

Purpose

- Culturally responsive teaching (CRT) is commonly researched in academic learning, but few studies have examined CRT with social-emotional learning (SEL) instruction.
- Certain skill sets including emotional intelligence (EI) and cultural intelligence (CI) may support individuals in displaying skills indicative of SEL and CRT.
- Many new teachers feel ill prepared to integrate CRT and/or SEL into practice. This is problematic as self-efficacy influences teacher practice.
- Our study examines whether preservice teachers (PSTs) EI and CI influences whether they:
 - Feel efficacious in using CRT;
 - Believe CRT will result in positive outcomes

Research Questions

- 1. How do PSTs' EI and CI competency influence their self-efficacy beliefs in delivering CRT?
- 2. How do PSTs' EI and CI competency influence their outcome expectancies of practicing CRT?

Acknowledgement

This study was funded by the UD Center for the Study of Diversity award granted to Drs. Tia Barnes and Bridgette Johnson

Relationships Between Preservice Teacher's Emotional and Cultural Intelligence and Culturally **Responsive Self-efficacy and Outcome Expectancy** Tia N. Barnes, Yu Xia, & Melissa Stoffers, University of Delaware

Table 1

Gı

ble 1									Table 2								
ultiple regression mo	dels for Cultur	ally Resp	ponsive 🛛	Feaching	Self-Efficacy			Multiple regression models for Culturally Responsive Teaching Outcome Expectancy									
	B(S.E)	β	t	ρ	B(S.E)	β	t	ρ		B(S.E)	β	t	ρ	B(S.E)	β	t	ρ
	Model 1				Model 2					Model 1			Model 2				
ade level									Grade level								
unior	5.84(14.67)	0.17	0.40	0.69	34.48(19.38)	1.03	1.78	0.09 †	Junior	-4.35(9.53)	-0.21	-0.46	0.65	3.97(10.78)	0.20	0.37	0.72
enior	13.11(15.68)	0.38	0.83	0.41	44.09(20.79)	1.28	2.12	0.04*	Senior	-5.43(10.20)	-0.26	-0.53	0.60	3.99(11.55)	0.19	0.35	0.73
aining (1, yes; 0, no)	2.39(4.69)	0.08	0.51	0.61	1.29(5.18)	0.04	0.25	0.80	Training (1, yes; 0, no)	-0.33(3.05)	-0.02	-0.11	0.92	0.52(2.88)	0.03	0.18	0.86
of ELL kids									% of ELL kids								
1, >25%; 0, < 25%)	13.68(5.07)	0.42	2.70	0.01*	14.63(5.67)	0.45	2.58	0.02*	(1, >25%; 0, < 25%)	7.76(3.29)	0.39	2.36	0.02*	8.79(3.15)	0.44	2.79	0.009**
of ethnic diversity									% of ethnic diversity								
1, >25%; 0, < 25%)	-12.04(5.61)	-0.33	-2.15	0.04*	-16.18(6.06)	-0.44	-2.67	0.01*	(1, >25%; 0, < 25%)	-8.36(3.65)	0.38	2.29	0.03*	-8.94(3.37)	-0.40	-2.66	0.01*
of disability kids									% of disability kids								
1, >25%; 0, < 25%)	-11.80(4.53)	-0.37	-2.60	0.01*	-8.58(5.02)	-0.27	-1.71	0.10 *	(1, >25%; 0, < 25%)	-0.03(2.95)	-0.001	-0.01	0.99	1.04(2.79)	0.05	0.37	0.71
motional Intelligence									Emotional Intelligence								
Total					1.36(1.26)	1.48	1.08	0.29	Total					-0.55(0.70)	-0.98	-0.78	0.44
Perceiving					-0.28(0.48)	-0.29	-0.58	0.57	Perceiving					0.29(0.27)	0.51	1.10	0.28
Using					-0.58(0.43)	-0.63	-1.34	0.19	Using					0.04(0.24)	0.08	0.19	0.85
Understanding					-0.55(0.49)	-0.47	-1.12	0.27	Understanding					0.66(0.27)	0.92	2.40	0.02*
Managing					-0.38(0.61)	-0.34	-0.64	0.53	Managing					-0.03(0.34)	-0.04	-0.09	0.93
Cultural Intelligence									Cultural Intelligence								
Motivational					-0.14(0.47)	-0.06	-0.30	0.77	Motivational					0.40(0.26)	0.26	1.52	0.14
Cognitive					0.56(0.29)	0.40	1.93%	0.06 †	Cognitive					-0.15(0.16)	-0.17	-0.90	0.38
Metacognitive					0.59(0.51)	0.25	1.15	0.26	Metacognitive					0.68(0.29)	0.48	2.39	0.02*
Behavioral					-0.42(0.38)	-0.24	-1.11	0.28	Behavioral					-0.23(0.21)	-0.22	-1.11	0.28
$e^{\dagger}n < 10 * n < 05$	Model 1 evolair	ned 31 70	6 of varie	ance the	amount of varian	ce evnlai	ned increa	sed to 47%	Note $\dagger n < 10 * n < 05$	Model 1 explain	ned 21 20	% of vari	ance the	amount of varia	nce evola	ined incre	eased to 55°

Note. p < .10, p < .05. Model 1 explained 31.7% of variance, the amount of variance explained increased to 47%. < .05. Would T explained 21.2% of variance, the amount of variance explained The difference in R² showed that the full model better predicted CRT outcome expectancy. However, difference in \mathbb{R}^2 did not show significant difference between two models.

• For Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy:

- Model 1 was the best fit for the data. Higher levels of CRT self-efficacy were associated with PST placements that included higher percentages of students who identified as ELL, from racially/ethnically diverse populations, or who had a disability.
- For Culturally Responsive Teaching Outcome Expectancy:
 - The full model offered better prediction. PSTs were more likely to expect positive outcomes from CRT when they were placed in classrooms with higher percentages of ELL students and students from racially/ethnically diverse backgrounds. Understanding emotions in MSCEIT and Metacognitive in CQS also predicted more positive outcome expectancy.

Method

Participants: 45 early childhood PSTs in a mid-Atlantic state completed online questionnaires **Measures:**

- Emotional Intelligence (EI): The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT; Mayer et al., 2002)
- Cultural intelligence (CI): The Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS; Van Dyne et al., 2008)
- Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy Scale (CRTSE; Siwatu, 2007)
- Culturally Responsive Teaching Outcome Expectancy Scale (CRTOE; Siwatu, 2007)

Analysis plan: Hierarchical multiple linear regressions were performed for CRTSE and CRTOE separately. In each model, we first examined five control variables: participant's grade level, indicator for training, percentage of students in placement who are ELL, ethnic diversity, and with disabilities. We dummy coded the last four variables. In the second step, we inserted EI and CI total scores. Lastly in the **full model**, all dimensions of EI and CI were inserted.

Results	Resu	lts
---------	------	-----

- outcomes.

Limitations: Small sample size. Also, we did not look at behavior so that we cannot speak to whether these skills sets and experiences are related to better pedagogical skill

Discussion

Placement in diverse classrooms support student CRT buy-in and self-efficacy.

Teacher candidates who are better at asking "why" and reflecting on their thinking may feel more efficacious in using CRT for better student

Skill sets in EI and CI played no part in self-efficacy. • CRT training may not be organized and effective enough to build confidence in PSTs ability to understand and teach diverse cultures of students.

• In our study, half of the trained PSTs referred to CRT as embedded in other instruction rather than as a direct focus of study. More direct instruction may develop critical awareness and content knowledge in race, ethnicity, and diversity.