

Emotional Intelligence, Self-Efficacy and Job Satisfaction of School Counselor

Joan Anak Lucas Monet and Tajul Rosli Shuib

Faculty of Education and Human Development, Sultan Idris Education University, 35900

Tanjong Malim, Perak, Malaysia

Email: joanbnk885@gmail.com

To Link this Article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v13-i1/21101>

DOI:10.6007/IJARPED/v13-i1/21101

Published Online: 08 March 2024

Abstract

Emotional intelligence, self-efficacy and job satisfaction are important aspects in the daily life of an educator. The importance of emotional intelligence and self-efficacy helps educators achieve job satisfaction and increase commitment to their work. Nevertheless, educators are always faced with problems and challenges according to the passage of time. The main purpose of this study is to identify differences in emotional intelligence, self-efficacy and teacher job satisfaction among school counselors. A total of 229 respondents were involved in this study. The main focus of the study is to identify differences in emotional intelligence, self-efficacy and job satisfaction of secondary school counselor teachers in Sarawak in carrying out guidance and counseling activities at school. The study utilises a quantitative approach, where in a series of questionnaires has been handed out to gather data from the respondents. The data obtained was analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics software. Based on the results of the study, it was found that there are differences in the level of emotional intelligence, self-efficacy and job satisfaction of school counselors in demographic factors. Two methods of analysis are used in analyzing these differences, namely the t-test and also one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The results of the analysis show that there are differences in each demographic factor that affects school counselors in carrying out counseling activities. To sum up, it is essential for every school counselor to possess emotional intelligence and self-efficacy, which is a sense of self-confidence, in order to achieve excellent outcomes in their endeavors.

Keywords: Teacher Guidance and Counseling, Emotional Intelligence, Self-Efficacy, Job Satisfaction

Introduction

Having high emotional intelligence and self-efficacy allows a teacher to always be in a stable emotional state as well as high self-confidence in achieving job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Such behavior is seen as capable of developing students' potential through more effective teaching and learning (Yahzanon and Yusof, 2011). According to Yu (2011), high emotional intelligence among employees will reduce or change the potential impact of negative work stress on work performance. Emotional instability due to the low level of emotional intelligence of teachers has been discussed a lot lately (Juhumin et al., 2020).

According to Bandura (1986), social learning theory emphasizes the reciprocal effect between environmental factors and the self-system which is the basis of self-efficacy. Self-efficacy greatly affects thought patterns and emotional reactions when a person behaves (Bakar, et al., 2017).

According to Happock (1935), job satisfaction is a combination of psychological, physiological and environmental factors that cause a person to be satisfied with his career. Positive attitude and adaptation to work is a concept that describes job satisfaction while negative attitude describes job dissatisfaction (Vroom, 1964).

School Counselor

In Malaysia, a school counselor refers to a Graduate Education Service Officer who has a first degree education background in Guidance and Counseling and Psychology or who is recognized as equivalent by the Public Service Department and has been appointed by the Malaysian Ministry of Education (KPM) as a school counselor in schools secondary schools throughout Malaysia. School counselors can also consist of teachers who have undergone a course in the field of counseling and have received a letter of appointment as a school counselor from the Malaysian Ministry of Education (KPM).

A school counselor refers to an individual who is officially assigned to work at the school to provide assistance to other individuals to manage a problem faced by the client. The client in question here is the person who comes to see the school counselor.

Emotional Intelligence

Emotional intelligence presented by Goleman in 1995 contains two competencies and five components. The first competency is self-competency which has three components namely recognizing one's own emotions, managing one's own emotions and motivating one's emotions while the second competency is social competence which has two components namely recognizing other people's emotions and building relationships. The following is an explanation related to each component found in Goleman's (1995) concept of emotional intelligence.

- i) Self-emotional awareness - is related to the ability to recognize one's own emotions and make rational decisions, realistic assessments and having high self-confidence.
- ii) Managing one's own emotions - describes the ability to organize emotions and take control of one's own life and psychology. A person who has intelligent emotions is able to manage his own emotions and move towards achieving his life goals.
- iii) Self-motivation - is the ability to move and push yourself to act more advanced and able to rise again after failing in your life.
- iv) Empathy - is the ability to understand and feel other people's feelings and good relationships can be established with everyone around them.

v) Social skills - involves the ability to manage emotions in order to build relationships with others. This component helps a good interaction with the people around him and is able to influence them in resolving any conflict that arises.

Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy is one's perception of one's ability to do something in a given situation. Self-efficacy is also closely related to a person's confidence to achieve something desired or to succeed in life. Self-efficacy is the confidence to face an opposition to achieve a goal. Without doubt, continue to believe in the ability to succeed. Individuals with high self-efficacy should have a high mindset. This extraordinary mental energy must be nurtured.

Previous studies have proven that the perception of self-efficacy will affect the form and level of difficulty of the actions that a person will perform. Individuals with high self-efficacy are found to be interested in difficult tasks and see them as measurable challenges rather than as threats to be avoided (Orpen, 1999; Boundreaux, 1998; Lin, 1998; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998; Zimmerman, 1995). Therefore, individuals with high self-efficacy will show characteristics such as high personal achievement, low stress level and not easily offended (Bandura, 2003).

Individuals with low self-efficacy will stay away from difficult tasks that are considered a threat to the personal (Betz, 2004). They have low aspirations and commitment to the goals they want to achieve. When faced with a difficult task, they will look at their own shortcomings, various obstacles and all kinds of difficult situations, instead of paying attention to how to carry it out.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a response that occurs in a career situation for employees. Job satisfaction can be achieved if the individual's physiological, safety, relationship, facility, welfare and financial needs can be met and there is less sadness in their work environment. Job satisfaction is linked to work conditions and the rewards that result from it directly from a task or work performed. According to Herzberg's theory, job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are caused by two separate factors. The two factors are called satisfier factors which are motivators and non-satisfiers which are health factors.

Locke (1976) defines job satisfaction as a comfortable or positive emotional state that results from an appraisal of a job or work experience. According to the definition of Staines and Quin (1979), job satisfaction is an overall assessment of the job and various opinions that are made to find that everyone likes their work. While the definition outlined in the "Job Descriptive Index" (JDI) by Smith et al (1989) - work, salary, promotion, supervision and colleagues.

Methodology

This study is in the form of a cross-sectional survey that uses questionnaires distributed randomly to samples of Guidance and Counseling teachers in secondary schools in Sarawak. The data obtained between emotional intelligence, self-efficacy and job satisfaction of a teacher. This study is also a quantitative study. Several statistical tests were used to analyze the data and determine whether there was a significant relationship between the above

factors. A survey study was chosen as the design of this study because the study needs to be completed within a predetermined period of time.

Sample Study

The study was conducted in secondary schools, Sarawak. The study sample consisted of 229 Guidance and Counseling teachers who were randomly selected from each school. The teachers are based on different demographics.

Study Instrument

The research instrument created is intended to obtain data to be analyzed. Based on this study, the researcher used a questionnaire. Questionnaires are used to measure differences in levels of emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In this study, the items used are as in the table:

Table 1
Details of Study Instrument Adaptation

Construct	Original Instrument	Number of Items
Teacher's Emotional Intelligence	<i>Inventory of Emotional Intelligence Scale</i> (EI scale (PcSc)	28
Teacher Self-Efficacy	<i>School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale</i> (SCSE) Bodernhorn & Skaggs (2005)	39
Teacher Job Satisfaction	<i>Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire</i> (TJSQ) Lester PE (1982)	27

Findings

This study focuses on School Counselor. A total of 229 people have been involved in this study. A total of seven demographic characteristics were used such as gender, age, length of service as GBK, level of education, length of service at the current school, length of service at the school before the current school presented in the form of a table based on the number and percentage of respondents. The demographic distribution of respondents is shown in Table 2.

Table 2
Respondent Background Information

Item	Frequency (N = 229)	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Men	74	32.3
Female	155	67.7
Age		
25 - 30 years	31	13.5
31 – 40 years old	87	38.0
41 – 50 years old	100	43.7
Over 50 years	11	4.8
Period of Service as GBK		
1 – 10 years	32	14.0
11 – 20 years	116	50.7

21 – 30 years old	81	35.4
Education Level in Guidance and Counseling		
Degree	207	90.4
Masters	22	9.6
Period of Service at Current School		
< 1 year	7	3.1
1 – 2 years	25	10.9
2-3 years	39	17.0
3 years and above	158	69.0
Served at the School Before the Current School		
< 1 year	3	1.3
1 – 2 years	13	5.7
2-3 years	27	11.8
3 years and above	186	81.2

Differences in Emotional Intelligence of Teachers and Gender

Differences in Emotional Intelligence of teachers based on gender factors are supported by an independent t-Test. Table 4.8 shows the p value of the independent t-test greater than the significant level ($t = -0.087$, $p = 0.931 > 0.05$). A p value greater than 0.05 is considered insignificant. Therefore, there is no difference between the Emotional Intelligence of teachers based on the gender factor. The results of the analysis of the study prove that the difference between male school counselor and female school counselor does not affect the emotional intelligence of teachers.

Table 3

Findings of Difference Analysis of Teacher Emotional Intelligence and Teacher Gender

Gender	Min	SP	t	P value
Men	4.4240	0.338	-0.087	0.931
Female	4.4278	0.288		

Differences in Teachers' Emotional Intelligence and Age

Differences in teachers' Emotional Intelligence based on the age factor are supported by the One-Way ANOVA method. Table 4.9 shows the p value of the One-Way ANOVA is greater than the significant level ($F = 0.295$, $p = 0.829 > 0.05$). A p value greater than 0.05 is considered insignificant. Therefore, there is no difference between the Emotional Intelligence of teachers based on the age factor. The results of the analysis of this study prove that the difference in age category between GBK does not affect the emotional intelligence of teachers.

Table 4

Findings of Analysis of Differences in Teacher Emotional Intelligence and Teacher Age

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mr	Mean Squared	F value	P value
Between Groups	0.083	3	0.028	0.295	0.829
In Group	21.139	225	0.094		
Sum	21.222	228			

Differences in Teachers' Emotional Intelligence and Duration of Serving as School Counselor

Differences in teachers' Emotional Intelligence based on the factor of length of service as school counselor is supported by the One-Way ANOVA method. Table 4.10 shows the p value of the One-Way ANOVA is greater than the significant level ($F = 0.447$, $p = 0.640 > 0.05$). A p value greater than 0.05 is considered insignificant. Therefore, there is no difference between the Emotional Intelligence of teachers based on the factor of length of service as school counselor. The findings of the analysis of this study prove that the difference in the length of service as a school counselor does not affect the emotional intelligence of teachers.

Table 5

Findings of Analysis of Differences in Teacher Emotional Intelligence and Length of Service

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mr	Mean Squared	F value	P value
Between Groups	0.084	3	0.042	0.447	0.640
In Group	21.138	226	0.094		
Sum	21.222	228			

Differences in Teacher Emotional Intelligence and Teacher Education Level

Differences in teachers' Emotional Intelligence based on teacher education factors are supported by the One-Way ANOVA method. Table 4.11 shows the p value of the One-Way ANOVA is greater than the significant level ($F = 0.406$, $p = 0.525 > 0.05$). A p value greater than 0.05 is considered insignificant. Therefore, there is no difference between teachers' Emotional Intelligence based on teacher education factors. The findings of the analysis of this study prove that the difference in the level of teacher education between school counselor does not affect the emotional intelligence of teachers.

Table 6

Findings of Difference Analysis of Teacher Emotional Intelligence and Teacher Education Level

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mr	Mean Squared	F value	P value
Between Groups	0.038	1	0.038	0.406	0.525
In Group	21.184	227	0.093		
Sum	21.222	228			

Differences in Teacher Self-Efficacy and Gender

Differences in teacher Self-Efficacy based on gender factors are supported by an independent t-Test. Table 4.11 shows that the p value of the independent t-test is greater than the significant level ($t = 1.193$, $p = 0.234 > 0.05$). A p value greater than 0.05 is considered insignificant. Therefore, there is no difference between teachers' Self-Efficacy based on

gender. The results of the analysis of the study prove that the difference between male school counselor and female school counselor does not affect the teacher's Self-Efficacy

Table 7

Findings of the Difference Analysis of Teacher Self-Efficacy and Teacher Gender

Gender	Min	SP	t	P value
Men	4.2030	0.565	1.193	0.234
Female	4.1064	0.577		

Differences in Teacher Self-Efficacy and Age

Differences in teacher self-efficacy based on the age factor are supported by the One-Way ANOVA method. Table 4.12 shows the p value for the One-Way ANOVA is smaller than the significant level ($F = 8.333$, $p = 0.000 < 0.05$). A p value smaller than 0.05 is considered significant. Therefore, there are differences between teachers' Self-Efficacy based on the age factor. The results of the analysis of this study prove that the difference in age category between school counselor affects the Self-Efficacy of teachers.

Table 8

Findings of Difference Analysis of Teacher Self-Efficacy and Teacher Age

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mr	Mean Squared	F value	P value
Between Groups	7.512	3	2.504	0.8333	0.000
In Group	67.608	225	0.300		
Sum	75.120	228			

Differences in Teacher Self-Efficacy and Length of Service as School Counselor

Differences in teacher Self-Efficacy based on the factor of tenure as school counselor are supported by One-Way ANOVA method. Table 4.13 shows the p value for the One-Way ANOVA is smaller than the significant level ($F = 8.324$, $p = 0.000 < 0.05$). A p value smaller than 0.05 is considered significant. Therefore, there is a difference between teacher Self-Efficacy based on the factor of length of service as school counselor. The findings of the analysis of this study prove that the difference in the length of service as a GBK affects the teacher's self-efficacy.

Table 9

Findings of Difference Analysis of Teacher Self-Efficacy and Length of Service

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mr	Mean Squared	F value	P value
Between Groups	5.154	2	2,577	0.8324	0.000
In Group	69,966	225	0.310		
Sum	75.120	228			

Differences in Teacher Self-Efficacy and Teacher Education Level

Differences in teacher Self-Efficacy based on teacher education factors are supported by the One-Way ANOVA method. Table 4.14 shows the p value of the One-Way ANOVA is greater than the significant level ($F = 0.203$, $p = 0.653 > 0.05$). A p value greater than 0.05 is considered

insignificant. Therefore, there is no difference between teachers' Self-Efficacy based on teacher education factors. The results of the analysis of this study prove that the difference in the level of teacher education between school counselor does not affect the teacher's Self-Efficacy.

Table 10

Findings of Difference Analysis of Teacher Self-Efficacy and Teacher Education Level

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mr	Mean Squared	F value	P value
Between Groups	0.067	1	0.067	0.203	0.653
In Group	75,053	227	0.331		
Sum	75.120	228			

Differences in Teacher Job Satisfaction and Gender

Differences in teacher job satisfaction based on gender factors are supported by an independent t-test. Table 4.15 shows that the p value of the independent t-test is greater than the significant level ($t = 0.729, p = 0.467 > 0.05$). A p value greater than 0.05 is considered insignificant. Therefore, there is no difference between teachers' Job Satisfaction based on gender factors. The results of the analysis of the study prove that the difference between male school counselor and female school counselor does not affect teachers' job satisfaction.

Table 11

Findings of the Difference Analysis of Teacher Job Satisfaction and Teacher Gender

Gender	Min	SP	t	P value
Men	3.5842	0.899	0.729	0.467
Female	3.4968	0.824		

Differences in Teacher Job Satisfaction and Age

The difference in teacher job satisfaction based on the age factor is supported by the One-Way ANOVA method. Table 4.16 shows the p value for the One-Way ANOVA is smaller than the significant level ($F = 9.134, p = 0.000 < 0.05$). A p value smaller than 0.05 is considered significant. Therefore, there are differences between teachers' Job Satisfaction based on the age factor. The results of the analysis of this study prove that the difference in age category between school counselor affects teachers' job satisfaction.

Table 12

Findings of Difference Analysis of Teacher Job Satisfaction and Teacher Age

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mr	Mean Squared	F value	P value
Between Groups	17,815	3	5.938	9.134	0.000
In Group	146.279	225	0.650		
Sum	164,095	228			

Differences in Teacher Job Satisfaction and Length of Service as School Counselor

Differences in teacher job satisfaction based on the factor of length of service as school counselor are supported by the One-Way ANOVA method. Table 4.17 shows the p value for

One-Way ANOVA is smaller than the significant level ($F = 7.734$, $p = 0.001 < 0.05$). A p value smaller than 0.05 is considered significant. Therefore, there is a difference between the Job Satisfaction of teachers based on the factor of length of service as school counselor. The findings of the analysis of this study prove that the difference in the length of service as a school counselor affects teacher job satisfaction.

Table 12

Findings of the Difference Analysis of Teacher Job Satisfaction and Length of Service

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mr	Mean Squared	F value	P value
Between Groups	10.511	2	5.256	7.734	0.001
In Group	153.583	226	0.680		
Sum	164,095	228			

Differences in Teacher Job Satisfaction and Teacher Education Level

Differences in teacher job satisfaction based on teacher education factors are supported by the One-Way ANOVA method. Table 4.18 shows the p value of the One-Way ANOVA is greater than the significant level ($F = 2.425$, $p = 0.121 > 0.05$). A p value greater than 0.05 is considered insignificant. Therefore, there is no difference between teachers' Job Satisfaction based on teacher education factors. The findings of the analysis of this study prove that the difference in the level of teacher education between GBK does not affect teacher job satisfaction.

Table 13

Findings of Difference Analysis of Teacher Job Satisfaction and Teacher Education Level

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mr	Mean Squared	F value	P value
Between Groups	1,734	1	1,734	2.425	1.21
In Group	162.361	227	0.715		
Sum	164,095	228			

Conclusion

The results of the analysis of the study proved that differences in gender, age, length of service and level of teacher education do not affect the emotional intelligence of teachers. Differences in gender and level of education do not affect teachers' self-efficacy. Meanwhile, the difference in age category and length of service as a school counselor affects the teacher's self-efficacy. Differences between gender and level of education of school counselors do not affect teacher job satisfaction.

Corresponding Author

Joan Anak Lucas Monet

Faculty of Education and Human Development, Sultan Idris Education University,
35000 Tanjung Malim Perak, Malaysia.

References

- Bakar, R. (2017). *Self-Efficacy Attitude, Readiness And Challenges In Executing The Guidance And Counseling Service With Special Need Clients*. Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (2003). *Self efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman and Company.
- Betz, N. E. (1996). Career assessment and the Career Decision-Making SelfEfficacy Scale. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 4, 313-328.
- Boundreaux, E. C. (1998). Predicting smoking stage of change among sample of low socio-economic status, primary care outpatients: Replication and extension using decisional balance and self-efficacy theories. *International Journal of Behavior Medicine* , 5: 148-165.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam.
- Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job Satisfaction*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Juhumin, H. S. (2020). Investigating Motivation, Emotional Intelligence, Work Satisfaction and Organizations Commitment among Primary School Islamic Education Teacher. *International Journal of Education, Psychology and Counseling*, 5 (35), 225-236.
- KPM. (2013). *Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013 - 2025*.
- Lin, A. C. (1998). *Bridging Positivist and Interpretivist Approaches to Qualitative Methods*. Retrieved from Policy Studies Journal, 26, 162- 180: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0072.1998.tb01931>
- Locke, E. (1976). *What is Job Satisfaction? Organizational Behavior nad Human Performance*. 4: 309-336.
- Orpen, C. (1999). The impact of self-efficacy on the effectiveness of employee training. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 11, 119-122.
- Smith, P. C. (1985). *The Revised Job Descriptive Index*. Bowling Green,. OH: Department of Psychology, Bowling Green State University.
- Staines, G. L. (1979). *American workers evaluate the quality of their jobs*. Monthly Labor Review, 102, 3-12.
- Stajkovic, A. D. (1998). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis *Psychological Bulletin*. 124, 240–261.
- Vroom, V. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: John Willey And Sons.
- Tahir, Y. B. (2011). Tahap Kecergasan Emosi Dan Hubungannya dengan Komitmen Guru Dalam Bekerja Dalam Kalangan Guru Mata Pelajaran Teras Tahun Enam. *Journal of Edupres Universiti Teknologi Malaysia*, 1,187-196.
- Yu, C. W. (2011). Job Stress dan Job Performance Among Employees in the Taiwanese Finance Sector: The Role Emotional Intelligence. *Social Behavior and Personality an International Journal* , 39 (1):21-31.
- Zimmerman, B. (1995). *Self-efficacy and educational development*. Dlm. A. Bandura (pnyt.). *Self-efficacy in changing societies*, hlm. 10-15. New York: Cambridge University Press.