The Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)
6 (3), Fall 2014, Ser. 76/4
ISSN: 2008-8191. pp. 125-145

The Relationship between EFL Teachers' Emotional Intelligence and Students' Motivational Attributes

A. Roohani *
Assistant Professor, TEFL
Shahrekord University
email: roohani.ali@gmail.com

N. Mohammadi
M.A., TEFL
Shahrekord University
email: mohamadinafiseh@gmail.com

Abstract

This study explored the relationship between EFL (English as a foreign language) teachers' emotional intelligence (EI) and their students' motivational attributes. Additionally, it investigated the contribution of EFL teachers' EI to students' motivational factors. To these ends, 30 EFL teachers were selected through convenience sampling from language institutes in Najaf-Abad, and were asked to complete Bar-On's Emotional Quotient Inventory. Then, Gardner's Attitude/Motivation Test Battery was administered to 221 randomly selected EFL students from the teachers' English courses in the language institutes. The results of bivariate correlation and multiple regression analyses revealed that there was a statistically significant and positive relationship between the teachers' EI and their students' motivational attributes. Moreover, *Adaptability*, *Interpersonal*, and *General Mood*, three competencies of teachers' EI, were found to have higher correlations with the students' motivational attributes. But the unique contributions of the above three EI subdomains as well as *Intrapersonal* and *Stress Management* subdomains to the motivational factors were not statistically significant. In general, the teachers' EI made a moderate contribution to the students' motivation.

Keywords: emotional intelligence, EFL students, EFL teachers, motivational attributes

1. Introduction

In the process of second/foreign language (L2) learning, motivation has been considered as a contributing factor that influences learners' success in

Received: 01/19/2014 Accepted: 10/15/2014
*Corresponding author

language learning (Norris-Holt, 2001). Dörnyei (2010) believes that learners with high motivation can achieve a working knowledge of an L2, regardless of their language aptitude, whereas without great motivation even the smartest L2 learners are unlikely to persist long enough to attain any really useful language. Motivation affects the extent to which language learners persevere in learning and their actual achievement (Ellis, 1994). Gardner (1985a) considers motivation to learn the language of another community to be a primary force for enhancing and hindering intercultural communication. Giving much attention to motivation in language learning, he defines motivation as "the extent to which the individual works or strives to learn the language because of a desire to do so and the satisfaction experienced in this activity" (p. 10). Despite the fact that there is no single integrated definition of motivation accepted by all researchers, as Root (1999) states, we can all focus on the factors which work together to create or increase motivation.

Accordingly, some studies on motivation (e.g., Csizér and Dörnyei, 2005; Dörnyei, 2001a) have focused on the factors affecting L2 learners' motivation. Among the factors increasing or decreasing learners' motivation, the role of teachers has been regarded as one of the determinants in the process of L2 learning (Dörnyei, 2001a; Dörnyei, 2001b). According to Dörnyei (2001a), the motivational characteristics of L2 teachers can have bearings on learners' motivational disposition, hence developing their L2 language use. Jinping also (2005) regards an L2 teacher as a facilitative drive. Thus, teachers' skills in motivating L2 learners should be considered as central to teaching effectiveness (Dörnyei, 2001b).

To move further, the impact of teachers' emotional intelligence (EI) has recently received considerable attention in educational setting. EI is "an array of noncognitive capabilities, competencies, and skills that influence one's ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures" (Bar-On, 1997, p. 14). This notion intends to reconcile the two notions of *cognition* and *emotion;* it is "the habitual practice of thinking about feeling and feeling about thinking when choosing what to do" (Sparrow & Knight, 2006, p. 29) and one of the potential predictors of success in life (Bar-On, 1997). Given its importance, some researchers (e.g., Dewaele, 2005) have argued in favor of broadening the field of instructed L2 acquisition/learning by including the emotional dimension in research to offer crucial theoretical insights into this field that are now absent. Some scholars (e.g. Goleman, 1995; Mortiboys, 2005) have also argued for the

necessity of using EI skills for teachers. Likewise, Goleman (1995) suggests that teachers become more effective when they are aware of the influence of EI on learning. Similarly, Mortiboys (2005) asserts that the way a teacher manipulates his/her own emotions and those of learners increases the chances of learners' engagement and motivation as emotion "might be the fundamental basis of motivation" (MacIntyre, 2002, p. 45).

Given the above issue and potential role of EI in educational settings, particularly in the language learning domain, there is still a scarcity of research on teachers' EI, particularly in English as foreign language (EFL) contexts. Thus, a gap is felt to study the possible relationship between EFL teachers' EI and learners' motivational attributes/factors. This issue is important since some EFL learners do not display a strong desire and interest in learning L2 and some teachers often complain about the lack of learners' motivation and active involvements in L2 learning. It has been assumed that it might be beneficial for teachers to be more aware of the aspects of their own personality and the variables affecting their students' success in educational settings. This way, they can create a climate of enthusiasm and motivation.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Emotional intelligence

Decades after the introduction of the theory of *social intelligence* in 1920s by Thorndike, who defined intelligence as "the ability to perceive ones' own and others' internal states, motives, and behaviors, and to act toward them optimally" (cited in Salovey & Mayer, 1990, p. 187), Gardner (1983) proposed the theory of *multiple intelligences*, which paved the way for the development of emotional intelligence (EI). Howard Gardner asserted that "our IQ is the tip of the iceberg… [Hence] we need more than our IQ in life to be effective and successful" (cited in Sparrow & Knight, 2006, p. 12). At the same time, other researchers (e.g., Salovey & Mayer, 1990) accentuated on the confluence of cognition and affection mediated by EI and expanded the notion of intelligence to take account of EI.

There are now two major conceptual models on EI: (a) the ability model (Mayer & Salovey, 1997; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2002), and (b) the mixed model (Bar-On 1997, 2000; Goleman, 1995). The proponents of the ability model (e.g., Mayer, Roberts, & Barsade, 2008) view EI as a form of pure intelligence, that is, a cognitive ability which is separate from the personality traits. According to them, EI is the ability to: (a) perceive

emotion; (b) use emotion to facilitate thought; (c) understand emotions; and (d) manage emotion (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). But Goleman (1995), who has proposed a mixed model, integrates an individual's abilities and personality. Like Goleman, who popularized the concept by publishing his book *Emotional Intelligence* in 1995, Bar-On (1997, 2000) perceives EI as a mixed intelligence involving cognitive ability and personality aspects and stresses the importance of emotional expression and the outcome of emotionally intelligent behavior in life. In his model, Bar-On (1997), the originator of emotional quotient (EQ), has identified five major areas: (a) *Intrapersonal*, including such skills as self-actualization, independence, self-regard, emotional self-awareness and assertiveness; (b) *Interpersonal*, including such skills as empathy, interpersonal relationship and social responsibility; (c) *Adaptability*, including such qualities as reality-testing, problem-solving and flexibility; (d) *Stress Management*, involving stress tolerance and impulse-control and e) *General Mood*, including optimism and happiness.

Despite criticisms against the concept of EI for the lack of a clear specification and difficulty in its measuring, and being non-moral, it has continued to be useful as a scientific construct and there is a growing interest to include the role of emotions as a new source of individual differences (IDs) in the research agenda. Although most of the studies on EI concern the role of EI with the focus on students or students' IDs (e.g., Fahim & Pishghadam, 2007; Pishghadam, 2009; Roohani, 2009), there are rigorous research as regards teachers. For instance, in the field of education, Penrose, Perry and Ball (2007) explored the underlying dimensions of teachers' EI among 239 teachers in Melbourne. Results revealed that teachers expressing high levels of EI would exhibit high levels of ability in teaching profession. Also, Salami (2007) investigated the relationship of EI to work attitudes of secondary school teachers in South Western Nigeria. Results indicated that emotional intelligence had a significant relationship with work attitude. Similarly, Lenka and Kant (2012) reported a significant positive relationship between emotional intelligence and professional development of 120 secondary school teachers in India. Moreover, in EFL context, Ghanizadeh and Moafian (2010) investigated the relationship between 89 EFL teachers' EI and their pedagogical success in language institutes in Iran. Results revealed a positive relationship between teachers' success and EI skills. Similarly, Moafian and Ghanizadeh (2009) have contended that promoting EFL teachers' EI had a positive effect on their sense of efficacy, leading to

their effective teaching and student achievement. The aforementioned studies are illuminating, but little is still known about the relationship between teachers' EI and students' motivational factors and the application of EI to the field of L2 teaching.

2.2 Motivation

The literature on motivation shows that exploring motivation is not new, but there are models which have been conspicuously influential in L2 motivation up-to-now and one of them is Gardner's (1985a, 1985b) socio-educational model. In this model, as Gardner (2005) explains, achievement in L2 is largely a function of two individual difference variables i.e., language aptitude and motivation. According to Gardner, motivation to learn L2 is considered as requiring three elements; effort, desire and positive attitude. Three other classes of variables supporting motivation are *Integrativeness* and *Attitudes toward the Learning Situation* and *Instrumentality*. Attitude is defined as "an evaluative reaction to some referent or attitude object, inferred on the basis of the individual's beliefs or opinions about the referent" (Gardner, 1985a, p. 9). Integrativeness refers to "an individual's openness to taking on characteristics of another cultural/linguistic group" (p. 7), and instrumentality refers to "conditions where the language is being studied for practical or utilitarian purposes" (p. 11).

Several studies (e.g., Lett & O'Mara, 1990; Vaezi, 2008) have been conducted indicating learners' motivation as contributors to L2 proficiency; some other studies have explored the relationship between motivation and other learner variables such as strategy use (e.g., Chun-huan, 2010; Schmidt & Watanabe, 2001) and gender (e.g., Salem, 2006) among others; some (e.g., Ogundokun & Adyeymo, 2010) have found motivation as a potent predictor associated with academic achievement; several studies (e.g., Guilloteaux & Dornyei, 2008) have examined the link between the teachers' teaching practice and their students' language learning motivation. The results of these studies on motivation, in general, indicate that, first, motivating L2 learners is one of the sources of difficulty in classrooms by language teachers; second, language learners' motivation and performance are correlated; third, teachers' motivational practice influence the motivational behavior of learners. Nonetheless, no empirical study, to the best of this researcher's knowledge, has addressed the relationship between teachers' EI and learners' motivation. There exists, of course, a study which

tests whether the EI construct can be applied to formal instruction in L2 learning. In this exploratory study, which focused on students' IDs, Rodríguez Prieto (2010) explored the relationship between the theory of EI and language learners' motivational orientations, motivational learning effort and achievement by adult L2 Spanish students at two levels of formal instruction (beginning and intermediate). Results showed positive correlations between some EI skills and some motivational orientations i.e., an integrative and instrumental orientation, at the intermediate level. But higher scores on EI did not predict greater learning effort in the Spanish class.

In sum, the knowledge about the role of teachers' EI in L2 learning motivation is not sufficient. It seems appropriate to attempt to add some knowledge to the related literature by exploring the relationship between the aforementioned variables. This issue becomes more important in EFL contexts such as that of Iran where some of the conditions such as close contact with target native speakers, which can contribute to successful L2 learning are missing. Additionally, a review of the literature reveals that much research has been conducted on learners' motivation (e.g., Csizér & Dörnyei, 2005; Gardner, 2000, Yin, 2008) and a gap is felt on the relation of learners' motivational factors as regards L2 teachers. This study then seeks to investigate how these two variables and their components are related. In addition, it explores the extent to which teachers' EI can contribute to EFL students' motivational characteristics. To these ends, this study relies on the Bar-On' (1997) mixed model of EI and Gardner's (1985a) socio-educational model of motivation in which both EI and motivation constructs include clusters of factors as the attributes of emotionally intelligent and motivated individuals. In light of the above issues, the following research questions are addressed:

1. Is there any significant relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' EI and their students' motivational attributes?
2. Is there any significant relationship between any subdomain of EFL teachers' EI construct (i.e., *Intrapersonal, Interpersonal, Adaptability, Stress Management and General Mood*) with any subdomain of students' motivational attributes (i.e., *Motivation, Integrativeness, Attitudes toward Learning Situation and Instrumentality*)?
3. To what extent can Iranian EFL teachers' EI predict/contribute to their students' motivational attributes?

3. Method

3.1 Participants

Thirty EFL teachers and 221 EFL students participated in the study. The teacher participants were selected through convenience sampling from the language institutes in Najaf-Abad, where they could be accessed by the researcher. They included 18 males and 12 females with the mean age of 27.5. The student participants, who enrolled in the high-intermediate and advanced-level English courses, were selected through simple random sampling from the teachers' English courses in the language institutes. They included 96 males and 125 females with the mean age of 24. The reason why high-intermediate and advanced-level adult courses were selected was to ensure the participants' acceptable command of English so as to respond well to the items in the motivation instrument of the study.

3.2 Instrumentation

Bar-On's (1997) Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) and Gardner's (1985b) Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) questionnaires were used in the study for data collection. EQ-i is a self-report measure of EI for individuals sixteen years of age and over. Following Bar-on' mixed model of EI, EQ-i measures five broad areas of skills/competencies of EI: *Intrapersonal* (40 items), *Interpersonal* (29 items), *Adaptability* (29 items), *Stress Management* (18 items), *General Mood* (17 items). The questionnaire uses a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very seldom or not true of me) to 5 (very often true of me). The sum of all items comprises the total scale score, being referred to as the EI score in this study, which can range from 133 to 665. Since this questionnaire had been translated and validated in Iranian setting by Dehshiri in 2003, the translation version was used in the present study. Dehshiri (2003) piloted it on 250 Iranian university students. According to him, the translation version is valid and all its subscales show acceptable reliability (0.76). As he states, the Persian questionnaire has generally good internal consistency, test-retest reliability, and construct validity; the Cronbach alpha coefficient for this measure was found to be satisfactory. Moreover, the factor analysis provided some support for the inventory hypothesized structure. Meanwhile, the reliability of this questionnaire, as measured through Cronbach alpha in the present study, was satisfactory (0.76); the reliability coefficients of the subscales were also

acceptable ($\alpha_{Intrapersonal}$ = 0.80, $\alpha_{interpersonal}$ = 0.78, $\alpha_{adaptability}$ = 0.72, $\alpha_{stress\ management}$ = 0.74, $\alpha_{general\ mood}$ = 0.75).

The second questionnaire i.e., AMTB, includes 104 items, coded on a 6-point Likert scale with the response ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree)* to 6 (*strongly agree)*. The test items correspond to the 5 main subscales: *Motivation* (30 items), *Integrativeness* (22 items), *Attitudes toward Learning Situation* (20 items), *Instrumentality* (4 items) and *Language Anxiety* (20 items). According to Gardner and MacIntyre (1993) the validity of AMTB has been supported. The internal consistency reliability and test-retest reliability of the test in Canadian context were reported to be 0.91 and 0.79 respectively (Gardner, 2005). The items related to the parental encouragement for young students and language anxiety were excluded from this study. Because of the age of the participants, who were above 18, it was appropriate to exclude the items. The Likert-type items on the parental encouragement are often used for young children (Robert C. Gardner, personal communication, January 9, 2011). Moreover, the focus of the study was not on the language anxiety variable, which would not directly contribute to motivational factors (Gardner, 2005), and excluding those items would not undermine the conceptual model (Robert C. Gardner, personal communication, January 9, 2011). As Gardner (1999) states, "the focus is not so much on the validity of a test or measure, but rather the elaboration of a conceptual model that is based on research" (p. 10). In addition, expert professional judgment provided some reassurance about the validity of the instrument in the present research setting. Also, the concurrent validity was determined using correlations between the larger (104-item) and shorter (76-item) versions of AMTB in the piloting stage. The correlation coefficient (r = .98, $^{**}p < 0.01$) provided more assurance concerning its validity. Meanwhile, the reliability of the test, as measured through Cronbach alpha with 76 items (with total scores ranging from 76 to 465) in the present study, was found to be high (0.77). The reliabilities of the subscales were all above .70, too ($\alpha_{motivation}$ = .80, $\alpha_{integrtativeness}$ = .78, $\alpha_{attitudes\ toward\ learning\ situation}$ = .73, $\alpha_{instrumentality}$ = .72).

4.3 Procedure

Before carrying out the main study in the language institutes, the two questionnaires of the study were piloted on 10 EFL teacher and 20 student participants, who were similar to the main participants in terms of age,

academic level and mother tongue, to check the suitability of words, instructions, and scoring procedure. The results confirmed desirability of the tests. Also, evidence about the concurrent validity of the AMTB measure of the study was obtained by administering the two versions of AMTB i.e., large and short versions, to the student participants in the piloting. Then, the data were collected in two stages during the 2011-2012 academic year. First, Bar-On's EQ-i (1997) was administered to all 30 EFL teacher participants individually within a week at the beginning of the spring semester before the teachers began to know their students. They were informed about the purpose of the test, but, to avoid sensitivity, they were not informed about the next stage of data collection. Second, the teachers were contacted personally and a time was set up to administer the AMTB. This survey was conducted within two weeks at the end of the semester. The participant teachers were asked to leave the classroom and the randomly selected students were informed about their right to withdraw at any time. The purpose of the test and the significance of providing honest responses were completely explained to the students. In doing so, the participants were also assured about the confidentiality and anonymity of their responses. Finally, to explore the relationship between teachers' EI and their students' motivational attributes, the scores of the AMTB from the students for each teacher's class were obtained, aggregated, and the mean scores were found. Statistical analyses were carried out with SPSS (verson18.0) for Windows.

5. Data Analysis and Results

The descriptive statistics of teachers' emotional intelligence i.e., EQ-i, and students' motivation i.e., AMTB, scores were obtained separately to identify the profile of the teachers' level of emotional intelligence as well as students' motivational attributes. As the number of items in both measures and the subscales was different, to report a comparable descriptive statistics, each teacher's and student's raw score on the EQ-i and AMTB was divided by the total number of the items in each test and number of the items composing the subscale in question, which resulted in a score on a scale of 1-5 and 1-6 respectively. The descriptive statistics of both measures are reported in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of emotional intelligence and motivation scores

Measure	N	Min	Max	M	SD
EQ-i	30	2.87	4.35	3.6	0.41
AMTB	221	3.07	5.64	4.4	0.53

Note. Min = Minimum; Max = *Maximum*

As Table 1 reports, the minimum and maximum EQ-i scores among 30 teachers were 2.87 and 4.35 respectively, that is, around 2 standard deviations below and above the EQ-i mean score (3.35). This mean score was larger than the 2.5 i.e., possible median score on a 5-point scale, indicating that the teacher sample generally received high scores on the emotional intelligence measure. Also, the minimum and maximum AMTB scores in the sample were 3.07 and 5.64 respectively, that is, a little above 2 standard deviations below and above the AMTB mean score (4.45). This mean score was larger than the possible median score, indicating that the student sample generally received high scores on the motivation measure, too.

To make sure that the distribution of scores obtained from the tests would not seriously violate the assumption of normality, Kolmogrov-Smirnov test was conducted. The results showed that the significance value of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for both EQ-i (.145, p = .110) and AMTB (.183, p = .130) scores were found to be more than 0.05, indicating the normality of both sets of scores. In addition, the skewness (0.33 and 0.44) and kurtosis values (0.78 and 0.20) for the EQ-i and AMTB scores were small i.e., within the range of -1.5 to +1.5, indicating an acceptable normality of variances. Thus, bivariate correlation analysis using the Pearson product moment correlational procedure was appropriate to address the first research question i.e., to explore the correlations between the teachers' emotional intelligence and students' motivational attribute scores. When correlations ran, a significant and positive correlation between teachers' EQ-i and students' AMTB scores was found (r = 0.57, $^{**}p <$ 0.01). Also, the effect size was found to be 0.33 for the correlation of the scores. Following Cohen's (1992, cited in Larson-Hall, 2010, p.112)

guidelines on the effect size magnitude for R^2, this effect size for the correlation was between medium (.30) to large (.50).

Furthermore, to have a profile of the subdomains of both measures, the descriptive statistics of the subscales of both measures were obtained. The results are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of the scores from the subscales of EQ-i and AMTB measures

Measures	Subscales	N	Min	Max	M	SD
EQ-i	Intrapersonal	30	2.83	4.35	3.74	0.47
	Interpersonal	30	2.17	4.59	3.71	0.54
	Stress Management	30	2.11	4.33	3.24	0.64
	Adaptability	30	2.58	4.65	3.56	0.54
	General Mood	30	2.29	4.76	3.84	0.44
AMTB	Motivation	221	3.07	5.83	4.53	0.57
	Integrativeness	221	2.73	5.77	4.64	0.61
	Attitude	221	2.65	5.95	4.40	0.71
	Instrumentality	221	1.25	6.00	4.40	0.89

As Table 2 demonstrates, the minimum and maximum EQ-i scores were observed in the *Stress Management* and *General Mood* subscales, which received the lowest and highest EQ-i mean scores (4.33 and 4.76, respectively). In general, the mean scores on all subscales of the EI were found to be high, indicating that the teacher participants scored high on each subscale of the emotional measure. Moreover, the minimum and maximum motivational attribute scores (1.25 and 6.00, respectively) were related to *Instrumentality*, which received a low mean score, too. In addition, the mean scores on the four subscales of the AMTB were found to be higher than the possible median, indicating that the student sample generally scored high on each subscale, particularly on *Integrativeness*. Furthermore, the standard deviations in both EQ-i and AMTB measures were below the unity, indicating little score variation on each subscale.

To address the second research question of the study, which intended to seek whether there were any significant relationships between the five subscales of teachers' emotional intelligence with the four scales of the students' motivational attribute AMTB measures, Pearson product moment

correlation coefficients were obtained after checking the test assumptions. The results are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Correlation matrix of the subscale of EQ-i and AMTB measures

	Motivation	Integrativeness	Attitude	Instrumentality
Intrapersonal	0.22	0.31	0.36*	0.28
	(.243)	(.092)	(.046)	(.130)
Interpersonal	0.49**	0.38*	0.54**	0.29
	(.005)	(.034)	(.002)	(.109)
Stress	0.30	0.38*	0.38*	0.23
Management	(.104)	(.038)	(.036)	(.207)
Adaptability	0.55**	0.54**	0.33	0.39*
	(.001)	(.002)	(.069)	(.033)
General Mood	0.53**	0.52**	0.47**	0.42*
	(.002)	(.003)	(.007)	(.021)

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$

As Table 3 reveals, significant and positive correlations between the components of both measures were found. The highest correlations were found between *Adaptability* and *Motivation* ($r = 0.55$, **$p < .01$, n = 30), *Adaptability* and *Integrativeness* ($r = 0.54$, $p < .01$, n = 30), *Interpersona*l and *Attitude* ($r = 0.54$, **$p < .01$, n = 30), and *General Mood* and *Motivation* ($r = 0.53$, **$p < .01$, n = 30) subscales. The size of the coefficients between the above-mentioned subscales was found to be relatively large, indicating a significant relationship between the aforementioned components. Meanwhile, the lowest correlations were observed between the *Intrapersonal* and *Motivation* ($r = 0.22$, $p = .243$, n = 30) and the *Stress Management* and *Instrumentality* subscales ($r = 0.23$, $p = .207$, n = 30).

To seek the extent to which the EFL teachers' emotional intelligence could predict their students' motivational factors, standard multiple regression was conducted. The scores obtained from the students on the motivation measure i.e., AMTB, were aggregated and the mean scores of AMTB for each teachers' class was considered as the dependent variable in the multiple regression and the scores obtained from the emotional intelligence measure i.e., the four subscales of EQ-i, were considered as independent variable. The major results are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4. Predictors of motivation in the regression

Model [a]	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	*t*	*Sig.*	Part Correlation
	B	Std Error	Beta			
Constant		35.22	-	5.95	.000	-
Intrapersonal	209.45	0.40	0.07	0.21	.832	0.033
Interpersonal	0.09	0.33	0.19	0.92	.366	0.142
Stress	0.30	0.66	0.14	0.53	.602	0.082
Management	0.35	0.53	0.39	1.83	.079	0.283
Adaptability	0.98	0.66	0.27	0.89	.384	0.137
General Mood	0.58					

$R = 0.65$; $R^2 = 0.43$; Adjusted $R^2 = 0.31$

[a] Predicators: Intrapersonal, Interpersonal, Stress management, Adaptability, and General mood

Dependent variable: Motivation

The R^2 value was found to be about 0.43, indicating that the teachers' EQ-i scores could predict 42.9 % of the variance in the students' AMTB scores. That is to say, about 43% of the variation in the students' motivational attributes could be explained by taking teachers' emotional intelligence into account. The R was relatively high and the model reached the statistical significance ($R = 0.65$, $*p < .05$). Besides, the adjusted R^2, providing "a better estimate of the true population value" (Pallent, 2007, p. 158), was significant too (about 31 %), indicating the great effect of the teachers' emotional intelligence in increasing the learners' motivational attributes.

According to Table 4, the largest and lowest Beta values, showing the unique contribution of each independent variable (EQ-i subscale scores), belonged to the *Adaptability* (0.39) and *Intrapersonal* (0.07) components, respectively. That is, the teachers' adaptability and intrapersonal characteristics made the most and least contributions to the motivational factors. As demonstrated in Table 4, the part correlation coefficients (indications of the contributions of independent variables to the total R square) for the *Adaptability* and *Interpersonal* subscales were higher than others (0.283 and 0.142), indicating that they uniquely explained about 8% and 2% of the variance in the motivation measure. However, none of the independent variables reached statistical significance by itself, given that the part correlation coefficients were found to be generally small.

6. Discussion

The descriptive results have demonstrated that the student sample received a relatively high mean score on the motivational attributes, with the highest mean score on *Integrativeness* scale. Students with higher scores on the motivation were the ones who were possibly open enough to understand and learn about the target community i.e., English. The above results are significant in the context of Iran where very few native English speakers can teach EFL courses due to social and political constraints. Despite limited opportunities to benefit from close contact with native speakers of English, the Iranian EFL participants attending private language institutes, showed a high level of motivation towards learning English; the substantial presence of motivation was reflected in terms of factors such as a desire to learn English, positive attitudes toward the English community, and growing expectations for learning English.

Also, the EFL participants exhibited a higher level of integrative motivation than instrumental one. This finding contradicts the common view that in a foreign language context students are more instrumentally motivated. In the present study, appreciating the cultural and intellectual values associated with English was found to be powerful integrative motives among the student participants. As Gardner (2005) states, integrative orientation does not always mean integration with a member of another cultural community, but rather one's openness to appreciate the characteristics of another cultural/linguistic group. As Dörnyei (1990) argues, in the absence of an L2 community in the learners' environment, as a case in point in the current study, the identification can be realized in terms of the cultural and intellectual values associated with the L2 itself.

Furthermore, the findings of this study indicated that the teacher participants were generally emotionally-intelligent and their level of emotional intelligence, in general, demonstrated positive and moderate relationships with the students' motivational attributes. In the conceptualization of EI, Salovey and Mayer (1990, p. 199) suggest that emotions "may be used to motivate and assist performance at complex intellectual tasks". This might hold true in the classrooms where teachers teach a foreign language like English, which is prone to creating intense emotions. It is thus reasonable to claim that the variation in the emotional states of the EFL teachers in the current study was related to the variation in the motivational attributes of their students. Although causal claims cannot be made in interpreting the correlations of the present study, the above

findings can lead us to claim that highly emotionally-intelligent EFL teachers who are high in such skills as interpersonal relationship, stress management, adaptability, and happy mood can influence their students' interest and intensity in L2 learning, and greater effort in the classroom activities. Some EI skills such as teachers' flexibility in handling changes in the classroom, stress-tolerance, impulse-control, social responsibility and empathy are related to better class participation and higher involvement in the classroom dynamic through the mediating variable of an integrative motivation orientation. As perceived by the participants, these students can demonstrate a better attitude towards their L2 instruction.

More specifically, the teachers' *Interpersonal* competency was found to be highly correlated with the students' *Attitude towards Learning Situation*. In Bar-On's (1997) terms, interpersonal characteristic comprises empathy, social responsibility, and interpersonal relationship. Being emotionally intelligent on the interpersonal level encompasses "the ability to be aware of others' emotions, feelings and needs, and to establish and maintain cooperative, constructive and mutually satisfying relationships" (Bar-On, 2006, p. 4). It is assumed that when students find that their teachers are highly cooperative and maintain a satisfying relationship, they may have a more positive evaluation of their teachers and, consequently, their field of study, resulting in higher L2 learning motivation. Similarly, teachers with acceptable level of adaptability are meant "to effectively manage personal, social and environmental changes by realistically and flexibly coping with the immediate situation, solving problems and making decisions" (Bar-On, 2006, p. 4); the feedback students receive from a flexible L2 teacher who can manage the classroom well and solve their problems can have an impact on their students' interest and their orientations towards L2 learning (Rubio, 2009), hence leading to higher integrative motivation in learning. To move further, EFL teachers with a high level of general mood can create a fun and optimistic environment in the L2 classrooms and establish a nonthreatening relationship with students, hence promoting interaction and participation in classroom activities (Yang, 2008). Provided that students find out that their teachers are happy to be in the classroom and so excited about teaching them, their interest in classroom activities and interacting with the teachers increase. The teacher-student rapport, expected to be a feature of classrooms with emotionally intelligent teachers who have high level of adaptability and interpersonal competencies, can make their students interested in learning English, hence enhancing motivation (Yang, 2008).

Therefore, the higher contribution of the EFL teachers' adaptability and interpersonal competencies to their students' motivational factors, observed in the regression analysis in the current study, is not against expectation. It can be argued that the flexibility of EFL teachers, the way they handle the classrooms, and the extent to which they are committed to solve learners' problems, can weaken or arouse their learners' motives about L2 learning. By the same token, when L2 teachers are more emotionally intelligent on the interpersonal level, they can be well aware of their own students' emotions, feelings, and needs; they can try to better understand others, appreciate others' feelings and fears too, and work effectively with others, not just have an effective working model of themselves. Their students, then, begin to show a great interest and intensity in learning the target language, hence promoting motivation. One can agree with Dörnyei (2001b), who believes that teachers are the main focal point in the classroom for motivating or demotivating students. However, caution should be exercised since, as the results indicate, not every competency of the teachers' EI made an equally plausible contribution to predicting the students' motivational attributes. The intrapersonal subdomain, for instance, showed a small contribution to the students' motivational attributes. Perhaps, to enhance their students' motivation, knowing how to keep positive emotions as well as how to deal with negative moods, and also knowing how to use emotions to promote other cognitive abilities are more important for the teachers in the classroom than simply being intrapersonal i.e., aware of one's own emotions at a given point in time. More research is, however, required before a strong conclusion is made about the precise contribution of EFL teachers' EI competencies to their students' motivational attributes.

7. Conclusion

Given the significant role of teachers in students' language achievement, the issue of the relationship between teachers' EI and students' motivational factors will become more important, particularly if we accept that the motivation is of considerable importance in EFL contexts where close contact with native speakers of the target language does not often exist. In essence, the results of the present study lead to the conclusion that in an Iranian EFL context, teachers' EI skills can be positively related to their students' motivational attributes such as their attitude towards learning situation. The results of this study have revealed that the EFL teachers' *adaptability* competency demonstrated a high correlation with the student

participants' motivational orientations and elements which would distinguish a motivated language learner i.e., effort, desire and positive attitude. Moreover, the teachers' *general mood* characteristics correlated positively with the students' integrativeness i.e., a genuine interest in learning English to come closer psychologically to English community, and attitudes toward learning situation i.e., attitude directed toward the teacher, the course, one's classmates, and the materials as well as qualities such as persistent effort and desire to learn English.

It can be claimed that enhancing Iranian EFL teachers' EI may have a positive influence on their students' motivation, which may, in turn, lead to improve student achievement. Hence, encouraging and assisting teachers to gauge, manipulate, and improve their emotional stands can create a classroom in which L2 students tend to have more positive attitudes and greater motivation in language learning. Furthermore, although the EFL teacher participants' adaptability and interpersonal characteristics are found to be better predictors of their students' motivational factors, we should avoid singling out just one component of EI as a significant predictor of students' motivational attributes since, as results have indicated, it is the whole construct of EI that can significantly contribute to motivating attributes.

Being knowledgeable is essential for EFL teachers to teach in language institutes. However, more is needed than a solid knowledge of the language to enhance language learning. The above findings imply that Iranian EFL teachers need to establish a positive interpersonal relationship with their learners, adapt themselves with the classroom settings and have a positive general mood to further boost learners' motivational factors. As Midgley, Feldaufer, and Eccles (1989, as cited in Yang, 2008) assert, in teacher-learner relations, a feeling of concern, care, support, and respect for our language learners and positive teacher-learner interactions are associated with positive motivational outcomes. Additionally, in EFL contexts such as that of Iran, the interpersonal and adaptability skills of teachers should be a matter of great importance since the teacher is assumed by many EFL learners to be the only language user they know and the classroom is considered as the single place where they can use English. By implication, under a cooperative and supporting condition created by an emotionally intelligent EFL teacher, learners can approach their teachers for assistance to solve their own problems in L2 learning. This study offers baseline information for L2 teacher curriculum developers to move forward. This

initial exploration is a step and further research is indeed required with a larger sample size and other measurement instruments to look at the variation in L2 learners' motivational factors.

References

Bar-On, R. (1997). *The emotional quotient inventory (EQ-i): Technical Manual*. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.

Bar-On, R. (2000). Emotional and social intelligence: Insights from the emotional quotient inventory (EQ-i). In R. Bar-On & J. D. Parker (Eds.). *The handbook of emotional intelligence* (pp. 363-388). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bar-On, R. (2006). The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence (ESI). *Psicothema, 18*, 13-25.

Chun-huan, F. (2010). A correlational study of language learning motivation and strategies of Chinese undergraduate. *Canadian Social Science, 6*(4), 202-209.

Csizér, K., & Dörnyei, Z. (2005). The internal structure of language learning motivation and its relationship with language choice and learning effort. *Modern Language Journal, 89*(1), 19-36.

Dehshiri, R. (2003). *The reliability and validity of EQ-i in Iran's context*. Unpublished master's thesis, Allame Tabatabaii University, Tehran, Iran.

Dewaele, J. M. (2005). Investigating the psychological and emotional dimensions in instructed language learning: Obstacles and possibilities. *Modern Language Journal, 89*(3), 367-380.

Dörnyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing motivation in foreign language learning. *Language Learning, 40*, 46-78.

Dörnyei, Z. (2001a). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2001b). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Harlow, England: Longman.

Dörnyei, Z. (2010). Researching motivation: From integrativeness to the ideal L2 self. In S. Hunston & D. Oakey (Eds.). *Introducing applied linguistics: Concepts and skills* (pp. 74-83). London: Routledge.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fahim, M. & Pishghadam, R. (2007). On the role of emotional, psychometric, and verbal intelligences in the academic achievement of university students majoring in English language. *Asian EFL Journal 9*(4), 240-253.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.

Gardner, R. C. (1985a). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitude and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.

Gardner, R. C. (1985b). *The attitude motivation test battery: Technical report*. Ontario: University of Western Ontario.

Gardner, R. C. (1999). Correlation, causation, motivation, and second language acquisition. *Canadian Psychology, 41*(1), 10-24.

Gardner, R. C. (2000). Correlation, causation, motivation and second language acquisition. *Canadian Psychology, 41*, 1-24.

Gardner, R. C. (2005). Integrative motivation and second language acquisition. Retrieved from: http://publish.uwo.ca/~gardner/docs/caaltalk5final.pdf

Gardner, R. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (1993). On the measurement of affective variables in second language learning. *Language Learning, 43*(2), 157-194.

Ghanizadeh, A., & Moafian, F. (2010). The role of EFL teachers' emotional intelligence in their success. *ELT Journal, 64*(4), 424-435.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.

Guilloteaux, M. J., & Dörnyei, Z. (2008). Motivating language learners: A classroom oriented investigation of the effects of motivational strategies on students' motivation. *TESOL Quarterly, 42*(1), 55-77.

Jinping, T. (2005). Classroom language teaching and students motivation. *CELEA Journal, 28*(2), 90-94.

Larson-Hall, J. (2010). *A guide to doing statistics in second language research using SPSS*. New York: Routledge.

Lenka, S. K., & Kant, R. (2012). Emotional intelligence of secondary school teachers in relation to their professional development. *Asian Journal of Management Sciences and Education, 1*(1), 90-101.

Lett, J., & O'Mara, F. E. (1990). Predictors of success in an intensive language learning context: Correlates of language learning at the defense language institute foreign language center. In T. S. Parry & C. W. Stansfield (Eds.). *Language aptitude reconsidered* (pp. 222-260). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

MacIntyre, P. D. (2002). Motivation, anxiety and emotion in second language acquisition. In P. Robinson (Ed.). *Individual differences and instructed language learning* (pp. 45-68). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Mayer, J. D., Roberts, R. D., & Barsade, S. G. (2008). Human abilities: Emotional intelligence. *Annual Review of Psychology, 59*, 507-536.

Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. Sluyter (Eds.). *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications* (pp. 3-31). New York: Basic Books.

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. (2002). *Mayer-Salovey-Caruso emotional intelligence test (MSCEIT) user's manual*. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.

Moafian, F., & Gahnizadeh, A. (2009). The relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' emotional intelligence and their self-efficacy in language institutes. *System*, *37*, 708-718.

Mortiboys, A. (2005). *Teaching with emotional intelligence: A step-by-step guide for higher and further education professionals*. London: Routledge.

Norris-Holt, J. (2001). Motivation as a contributing factor in second language acquisition. *The Internet TESL Journal, 7*(6). Retrieved from: http://iteslj.org/Articales/Norris-Motivation.html

Pallent, J. (2007). *SPSS: Survival manual* (3th ed.). Berkshire, England: Open University Press (McGraw Hill).

Ogundokun, M. O., & Adeyemo, D. A. (2010). Emotional intelligence and academic achievement: The moderating influence of age, extrinsic motivation. *Journal of the African Educational Research Network, 10*(2), 128-141.

Penrose, A., Perry, C., & Ball, I. (2007). Emotional intelligence and teacher self-efficacy: The contribution of teacher status and length of experience. *Issues in Educational Research, 17*(1), 107-126.

Pishghadam, R. (2009). A qualitative analysis of the relationship between emotional intelligence and foreign language learning. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Learning 6*(1), 31-41.

Rodríguez Prieto. J. P. (2010). Emotional intelligence, motivational orientations, and motivational learning effort and achievement in Spanish as a foreign language. In C. Borgonovo, M. Español-Echevarría, & P. Prévost (Eds.). *The Proceedings of the 12th Hispanic Linguistics Symposiu*m (pp. 284-297). Somerville, USA.

Roohani, A. (2009). The study of emotional intelligence and literature in education; Gender and major of study. *The Journal of Asian TEFL, 6*(4), 33-69.

Root, E. (1999). *Motivation and learning strategies in a foreign language setting: A look at a learner of Korean.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Minnesota, USA.

Rubio, C. M. (2009). Effective teachers–professional and personal skills. *ENSAYOS: Revista de la Facultad de. Educación de Albacete, 24*, 35-46.

Salami, S. O. (2007). Emotional Intelligence and self-efficacy to work attitudes among secondary school teachers in south western Nigeria. *Essays in Education, 20*, 43-56.

Salem, N. M. (2006). *The Role of motivation, gender, and language learning strategies in EFL proficiency*. Unpublished master's thesis, American University of Beirut, Beirut, Lebanon.

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality, 9*, 185-211.

Schmidt, R., & Watanabe, Y. (2001). Motivation, strategy use, and pedagogical preferences in foreign language learning. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.). *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 313-359). Honolulu: University of Hawaii.

Sparrow, T. & Knight, A. (2006). *Applied EI: The importance of attitudes in developing emotional intelligence*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Vaezi, Z. (2008). Language learning motivation among Iranian undergraduate students. *World Applied Sciences Journal, 5*(1), 54-61.

Yang, Y. (2008). The importance of the teacher for developing interest in learning English by Chinese students. *International Education Studies, 1*(1), 95-100.

Yin, C. (2008). *Language learning strategies in relation to attitudes, motivations, and learner beliefs: Investigating learner variables in the context of English as a foreign language in China*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, Maryland, USA.