ADA5

A STUDY OF MALAYSIAN SCHOOL COUNSELOR RESILIENCE

HASLEE SHARIL LIM BIN ABDULLAH

Perpustakaan Universiti Malaya
A510841066

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Education
University of Malaya in Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

2003

ABSTRAK

Satu Kajian Daya Ketahanan Kaunselor Sekolah Di Malaysia

Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia telah melaksanakan skim perkhidmatan kaunseling sepenuh masa di sekolah-sekolah menengah sejak awal tahun 1996. Setelah lebih kurang empat tahun, didapati sebilangan kaunselor telah meletak jawatan dan sebilangan lagi telah diminta untuk meletak jawatan mereka atas sebab-sebab tertentu. Berdasarkan pemerhatian dan juga maklum balas terus daripada para kaunselor yang masih berkhidmat di sekolah-sekolah, terdapat banyak isu yang perlu ditangani untuk membendung keadaan ini. Namun begitu, adalah dipercayai bahawa tahap kesejahateraan psikologi para kaunselor adalah faktor penentu utama dalam menjayakan perkhidmatan kaunseling sepenuh masa di sekolah-sekolah. Kaunselor yang sejahtera dan berdaya tahan khususnya, berupaya memulihkan diri dengan cepat apabila menghadapi kesulitan dan kekecewaan. Mereka pantas mengembalikan kefungsian diri apabila mengalami tekanan dengan memuhasabahkan diri dan mengaplikasikan kemahiran memujuk dan merawat diri. Fenomena inilah yang telah mencetuskan minat kajian ini untuk mencari jawapan kepada soalan-soalan berikut: (1) Sejauh manakah daya ketahanan diri para kaunselor sekolah? (2) Siapakah para kaunselor yang berdaya tahan? (3) Bagaimanakah profil ketahanan para kaunselor? (4) Adakah persekitaran sekolah mempengaruhi daya ketahanan kaunselor? (5) Adakah daya ketahanan kaunselor dipengaruhi oleh kelayakan akademik dan ikhtisas mereka? (6) Apakah prediktor-prediktor daya ketahanan umum para kaunselor? (7) Apakah korelasi di antara daya ketahanan kaunselor dengan efikasi kendiri dan `*burnout*' ?

Kajian ini telah dijalankan untuk mencari jawapan kepada tujuh soalan kajian utama dengan menggunakan *Resiliency Attitudes Scales, General Self-Efficacy Scale,* dan *Burnout Potential Inventory*. Kesemua instrumen kajian ini telah diterjemahkan ke dalam bahasa Melayu dan ditentusahkan dalam satu kajian awal sebelum digunakan dalam kajian ini. Bacaan Cronbach's alpha untuk ketiga-tiga instrumen adalah .84, .94, dam .81. Sementara bacaan Guttman Split-half pula adalah .85, .93, dan .84. Soal-selidik telah dihantar kepada 1, 061 orang kaunselor sepenuh masa di seluruh Malaysia dan 615 (57.96%) orang telah mengembalikannya.

Pengiraan Indeks Dayatahan (*Resiliency Index*) menghasilkan min 71.94 dengan sisihan lazim 4.40. Daripada 615 subjek kajian, 414 orang (67.32%) didapati berdaya tahan dengan Indeks Dayatahan (ID) mereka 70 dan ke atas. Selebihnya, 201 orang (32.68%) didapati tidak berdaya tahan. Analisis lanjutan telah dilakukan untuk mengenal pasti kaunselor berdaya tahan berasaskan ras, jantina dan lokasi sekolah. Profil kaunselor yang berdaya tahan yang telah dikumpul dan disusun-atur adalah *Creativity, Morality, Initiative, Relationships, Independence, Humor,* dan *Insight.* Ketujuh-tujuh komponen daya ketahanan ini adalah berdasarkan teori daya ketahanan Wolin dan Wolin (1993). Persekitaran sekolah berdasarkan sekolah berasrama penuh dan harian; sekolah bandar dan luar bandar; sekolah lelaki, perempuan dan campuran; sekolah teknik, agama, China dan biasa; dan sekolah berprestasi akademik rendah, sederhana, dan tinggi didapati tidak membawa kesan yang signifiken terhadap daya ketahanan kaunselor. Analisis melalui ujian-*t* dan ANOVA menunjukkan bahawa tiada perbezaan daya ketahanan yang

signifiken dalam kelima-lima pengkategorian sekolah tersebut. Walau bagaimanapun, analisis yang sama terhadap kelayakan akademik dan ikhtisas kaunselor menunjukkan pengaruh yang signifiken ke atas daya ketahanan kaunselor. Keputusan *stepwise multiple regression* menunjukkan bahawa *Morality, Creativity, Initiative,* dan *Relationship* secara bersama menyumbang sebanyak 35.20% daripada *variance* keseluruhan daya ketahanan umum para kaunselor. Perhubungan keseluruhan juga didapati signifiken ($F_{4,610} = 82.70$, $p < .001$). *Morality* didapati adalah prediktor terbaik yang menyumbang sebanyak 24.70% *variance*, manakala *Relationship* (1.00% *variance*) pula, adalah prediktor yang terakhir yang termasuk ke dalam *prediction equation.* Akhir sekali, daya ketahanan para kaunselor didapati mempunyai korelasi sederhana dengan efikasi kendiri ($r = .57$, $p < .05$) dan berkorelasi sederhana secara negatif dengan `*burnout*' ($r = -.42$, $p < .05$).

Berdasarkan dapatan kajian, implikasi teori dan praktikal daya ketahanan telah dibincangkan. Sesungguhnya, daya ketahanan adalah elemen penting dalam tugas seseorang kaunselor sekolah. Usaha mempertingkatkan daya ketahanan diri adalah sejajar dengan prinsip asas kaunseling. Namun begitu, adalah perlu bagi para kaunselor sendiri senantiasa mengawal selia tahap kesejahteraan fizikal dan mental dirinya. Kaunselor yang sejahtera dan berdaya tahan pasti lebih berupaya membantu kliennya mengatasi halangannya agar dapat berkembang ke tahap yang optimum.

ABSTRACT

The Ministry of Education in Malaysia implemented the full-time counseling scheme in secondary schools in early 1996. After about four years, it was observed that a sizeable number of counselors resigned from their post. There were also some who were asked to relinquish their post due to attitudinal problems. Based on observation as well as direct feedback from practicing counselors, there are far too many issues to be addressed to arrest the situation. Nevertheless, it is believed that the psychological make-up of the counselors themselves is the major determining factor in ensuring the success of the counseling service in schools. The resilient ones are able to bounce back quickly from any setbacks and disappointments. They recoil fast from pressure and regain their level of productivity through a self-reflective and self-soothing capacity. This has prompted the researcher's inquiry interests to seek answers to the following questions: 1. How resilient are Malaysian school counselors? 2. Who are the resilient counselors? 3. What is the resiliency profile of school counselors in Malaysia? 4. Does school environment affect their resilience? 5. Is their resilience influenced by their academic and professional qualifications? 6. What are the main predictors of counselors' general resilience? 7. Is resilience correlated significantly with self-efficacy and burnout?

The study was conducted to seek answers to these research questions using the Bahasa Melayu version of the Resiliency Attitudes Scale, the General Self-Efficacy Scale, and Burnout Potential Inventory. These instruments were translated and validated in a pilot study before being used in the study. The internal consistency of Cronbach's

alpha for the three instruments were .84, .94, and .81 respectively. Reliability analysis using Guttman Split-half procedure yielded readings of .85, .93 and .84. Questionnaires were sent to 1,061 full-time counselors throughout Malaysia , of which 615 (57.96%) responded.

The computation of the Resiliency Index (RI) yielded a mean of 71.94 with a standard deviation of 4.40. Out of 615 respondents, 414 (67.32%) of them were found to be resilient with a mean RI of 70 and above. The remaining 201 (32.68%) respondents were found to be non-resilient. Further analyses were done to identify resilient counselors according to their race, gender and school location. The resilient counselors were found to have a profile of Creativity, Morality, Initiative, Relationships, Independence, Humor, and Insight, which constitute resiliency according to Wolin and Wolin's (1993) theory of resilience. The school environment, in terms of boarding and day schools; rural and urban schools; boys', girls' and coeducational schools; technical, religious, Chinese and normal schools; and academically low, average and high performing schools, was found to have no significant effect on counselor resilience. This is concluded from *t*-test analyses and ANOVA which yielded no significant difference in counselor resilience in all the five school categorizations. On the other hand, *t*-test analyses and ANOVA showed that the counselors' academic and professional counseling qualifications have a significant influence on their resilience. The results of the stepwise multiple regression showed that Morality, Creativity, Initiative and Relationship together contributed 35.20% of the total variance of counselors' general resilience. And the overall relationship was also found to be

significant ($F_{4, 610}$= 82.70, p < .001). Morality was found to be the best predictor, which accounted for 24.70% of the variance, whereas Relationship which accounted for 1.00% of the variance, was the last predictor that entered the prediction equation. The subjects' resilience was found to be moderately correlated with their self-efficacy (r = .57, p < .05), and negatively correlated with their burnout score (r = -.42, p < .05). The results were interpreted and discussed based on Wolin and Wolin's (1993) theory as well as the literature reviewed.

Based on the findings, the theoretical and practical implications were discussed. Inevitably, resilience features prominently in the counselors' work with their clients. Promoting self-resilience is highly consonant with the basic principle of counseling. Nevertheless, the counselors themselves need to constantly monitor their own physical and mental wellbeing. Healthy and resilient counselors are definitely more capable of helping their clients to overcome obstacles that block their optimal personal development.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to express my immense gratitude and deep appreciation to my supervisor, Prof. Suradi, for his invaluable support, guidance and encouragement. My special thanks also go to my head of department, Prof. Zulkifli, who granted me the study leave and helped me a great deal in the initial conceptualization of the study as well as in data collection.

My research could not have been completed without the approval of the Educational Planning and Research Division, Ministry of Education, Malaysia, the permission of all the state education directors which facilitated my data collection, and the cooperation of the counselors who took time to respond to my questionnaire. Thank you very much.

The Education Faculty members of University of Malaya also contributed in many ways in making the completion of this research possible. Dr. Ananda, Dr. Kuldip, Prof. Seow, Dr. Saratha, Mr. Liew, your constructive comments, suggestions, help and support will always be remembered.

A special thank you also goes to Dr. Marilyn Susman, who has been my confidant since we met during her first visit to Malaysia in 1997. Though we could only communicate through emails most of the time, your support and encouragement enabled me to pull through many difficult times. I really can't thank you enough, Marilyn.

Puan Halijah, my former lecturer in Universiti Putra Malaysia, is another person to whom I wish to extend my deep appreciation. Thank you for being my listener despite your ill health. You were always there for me whenever I needed someone to talk with. Besides that, I owe it to you to have spotted my potentials as a counselor. You are the most wonderful mentor in grooming me continuously till this day. I really appreciate the relationship we have developed since my undergraduate days. My gratitude extends well beyond the expression of words. May Allah bless you, Puan Halijah.

In a very special way, I thank Zie, my beloved wife, who had to shoulder most of the responsibilities of taking good care of our children, Elia, Ezzati, Eliana, and Shah Iman. I know you had made enormous sacrifices to let me concentrate on my research. To my children, thank you for behaving well despite the reduced time I could afford to be with you. Thank you very very much for your understanding, support and patience throughout the past three years or so.

Last but not least, to all the rest of my family members, friends, and students, thank you for your encouragement and concern about my progress. Your blessings have given me strength, which bolstered my resilience to soldier on this bumpy road to success. Above all, I thank Allah, the almighty for giving me strength and enlightenment that helped me through this academic endeavor.

Thank you all!

Sharil.

CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRAK	i
ABSTRACT	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
CONTENTS	ix
GRAPHS	xiii
FIGURES	xiv
TABLES	xv
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
Statement Of The Problem	2
Objectives Of The Study	13
Research Questions	15
Hypotheses	17
Operational Definition Of Terms	18
Resilience	19
Resiliency Index	19
School Counselors	19
Experienced/Non-experienced Counselors	20
Urban/Rural Schools	20
Non-performing/Performing Schools	20
Low/Average/High Performing Schools	21
Resiliency Profile	21
Self-Efficacy	22
Burnout	22
Significance Of The Study	23
Limitations Of The Study	27
II REVIEW OF LITERATURE	
Introduction	29
The Concept of Resilience	29

		Page
	Theoretical Framework	31
	Related Concepts of Resiliency	37
	Coping	37
	Self-help	38
	Social support	38
	Empowerment	39
	Self-esteem	39
	Self-efficacy	40
	Competence	40
	Traits Of The Resilient Personality	41
	Profile Of Resilient Personality	44
	The Seven Resiliencies	46
	Insight	46
	Independence	47
	Relationships	47
	Initiative	48
	Creativity	49
	Humor	49
	Morality	49
	The Damage Model	53
	The Challenge Model	56
	Conclusion	60
III	METHODOLOGY	
	Introduction	61
	Research Design	62
	Population	62
	Respondents	63
	Instrumentation	67
	Resiliency Attitude Scale (RAS)	68
	The Translation Procedure	69
	RAS Items and Subscales	69
	The General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSES)	71
	The Burnout Potential Inventory (BPI)	71
	Pilot Study	72
	Administering the Instruments	74
	Scoring the RAS	75
	Interpretation of RAS Scores	76
	Scoring the GSES and BPI	76
	Interpretation of GSES and BPI Scores	77
	Data Collection	77
	Data Analysis	79
	Summary	81

		Page
IV	DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSIONS OF FINDINGS	
	Introduction	83
	Malaysian School Counselor Resilience	86
	Proportion of Resilient and Non-resilient Counselors	90
	Resilient and Non-resilient counselors based on gender and race	91
	Resilient and Non-resilient counselors according to school location and academic performance	93
	Low resilient and high resilient counselors according to gender and race	96
	Low resilient and high resilient counselors according to school location and academic performance	98
	Resiliency Profile of School Counselors	100
	Non-resilient and resilient counselor profile	103
	Low resilient and high resilient counselor profile	107
	Low resilient male and female counselor profile	112
	High resilient male and female counselor profile	116
	Effect of School Environment on Counselor Resilience	121
	Comparisons of counselor resilience between boarding and day, rural and urban schools	121
	Comparisons of counselor resilience between boys', girls' and co-educational schools	123
	Comparisons of counselor resilience between technical, religious, Chinese and normal national schools	125
	Comparisons of counselor resilience between academically low, average and high performing schools	127
	Influence of Academic and Professional Qualifications on Counselor Resilience	129
	Comparisons of counselor resilience between counselors of different academic qualifications	130
	Comparison of resilience between graduate and non-graduate counselors	132
	Comparisons of resiliency components between graduate and non-graduate counselors	134
	Comparisons of resilience between counselors of different professional counseling qualifications	136
	Comparison of resilience between counselors with and without professional counseling degree	138

Page

Comparisons of resiliency components between counselors with and without professional counseling degree 140
Comparison of resilience between counselors with and without prior working experience 143
Comparison of resilience between experienced and inexperienced counselors 144
Predictors of School Counselor Resilience 146
The relationships between general resiliency and the seven components of resiliency 146
Stepwise multiple regression analysis 149
Stepwise regression analysis on low resilient counselors 152
Stepwise regression analysis on high resilient counselors 153
Resilience and Self-Efficacy Correlation 155
Resiliency components and self-efficacy correlation 158
Resilience and Burnout Correlation 159
Resiliency components and burnout correlation 162
Summary of Findings 163

V SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS
The Problem 167
The Objectives 168
Methodology 169
The Findings 171
Theoretical Implications 174
Practical Implications 176
Recommendations 179
Implications For Future Research 182
Conclusion 184

REFERENCES 186

APPENDICES

A Research Approval Letter from Educational Planning and Research Division Ministry of Education, Malaysia 195

B	Research Approval Letters from State Education Departments, Malaysia	198
C	Covering Letter to Respondents and Questionnaire	211
D	Covering Letter to Respondents from State Education Departments, Malaysia	219

GRAPHS

Graph		Page
1	Resiliency Index Distribution	87
2	Overall, Non-Resilient and Resilient Profiles	105
3	Overall, Low Resilient and High Resilient Profiles	110
4	Low Overall, Low Resilient Male and Low Resilient Female Profiles	114
5	High Overall, High Resilient Male and High Resilient Female Profiles	118
6	Self-Efficacy Score Distribution	156
7	Burnout Score Distribution	160

FIGURES

Figure		Page
1	Conceptual framework of the research	13
2	The Normal Disruption-Reintegration Cycle	32
3	The Damage Model	54
4	The Challenge Model	58

TABLES

Table		Page
1	Respondents by Race and Gender	64
2	Respondents by State, Gender and States' Return Rate	66
3	RAS Items and Subscales	70
4	A Summary of Multidimensional Scaling Analysis	74
5	Resiliency Index Mean for Male Counselors, Female Counselors and Overall Sample	88
6	Resiliency Index Mean According to States.....	89
7	Resilient and Non-resilient Counselors Based on Gender and Race.....	92
8	Resilient and Non-resilient Counselors According to School Location and Academic Performance.....	94
9	Low and High Resilient Counselors According to Gender and Race....	97
10	Low and High Resilient Counselors According to School Location and Academic Performance	99
11	Descriptive Statistics of the Components of Resiliency for the Overall Sample (N= 615).....	102
12	Resiliency Profiles Based on Mean and Ranked Scores.....	104
13	T-test Comparisons of RI Components Between Non-resilient (n=201) and Resilient (n=414) Counselors	106
14	Profiles of Low Resilient and High Resilient Counselors	108
15	T-test Comparisons of RI Components Between Low resilient (n=82) and High Resilient (n=95) Counselors	111
16	Profiles of Low Resilient Male and Female Counselors	113
17	T-test Comparisons of RI Components Between Low Resilient Male (n=48) and Female (n=34) Counselors	115

18	Profiles of High Resilient Male and Female Counselors	116
19	T-test Comparisons of RI Components Between High Resilient Male (n=63) and Female (n=32) Counselors	119
20	T-test Comparisons of RI Between Counselors in Boarding and Day, Rural and Urban Schools	122
21	One-way Analysis of Variance for Resiliency Index Between Boys', Girls' and Co-educational Schools	124
22	One-way Analysis of Variance for Resiliency Index Between Technical, Religious, Chinese and Normal Schools	126
23	One-way Analysis of Variance for Resiliency Index by School Academic Achievement Level	128
24	One-way Analysis of Variance for Resiliency Index by Academic Qualifications	131
25	T-test Comparisons of RI between Graduate and Non-graduate Counselors	133
26	T-test Comparisons of RI Components Between Graduate (n=477) and Non-Graduate (n=138) Counselors	135
27	One-way Analysis of variance for Resiliency Index by Counseling Qualifications	137
28	T-test Comparisons of RI Between Counselors With and Without a Professional Counseling Degree	139
29	T-test Comparisons of RI Components Between Counselors with Counseling degree (n= 394) and without Counseling Degree (n= 221)	141
30	T-test Comparisons of RI Between Counselors With and Without Prior Working Experience	144
31	T-test Comparisons of RI Between Experienced and Inexperienced Counselors	145
32	Correlation Matrix among Components of Resiliency	147
33	Stepwise Regression Analysis Using General Resiliency As Criterion For The Whole Sample (N=615)	150

34	Stepwise Regression Analysis Using Resiliency Index As Criterion For Low Resilient Counselors (n = 82)	152
35	Stepwise Regression Analysis Using Resiliency Index As Criterion For High Resilient Counselors (n = 95)	154
36	Pearson Product Moment Correlation Between Resilience and Self-Efficacy	157
37	Correlation Between Resiliency Components and Self-Efficacy (N=615)	158
38	Pearson Product Moment Correlation Between Resilience and Burnout	161
39	Correlation Between Resiliency Components and Burnout (N=615)	162