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Abstract

A project conducted in a primary school explored the hypothesis that student teachers could reflect upon feedback to improve their use of emotional intelligence in the classroom, thereby improving their teaching as defined by the required professional teaching standards. Four student teachers and their teacher mentors participated with a teacher educator to provide two data sets - joint lesson observations records and semi-structured interviews. The joint observations were conducted with the teacher educator using an observational checklist based on an emotional intelligence competencies framework and the mentor assessing demonstration of the required professional standards. Two lessons per student were observed with a four week interval. Shortly after the second observation, student teachers and mentors were interviewed in peer pairs. Qualitative analysis indicated linked improvements in performance, in terms of emotional intelligence and the professional standards. While wary of generalising from such a small sample, the study suggests a place for learning communities of good practice and support to develop emotionally-intelligent teaching. The study concludes that the improvements are first indications of the benefits of developing emotional intelligence in student teachers and that further research, with larger samples and the use of other feedback methods, has a contribution to make to teacher education.
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Introduction

Successful teaching requires not just subject knowledge and appropriate teaching methods, but also affective skills (Jacques and Hyland, 2000; Tickle, 1991; Hayes, 2006). Many know this as a combination of thinking and feeling or of head and heart. Since Goleman’s zeitgeist book (Goleman, 1995), one classification of those affective skills is ‘emotional intelligence’. This research was a Masters dissertation study intended to impact positively on researcher and participant practice.

In this paper, for the sake of clarity, the school teachers who support the student teachers during work placements are referred to as ‘mentors’.

Theoretical background

Understanding of emotional intelligence has broadly fallen into one of two camps: a broad concept linking emotions, personal and social capabilities into an ability to cope with life (Bar-On; 2000) or more closely-defined processing skills to identify, relate to and manage emotions in oneself and others (Mayer et al., 2004). Psychologists Mayer and Salovey coined the term emotional intelligence, presenting an emotional intelligence capabilities model (Mayer and Salovey, 1989) which Goleman, who subsequently popularised the term, presented as a more detailed Emotional Competence Inventory (Goleman, McKie and Boyzatis, 2002).

This study is within this latter camp and, relating this understanding to Gardner’s theory of multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1993), is summarised by a simple matrix framework (Table 1).
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Table 1: Emotional intelligence: a theoretical framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personal (or Intrapersonal)</th>
<th>Social (or Interpersonal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of feelings</td>
<td>Recognising our own feelings</td>
<td>Recognising the feelings of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural response to feelings</td>
<td>Managing our own feelings effectively</td>
<td>Action that takes account of the feelings of others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definitions of the term are diverse, from restraining negative feelings while focusing on positive ones (Murray, 1998) to non-cognitive abilities to cope with one’s environment (Bar-On, 2000). Mayer and Salovey, however, recognise the interpersonal dimension: “The ability to monitor one’s own and others' feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and actions.” (Mayer & Salovey, 1997)

The definition used in this study was simply: Tuning into emotions and taking appropriate action. Though recognising the colloquialism “tuning into” is likely to make pedants wince, this contraction of Orme’s definition (2001) was used because, set alongside Table 1, it is likely to have currency with teachers.

The bulk of research on emotional intelligence has focused on leadership, where it finds a commercial market (for example, Cherniss and Goleman, 2001). There has long been recognition that teachers experience a wide range of positive and negative emotions while teaching and interacting with pupils (Hargreaves, 1998) and that cognition, learning, and emotional regulation are interlinked in student teachers (Oosterheert and Vermunt, 2001; Leat et al, 1995). But an emphasis on emotional problems, such as dealing with teacher anger or anxiety, has helped retain a traditional caution towards the subject (Sutton & Wheatley 2003).

However, effective schools are becoming affective schools. Every Child Matters legislation in England (DfES, 2004) places pupil emotional wellbeing as a central concern and studies reveal the benefits to pupils when emotional intelligence is integrated into the school curriculum (e.g. Qualter et al., 2007). Working on pupils’ emotional intelligence could also be seen as an economic and political function to produce emotionally-aware consumers (Hartley, 2003).

Whether the driving forces are internal or external, schools and authorities responsible for educational standards will need to address the part that teachers’ emotions play in the process. However, little research has been published on the development of teachers’ own emotional intelligence. Notable exceptions are Alan Mortiboys’ excellent guidebook to support FE and HE lecturers wishing to develop their own emotional intelligence (Mortiboys, 2005) and Brian Dwyer’s model incorporating understanding of emotional intelligence alongside brain-based learning, multiple intelligences and personal reflection (Dwyer, 2000).

The dearth of work on provision in teacher education is recognised by educationalists (for example, Tickle, 1991; Hayes, 2003; O’Hanlon, 2005) and starkly stated in Sutton and Wheatley’s review:

“Researchers know surprisingly little about the role of emotions in learning to teach, how teachers’ emotional experiences relate to
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their teaching practices, and how the sociocultural context of teaching interacts with teachers’ emotions. Researchers also know little about how teachers regulate their emotions…” (Sutton and Wheatley, 2003:328)

Perhaps there is little guidance to successful ways to support emotionally-intelligent teaching because the concept is viewed with scepticism as well as caution. Emotional intelligence is a commonly known term, but is diversely defined and overlaps the study of feelings, behaviour, brain function and psychology (McIntosh, 2004). One study, rejecting its claim to be a scientifically-measurable construct, labelled it ‘old wine in a new bottle’ with little to add to existing knowledge (Matthews et al, 2002).

Nevertheless, that critical report also concluded that observing behavioural response in emotional interpersonal situations is a valid way to assess proceduralized knowledge. So an observer with experience of the context (a classroom, in this case) could confidently assess emotional intelligence in action by reading underlying feelings and observing the subject’s behaviours (see Table 1). This argument, however, hinges on an assertion that all observers have the ability to notice emotions (Orme, 2001).

Research focus

So, while Sutton and Wheatley identified glaring gaps in knowledge about emotions in teaching, it was the almost incidental findings of Matthews, together with Orme’s claim, that shaped the first premise - that formative assessment of student teacher emotional intelligence is possible and useful in the interpersonal environment of a classroom.

Because the research sought improvement for participants as well as researcher (Bell, 1999, McNiff, Lomax and Whitehead, 2003), the first hypothesis was that sharing these assessments with student teachers would result in reflection on the feedback and ‘raising their game’ in terms of emotional intelligence. This led to the question:

• Would student teachers improve the emotional intelligence of their teaching if given feedback by a teacher educator?

The second supposition was that such improvement would result in better teaching as defined by the professional standards required for the award of Qualified Teacher Status (QTS), posing the question:.

• If student teacher emotional intelligence improves, does this lead to improved teaching performance?

Methodology

i) School setting

Within a HE teacher educator role, the author serves as link tutor, a role providing teacher mentors and the student teachers themselves with support from the programme institution during placements. This includes moderating assessments of mentors who, on a final placement, make summative judgements on whether the students meet the professional standards for the award of QTS. Consequently, this practitioner research was conducted as link tutor, with a qualitative and interpretivist approach by means of a focused sample, availing of the programme placement requirement for joint observation of teaching by link tutor and mentor. Rather than travelling between several schools, data was collected using eight participants within one primary school (four student teachers and their mentors). Thus the project was manageable within the time constraints of normal link tutor visits to schools.

ii) Ethical issues
Seeking this insight into the sensitive area of student teacher feelings and behaviours had ethical implications. All prospective participants were given a brief description of emotional intelligence and the research methodology. They had written assurances of their right to withdraw at any stage and of anonymity in reporting or publishing the project. Four of the six student teacher/mentor pairs in the school made the informed choice to participate.

The student and researcher perception of the power relations would nevertheless be different. While the researcher view is of all participants being equal co-learners in this research, at interview the participants could express views they thought were socially desirable. However this risk of invalidation was reduced by data triangulation, explained below, and by holding the interviews when the placement reports and grades had already been shared with the student teachers i.e. when mentors and researcher no longer held that leverage over the student teacher response.

iii) Data collection: observational records

Because assessment of one person’s emotional intelligence by another requires the behavioural evidence of what the subject says, does or shows (Goleman, 1995), observational data was essential. Reliability was assisted by using an emotional intelligence observation record sheet assessing emotional competencies, adapted from Mortiboys’ self-assessment proforma for higher education lecturers (Mortiboys, 2002: 23). It added flesh to the bones of the theoretical framework by listing behaviours indicative of student teacher awareness and response to their own feelings and those of their pupils; actions such as eye contact, facial expression, voice tone/volume, response to the moods of pupils, depth of listening to pupils and incidents of ‘emotional hijacking’ - the ‘fight or flight’ reaction of acting on impulse without thinking (Goleman, 1995).

Each student received two full lesson observations and subsequent written feedback, the second observation four weeks after the first. The purpose was to measure the effect of the first feedback upon the students’ emotional intelligence and overall teaching in the next observed lesson.

However, this data-collection method alone would not ensure validity, relying on the claim that an observer could ‘read’ the emotional awareness by the student teachers that prompts behavioural response. Some triangulation was provided through the mentors, who alongside the link tutor researcher assessing emotional intelligence, was assessed the teaching against the professional standards. Both recording strengths, weaknesses and targets, based on the respective observation criteria.

The feedback data for all student teachers was coded and sorted into two tables (main strengths and weaknesses) to enable comparison for connection or deviation between both lessons and both categories (emotional intelligence and overall teaching).

Data collection: interviews

The observational data was triangulated with semi-structured interviews with the student teachers, audio-taped and transcribed discussions building on the observational data to shape a socially-constructed understanding. They drew out recollections of student feelings and reactions during the observed lessons (prompted by the written feedback sheets they received after the observations) and their subsequent views about the value of formative assessment of student emotional intelligence. The interviewees were not asked the key research questions directly; rather the dialogue transcripts were coded to sift implicit acceptance of the feedback.

The students were interviewed in pairs to allow participant reaction to and comparisons with what others said. Nevertheless, opportunity was also given within the interview for individual depth of response, recognising that each would construct differently the ‘emotional knowledge’ stemming from how a teacher feels (Zembylas, 2005: 67), particularly about relationships in the complex context of a classroom.
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Similar interviews with pairs of mentors enabled these were experienced teachers to share their perspectives on their own student teacher’s development in terms of emotional intelligence and the professional standards, as well as to discuss the relationship between these two frameworks and possible developments in this area of research.

All interview transcripts were deductively and inductively coded to address the research questions and issues arising.

Results

- Did student teachers improve the emotional intelligence of their teaching when given feedback by a teacher educator?

Scored on a 1-10 scale for their ability to use emotional intelligence effectively in the class, two of the four students improved from 5 to 7.5 by their second observed lesson, one from 8 to 9 with the fourth scoring 7 in both lessons. These scores were an overview of the emotional competency assessments recorded on the observation pro formas (see Figure 1 for illustration).

None challenged the interpretation and validity of the observations, with comments at interview such as “I could feel it going wrong at an early point and I was mad at myself” (see Figure 1: ‘Behaviours that indicate..’).

The mentors all affirmed agreement with the emotional intelligence assessments and the large majority of identified emotional intelligence strengths and weaknesses were closely related to the mentors’ own assessments. As one said, “It’s interesting because a lot of emotional intelligence things overlapped with what I picked up through the normal lesson observation format”.

- Did this lead to improved teaching performance?

Constructed from the proforma data, comparative tables of strengths and weaknesses showed improved emotional intelligence competencies corresponding closely to the professional standards that were identified and successfully addressed. One illustration is a student teacher whose emotional intelligence feedback advised her to respond to the class atmosphere and professional standards feedback set her a target of taking more control and leadership of the class. She reflected on both and, in showing more empathy with how the pupils were feeling, she was simultaneously more decisive in adjusting her planned delivery in response to the pupils during the lesson. When interviewed, the mentors were able to point to examples of how formative assessment of emotional intelligence had led to improved student teacher performance.

Discussion

With regard to the value placed in the observational feedback, the grading judgements were supported by direct observations using two sets of criteria. Amongst the successes was a student teacher who showed greater control of her anxiety or irritation with any classroom noise, another who showed improved ability to empathise by listening closely to pupil contributions without interrupting, and one who responded with group activities that enabled collaborative learning when needing to build pupil teamwork in the class.

However a ‘chicken and egg’ situation could exist between the behaviours informing each. Greater confidence in demonstrating the professional standards are likely to bring about a frame of mind conducive to the use of emotional intelligence. For example, had one trainee (see Figure 1) shared the success criteria for a lesson of practical science investigations with the pupils, she was far less likely to have been in a position where the class didn’t settle to the activities and she responded with an emotionally-hijacked and inappropriate response.
Nonetheless, they do show a strong improvement and are therefore a first indication that something important is happening when feedback on emotional intelligence is provided, implying that future large scale research is necessary to study the full impact and seek findings which may be generalisable to other schools or institutions providing teacher education.

New issues also emerge through inductive data coding. The mentors valued the specific feedback on emotional intelligence as an empowering tool, calling for it to be more explicitly recognised within the programme. “You do seem to forget that’s the most important part of being a teacher really. But it all seems to be about subject knowledge and teaching techniques”.

“You do seem to forget that’s the most important part?’”

“Interacting with the children. …all the things that seem to get lost. It was nice to refocus back in on that side of it because that’s teaching really”.

This was mirrored in the student teacher dialogue. A typical reflection on the value and validity of the emotional intelligence focus was:

“Yeah, if they looked at emotional intelligence as part of your observation... as well as your teaching, planning and all that…”

“And it’s not extra work for us is it?”

“No; it’s us as teachers. I found, when my mentor was observing with you, some things crossed over. It shows that they are picked out when people are observing you. If that [the formative assessment process] was part of it, it’d be great”.

Two of them took greater ownership of the emotional intelligence concept by proposing that they get feedback from their pupils. However, one less confident student felt threatened by the early part of the process:

“If I’d had a bit more background knowledge, I’d have been a bit more relaxed and confident about what you were actually going to observe. Being observed is nerve-wracking enough, but not knowing what you were looking for…”

For feedback to be effective, it needs to relate to specific and clear goals for the learner (Hattie and Timperley, 2007), a limitation that further study should address. Indeed, if the emotional intelligence focus was adapted to impact on the achievements of student teachers with lower emotional intelligence starting points or less classroom experience (this was a final placement), they would need more than support. Assessment of their emotional intelligence in the classroom would need to be placed in the context of other programme provision (Black and Williams, 2004; Biggs, 2003).

The importance of relationships between each student teacher and her mentor emerged (Simpson et al, Hawkey, 2006). When interviewed, these committed, confident mentors recognised their responsibility to model emotionally-intelligent teaching for their pupils and the student teachers. They were also working with students who were open and quite self-assured in embracing scrutiny of their emotions and responses. Others individuals or pairings may need more support.

Two mentors also flagged the importance of student teacher relationships, not only with the pupils, but with the mentor and all adults with whom they interact in the school. Student teachers have to deal not only with their own emotions and those of their pupils, but also those of their mentors, other teaching and support staff and, sometimes parents. (Brackett M, Katulak N, 2007) The mentor/student teacher relationship, in particular, has to be a trusting one if both are to discuss emotional intelligence, show it in action and reflect honestly upon their strengths and weaknesses.
This feedback should be read alongside any feedback using the profession teaching standard criteria.

**Student Teacher:** XXXXXX  **Class:** Y2 (26 pupils)  **Subject:** Science  **Date:** XXXX

### Use of non-verbal communication – maintained throughout lesson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eye contact</th>
<th>Facial expression</th>
<th>Gesture</th>
<th>Humour</th>
<th>Voice intonation</th>
<th>Voice volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good on 1 to 1; develop shifting eye contact amongst pupils</td>
<td>Initially hard faced, but softened! Then smile registered relaxation; develop to show range of positive feelings.</td>
<td>Some use to aid explanations</td>
<td>Quite good; mainly reactive; develop to initiate humour more</td>
<td>Some, within narrow range</td>
<td>Quite good; loud enough without being dominating or intimidating.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What responses were shown to the mood of the class?** Recognised mood in anticipating that pupils were sluggish about ‘work’. However, you acknowledged this to them, without acting positively to change mood.

**E.g. of student giving pupils a chance to voice their feelings as well as thoughts?** Unfortunate message, 3 times, that you ‘didn’t want anyone bothering you’. Unintentional, I’m sure … might have been better phrased to emphasise time needed with investigation group.

**E.g. of response to the feelings of any pupil.** No examples noticed

**Student response to show that she fully listened & understood what pupils said.** Some examples of affirming – nodding, “Ah-huh”. Some examples of interrupting before child finished talking; also rhetorical questions that didn’t really seek a response (“Isn’t that right?-Yes”)

**Response to pupils’ non-verbal communication (above categories):** you noticed XXXX pulling a face; reassured her with a smile and said “don’t look so gutted; you’ll get a turn” [with investigation]

**What feelings did she show to the pupils?** Interest (particularly 1 to 1 and with guided group), Amusement, Urgency, Tension, Impatience

**Behaviours that indicated anxiety or anger; any example of “emotional hijack”?** Just one incident – halting whole class, instructing them all to put hand up to get their attention, then rebuking them while they sat with hands up. Did you think which pupils were off-task, why and what your choices of response were before acting?

**E.g. of student apparently managing her own feelings** No examples noticed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many pupils had responses acknowledged in manner that valued them? All pupil names used?</th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>7-10</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>20 +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How often did she refer back later to individual contributions?</strong> Likely to develop as placement progresses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>7+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evidence of any apparent prejudice towards particular pupils?** No

**End score: Success in creating positive emotional environment. (10 highest)** 5

**Students EQ strength(s)** Conscientiousness (willingness to work hard, preparation etc), Service Orientation – focused on children’s learning. Some Empathy – picking up pupil moods

**Student’s EQ area(s) for development** Self-control (when anxious or irritated), being a Change Catalyst – evaluate, assess and be prepared to change approach & activities) More Empathy – listening closely, more upbeat Communication (modelling positive feelings towards learning and pupils)
With all other participants being female, the gender issue inevitably arose. “I think it links more to the nurturing side of somebody as a teacher, the way they really value and nurture children in the classroom. Maybe men are less …” [sentence tailed away]. The mentor speaking may have recognised the political incorrectness of her comment at that point, but it was legitimate to reflect on whether male student teachers demonstrate more, less or the same emotional intelligence levels. She was informed that test results (Bar-On, 2000) show no significant overall gender difference, with men scoring higher on personal competencies and women on social ones.

Kate Hawkey, in the context of teacher education, considered that learning about the impact of the emotions on learning may be useful for researchers, mentors and student teachers in raising self-awareness, but that “it is not clear… that it would impact on the thinking or behaviour of either mentor or student” (Hawley, 2006:141). This study provides some evidence of such an impact.

Several of the mentors and student teachers queried why emotional intelligence wasn’t addressed more explicitly through teacher education and continuous professional development. This prompted a mapping of the emotional intelligence competencies assessed against the most relevant English professional teaching standards (Table 2).

### Table 2: Emotional intelligence and professional teaching standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Competence Inventory (Goleman, McKie and Boyzatis, 2002).</th>
<th>Related standards for Qualified Teacher Status (TDA, 2007)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Awareness:</strong> Knowing one’s internal states, preferences, resources, intuitions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Emotional Self-Awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accurate Self-Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-Confidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Management:</strong> Managing ones’ internal states, impulses, and resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Emotional Self-Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transparency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Optimism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adaptability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Achievement Orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Awareness:</strong> Awareness of others feelings, needs, and concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Empathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Service Orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship Management:</strong> Adeptness at inducing desirable responses in others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developing Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inspirational Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Change Catalyst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conflict Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teamwork &amp; Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8 Have a creative and constructively critical approach towards innovation, being prepared to adapt their practice where benefits and improvements are identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 Demonstrate the positive values, attitudes and behaviour they expect from children and young people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 Act upon advice and feedback and be open to coaching and mentoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 Communicate effectively with children, young people, colleagues, parents and carers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 Recognise and respect the contribution that colleagues, parents and carers can make to the development and well-being of children and young people, and to raising their levels of attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21 (b) Know how to identify and support children and young people affected by changes or difficulties in their personal circumstances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 Establish fair, respectful, trusting, supportive and constructive relationships with children and young people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32 Work as a team member and identify opportunities for working with colleagues, sharing effective practice with them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Others may match them differently or indeed conclude that these abilities are already embedded in the standards. An alternative view held by the research participants is that this part of teaching needs to be explicitly recognised within such standards.

A recommendation from government-commissioned research (Weare and Gray, 2003) had indeed urged support for the development of teachers’ emotional and social competence and wellbeing by conducting an audit of current teacher training provision and working within the inspection framework and criteria, both for schools and teacher education establishments. However, since that framework refers to the current professional standards, it would seem that the place for the emotional intelligence in teacher education to be overtly recognised, and thereby systematically addressed, is within those standards. Key external drivers for teacher education in England - the professional teaching standards (TDA, 2007) and the government inspection framework for initial teacher training (Ofsted, 2005) recognise the impact of emotional intelligence on teaching standards. Are current and future generations of teachers working with a flawed model? In recalling Stephen Covey’s definitions of leadership as ‘doing the right things’ and management as ‘doing things right’, his analogy is of ‘leadership’ determining whether the ladder is leaning against the right wall before ‘management’ efficiently climbs up it (Covey, S, 1999). When emotional intelligence in teaching is recognised and better understood, perhaps the ladder will be placed against the right wall for it to be developed within the teaching profession.

Perhaps transformation of teacher development to include knowing engagement and formative assessment of feelings as well as actions requires a new model of effective teaching which includes emotional intelligence as a core capability, such as that of Mortiboys. (Figure 2).

Further research on valid measurement of emotional intelligence is needed to take understanding beyond the tentative findings of this small scale project. Assessment of emotional intelligence cannot be solely reliant upon paper or on-line tests of emotional intelligence, such as Mayor and Salovey's MSCEIT (2004) or Bar-On’s EQ-I (2000). Valuable though they may be for selection purposes – for recruitment of student teachers, for example - they are primarily summative assessments without a context in which to assess procedural knowledge. Government policy in Britain has placed schools as full partners in the education of teachers, coinciding with a shift in emphasis from theory in teacher education to more ‘learning by doing’. While having reservations and recognising that teaching can only become a Masters level profession if theory and practice inform each other, the acid test of teaching standards is application of theory at the chalk face.

**Figure 2: Effective teaching (Mortiboys, A, 2005)**

![Figure 2: Effective teaching](image-url)
Formative assessment of student teachers’ emotional intelligence

The study indicates this method of assessing emotional intelligence in the classroom can be a manageable and effective tool to raise student teacher performance. However, feedback from assessment can take various forms. One review (Hattie and Timperley, 2007: 81) conceptualises it as “information provided by an agent (e.g. teacher, peer, book, parent, self, experience) regarding aspects of one’s performance”. Perhaps comparing assessment by different agents - and the impact of tools such as reflective journals, placement tutorials or peer support is a way forward.

Conclusion

Further to this piece of practitioner research, the author is more adaptive to the affective skills that student teachers need and, having incorporated an emotional intelligence filter into peer reviewed observation of his teaching, is more reflective about the emotional intelligence of his own teaching.

As Kremenitzer argues, “Teacher preparation programs need to support teacher candidates by scaffolding the reflective abilities surrounding emotional intelligence and by providing sufficient time within the curriculum to infuse this process” (Kremenitzer, 2005:7).

For the participants too, this project was a positive introduction to formative assessment of emotional intelligence in teaching. While recognising possible researcher bias, the findings from this small scale study indicate need for a wider learning community in school and higher education settings, professionals who will openly share existing good practice and support each other’s development through observation, discussion and modelling of emotionally-intelligent teaching.
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