

2004

Assessing Job Satisfaction and Emotional Intelligence in Public School Teachers

Brandy Cobb

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Cobb, Brandy, "Assessing Job Satisfaction and Emotional Intelligence in Public School Teachers" (2004). *Masters Theses & Specialist Projects*. Paper 1103.

<http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses/1103>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR®. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses & Specialist Projects by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact topscholar@wku.edu.

ASSESSING JOB SATISFACTION AND EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE IN
PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS

A Thesis
Presented to
The Faculty of the Department of Psychology
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Specialist in Education

By
Brandy Cobb

May 2004

ASSESSING JOB SATISFACTION AND EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE IN
PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS

Date Recommended 06/07/04

William Pfohl, Director of Thesis

Steven Winger

Reagan Brown

Elmer Gray, Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, June 10, 2004

Acknowledgements

I want to first thank my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ for making all of this possible. I want to thank Him for his guidance and his favor through all of this. I could not have completed this thesis project without the support of some very special people. I would like to thank my committee chairperson, Dr. William Pfohl. Thank you for taking time out of your tremendously busy schedule to guide me through this process. I would also like to thank Dr. Steven Wininger for your unending assistance, patience, and support. Dr. Reagan Brown, thank you for serving as a member of my thesis committee. I would like to thank my family and friends for their unwavering support and for putting up with me during this stressful time. To my fiancé, Cris, thank you for providing me with your love and support not only through the completion of this thesis, but also through these past three years of graduate school. To my mother, thank you for being my rock. Lastly, I would like to thank the faculty who have supported and encouraged me through this time. Dr. Carl Myers, Dr. Elizabeth Jones, and Dr. Debra Crisp, thank you all for believing in me. Because of each of you mentioned in the acknowledgement, I can truly say that I am a better person!

Table of Contents

	Page
List of Tables	iv
Abstract.....	vi
Introduction.....	1
Literature Review.....	7
Method	23
Results.....	29
Discussion.....	44
References.....	49
Appendix A: Demographic Survey Form	54
Appendix B: Job Descriptive Index Form	56
Appendix C: Emotional Intelligence Categories and Subscale Definitions	59
Appendix D: Teacher Assent Form	61

List of Tables

	Page
Table 1: Demographics of Teachers in Current Study.....	30
Table 2: Means and Standard Deviations for Demographic Data	33
Table 3: Means and Standard Deviations for Teacher Job Satisfaction	34
Table 4: Means and Standard Deviations for BarOn EQ-i Self Report Scale	34
Table 5: Means for the Interaction of the Independent Variables Mentoring and Geographical Area for the Dependent Variable Job Enjoyment	38
Table 6: Means for the Interaction of the Independent Variables Grade Level and Mentoring for the Dependent Variable Teaching Enjoyment.....	39
Table 7: Means for the Interaction of the Independent Variables Grade Level and Mentoring for the Dependent Variable Job Enjoyment.....	40
Table 8: Means for the Interaction of the Independent Variables Geographical Area and Career Change for the Dependent Variable Coworker Satisfaction	41
Table 9: Means for the Interaction of the Independent Variables Mentoring and Career Change for the Dependent Variable Coworker Satisfaction	42
Table 10: Correlations for EQ-i Scores and Dependent Variables	43

ASSESSING JOB SATISFACTION AND EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE IN
PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS

Brandy Cobb

May 2004

63 Pages

Directed by: Dr. William Pfohl, Dr. Steven Wininger, and Dr. Reagan Brown

Department of Psychology

Western Kentucky University

The professional field of education has been particularly vulnerable to the retention of public school teachers. Teachers in today's educational system face excessive expectations and demands such as increased accountability, lack of available resources, lack of parental support and involvement, negative student attitudes, low status of the profession, and low paying salaries (Meek, 1998; Tye & O'Brien, 2002). As a result of these demands, many teachers experience job dissatisfaction. According to Colbert and Wolff (1992), 50% of new teachers drop out of the profession during the first five years. The recent works of Daniel Goleman (1995, 1998) proclaim that individuals' emotional intelligence is a predictor of on the job success and job satisfaction. There appears to be no studies conducted on emotional intelligence and teacher job satisfaction to date. To look at this phenomenon in the realm of teachers, this study asked teachers to complete a demographic survey, the BarOn EQ-i Self Report Scale, and the Job Descriptive Index. One hundred and one teachers were asked to complete these forms and 101 surveys were completed and returned. Data analyses revealed that emotional intelligence does play a role in how teachers perceive their overall job satisfaction based on self-report measures. The present study did support the hypotheses that emotional intelligence was correlated with years of teaching experience and job satisfaction. Suggestions for further research are discussed.

Chapter I

Introduction

Teacher job satisfaction was an area of concern for a number of school personnel. Many teachers dropped out of the profession for a plethora of reasons. Teachers felt that the profession was not valued by society, the demands and accountability increased, and an overabundance of stress all played significant roles in how teachers viewed their jobs and the satisfaction they received from it (Latham, 1998).

Many teachers chose teaching as a profession because they valued the intrinsic rewards that they received (Iwanicki, 2001) and because they enjoyed the emotional and personal benefits of the job itself, such as personal growth and a sense of accomplishment. In fact, many teachers selected this profession because they desired helping others and were afforded the opportunity for personal development and public service (Jones, 2002). So, why were so many teachers leaving the profession? The literature on teacher attrition consistently showed a bimodal curve: most of those who left the profession were either beginners with five years of experience or less in the classroom or 30 year veterans who were ready to retire (Tye & O'Brien, 2002).

Teachers are important in their role in shaping students' intellectual, emotional, and social development. Many teachers entered the field of education and the teaching profession because they had a passion for helping others and enjoyed the personal growth and sense of accomplishment (Latham, 1998). According to Jones (2002), the number one reason for the passion that teachers shared was their ability to make positive differences in the lives of young people. In addition, the majority of professionals who taught felt that their ability to contribute to society, while helping others, made teaching a rewarding profession (Jones).

The teaching profession was vital to American society because federal law required that

all school-age children attend school. Nonetheless, teachers have stated that their job was not easy, because teachers were required to do much more than teach (Latham, 1998). In the Commonwealth of Kentucky, teachers are required to obtain a four-year college degree, plus they are required to complete a Master's or post baccalaureate program. Once their education was completed and teachers were actually in the classroom, they were expected to handle a variety of duties such as: manage classroom discipline; complete extensive paperwork; serve as bus, cafeteria, or hall monitors; attend professional development trainings; consult with parent and colleagues; and teach at a level where students will achieve at a proficient level on high stakes and state mandated tests. Teachers also found themselves teaching more toward tests than from an actual curriculum (Tye & O'Brien, 2002). Many teachers complained about not having the opportunity to use their creativity when planning instructional lessons; instead, they found themselves using state and district mandated materials (Tye & O'Brien).

Since the early 90's, the American education system has faced a national teacher shortage (Colbert & Wolff, 1992). There were approximately 53.1 million children enrolled in elementary and secondary schools and this number was expected to increase to 53.5 million within the next five years (Jones, 2002). There were only 3.3 million teachers in American schools. As the student population continued to grow, many school districts found themselves under tremendous pressure to prepare students to meet state and national academic standards.

Other teacher concerns included increased accountability, lack of administrative leadership and support, lack of cooperation and tension among colleagues, lack of available resources, lack of parental support and involvement, negative student attitudes, low status of the profession, and low paying salaries (Meek, 1998; Tye & O'Brien, 2002). These excessive demands placed upon teachers contributed to stress, burnout, and a high turnover rate.

According to Colbert and Wolff (1992), 50% of new teachers dropped out of the profession during the first five years. This statistic was very alarming and raised many concerns about teacher job satisfaction and retention for those in the education field.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction was defined as “peoples’ affective relation to their work role, and a function of the perceived relationship between what they wanted from the job, and what they perceived it was offering” (Syptak, Marsland, & Ulmer, 1999, p. 23). More specifically, teacher job satisfaction was “a predictor of teacher retention, a determinant of teacher commitment, and a contributor to teacher effectiveness” (Shann, 1998, p. 67). Teacher job satisfaction reduced attrition, enhanced job performance, and had a positive influence on student outcomes (Shann).

Stress and Burnout

As teacher job satisfaction was addressed, it was important to briefly discuss the issues of teacher stress and burnout as it related to job satisfaction. Many teachers left the teaching profession because of the stress and burnout they encountered on the job (Iwanicki, 2001). Stress and burnout were occupational hazards in which members of the helping profession were easily exposed. Teacher burnout was defined as physical, emotional, and attitudinal exhaustion that began with a feeling of uneasiness and increased as the joy of teaching began to gradually decrease (Carter, 1994). Teacher stress and burnout, as it related to job satisfaction, was linked to teachers’ perceptions of their career and emerged as a result of their psychological needs and personality. Since burned-out teachers were often worn out and lacked motivation, patience, and optimism, there could possibly have been internal factors within teachers that determined how they perceived their satisfaction on the job (Farber, 1991); this internal factor being emotional intelligence.

Emotional Intelligence

Emotional intelligence was closely related to job satisfaction and job success (Goleman, 1998). It was defined as relating and understanding others, while adapting and coping with surroundings in order to become more successful in dealing with environmental demands (BarOn, 1997). Emotional intelligence helped to predict job success because it reflected how one applied emotional knowledge to an immediate situation (BarOn). Goleman (1995) expressed the argument that IQ was not the only critical factor that determined individual success; instead he believed that peoples' emotional intelligence played a large role in success in life and on the job.

Emotional intelligence had its roots in social intelligence. Social intelligence, as defined by E.L. Thorndike in 1920, was the "ability to understand and manage men and women, boys and girls—to act wisely in human relations" (Thorndike, 1920, p. 13). Social intelligence included interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences. Interpersonal intelligence was the ability to understand other people; such as what motivated them and how to work cooperatively with them. Intrapersonal intelligence was the ability to form an accurate view of one's self and be able to use this view to operate effectively in life (Gardner, 1993).

According to Mayer and Salovey (1997), emotional intelligence "involved the abilities to perceive, appraise, and express emotion; to access and/or generate feelings when they facilitated thought; to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; and to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth" (Mayer & Salovey, 1997, p. 10). Emotional intelligence was included in the realm of intelligence and was viewed much like spatial or verbal intelligence, except it operated with emotional components (Caruso, Mayer, & Salovey, 2002). It derived from cognitive and emotion systems, in which the cognitive system carried out abstract

reasoning about emotions, while the emotion system enhanced cognitive capacity (Caruso, Mayer, & Salovey). Typically, individuals high in emotional intelligence had the ability to perceive, understand, and manage emotions and allow emotions to facilitate their thought (Mayer, 2001). In addition, emotional well-being was increasingly recognized as a predictor of success in school, family, and work life (BarOn, 2000).

Emotional Intelligence and Job Satisfaction

To show the relationship between job success and satisfaction with emotional intelligence, Goleman (1998) relied upon others' research to support this notion. Goleman's emotional intelligence theory of performance had direct applicability to the domain of work and in predicting excellence in all jobs from sales to leadership (Goleman, 1998). Goleman believed that increased understanding of emotional intelligence allowed individuals to flourish in their lives, as citizens in their communities, and on their jobs. To support this statement, the latter in particular, Goleman proposed a theory of performance that was built on the basic emotional intelligence model by Mayer and Salovey (1993) and adapted this original model to predict peoples' personal effectiveness at work and in leadership. To do this, Goleman made the case for the importance of emotional intelligence in the workplace and set forth guidelines for effective individual development. The framework of emotional intelligence that translated into on the job success, as postulated by Goleman, were the skills of self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management. This model was based on emotional intelligence competences that were identified in internal research at corporations and organizations as distinguishing outstanding performers (Goleman, 1998).

Purpose of the Current Study

The purpose of the current study was to determine whether emotional intelligence played a

significant role in teacher job satisfaction. This study sought to discover whether the two constructs, emotional intelligence and job satisfaction in public school teachers, were positively correlated, for the purpose of providing further information on teacher retention.

Chapter II

Literature Review

According to Colbert and Wolff (1992), 50% of new teachers dropped out of the teaching profession during the first five years. There appeared to be several reasons for this decline in enthusiasm. Studies were conducted on teacher job satisfaction and concluded that numerous factors were responsible for the dissatisfaction that teachers received from their jobs.

Job satisfaction was defined as “peoples’ affective relation to their work role, and a function of the perceived relationship between what they wanted from the job, and what they perceived it was offering” (Syptak, Marsland, & Ulmer, 1999, p. 23). Job satisfaction as it related to teachers was “a predictor of teacher retention, a determinant of teacher commitment, and a contributor to teacher effectiveness” (Shann, 1998, p. 67). Job satisfaction was a difficult construct to measure among teachers because they were not unified in their perspectives about what made their careers satisfying (Shann).

Job satisfaction was extremely important for teachers to have because their attitudes toward the job impacted the learning environment of students. When teachers possessed high levels of job satisfaction, they had a greater chance in believing that their role in the school was satisfying over time, cared more about the quality of their work, were more productive and committed to the school, and had higher retention rates (Bavendam Research Incorporated, 2000). The literature on teacher attrition and teacher job satisfaction showed that teachers viewed their job as difficult, yet rewarding (Singh & Billingsley, 1996). However, the continually growing expectations and demands placed upon teachers contributed to stress, burnout, and a low rate of retention. Studies that pertained to teacher job satisfaction yielded

important factors that influenced teacher job satisfaction (Klecker & Loadman, 1999; Mertler, 2002). According to Bavendam Research Incorporated (2000), job opportunities, stress, leadership, work standards, fair rewards, and adequate authority were contributing factors to teacher job satisfaction. Job opportunities influenced job satisfaction because employees were most satisfied when they had challenging opportunities at work. These opportunities included participation on interesting projects such as serving on committees that were imperative to their profession. Such opportunities included participation on committees such as Site Based Decision Making Councils, crisis response teams, student intervention teams, and curriculum committees (Woods & Weasmer, 2000).

Stress was also a factor that influenced teacher job satisfaction. When negative stress was high, job satisfaction was low (Bavendam Research, Inc., 2000). In fact, jobs were more stressful when they interfered with employees' personal lives or were a continuing source of worry and concern. To alleviate stress, employers promoted and modeled a balance between work and personal lives. In addition, duties were distributed evenly and fairly among employees, and the number of interruptions imposed while teaching was limited.

Another factor that influenced job satisfaction was leadership. Teachers reported that they were satisfied when their principals were good leaders, motivating, continually striving for excellence, well trained and credentialed (Bavendam Research, Inc.; Ma & MacMillan, 1999). Teachers also reported that they responded and communicated more effectively with administrators that were trustworthy and inspired them to achieve meaningful goals (Iwanicki, 2001).

Work standards, another factor that influenced job satisfaction, supported the notion that teachers were more satisfied when their entire teaching staff took pride in the quality of their

work (Iwanicki). For this reason, teachers were encouraged to communicate with one another and celebrate achievements and accomplishments together. Teachers who were rewarded fairly experienced less job stress (Iwanicki, 2001). It appeared that teachers were more satisfied when they had freedom and authority to do their jobs in a manner that was accommodating to them. It was extremely imperative that teachers were allowed to make decisions that pertained to their instruction and their class(es) and had input on decisions that ultimately affected them (Woods & Weasmer, 2000).

Other issues and concerns related to job satisfaction that teachers expressed were increased paperwork, lack of available resources, lack of parental support and involvement, negative student attitudes, low status of the teaching profession, and low paying salaries (Ma & MacMillan, 1999). Many teachers reported that the increased paperwork actually took away from the students rather than benefiting the students. Teachers reported that the excessive amount of paperwork trickled over into their personal lives, and they found themselves grading papers at home and working after hours to complete documentation that they did not have time to complete during normal school hours (Ma & MacMillan, 1999).

The low status of teachers in today's society had a negative effect on teacher job satisfaction. The teaching profession was not a career that was usually chosen by the best and brightest (Tye & O'Brien, 2002). Many people thought that a career in teaching was not very important. In fact, society often equated low pay with less respect (Tye & O'Brien, 2002). Salaries for beginning teachers were generally low; however, teacher salary increased for those who chose to stay in the profession and further their education. All of the aforementioned factors that influenced job satisfaction was associated with teacher effectiveness and ultimately influenced student achievement. According to Perie, Baker, and Whitener (1997), approximately

5% of public school teachers and 12% of private school teachers left the teaching field after the 1987-88 and 1990-91 school years. Twenty percent of public school teachers and 28 % of private school teachers left because they either wanted to pursue other career opportunities, were dissatisfied with the profession, or because they desired better salaries and benefits (Perie, Baker, & Whitener).

The literature on teacher job satisfaction showed a reoccurring theme supporting the idea that supervision and leadership heavily influenced teacher job satisfaction. Davis and Wilson (2000) took this idea one step further and conducted a study on principal empowering behaviors. They wanted to know specifically how principals could improve teacher job satisfaction. The sample for this study consisted of teachers and principals in public elementary schools in eastern Washington. Principals were in their position for at least a full year and a total of 44 principals (37% female) and 660 elementary teachers (77% female) participated in the study.

The teachers were asked to complete a questionnaire that measured principal empowering behaviors, motivation, job satisfaction, and job stress. Motivation was assessed by four cognitive assessments that individuals made about work related tasks. These cognitive processes included impact, competence, meaningfulness, and choice. A total of seven questions for each four assessments were used on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Teachers responded to the items on the questionnaire in terms of their job in general. Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the four assessments ranged from, $\alpha = .73$ to $\alpha = .94$.

Job satisfaction was measured using four items that focused on the teachers' general satisfaction with the work they did and their desire to continue with the same job. Three of the items were based on the same 7-point scale as the motivation items; however, the fourth item was measured on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (definitely would not take the job again) to 6

(would definitely take the job again). Cronbach's alpha coefficient for job satisfaction was $\alpha = .72$.

Job stress was measured using ten items that asked the teachers how they felt while working. A similar sample question was, "How often do you feel nervous, tense, or edgy while on the job?" The same 7-point scale used to measure motivation was used for seven of the job stress items. The remaining three items were measured on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (very rarely or never) to 5 (more than 50 percent of the time). Cronbach's alpha coefficient for job stress was $\alpha = .62$.

Davis and Wilson (2000) developed the principal empowering behaviors survey that was used in their study. A total of 26 items were used to measure development of self, groups, and organization. Examples of these items included: exhibited good self-awareness, handled ambiguity, exhibited a good understanding of group dynamics, encouraged working collaboratively, recognized each person's uniqueness, had a vision to chart the course of the future, and had an internal process for renewing the school. The same 7-point scale used to assess motivation was employed to measure principal empowering behaviors. Cronbach's alpha coefficient for principal empowering behaviors was $\alpha = .91$ for principals' self-score and $\alpha = .98$ for teachers' ratings of principal behaviors.

Teachers' scores for principal empowering behaviors, motivation, job satisfaction, and job stress were summarized by school building. The results of the study indicated that there was a significant relationship between principal empowering behaviors and teacher motivation, $r = .38$; $p < .01$. The higher the principal empowering behavior scores for a building, the higher teachers' overall motivation score. In essence, the more principals participated in empowering behaviors, the greater impact teachers felt they made, $r = .37$; $p < .01$. Davis and Wilson

(2000) also found that teacher motivation was related to both job satisfaction, $r = .56; p < .01$, and job stress, $r = -.53; p < .01$. The greater teachers' motivation, the more satisfied they were with their jobs and the less stress they experienced (Davis & Wilson).

The findings in the study indicated that there was a strong relationship between motivation, job satisfaction, and job stress. These findings suggested that principal empowering behaviors were not associated with teacher job satisfaction or their level of job stress. The authors of the study suggested that principal empowering behaviors were associated with teacher job satisfaction and job stress in an indirect manner, through teacher motivation. The limitations of the study suggested a need to further investigate the understanding of the role that the principal played in developing a sense of empowerment among teachers.

Mertler (2002) conducted further assessment of teacher motivation. The goal of the study was to better understand motivation and job satisfaction in secondary teachers. Middle and high school teachers ($N = 710$) responded to several questions that included their overall level of job satisfaction, performance incentives, the extent to which they were motivated in general, and the motivational effects of various school and non-school based factors.

The data for the study was collected through the administration of a Web-based survey of teacher motivation and job satisfaction. The teacher motivation and job satisfaction surveys were administered via 43 listservs. Responses were received from 710 middle and high school teachers. The majority of teachers responding were Caucasian (92%). The median age represented by these teachers ranged from 41 - 45 years of age, and the median years of teaching experience was 11 - 15 years. Nearly half (49%) of the teachers taught in a suburban setting.

These teachers were asked to rate several factors that dealt with their perceptions of motivation and job satisfaction. Teachers were asked the following questions:

1. “What is your overall level of satisfaction with your job as a teacher?”
2. If you had the opportunity to start over in a new career, would you choose to become a teacher?
3. Generally speaking, do you believe that the teachers with whom you work are motivated?
4. How many teachers that you know or work with you would you classify as unmotivated?” (Mertler, 2002, p. 50).

For the first question, 77% of the teachers indicated that they were satisfied with their jobs and gender made no difference, $X^2(1, N = 697) = .222; p = .64$. Responses to the second question indicated that 36% of teachers reported that they would not choose to become teachers and no gender difference was found, $X^2(1, N = 683) = .89; p = .35$. Seventy-four percent of all teachers that responded to the third question indicated that they believed teachers in general were motivated and again, no significant gender difference was found, $X^2(1, N = 694) = .02; p = .90$. Responses to the fourth question revealed a median of 5 - 6 teachers as unmotivated. A significant difference existed between males and females with respect to reporting the number of teachers that were unmotivated, $X^2(5, N = 689) = 12.19; p = .03$. Males reported a higher number of unmotivated teachers than females (Mertler, 2002).

Overall, males reported a higher level of job satisfaction than did females. Mertler (2002) also discovered that teachers early in their careers and those nearing the end of their careers indicated higher levels of job satisfaction than did teachers who were in the middle of their teaching careers. In general, 23% of teachers reported job dissatisfaction.

Implications for the study suggested that it might be difficult for teachers to render the highest quality of education if they were dissatisfied with their jobs. Professional attempts were

made to improve the levels of motivation and satisfaction of teachers in the classroom. To accomplish this, it was necessary to redesign existing systems of reward and performance based incentives that were currently in place in the school settings (Mertler, 2002).

In order to obtain a broader view of teacher job satisfaction, the current researcher investigated whether there were differences in job satisfaction among various groups within a school setting, and in particular, whether there were differences in job satisfaction across grade level and teaching population.

To address the above idea, Klecker and Loadman (1999) served as a foundation for this study. They conducted a study that assessed the aspects of teaching that elementary school teachers found the most and least satisfying. They also investigated gender differences in job satisfaction ratings of elementary teachers and whether there were differences in their ratings of job satisfaction across years of teaching experience. There were a total of 4,428 elementary teachers that participated in the study, all of which worked in 129 Venture Capital schools in Ohio. The Job Satisfaction Subscale of the National Survey of Teacher Education Graduates was used to measure job satisfaction. A total of 1,877 (42%) surveys were returned.

The Job Satisfaction Subscale measured seven aspects of job satisfaction: salary/benefits, opportunities for professional advancement, level of personal/professional challenge, level of professional autonomy/decision making autonomy, general work conditions, interactions with colleagues, and interactions with students. Satisfaction with these aspects of teaching was rated on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (very negative) to 7 (very positive) (Klecker & Loadman). Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated for each subscale with the study sample and two-way ANOVA's were used to test for differences in responses to the job satisfaction items by gender and years of teaching experience. The total number for the analysis was 1,848.

The two-way ANOVA's found no statistically significant interaction by gender and years of teaching experience. No statistically significant differences by gender or years of teaching experience in elementary teachers' ratings of satisfaction with salary, opportunities for advancement, degree of autonomy/decision making, general work conditions, interactions with students, or total scale score was found. Overall, elementary teachers rated their satisfaction with teaching positively on all seven aspects with interaction with students most positive and satisfaction with general working conditions the least positive (Klecker & Loadman, 1999).

The results of this study suggested that there were no gender differences in teacher job satisfaction and that years of teaching experience had no bearing on job satisfaction. Limitations of this study included the low return rate (42%). Perhaps if more surveys were returned, the results of this study might have shown a significant difference between the two groups.

To address the notion of differences in job satisfaction across teaching populations, research conducted by Stempien and Loeb (2002) served as a foundation. They compared the satisfactions and dissatisfactions of teachers of emotionally/behaviorally impaired students in special education with teachers of students in general education and teachers responsible for both groups of students.

The participation of teachers was requested from eight suburban schools from five different school districts. Six of the schools were predominately general education schools and the other two schools exclusively offered special education programs. The schools were located within a 30-mile radius of Detroit, Michigan and served predominately Caucasian, middle class, suburban neighborhoods. One hundred ninety-nine teachers were distributed questionnaires and 116 were returned.

Group 1 (N = 60) consisted of teachers who reported that their students were exclusively

in general education programs. Group 2 (N = 36) consisted of teachers who taught students with emotional/behavioral disorders in either general education schools (n = 10) or schools exclusively with special education (n = 26). These two groups were treated as one group. The final group (N = 20) consisted of teachers who taught students in both general and special education programs in general education schools (Stempien & Loeb, 2002).

Participants were given a five-page survey that requested extensive demographic information. The questionnaire consisted of two satisfaction scales: the Brayfield-Rothe Job Satisfaction Index and the Life Satisfaction Index-A. The authors chose the Brayfield-Rothe Job Satisfaction Index because it focused more on emotional reactions to work. This index consisted of eighteen statements, such as “I feel satisfied with my present job” and “Most days I am enthusiastic about my work.” The possible range of scores was from 18 - 90 (Stempien & Loeb, 2002).

The Life Satisfaction Index-A was a self-report instrument that approximated the level of psychological well being. This index had twenty statements on general life satisfaction such as, “My life could be happier than it is now” and “I’ve gotten pretty much what I expected out of life.” This scale’s scores ranged from 20 - 100 (Stempien & Loeb, 2002).

All items on both scales were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). Some items required reverse scoring. To assess aspects of satisfaction/dissatisfaction directly related to teaching, the authors included five additional Likert-scale items. These items were:

1. “I enjoy working with my students.
2. I feel that teaching is a rewarding experience.
3. I have the opportunity to express my creativity in my teaching.

4. If I had the opportunity to change careers, I would not choose teaching.
5. I often feel frustrated when teaching my students” (Stempien & Loeb, 2002, pp. 260).

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to assess the differences in job satisfaction and life satisfaction among the three groups of teachers. A significant difference in job satisfaction was found, $F(2, 113) = 4.74; p = .01$. Teachers of students in general education reported higher job satisfaction than teachers of students with emotional/behavioral disorders (Stempien & Loeb).

Stempien and Loeb (2002) stated that a significant difference was found between the two groups of teachers because of the greater specificity of the target group and the guarantee of confidentiality, which may have resulted in greater honesty when completing the surveys. The limitations of the study included the low rate of return (58%), the differences between Group 1 and Group 2 in the severity of disabilities of the students they served, and the lack of access to teachers who previously left the field of education to access their job satisfaction and their reasons for leaving the teaching profession.

Implications of this study suggested that the stress that appeared to produce special education teachers’ frustration and dissatisfaction needed to be reduced. Another implication of the study was that new special education teachers needed mentoring to prepare them for the pressures of the job.

Research supports the notion that teachers were dissatisfied with their jobs and for this reason, many were leaving the teaching profession. Several reasons were provided for the low retention rate among teachers. The current literature suggested that emotional intelligence played a major role in this perception. The conclusions of works from researchers (BarOn, 1997; Goleman, 1998; Mayer & Salovey, 1997) supported the idea that there was a strong link between emotional intelligence and people’s perception of job satisfaction. Since the topic of job

satisfaction in teachers was discussed, the topic of emotional intelligence will be discussed.

Emotional Intelligence

Theorists have generated several distinctive emotional intelligence models. Mayer and Salovey (1997) framed emotional intelligence within a model for intelligence. BarOn (2000) placed emotional intelligence in the context of personality theory specifically well being; whereas, Goleman (1995; 1998) formulated emotional intelligence in terms of a theory of performance. According to Mayer and Salovey (1997), emotional intelligence “involved the abilities to perceive, appraise, and express emotion; to access and/or generate feelings when they facilitated thought; to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; and to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth” (Mayer & Salovey, 1997, p. 10). This definition hypothesized that there were four different abilities, which Mayer and Salovey referred to as branches. The first branch of this ability model was Identifying Emotions, which included the ability to identify feelings, express emotions accurately, and to differentiate between real and fake emotional expressions (Caruso, Mayer, & Salovey, 2002). The second branch, Emotional Facilitation of Thought or Using Emotion, referred to the ability to use emotions to redirect attention to important events, to produce emotions that assisted in decision making, to use unstable moods to contemplate multiple viewpoints, and connect different emotions to encourage different approaches to problem solving (Caruso, Mayer, & Salovey). The third branch, Understanding Emotions, was the ability to understand complex emotions, chains of emotions, how emotions transition from one stage to another, the ability to recognize the causes of emotions, and the ability to understand relationships among emotions. Managing Emotions was the fourth stage of the ability model and referred to people’s ability to stay aware of emotions, the ability to determine whether an emotion was typical, and the ability to solve emotional

problems without suppressing the negative emotions that coincide with these feelings (Mayer & Salovey).

Emotional intelligence was included in the realm of intelligence and was viewed much like spatial or verbal intelligence, except it operated with emotional components (Caruso, Mayer, & Salovey, 2002). Emotional Intelligence arose from both cognitive and emotion systems, in which the cognitive system carried out abstract reasoning about emotions, while the emotion system enhanced cognitive capacity. Typically, individuals high in emotional intelligence had the ability to perceive, understand, and manage emotions and allow emotions to facilitate their thought (Mayer, 2001).

BarOn (1997) stated that emotional intelligence was concerned with relating to and understanding others and adapting and coping with people's surroundings in order to become more successful in dealing with environmental demands. Emotional intelligence helped predict job success because it reflected how people applied emotional knowledge to an immediate situation (BarOn, 1997). Emotional well being was increasingly recognized as a predictor of success in school, family, and work life (BarOn, 2000).

Goleman (1995) defined emotional intelligence, at the most general level, as the "ability to recognize and regulate emotions in ourselves and in others" (p. 101). In his book *Emotional Intelligence*, Goleman expressed the argument that IQ was not the only critical factor that determined individual successes. Instead, he believed that emotional intelligence played a large role in people's successes in life and on the job.

Emotional Intelligence and Job Performance. According to Goleman (1998), the framework of emotional intelligence that translated into job satisfaction and on the job success were the skills of self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship

management. This model was based on emotional intelligence competences that were identified in internal research at corporations and organizations as distinguishing outstanding performers from average performers. The self-awareness cluster included the competencies of emotional self-awareness, self-assessment, and self-confidence. People with accurate self-awareness were aware of their abilities and limitations, sought feedback, and learned from their mistakes. They knew where they needed to improve and when to work with others who complemented their strengths. Accurate self-awareness was found in virtually every outstanding employee (Goleman, 1998). The positive impact of self-confidence was shown among supervisors, managers, and executives and distinguished the best from the average performers. Among 112 entry-level accountants, those with the highest sense of self-confidence were rated by their supervisors 10 months later as having superior performance (Goleman).

The cluster of self-management included the competencies of self-control, trustworthiness, conscientiousness, adaptability, achievement, drive, and initiative. A sign that people possessed the characteristics of this cluster was that they were unfazed in stressful situations or dealt with a hostile person without lashing out in return. Employees with strong control over themselves and the events in their lives were less likely to become angry or depressed when faced with job stress. Superior performers tended to respond calmly to angry attacks by a client and were able to balance their drive and ambition with self-control. Individuals who exhibited competencies in this cluster were also set apart as superior executives (Goleman, 1998).

Social Awareness manifested into three competencies: empathy, service, and organizational awareness. The sensitivity to others was critical for superior job performance whenever the focus was on interactions with others. For example, physicians who were better at

recognizing emotions in patients were more successful than their colleagues who were less sensitive (Goleman, 1998). Outstanding performers in most organizations shared the ability of organizational awareness. People's abilities to read situations objectively and free from their own biases allowed them to respond effectively. In addition, members of successful sales teams were able to combine taking the customer's point of view while showing appropriate assertiveness in order to steer the customer toward a choice that was beneficial for both the customer and vendor (Goleman, 1998).

Relationship management included the competencies of influence, communication, conflict management, leadership, change catalyst, building bonds, and collaboration. With this competence, outstanding performers drew on a wider range of persuasion strategies than others (Goleman, 1995). Data on managers and executives showed that the more effective people executed this competence, the more others preferred to work with them (Goleman, 1998). In addition, those who exhibited this competence were able to articulate and arouse enthusiasm for a shared vision and mission and guided the performance of others to take more initiative.

Summary

In summary, a review of the literature showed that a job satisfaction problem existed among teachers. Specifically, many teachers were leaving the teaching profession due to teacher job dissatisfaction. Research was conducted to address teacher job satisfaction; however, these studies have focused on workplace conditions, leadership, job stress, motivation, gender issues, and differences in grade level and teaching populations. With the supporting evidence that emotional intelligence was closely related to and a predictor of job satisfaction, the current researcher investigated relations among emotional intelligence, teacher job satisfaction and teaching experience.

Hypotheses

The following were proposed hypotheses of the current study:

1. Teacher job satisfaction will be positively correlated with emotional intelligence; and
2. Years of teaching experience will be positively correlated with emotional intelligence and job satisfaction in teachers.

Chapter III

Method

Participants

The sample for this study consisted of 101 school teachers who were currently teaching in a public school setting. This sample was selected from volunteer school teachers who were enrolled in graduate courses at Western Kentucky University and other practicing school teachers from south central Kentucky.

Recruitment: In order to recruit teachers to participate in the current study, flyers were hung on bulletin boards in Tate Page Hall, where Western Kentucky University education graduate courses were held. These participants completed the surveys in the presence of this examiner during the summer of 2003. For those participants not enrolled in graduate courses at Western Kentucky University, flyers were placed in their school mailboxes and e-mails were sent to these teachers. Each teacher completed the surveys on his or her own time and returned the surveys to this examiner. These surveys were completed during the fall semester of 2003.

Materials

The primary instruments utilized in this study were a researcher defined demographic survey, the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), and the BarOn Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) Self Report Scale.

Demographic Survey. The demographic survey (see Appendix A) was developed by this investigator and was used to gather general information about each teacher.

Job Descriptive Index (JDI). The Job Descriptive Index, a measure of employees' satisfaction with their present job, is a widely used measure of job satisfaction (Balzer, et al., 1997). The JDI focused on job satisfaction and had a total of five scales, each of which represented distinct components of job satisfaction. The individual scales on the JDI were:

present job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, opportunities for promotion, supervision satisfaction, and coworker satisfaction. Present job satisfaction measured the employee's satisfaction with the work itself. Pay satisfaction referred to the employee's attitude toward pay and was based on the perceived difference between expected pay and actual pay. Opportunities for promotion was the employee's satisfaction with the company's promotion policy and the administration. This particular scale was not used in the current study because there was no clear opportunity for promotion among teachers. Supervision satisfaction assessed the employees' satisfaction with their supervisor. This type of satisfaction was based on how considerate and competent the supervisor was perceived to be by the employee. Coworker satisfaction assessed the level of employee satisfaction with fellow coworkers. Work related interaction and mutual liking among coworkers determined satisfaction on this particular scale (Balzer, et al., 1997). Each scale of the JDI was distinct and could be used independently from one another.

Job Descriptive Index Scale Format. The format of the Job Descriptive Index was presented in an adjective/short phrase checklist form. A total of 63 items on this scale were used in the current study; 18 items for present job satisfaction, supervision satisfaction, and coworker satisfaction, and 9 items for pay satisfaction. Items on the Job Descriptive Index were five words or less and of low reading difficulty. Teachers marked 0, 1, or 3 corresponding with a N, ?, or Y based on whether they thought the item applied to their current job. The Job Descriptive Index took approximately five minutes for the participants to complete (Balzer, et al., 1997). A copy of the Job Descriptive Index is included in Appendix B and is used with the permission of its authors.

Job Descriptive Index Scoring. Each scale was scored separately and numerical variables were assigned to employee responses; (Y = 3, N = 0, ? = 1 for positive items). Unfavorable items

were reverse scored; (Y = 0, N = 3, ? = 1). The possible range for scores on each scale was 0-54; scores on the pay satisfaction scale was doubled because it contained half as many items as the other scales. Scores on the individual scales were summed and scores on all components yielded an individual score for that particular component. The scores were not added to yield an overall job satisfaction score because one component compensated for another and assumed equal weights of the components (Balzer, et al., 1997).

Interpretation of the Job Descriptive Index. When interpreting the results of the JDI, a score of 27, per scale, was considered to be the neutral point. A score above or below this neutral point indicated either general satisfaction or general dissatisfaction (Balzer, et al. 1997). Moreover, a score above 27 indicated general satisfaction, whereas a score below 27 indicated general dissatisfaction.

Validity and Reliability of the Job Descriptive Index. This scale was normed using a stratified random sampling procedure. Norms were developed based on a sample of 1,737 workers from a variety of occupations. This scale included both discriminant and convergent validity. Evidence of discriminant validity required the Job Descriptive Index to distinguish satisfaction with pay from satisfaction with work and distinguished these from satisfaction with other aspects of the job. Evidence of convergent validity required the Job Descriptive Index and other similar measures using different methods that assessed satisfaction were significantly similar (Balzer, et al., 1997). Validity was assessed using a modification of the Campbell-Fiske model for establishing convergent and discriminant validity. Items loading on relevant factors were higher than loadings on irrelevant factors, which indicated that the components of this scale focused on discriminable aspects of jobs. With regard to convergent validity, the JDI was identified by the loading of different measures intended to cover the same aspects on the

appropriate components. The average internal consistency, Cronbach's alpha, for all five facets of the Job Descriptive Index was $\alpha = .88$ with some estimates as high as $\alpha = .92$ and the test-retest reliability was approximated at $\alpha = .65$ (Balzer, et al.).

BarOn EQ-i Self Report Scale. This scale defined and assessed the skills that comprised emotional intelligence. It had the capacity to assess an individual's general degree of emotional intelligence, potential for emotional health, and present psychological well being (BarOn, 2000, p. 1). Components on the BarOn EQ-i Scale included five broad categories and these broad categories were further divided into sub-categories. There were a total of fifteen subcategories on the BarOn EQ-i Self Report Scale and are defined in Appendix C.

BarOn EQ-i Scale Format. This scale had 133 questions, which measured people's emotional intelligence and employed a five-point Lickert scale ranging from "very seldom or not true of me" to "very often true of me or true of me" (BarOn, 2000). The reading level of this scale was assessed and determined to be at a sixth grade level. This particular scale was designed for individuals age seventeen years of age and older. It took approximately 40 minutes to complete this self-report measure. Multi Health Services (MHS) reserved all rights to the BarOn EQ-i Scale (2000). For this reason, a copy of this scale was not included in the Appendix.

BarOn EQ-i Scoring. The scores were computer generated and the results were displayed in verbal, numeric, and graphic fashion followed by a report. The raw scores on this scale were converted to standard scores based on a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. Average to above average scores suggested that people were effective in emotional and social functioning and were emotionally and socially intelligent. The higher the scores, the more positive prediction for effective functioning in meeting environmental demands and stressors (BarOn,

2000). Low scores (85 or below) on this scale suggested that one may have difficulty succeeding in life and experienced social, emotional, and behavioral problems. Low scores on stress tolerance, impulse control, reality testing, and problem solving were considered problematic for coping with one's environment.

Validity and Reliability of the BarOn EQ-i . This scale was normed on a large and representative sample of the North American population including nearly 4,000 participants in the United States and Canada and published in 1997 (BarOn, 2000). This scale included a total of four validity indicators: Omission Rate (the number of omitted responses), Inconsistency Index (the degree of inconsistency between similar types of items), Positive Impression (the tendency to give an exaggerated positive response), and Negative Impression (the tendency to give an exaggerated negative response). This scale had a built-in correlation factor that automatically adjusted the scale scores based on the Positive Impression and Negative Impression Scale scores. No scales from the current study were excluded.

The average intercorrelation of the fifteen subscales is .50, which indicated a fairly high intercorrelation among factors (BarOn, 2000). The internal consistency of the EQ-i scales was examined on several population samples and the average Cronbach alpha coefficients are high for all of the subscales ranging from $\alpha = .69$ on social responsibility to $\alpha = .86$ on self-regard. The overall average internal consistency coefficient was $\alpha = .76$. The test-retest reliability for the EQ-i Scale was $\alpha = .73$.

Procedure

Teachers who expressed interest in participating in this research experiment were asked to sign an Assent Form, which is located in Appendix D. Teachers were also asked to complete a demographic survey, which was used for data analysis, the BarOn EQ-i Self Report Scale, and

the Job Descriptive Index (JDI). Each instrument was assigned a code number which served as the teacher's identification code, since no identifiable information was placed on either form. Teachers either picked up a packet containing the three instruments and a response sheet for the BarOn EQ-i Self Report Scale, or a packet was personally delivered to the teacher. This researcher explained to each teacher that this research experiment received prior approval from the Western Kentucky University Human Subjects Review Board and the directions were explained verbatim, as presented on the instruments. Once these instruments were completed, the teachers returned them to this researcher.

Chapter IV

Results

Descriptive Statistics

The sample (N = 101) of teachers consisted primarily of females (n = 92). The vast majority of teachers were Caucasian (n = 87) followed by African American (n = 14). The majority of teachers taught in suburban areas (n = 74), followed by rural areas (n = 22) and urban areas (n = 5). All teachers, except one, taught in a public school setting (n = 100). Of the teachers in the study, 62 taught at the elementary school grade level, 4 taught at the middle school grade level and 35 taught at the high school grade level. Regular education teachers (n = 60) made up the majority of the population, followed by special education teachers (n = 29), 10 taught both regular and special education, and 2 teachers taught gifted/talented. Mentoring was received by 56 of the teachers. Self-report concerning their satisfaction with mentoring, 15 reported that they were satisfied, 17 were somewhat satisfied, 13 were undecided, and 11 were somewhat dissatisfied.

Teachers in this study taught a variety of subjects including: band, biology, English, health, history, journalism, language, Latin, math, practical living, psychology, reading, science, social studies, spelling, and writing. When asked if they ever considered a career change, 64 teachers stated that they had considered a career change. Many of the teachers that considered a change were undecided in an area of interest. Other teachers contemplated a career change to one of the following areas: business, child development, chemistry, Christian ministry, counseling, computer technology, consultation, editing, higher education, photography, publishing, non profit organization, private tutoring, school administration, social work, therapy,

author, sales, and serving as a full time mother and wife. Teachers were also asked to rate their teaching and job enjoyment. Teachers reported greater enjoyment of teaching (n = 49) than the job itself (n = 31). A summary of demographic data and self-report data are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Demographics of Teachers in Current Study (N = 101 for each category)

Demographic Category	n
Gender	
Male	9
Female	92
Race	
African-American	14
Caucasian	87
Geographical Area	
Rural	22
Suburban	74
Urban	5
School Type	
Public	100
Private	1
Grade Level	
Elementary	62
Middle	4
High	35

Table 1 (cont.)

Demographic Category	n
Teaching Population	
Regular Education	60
Special Education	29
Both	10
Gifted	2
Career Change Considered	
Yes	64
No	37
Mentoring Received	
Yes	56
No	45
Satisfaction with Mentoring	
Very Satisfied	15
Somewhat Satisfied	17
Neutral	13
Somewhat Dissatisfied	11
Very Dissatisfied	0

Table 1 (cont.)

Demographic Category	n
Teaching Enjoyment	
Enjoy	49
Somewhat Enjoy	29
Undecided	12
Somewhat Dislike	10
Dislike	1
Job Enjoyment	
Enjoy	31
Somewhat Enjoy	40
Undecided	20
Somewhat Dislike	10
Dislike	0

Note. N = 101 for each category

The mean years of teaching experience were 12.37 years with a standard deviation of 8.43, and the mean age of participants was 40 years, with the mean years of education being 7 years. The mean number of graduate hours was 42.38. The mean number of jobs that the teachers held over their teaching career was 2.53 and the mean years that teachers planned or estimated to continue teaching was 34.70. These means and standard deviations are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Demographic Data

Demographic	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Years of Teaching Experience	12.37	8.40
Age	40.00	10.19
Years of Education	7.00	4.00
Number of Graduate Hours	42.38	24.44
Number of Teaching Jobs	2.53	2.35
Years Planning to Teach	34.70	31.85

Note: N = 101 for each group.

The means and standard deviations for the six dependent variables of job satisfaction (teaching enjoyment, job enjoyment, present job satisfaction, supervision satisfaction, pay satisfaction, and coworker satisfaction) are presented in Table 3, and the means and standard deviations for the total, broad categories, and subcategories of the BarOn EQ-i Self Report Scale are presented in Table 4. Overall, the teachers in this study enjoyed teaching, were satisfied with their present job, supervision, and coworkers, somewhat enjoyed their jobs, and were neutral about their salary. Teachers' emotional intelligence scores ranged from a low of 73 (extremely underdeveloped emotional capacity) to a high of 126 (extremely well developed emotional capacity). The mean emotional intelligence scores for all teachers fell in the average range for all areas on the emotional intelligence measure, which suggested that teachers, as a collective group, have normal emotional capacity.

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for Teacher Job Satisfaction

Job Satisfaction	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Demographic ^a		
Teaching Enjoyment	1.86	1.04
Job Enjoyment	2.09	.95
Job Descriptive Index (JDI) ^b		
Present Job Satisfaction	42.54	10.22
Supervision Satisfaction	37.44	11.99
Pay Satisfaction	27.27	12.70
Coworker Satisfaction	37.91	11.81

Note: ^a= scale range 1 (high) – 5 (low); ^b= scale range 0 – 54; N = 101.

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations for BarOn EQ-i Self Report Scale

Total/Category/Subcategory	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Total EQ	102.65	11.17
Intrapersonal		
Emotional Self Awareness	106.09	11.91
Self Actualization	102.12	13.16
Self Regard	96.88	13.56
Assertiveness	99.04	14.23
Independence	98.84	14.06

Table 4 (cont.)

Total/Category/Subcategory	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Interpersonal	107.12	9.74
Empathy	107.94	10.73
Interpersonal Relationships	104.41	11.65
Social Responsibility	108.34	8.64
Adaptability	102.20	12.97
Problem Solving	101.44	13.40
Reality Testing	104.54	11.27
Flexibility	99.00	13.83
Stress Management	101.22	11.32
Stress Tolerance	99.61	11.89
Impulse Control	102.87	11.98
General Mood	102.71	10.71
Optimism	102.20	10.80
Happiness	103.08	10.94

Note: N = 101.

Inferential Statistics

The hypotheses stated for this study were: 1) emotional intelligence will be positively correlated with teacher job satisfaction, and 2) years of teaching experience will be positively correlated with emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. Pearson Product Moment Correlation coefficients (one-tailed) were computed to address these hypotheses. To address the first hypothesis that emotional intelligence was positively correlated with teacher job satisfaction,

correlation coefficients were computed for the independent variable, Total EQ, and the dependent variables, job enjoyment, and present job satisfaction. The Pearson Product Moment correlation analyses (one-tailed) of $r = -.304$; $p = .001$ was significant for Total EQ and job enjoyment. Although there appears to be a negative correlation, for the single self-report items (job enjoyment and teaching enjoyment) low numbers indicate greater satisfaction. The results suggest that teachers with higher emotional intelligence also reported greater enjoyment of their job. The Pearson Product Moment correlation analyses of the Total EQ and present job satisfaction revealed that $r = .145$; $p = .073$. These results suggested that although there was not a significant relationship, there appeared to be a trend showing that Total EQ was positively related to present job satisfaction.

For the second hypothesis, years of teaching experience were positively correlated with emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficients were computed for Total EQ, years of teaching experience, job enjoyment, and present job satisfaction. The correlation analyses of $r = .164$; $p = .051$ was significant for Total EQ and years of teaching experience. This suggested that teachers with more years of teaching experience had higher levels of emotional intelligence. There appears to be a trend among years of teaching experience and present job satisfaction, $r = .138$; $p = .084$. Years of teaching experience had no effect on job enjoyment, $r = -.108$; $p = .141$.

Exploratory analyses to identify variables affecting job satisfaction were conducted. A MANCOVA was run to examine both potential covariate and independent variables. A MANCOVA was conducted because there were six dependent variables (job enjoyment, teaching enjoyment, present job satisfaction, supervision satisfaction, coworker satisfaction, and pay satisfaction) used in this study. Potential covariates examined were Total EQ, years of

teaching experience, and years planning to teach. Potential independent variables examined were race, geographical area, grade level, mentoring received, and consideration of a career change. These results are reported below.

Emotional intelligence was a significant covariate for teaching enjoyment, $F(1,72) = 7.51$; $p = .009$; $\eta^2 = .090$. Teachers with higher levels of emotional intelligence also reported higher levels of teaching enjoyment.

Years of teaching experience was a significant covariate for coworker satisfaction, $F(1, 72) = 4.322$; $p = .041$; $\eta^2 = .057$. As years of teaching experience increased, teachers reported increased satisfaction with their coworkers.

Years planning to teach was a significant covariate for job enjoyment, $F(1, 72) = 9.666$; $p = .003$, $\eta^2 = .118$. The longer teachers planned to teach, the more they enjoyed their job.

There was a significant difference between the two races for the dependent variable of teaching enjoyment, $F(1,72) = 4.984$; $p = .029$; $\eta^2 = .065$. Caucasian teachers ($M = 1.702$) reported enjoying teaching more than African-American teachers ($M = 2.489$).

A significant difference occurred between the two races for the dependent variable of satisfaction with supervision, $F(1,72) = 9.531$; $p = .003$; $\eta^2 = .117$. Caucasian teachers ($M = 38.637$) also reported more satisfaction with supervision than African American teachers ($M = 29.361$).

There was a significant difference between the three grade levels (elementary, middle, high) where a teacher taught, for the dependent variable satisfaction with pay, $F(2,72) = 4.357$; $p = .016$; $\eta^2 = .108$. Middle school teachers ($M = 34.503$) reported the most satisfaction with pay, followed by high school teachers ($M = 29.896$) then elementary teachers ($M = 22.492$).

A significant difference occurred between teachers that received mentoring for the

dependent variable job enjoyment, $F(1,72) = 6.264$; $p = .015$; $\eta^2 = .080$. Teachers that previously had mentors ($M = 2.232$) enjoyed their job less than teachers who did not have mentors ($M = 1.746$).

A significant interaction occurred among teachers that had mentors and the geographical area (rural, suburban, urban) where they taught, for the dependent variable job enjoyment, $F(1,72) = 6.537$; $p = .013$; $\eta^2 = .083$. Teachers that received mentoring and worked in urban areas ($M = 1.748$) reported greater job enjoyment than teachers that received mentoring and worked in suburban ($M = 2.230$) and rural ($M = 2.478$) areas. This pattern changed for teachers who did not have mentors. Teachers in rural areas ($M = 1.656$) reported greater job enjoyment followed by teachers in urban ($M = 1.715$) and suburban ($M = 1.811$) areas. These results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Means for the Interaction of the Independent Variables Mentoring and Geographical Area for the Dependent Variable Job Enjoyment

Geographical Area	Mentoring	
	Yes	No
Rural	2.478	1.656
Suburban	2.230	1.811
Urban	1.748	1.715

Note. Scale range 1 (high) to 5 (low).

There was a significant interaction among teachers that received mentoring and the three grade levels where they taught (elementary, middle, high) for the dependent variable of teaching enjoyment, $F(2,72) = 3.381$; $p = .039$; $\eta^2 = .086$. Elementary school teachers that received

mentoring ($M = 1.674$) reported greater enjoyment of teaching than high school ($M = 2.008$) and middle school teachers ($M = 3.360$) who also received mentoring. This pattern changed for teachers who did not have mentors. Middle school teachers ($M = .597$) reported greater teaching enjoyment than high school ($M = 1.819$) and elementary school ($M = 1.955$) teachers. These results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Means for the Interaction of the Independent Variables Grade Level and Mentoring for the Dependent Variable Teaching Enjoyment

Grade Level	Mentoring	
	Yes	No
Elementary	1.674	1.955
Middle	3.360	.597
High	2.008	1.819

Note. Scale range 1 (high) to 5 (low).

A significant interaction occurred among the teacher's grade level and mentoring received for the dependent variable job enjoyment, $F(2,72) = 5.435$; $p = .006$; $\eta^2 = .131$. High school teachers that received mentoring ($M = 1.827$) reported more job enjoyment than elementary ($M = 2.329$) and middle ($M = 2.856$) school teachers that also received mentoring. This pattern changed for teachers that did not have mentors. Middle school teachers ($M = .642$) reported greater job enjoyment than elementary ($M = 1.719$) and high school teachers ($M = 2.061$). These results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Means for the Interaction of the Independent Variables Grade Level and Mentoring for the Dependent Variable Job Enjoyment

Grade Level	Mentoring	
	Yes	No
Elementary	2.329	1.719
Middle	2.856	.642
High	1.827	2.061

Note. Scale range 1 (high) to 5 (low).

There was a significant interaction among geographical area where the teachers taught (rural, suburban, urban) and their consideration of changing careers for the dependent variable satisfaction of coworkers $F(1, 72) = 4.375; p = .040; \eta^2 = .057$. Teachers considering a career change in suburban areas ($M = 40.151$) reported greater satisfaction with coworkers than teachers considering career changes in urban ($M = 32.502$) and rural ($M = 25.536$) areas. This pattern changed for teachers not considering a career change. Teachers in urban areas ($M = 44.429$) reported greater coworker satisfaction than teachers in rural ($M = 38.231$) and suburban ($M = 34.622$) settings. These results are presented in Table 8.

Table 8

Means for the Interaction of the Independent Variables Geographical Area and Career Change for the Dependent Variable – JDI Coworker Satisfaction

Geographical Area	Career Change	
	Yes	No
Rural	25.536	38.231
Suburban	40.151	34.622
Urban	32.502	44.429

Note. Scale range = 0 – 54

A significant interaction was shown among teachers that had mentors and those who considered a change in career for the dependent variable of coworker satisfaction, $F(1,72) = 4.781$; $p = .032$; $\eta^2 = .062$. Teachers who had mentors and considered a career change ($M = 36.898$) reported greater coworker satisfaction than teachers who had mentors and did not considered a career change ($M = 32.987$). This pattern changed for teachers who did not have mentors. Teachers who had no mentor and considered no career change ($M = 40.296$) reported greater satisfaction of coworkers than teachers who had no mentors and considered changing careers ($M = 31.255$). These results are presented in Table 9.

Table 9

Means for the Interaction of the Independent Variables Mentoring and Career Change for the Dependent Variable - JDI Coworker Satisfaction

Mentoring	Career Change	
	Yes	No
Yes	36.898	32.987
No	31.255	40.296

Note. Scale range = 0 – 54

Additional correlations (one-tailed) among the various emotional intelligence scores and the dependent variables of teaching enjoyment, job enjoyment, present job satisfaction, supervision satisfaction, pay satisfaction, and coworker satisfaction were examined. It was decided to identify correlations with at least a medium effect size. The criteria chosen was based on Cohen's (1988) assertion that correlation values of .3 or higher are considered to be of medium effect size. Only three EQ subscales met the aforementioned criteria, intrapersonal EQ, self-actualization, and reality testing. The results of the correlational analyses showed that teachers who were better self-actualizers reported greater teaching enjoyment, $r = -.312$, and job enjoyment, $r = -.450$, and were also more satisfied with their present job, $r = .376$. As intrapersonal emotional intelligence increased, teachers reported greater job enjoyment, $r = -.294$, and as reality testing increased, coworker satisfaction increased, $r = .295$. For further details on correlations for EQ scores and dependent variables, refer to Table 10.

Table 10
Correlations for EQ - i Scores and Dependent Variables

	ET	EJ	PJ	SU	PP	CW
EQ	-.100	-.304**	.145	.015	.046	.120
RA	-.047	-.294**	.152	-.104	.083	.022
ER	-.144	-.158	.033	0.13	-.158	.180*
AD	-.094	-.223**	.127	.140	-.004	.107
SM	.034	-.193*	.057	.130	.149	.111
GM	-.013	-.198*	-.025	-.082	.024	.197*
ES	.012	-.161	.022	-.089	-.029	.117
SA	-.312**	-.450**	.376**	-.026	.068	.004
SR	.015	-.208	.081	-.156	.149	-.010
AS	.148	-.101	-.058	-.114	.069	.004
IN	-.012	-.155	.105	.011	.022	-.026
EM	-.309	-.238*	.211*	.034	-.014	.184*
IR	.014	-.092	-.097	-.056	-.141	.095
RE	-.179*	-.090	.079	.140	-.199*	.199*
PS	-.097	-.162	.085	.167*	.071	.012
RT	-.163	-.154	.212*	.226*	-.016	.295**
FL	.014	-.237**	.023	-.031	-.060	-.036
ST	.100	-.173*	-.002	.148	.165*	.106
IC	-.061	-.153	.121	.073	.075	.084
OP	-.015	-.171*	-.058	-.099	-.016	.134
HA	-.030	-.199*	.024	-.026	.065	.223*

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$, one - tailed test. The following are explanations of abbreviations: ET = enjoy teaching; EJ = enjoy job; PJ = present job; SU = supervision; PP = present pay; CW = coworker; EQ = total emotional intelligence; RA = intrapersonal; ER = interpersonal; AD = adaptability; SM = stress management; GM = general mood; ES = emotional self-awareness; SA = self- actualization; SR = self- regard; AS = assertiveness; IN = independence; EM = empathy; IR = interpersonal relationships; RE = social responsibility; PS = problem solving; RT = reality testing; FL = flexibility; ST = stress tolerance; IC = impulse control; OP = optimism; HA = happiness.

Discussion

To date there appears to have been no studies conducted on the effects of emotional intelligence with job satisfaction in teachers. This researcher set out to determine whether emotional intelligence plays a significant role in teachers' perception of their job satisfaction and how this may affect teacher retention. The present study expands the literature on the effectiveness of emotional intelligence with teacher job satisfaction. Analysis of the data supports the hypothesis that emotional intelligence is positively correlated with self-report measures of job enjoyment. It appears that although not statistically significant, the trend supporting the notion that emotional intelligence is positively related with present job satisfaction suggests that emotional intelligence does make a difference in how teachers perceive their satisfaction on the job. Deeter-Schmelz and Sojka (2003) also found trends, but no significant difference, that emotional intelligence was related to job satisfaction in salespeople. In addition, studies conducted by Hendee (2002), Feyerherm and Rice (2002) and Donaldsofeider and Bond (2004) found no significance that emotional intelligence was related to job satisfaction.

The results of this study also support the hypothesis that emotional intelligence is positively correlated with years of teaching experience. This suggests that teachers who intend on staying in the teaching profession longer than their fellow colleagues could possibly possess higher emotional intelligence. However, the results of this study do not support the hypothesis that years of teaching experience is positively correlated with teacher job satisfaction, although there appears to be a trend in this data. This finding is also supported in the literature of Klecker and Loadman (1999). They too, found no significant difference among years of teaching experience and job satisfaction. In addition, years of teaching experience have no bearing on

self-report measures of job enjoyment.

Interesting enough, the results of this study reveal that teachers with high emotional intelligence also report high levels of teaching enjoyment. This makes sense. This researcher offers the following explanation: if teachers possess high emotional intelligence, they should also have a positive outlook on their work environment and current situations at work. This could possibly explain why teachers with high emotional intelligence also report greater teaching enjoyment than other teachers with lower emotional intelligence.

The results of the current study also indicate that teachers who have more years of teaching experience also report increased satisfaction with their coworkers. An explanation for this finding is that the longer teachers work in the same school building and become more acclimated to the school system, the more opportunity they have to build positive relationships with their fellow colleagues. These positive relationships would suggest an increase in satisfaction with coworkers.

The more teachers enjoy their job, the longer they plan to teach. Usually, if people enjoy doing something, they are more committed to the task. This result shows just that. When teachers enjoy their job, they anticipate doing that job for a longer duration of time.

Once the demographic information is presented, it shows that Caucasian teachers report greater enjoyment of teaching and more satisfaction with supervision than African-American teachers. The only explanation that this researcher can offer is that there may be cultural differences among these groups in how they perceive their role as a teacher and the supervision they received. This could possibly suggest that it may be more difficult to retain African-American teachers than Caucasian teachers. Since today's society is becoming more diverse along with the shortage of African-American teachers (Colbert & Wolff, 1992), efforts must be

put into place to retain this population of teachers.

Another interesting result that this study yields is that middle school teachers are more satisfied with pay than elementary and high school teachers. Perhaps middle school teachers feel that they are fairly compensated for their efforts and the work that they do. Maybe elementary and high school teachers feel that they have an excessive amount of “unusual” duties for their particular job and are not adequately compensated. Elementary school teachers may feel more like caretakers than actual teachers. For instance, teachers of young elementary students in particular, have to wipe students’ noses when they have a cold, take them back and forth to the restroom, make sure they stand and walk in a single file line, and ensure their safety during recess. High school teachers, on the other hand, may have to deal with student attitudinal issues (Tye & O’Brien, 2002). Since students at the high school level are considered to be young adults, it may be difficult for these students to take directions and follow rules from an authority figure.

In summary, the goals of the present study were to discover whether emotional intelligence was correlated with job satisfaction in teachers and to present global and exploratory data on these two constructs. The results of this study support that emotional intelligence does play a significant role in how teachers perceive their jobs based on self-report measures. If teachers’ emotional intelligence is low, perhaps remedial and in-service trainings can be implemented to assist teachers in increasing their emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1998), which will ultimately increase their job satisfaction. If interventions such as these are implemented in public school settings, the retention rate among effective teachers may increase (BarOn, 1997).

Strengths of this study

There are several strengths of this study. Since there are few, if any, studies to date

addressing the issue to emotional intelligence and job satisfaction in teachers, the fact that this study was conducted is a strength in itself. There is now literature to increase the knowledge of school administrators that will provide information that can lead to an increase in the teacher retention rate in public schools. This study also presented itself as a learning opportunity for its participants. Because of their participation in this study, teachers are now aware of the concept of emotional intelligence and how it may play a role in their success and satisfaction on the job. Other strengths of the study include the use of valid and reliable scales and a 100% return rate.

This result of this study may increase life long learning among those in the educational field. If educators are aware that emotional intelligence is positively correlated with self-report measures of job satisfaction, teachers may be interested in ways to become involved in remedial and retraining programs that could possible increase their emotional intelligence.

Limitations of this study

There are some limitations to this study. The limited number of males ($n = 9$), African-Americans ($n = 14$), teachers in urban areas ($n = 5$), and middle school teachers ($n = 4$) participating in this study was a limitation. Perhaps, if more from each group were in the sample population, the outcomes pertaining to each group may have presented different results. An additional limitation may be that the teachers were not truthful in their responses to some of the questions on either scale. Finally, since teachers volunteered their time and participation in the study and were not randomly selected, this could be a possible indication that those participating possessed higher emotional intelligence than teachers who did not participate in this study. Thus, this sample would not be representative of all public school teachers.

Future Research

Only one private school teacher participated in the study which offers suggestions for

future research. It would be interesting to know whether the outcomes of the current study also apply to teachers in a private school setting and whether the same trends and patterns exist.

Other ideas for future research would include conducting this study with teachers who have left the teaching profession, but taught two or more years. Do teachers in the group possess lower emotional intelligence than participants in the current study? It would also be interesting to see if those teachers who receive mentoring for their first year of teaching and decide to remain in the field possess high emotional intelligence. Lastly, this investigator offers conducting a study assessing teachers' emotional intelligence and teacher effectiveness. Are teachers with higher levels of emotional intelligence more effective on the job?

For those teachers with low emotional intelligence, it would be interesting to see if teachers' emotional intelligence increases significantly after implementation of workshops and in-service trainings that were aimed at specifically increasing teachers' emotional intelligence. Additional future research would include looking more in depth at the EQ subscales and discovering which subscale scores are higher in teachers at various stages of their career and discovering patterns of how this changes over time. For example, do elementary school teachers, early in their career possess higher general mood EQ, which involves optimism and happiness, and does this change later in their career to show higher levels of adaptability EQ, which involves problems solving, reality testing, and flexibility? It would be interesting to see whether different patterns persist among different groups of teachers.

References

- Balzer, W., Kihm, J., Smith, P., Irwin, J., Bachiochi, P., Robi, C., et al. (1997). *User's manual for the job descriptive index and the job in general scales*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University.
- BarOn, R. (1997). *EQ-i BarOn emotional quotient inventory technical manual*. Multi- Health Systems Inc., Toronto.
- BarOn, R., & Parker, J. (2000). *The handbook of emotional intelligence: Theory, development, assessment, and application at home, school, and in the workplace*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Bavendam Research, Inc (2000). Managing job satisfaction. Special Reports: Effective Management Through Measurement, Retrieved February 18, 2003, from <http://www.employeesatisfactions.com>.
- Boyatzis, R., Goleman, D., & Rhee, K. (2000). Clustering competence in emotional intelligence: Insights for the emotional competence inventory. In R. Bar-On and J. Parker, *Handbook of Emotional Intelligence*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Carter, S. (1994). Teacher stress and burnout. Organizing systems to support competent social behavior in children and youth, 3, 79 – 84. Retrieved February 6, 2003, from <http://interact.uoregon.edu/wrrc/Burnout.html>.
- Caruso, D., Mayer, J., & Salovey, P. (2002). Relation of an ability measure of emotional intelligence to personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 79, 306-320.
- Colbert, J., & Wolff, D. (1992). Surviving in urban schools. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 43, 193-199.

- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed). Hillsdale, N.J.: LEA Publishers.
- Davis, J., & Wilson, S. (2000, July/August). Principals' efforts to empower teachers: Effects on teacher motivation and job satisfaction and stress. *The Clearing House*, 73, 349-353.
- Deeter-Schmelz, D. R., & Sojka, J. Z. (2003). Developing effective salespeople: Exploring the link between emotional intelligence and sales performance. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 11, 211-221.
- Donaldson-Feider, E. J., & Bond, F. W. (2004). The relative importance of psychological acceptance and emotional intelligence to workplace well being. *British Journal of Guidance & Counseling*, 32, 187-204.
- Farber, B. (1991). *Crisis in education stress and burnout in the American teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Feyerherm, A. E., & Rice, C. L. (2002). Emotional intelligence and team performance: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 10, 343-363.
- Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Hendee, S. S. (2002). Measurement of differences in emotional intelligence and job satisfaction of practicing chefs and culinary educators as measures by the Mayer-Salovey-Curuso emotional intelligence test and Spector's job satisfaction survey. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A. Humanities and Social Sciences*, 63, 916-918.
- Iwanicki, E. (2001). Understanding and alleviating teacher burnout. *Theory Into Practice*, 22,

27-32.

Jones, W. (2002, February). Making a difference through teaching. *Black Collegian*, 32, 2-4.

Klecker, B. and Loadman, W. (1999). Male elementary school teachers' rating of job satisfaction by years of teaching experience. *Education*, 119, 70-77.

Latham, A. (1998, February). Teacher satisfaction. *Educational Leadership*, 68, 123 - 126.

Mayer, J. (2001, April). Emotional intelligence and giftedness. *Roeper Review*, 23, 97-103.

Mayer, J., Caruso, D., & Sitarenios, G. (2001). Emotional intelligence as a standard intelligence. *Emotion*, 1, 232-242.

Mayer, J., & Salovey, P. (1993). The intelligence of emotional intelligence. *Intelligence*, 17, 433- 442.

Mayer, J., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Implications for educators*. New York: Basic Books.

Meek, A. (1998, February). America's teachers: much to celebrate. *Educational Leadership*, 25, 125-129.

Mertler, C. (2002). Job satisfaction and perception of motivation among middle and high school teachers. *American Secondary Education*, 31, 43-53.

Perie, M., Baker, D., & Whitener, S. (1997). Job satisfaction among America's teachers: Effects of workplace conditions, background characteristics, and teacher compensation. *Educational Leadership*, 25, 90-110.

Roberts, R., Zeidner, M., & Matthews, D. (2001). Does emotional intelligence meet traditional standards for and intelligence? Some new data and conclusions. *Emotion*, 1, 196-231.

Shann, M. (1998). Professional commitment and satisfaction among teachers in urban middle schools. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 92, 67-75.

- Singh, K., & Billingsley, B. (1996). Intent to stay teaching. *Remedial and Special Education, 17*, 37-53.
- Sparks, D. (2001). Practical solutions for teacher stress. *Theory Into Practice, 22*, 33- 42.
- Stempien, L., & Loeb, R. (2002). Differences in job satisfaction between general education and special education teachers. *Remedial and Special Education, 23*, 258-268.
- Syptak, J., Marsland, D., & Ulmer, D. (1999, October). Job satisfaction: putting theory into practice. *Family Practice Management, 65*, 23-30.
- Thorndike, E. L. (1920). Intelligence and its uses. *Harper's Magazine, 140*, 227-235.
- Tye, B., & O'Brien, L. (2002). Why are experienced teachers leaving the profession. Phi Delta Kappa (Issue Brief No. 00317217).
- Woods, A., & Weasmer, J. (2002, March/April). Maintaining job satisfaction: Engaging professionals as active participants. *Clearing House, 75*, 186-189.

Appendix

Appendix A
Demographic Survey Form

Code #: _____

DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY FORM

1. Gender: Male Female (please circle)
2. Race: _____
3. Age: _____
4. Highest level of college education in years and graduate hours: _____ / _____
Years of Ed. Graduate Hours
5. Do you teach at a private or public school? (please circle)
6. Do you teach in an urban, suburban, or rural area? (please circle)
(urban population= 50,000+; suburban population= less than 50,000; rural population=less than 25,000)
7. Do you teach special education, regular education, or both? (please circle)
8. What grade(s) do you teach? _____
9. What subject(s) do you teach? _____
10. Did you receive mentoring? Yes No (please circle) if so, how long? _____
11. How satisfied were you with your mentoring? Very Satisfied _____ Not Satisfied At All
1 2 3 4 5 (please circle)
12. How many teaching jobs have you had since you entered the teaching profession? _____
13. How many years have you been teaching since graduation? _____
14. How many years do you **plan** on teaching? _____
15. Have you ever considered a career change since you began teaching? Yes No (please circle)
*If yes, to what area? _____
16. How much do you enjoy teaching? Very Much _____ Not Much At All (please circle)
1 2 3 4 5
17. How much do you enjoy your job? Enjoy Very Much _____ Do Not Enjoy (please circle)
1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX B

Job Descriptive Index Form

PRESENT JOB SATISFACTION

Think of the work you do at present. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your work? Circle:

- 1 for "Yes" if it describes your work
 2 for "No" if it does not describe it
 3 for "?" if you cannot decide

	Yes	No	?
Fascinating.....	3	0	1
Routine.....	0	3	1
Satisfying.....	3	0	1
Boring.....	0	3	1
Good.....	3	0	1
Gives sense of accomplishment.....	3	0	1
Respected.....	3	0	1
Uncomfortable.....	0	3	1
Pleasant.....	3	0	1
Useful.....	3	0	1
Challenging.....	3	0	1
Simple.....	0	3	1
Repetitive.....	0	3	1
Creative.....	3	0	1
Dull.....	0	3	1
Uninteresting.....	0	3	1
Can see results.....	3	0	1
Uses my abilities.....	3	0	1

PAY SATISFACTION

Think of the pay you get now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your present pay?

	Yes	No	?
Income adequate for normal expenses	3	0	1
Fair.....	3	0	1
Barely live on income.....	0	3	1
Bad.....	0	3	1
Income provides luxuries.....	3	0	1
Insecure.....	0	3	1
Less than I deserve.....	0	3	1
Well paid.....	3	0	1
Underpaid	0	3	1

Used with Permission

SUPERVISION SATISFACTION

Think of your supervisor and the kind of supervision that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your supervision?

	Yes	No	?
Asks my advice.....	3	0	1
Hard to please.....	0	3	1
Impolite.....	0	3	1
Praises good work.....	3	0	1
Tactful.....	3	0	1
Influential.....	3	0	1
Up-to-date.....	3	0	1
Doesn't supervise enough.....	0	3	1
Has favorites.....	0	3	1
Tells me where I stand.....	3	0	1
Annoying.....	0	3	1
Stubborn.....	0	3	1
Knows job well.....	3	0	1
Bad.....	0	3	1
Intelligent.....	3	0	1
Poor planner.....	0	3	1
Around when needed.....	3	0	1
Lazy.....	0	3	1

COWORKER SATISFACTION

Think of the majority of people that you work with now or the people you meet in connection with your work. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe these people?

	Yes	No	?
Stimulating.....	3	0	1
Boring.....	0	3	1
Slow.....	0	3	1
Helpful.....	3	0	1
Stupid.....	0	3	1
Responsible.....	3	0	1
Fast.....	3	0	1
Intelligent.....	3	0	1
Easy to make enemies.....	0	3	1
Talk too much.....	0	3	1
Smart.....	3	0	1
Lazy.....	0	3	1
Unpleasant.....	3	0	1
Gossipy.....	0	3	1
Active.....	3	0	1
Narrow interests.....	0	3	1
Loyal.....	3	0	1
Stubborn.....	0	3	1

Used with Permission

APPENDIX C

Definitions of Emotional Intelligence Subcategories

Definitions of Emotional Intelligence Subcategories

- 1) Intrapersonal EQ
 - a) Emotional Self-Awareness (ES): The ability to recognize and understand one's emotions
 - b) Self-Actualization (SA): The ability to realize one's potential and to do what one wants to do; enjoys doing, and can do
 - c) Self-Regard (SR): The ability to be aware of, understand, accept and respect oneself
 - d) Assertiveness (AS): The ability to express feelings, beliefs, and thoughts, and to defend one's rights in a nondestructive manner
 - e) Independence (IN): The ability to be self-directed and self-controlled in one's thinking and actions and to be free of emotional dependency
- 2) Interpersonal EQ
 - a) Empathy (EM): The ability to be aware of, understand, and appreciate the feelings of others
 - b) Interpersonal Relationships (IR): The ability to establish and maintain mutually satisfying relationships that are characterized by emotional closeness, intimacy, and by giving and receiving affection
 - c) Social Responsibility (RE): The ability to demonstrate oneself as a cooperative, contributing, and constructive member of one's social group
- 3) Adaptability EQ
 - a) Problem solving (PS): The ability to identify and define personal and social problems as well as to generate and implement potentially effective solutions
 - b) Reality testing (RT): The ability to assess the correspondence between what is internally and subjectively experienced and what externally and objectively exists
 - c) Flexibility (FL): The ability to adjust one's feeling, thoughts, and behavior to changing situations and conditions
- 4) Stress Management EQ
 - a) Stress Tolerance (ST): The ability to withstand adverse events, stressful situations, and strong emotions without "falling apart" by actively and positively coping with stress
 - b) Impulse Control (IC): The ability to resist or delay an impulse, drive, or temptation to act, and to control one's emotions
- 5) General Mood EQ
 - a) Optimism (OP): The ability "to look at the brighter side of life" and to maintain a positive attitude, even when faced with adversity
 - b) Happiness (HA): The ability to feel satisfied with one's life, to enjoy one's self and others, and to have fun and express positive emotions (BarOn, 2000, pp. 15 - 18).

APPENDIX D

Teacher Assent Form

TEACHER ASSENT FORM

Project Title: Assessing Job Satisfaction and Emotional Intelligence in School Teachers

Investigator: Brandy Cobb, Psychology Department, 270-843-1351;
Faculty Advisor: William Pfohl, Psy.D., Psychology Department,
270-745-4419
 (include name, department and phone of contact person)

You are being asked to participate in a project conducted through Western Kentucky University. The University requires that you give your signed agreement to participate in this project.

The investigator will explain to you in detail the purpose of the project, the procedures to be used, and the potential benefits and possible risks of participation. You may ask him/her any questions you have to help you understand the project. A basic explanation of the project is written below. Please read this explanation and discuss with the researcher any questions you may have. The information and data collected in the current study will be used for the purpose of fulfilling the requirements for a thesis project in order to obtain a Specialist Degree in Education.

If you then decide to participate in the project, please sign on the last page of this form in the presence of the person who explained the project to you. You should be given a copy of this form to keep.

1. **Nature and Purpose of the Project:** Many teachers encounter stress and burnout on the job and therefore are dissatisfied with their present job. The symptoms of teacher stress and burnout appear to be closely related to the construct of emotional intelligence. The purpose of the current study is to determine if emotional intelligence plays a significant role in teacher job satisfaction. This study aims to discover whether the two constructs emotional intelligence and teacher job satisfaction are correlated.
2. **Explanation of Procedures:** You will be given the BarOn EQ-i Self Report Scale to complete. Upon the completion of this scale, you will be given the Job Descriptive Index to complete. You will be informed of the scoring process and the researcher will contact you by attending your class for feedback sessions, if desired. You will be asked to complete a demographic form, which will also be for confidentiality after data is coded.
3. **Discomfort and Risks:** Potential risks of the current study include possibly discovering that based on the results of the BarOn EQ-i Self Report Scale you may have low emotional intelligence. You may also discover based on the Job Descriptive Index that you may have low job satisfaction.
4. **Benefits:** Teachers will have the opportunity to receive a free emotional intelligence and job satisfaction assessment. The information obtained from the BarOn EQ-i Self Report Scales and the Job Descriptive Index will allow the researcher to determine if emotional intelligence and job satisfaction are correlated.

5. **Confidentiality:** In order to maintain confidentiality, all BarOn EQ-i Self Report Scales will be number from 1-100 and all Job Descriptive Index forms will be numbered from 1-100. The corresponding numbers of the two scales will be grouped together. You will be asked to sign your name to a separate form. The number on the form in which you sign should coincide with the number on the two scales. The signature forms will be kept separate from the two scales and no one aside from the thesis committee will have access to these forms and scales.
6. **Refusal/Withdrawal:** You can refuse to answer any question and are free to withdraw from the current at any given time. Refusal to participate in this study will have no effect on any future services you may be entitled to from the University. Anyone who agrees to participate in this study is free to withdraw from the study at any time with no penalty.

You understand also that it is not possible to identify all potential risks in an experimental procedure, and you believe that reasonable safeguards have been taken to minimize both the known and potential but unknown risks.

Signature of Participant

Date

Witness

Date

THE DATED APPROVAL ON THIS CONSENT FORM INDICATES THAT
THIS PROJECT HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY
THE WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW BOARD
Dr. Phillip E. Myers, Human Protections Administrator
TELEPHONE: (270) 745-4652