

Iraqi EFL Teachers' Emotional Intelligence and Their Classroom Management across Gender

Wissam Mohammed Mohammed Jawad

alfatlawywiss@gmail.com

Dr. Zohreh Seifoori

zseifoori@gmail.com

Islamic Azad University/ Science and Research Branch
Faculty of Literature, Humanities and Social Sciences/ Iran, Tehran

ABSTRACT

This study explored the self-reported classroom management (CM) and emotional intelligence (EI) levels of Iraqi EFL teachers across gender. A sample of 120 teachers, 68 females and 52 males, completed CM and EI scales. The results showed that both male and female participants rated themselves above average on CM and EI, with no significant differences in their reported subcomponents. However, female teachers reported significantly higher levels of CM. Interestingly, CM and EI were positively and significantly correlated for females, but negatively and significantly correlated for males. The findings underscore the importance of considering teacher-related factors, such as CM and EI, in enhancing teacher education programs and ELT pedagogy in Iraq.

Key Words: Classroom Management, Emotional Intelligence, Gender.

الذكاء الوجداني للمدرسين العراقيين دارسي اللغة الإنجليزية كلفة أجنبية وإدارتهم للصف عبر
الجنسين

وسام محمد محمد جواد

الدكتورة زهره سيفوري

جامعة آزاد الإسلامية/ كلية الآداب والعلوم الإنسانية والاجتماعية/ إيران، طهران

الملخص

تناولت هذه الدراسة مستويات إدارة الصف والذكاء الوجداني (EI) التي أفاد بها معلمو اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية (EFL) العراقيين عبر الجنسين. تكونت عينة الدراسة من ١٢٠ معلمًا، ٦٨ إناثًا و ٥٢ ذكورًا، وأكملوا مقاييس إدارة الصف والذكاء الوجداني. أظهرت النتائج أن المشاركين من الذكور والإناث قيّموا أنفسهم بمتوسطات فوق المتوسط في إدارة الصف والذكاء الوجداني، دون وجود فروق كبيرة في المكونات الفرعية المبلغ عنها. ومع ذلك، أفادت المعلمات بمستويات إدارة الصف أعلى بكثير. وبشكل مثير للاهتمام، ارتبطت إدارة الصف والذكاء الوجداني ارتباطًا إيجابيًا وكبيرًا للإناث، ولكن ارتباطًا سلبيًا وكبيرًا للذكور. تؤكد هذه النتائج على أهمية مراعاة العوامل المتعلقة بالمعلم، مثل إدارة الصف والذكاء الوجداني، في تعزيز برامج إعداد المعلمين وتدريب اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في العراق.

الكلمات المفتاحية: إدارة الفصل الدراسي، الذكاء الوجداني، الجنس .

1. Introduction

Emotions play a crucial role in education, as Aristotle rightly pointed out that "teaching the head without educating the heart is no education at all." Teachers must recognize and address the emotional aspects of teaching and learning to achieve their objectives effectively. A skilled language instructor should be aware of and manage potential classroom issues to foster engaging classes, a love for the language, and students' confidence in their learning abilities.

EI is a critical skill for controlling personal and others feelings. It can be viewed as a degree of personality feature or as a developing competency. Since 1990, several fields of psychology have studied and explored the idea of EI (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). The capacity to keep track of personal and people's behaviors is included in the intelligence known as "EI," which has been defined as "a subset of social intelligence."

Classroom management (CM) is a significant concern for teachers, especially new ones, as it becomes more challenging in the context of foreign language teaching. However, the ideal EFL classroom should prioritize communication and engagement over mere discipline and

control. Teachers must serve as administrators and organizers, preventing classroom problems rather than addressing them later. Additionally, research suggests that gender may affect teachers' teaching styles, social responsibility, and CM approaches, with some studies finding significant differences between male and female instructors. Understanding these gender-based differences in emotional intelligence (EI) and CM techniques can inform teacher training and professional development programs, ultimately enhancing the quality of language education.

2. Review of the Literature

2.1. Classroom Management

It is crucial to keep discipline, pupil interaction, and academic production in the classroom, which may be achieved by using a range of skills and strategies (Abdzadeh& Baker, 2020; Ahmed et al., 2018; Garrett, 2015; Sibiya et al., 2019). Canter (2010) claimed that making and keeping a learning setting is fundamental to effective CM. Teaching ideas and skills to mastery is the job of today's educators. According to research, it is challenging for learning, much alone mastery, to happen in a setting where CM is badly designed and managed (Jones et al., 2014). Although studies have linked CM to improved student performance, it takes effort to build properly managed classes (Burden, 2020). To establish and sustain a well-managed classroom, teachers must make an attempt to align management framework with both their own behavior and the attitudes of their class (Burden, 2020).

According to Marzano (2013), good teachers may be made. Canter (2010) went on to say that teachers have to be proficient in the methods required to create and sustain a successful classroom. Marzano (2013) asserts that for controlling classroom efficiently, educators must be prepared to spend the time learning about the basic tenets and strategies for doing so.

In education, a variety of CM theories are applied (Wolff et al., 2021). John Dewey (1916), a prominent a theorist who supported progressive education, is one example. Constructivist Learning Theory's creator, Jean Piaget, pushed a hands-on, exploratory method of instruction (Brummitt, 2013). According to Fosnot (2013), in a constructivist classroom, the trainer serves as a mentor for the students, who subsequently take charge of their own education. Specific lesson management techniques, according to discipline theorist Jacob Kounin (1970), kept classes under check. Albert Bandura, William Glasser, and Fred Jones were three further theorists who made significant contributions to the discipline.

2.2. Emotional Intelligence

EI, according to Mayer et al. (2003), is the capability to evaluate emotive information and the application of feelings to improve thinking. Goleman (1995) extended the idea of EI to the world of business and characterized it as the aptitude to keep track of one's own and other people's emotions utilizing social, self-awareness, self-regulation, and empathy abilities. EI, as described by Wharam (2009), is the capacity to drive and govern oneself and others via a knowledge of emotions. EI, modelled on Bradberry and Greaves (2009), is the capacity for recognizing, expressing, and controlling one's own emotions. Equally crucial are knowing what EI is and being familiar with the many models of EI.

EI, albeit still a relatively recent phenomena, hark back to the 1930s, when Edward Thorndike established the idea of social intelligence (Barrios, 2016). Success in business and life is attributed to social intelligence, which is the capacity to interact with the environment successfully (Rahimi & Asadollahi, 2012). The phrase "EI" was first used by Peter Salovey and John Mayer to explain how individuals may keep track of their own reactions and apply them to inform decisions in 1990.

In his book EI (1995), researcher Daniel Goleman recognized five facets of EI: “knowing your emotions, managing your emotions, motivating yourself, recognizing and understanding other people's emotions, and managing relationships”. Around this time, Goleman became aware of the importance of EI. Interest in the idea increased when EI was published.

3. The Present Study

Previous studies have examined the relationship between EI and CM, but to the best of our knowledge, no research could be found that looked at how the two relate to gender. As a result, the present study aimed to fill out this gap by investigating Iraqi EFL teachers' emotional intelligence and their classroom management across gender. Despite growing in popularity and encouraging societal and emotive emotional learning in both children and adults, more study is required to establish the link between EI and gender-neutral CM strategies. The following research questions were addressed for the purpose of this study:

1. Are there any significant differences among female Iraqi EFL teachers' CM components?
2. Are there any significant differences among female Iraqi EFL teachers' EI components?
3. Is there any significant relationship between female Iraqi EFL teachers' EI and their CM?
4. Are there any significant differences among male Iraqi EFL teachers' CM components?
5. Are there any significant differences among male Iraqi EFL teachers' EI components?
6. Is there any significant relationship between male Iraqi EFL teachers' EI and their CM?
7. Is there any significant difference in female and male Iraqi EFL teachers overall EI?

8. Is there any significant difference in female and male Iraqi EFL teachers overall CM?

4. Methodology

4.1 Research Design

As we already mentioned, the purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship between EFL teachers' EI and their CM across genders in the context of Iraq. The study employed an ex-post-facto research design. A self-report questionnaire was used to gather the research data. As Salkind (2003) states, ex-post-facto survey research involves studying a sample of a particular population, the trends, attitudes, or opinions of the population the results of which might be used to make further modifications or suggestions to enhance the quality of affairs.

4.2. Participants

The sample of the study consisted of 120 Iraqi English language teachers teaching English with different years of experience working at state secondary schools in Iraq. The participants were between the age ranges of 25 and 45; they were of both genders (52 males and 68 females) and had academic qualifications of bachelor's and master's degrees. They were provided with questionnaires either in person or online through link. To recruit participants, the researcher contacted school principals and teachers through email, phone calls, and in-person visits. The participants were informed about the purpose of the study and were asked to voluntarily participate. They were also assured that their participation was anonymous and confidential, and they could withdraw from the study at any time.

4.3. Instruments and Materials

The research data in this ex-post-facto study were collected using two five level Likert-scale questionnaires that measured the participants' CM and EI as they responded to the questionnaire items.

4.3.1. The Emotional Intelligence Scale

The EI questionnaire was developed by Schutte et al. (1998) to estimate EI. It was a kind of self-reported scale of EI which contains two parts: the first part was about the demographic features such as participants' names, age, gender, and years of teaching experience. The second part included 33 items developed based on five-Likert scale. The items need participants to show the level of acceptance with each item utilizing a scale ranging from strongly disagree = 1 to strongly agree = 5 and three of which (5, 28, and 33) are scored in reverse. This scale has a score range from 33 to 165. The teacher who gets a score range from 33 to 77 is considered to have a low EI. The teacher who gets a score range from 78 to 121 is considered to have an average EI. The teacher who gets a score range from 122 to 165 is considered to have a high EI.

This questionnaire includes four subscales which are as follows:

1. Items 5, 9, 15, 18, 19, 22, 25, 29, 32, and 33 under "Perception of Emotion"
2. Items 2, 3, 10, 12, 14, 21, 23, 28, and 31 under the heading "Managing Own Emotions"
3. Items 1, 4, 11, 13, 16, 24, and 30 under the heading "Managing Others' Emotions"
4. Items 6, 7, 8, 17, 20, and 27 "Emotional Use"

4.3.2. Classroom Management Questionnaire

The CM questionnaire was developed by Cyril and Raj (2018) to estimate the CM scale for high school teachers. The questionnaire includes 74 items developed based on five-Likert scale. Each item utilizing a scale ranging from Never to Always (1 to 5) and this questionnaire does not have any reverse scoring.

4.4. Research Procedure

As we already mentioned, the participants of the study were English teachers who taught English as a second or foreign language to students in state secondary schools.

All the processes in the research were conducted with permission from the Ministry of Education in Iraq, the schools' principals, and the English teachers who participated in the survey. The researcher explained the aims of the research to the participants. Later, by the end of the school semester, the researcher provided English teachers with two questionnaires of EI and the CM through a link. The traditional ethical processes were clarified, and English teachers were informed about the confidentiality of the gathered data before they accepted to participate in the study.

4.5. Data Analysis

After the data collection, the data was analyzed using statistical analysis techniques. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software was utilized for data analysis. Descriptive statistics were used to identify the means and standard deviations of the scores of EI and CM were computed and the normality of the research data was checked. Inferential statistics were then used to analyze the data and test the research hypotheses. Specifically, four Repeated Measures ANOVA tests were employed to find out male and female EFL teachers' level in subcomponents of EI and CM, two independent-samples t-tests were employed to compare their overall CM and EI and two Pearson correlation tests were run on each group's overall CM and EI scores to find out any significant relationship between the two variables.

5. Results

5.1. Female Iraqi EFL Teachers' Classroom Management and Emotional Intelligence

The first two research questions addressed female Iraqi EFL teachers' variations in subcomponents of their EI and CM. These two research questions were answered via two Repeated Measures ANOVA analyses. Multivariate Test was run to check the significance of the observed difference. Table 1 demonstrates the outcomes.

Table 1

Multivariate Tests of Female Iraqi EFL Teachers' EI Score Sets

| Effect | | Value | F | Hypothesis df | Error df | Sig. | Partial Eta Squared |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|--------|----------------------|---------------|----------|------|---------------------|
| factor1 | Pillai's Trace | .951 | 418.370 ^b | 3.000 | 65.000 | .000 | .951 |
| | Wilks' Lambda | .049 | 418.370 ^b | 3.000 | 65.000 | .000 | .951 |
| | Hotelling's Trace | 19.309 | 418.370 ^b | 3.000 | 65.000 | .000 | .951 |
| | Roy's Largest Root | 19.309 | 418.370 ^b | 3.000 | 65.000 | .000 | .951 |
| a. Design: Intercept | | | | | | | |
| Within Subjects Design: factor1 | | | | | | | |
| b. Exact statistic | | | | | | | |

The consequences of the Multivariate test, Table 1, revealed significant difference between the participants' EI score sets, Wilks' Lambda = .50, $F(3.65) = 418$, $p < .0001$, multivariate partial eta squared = .95. That is to say, the female Iraqi EFL teachers EI components varied significantly. To locate the difference, the Pairwise comparisons test was run, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2 *Pairwise Comparisons*

| Measure: MEASURE_1 | | | | | | |
|--------------------|----------------|------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|--|----------------|
| (I) factor1 | (J) factor1 | Mean Difference (I- J) | Std. Error | Sig. ^b | 95% Confidence Interval for Difference ^b | |
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |

| | | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|------|------|---------|---------|
| 1 | 2 | 1.059 | .538 | .320 | -.405 | 2.522 |
| | 3 | 5.471* | .518 | .000 | 4.063 | 6.878 |
| | 4 | 11.897* | .389 | .000 | 10.840 | 12.954 |
| 2 | 1 | -1.059 | .538 | .320 | -2.522 | .405 |
| | 3 | 4.412* | .446 | .000 | 3.200 | 5.623 |
| | 4 | 10.838* | .455 | .000 | 9.602 | 12.074 |
| 3 | 1 | -5.471* | .518 | .000 | -6.878 | -4.063 |
| | 2 | -4.412* | .446 | .000 | -5.623 | -3.200 |
| | 4 | 6.426* | .469 | .000 | 5.152 | 7.701 |
| 4 | 1 | -11.897* | .389 | .000 | -12.954 | -10.840 |
| | 2 | -10.838* | .455 | .000 | -12.074 | -9.602 |
| | 3 | -6.426* | .469 | .000 | -7.701 | -5.152 |
| Based on estimated marginal means | | | | | | |
| *. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level. | | | | | | |
| b. Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Bonferroni. | | | | | | |

The results demonstrated significant difference among female EFL teachers' four EI sub-scores. Hence, the answer to the first research question is positive, there is considerable difference in female Iraqi EFL teachers' sub-components of EI.

The second research questions addressed female Iraqi EFL teachers' variations in subcomponents of their CM. This research question was answered via a Repeated Measures ANOVA analyses of the data obtained from the CM questionnaire. Another Multivariate Test was run to check the significance of the observed difference. Table 3 designates the results.

Table 3 *Multivariate Tests of Female Iraqi EFL Teachers' CM Score Sets*

| Effect | | Value | F | Hypothesis df | Error df | Sig. | Partial Eta Squared |
|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-------------|----------------------------|
| factor1 | Pillai's Trace | .920 | 119.158 ^b | 6.000 | 62.000 | .000 | .920 |
| | Wilks' | .080 | 119.158 ^b | 6.000 | 62.000 | .000 | .920 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--------|----------------------|-------|--------|------|------|
| | Lambda | | | | | | |
| | Hotelling's Trace | 11.531 | 119.158 ^b | 6.000 | 62.000 | .000 | .920 |
| | Roy's Largest Root | 11.531 | 119.158 ^b | 6.000 | 62.000 | .000 | .920 |
| a. Design: Intercept | | | | | | | |
| Within Subjects Design: factor1 | | | | | | | |
| b. Exact statistic | | | | | | | |

The results of the Multivariate test, Table 3, revealed significant difference between the participants' CM score sets, Wilks' Lambda = .80, $F(6.62) = 119$, $p < .0001$, multivariate partial eta squared = .92. That is to say, the female Iraqi EFL teachers were significantly different in their CM. To locate the difference, the Pairwise comparisons test was run, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4 *Pairwise Comparisons*

| Measure: MEASURE_1 | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---|------------------------|
| (I) factor1 | (J) factor1 | Mean Difference (I- J) | Std. Error | Sig.^b | 95% Confidence Interval for Difference^b | |
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| 1 | 2 | 2.279 [*] | .716 | .046 | .018 | 4.541 |
| | 3 | 4.338 [*] | 1.009 | .001 | 1.153 | 7.524 |
| | 4 | -2.426 | .864 | .137 | -5.155 | .302 |
| | 5 | -2.662 [*] | .645 | .002 | -4.699 | -.625 |
| | 6 | -7.059 [*] | .768 | .000 | -9.483 | -4.635 |
| | 7 | 6.897 [*] | .649 | .000 | 4.848 | 8.946 |
| 2 | 1 | -2.279 [*] | .716 | .046 | -4.541 | -.018 |
| | 3 | 2.059 | .941 | .675 | -.913 | 5.031 |
| | 4 | -4.706 [*] | .845 | .000 | -7.375 | -2.037 |
| | 5 | -4.941 [*] | .811 | .000 | -7.503 | -2.379 |
| | 6 | -9.338 [*] | .754 | .000 | -11.719 | -6.957 |
| | 7 | 4.618 [*] | .624 | .000 | 2.646 | 6.590 |
| 3 | 1 | -4.338 [*] | 1.009 | .001 | -7.524 | -1.153 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|----------|-------|-------|---------|---------|
| | 2 | -2.059 | .941 | .675 | -5.031 | .913 |
| | 4 | -6.765* | .686 | .000 | -8.930 | -4.599 |
| | 5 | -7.000* | .911 | .000 | -9.876 | -4.124 |
| | 6 | -11.397* | 1.010 | .000 | -14.586 | -8.208 |
| | 7 | 2.559 | .984 | .240 | -.549 | 5.666 |
| 4 | 1 | 2.426 | .864 | .137 | -.302 | 5.155 |
| | 2 | 4.706* | .845 | .000 | 2.037 | 7.375 |
| | 3 | 6.765* | .686 | .000 | 4.599 | 8.930 |
| | 5 | -.235 | .786 | 1.000 | -2.718 | 2.248 |
| | 6 | -4.632* | .904 | .000 | -7.488 | -1.776 |
| | 7 | 9.324* | .910 | .000 | 6.450 | 12.198 |
| 5 | 1 | 2.662* | .645 | .002 | .625 | 4.699 |
| | 2 | 4.941* | .811 | .000 | 2.379 | 7.503 |
| | 3 | 7.000* | .911 | .000 | 4.124 | 9.876 |
| | 4 | .235 | .786 | 1.000 | -2.248 | 2.718 |
| | 6 | -4.397* | .526 | .000 | -6.057 | -2.737 |
| | 7 | 9.559* | .612 | .000 | 7.625 | 11.493 |
| 6 | 1 | 7.059* | .768 | .000 | 4.635 | 9.483 |
| | 2 | 9.338* | .754 | .000 | 6.957 | 11.719 |
| | 3 | 11.397* | 1.010 | .000 | 8.208 | 14.586 |
| | 4 | 4.632* | .904 | .000 | 1.776 | 7.488 |
| | 5 | 4.397* | .526 | .000 | 2.737 | 6.057 |
| | 7 | 13.956* | .537 | .000 | 12.261 | 15.651 |
| 7 | 1 | -6.897* | .649 | .000 | -8.946 | -4.848 |
| | 2 | -4.618* | .624 | .000 | -6.590 | -2.646 |
| | 3 | -2.559 | .984 | .240 | -5.666 | .549 |
| | 4 | -9.324* | .910 | .000 | -12.198 | -6.450 |
| | 5 | -9.559* | .612 | .000 | -11.493 | -7.625 |
| | 6 | -13.956* | .537 | .000 | -15.651 | -12.261 |
| Based on estimated marginal means | | | | | | |
| *. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level. | | | | | | |
| b. Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Bonferroni. | | | | | | |

The results demonstrated significant difference among female EFL teachers' seven CM sub-scores. Hence, the answer to the second research question is positive, there is meaningful difference in female Iraqi EFL teachers' sub-components of CM.

The third research questions addressed any significant relationship between female Iraqi EFL teachers' overall EI and CM. The relationship between female Iraqi EFL educators' EI and CM scores was inspected applying Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. The results are illustrated in Table 5.

Table 5 *The Relationship between Female Iraqi EFL Teachers' Overall EI and CM Scores*

| | | Total EI | Total Management |
|--|---------------------|----------|------------------|
| Total EI | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .517** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .000 |
| | N | 68 | 68 |
| Total Management | Pearson Correlation | .517** | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | |
| | N | 68 | 68 |
| **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

The analysis displayed a strong, positive connection between the two variables, $r = .51$, $n = 68$, $p = .000 < .001$ with great stages of EI connected with great stages of CM.

5.3. Male Iraqi EFL Teachers' CM and EI

The fourth and fifth research question addressed male Iraqi EFL teachers' variations in subcomponents of their EI and CM. Two Repeated Measures ANOVA tests were conducted on the data obtained from the EI and CM questionnaires completed by male participants to answer these research questions. A Multivariate Test was run to check the observed difference. Table 6 depicts the results.

Table 6 *Multivariate Tests^a*

| Effect | | Value | F | Hypothesis df | Error df | Sig. | Partial Eta Squared |
|--|-----------------------------------|--------|----------------------|------------------|-------------|------|---------------------------|
| factor1 | Pillai's Trace | .927 | 207.832 ^b | 3.000 | 49.000 | .000 | .927 |
| | Wilks' Lambda | .073 | 207.832 ^b | 3.000 | 49.000 | .000 | .927 |
| | Hotelling's Trace | 12.724 | 207.832 ^b | 3.000 | 49.000 | .000 | .927 |
| | Roy's Largest Root | 12.724 | 207.832 ^b | 3.000 | 49.000 | .000 | .927 |
| a. Design: Intercept | | | | | | | |
| Within Subjects Design: factor1 | | | | | | | |
| b. Exact statistic | | | | | | | |

The results of the Multivariate test, Table 6, revealed significant difference between the male participants' EI score sets, Wilks' Lambda = .073, $F(3.49) = 208$, $p < .0001$, multivariate partial eta squared = .95. That is to say, the male Iraqi EFL teachers EI components varied significantly. To locate the difference, the Pairwise comparisons test was run, as shown in Table 7.

Table 7 *Pairwise Comparison of Male Iraqi EFL Teachers' EI Score Sets*

| Measure: MEASURE_1 | | | | | | |
|--------------------|----------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------------|--|-------------|
| (I) factor1 | (J) factor1 | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. ^b | 95% Confidence Interval for Difference ^b | |
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| 1 | 2 | .615 | .757 | 1.000 | -1.462 | 2.692 |
| | 3 | 4.808 [*] | .534 | .000 | 3.342 | 6.273 |
| | 4 | 11.327 [*] | .610 | .000 | 9.652 | 13.002 |
| 2 | 1 | -.615 | .757 | 1.000 | -2.692 | 1.462 |
| | 3 | 4.192 [*] | .604 | .000 | 2.534 | 5.851 |
| | 4 | 10.712 [*] | .545 | .000 | 9.215 | 12.209 |
| 3 | 1 | -4.808 [*] | .534 | .000 | -6.273 | -3.342 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|------|------|---------|--------|
| | 2 | -4.192 [*] | .604 | .000 | -5.851 | -2.534 |
| | 4 | 6.519 [*] | .425 | .000 | 5.353 | 7.686 |
| 4 | 1 | -11.327 [*] | .610 | .000 | -13.002 | -9.652 |
| | 2 | -10.712 [*] | .545 | .000 | -12.209 | -9.215 |
| | 3 | -6.519 [*] | .425 | .000 | -7.686 | -5.353 |
| Based on estimated marginal means | | | | | | |
| *. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level. | | | | | | |
| b. Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Bonferroni. | | | | | | |

The results demonstrated significant difference among male EFL teachers' four EI sub-scores. Hence, the reply to the fourth research question is positive, there is considerable difference in male Iraqi EFL teachers' sub-components of EI and the relevant null hypothesis is rejected.

The fifth research questions addressed male Iraqi EFL teachers' variations in subcomponents of their CM. This research question was answered via a Repeated Measures ANOVA analysis of the data obtained from the CM questionnaire. Another Multivariate Test was run to verify the significance of the observed difference. Table 8 indicates the results.

Table 8 *Multivariate Tests^a*

| Effect | | Value | F | Hypothesis df | Error df | Sig. | Partial Eta Squared |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|-------|----------------------|---------------|----------|------|---------------------|
| factor1 | Pillai's Trace | .903 | 175.004 ^b | 6.000 | 113.000 | .000 | .903 |
| | Wilks' Lambda | .097 | 175.004 ^b | 6.000 | 113.000 | .000 | .903 |
| | Hotelling's Trace | 9.292 | 175.004 ^b | 6.000 | 113.000 | .000 | .903 |
| | Roy's Largest Root | 9.292 | 175.004 ^b | 6.000 | 113.000 | .000 | .903 |
| a. Design: Intercept | | | | | | | |
| Within Subjects Design: factor1 | | | | | | | |
| b. Exact statistic | | | | | | | |

As indicated in the results of the Multivariate test, Table 8, significant differences were observed between the male participants' CM score sets, Wilks' Lambda = .98, $F(6.113) = 175$, $p < .0001$, multivariate partial eta squared = .95. That is to say, the male Iraqi EFL teachers CM components varied significantly. To locate the difference, the Pairwise comparisons test was run, as shown in Table 9.

Table 9 *Pairwise Comparison of Male Iraqi EFL Teachers' CM Score Sets*

| Measure: MEASURE_1 | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------|-----------------------|------------|-------------------|---|-------------|
| (I) factor1 | (J) factor1 | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. ^b | 95% Confidence Interval for Difference ^b | |
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| 1 | 2 | 2.479 [*] | .491 | .000 | .956 | 4.002 |
| | 3 | 2.874 [*] | .679 | .001 | .766 | 4.982 |
| | 4 | -3.067 [*] | .678 | .000 | -5.171 | -.963 |
| | 5 | -3.210 [*] | .515 | .000 | -4.808 | -1.612 |
| | 6 | -7.143 [*] | .552 | .000 | -8.857 | -5.429 |
| | 7 | 6.361 [*] | .518 | .000 | 4.754 | 7.969 |
| 2 | 1 | -2.479 [*] | .491 | .000 | -4.002 | -.956 |
| | 3 | .395 | .645 | 1.000 | -1.608 | 2.398 |
| | 4 | -5.546 [*] | .634 | .000 | -7.516 | -3.577 |
| | 5 | -5.689 [*] | .602 | .000 | -7.558 | -3.820 |
| | 6 | -9.622 [*] | .594 | .000 | -11.468 | -7.776 |
| | 7 | 3.882 [*] | .505 | .000 | 2.314 | 5.451 |
| 3 | 1 | -2.874 [*] | .679 | .001 | -4.982 | -.766 |
| | 2 | -.395 | .645 | 1.000 | -2.398 | 1.608 |
| | 4 | -5.941 [*] | .561 | .000 | -7.684 | -4.198 |
| | 5 | -6.084 [*] | .670 | .000 | -8.164 | -4.005 |
| | 6 | -10.017 [*] | .741 | .000 | -12.317 | -7.717 |
| | 7 | 3.487 [*] | .711 | .000 | 1.281 | 5.694 |
| 4 | 1 | 3.067 [*] | .678 | .000 | .963 | 5.171 |
| | 2 | 5.546 [*] | .634 | .000 | 3.577 | 7.516 |
| | 3 | 5.941 [*] | .561 | .000 | 4.198 | 7.684 |
| | 5 | -.143 | .529 | 1.000 | -1.784 | 1.499 |
| | 6 | -4.076 [*] | .687 | .000 | -6.208 | -1.943 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|----------|------|-------|---------|---------|
| | 7 | 9.429° | .637 | .000 | 7.451 | 11.406 |
| 5 | 1 | 3.210° | .515 | .000 | 1.612 | 4.808 |
| | 2 | 5.689° | .602 | .000 | 3.820 | 7.558 |
| | 3 | 6.084° | .670 | .000 | 4.005 | 8.164 |
| | 4 | .143 | .529 | 1.000 | -1.499 | 1.784 |
| | 6 | -3.933° | .467 | .000 | -5.383 | -2.482 |
| | 7 | 9.571° | .439 | .000 | 8.208 | 10.934 |
| 6 | 1 | 7.143° | .552 | .000 | 5.429 | 8.857 |
| | 2 | 9.622° | .594 | .000 | 7.776 | 11.468 |
| | 3 | 10.017° | .741 | .000 | 7.717 | 12.317 |
| | 4 | 4.076° | .687 | .000 | 1.943 | 6.208 |
| | 5 | 3.933° | .467 | .000 | 2.482 | 5.383 |
| | 7 | 13.504° | .451 | .000 | 12.105 | 14.904 |
| 7 | 1 | -6.361° | .518 | .000 | -7.969 | -4.754 |
| | 2 | -3.882° | .505 | .000 | -5.451 | -2.314 |
| | 3 | -3.487° | .711 | .000 | -5.694 | -1.281 |
| | 4 | -9.429° | .637 | .000 | -11.406 | -7.451 |
| | 5 | -9.571° | .439 | .000 | -10.934 | -8.208 |
| | 6 | -13.504° | .451 | .000 | -14.904 | -12.105 |
| Based on estimated marginal means | | | | | | |
| *. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level. | | | | | | |
| b. Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Bonferroni. | | | | | | |

The results, as indicated in Table 9, demonstrated significant difference among male EFL teachers' seven CM sub-scores. Hence, the reply to the fifth research question is positive, there is remarkable difference in male Iraqi EFL teachers' sub-components of CM and the relevant null hypothesis is rejected.

Research question 6 addressed any significant relationship between male Iraqi EFL teachers' overall EI and CM. The correlation between male Iraqi EFL teachers' EI and CM scores was probed using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. The outcomes are illustrated in Table 10.

Table 10 *The Relationship between Male Iraqi EFL Teachers' Overall EI and CM Scores*

| | | Total EI | Total Management |
|------------------|---------------------|----------|------------------|
| Total EI | Pearson Correlation | 1 | -.066 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .644 |
| | N | 52 | 52 |
| Total Management | Pearson Correlation | -.066 | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .644 | |
| | N | 52 | 52 |

The results of the correlation analysis displayed negative correlation between the two variables that does not reach significance level, $r = -.066$, $n = 52$, $p = .64 > .001$.

5.4. Comparing Male and Female Iraqi EFL Teachers' EI and CM

The seventh and eighth research questions delved into gender variations in Iraqi EFL teachers' overall EI and CM. To answer these research questions, the participants' overall EI and CM scores were compared using two independent samples t-tests. Table11 presents the results.

Table11 *Independent Samples t-test of Male and Female Iraqi EFL Teachers' Overall EI and CM Scores*

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|----------|-------------------------|---|------|------------------------------|-----|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|---|-------|
| | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| Total EI | Equal variances assumed | 1.55 | .21 | 1.60 | 118 | .110 | 4.93 | 3.06 | -1.13 | 11.0 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|------|-----|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|
| | EV. not assumed | | | 1.56 | 97.88 | .120 | 4.93 | 3.14 | -1.30 | 11.1 |
| Total Management | notEV assumed | 4.18 | .04 | 2.42 | 118 | .017 | 17.30 | 7.12 | 3.18 | 31.41 |
| | EV assumed | | | 2.33 | 91.25 | .022 | 17.30 | 7.40 | 2.59 | 32.00 |

The results of the analyses in Table11 revealed no meaningful difference in male and female participants' overall EI ($t(118) = 1.60$, $p = .21$, two-tailed). Hence, the reply to the seventh research question is negative and the corresponding null hypothesis is verified. However, the difference in the two groups participating teachers reached significance level EI ($t(118) = .04$, $p = .02$, two-tailed) verifying the higher CM skills of female teachers.

6. Discussion

The study examined emotional intelligence (EI) and classroom management (CM) of Iraqi EFL teachers across gender. The findings revealed significant differences among female teachers' EI and CM sub-scores, with a positive correlation between the two. Similarly, male teachers showed significant differences in their EI and CM sub-scores, but with a negative correlation between the two. Gender differences were also found, with female teachers exhibiting higher overall CM skills compared to their male counterparts.

The study provided insights into the specific EI and CM components of the participants. Female teachers scored well above average in perceiving emotions, managing their own and others' emotions, and utilizing emotions. Male teachers also scored above average in these EI

sub-components. Regarding CM, the participants exhibited high levels of skills across the various sub-components, with the highest being in the management of planning.

The findings suggest the importance of EI in effective CM, as teachers who can better cope with their emotions may also demonstrate better classroom discipline. The study underscores the need for teacher training programs to enhance both EI and CM skills, as these attributes can significantly impact student learning and the overall classroom environment. The close link between the mental and emotional aspects of learning highlights the requirement to create a supportive and friendly atmosphere in the classroom.

7. Conclusion

This analysis investigated Iraqi EFL teachers' Classroom Management (CM) and their emotional intelligence (EI). The findings, as explained in Chapter 6, demonstrated that the participant teachers self-scored themselves at above average levels with regard to both of these variables with significant difference only in CM with females outperforming males. In addition, positive relationship was found between female participants' CM and EI.

Modelled on the findings from the current study, it might be inferred that Iraqi EFL teachers' although both males and female reported higher than average levels of EI and CM, they seem to need some in-service training in order to raise their awareness of the significant features of these two variables so that they can become cognizant of various aspects of their own and students' emotions, and thereby, more adequately manage their teaching.

References

Abdzadeh, Y., & Baker, W. (2020). Cultural awareness in an Iranian English language classroom: A teaching intervention in an intercultural

“conservative” setting. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 9(1), 57–80.

Ahmed, M., Ambreen, M., & Hussain, I. (2018). Gender differentials among teachers’ classroom management strategies in Pakistani context. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 5(2), 178–193.

Barrios, M. (2016). *Comparing emotional intelligence levels in teachers of the year in elementary school, middle school, and high school and how their emotional intelligence traits are exhibited in the classroom* [Doctoral dissertation]. Brandman University.

Bradberry, T., & Greaves, J. (2009). *Emotional intelligence 2.0*. TalentSmart.

Brummitt, M. (2013). The comprehensive handbook of constructivist teaching: From theory to practice. *Teaching Theology and Religion*, 16 (1), 200–215.

Burden, P. R. (2020). *Classroom management: Creating a successful K–12 learning community*. John Wiley & Sons.

Canter, L. (2010). *Assertive discipline: Positive behavior management for today's classroom*. Solution Tree Press.

Cyril, A. V., & Raj, M. A. (2018). Emotional maturity and metacognition of high school teachers. *i-Manager's Journal on Educational Psychology*, 12(2), 24–36.

Fosnot, C. T. (2013). *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives, and practice*. Teachers College Press.

Garrett, T. F. (2015). Misconceptions and goals of classroom management. *The Education Digest*, 80(5), 45.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. Bantam.

Jones, S. M., Bailey, R., & Jacob, R. (2014). Social–emotional learning is essential to classroom management. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 96(2), 19–24.

- Kounin, J. S. (1970). *Discipline and group management in classrooms*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Marzano, R. (2013). *Art and science of teaching/ask yourself: Are students engaged*. ASCD: Technology–Rich.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R., & Sitarenios, G. (2003). Measuring emotional intelligence with the MSCEIT V2. 0. *Emotion*, 3(1), 97–105.
- Rahimi, M., & Asadollahi, F. (2012). On the relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' classroom management orientations and teaching style. *Procedia–Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 31, 49–55.
- Salkind, N. J. (2003). *Exploring Research*. Pearson Education BR.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, cognition and personality*, 9(3), 185–211.
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D. J., Cooper, J. T., Golden, C. J., & Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and individual differences*, 25(2), 167–177.
- Sibiya, M. N., Madlala, S. T., & Ngxongo, T. S. (2019). Challenges faced by student accoucheurs during clinical placement at the free state maternal health care institutions. *African Health Sciences*, 19(2), 2263–2269.
- Wharam, J. (2009). *Emotional intelligence*. O Books.
- Wolff, C. E., Jarodzka, H., & Boshuizen, H. (2021). Classroom management scripts: A theoretical model contrasting expert and novice teachers' knowledge and awareness of classroom events. *Educational Psychology Review*, 33(1), 131–148.