-Awareness</td>
<td>105.10</td>
<td>86-132</td>
<td>11.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Expression Composite</td>
<td>101.60</td>
<td>74-129</td>
<td>16.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Emotional Expression</td>
<td>102.35</td>
<td>56-129</td>
<td>20.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assertiveness</td>
<td>97.10</td>
<td>81-126</td>
<td>11.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Independence</td>
<td>103.15</td>
<td>84-121</td>
<td>12.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Composite</td>
<td>109.40</td>
<td>93-131</td>
<td>10.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td>102.80</td>
<td>89-122</td>
<td>9.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Empathy</td>
<td>111.10</td>
<td>97-129</td>
<td>10.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social Responsibility</td>
<td>110.55</td>
<td>83-129</td>
<td>12.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making Composite</td>
<td>104.85</td>
<td>83-121</td>
<td>10.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Problem Solving</td>
<td>99.60</td>
<td>79-122</td>
<td>10.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reality Testing</td>
<td>106.30</td>
<td>87-120</td>
<td>11.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impulse Control</td>
<td>106.25</td>
<td>83-123</td>
<td>10.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Management Composite</td>
<td>105.50</td>
<td>82-123</td>
<td>12.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flexibility</td>
<td>105.25</td>
<td>84-122</td>
<td>12.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stress Tolerance</td>
<td>103.00</td>
<td>84-120</td>
<td>10.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Optimism</td>
<td>105.40</td>
<td>67-123</td>
<td>14.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. EQ-i 2.0 = Emotional Quotient Inventory 2.0

Of all of the composite and subscale scores, the Interpersonal composite stands out for this sample as an area of strength, particularly with regard to the subscales of empathy and social responsibility. All other composites and subscales had at least one teacher receive a score within the low range except for the empathy subscale and the interpersonal composite, both of which showed results in which all teachers at least scored in the mid-range or higher. This is reflected
in Table 2 in the Range column, as well as in Table 3, which shows 0% of the teachers in the low range for empathy and the interpersonal composite. Also of note in Table 3 is that 70% of teachers scored in the high range in the subscale of social responsibility.

Table 3

*Levels of emotional intelligence of 3rd–5th grade teachers – percentages of Low, Mid, and High ranges based on Standard Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ-i 2.0 Composites and Subscales</th>
<th>% Low Range</th>
<th>% Mid-Range</th>
<th>% High Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Perception Composite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-Regard</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td><strong>55%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-Actualization</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Emotional Self-Awareness</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td><strong>55%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Expression Composite</td>
<td><strong>25%</strong></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Emotional Expression</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assertiveness</td>
<td><strong>30%</strong></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Independence</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Composite</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td><strong>50%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Empathy</td>
<td><strong>0%</strong></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td><strong>50%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social Responsibility</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td><strong>70%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making Composite</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Problem Solving</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reality Testing</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impulse Control</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Management Composite</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flexibility</td>
<td><strong>25%</strong></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stress Tolerance</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Optimism</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note*. Percentages for standard scores on either the high or low end of the spectrum are in boldface. Low Range = 70-90; Mid-Range = 91-110; High Range = 111-130. EQ-i 2.0 = Emotional Quotient Inventory 2.0.
As can be seen, the majority of this sample’s standard scores show a tendency to lie in the mid- to high ranges in all composites and subscales. While some of the percentages are higher for some composites and subscales in the low range, the low range of scores is consistently found in a minority of teachers throughout the sample. The percentage of teachers with a low subscale or composite score ranges from 0%–30% of the sample, indicating that for each subscale or composite score, 70%–100% of the teachers scored at least in the mid-range for emotional intelligence and higher.

Also of important note is the diversity of individual scores. For example, one participant scored in the mid-range for the subscale for self-regard and in the low range for emotional expression. The EQ-i 2.0 results reflect the underlying notion of variability in personalities and individual strengths and weaknesses. However, the sample data does show trends and patterns. For example, as stated earlier, the majority of teachers scored in the mid- to high range of standard scores for each subscale, composite, and the total score. In addition, Table 4 and Table 5 show where participants tended to score the lowest (Table 4) and the highest (Table 5) as a group with regard to the subscales and composites, and excluding the total score. This is based on the percentage of teachers within these subscales and composites either scoring in the low range or the high range.

Table 4

Top 5 for percentage of scores within the Low Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ-i 2.0 Composites and Subscales</th>
<th>%Low Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness Subscale</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Expression Composite</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Expression Subscale</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence Subscale</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility Subscale</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

*Top 5 for percentage of scores within the High Range*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ-i 2.0 Composites and Subscales</th>
<th>%High Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Responsibility Subscale</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualization Subscale</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Perception Composite</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Composite</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy Subscale</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table 4, the highest percentage of teacher participants scoring within the low range was in the self-expression composite score, including the three subscales comprised in this composite, namely assertiveness, emotional expression, and independence. Intriguingly, four of the top five within this low range category are comprised of the self-expression composite and its components. This is not to say that the entire sample was low in these areas—at least half were at least mid-range or higher—however, these are by far the lowest scores seen as a pattern within the sample. The flexibility subscale also falls within this distinction of being one of the lower categorical scores of the sample. The next lowest sample score not shown in Table 4 is the problem solving subscale, with 20% of teachers in the low range.

Table 5 speaks to the sample’s strengths, displaying the top five percentages of high scores within various composite or subscale categories. There is a clear distinction in the subscale of social responsibility in which 70% of the sample was within the high range of standard scores. The empathy subscale and interpersonal composite scores are also quite significant, considering that 0% of these scores fell within the low range. Of note, the highest mean scores manifest within this sample are within the self-perception and interpersonal...
composites, under which the social responsibility, self-actualization, and empathy subscales are all a part. These two composites are clearly emotional intelligence strengths inherent within this sample of teachers.

In terms of the rejection or retention of the hypothesis, it is perhaps too simplistic to state that there is a significant level of emotional intelligence among this sample of teachers. There exists a variation of emotional intelligence levels among this sample, with various individual strengths and weaknesses evident in the data. That being said, as a group there is a clear general tendency leaning towards a mid- to high level of emotional intelligence for the total EI score, as well as for all of the individual composite and subscale scores. Teachers in this sample clearly show a robust level of emotional competencies, especially in the interpersonal and self-perception composites, and more particularly in the subscale area of social responsibility. The hypothesis that there is a significant presence of emotional intelligence as determined among 3rd–5th grade classroom teachers in schools that outperform others with similar demographics is retained.

**Hypothesis 2:** Schools that outperform others with similar challenging demographics will have a high level of collaboration, collegiality, and self-determination/efficacy as determined by the School Culture Triage survey.

The scoring of the School Culture Triage is as follows (Wagner, 2006, p. 43):

- 17–40 Critical and immediate attention necessary
- 41–59 Modifications and improvements are necessary
- 60–75 Monitor and maintain making positive adjustments
- 76–85 Amazing!
Table 6 displays a summary of this sample’s School Culture Triage results, both in terms of the overall scores and as broken down into the three categories of professional collaboration, affiliative collegiality, and self-determination/efficacy. As a group, the sample mean is good, within the area of monitoring and maintenance of positive adjustments. This is the reality for the majority of the sample, although it should be noted that the range in scores varies from 53–77.

Two respondents scored below 60, indicating the need for necessary changes from their perspective. Two respondents scored 76 or above, indicating that from their perspective, the culture in their school is exceptional. The two respondents scoring above 76 represent two of the five schools. The two respondents scoring below 60 also represent two different schools, separate from the two that scored above 76.

In other words, 16 of the respondents’ scores were within the range of monitoring and maintaining, indicating a general sense of there being a positive and productive working environment. As individual schools, two schools each had a very high respondent, two other schools had a low respondent, and the remaining school’s scores were all within the monitor and maintain category.

Table 6

*School Culture Triage Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53-77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Culture Triage Categories</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Collaboration</td>
<td>19.55</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliative Collegiality</td>
<td>22.55</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Determination/Efficacy</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Total points possible = 85*
Based on the total possible points for each of the three categories and the actual scores realized, professional collaboration and self-determination/efficacy both had a mean percentage of approximately 78% of the total points possible, and affiliative collegiality recorded 73% of the total possible. Overall, it is apparent that according to the School Culture Triage data from this sample of teachers, these schools have a strong school/staff culture. For each school, the data suggests that this effort is a work in progress, but also that none of these schools appear to be in crisis. The hypothesis that these schools will have a high level of collaboration, collegiality, and self-determination/efficacy as determined by the School Culture Triage survey is retained.

**Hypothesis 3:** There is a significant correlational relationship between teachers’ emotional intelligence assessment composite scores on the EQ-i 2.0 as it relates to perspectives of professional collaboration, as determined by the School Culture Triage survey.

Based on the data presented in Table 7, displaying correlation values for EQ-i 2.0 composites scores compared to the category of professional collaboration in the School Culture Triage, correlation coefficients ranged from 0.21 to -0.25. There were no significant relationships between profession collaboration and self-perception ($r=-0.05$, $p < 0.83$); interpersonal relationships ($r=0.19$, $p < 0.42$); decision making ($r=-0.07$, $p < 0.77$); and stress management ($r=0.17$, $p < 0.47$). There was a weak to moderate negative relationship between self-expression and professional collaboration ($r=0.14$, $p < 0.54$). The hypothesis was rejected at the $p < 0.05$ level of significance, revealing no significant relationship between the professional collaboration category on the School Culture Triage and emotional intelligence as measured by the EQ-i 2.0.
Table 7

Relationships of EQ-i 2.0 composite scores to professional collaboration (School Culture Triage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Collaboration</th>
<th>Self-Perception</th>
<th>Self-Expression</th>
<th>Interpersonal Relationships</th>
<th>Decision Making</th>
<th>Stress Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$ value</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>0.586</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 4:** There is a significant correlational relationship between teachers’ emotional intelligence assessment composite scores on the EQ-i 2.0 as it relates to perspectives of affiliative collegiality, as determined by the School Culture Triage survey.

Based on the data presented in Table 8, displaying correlation values for EQ-i 2.0 composites scores compared to the category of affiliative collegiality of the School Culture Triage, correlation coefficients ranged from 0.21 to -0.025. There were no significant relationships between affiliative collegiality and self-perception ($r=0.01, p < 0.966$); self-expression ($r=-0.025, p < 0.92$); interpersonal relationships ($r=0.18, p < 0.443$); decision making ($r=0.09, p < 0.696$). However, there was a weak relationship between stress management and affiliative collegiality ($r=0.21, p < 0.373$). The hypothesis was rejected at the $p < 0.05$ level of significance.

Table 8

Relationships of EQ-i 2.0 composite scores to affiliative collegiality (School Culture Triage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliative Collegiality</th>
<th>Self-Perception</th>
<th>Self-Expression</th>
<th>Interpersonal Relationships</th>
<th>Decision Making</th>
<th>Stress Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$ level</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td>0.443</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td>0.373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Hypothesis 5:** There is a significant correlational relationship between teachers’ emotional intelligence assessment composite scores on the EQ-i 2.0 as it relates to perspectives of self-determination/efficacy, as determined by the School Culture Triage survey.

Based on the data presented in Table 9, displaying correlation values for EQ-i 2.0 composite scores compared to the category of self-determination/efficacy of the School Culture Triage, correlation coefficients ranged from 0.36 to 0.04. There was no significant relationship between self-determination/efficacy and self-perception ($r=0.18$, $p < 0.436$), self-expression ($r=0.13$, $p < 0.579$), interpersonal relationships ($r=0.18$, $p < 0.453$), decision making ($r=0.04$, $p < 0.86$); and only a moderate relationship between stress management and self-determination/efficacy ($r=0.36$, $p < 0.12$). The hypothesis was rejected at the $p < 0.05$ level of significance.

Table 9

*Relationships of EQ-i 2.0 composite scores to self-determination/efficacy (School Culture Triage)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Determination/Efficacy</th>
<th>Self-Perception</th>
<th>Self-Expression</th>
<th>Interpersonal Relationships</th>
<th>Decision Making</th>
<th>Stress Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$ level</td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chapter 4 Summary**

As the data suggests, this sample represents a group of generally emotionally competent teachers working within organizations that are functioning well in a generally positive and productive work and learning environment. The strengths exhibited as a group in the interpersonal and self-perception composites, especially within the subscales of social
responsibility, empathy, and self-actualization is a matter to be considered further. The variability of scores for both the EQ-i 2.0 and the School Culture Triage raises some insights and questions for further exploration and consideration as it relates to high-performing schools.

There was no significant relationship between the EQ-i 2.0 scores and the results from the School Culture Triage. However, the data does provide some insight into attitude and perceptions of school culture, as based on a weak to moderate relationship between the stress management composite of the EQ-i 2.0 and the affiliative collegiality and self-determination/efficacy categories of the School Culture Triage.
Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to examine successful, “beat the odds,” schools with regard to the level of emotional intelligence of 3rd–5th grade classroom teachers. The intent was to determine whether emotional intelligence might be an important factor in the success of these schools. Emotional intelligence data is also presented as it relates to school culture to determine whether a significant relationship exists between the two. Included in this chapter will be a brief summary of the results, including a review of the theory and literature leading to this study. A discussion of the results will follow, in which personal interpretation, along with practical and theoretical implications, will be discussed and explored. This will be followed by a discussion of the results as they relate to the literature. Limitations will discussed, including whether possible differences may have strengthened the study. Implications for practice, policy, and theory, as well as recommendations for further research will follow and conclude this dissertation study.

Summary of the Results

Daniel Goleman recently presented a keynote address during the National Association of Elementary School Principal’s 2016 National Conference, highlighting the importance that principal and teacher emotional intelligence plays in the success of schools and relationships (as cited by Sommers, 2016). He made the argument that low EI, especially for principals, can have a direct impact on school culture and student and adult learning (Sommers, 2016). The elements and practices existent among schools that “beat the odds” are also a matter of interest in the field of educational research and literature reflected in the work of various researchers (Charles A. Dana Center, 1999; Chenowith, 2009; Cunningham, 2006; Langer, 2001; Taylor, Pearson, Clark, & Walpole, 2000; Taylor, Peterson, & Rodriguez, 2003; Waits et al., 2006; Wilder & Jacobsen,
As discussed earlier, these schools share various elements and practices in common, including effective leadership, focused collaborative work, and effective assessment practices. Further, research has shown that positive classroom environments (Arghode, 2013; Jennings & Greenberg, 2009; Zinsser et al., 2015), as well as a collaborative, positive work environment (Goddard et al., 2007; Johnson & Asera, 1999) relate to better student achievement.

The majority of this research surrounding positive classroom and work environments in the school setting (Arghode, 2013; Goddard et al., 2007; Jennings & Greenberg, 2009; Johnson & Asera, 1999; Zinsser et al., 2015) points towards the importance of the soft skills of emotional intelligence. This research speaks little about instructional skill or mastery of pedagogical practices, but is based more in relationships, focus, teamwork, and “grit.” This isn’t to say that instructional skill or quality curricula is unimportant, but that what sets these schools apart from the rest is how people in these schools face challenges, and not necessarily a superior curriculum or set of instructional strategies. Based on this premise of the importance of emotional intelligence, this study seeks first to examine the following question: (1) What is the presence of emotional intelligence among 3rd–5th grade classroom teachers within successful Washington state schools that outperform others with similar challenging demographics of at least 65% rate of poverty, 60% Hispanic population, and 35% bilingual? Related to this concept of relationships, collaboration, and working through challenges together, this study also seeks to examine the following questions: (2) What level of staff and school culture exists in these successful “beat the odds” schools? and (3) How do teachers’ perspectives of professional collaboration, affiliative collegiality, and self-determination/efficacy compare to teachers’ emotional intelligence composite assessment scores?
To examine these research questions, this study used both a descriptive and a correlational research design. The EQ-i 2.0 emotional intelligence assessment was used to determine levels of emotional intelligence of the sample of teachers, including an overall EI score, 5 composite scores, and 15 subscale scores. The School Culture Triage survey was used to determine the level of school and staff culture within the schools, based on the three categories of professional collaboration, affiliative collegiality, and self-determination/efficacy. These two assessments were used for each individual as a data pair in calculating the Pearson r correlation coefficient to examine the strength of linear relationship.

In summary, the examination of data found that teachers within the sample showed an overall trend towards having a mid- to high level of emotional intelligence for all elements of emotional intelligence. Strengths were seen especially within the interpersonal composite. Levels of school culture were high, without cause for concern, but rather called for a continuation of monitoring and maintaining positive practices in place. Correlation results showed no significant relationship between the five composites of EQ-i 2.0 and professional collaboration, affiliative collegiality, and self-determination/efficacy as reflected by the School Culture Triage.

**Discussion of the Results**

As stated earlier, the mean scores for each of the composites and subscales of the EQ-i 2.0, as well as the total EI score, were all in the mid- to high ranges. This does not mean that all teachers in this sample had EI strengths in every area, nor is this practical. In fact, it is quite normal for individuals to have areas of strengths and weaknesses, depending on their personality, experience, and training (Stein & Book, 2011). However, what this does suggest is that this sample of teachers is a stable set of educators in the area of emotional competence, displaying
those elements of emotional intelligence necessary to successfully work together as a collaborative group, as well as to establish trusting, positive relationships within the classroom setting. Whether this is the reality within the classroom and work environment on a consistent basis would require further examination and observation, however, the data suggests a sample of generally emotionally intelligent individuals.

It is quite evident that a strength of this sample of teachers is had within the interpersonal composite, particularly the subscales social responsibility and empathy. The interpersonal composite deals with people skills, being able to create trusting relationships, relate well with others, exhibit dependability, and function well as a team (Stein & Book, 2011). The social responsibility subscale had the highest level of teachers scoring within the high range. This subscale relates to the willingness of the individual to contribute meaningfully to society, often without recognition or personal benefit, as well as being a rule-abiding citizen (Stein & Book, 2011). Empathy speaks to the ability to relate to and understand others, showing interest and concern for others (Stein & Book, 2011).

Thus, one of the key characteristics of this sample of teachers within these successful, “beat the odds” schools is the teacher’s heart. Teaching is a profession that requires a great deal, but is also something that can be performed by simply going through the motions. These EQ-i 2.0 results seem to indicate that this group of teachers had an intrinsic motivation when working with students, the desire to contribute to their learning with a general concern for their welfare. What great power can be had when an individual teacher cares and has concern for their students! Perhaps this is an important, foundational ingredient necessary when working with underprivileged students with the odds stacked against them.
This sample of teachers also scored high on the self-actualization subscale. This subscale is associated with knowing who you are with regard to talents, potential, and interests, and in the ability to make and attain goals (Stein & Book, 2011). This process of self-actualization is a process of continual learning and improvement as well. This is consistent with the notion described by Denton et al. (2003) as a “no excuses” approach among “beat the odds” schools, meaning that when some approach is not working to help students make progress, educators adjust their practices to adjust to the needs of the learners, developing their own understanding and competency as part of the process. These teachers scored relatively high in this area, suggesting that there is a general sense of a willingness to continue to strive to further develop their talents and competencies.

On the assertiveness subscale, while 70% of the sample scored in the mid-range or higher, 30% scored low in this area, the highest percentage in the low range for any one subscale or composite. Assertiveness deals with the ability to express oneself, one’s desires and thoughts, and to stand up for what is believed to be right (Stein & Book, 2011). Assertiveness is not aggression, and it is not passive. It means to clearly communicate thoughts, ideas, boundaries, and beliefs without ambiguity, yet being sensitive to others feelings and perspectives (Stein & Book, 2011). It is clear that a certain population within the sample finds confrontation and assertive behavior difficult, which most likely translates into passive compliant—or possibly passive-aggressive—behavior. This is not a healthy behavior pattern, often leading to disgruntled feelings. This leads to an observation made regarding the School Culture Triage.

It is interesting to note that despite the general feeling that the culture of these schools is good and going in a positive direction, as indicated by a mean score within the high level of monitoring and maintaining, as well as some very high scores, there were three scores that
dropped down into the lower ranges indicating a need to make modifications and improvements. This is an intriguing scenario, in which the majority of the teachers are functioning within an element of general contentment, and yet there are some who feel differently. The reasons could be many, however, emotional intelligence scores may provide interesting insight into this condition. And it may be noted that the sample of teachers in this study are functioning within high performing schools. This condition is quite likely to be similar in other schools, perhaps to an even greater degree in under-performing schools.

According to Table 4 in Chapter 4, the highest percentage of teachers scoring in the low range is concentrated within the self-expression composite. Within this composite, 25%-30% of the sample received a low score in each of the three subscales, including assertiveness (30%), emotional expression (25%), and independence (25%). Emotional expression is similar in some degree to assertiveness, but speaks primarily of the ability to express oneself emotionally in an effective manner, showing openness and consistency in the messages being sent to others both verbally and visually (Stein & Book, 2011). Independence speaks of self-reliance, the ability to be free of emotional dependency, and to stand on one’s own (Stein & Book, 2011). Each of these elements of self-expression contain an element of confidence and the ability to clearly and accurately communicate one’s thoughts and feelings. An individual who is low in these abilities will find it difficult to have their voice heard, and may possibly slip into destructive practices such as gossip, withholding information, etc. to have a sense of control and power. The low scores in these areas for one-quarter of the sample could be an explanation for some feeling discontented with the culture of the school.

In terms of correlation between the EQ-i 2.0 and School Culture Triage results, unfortunately the data must be interpreted with caution. This is due to the mistake made by the
researcher in the initial gathering of data, in which School Culture Triage results were collected without requiring a name or method of identification to enable accurate data pairing with the EQ-i 2.0. This survey was re-sent to participants retrieve their name with their survey; however, there was still one that was not returned again with identification. As explained earlier, this one unidentified survey was paired with the remaining EQ-i 2.0 score report without a pair. Because there was only one left without identification, the certainty of pairing with the correct EQ-i 2.0 score is high, eliminating this potential threat to internal validity.

The calculation of correlation reveals some interesting results. Emotional intelligence does not appear to correlate significantly with professional collaboration, at least in terms of the School Culture Triage. The weakness in correlation was initially quite surprising, as collaboration implies the act of working with others in an effective and productive manner. It implies a level of trust, especially with regard to the type of collaboration presented by DuFour (2007), that of effectively building trust and learning from each other. However, upon taking a further look at the questions in the School Culture Triage (Appendix B), questions within the professional collaboration category speak more of the leadership in the school, and the organizational systems in place allowing for collaboration to occur. For example, one question asks whether teachers discuss instruction and curriculum, and another asks if teachers are involved in decision-making processes. These are important questions regarding the current state of collaboration, yet they may be independent of the teachers’ emotional intelligence and more dependent on the leadership, opportunities, and expectations within which teachers find themselves.

It is interesting to note that there exists a weak negative relationship between EQ-i 2.0 scores for self-expression and how this sample responded to questions about professional
collaboration practices and structures. The self-expression composite includes the subscales emotional expression, assertiveness, and independence. A plausible explanation for this could be that with higher independence scores there may be less of a sense or desire for interdependence between colleagues, and vice versa. Stein and Book (2011) explain that independent people show attributes of self-reliance, and although they may seek advice and counsel, this self-reliance includes their practices of planning and decision making. This is a small sample, and a weak relationship, but it does create some insight into a dynamic that exists among a staff of teachers with regard to planning, working, and learning together.

The categories of affiliative collegiality and self-determination/efficacy both showed generally no significant relationship when paired with EQ-i 2.0 composite scores. However, in both categories of school culture, the stress management composite score resulted in a weak to moderate level of significance. The stress management composite includes the subscales of flexibility, stress tolerance, and optimism. Another way to describe this composite is one’s tendency towards a positive or negative attitude, as well as how one copes with changes or challenges. When considering the results of the School Culture Triage, it is crucial to note that the school culture is being related through the perspective of the sample, which includes classroom teachers. In that regard, there is slight evidence in this sample of there being a relationship between one’s attitude and the way that respondents perceived and rated the staff culture: in this case, staff culture specifically being in reference to staff collegiality, as well as and their ability to resolve issues, make personal improvements, and make decisions (Wagner, 2006).
Discussion of the Results in Relation to the Literature

This is not the first study made of “beat the odds” schools, but joins in the literature surrounding this discussion (Charles A. Dana Center, 1999; Chenowith, 2009; Cunningham, 2006; Langer, 2001; Taylor, Pearson, Clark, & Walpole, 2000; Taylor, Pearson, Peterson, & Rodriguez, 2003; Waits et al., 2006; Wilder & Jacobsen, 2010). These studies examine “beat the odds” schools through the lens of leadership, curriculum, assessment, instruction, collaboration, focus, determination, and others. This study, however, examines “beat the odds” schools through the lens of emotional intelligence, adding a unique element in the discussion. Dickey (2012) conducted a similar study as part of a dissertation, examining the presence of emotional intelligence in 3rd grade teachers in Title I elementary schools, as well as the presence of classroom management styles among these teachers. The schools comprised in this study were also schools that qualify for Title I funding. The difference between this study and that of Dickey (2012) is that this study selectively examined top performing schools to assess levels of emotional intelligence, whereas Dickey (2012) did not, providing an opportunity for comparison.

Based on the “beat the odds” schools sample EQ-i 2.0 results, no less than 70% of the teachers scored within the mid- to high range on all possible scores, including the total EI score, 5 composites, and 15 subscales, with most scores resulting in 80%–95% of the teachers within this mid- to high range. In contrast, Dickey (2012) found that according to the results of the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal (Bradberry & Greaves, 2011)—one of the three most widely used and validated emotional intelligence assessments, along with the EQ-i 2.0 and the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2002)—60% of the research sample had below or significantly below average levels of emotional intelligence. There is a clear difference between the two studies with regard to emotional
intelligence levels of the participating teachers, increasing the value of these studies both in the literature surrounding “beat the odds” schools, as well as the literature focusing on the influence of emotional intelligence in the workforce.

**Limitations**

The focus of this study was the description and examination of successful, “beat the odds” schools in Washington state in terms of emotional intelligence, including the lens of staff culture. The study was limited to only 3rd–5th grade teachers who taught during the 2014–2015 school year. This delimitation was imposed because the state assessment, the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium, is administered beginning in 3rd grade, and because it was the 2014–2015 spring assessment data that was used to identify successful schools to be invited to participate in the study. It may be useful and insightful to also include Kindergarten–2nd grade teachers in the study as well, as they would have played a crucial part in the early learning phases of those in 3rd–5th grades. Also, the initial number of potential participants was nearly twice as many as the number of actual participants in the study. The majority of outreach to participants was through email, with only one attempt being made to visit the schools in person and leave information and a note to encourage completion of the assessments. With less time constraints, and greater ability to travel to the schools, it is likely that there would be a greater level of participation, improving the power of the sample data, and lowering the likelihood of outliers skewing the correlational data.

In terms of the correlational data, as explained, the mistake was made to not acquire the identity of participants’ completed surveys on the School Culture Triage initially, a misunderstanding of what was necessary for statistical computation of a linear correlation. It would be important for future correlational study between two different assessments of the same
sample to ensure appropriate identification from each of the assessments in order to ensure accurate data pairing.

One possible difference that, if implemented, would have strengthened this study would have been to spend time observing teacher-student interactions. This would have added a great deal in terms of teacher and student relations, and how that might relate to teacher emotional intelligence. The literature supports the positive impact that a positive, prosocial classroom can have on the learning environment (Arghode, 2013; Jennings & Greenberg, 2009; Zinsser et al., 2015), which can be linked to emotional and social competencies within emotional intelligence. However, time restraints restricted the ability to observe the five schools located across the state of Washington.

**Implication of the Results for Practice, Policy, and Theory**

There is evidence in this study of a strong presence of emotional intelligence among this sample of teachers within “beat the odds” schools. The difference is striking in comparison to the results found in Dickey’s (2012) study, pointing to the importance that teachers exhibit these subset of skills and competencies within the realm of school achievement. This in no way is intended to overshadow the importance of content knowledge of pedagogical skills and practices, but does speak to what may set some teachers apart from others, and what may subsequently follow as setting some schools apart from others. This is consistent with Goleman’s (1995) initial assertion that EQ can matter more than IQ in terms of overall success.

As stated earlier, Daniel Goleman addressed educators at the National Association of Elementary School Principals 2016 National Conference, in which he described the importance of emotional intelligence within the school setting (Sommers, 2016). The majority of his discussion was centered on the role of principals and the importance of emotional intelligence
with regard to principal leadership. However, a key component also referred to teacher emotional intelligence in the classroom, and the importance of setting up a productive learning environment. The strong presence of teacher emotional intelligence in these successful schools supports this notion. Goleman (Sommers, 2016) suggests hiring teachers that exhibit high levels of emotional intelligence.

Consistent with this suggestion—along with strong pedagogical skills and content knowledge in effective teaching practices—especially with regard to at-risk learners, the preference for teachers with high emotional intelligence in hiring practices would seem an imperative part of developing a staff capable of creating a school that could “beat the odds.” This study suggests that interpersonal and self-perception strengths may be keys areas of strength for teachers of struggling and challenged students to possess. As this sample’s data showed, the interpersonal and self-perception composites were high, particularly with regard to the subscales of social responsibility, empathy, and self-actualization. In other words, these teachers care about their students, have a tendency to exert themselves beyond what they may be recognized or compensated for, and are capable of making personal growth and achieving goals. Schools and school districts may consider utilizing emotional intelligence assessments as part of their interviewing and screening practices to determine further candidates’ strengths in these areas and others. These could serve as another valuable piece of personal data when making these important personnel decisions.

Stein and Book (2011) emphasize that emotional intelligence can be improved upon with professional development and training. With that understanding, professional development for teachers surrounding emotional intelligence and its competencies, especially with regard to interactions between teachers and students, teachers, and parents, and between teacher
colleagues, may also be worthy of further exploration by administrative and leadership professional development teams. This training would be centered on improving and developing teachers already employed within the school and district. It should be noted that this would of necessity be one component of staff development considered, included along with other important teaching skills and capacities, such as classroom management, effective assessment practices, student engagement strategies, among others.

Finally, it should be noted that teachers in this sample exhibited both strengths and weaknesses in emotional intelligence. There were also differences in perspective with regard to school culture, depending on the individual. Some were more negative or positive than others. School leaders should not despair when working with staff to create a positive, productive school culture and learning environment, but focus on continual development of individuals within the organization.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

Because this study focused solely on 3rd–5th grade teachers, a replica of this study might broaden the scope of the sample population to include all teachers within the school. Within a typical elementary school setting, this would generally include Kindergarten through 5th or 6th grade. This would validate the foundational work that occurs in the primary grades before students begin state testing, as well as provide a more holistic view of the school organization.

This study, especially when compared to the results found by Dickey (2012) in an earlier, similar study, sheds light on the possible importance that emotional intelligence may truly have with regard to schools rising above demographic challenges and beating the odds. Further research comparing teacher emotional intelligence in high-performing schools to that in low-performing schools with similar demographics and related variables would build on and
This need not be confined to schools with high poverty, high Hispanic, and high numbers of bilingual students. With regard to teacher emotional intelligence, it would also be intriguing to compare schools that were more affluent, yet experienced differences in student achievement.

The teachers in this sample demonstrated particular strengths on the EQ-i 2.0 emotional intelligence assessment in the interpersonal and self-perception composites, especially with regard to the subscales of social responsibility, empathy, and self-actualization. Further study of teacher emotional intelligence, both in high-performing and low-performing schools, would be interesting to determine whether this pattern is consistent with teachers in general, specific to teachers within high-performing schools, or merely specific to this sample. Truly, this finding would be significant in either substantiating the concept of emotional intelligence playing a foundational role within the profession, and especially with regard to successful schools.

The methodology and design of this study relied solely upon two survey tools, the EQ-i 2.0 and the School Culture Triage, to collect and analyze data. With more time, this study would have benefited greatly from a more diverse method of collecting data with regard to teacher emotional intelligence and its role in the success of these schools. Personal interviews of teachers, administrators, students, and parents would each play an important role in collecting data based on a particular perspective. Observations within the classroom setting with the purpose of collecting data on the observed social interactions between teacher and students would have enhanced this study greatly. This would also be consistent with the methodologies of other studies conducted which have shown the importance of a prosocial, positive classroom environment for enhanced student learning (Curby, Brock, Hamre, 2013; Jennings & Greenberg, 2009).
Finally, in reference to the notion that emotional intelligence can improve with professional development (Stein & Book, 2011), a study examining the change in teacher emotional intelligence after having undergone professional development focused on emotional intelligence would be an opportunity to substantiate this claim. To broaden this concept of professional development, a study that coupled this with its relationship to student achievement would bring further light onto the subject. This type of study may be invaluable as a guide to providers of professional development, informing decision making processes with regard to time and resources spent in various professional development pursuits.

Conclusion

This study takes a unique perspective on schools that “beat the odds” and outperform other schools with similarly challenging demographics, examining them through the lens of teacher emotional intelligence. Great appreciation must be expressed to the principals, and especially the participating teachers, from the five participating schools in this study. Their willingness to devote their time to completing the two survey tools was crucial to the success of this study, and greatly appreciated. In addition to the researcher’s time and effort, this research study is the culminating effort of many hours from earlier researchers and theorists, participants in this study, and a helpful and reflective dissertation committee, all of whom deserve a measure of acknowledgment and gratitude.

One question that has been examined is what level of emotional intelligence exists among 3rd–5th grade classroom teachers within successful Washington state schools that outperform others with similar demographics of at least 65% rate of poverty, 60% Hispanic population, and 35% bilingual. According to the sample involved in this study, there is evidence to suggest that there is a strong presence of emotional intelligence, and that almost all teachers scored in the
mid- to high range for emotional intelligence on all EQ-i 2.0 subscales. Clear areas of strength for this sample were within the composites of interpersonal and self-perception, particularly the subscales of social responsibility, empathy, and self-actualization. This supports literature highlighting the link between a positive, prosocial classroom environment and improved student learning (Curby, Brock, & Hamre, 2013; Jennings & Greenberg, 2009).

Another question guiding this study is to what extent teachers’ perspectives of professional collaboration, affiliative collegiality, and self-determination/efficacy compare to teachers’ emotional intelligence assessment scores, as determined by scores on the School Culture Triage and the EQ-i 2.0. It is interesting to note that most teachers rated the schools as being within the monitor and maintain category with regard to school culture, an indication of a positive and productive work and learning environment. No significant correlations exist between this sample’s emotional intelligence scores and their scores on the School Culture Triage survey. However, there is a weak to moderate relationship between the stress management component of the EQ-i 2.0 and the school culture surveys, hinting towards the idea that the more positive the person, the more positive their perspective of their surrounding environment.

In conclusion, there is evidence to suggest that emotional intelligence does form an important, perhaps even crucial, part of the equation with regard to schools rising above the challenges of educating a diverse student population, especially when students are at-risk due to learning a new language, poverty, and/or minority status. With that being said, according to this study, there is little to suggest that levels of emotional intelligence relate to school culture. If teacher emotional intelligence is important in school achievement, and it doesn’t relate to school
culture, what is its key role? Is it primarily an important component within the classroom as teachers interact with students? That is a research question for another study.
References


https://tap.mhs.com/EQi20TheScience.aspx


http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/secletter/020724.html


U.S. Department of Education. (2016a). *Improving basic programs operated by local educational agencies (Title I, Part A).* Retrieved from:
http://www2.ed.gov/programs/titleiparta/index.html

http://www.ed.gov/essa


Appendix A

EQ-i 2.0

For item specific questions, please refer to the EQ-i 2.0 Technical Manual. This may be accessed through Multi-Health Systems, Inc. by going to the following website: https://tap.mhs.com/EQi20.aspx, or by calling 1-800-456-3003 to speak with a Partner Relations Consultant.
Appendix B

School Culture Triage Survey

SCORING: 1=NEVER  2=RARELY  3=SOMETIMES  4=OFTEN  5=ALWAYS OR AMOST ALWAYS

Professional Collaboration
Teachers and staff discuss instructional strategies and curriculum issues... ................................. 1 2 3 4 5
Teachers and staff work together to develop the school schedule................................. 1 2 3 4 5
Teachers and staff are involved in the decision-making process with regard to materials
and resources.............................................................................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
The student behavior code is a result of collaboration and consensus among staff. ................. 1 2 3 4 5
The planning and organizational time allotted to teachers and staff is used to plan as collective
units/teams rather than as separate individuals........................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5

Affiliative Collegiality
Teachers and staff tell stories of celebrations that support the school’s values ......................... 1 2 3 4 5
Teachers and staff visit/talk/meet outside of the school to enjoy each others’ company .......... 1 2 3 4 5
Our school reflects a true “sense” of community.................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
Our school schedule reflects frequent communication opportunities for teachers and staff... 1 2 3 4 5
Our school supports and appreciates the sharing of new ideas by members of our school.... 1 2 3 4 5
There is a rich and robust tradition of rituals and celebrations including holidays, special events
and recognition of goal attainment............................................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5

Self-Determination/Efficacy
When something is not working in our school, the faculty and staff predict and prevent
rather than react and repair ........................................................................................................ 1 2 3 4 5
School members are interdependent and value each other...................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
Members of our school community seek alternatives to problems/issues rather than repeating what
we have always done.................................................................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
Members of our school community seek to define the problem/issue rather than blame others. 1 2 3 4 5
The school staff is empowered to make instructional decisions rather than waiting for supervisors
to tell them what to do............................................................................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
People work here because they enjoy and choose to be here.................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
Appendix C

CONSENT FORM

Research Study Title: Levels of teacher emotional intelligence in selected “beat the odds” schools: A descriptive study.

Principle Investigator: Nathan Schmutz

Research Institution: Concordia University – Portland

Faculty Advisor: Dr. Mark Jimenez

Purpose and what you will be doing:
The purpose of this study is to gain more information about successful schools that “beat the odds”. The intended purpose is to determine the level of teachers’ emotional intelligence, and how it relates to school climate within these schools. We expect approximately 30 volunteers, 3rd through 5th grade teachers from 4 different schools in Washington State. To be in the study, you will participate in two different surveys, the EQ-i 2.0 (Emotional Quotient Inventory) and the School Culture Triage. No one will be paid to be in the study, although participating teachers will receive a $15 Amazon gift card upon completion of the two surveys.

For both the EQ-i 2.0 and the School Culture Triage survey, teacher participants will receive access to the assessments via email. You will receive a separate email for each assessment in your work email. The EQ-i 2.0 assessment will come through the account and system provided by Multi-Health Systems, the producer of the EQ-i 2.0. You will receive step-by-step instructions upon opening up the email, with login information and a link to the assessment. The EQ-i 2.0 will open and participants will proceed through each question, which automatically proceeds to the next question once an answer is selected. Participants are able to navigate back if necessary to previous questions. There is also a final question that asks if responses were honest, with instructions to wait, as it takes a moment to load once the final question is answered. The assessment takes between 20-40 minutes to complete.

The School Culture Triage survey will be administered utilizing Google Forms, a function of Google Drive. You will receive an email from the researcher with a link to the survey. You will click on the link, which will direct you to an online survey. Step-by-step instructions will be provided at the top of the page. Upon answering the questions, you will click submit, which will complete the survey and send results to the researcher’s Google Drive account. This survey should take less than 10 minutes to complete.
Risks:
There are no risks to participating in this study other than providing your information. However, we will protect your information. Any personal information you provide will be coded so it cannot be linked to you. Any name or identifying information you give will be kept securely via electronic encryption or locked inside the researcher’s personal computer. When we or any of our investigators look at the data, none of the data will have your name or identifying information. We will only use a secret code to analyze the data. We will not identify you in any publication or report. Your information will be kept private at all times and then all study documents will be destroyed 3 years after we conclude this study.

According to Federal Regulations, all research carries with it minimal risk, however, there are no known inherent risks in or discomforts in voluntarily completing these online surveys. Trust commercial and non-commercial sites will be used to administer the surveys, however, despite efforts for confidentiality, transfer of information across the Internet is not secure and could be observed by a third party. To varying degrees, this is a fundamental aspect of all Internet activity and communications. If you choose to complete these surveys on a computer and/or network owned or accessible by a third party, such as your employer, then such persons may be able to view your responses. You may be able to increase your privacy protection by using a limited access computer and closing your browser after completing each survey.

Benefits:
Information you provide will help to further the work of understanding how some schools “beat the odds” from the lens of emotional intelligence. You could benefit this by honestly participating in and completing these surveys. Your responses will help provide a deeper look at what makes successful schools a reality.

Confidentiality:
This information will not be distributed to any other agency and will be kept private and confidential. The only exception to this is if you tell us abuse or neglect that makes us seriously concerned for your immediate health and safety.

Right to Withdraw:
Your participation is greatly appreciated, but we acknowledge that the questions we are asking are personal in nature. You are free at any point to choose not to engage with or stop the study. You may skip any questions you do not wish to answer. This study is not required and there is no penalty for not participating. If
at any time you experience a bad emotion from answering the questions, you may withdraw from completing the surveys.

Contact Information:
You will receive a copy of this consent form. If you have questions you can talk to or write the principle investigator, Nathan Schmutz at nschmutz@nfdsd.org. If you want to talk with a participant advocate other than the investigator, you can write or call the director of our institutional review board, Dr. OraLee Branch (email obranch@cu-portland.edu or call 503-493-6390).

Your Statement of Consent:
I have read the above information. I asked questions if I had them, and my questions were answered. I volunteer my consent for this study.

_________________________________________                   ___________
Participant Name                                      Date
_________________________________________                   ___________
Participant Signature                                 Date
_________________________________________                   ___________
Investigator Name                                    Date
_________________________________________                   ___________
Investigator Signature                               Date
## Appendix D – EQ-i 2.0 Raw Scores (R)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>TOT_ R</th>
<th>SP_ R</th>
<th>SR_ R</th>
<th>SA_ R</th>
<th>ES_ R</th>
<th>SE_ R</th>
<th>EE_ R</th>
<th>AS_ R</th>
<th>IN_ R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOT Total Score</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP Self-Perception</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR Self-Regard</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Self-Actualization</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES Emotional Self-Awareness</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Self-Expression</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE Emotional Expression</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS Assertiveness</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN Independence</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM Empathy</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE Social Responsibility</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM Decision Making</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS Problem Solving</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT Reality Testing</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC Impulse Control</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM Stress Management</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL Flexibility</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST Stress Tolerance</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP Optimism</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IS_ R</th>
<th>IR_ R</th>
<th>EM_ R</th>
<th>RE_ R</th>
<th>DM_ R</th>
<th>PS_ R</th>
<th>RT_ R</th>
<th>IC_ R</th>
<th>SM_ R</th>
<th>FL_ R</th>
<th>ST_ R</th>
<th>OP_ R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E – EQ-i 2.0 Standard Scores (T)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>EM</th>
<th>RE</th>
<th>DM</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>RT</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>SM</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>OP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix F – School Culture Triage Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL SCORE</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>SD/E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PC – Professional Collaboration  
AC – Affiliative Collegiality  
SD/E – Self-Determination/Efficacy
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