



Emotional intelligence and work values of selected faculty from a teacher education institution

Erin E. Riego de Dios

College of Education, Arts and Sciences, Gordon College, Olongapo City, 2200, Philippines
erin.riegodedios.asio@gmail.com

Available online at: www.isca.in, www.isca.me

Received 4th April 2020, revised 10th October 2021, accepted 15th April 2022

Abstract

This study aimed to assess the emotional intelligence and work values of the selected faculty members in a local college. The researcher used a descriptive correlational design in the study with the questionnaire as the main instrument of gathering data. Thirty respondents took part in the survey via convenience sampling. For the instrument, an adapted and modified version of the Emotional Intelligence Self-Assessment Questionnaire (1998) and Work Values Inventory (2006). The researcher subjected the data gathered with the following tools: Weighted Mean, t-test, ANOVA and Pearson-r with the help of SPSS 20. This study generated the following results: respondents agree moderately on the different indicators of emotional intelligence. The respondents also stated that all the indicators are important for the work values inventory. There are no significant differences found in the emotional intelligence and work values when grouped according to sex, civil status, educational attainment, and length of service. However, in terms of age, emotional intelligence got a substantial result but not with the work values. There is also no significant relationship found between the demographic profile, emotional intelligence, and work values of the respondents. Based on the results, the researcher endorses relevant recommendations.

Keywords: Emotional intelligence, work values, faculty, local college.

Introduction

Professionals run every institution and we consider a faculty employee as one. Educators are expected to have a great deal of professional and personal qualities and extraordinary skills¹. The personnel ensure the work and make stuffs happen. A set of motivated staff can turn work vision into a reality. A study confirmed differences in the work ethics of professionals and relationship between professionalism and work ethics². Professional employees are the ones who gain knowledge of the institution and what it needs to run.

A group of motivated professionals equipped with the right set of values and emotional intelligence will most likely lead to a successful organizational venture. Emotional intelligence is a set of competencies showing the ability to recognize, understand and manage behaviors, moods and impulses³. In addition, trait emotional intelligence as perceptions of how good we believe we are in understanding, regulating, and expressing emotions to adapt to our environment and maintain well-being⁴. If the employees are happy and content with themselves, this emanates into how they view the workplace beginning from the physical structure to the elements. Emotional intelligence is also the ability to perceive emotions, to use emotions to enhance thinking, to understand and label emotions, and regulate emotions in the self and other³. If the innate foundations of the employees are not functioning, this also shows in handling their coworkers and the work itself. Individuals with high general

factor of personality (GFP) score higher on trait and ability emotional intelligence, so the GFP is a social effectiveness factor⁵. Stress and emotional intelligence showed unique associations with burnout the values and the emotional intelligence of the workforce reflect the decisions they make and these affect the whole organization⁶. Emotional intelligence has a positive impact on project success, job satisfaction and trust in an organization⁷. There is also a negative association between emotional intelligence and burnout dimensions⁸.

With basic human values, work goals or work values are specific expressions of work values in the workplace. Without these specific perceptions, it will compromise work in the organization. In relation, a study stipulated that the attributes could affect the skills of an individual⁹. The different work goals are ranked by their importance as guiding principles for testing work outcomes and settings and for choosing among different work alternatives. Based on another study it suggested that a boundary less-organizational mobility orientation has significant association with extrinsic/material work values¹⁰.

People who highly value extrinsic job rewards are even less politically active in individualist countries, whereas people who highly value intrinsic job aspects are more politically engaged¹¹. In addition, a trade-off between the number of items researchers use to study work values and the number of countries analyzed if it aims for a more equivalent analysis of work values¹². Work values were significantly related to relational communication

satisfaction¹³. This is another perspective that signifies the various importance's of work values in the organization. However, the importance of delving beneath the national-level to gain a more fine-grained, regional-level understanding of values evolution¹⁴. In another different point of view, there are some differences in work values are also attributable to aging or life course processes¹⁵.

All persons involved in the organization should know how these factors affect the behavior of the employees in the workplace. This is to achieve better logistics, movement and delivery of goods and services. Cognizant of the foregoing, the researcher intends to undertake this study. Assessing the relationship between emotional intelligence and work values of the employees can provide valuable inputs. It can also help to enhance knowledge and handling techniques in teaching and in management.

Methodology

This quantitative study used a descriptive-correlational design with a survey questionnaire as the main instrument for gathering data.

There are 30 participants that took part in the survey. The researcher made use of a convenience sampling technique in choosing the participants. The respondents were bona fide faculty, full-time in status and have been part of the institution for at least one year.

In gathering the data, the researcher adapted and modified two sets of instruments the Work Values Inventory (2006) and the Emotional Intelligence Self-Assessment Questionnaire (1998). The researcher subjected it first to the reliability test before administering the actual data gathering. The reliability result is 0.96 in the alpha Cronbach test. The instrument has three parts: the demographic profile that differentiates the participants according to age, gender, civil status, educational experience and length of service in the company. Next is the part of the questionnaire that deals with the attribute of the employee's emotional intelligences in terms of emotional awareness, managing their own emotions, self-motivation, and empathy and coaching their own emotions. Last is the part of the questionnaire that describes the participants in terms of their work values in terms of achievement, challenge, independence, money, power, recognition, service to others and variety of tasks.

The study used several statistical tools to compute for the data gathered like frequency and percentage for the profile variables, mean for the emotional intelligence and work values, t-test and ANOVA for significant differences between means and Pearson-r for relationships. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 20 computed the statistical treatments for the data. The researcher assigned a Five point and Six point Likert scale for the weighted means of the study.

Results and discussion

This study analyzes the emotional intelligence and work values of the selected faculty members in a local college. It presents the following results:

Table-1: Demographic Profile of the Respondents.

Respondents		Frequency	Percentage
Age	21-30 years old	13	43
	31-40 years old	10	33
	41-50 years old	3	10
	51 above	4	14
	Total	30	100
Gender	Male	17	57
	Female	13	43
	Total	30	100
Civil Status	Single	22	73
	Married	8	27
	Total	30	100
Educational Attainment	BA/BS Graduate	6	19
	MA/MS Units	20	67
	MA/MS Graduate	4	14
	Total	30	100
Years in Service	1-5 years	12	40
	6-10 years	8	27
	11-15 years	10	33
	Total	30	100

Table-1 represents the demographic profile of the respondents. As seen, most of the respondents belong to the age bracket 21-30 years old, which means most of them are still young in the teaching field. There are more males than females, and the majority is still single. Most of the respondents are already studying their master's degrees and are serving at least 1-5 years in the institution.

Table-2: Emotional Intelligence of the Selected Faculty.

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
Emotional Awareness	5.01	Agree Moderately
Managing One’s Emotion	5.28	Agree Moderately
Self-Motivation	5.09	Agree Moderately
Empathy	5.05	Agree Moderately
Coaching Other’s Emotion	4.98	Agree Moderately
Weighted Mean	5.08	Agree Moderately

*Legend: 5.50 – 6.00=Agree Very Much; 4.50 – 5.49=Agree Moderately; 3.50 – 4.49=Agree Slightly; 2.50 – 3.49=Disagree Slightly; 1.50 – 2.49=Disagree Moderately; 1.00 – 1.49=Disagree Very Much

Table-2 shows the emotional intelligence of the respondents. As observed, indicator 2 got the highest mean with 5.28, which is equivalent to *agree moderately* on the Likert scale. Indicator 5 got the lowest mean with 4.98, with a descriptive interpretation of *agree moderately* on the Likert scale. The overall weighted mean is 5.08, and it has a Likert scale equivalent to *agree moderately*.

Table-3: Work Values of Selected Faculty.

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
Achievement	4.36	Important
Challenge	4.38	Important
Independence	4.30	Important
Money	4.20	Important
Power	4.21	Important
Recognition	4.29	Important
Service to Others	4.18	Important
Variety	4.25	Important
Weighted Mean	4.27	Important

*Legend: 4.50 - 5.00=Very Important; 3.50 – 4.49=Important; 2.50 – 3.49=Moderately Important; 1.50 – 2.49=Less Important; 1.00 – 1.49=Not Important.

Table-3 shows the work values of the respondents. As perceived, indicator 2 got the highest mean with 4.38 with a Likert scale interpretation of important. Meanwhile, indicator 7 got the lowest mean score of 4.18, which is also has a Likert scale equivalence of important. The overall weighted mean is 4.27 and has a Likert scale equivalent to *important*.

Table-4: Test for Significant Differences in the Emotional Intelligence and Work Values of the Respondents.

Demographic Profile	Emotional Intelligence	Work Values
Age	3.339* (.035)	2.081 (.127)
Gender	-0.510 (.614)	-0.637 (.531)
Civil Status	0.823 (.418)	-1.360 (.185)
Educational Attainment	1.189 (.320)	0.420 (.661)
Years in Service	1.157 (.329)	1.311 (.286)

* $p > .05$

Table-4 shows the test for significant differences in emotional intelligence and work values when grouped according to demographic profile. In terms of sex and civil status. Based on the results, there are no significant differences in the means of the respondents in terms of emotional intelligence and work values when grouped according to sex and civil status since emotional intelligence has t values of -0.51 (for sex) and 0.82 (for civil status) with corresponding p values of .61 and .42. The p values are higher than the designated alpha significance value of .05, thus, no substantial findings. Work values has t values of -.64 (for sex) and -1.36 (for civil status) with corresponding p values of .53 and .18 which are higher than the alpha significance level of .05, hence, no significant differences.

Emotional intelligence provided a significant result in terms of age since $F(3, 26) = 3.339, p = .035$, the result is lower than the alpha significance level of .05. However, in terms of work values, there is no significant finding since $F(3, 26) = 2.081, p = .127$ wherein the p value is higher than the alpha level of significance of .05. In terms of educational attainment, the results are unremarkable since the following results came out $F(2, 27) = 1.189, p = .320$ for emotional intelligence and $F(2, 27) = 0.420, p = .661$ for work values. The p values are higher than the alpha significance level of .05 thus, no significant differences in the result. For the years in service, it also yield no significant results since $F(2, 27) = 1.157, p = .329$ in the emotional intelligence and $F(2, 27) = 1.311, p = .286$ for work values. There p values were also higher than the alpha significance level of .05 hence, no significant differences from the result.

Table-5: Correlation Matrix between Demographic Profile, Emotional Intelligence and Work Values of the Respondents

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Age	1						
Sex	-.009 (.964)	1					
Civil Status	.258 (.168)	.233 (.215)	1				
Educ. Attain.	.049 (.798)	.219 (.245)	.070 (.713)	1			
Length of Service	.601* (.000)	-.168 (.375)	.400* (.028)	-.009 (.962)	1		
Work Values	.143 (.452)	.119 (.530)	.249 (.185)	.075 (.694)	.199 (.291)	1	
Emotional Intelligence	-.145 (.446)	.096 (.614)	-.154 (.418)	.252 (.180)	-.156 (.409)	.216 (.252)	1

* $p > .05$

Table-5 exhibits the correlation matrix between demographic profiles, emotional intelligence and work values of the respondents. We can see that no relationship exists between the three variables. This is because their p values are higher than the alpha significance value of .05. This only means that work values have no relationship to demographic profiles, so does the emotional intelligence. The work values also had no relationship to the emotional intelligence of the respondents in the study.

Discussion: This study aimed at analyzing the emotional intelligence and work values of the respondents and if there is any possibility of relationship between the two variables. The result is essential in many aspects of human resource management and in the organizational behavior itself. The results provided a substantial finding to some extent and areas on which human resource practitioners can benefit.

For the emotional intelligence results, it has a uniform finding with all of the responses falling into the context of agreeing moderately, this is so since in teaching profession, the environment is always changing. Teachers undergo stress because of the changes in the educational policies, globalization liberalization, and advances in the information technology¹⁶. However, individual differences in trait emotional intelligences are a consistent predictor of human behavior across the life span⁴. In addition, emotional intelligence could increase employee performance through organizational citizenship behavior¹⁷. A study also explored and explained the relationship of trait models of emotional intelligence for both pleasure and happiness of an individual¹⁸. This is important in the organization for having employees with such traits in the workplace can influence others.

For the part of the work values, the respondents stated that all of the indicators were important. This only shows that the respondents have high work values in different terms. In a study, it was found that those who rate power as a relatively

important value are more likely to violate professional conduct rules notwithstanding receiving training regarding ethical principles¹⁹. Both mothers' and fathers' work values, and their parenting behavior were significantly associated with their children's work values²⁰. In a different note, there are areas of work supportive of an efficient Generation Y performance relationship, and incompetent areas of performance where administrators and Generation Y hold diverse work values inclinations²¹.

Statistical analysis provided a vivid result for this study. In terms of sex and civil status, there is no significant finding for both emotional intelligence and work values. For educational attainment and length of service, we observed the same result. However, in terms of age, there is a significant finding for emotional intelligence but not with work values. In contrast, according to a study it showed that work instrumentalism reduces the positive effect of training on job satisfaction while boosting the positive effect of remuneration on job satisfaction²². Males and younger people rated Recognition and Security as work motivational factors²³. In relation, gender affects the total ability emotional intelligence score²⁴. However, another study indicated that values related to self-employment are not rooted in a general value of work²⁵.

There is no significant relationship observed in this study between the demographic profile, emotional intelligence and work values. Yet a study indicated that work values are attributable to aging or life course processes, especially the greater importance placed on high income during the mid-life years¹⁵. Additionally, work values are related to gender, educational level, and age of the respondents²⁶. Although not related, certain relationship between emotional intelligence with job satisfaction²⁷. Moreover, emotional intelligence was significantly associated with all three forms of emotional labor in different directions²⁸.

Conclusion

Based on the aforementioned results, the researcher therefore concluded that: the respondents agree moderately on the different indicators of the emotional intelligence. The respondents also stated that all the mentioned indicators are important. There is no significant differences found in the emotional intelligence and work values when grouped according to sex, civil status, educational attainment, and length of service. However, in terms of age, emotional intelligence got a substantial result but not with the work values. There is also no significant relationship found between the demographic profile, emotional intelligence and work values of the respondents.

References

1. Asio, J.M.R., & Riego de Dios, E.E. (2019). The College Students' Perspective on What Makes an Educator Well-qualified. *J. Pedagog. Research.*, 3(3), 126-138. <https://dx.doi.org/10.33902/jpr.v3i3.124>
2. Asio, J.M.R., Riego de Dios, E.E., & Lapuz, A.M.E. (2019). Professional Skills and Work Ethics of Selected Faculty in a Local College. *PAFTE Research J.*, 9 (1), 164-180. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3452971>
3. Hubscher-Davidson, S. (2019). Emotional Intelligence and Professional Translation. In: CIOL AGM & Members' Day 2019, 16 Mar 2019, London, CioL.
4. Petrides, K. V., Mikolajczak, M., Mavroveli, S., Sanchez-Ruiz, M. J., Furnham, A., & Pérez-González, J. C. (2016). Developments in trait emotional intelligence research. *Emotion review*, 8(4), 335-341.
5. Van der Linden, D., Pekaar, K. A., Bakker, A. B., Schermer, J. A., Vernon, P. A., Dunkel, C. S., & Petrides, K. V. (2017). Overlap Between the General Factor of Personality and Emotional Intelligence: A Meta-Analysis. *Psychol. Bull.*, 143(1), 36-52
6. Zysberg, L., Orenshtein, C., Gimmon, E., & Robinson, R. (2017). Emotional Intelligence, Personality, Stress, and Burnout among Educators. *Int. J. Stress Manag.*, 24(1), 122-136. <https://doi.org/10.1037/str0000028>
7. Rezvani, A., Chang, A., Wiewiora, A., Ashkanasy, N.M., Jordan, P.J., & Zolina, R. (2016). Manager Emotional Intelligence and Project Success: The Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction and Trust. *Int. J. Proj. Manag.*, 34 (7), 1112-1122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2016.05.012>
8. Mérida-López, S., & Extremera, N. (2017). Emotional Intelligence and Teacher Burnout: A Systematic Review. *Int. J. Educ. Res.*, 85, 121-130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2017.07.006>
9. Asio, J.M.R., & Riego de Dios, E.E. (2018). 21st Century Attributes and Skills of a Teacher in the Perspective of College Students. *Online Submission* <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED594675>
10. Abessolo, M., Hirschi, A. & Rossier, J. (2017). Work Values Underlying Protean and Boundaryless Career Orientations. *Car. Dev. Int.*, 22(3), 241-259. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-10-2016-0167>
11. Visser, M., Gesthuizen, M., & Kraaykamp, G. (2019). Work Values and Political Participation: A Cross-national Analysis. *Ann. Am. Acad. Pol. Soc. Sci.*, 682(1), 186-203. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716219830961>
12. Gesthuizen, M., Kovarek, D., & Rapp, C. (2019). Extrinsic and Intrinsic Work Values: Findings on Equivalence in Different Cultural Contexts. *Ann. Am. Acad. Pol. Soc. Sci.*, 682(1), 60-83. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716219829016>
13. Jalalkamali, M., Ali, A., Hyun, S. and Nikbin, D. (2016). Relationships between Work Values, Communication Satisfaction, and Employee Job Performance: The Case of International Joint Ventures in Iran. *Manag. Decis.*, 54 (4), 796-814.
14. Ralston, D.A., Egri, C.P., Karam, C.M., Li, Y., & Fu, P.P. (2018). Changes in Work Values across the regions of China. *Asia Pac. J. Manag.*, 35 (1), 145-179.
15. Kalleberg, A.L., & Marsden, P.T. (2019). Work Values in the United States: Age, Period, and Generational Differences. *Ann. Am. Acad. Pol. Soc. Sci.*, 682 (1), 43-59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000271621882291>
16. Rao, R.V., & Lakshmi, G.B. (2018). Emotional Intelligence of School Teachers. *Int. J. Adv. Res., Ideas Innov. Technol.*, 4 (3), 2123-2125.
17. Supriyanto, A.S., Ekowati, V.M., & Masyhuri (2019). The Relationship among Spiritual Intelligence, Emotional Intelligence, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, and Employee Performance. *Etikonomi*, 18 (2), 249-258.
18. Di Fabio, A. & Kenny, M.E. (2016). Promoting Well-being: The Contribution of Emotional Intelligence. *Front. Psychol.*, 7, 1182. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01182>
19. Politi-Salame, I., Obregón-Schael, D., Puga-Méndez, D., Stanley, L., & Arciniega, L. (2019). The Relationship between Individual Work Values and Unethical Decision-Making and Behavior at Work. *J. Bus. Ethics*, 158 (4), 1133-1148.
20. Cemalcilar, Z., Secinti, E., & Sumer, N. (2018). Intergenerational Transmission of Work Values: A Meta-Analytic Review. *J. Youth Adolesc.*, 47 (8), 1559-1579.
21. Winter, R.P., & Jackson, B.A. (2016). Work Values Preferences of Generation Y: Performance Relationship Insights in the Australian Public Service. *Int. J. Hum. Resour. Manag.*, 27(17), 1997-2015. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1102161>

22. Huo, M. & Boxall, P. (2018), Instrumental Work Values and Responses to HR Practices: A Study of Job Satisfaction in a Chinese Manufacturer. *Pers. Rev.*, 47(1), 60-73.
23. Furnham, A. & MacRae, I. (2018). The Dark Side of Work Values. *Curr. Psychol.*, 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-018-9873-z>
24. Cabello, R., Sorrel, M. A., Fernández-Pinto, I., Extremera, N., & Fernández-Berrocal, P. (2016). Age and Gender Differences in Ability Emotional Intelligence in Adults: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Dev. Psychol.*, 52(9), 1486–1492. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000191>
25. Lukeš, M., Feldmann, M., & Vegetti, F. (2019). Work Values and the Value of Work: Different Implications for Young Adults' Self-Employment in Europe. *Ann. Am. Acad. Pol. Soc. Sci.*, 682(1), 156–171. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716219828976>
26. Borg, I., Hertel, G., Krumm, S., & Bilsky, W. (2019) Work Values and Facet Theory: From Intercorrelations to Individuals. *Int. Study Manag. Organ.*, 49(3), 283-302. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00208825.2019.1623980>
27. Miao, C., Humphrey, R.H., & Qian, S. (2017). A Meta Analysis of Emotional Intelligence and Work Attitudes. *J. Occup. & Organ. Psychol.*, 90 (2), 177-202.
28. Lee, Y.H., & Chelladurai P. (2018). Emotional Intelligence, Emotional Labor, Coach Burnout, Job Satisfaction, and Turnover Intention in Sport Leadership. *Eur. Sport Manag. Q.*, 18(4), 393-412. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2017.1406971>