CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Introduction

The objectives of this study are to measure Malaysian school counselors' resilience; to identify resilient school counselors; to establish a resiliency profile of school counselors; to examine the effect of school environment on counselor resilience; to investigate the influence of academic and professional credentials on counselor resilience; to identify predictors of counselor resilience; and, lastly, to examine the relationship between counselor resilience, self-efficacy and burn-out.

The data were organized, analyzed and interpreted to achieve the research objectives, seek answers to the research questions as well as to test the related hypotheses. The research questions are:

- 1. How resilient are Malaysian school counselors?
- 2. What proportion of school counselors in Malaysia are resilient and who are they?
- 3. What is the resiliency profile of school counselors in Malaysia?
- 4. Does school environment affect counselor resilience in terms of:
 - a. boarding and day schools?
 - b. rural and urban schools?

- c. boys', girls' and co-educational schools?
- d. technical, religious, Chinese and normal national schools?
- e. academically low, average and high performing schools?
- Do counselors' academic and professional qualifications influence their resilience in terms of:
 - a. counselors with different academic qualifications?
 - b. counselors who are graduate and non-graduate?
 - c. counselors with different professional counseling qualifications?
 - d. counselors with and without a professional counseling degree?
 - e. counselors with and without prior working experience?
 - f. Counselors who are experienced and inexperienced?
- 6. What are the variables that predict school counselor resilience?
- 7. Is counselor resilience significantly related to:
 - a. counselor self-efficacy?
 - b. counselor burnout scale?

The hypotheses to be tested in this study are as follows:

- There is no significant difference in resilience between counselors in boarding and day schools.
- There is no significant difference in resilience between counselors in rural and urban schools.

- There is no significant difference in resilience between counselors in boys, girls, and co-education schools.
- There is no significant difference in resilience between counselors in technical, religious, Chinese, and normal national schools.
- There is no significant difference in resilience between counselors in academically low, average and high performing schools.
- There is no significant difference in resilience between counselors of different academic qualifications.
- There is no significant difference in resilience between graduate and nongraduate counselors.
- There is no significant difference in resilience between counselors of different professional counseling qualifications.
- There is no significant difference in resilience between counselors with and without a counseling degree.
- There is no significant difference in resilience between counselors with and without prior working experience.
- There is no significant difference in resilience between experienced and inexperienced counselors.

Descriptive statistics of overall resilience and its seven components for the sample as a whole and the various subgroups were computed to answer research questions 1, 2 and 3 which were formulated based on objectives 1 and 2. One-way analysis of variance for independent samples and *t*-test analyses were performed accordingly to seek answers to research questions 4 and 5 and to test hypotheses 1 to 11.

In order to answer research question 6, two types of statistical analysis were performed to ascertain the relationships among the components of resilience. Firstly, the seven components of resilience were subjected to Pearson product-moment correlation. Secondly, a stepwise multiple regression analysis was carried out, using general resilience as the dependent variable, and the seven components namely, Insight, Independence, Relationships, Initiative, Creativity, Humor, and Morality as the predictors.

As an attempt to answer research question 7, the correlation coefficients were computed using Pearson product-moment to examine the relationships between resilience, self-efficacy and burnout.

Malaysian School Counselor Resilience

In order to answer research question 1, the resiliency index (RI) is used as the indicator of Malaysian school counselor resilience. Resiliency index is a computed value of resilience based on the scores of the 72 items in the Resiliency Attitudes Scale used to measure resilience. It is derived by dividing the total score by 36 as explained in chapter I and III.

The computation of RI for the whole sample of 615 subjects yielded a mean of 71.94 with the standard deviation of 4.40. The minimum index is 55.81 and the maximum is 86.45 providing a range of 30.64. Prior to this, the distribution of RI was checked for its normality and skewness. The resiliency index was found to be normally distributed with a skewness of 0.10. The distribution frequency of the scores in the form of a histogram is presented in Graph 1.



Graph 1: Resiliency Index Distribution

Resiliency Index

The RI for male counselors (n = 352) is 72.16 which is slightly higher than the female counselors' (n = 263) 71.65. The minimum and maximum RI for the male counselors are 59.35 and 86.45 giving a range of 27.10. Whereas the minimum and maximum RI for female counselors are 55.81 and 85.16 with a range of 29.35. The respective standard deviations are 4.51 and 4.26. These results are summarized and presented in Table 5.

	Min. RI	Max. RI	RI Mean	SD
Male (n = 352)	59.35	86.45	72.16	4.51
Female $(n = 264)$	55.81	85.16	71.65	4.26
Overall (N=615)	55.81	86.45	71.94	4.40

Table 5 : Resiliency Index Mean for Male Counselors, Female Counselors and Overall Sample.

of the 14 states surpassed the overall RI mean of 71.94. Trengganu (n=40) has the highest RI mean of 72.81 with the standard deviation of 4.35. Its RI ranges from 66.13 to 85.49. Pulau Pinang (n=36), on the other hand, has the lowest RI mean of 70.81 with the standard of deviation of 4.72. Its RI ranges between 61.94 and 80.65. The disparity of RI between the states may be small but it is still an interesting avenue for future research and investigations.

	n	Min. RI	Max. RI	SD	RI Mean
Kedah	43	62.26	86.45	4.77	72.09
Pahang	48	59.35	78.06	4.44	71.93
Melaka	21	64.19	84.52	4.36	71.18
N.Sembilan	49	60.00	81.94	4.44	72.16
Trengganu	40	66.13	85.49	4.35	72.81
Selangor	56	64.52	82.90	3.98	72.21
K.Lumpur	33	60.97	79.35	3.67	72.70
Johor	103	56.45	85.16	4.50	71.98
Perlis	13	65.81	80.00	4.24	71.66
P.Pinang	36	61.94	80.65	4.72	70.81
Kelantan	44	59.35	80.97	5.02	71.03
Perak	82	62.90	86.45	4.18	72.12
Sabah	29	55.81	84.52	4.93	71.48
Sarawak	18	64.52	80.65	4.05	72.13

Table 6: Resiliency Index Mean According to States

The findings show that generally Malaysian school counselors are resilient since the RI mean is above 70. This could be attributed to the fact that the majority of the counselors are still fresh in the five-year-old service. Their enthusiasm and dedication might have helped them go through the challenges in their course of duty. Another plausible reason could be the fact that as of December 2000, 131 counselors who could not withstand the pressure of work had resigned and gone back to teaching instead of counseling. According to the spokesperson of the School Division, Ministry of Education, Malaysia, counselors who resigned cited various reasons. Among them were longer working hours compared to teaching, unreasonable expectations of school administrators, unsupportive staff members, hazy prospect of career advancement, and overwhelming workload since most, if not all, of them are the only counselor in their school with student populations of well over one thousand.

Proportion of Resilient and Non-resilient Counselors

Based on their resiliency index, counselors are categorized as non-resilient and resilient in order to answer research question 2. Those who have a resiliency index of below 70 are operationally considered as non-resilient and there are 201 or 32.70% of them. There are 414 counselors who constituted 67.30% of the sample, found to be resilient as shown in Table 7. This augurs well for Malaysian school counseling at this early stage of implementation. Hopefully, these resilient counselors could continue to upgrade their resiliency in order to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of counseling services in schools despite the shortcomings and challenges. The resilient counselors, in spite of setbacks and disappointments, are more capable of returning to the pre-adversity level of functioning or even surpass it in some manner (O'Leary and Ickovics, 1995). To do that, they need to continuously bolster their resiliency in order not to succumb to the

job demands and pressure. Even though they seem to have been coping quite well, the often-heard grouses like overwhelming workload, unrealistic expectations and so on from practicing counselors is a matter of concern. Thus, help and support need to be rendered to them from the relevant authority from the Ministry of Education.

The sizeable proportion of non-resilient counselors definitely needs immediate attention since there is a high tendency for them, when faced with adversity, to have a psychological downward slide in which the detrimental effect is compounded. They are diminished or impaired in some respect and eventually succumb to their ill-perceived situations (O'Leary and Ickovics, 1995). Once they slumped into such a deplorable state of functioning, they become more of a liability than an asset to the school counseling service. They themselves need to be counseled instead to get them out of their difficult situations. If this group of non-resilient counselors is left unattended to, the counseling services in schools will suffer due to their lackadaisical job performance. Probably, fellow counselors could form a support group to help them re-sharpen their coping skills and develop more protective factors, which will promote their resiliency.

Resilient and Non-resilient counselors based on gender and race

Further analyses of the data based on gender and race yielded results as shown in Table 7. A total of 243 male counselors comprising 216 Malay, 10 Chinese, 5 Indian, and 12 of other ethnic groups are found to be resilient. This works out to be 69.03% out of the overall total of 352 male counselors. Similarly, 171 female counselors comprising 143 Malay, 17 Chinese, 4 Indian, and 7 of other ethnic groups are found to be resilient. This constitutes 65.02% from a total of 263 female counselors. This shows that there are more male counselors who are resilient than the female counselors.

		MALE (1	n = 352)			FEMALE (n = 263)	
	Malay	Chinese	Indian	Others	Malay	Chinese	Indian	Others	Total
Non- Resilient	98	1	7	3	75	15	-	2	201
Resilient	216	10	5	12	143	17	4	7	414
Total	314	11	12	15	218	32	4	9	615

Table 7: Resilient and Non-resilient Counselors Based on Gender and Race

In terms of race, 359 out of 532 (67.48%) Malay counselors are found to be resilient. Further analysis according to gender shows that 216 Malay male counselors out of 314 or 68.79% are found to be resilient compared to 143 Malay female counselors out of 218 or 66.27%. This shows that there are more Malay male counselors who are resilient compared to their female counterparts.

Since the number of non-Malay counselors is comparatively small, for the purpose of analysis, they are grouped into one. Out of 83 non-Malay counselors, 55 of them or 66.27% are found to be resilient. According to gender, 27 out of 38 males or

might have helped them go through the challenges in their course of duty. Another plausible reason could be the fact that as of December 2000, 131 counselors who could not withstand the pressure of work had resigned and gone back to teaching instead of counseling. According to the spokesperson of the School Division, Ministry of Education, Malaysia, counselors who resigned cited various reasons. Among them were longer working hours compared to teaching, unreasonable expectations of school

90

administrators, unsupportive staff members, hazy prospect of career advancement, and

overwhelming workload since most, if not all, of them are the only counselor in their

school with student populations of well over one thousand.

Proportion of Resilient and Non-resilient Counselors

Based on their resiliency index, counselors are categorized as non-resilient and

resilient in order to answer research question 2. Those who have a resiliency index of below 70 are operationally considered as non-resilient and there are 201 or 32.70% of them. There are 414 counselors who constituted 67.30% of the sample, found to be resilient as shown in Table 7. This augurs well for Malaysian school counseling at this early stage of implementation. Hopefully, these resilient counselors could continue to upgrade their resiliency in order to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of counseling services in schools despite the shortcomings and challenges. The resilient counselors, in

spite of setbacks and disappointments, are more capable of returning to the pre-adversity

level of functioning or even surpass it in some manner (O'Leary and Ickovics, 1995). To

do that, they need to continuously bolster their resiliency in order not to succumb to the

71.05% are found to be resilient compared to 28 females out of 45 or 62.22%. This shows that non-Malay male counselors have a higher percentage of being resilient compared to the female. In summary, non-Malay male counselors are found to have the highest percentage (71.05%) of being resilient, followed by Malay male (68.79%), Malay female (66.27%), and non-Malay female (66.22%) counselors.

The findings show that more male counselors are found to be resilient compared to the female counselors. This could be related to the Malaysian culture whereby males are brought up to shoulder more responsibilities than the females. To do so, they are trained to be more hardy, more resourceful, more independent which are related to their being more resilient. However, the male-female gap has been narrowed considerably in recent years. In fact it has become a national concern that male students and undergraduates are lagging behind their female counterparts not only in terms of quantity but quality as well. Thus, the scenario may differ in the near future.

Resilient and non-resilient counselors according to school location and academic performance

Academic achievement in public examinations is of top priority in Malaysian schools. A lot of resources are allocated by schools to implement various programs and activities besides the normal teaching-learning process to ensure they attain good results. Comparatively, the rural schools are still lagging behind the urban schools in this respect even though the gap has been bridged slowly. Serving in non-performing schools, especially in the rural areas, is a real challenge for the teachers and counselors alike. Besides striving hard to improve their students' academic performance, they have to grapple with issues like poverty, substance abuse, indiscipline, low motivation, low selfesteem and morality. It is against this backdrop that an analysis was also done on the distribution of non-resilient and resilient counselors according to school location and academic performance.

The schools were categorized based on their rural or urban location according to the criteria set by the Ministry of Education. One major criterion is whether the schools fall within the jurisdiction of any city or town council. Those which are located within the city or town municipality are considered as urban schools. The others are categorized as rural schools. The Malaysian Certificate of Education (*Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia*) results of the schools were used to categorize them into non-performing and performing schools depending on whether they surpassed the mean passing rate of 72.4% in the 1999 results released in 2000. The results are presented in Table 8.

	Urban (n = 268)		Rural (n	Rural (n = 347)		
	Non- performing	Performing	Non- performing	Performing	Total	
Non-resilient	34	49	77	41	201	
Resilient	81	104	147	82	414	
Total	115	153	224	123	615	

 Table 8: Resilient and Non-resilient Counselors According to School Location and Academic Performance.

As shown in Table 8, there are 77 non-resilient counselors found in rural, nonperforming schools and 34 are found in urban, non-performing schools. This makes up 111 out of 201 (55.22%) of non-resilient counselors found in the schools. This is an indication of the dire need to reach out to the counselors in rural, non-performing schools. The rural location and the poor academic performance of their school could have had an adverse impact on their resilience. The difficulty in soliciting professional support due to logistic problem could be one main reason. Nevertheless, this could also be due to the intrapersonal factors of the counselors themselves who are not practicing what they "preach" to their clients when faced with adversity. They are supposed to be in control of their situation instead of being controlled by their situation.

However, there are 90 out of 201 (44.78%) non-resilient counselors found in performing schools. Out of these, 49 are found in urban, performing schools compared to 41 in rural, performing schools. This is an interesting finding since performing schools are supposed to be more conducive to work in. A further research with more focus on the counselors' personality will shed more light on this.

Out of 414 resilient counselors, 228 (55.07%) were found in non-performing schools. Out of these, 147 are in rural schools compared to 81 in urban schools. On the other hand, there are 186 resilient counselors or 44.93% found in performing schools. Out of these 186 resilient counselors, 104 of them are found in urban schools compared to 82 in rural schools. It is heartening to note that the rural, non-performing schools have the highest number of resilient counselors. They thrived despite the adverse working

environment. Their resiliency profile could throw more light on how they thrive despite the odds stacked against them. The profile could also serve as a model in counselor training program.

Based on the results, it is premature to conclude whether counselors' resilience is related to their school location and their school academic performance. Further analyses will be done to examine the impact of school environment on counselor resilience.

Low resilient and high resilient counselors according to gender and race

Like any other psychological construct, resilience is also faced with the issue of consistency and fluctuation. According to Wolin and Wolin's (1993) Theory of Resilience, the higher the resilience a person has, the more consistent his resiliency is and the degree of fluctuation is also less. The reverse is also true. Thus, it is of significance to examine counselors of these two extremes.

There are two ways of determining the low and high resilient counselors. First is by way of taking the first quartile and third quartile of the cumulative RI score. The score of the first quartile in this study is 69.03 and below. Whereas the third quartile score is 74.85 and above.

The second way is to subtract the RI mean score by on low resilient counselors and to add the RI mean score with viation for the high resilient counselors. In this study, the calculations yielded the scores of 67.54 and 76.34.

The second way of determining the low and high resilient counselors is preferred since the RI score is found to be normally distributed. Based on this, 82 out of 615 subjects or 13.33%, are found to have a RI score of 67.54 and below, and 95 (15.45%) of the subjects are found to have a RI of 76.34 and above. An analysis of the data according to gender and race yielded results as presented in Table 9.

		MA	LE			FEM	ALE		
	Malay	Chinese	Indian	Others	Malay	Chinese	Indian	Others	Total
Low Resilient	43	-	4	1	28	6		÷	82
High Resilient	54	5	1	3	25	5	2		95

Table 9: Low and High Resilient Counselors According to Gender and Race

Out of 82 low resilient counselors, 48 are male and 34 are female. Among the 48 males, 43 of them are Malay, 4 Indian and 1 minority race. Whereas among the 34 females, 28 are Malay and 6 Chinese.

Out of 95 high resilient counselors, 63 are male and 32 are female. Among the 63 males, 54 of them are Malay, 5 Chinese, 1 Indian and 3 minority race. Whereas, among the 32 females, 25 are Malay, 5 Chinese, and 2 Indian.

The findings provided a glimpse into the composition of low and high resilient counselors in schools according to gender and race. In view of the Malay and non-Malay disparity in sample size, it is difficult to draw any conclusion from the findings. Perhaps more non-Malay candidates need to be recruited, trained and then appointed as counselors in schools to reduce the imbalance.

Low resilient and high resilient counselors according to school location and academic performance

Considering the vulnerability of being low resilient and the consistency of being high resilient, an analysis of low resilient and high resilient counselors according to school location and academic performance was also carried out and the findings are presented in Table 10. In fact, it is the close examination of these two extreme groups of counselors that provides more reliable findings.

Urban Schools		Rural Sch		
Non-performing	Performing	Non-performing	Performing	Total
9	21	31	21	82
20	24	35	16	95
	Non-performing 9	Non-performing Performing 9 21	Non-performing Performing Non-performing 9 21 31	Non-performing Performing Non-performing Performing 9 21 31 21

Table 10: Low and High Resilient Counselors According to School Location and Academic Performance

Out of 82 low resilient counselors, 52 are in rural schools and the remaining 30 in urban schools. There are 31 low resilient counselors in rural, non-performing schools compared to 9 in urban, non-performing schools. Coincidentally, there are 21 low resilient counselors in both rural and urban, performing schools. If one of the earlier findings showed the highest number of non-resilient counselors are in rural, nonperforming schools, the highest number of low resilient counselors are also found in rural, non-performing schools. This reinforces the need to reach out to these counselors so that their level of resiliency could be improved. Failing which, their services may do more harm than good and this will tarnish the image of the school counseling service. The other counselors may need to deal with the unnecessary adverse reports which could have been avoided if steps are taken early to arrest the situation. As also shown in Table 10, there are 95 high resilient counselors and out of these, 51 are in rural schools and the remaining 44 in urban schools. There are 35 high resilient counselors in rural, non-performing schools compared to 20 in urban, non-performing schools. There are 16 high resilient counselors in rural, performing schools compared to 24 in urban, performing schools. It is heartening to note that rural, non-performing schools also have the biggest number of high resilient counselors. Their resiliency profile would be of great interest to investigate and compile. This could provide a good input in devising or developing a program to enhance counselor resilience in the counselor training program. The resiliency profile of Malaysian school counselors is presented next.

Resiliency Profile Of School Counselors

The resiliency profile of school counselors was based on the computed mean score of the seven components of Wolin and Wolin's (1993) theory of resilience. The seven components are Insight, Independence, Relationships, Initiative, Creativity, Humor, and Morality. The order of these components is of no importance but the magnitude is.

The first component, Insight, is briefly defined as the mental habit of asking searching questions and giving honest answers. It also includes the ability to sense and read signals from other people, identify the source of problems and try to work out things for self and others. The second component, Independence, is defined as the right to safe boundaries between oneself and significant others. It includes the ability to keep an emotional distance from being jerked around by people and also know when to separate from bad relationships. The third component, Relationships, is defined as the ability to develop and maintain intimate and fulfilling ties with other people. This also includes the ability to select healthy partners, to start new relationships and maintaining them. Whereas the fourth component, Initiative, is defined as the determination to master oneself and one's environment. This includes creative problem solving skills and the ability to generate constructive activities. The fifth component, Creativity, is defined as the safe harbors of the imagination where one can take refuge and rearrange the details of one's life to his own pleasing. This involves creative thinking and the ability to use creativity to forget pain and to express emotions. The next component, Humor, is basically the ability to make a bad situation better to reduce tension. Finally, the last component, Morality, is defined as knowing what is right and wrong and being willing to stand up for those beliefs. It also includes the liking to help other people.

The descriptive statistical analysis of the seven components for the overall sample is presented in Table 11 to provide an overview for the profiling. All the scores are found to be normally distributed with skewness of between -.08 and .29.

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Insight	44.00	82.00	64.37 (6)*	5.76
Independence	42.00	88.00	67.91 (5)*	7.13
Relationships	48.00	100.00	74.11 (4)*	8.27
Initiative	54.00	94.00	75.41 (3)*	6.49
Creativity	54.29	100.00	77.33 (1)*	8.35
Humor	33.33	100.00	63.20(7)*	12.68
Morality	50.00	96.67	75.95 (2)*	6.55

Table 11: Descriptive Statistics of the Components of Resiliency for the Overall Sample (N= 615).

*Rankings of mean scores are in parenthesis.

The mean scores of these seven components were ranked in an ascending order based on their magnitude. The highest mean is accorded the rank of 1. The ranked profile for the overall sample is found to be Creativity, Morality, Initiative, Relationships, Independence, Insight, and Humor. Based on the profile, Malaysian school counselors firstly tend to maneuver their life creatively in order to cope with their job demands and expectations. They also use their creative thinking to forget their misery and ventilate their emotions without hurting others. Secondly, they are guided by their morality, knowing what is right and wrong and stand up for those beliefs. Their passion to help other people and the satisfaction gained enabled them to persevere. Thirdly, Malaysian school counselors are determined to not only master themselves but also their environment. They are able to apply their creative problem solving skills effectively to deal with difficult situations and generate constructive activities to build rapport and improve relationships. Fourthly, they are capable of developing and maintaining healthy relationships, which is an important trait in expanding their own network. This is followed by their ability to keep an emotional distance from being irked by people and to dissociate themselves from bad relationships. Subsequently, they are quick in picking up signals from other people and are proactive in working things out for themselves and others. Lastly, they are capable of seeing the humorous side of events, making bad situation better to reduce tension. These are the resiliency traits found among Malaysian school counselors in protecting and enhancing their resilience.

Non-resilient and resilient counselor profile

As explained earlier, non-resilient counselors were those with a resiliency index of 70 and below. Those with a resiliency index of above 70 were categorized as resilient. The profiles were obtained based on the mean ranked score of the seven components of resiliency.

As presented in Table 12, the non-resilient counselor scores are all lower than the resilient counselor scores. The lowest and highest score for the non-resilient counselors are 57.31 and 71.40 respectively. This gives a range score of 14.09. For the resilient counselors, the lowest score is 65.64 and the highest is 80.21. This gives a range score of

14.57 which is slightly higher than the non-resilient. The significance of the score difference will be examined later.

	Non-resilient Profile ($n = 201$)	Resilient Profile (n = 414)
Insight	61.74 [6]*	65.64 [7]*
Independence	64.51 [5]	69.56 [5]
Relationship	67.83 [4]	77.15 [4]
Initiative	70.83 [3]	77.64 [3]
Creativity	71.40 [1]	80.21 [1]
Humor	57.31 [7]	66.05 [6]
Morality	70.95 [2]	78.38 [2]

Table 12: Resiliency Profiles Based on Mean and Ranked Scores

*Rankings are in parenthesis.

For the non-resilient counselors, the profile found is Creativity, Morality, Initiative, Relationships, Independence, Insight, and Humor. This is identical with the overall profile. The resilient counselor profile compiled is Creativity, Morality, Initiative, Relationships, Independence, Humor, and Insight. The profiles are almost identical. The only difference lies in the last two components. In view of the similarity, an attempt was made to get the profiles of low and high resilient counselors. Even though the profiles compiled are almost identical, the magnitudes of the mean scores differ as shown in Graph 2.



Graph 2: Overall, Non-Resilient and Resilient Profiles

The follow-up *t*-test analyses show that the mean difference in all the seven components are significant at p < .05 between non-resilient and resilient counselors. The results are presented in Table 13.

		Mean	SD	1	р
Insight	Non-Resilient Resilient	61.74 65.64	5.25 5.57	-8.47	.00
Independence	Non-Resilient Resilient	64.51 69.56	6.77 6.71	8.71	.00
Relationship	Non-Resilient	67.83	5.74	-15.43	.00
Initiative	Resilient Non-Resilient	77.17 70.83	7.57 5.56	-14.15	.00
	Resilient	77.64	5.70	14.07	00
Creativity	Non-Resilient Resilient	71.40 80.21	7.30 7.24	-14.07	.00
Humor	Non-Resilient Resilient	57.31 66.05	11.28 12.35	8.74	.00
Morality	Non-Resilient Resilient	70.95 78.38	5.24 5.69	-15.58	.00

Table 13: T-test Comparisons of RI Components Between Non-resilient (n=201) and Resilient (n=414) Counselors

The resilient counselors are found to be significantly better in all the seven components of resilience, namely, Insight (t (613) = -8.47, p <.01), Independence (t (613) = -8.71, p <.01), Relationship (t (613) = -15.43, p <.01), Initiative (t (613) = -14.15,

p <.01), Creativity (t (613) = -14.07, p <.01), Humor (t (613) = -8.74, p <.01), and Morality (t (613) = -15.58, p <.01).

Low resilient and high resilient counselor profile

As the profiles of resilient and non-resilient counselors are quite similar, an attempt was also made to compile the profiles of low resilient counselors and high resilient counselors based on the computed mean score of the seven components of resiliency. Low resilient counselors are those whose RI was one standard deviation or more below the RI mean. They are the most vulnerable lot who needs immediate attention. Whereas high resilient counselors, the most consistent lot, are those whose RI was one standard deviation or more above the mean. The vulnerability of the low resilient counselors and the consistency of the high resilient counselors warrant the compilation of their profiles. In order to get the profiles, the scores were ranked in an ascending order and the results are presented in Table 14.

	Low Resilient Profile (n =	82) High Resilient Profile (n = 95)
Insight	60.78 [6]*	68.21 [7]*
Independence	63.07 [5]	72.67 [5]
Relationship	65.17 [4]	84.17 [2]
Initiative	68.56 [1]	82.67 [4]
Creativity	68.54 [2]	85.20 [1]
Humor	55.04 [7]	71.37 [6]
Morality	68.31 [3]	83.77 [3]

Table 14: Profiles of Low Resilient and High Resilient Counselors

*Rankings are in parenthesis

As shown in Table 14, the scores of high resilient counselors are consistently higher than the low resilient counselors'. The smallest difference is the Insight score which is 7.43. The biggest difference is the Relationship score which is 19.00. Besides the difference in magnitude for each of the scores, the rankings which provide the profiles are found to be different as well. The profile for the low resilient counselors is found to be Initiative, Creativity, Morality, Relationships, Independence, Insight, and Humor. An analysis of the first three components indicate generally, the low resilient counselors have the determination to exert control over themselves and their environment through creative problem solving skills and initiating constructive activities. Besides that, they are quite creative in re-framing unpleasant events as a means of self-soothing and ventilating emotions. Further more, they are guided by their morality in the sense that they are aware of what is right and wrong and have a liking to help others. These low resilient counselors not only need to find ways to enhance their resiliency, the relevant authorities need to reach out to them to render support so that these counselors will be able to bounce back to their normal functioning selves.

On the other hand, the high resilient counselors are found to have a profile of Creativity, Relationships, Morality, Initiative, Independence, Humor, and Insight. An analysis on the top three components show that generally the high resilient counselors are highly creative in creating safe harbors for them to take refuge and realign their life for their own pleasing. They utilize their creative thinking to forget pain and to express their emotions well. Besides that they are skillful in fostering and maintaining relationships with other people. They are adept in recruiting people, attaching themselves and staying connected to as many support systems as possible. This is one aspect that the low resilient counselors are found to be highly lacking compared to the high resilient counselors. The high resilient counselors are well guided by their morality too. They have strong faith in their work which is basically the business of helping others in need of help. They are very clear on what is right and wrong and uphold their values and beliefs.

The results provide a clear contrast of the coping mechanism pattern employed by low resilient and high resilient counselors. It is the profile of the high resilient counselors that low resilient counselors need to develop to enhance their level of resilience. The profiles of low resilient and high resilient counselors are graphically presented in Graph 3.



Graph 3: Overall, Low Resilient and High Resilient Profiles

In order to verify the significance of differences in the mean ranked scores of the seven components, *t*-test analyses were performed and the results are presented in Table 15.

		Mean	SD	Т	р
Insight	Low Resilient	60.78	4.92	-9.15	.00
J	High Resilient	68.21	5.89		
Independence	Low Resilient	63.07	6.85	-9.65	.00
	High Resilient	72.67	6.30		
Relationship	Low Resilient	65.17	5.58	-18.89	.00
r.	High Resilient	84.17	7.49		
Initiative	Low Resilient	68.56	6.10	-15.55	.00
	High Resilient	82.67	5.93		
Creativity	Low Resilient	68.54	7.57	-14.43	.00
	High Resilient	85.20	7.76		
Humor	Low Resilient	55.04	10.57	-8.74	.00
	High Resilient	71.37	13.78		
Morality	Low Resilient	68.31	5.73	-18.77	.00
	High Resilient	83.77	5.14		

 Table 15: T-test Comparisons of RI Components Between Low resilient (n=82) and High Resilient (n=95) Counselors

Based on Table 15, high resilient counselors are found to have significantly scored higher than the low resilient counselors in all the seven components of resiliency. The components are Insight (t (175) = -9.15, p <.01), Independent (t (175) = -9.65, p <.01), Relationships (t (175) = -18.89, p <.01), Initiative (t (175) = -15.55, p <.01), Creativity (t (175) = -14.43, p <.01), Humor (t (175) = -8.74, p <.01), and Morality (t (175) = -18.77, p <.01).

Low resilient male and female counselor profile

There are 48 low resilient male counselors compared to 34 female counselors. An analysis of their resiliency scores yielded results as presented in Table 16. The male scores are higher than the female scores except for Morality in which the female counselors score higher. Male counselors have the lowest score of 55.42 and the highest score of 68.99 which give a range of 13.57. Female counselors on the other hand have the lowest score of 54.51 and the highest score of 68.66 providing a range score of 14.15. The significant difference of the scores will be analyzed in the subsequent section.

	Male (n = 48)	Female $(n = 34)$
Insight	60.96 [6]*	60.53 [6]*
Independence	63.38 [5]	62.65 [5]
Relationship	65.71 [4]	64.41 [4]
Initiative	68.75 [2]	68.29 [2]
Creativity	68.99 [1]	67.90 [3]
Humor	55.42 [7]	54.51 [7]
Morality	67.99 [3]	68.77 [1]

Table 16: Profiles of Low Resilient Male and Female Counselors

*Rankings are in parenthesis

Based on the ranked scores, the profile for the low resilient male counselors is found to be Creativity, Initiative, Morality, Relationships, Independence, Insight, and Humor. Whereas the low resilient female counselors are found to have a profile of Morality, Initiative, Creativity, Relationships, Independence, Insight, and Humor. The main difference in the profiles lies in the first and third component. Nevertheless, being low in resilience, these counselors need to seek ways to enhance their resilience in practically all the components. The overall low resilient counselors, low resilient male and low resilient female counselor profiles are presented in Graph 4.



Graph 4: Low Overall, Low Resilient Male and Low Resilient Female Profiles

In order to verify the significance of differences in the mean ranked scores of the seven components, t-test analyses were performed and the results are presented in Table 17.

		Mean	SD	t	р
Insight	Low Resilient Male	60.96	5.14	39	.70
	Low Resilient Female	60.53	4.65		
Independence	Low Resilient Male	63.38	6.12	.45	.65
	Low Resilient Female	62.65	7.84		
Relationship	Low Resilient Male	65.71	5.10	1.00	.32
	Low Resilient Female	64.41	6.19		
Initiative	Low Resilient Male	68.75	5.20	.31	.76
	Low Resilient Female	68.29	7.26		
Creativity	Low Resilient Male	68.99	7.48	.64	.53
	Low Resilient Female	67.90	7.77		
Humor	Low Resilient Male	Resilient Male 55.42 9.74 .37	.71		
	Low Resilient Female	54.51	11.77		
Morality	Low Resilient Male	67.99	5.44	60	.55
	Low Resilient Female	68.77	6.19		

Table 17: T-test Comparisons of RI Components Between Low Resilient Male (n=48) and Female (n=34) Counselors

Based on Table 17, low resilient males counselors are found to have higher scores in all the components except Morality. However, *t*-test analysis shows that there is no significant difference in all the components. The components are Insight (t (80) = 39, p > .05), Independent (t (80) = .45, p > .05), Relationships (t (80) = 1.00, p > 05), Initiative (t (80) = .31, p > 05), Creativity (t (80) = .64, p > 05), Humor (t (80) = .37, p > 05), and Morality (t (80) = -.60, p > 05).

High resilient male and female counselor profile

It has been found that there are more male high resilient counselors than the female in a ratio of almost 2 : 1. This has been discussed and explained in the earlier section. A plausible explanation is the Malaysian cultural context where males are brought up to be more hardy and resilient than the females. It is interesting to find out among the high resilient counselors whether there is any difference in their resiliency profile. An analysis was carried out to compile the profiles and the results are shown in Table 18.

	Male (n = 63)	Female (n = 32)	
Insight	68.38 [7]*	67.88 [7]*	
Independence	71.75 [5]	74.50 [5]	
Relationship	84.67 [2]	83.19 [2]	
Initiative	82.63 [4]	82.75 [3]	
Creativity	85.58 [1]	84.46 [1]	
Humor	70.37 [6]	73.33 [6]	
Morality	84.42 [3]	82.50 [4]	

Table 18: Profiles of High Resilient Male and Female Counselors

*Rankings are in parenthesis

Based on Table 18, the scores between male and female high resilient counselors do not differ much. Initiative has the smallest score difference of .12, whereas Humor has the biggest score difference of 2.96. The range score for the males and females are 17.20 and 16.58 respectively. Based on the rankings of the scores, male high resilient counselors are found to have a profile of Creativity, Relationships, Morality, Initiative, Independence, Humor, and Insight. This is identical with the high resilient counselors' profile.

The female high resilient counselors are found to have a resiliency profile of Creativity, Relationships, Initiative, Morality, Independence, Humor, and Insight. The only difference lies in the third and fourth code. Though the scores do not differ much, the significance will be established in the subsequent section. Meanwhile, the profiles found for high resilient male and female counselors are highly similar as shown in Graph 5.


Graph 5: High Overall, High Resilient Male and High Resilient Female Profiles

Even though the profiles for high resilient male and female counselors are similar, the differences of scores in the seven components need to be verified for their significance. Results of *t*-test analysis are presented in Table 19.

	Mean	SD	t	р
High Resilient Male	68.38	6.44	.44	.66
High Resilient Female	67.88	4.68		
High Resilient Male	71.75	6.26	-2.07	.04
High Resilient Female	74.50	6.05		
High Resilient Male	84.67	7.18	.88	.39
High Resilient Female	83.19	8.08		
High Resilient Male	82.64	5.57	08	.93
High Resilient Female	82.75	6.68		
High Resilient Male	85.58	7.96	.67	.50
High Resilient Female	84.46	7.43		
High Resilient Male	70.37	13.16	95	.35
High Resilient Female	73.33	14.96		
High Resilient Male	84.42	4.92	1.69	.10
High Resilient Female	82.50	5.39		
	High Resilient Male High Resilient Female High Resilient Male High Resilient Female High Resilient Male High Resilient Male High Resilient Female High Resilient Female High Resilient Female High Resilient Female	High Resilient Male High Resilient Female68.38 67.88High Resilient Female71.75 74.50High Resilient Female74.50High Resilient Male High Resilient Female84.67 83.19High Resilient Male High Resilient Female82.64 82.75High Resilient Male High Resilient Female85.58 84.46High Resilient Male High Resilient Female85.33 84.46High Resilient Male High Resilient Female70.37 73.33High Resilient Male High Resilient Female70.37 73.33High Resilient Male High Resilient Female84.42	High Resilient Male High Resilient Female68.38 67.886.44 4.68High Resilient Female71.75 74.506.26 6.05High Resilient Female74.506.05High Resilient Male High Resilient Female84.67 83.197.18 8.08High Resilient Male High Resilient Female82.64 82.755.57 6.68High Resilient Male High Resilient Female85.58 84.467.96 7.43High Resilient Male High Resilient Female85.77 84.4613.16 7.43High Resilient Male High Resilient Female70.37 73.3313.16 14.96High Resilient Male High Resilient Female70.37 74.3313.16 73.33High Resilient Male High Resilient Female70.37 74.3313.16 74.30High Resilient Male High Resilient Female70.37 74.3313.16 74.30High Resilient Male High Resilient Female70.37 74.3313.16 74.30	High Resilient Male High Resilient Female68.38 67.886.44 4.68.44High Resilient Female71.75 74.506.26 6.05-2.07High Resilient Male High Resilient Female74.506.05-2.07High Resilient Male High Resilient Female84.67 83.197.18 8.08.88High Resilient Male High Resilient Female82.64 82.755.57 6.6808High Resilient Male High Resilient Female85.58 84.467.96 7.43.67High Resilient Male High Resilient Female70.37 713.16 14.9695High Resilient Male High Resilient Female73.33 14.9695High Resilient Male High Resilient Female73.33 14.961.69

Table 19: T-test Comparisons of RI Components Between High Resilient Male (n=63) and Female (n=32) Counselors

Based on Table 19, high resilient male counselors scored higher than the female in Insight, Relationships, Creativity, and Morality. Whereas high resilient female counselors scored higher than the male in Independence, Initiative, and Humor. The difference ranges from .12 (Initiative) and 2.96 (Humor). The results of *t*-test analysis show that there is no significant difference in all the components except in Independence ((t (93) = -2.07, p < .05)). Based on the resiliency profiles compiled so far, Humor has been consistently found to be ranked last or second last. This is an interesting indication that Malaysian school counselors are serious in carrying out their roles and responsibilities that they failed to see the humorous side of events. This is highly understandable in view of the fact that counseling sessions are generally calm yet serious, relaxed yet enabling, passionate and yet focussed. However, it is felt that outside the realm of counseling, when faced with difficulties and hardship, the counselors may want to resort to a form of self therapy called humor therapy, or the related laughter therapy whereby they would be able to laugh good-naturedly at their mistakes, weaknesses, or previous fanaticism. Humor and laughter are effective healing tools when used appropriately.

As a summary, the resiliency profile for the overall sample is found to be Creativity, Morality, Initiative, Relationships, Independence, Insight, and Humor. Whereas, the high resilient counselors are found to have a profile of Creativity, Relationships, Morality, Initiative, Independence, Humor, and Insight. In comparison, the low resilient counselors are found to have a profile of Initiative, Creativity, Morality, Relationships, Independence, Insight, and Humor. It has also been found that the high resilient counselors scored significantly higher than the low resilient counselors in all the seven components of resiliency. In addition, there is no significant difference found in all the seven components of resilience based on gender. This implies that gender does not differentiate counselor resilience.

Effect of School Environment on Counselor Resilience

The school environment in this study is defined by the different ways schools are categorized. Malaysian secondary schools can be categorized into boarding or day school; rural or urban schools; boys', girls', or co-educational schools; technical, religious, Chinese, or normal national schools; and academically low, average, or high performing schools.

To answer research question 4 and to test hypotheses 1 and 2, *t*-test analyses were performed to investigate differences between boarding and day schools; rural and urban schools. One-way analysis of variance treating counselor RI as the dependent variable was administered to test hypotheses 3, 4 and 5.

Comparisons of counselor resilience between boarding and day, rural and urban schools

Counselors serving in boarding or day schools, in rural or urban schools faced different challenges. Based on resiliency theory, it is the counselors' personal attributes that matter most in thriving under environmental stress. Thus, comparisons were made using t-test analysis to investigate if there is any significant difference in resiliency in such school settings. The results are presented in Table 20.

There were 43 counselors serving in boarding schools and 572 in day schools. The mean RI of counselors in the boarding schools is 71.19 with the standard deviation of 4.76. Whereas, counselors in the day schools have a mean RI of 72.00 and a standard deviation of 4.38. The mean difference is .81 which is not significant (t (613) = -1.08, p > .05). Thus, hypothesis 1 failed to be rejected. There is no significant difference in resiliency between counselors serving in boarding and day schools.

Categories of schools	Mean	SD	t	Р
Boarding $(n = 43)$	71.19	4.76	-1.08	.29
Day (n = 572)	72.00	4.38		
Urban (n = 268)	72.19	4.51	1.24	.22
Rural (n = 347)	71.75	4.32		

Table 20: T-test Comparisons of RI Between Counselors in Boarding and Day, Rural and Urban Schools

In the urban-rural categorizations, there were 268 counselors who served in the urban schools. Their mean RI and standard deviation are 72.19 and 4.51 respectively. In the rural schools, there were 347 counselors with a mean RI of 71.75 and a standard deviation of 4.32. Their mean RI difference of .44 is found to be not significant (t (613) = 1.24, p > .05). Thus, hypothesis 2, which states that there is no significant difference in resilience between counselors in urban and rural schools is retained.

Comparisons of counselor resilience between boys', girls' and co-educational schools

In Malaysia, there are single gender and co-educational schools. The schools can thus be categorized into boys', girls' and co-educational schools. Most of the schools are co-educational schools though. In this study, there were 42 counselors who served in girls' schools, 18 in boys' schools and 555 in co-educational schools. Both single gender and co-educational schools have their own unique culture and challenges. An investigation was made to examine if there is any significant difference in mean RI between counselors serving in these schools by administering the one-way analysis of variance. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 21.

Source	Sum of squares	DF	Mean square	F	Probability
Between Groups	9.97	2	4.99.23	.26	.78
Within Groups	11916.96	612	19.47		
Total	11926.93	614			
Multiple Comparis Tukey HSD Proce					
(*) denotes pairs o	f groups significantly dif	fferent at .(05 level		
Mean	Category of school	Boys' (n =18)	Girls' (n=42)	Co-educ (n=55	
`71.58	Boys'		1.00	.92	
71.54	Girls'	1.00		.81	
71.98	Co-educational	.92	.81		

Table 21: One-way Analysis of Variance for Resiliency Index Between Boys', Girls' and Co-educational Schools

As presented in Table 21, counselors serving in the co-educational schools scored the highest RI mean of 71.98, followed by those serving in boys' schools with a mean of 71.58 and those serving in girls' schools had the lowest RI mean of 71.54. The RI mean differences are small and the results as presented in Table 21. The results indicate that there is no significant difference between counselors serving in boys', girls' and coeducational schools ($F_{2,612}$ =.26, p >.05). Thus, hypothesis 3 failed to be rejected.

Comparisons of counselor resilience between technical, religious, Chinese and normal national schools

Malaysian secondary schools can also be identified by technical, religious, Chinese, or normal national schools. The majority are the normal national schools. In this study, there were 42 counselors serving in technical schools, 22 in religious schools, 11 in Chinese schools and 540 in normal national schools. This is a close reflection of the types of secondary schools in Malaysia.

Each of these schools was said to have its own culture and challenges also. The RI means are 71.30, 71.63, 72.90 and 71.98 respectively which give an RI range of 1.60. The results, ($F_{3,611} = .53$, p > .05) are shown in Table 22.

Source	Sum of squares	DF	Mean square	F	Probability
Between Groups	30.70	3	10.23	.53	.67
Within Groups	11896.23	611	19.47		
Total	11926.93	614			

Table 22: One-way Analysis of Variance for Resiliency Index Between Technical, Religious, Chinese and Normal Schools

Multiple Comparisons Test Tukey HSD Procedure

(*) denotes pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level

Mean	Types of School.	Technical (n =42)	Religious (n=22)	Chinese (n=11)	Normal (n=540)	
71.30	Technical		.99	.71	.77	
71.63	Religious	.99		.86	.98	
72.90	Chinese	.71	.86		.90	
71.98	Normal	.77	.98	.90		

The results suggest that counselor resilience is not significantly different immaterial of whether the counselors were serving in technical, religious, Chinese or normal national schools. Therefore, hypothesis 4 is retained. This finding is consistent with an earlier finding that showed no significant difference in counselor resilience between boys', girls', and co-educational schools.

Comparisons of counselor resilience between academically low, average and high performing schools

Generally Malaysian schools are examination oriented. Academic performance in public examinations especially the Malaysian Certificate of Education has always been the top priority of all the schools. Most schools spare no efforts to improve their academic achievement, which is quite stressful to teachers especially those serving in low achieving schools.

To recapitulate, the Malaysian Certificate of Education (*Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia*) 1999 results announced in March 2000 was used as the benchmark of academic performance. The schools involved in this study scored a mean passing rate of 72.35% with a standard deviation of 15.00. Schools that scored one standard deviation below the mean were categorized as low performing schools. On the other hand, those that scored one standard deviation above the mean were considered as high performing schools. Those which fall in between were considered as average performing schools. Based on this categorization, there were 89 low, 415 average and 111 high performing schools. The counselors in these schools had an RI mean of 71.91, 71.93 and 72.00 respectively.

The one-way analysis of variance using counselor resilience as the dependent variable and the school academic performance levels as independent variables gives a F-ratio of .01 which is found to be not significant at p < .05 as shown in Table 23.

Source	Sum of squares	DF	Mean square	F	Probability			
Between Groups	.56	2	.28	.014	.99			
Within Groups	11896.23	611	19.49					
Total	11926.93	614						
Multiple Comparisons Test Tukey HSD Procedure								

Table 23: One-way Analysis of Variance for Resiliency Index by School Academic Achievement Level

(*) denotes pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level

Mean	Academic Achievement Level	Low (n =89)	Average (n=415)	High (n=111)
71.91	Low		.99	.98
71.93	Average	.99		.99
72.00	High	.98	.99	

Based on the results, hypothesis 5 failed to be rejected. The findings indicate that counselor resilience is not significantly different according to the levels of academic performance in the schools the counselors served in.

After examining the counselor RI mean differences according to five categories of schools, it seems that school environment as the external factor does not seem to make any significant difference on counselor resilience. However, the comparisons made were

based on a static division or categorization of schools without looking into the school dynamics itself. Nevertheless, the findings indicate that counselor resilience is very dependent on the counselors themselves and not the school environment that they were in. This is consistent with the resiliency theory which focuses more on the individuals' intrapersonal and interpersonal coping skills in making the best out of any situation

despite the odds stacked against them.

Influence of Academic and Professional Qualifications on Counselor Resilience

The theory of resilience acknowledges the individuals' resilience depends to a

large extent on their personal attributes which are influenced by many factors. The factors

could be social, cultural in nature as in their family and upbringing practices. These

factors are of great influence on the individuals' resilience.

For the purpose of this study, the factors to be examined are the counselors' academic and professional qualifications. This is done to answer research question 5, and to achieve the fifth objective of the study, that is, to investigate if these two factors influence the counselors' resilience. One-way analysis of variance treating RI as the dependent variable was administered to test hypotheses 6 and 8. Whereas *t*-test analyses were performed to test hypotheses 7, 9, 10 and 11.

Comparisons of counselor resilience between counselors of different academic qualifications

Based on the subjects' academic qualifications, there were 73 of them with a Master degree, 404 of them with a Bachelor degree, 31 of them have a Diploma, 43 of them with Malaysian Higher School Certificate (*Sijil Tinggi Persekolahan Malaysia*), and 64 of them with Malaysian Certificate of Education (*Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia*). In order to address research question 5 (a), which is to find out if there is any significant difference in resilience according to counselors' academic qualifications, comparisons of counselor resilience according to their academic qualifications were made by administering one-way ANOVA with resiliency index (RI) as the dependent variable and academic qualifications as independent variables. The results are presented in Table 24.

As shown in Table 24, counselors' with a Master degree have the highest RI mean score of 73.59, followed by those with a Bachelor degree who have an RI mean score of 72.04. This is followed by those with an STPM and their RI mean score is 71.27. Those with a Diploma and SPM have an RI mean score of 70.59 and 70.55 respectively. The range of scores is 3.04. The one-way analysis of variance using RI as the dependent variable and academic qualifications as independent variables gives a *F*-ratio of 5.33 which is significant at the p < .05. Thus, hypothesis 6 is rejected. There is a significant difference in resilience between counselors of different academic qualifications.

Source	Sum of squares	DF	Mean square	F	Probability
Between Groups	402.65	4	100.66	5.33	0.001
Within Groups	11524.29	610	18.89		
Total	11926.94	614			

Table 24: One-way Analysis of Variance for Resiliency Index by Academic Qualifications

Multiple Comparisons Test Tukey HSD Procedure

(*) denotes pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level .

Mean	Academic Qualification	Master (n=73)	Bachelor (n=404)	Diploma (n=31)	STPM (n=43)	SPM (n=64)
73.59	Master		.04*	.01.*	.04*	.00*
72.04	Bachelor	.04*		.38	.80	.08
70.59	Diploma	.01*	.38		.97	1.00
71.27	STPM	.04*	.80	.97		.92
70.55	SPM	.00*	.08	1.00	.92	

The results of the Tukey Procedure indicate that the mean RI of counselors with a Master degree is significantly higher than mean RI of counselors with other academic qualifications. The results suggest that a post-graduate degree does contribute significantly to the counselors' resilience probably due to the rigorous process that they had endured to obtain the Master degree. Generally, they were also more experienced, having served the Ministry of Education for some years before pursuing their Master degree. Thus, they tend to have a better professional networking compared to the rest and the networking could have helped them to gain support and help in times of need.

It is interesting to note that even though counselors with a Bachelor degree have a higher RI mean score than those with lower academic qualifications, the results show no significant RI mean difference at p < .05 between counselors with a bachelor degree and those with lower academic qualifications. Similarly, no significant differences at p < .05 were found between counselors with a Diploma, STPM and SPM. The results indicate that a Bachelor degree does not contribute significantly to the counselors' resilience since their RI, though higher than those with a lower qualification, is found to be of no significant difference.

Comparison of resilience between graduate and non-graduate counselors

In the Malaysian civil service, including education service, the academic qualification at the point of entry into the service will determine the individuals' scheme of service, whether they are placed in the professional category which requires at least a bachelor degree, or the support group category for non-degree holders. Between the two categories, there is quite a big difference in terms of remuneration, authority and career advancement. In the education service, opportunities are provided for non-graduate teachers to upgrade themselves academically as well as professionally to gain promotion to the professional category.

The preceding finding showed that there is a significant difference in resilience between counselors of different academic qualifications. In particular, counselors with a Master degree are found to have a significantly higher resilience than those with a lower academic qualification. However, the analysis could not indicate if there is any significant difference in resilience between graduate and non-graduate counselors. Thus, the attempt to investigate the differences between them in order to answer research question 5 (b).

Table 25: T-test Comparisons of RI between Graduate and Non-graduate Counselors

Categories of counselors	Mean	SD	t	p
Graduate ($n = 477$)	72.28	4.49	3.54	.00
Non-graduate (n = 138)	70.78	3.90		

In this study, as shown in Table 25, there were 477 graduate counselors compared to 138 non-graduate counselors. The graduate counselors had an RI mean of 72.28, which is 1.50 higher than the non-graduates' 70.78. Their standard deviations are 4.49 and 3.90 respectively. The mean difference of 1.50 is found to be significant (t (613) = 3.54, p < .01) Thus, hypothesis 7 is rejected. This indicates that there is a significant difference in

resilience between graduate and non-graduate counselors. It is noted that the difference between the two means is small. This could be due to the homogeneity of both samples as reflected in the standard deviations. Graduate counselors tend to have a higher resilience than non-graduate counselors. Their ability to go through the grind of a university degree could have contributed to their higher resilience. The graduate counselors also tend to have a better professional network to fall back on in time of need and support. Their intellectual functioning could be better compared to non-graduate counselors. Nevertheless, further study needs to be carried out to ascertain the factors that contributed to this phenomenon. The implication of this finding is that non-graduate counselors need to be given the opportunity to upgrade their academic credentials. The on-going effort by the Ministry of Education towards this is highly laudable. Similarly, counselors with a bachelor degree should also be given more opportunity to pursue a master degree in counseling.

Comparisons of resiliency components between graduate and nongraduate counselors

Since it has been found that there is a significant difference in RI between graduate and non-graduate counselors, further analysis was done to examine the differences in the components of RI. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 26.

		Mean	SD	t	р
Insight	Graduate	64.73	5.96	3.22	.00
U	Non-graduate	63.13	4.85		
Independence	Graduate	68.20	7.02	1.87	.06
	Non-graduate	66.91	7.45		
Relationship	Graduate	74.68	8.46	3.21	.00
	Non-graduate	72.13	7.29		
Initiative	Graduate	75.57	6.68	1.10	.28
	Non-graduate	74.88	5.79		
Creativity	Graduate	77.78	8.48	2.52	.01
,	Non-graduate	75.76	7.70		
Humor	Graduate	63.41	12.56	.77	.44
	Non-graduate	62.46	13.11		
Morality	Graduate	76.22	6.47	1.90	.06
,	Non-graduate	75.02	6.75		

Table 26: *T*-test Comparisons of RI Components Between Graduate (n=477) and Non-Graduate (n=138) Counselors

As shown in Table 26, only 3 out of the 7 RI component means are found to be significantly different at p <.05 between graduate and non-graduate counselors. The components are Insight (t (613)= 3.22, p<. 01), Relationship (t (613)= 3.21, p<. 01), and Creativity (t (613)=2.52, p<. 05). Generally, the graduate counselors seem intellectually and socially more attuned to the demands and challenges of the counseling profession compared to the non-graduate counselors. They are found to be more able to sense and

read signals from other people, identify the source of problems and sort them out amicably. At the same time, they seem more adept at forging and maintaining healthy and productive relationships. In addition, they are also found to be more creative in working things out for themselves and others.

Comparisons of resilience between counselors of different professional counseling qualifications

Even though Malaysian secondary schools are supposed to be provided with at least a trained, qualified counselor each at the point of data collection, the counselors' professional qualification in counseling varied. The variations were from having attended a short exposure course in counseling (n=47), a Certificate in counseling (n=103), a Diploma in counseling (n=71), a Bachelor degree in counseling (n=349) to a Master degree in counseling (n=45). Further more, counselors with a Master degree in counseling were found to have the highest mean RI of 73.58, followed by those with a Bachelor degree. On the other hand, counselors with a Certificate in counseling were found to have the lowest mean RI of 70.72. In view of these variations, an inquiry was made to see if the subjects' professional qualification in counseling influenced their resiliency. The resiliency index of the subjects according to their counseling qualifications was analyzed to seek answers to the research question 5 (c) and to test hypothesis 8. The results are shown in Table 27.

Source	Sum of squares	DF	Mean square	F	Probability
Between Groups	334.59	4	83.65	4.40	0.002
Within Groups	11592.35	610	19.00		
Total	11926.94	614			

Table 27: One-way Analysis of variance for Resiliency Index by Counseling Qualifications

Multiple Comparisons Test Tukey HSD Procedure

(*) denotes pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level .

Mean	Counseling Qualification	Master (n =45)	Bachelor (n=349)	Diploma (n=71)	Certificate (n=103)	Exposure (n=47)
73.58	Master		.30	.06	.00*	.20
72.25	Bachelor	.30		.55	.02*	.89
71.39	Diploma	.06	.55		.86	.99
70.72	Certificate	00*	02*	.86		.76
71.63	Exposure	.20	.89	.99	.76	

The one-way analysis of variance using RI as the dependent variable and counseling qualifications as independent variables provides a *F*-ratio of 4.40 which is significant at p < .05. Therefore, hypothesis 8 is rejected. It is found that there is a

significant difference in resilience between counselors of different professional counseling qualifications. However, the results of Tukey Procedure show that only the RI means of counselors with a Master and Bachelor degree in counseling are significantly higher that those with a certificate in counseling.

The mean RI comparisons between the other groups of counselors, namely, counselors with a Diploma in counseling, a Certificate in counseling, and those who attended exposure courses in counseling, yielded no significant differences at p < .05. In other words, the training they went through did not contribute much difference significantly to their resilience. This is an indication of the necessity to re-examine the training programs at these levels in terms of their rigor and effectiveness in producing resilient counselors. Failing which, the issue of non-resilient school counselors will perpetuate and this should not be allowed.

Comparison of resilience between counselors with and without professional counseling degree

The Ministry of Education in Malaysia has been providing opportunities for counselors without a professional counseling degree to upgrade themselves. It is also the aspiration of the ministry to provide all secondary schools in Malaysia with at least a counselor with a professional counseling degree. In fact, plans are already made to emplace trained counselors to primary schools as well. This is definitely a move in the right direction. It has been found earlier that there is a significant difference in resilience between counselors of different professional counseling qualifications. However, the finding could not tell if there is any significant difference in resilience between counselors with and without a professional counseling degree. Thus, an investigation was made to examine this and this will help to answer research question 5 (d).

Categories of counselors	Mean	SD	t	Р
With counseling degree (n = 394)	72.40	4.48	3.47	.00
No counseling degree (n = 221)	71.13	4.15		

 Table 28: T-test Comparisons of RI Between Counselors With and Without a

 Professional Counseling Degree

As shown in Table 28, the RI mean for counselors with a counseling degree (n=394) is 72.40, which is 1.27 higher than those without a counseling degree (n=221). Their standard deviations are 4.48 and 4.15 respectively. The mean difference is found to be significant (t (613) = 3.47, p < .01). Therefore, hypothesis 9 is also rejected. This indicates that counselors with a counseling degree tend to have a significantly higher resilience than their counterparts without a counseling degree. The professional training at the undergraduate or post-graduate level in counseling might have helped them to enhance their resilience better than their counterparts without a counseling degree.

It is believed that the development of school counseling has reached the stage where training programs at the Certificate and Diploma levels should be replaced with programs at the Bachelor and Master degree level. The curriculum and syllabuses of programs at both the Bachelor and Master degree level are definitely more rigorous and demanding compared to those at the Certificate and Diploma levels. The requirements to graduate with a Bachelor and Master degree itself are more stringent and highly challenging. The requirements are also in accordance to the criteria set by the Malaysian Counseling Board, which is responsible for counselor registration and licensing. To succeed at the Bachelor and Master degree level, besides fulfilling the academic and professional requirements, the candidates need to develop their self-resilience throughout the duration of their training. This could be the explanation to the findings that counselors with a Bachelor or a Master degree are found to be more resilient than those with lower counseling qualifications.

Comparisons of resiliency components between counselors with and without professional counseling degree

Prior to this, it has been found that there is a significant difference in RI between counselors with and without a professional counseling degree. A further analysis was done to examine the differences in the seven components of RI.

There were 394 counselors with a professional counseling degree compared to 221 without it. The highest RI mean difference is 2.95, which is found in Relationships.

While the lowest RI mean difference is .31, in Morality. *T*-test analyses for independent samples yielded results as presented in Table 29.

		Mean	SD	ı	р
Insight	Counseling degree No Counseling Degree	65.06 63.14	5.83 5.44	4.08	.00
Independence	Counseling degree No Counseling Degree	68.23 67.34	7.09 7.19	1.48	.14
Relationship	Counseling degree No Counseling Degree	75.17 72.22	8.33 7.85	4.38	.00
Initiative	Counseling degree No Counseling Degree	75.54 75.19	6.76 5.99	.65	.52
Creativity	Counseling degree No Counseling Degree	77.86 76.38	8.33 8.32	2.12	.04
Humor	Counseling degree No Counseling Degree	63.65 62.38	12.25 13.40	1.16	.25
Morality	Counseling degree No Counseling Degree	76.07 75.75	6.46 6.70	.56	.58

Table 29: T-test Comparisons of RI Components Between Counselors with Counseling degree (n= 394) and without Counseling Degree (n= 221)

As shown in Table 29, only 3 out of the 7 RI component means are found to be significantly different at p <.05 between counselors with and without a professional counseling degree. The components are Insight (t (613)= 4.08, p<. 01), Relationship (t (613)= 4.38, p<. 01), and Creativity (t (613)=2.12, p<. 05). The results are similar compared to graduate and non-graduate counselors. Counselors with a professional counseling degree seem intellectually and socially more refined in meeting the demands and dealing with the challenges of the counseling profession compared to those without a professional counseling degree.

The nature of professional training in counseling in Malaysia is highly demanding and challenging. In order to succeed, the candidates need to be insightful, which means that they have to develop a quick sense and interpretation of signals from people around them. Most of the time, they are expectable to be able to identify and sort out problems for themselves and others. This requires a high level of intelligence on the part of the candidates.

Besides that, the training programs at the Bachelor and Master degree level also have plenty of provisions for the candidates to develop their professional as well as social skills especially in developing and maintaining healthy relationships. Opportunities are provided for them to plan, organize and run projects, workshops, seminars, and conferences to develop and sharpen their social skills that are crucial elements in the counseling profession. Evidently, counselors with a professional counseling degree are found to be better in their relationship skills.

In coping with the demands and challenges in their training programs, counseling students at the Bachelor and Master degree levels need to be creative in turning difficult and tight situations around. This helps them to develop their creative problem solving skills without jeopardizing others. At times, they also need to use their imaginations to take refuge and to express themselves when in pain and sorrow. These may be in the form of creative arts and expressions as they journey through their training program. To a

certain extent, this also helps to enhance their resilience. Thus, counselors with a

professional counseling degree are found to be significantly more creative than counselors without a professional counseling degree.

Comparison of resilience between counselors with and without prior working experience

To answer research question 5 (e), t-test comparisons of resiliency index were

made between counselors with prior working experience and counselors without prior

working experience and the results of the comparisons are summarized and presented in

Table 30.

Categories of counselors	Mean	SD	t	p
With prior working experience (n = 511)	71.91	4.51	.37	.71
Without prior working experience (n = 104)	72.09	3.90		

Table 30: T-test Comparisons of RI Between Counselors With and Without Prior Working Experience

As shown in Table 30, there were 511 counselors with prior working experience before becoming a counselor compared to 104 counselors who had no prior working experience. The mean RI of counselors with prior working experience is 71.91, which is .18 lower than the mean RI of those without prior working experience. Their respective standard deviations are 4.51 and 3.90. The RI mean difference is found to be not significant (t (613)=.37, p >.05). Thus, hypothesis 10 is accepted. This suggests that prior working experience does not make any significant difference in counselors' resilience.

Comparison of resilience between experienced and inexperienced counselors

Among the subjects in this study, some had as many as 25 years of counseling experience behind them. However, there are some who had just started out as counselors. The subjects have an average of 6.8 years of counseling experience inclusive of being counseling teachers. As full-time counselors, the subjects have an average of 2.4 years of experience. Based on the averages, the counselors were arbitrarily categorized as experienced counselors if they had 5 or more years of counseling experience. Those with less than 5 years of counseling experience were considered as inexperienced. Based on this criterion, there were 288 counselors found to be experienced and 327 considered as inexperienced.

Table 31: T-test Comparisons of RI Between Experienced and Inexperienced Counselors

Categories of counselors	Mean	SD	t	p
Experienced ($n = 288$)	72.20	4.40	-1.35	.18
Inexperienced ($n = 327$)	71.72	4.41		

As shown in Table 31, the RI mean of experienced counselors is 72.20, which is .48 higher than inexperienced counselors' 71.72. Their standard deviations are 4.40 and 4.41 respectively. The RI mean difference is found to be not significant (t (613)=-1.35, p > .05). Therefore, hypothesis 11 is retained. The result indicates that counselors' experience in counseling does not make any significant difference in their resilience.

Looking at the results thus far, it is interesting to note that counselors' academic and professional credentials seem to contribute significantly to the resiliency difference. On the other hand, prior working experience and counseling experience do not contribute significantly to the resiliency difference.

Predictors of School Counselor Resilience

Two types of statistical analyses were carried out to ascertain the relationships among the components of resiliency. The components were first subjected to Pearsonproduct moment correlations. Next, a step-wise multiple regression analysis was performed for the overall sample, using general resiliency as the dependent variable, and Wolin and Wolin's (1993) seven components of resiliency as the predictors. Step-wise multiple regression analyses were also performed for the low resilient counselors and high resilient counselors to explore and examine the differences if there is any.

The relationships between general resiliency and the seven components of resiliency

The general resiliency and the seven components of resiliency, namely, Insight, Independence, Relationships, Initiative. Creativity, Humor, and Morality are intercorrelated to obtain a measure of the relationships among them. The inter-correlations matrix is presented in Table 32.

As shown in Table 32, the correlation coefficients between General Resilience and Relationship, Initiative, Creativity, and Morality are quite high at .40, .46, .43, and .50 respectively. Its correlations with Insight, Independence and Humor are rather low at .12, .08, and .22. However, all the correlations are found to be significant at p < .05.

	General Resilience	Insight	Independence	Relationship	Initiative	Creativity	Humor	Mora
General Resilience	1.00	.12**	.08*	.40*	.46*	.43*	.22**	.50**
Insight		1.00	.10**	.22**	.12**	.10**	.09*	.14**
Independence			1.00	.13**	.13**	.11*	01	.23*
Relationship				1.00	.45**	.42**	.28**	.45*
Initiative					1.00	.43**	.24**	.51*
Creativity						1.00	.26**	.40*
Humor							1.00	.21*
Morality							1.	1.0(
N = 615	1-tailed sign	ificant: *	.05 ** .01					

Table 32: Correlation Matrix among Components of Resiliency

Table 32 also shows that the correlation coefficients between Insight and Independence, Insight and Relationship, Insight and Initiative, Insight and Creativity, Insight and Humor, Insight and Morality as .10, .22, .12, .10, .09 and .14 which are generally low but are all significant at p < .05. This indicates that resilient counselors who utilize Insight have a tendency to utilize Independence, Relationship, Initiative, Creativity, Humor and Morality in enhancing their resiliency.

As shown in Table 32, the correlation coefficients between Independence and Relationship, Independence and Initiative, Independence and Creativity as well as Independence and Morality are .13, .13, .11, and .23. These are generally low also but significant at p < .05. However, the correlation coefficient between Independence and Humor is -. 01, the only relationship which is found to be not significant at p < .05. The results indicate that resilient counselors who utilize independence have a tendency to utilize Relationship, Initiative, Creativity, and Morality in enhancing their resiliency without resorting to Humor.

The correlation coefficients of Relationship with Initiative, Creative, Humor and Morality range from .28 to .45 and they are all found to be significant at p < .05. The results show a moderate level of correlations. This indicates that resilient counselors who utilize Relationship have a moderate tendency of utilizing Initiative, Creativity, Humor and Morality in enhancing their resiliency.

The correlation coefficient of Initiative with Creative, Humor and Morality range from .24 to .51 and they are all found to be significant at p < .05. The results show that the correlations are moderately high. These give an indication that resilient counselors who utilize Initiative have a moderately high tendency to utilize Creativity, Humor and Morality in enhancing their resiliency.

The correlation coefficients of Creativity with Humor and Morality are .26 and .40 respectively. The moderate correlations are found to be significant at p < .05. The results

indicate that resilient counselors who utilize Creativity in enhancing their resiliency have a tendency to utilize Humor and Morality as well.

Finally, the correlation coefficient between Humor and Morality is found to be .21 and significant at p < .05. The correlation may not be high but it gives an indication that resilient counselors who utilize Humor in enhancing their resiliency have a tendency to utilize Morality as well.

Stepwise multiple regression analysis

In the Stepwise Multiple Regression analysis of the data, the General Resiliency was the dependent variable and the seven components of resiliency were treated as the independent variables or predictors. The method employed allows a prediction equation for General Resiliency to be formulated by choosing one scale at a time. First it would choose the scale that was the best predictor followed by the next best predictor and so on. Variables were then added step-by-step until no other variables would make a significant contribution to the prediction equation. For the inclusion of this stepwise mode, the minimal F-value was 0.01 and the tolerance level was 0.001. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 33.

Significant Predictor Variables	Multiple R	R Square	R Square Change	Simple R	Beta
a. Morality	.497	.247	.247	.497	.288
b. Creativity	.557	.310	.063	.430	.158
c. Initiative	.584	.342	.032	.460	.200
d. Relationship	.593	.352	.010	.404	.101

Table 33: Stepwise Regression Analysis Using General Resiliency As Criterion For The Whole Sample (N = 615)

As shown in Table 33, only four variables entered into the prediction equation. The regression was a moderate fit ($\mathbb{R}^2 = 35.20\%$) and the overall relationship was also found to be significant ($F_{4,610}=82.70, p < .001$). Morality is found to be the best single predictor of resiliency, and alone accounts for about 24.70% of the total variance of overall resiliency. The table also shows that Morality together with Creativity account for about 31.00% of the total variance of overall resiliency. These two components together with Initiative account for about 34.20% of the total variance of overall resiliency. When Relationship was entered into the equation, the four variables together explained 35.20% of the variance in overall resiliency.

The results of the stepwise multiple regression indicate that the scores of Morality, Creativity, Initiative, and Relationships are the best predictors of general resiliency even though all the components are inter-correlated among themselves with the exception of relationship between Independence and Humor. It is also interesting to note that whereas Morality is the foremost predictor of general resiliency, Relationship is the last predictor to be entered in the prediction equation. The regression equation obtained for the whole sample in this study is:

General Resiliency =
$$27.15 + .29a + .16b + .20c + .10d$$
.

The prediction equation enabled an estimation of any Malaysian school counselor's general resilience once his (a) Morality, (b) Creativity, (c) Initiative, and (d) Relationships scores are entered into the equation which has the computed constant value of 27.15.

This finding suggests that Malaysian school counselors tend to utilize Morality, Creativity, Initiative and Relationship in safe-guarding, if not enhancing, their general resiliency. They are less likely to resort to Insight, Independence and Humor to enhance their resiliency. This is quite consistent with the common observation among Malaysian school counselors who uphold and practise good moral values but lack wittiness and humor in discharging their roles and responsibilities.

Stepwise regression analysis on low resilient counselors

In an attempt to explore the predictors of resiliency among 82 low resilient counselors, stepwise regression analysis was performed and the results are presented in Table 34.

Significant Predictor Variables	Multiple R	R Square	R Square Change	Simple R	Beta
a. Initiative	.292	.085	.085	.292	.263
b. Creativity	.382	.146	.061	.274	.196

Table 34: Stepwise Regression Analysis Using Resiliency Index As Criterion For Low Resilient Counselors (n = 82)

As shown in Table 34, the regression is found to be a moderate fit ($\mathbb{R}^2 = 14.6\%$) and the overall relationship is found to be significant ($F_{2,79} = 6.76$, p < .05). Initiative is found to be the best single predictor of general resiliency among low resilient counselors. Initiative alone accounts for about 8.50% of the total variance of overall general resiliency. The table also shows that Initiative together with Creativity account for about 14.60% of the total variance of overall general resiliency among low resilient counselors. The remaining 85.40% of the total variance are accounted by other factors which are yet to be determined.

The results of the stepwise multiple regression indicate that the scores of Initiative and Creativity predicted to a certain extent the General Resiliency scores of low resilient counselors. Although Morality is significantly correlated (r = .23, p<.05) with General Resiliency, it did not enter the prediction equation. Since only Initiative and Creativity entered in the prediction equation, which has a computed constant value of 48.02, the regression equation obtained for the low resilient counselors in this study is:

General Resiliency = 48.02 + .26a + .20b

The findings suggest that Initiative and Creativity seem to be the main driving factors behind low resilient counselors who soldier on despite unfavorable working environment. However, they need to harness on their Morality, Independence, Relationship, Insight, and Humor to enhance their resilience.

Stepwise regression analysis on high resilient counselors

Stepwise regression analysis was also performed in an attempt to explore the predictors of resiliency among 95 high resilient counselors and the results are presented in Table 35.
Significant Predictor Variables	Multiple R	R Square	R Square Change	Simple R	Beta
a. Morality	.478	.229	.229	.478	.495
b. Relationship	.535	.286	.057	.277	.171
c. Initiative	.574	.330	.044	.316	.215

Table 35: Stepwise Regression Analysis Using Resiliency Index As Criterion For High Resilient Counselors (n = 95)

The regression is found to be a moderate fit ($R^2 = 33.00\%$) and the overall relationship is also found to be significant ($F_{3,91} = 14.92, p < .001$). In the preceding sections, Morality has been found to be the best predictor of General Resilience for the overall sample. Thus it is interesting to find that among the high resilient counselors, Morality is also the best predictor of their resilience. Morality itself accounts for about 22.90% of the counselors' resilience. The second predictor that entered the equation was Relationship which contributed 5.70% to the General Resiliency score. The last predictor which entered the regression equation was Initiative, which accounted for about 4.40% of the total variance.

Since only Morality, Relationship, and Initiative entered the prediction equation, which is found to have a constant value of 16.74, the regression equation obtained for high resilient counselors in this study is:

General Resiliency =
$$16.74 + .50a + .17b + .22c$$

It is interesting to find that Morality has been found to be the best predictor as well as best contributor to the high resilient counselors' general resilience. This has affirmed the fact that counseling entails a lot of commitment to serve the needy. It is the commitment that keeps the counselors going despite the odds against them. Besides, Relationship that takes the form of interpersonal trust, cooperation, collaboration, and support also helped bolstered the counselors' general resilience. They utilized their interpersonal skills that build effective and efficient working relationships. Further more, it takes a lot of Initiative on the part of the counselors to get things worked out and done well for their own as well as their clientele's benefits.

Resilience and Self-Efficacy Correlation

One of the objectives of the study is to examine if there is any correlation between resilience and self-efficacy as acknowledged by Rutter (1990) and Labonte (1993). In this study, self-efficacy score is derived from the General Self-Efficacy Scale. The subjects' mean self-efficacy score and standard deviation were found to be 40 and 4.58 respectively. The minimum and maximum scores were 24 and 50, which gives a range of



Graph 6 : Self-Efficacy Score Distribution

In order to achieve the seventh and last objective of the study, that is to examine the relationship between counselor resilience and self-efficacy, Pearson product-moment

correlation was carried out on low resilient, resilient, and high resilient counselors. This

helped to answer research question 7 (a). The results are presented in Table 36.

Table 36: Pearson Product Moment Correlation Between Resilience and Self-Efficacy



Low Resilient Counselors (n = 82)	.474	.000
Resilient Counselors (n = 438)	.400	.000
High Resilient Counselors (n = 95)	.539	.000
Overall ($N = 615$)	.571	.000

The correlation coefficients between resilience and self-efficacy for the overall sample and the sub-groups are found to be significant at p < .05. Generally, the counselors' resilience is found to be moderately correlated with their self-efficacy (r = .57, p < .05). This shows that there is a positive relationship between the

counselors' resilience and their self-efficacy.

It is interesting to note that the resilience of high resilient counselors is found to

be most closely correlated with their self-efficacy compared to the other two groups'.

This gives an indication that counselors with high resilience tend to have high self-

efficacy. Similarly, those with low resilience tend to have low self-efficacy. This is consistent with the findings of Rutter (1990) and Labonte (1995).

Resiliency components and self-efficacy correlation

Prior to this, resilience was found to be significantly correlated with self-efficacy.

A further analysis was carried out to examine the correlations between the resiliency

components and self-efficacy. The result are presented in 37.

Table 37: Correlation Between Resiliency Components and Self-Efficacy (N= 615)

r •	Significance (2-tailed)
------------	-------------------------

Insight	.100	.013	

Independence	.134	.001
Relationship	.480	.000
Initiative	.466	.000
Creativity	.418	.000
Humor	.227	.000
Morality	.480	.000

As shown in Table 37, all the seven resiliency components are found to be significantly correlated with self-efficacy at p < .05. The correlation coefficients of four

components are above .40. Relationship and Morality are found to have the highest correlation coefficients at .480. This is followed by Initiative and Creativity at .466 and .418 respectively. Interestingly, these four components were found to be the predictors of the counselors' general resilience. Together, they explained 35.20% of the variance in general resiliency.

Although the correlations between Humor, Independence and Insight are also

found to be significant, their correlation coefficients are quite low at . 227, .134, and .100

respectively.

Resilience and Burnout Correlation

People who are resilient have a repertoire of skills and resources that help them to

restore their balance and personal functioning quickly after encountering certain setbacks.

Thus, resilient people are able to protect themselves from experiencing burnout. A high

resilient counselor logically should have low burnout scores and vice versa.

The burnout scores of the subjects were obtained from Burnout Potential

Inventory. The mean burnout score of the subjects was found to be 50.5 with the standard

deviation of 13.34. The highest and lowest score were 24 and 106, which gives a range

of 82. The scores were found to have a normal distribution with a skewness of .58. The

burnout score distribution in the form of a histogram is presented in Graph 7.

Graph 7: Burnout Score Distribution







Burnout Score

In an attempt to examine the relationship between counselor resilience and

burnout, Pearson product-moment correlation between the counselors' RI and their

burnout scores produced results as shown in Table 38. This helped to answer research

question 7 (b).

Table 38: Pearson Product Moment Correlation Between Resilience and Burnout

Significance (2-tailed)



r

As presented in Table 38, correlation coefficient for all the subjects is -.42 which

is significant at p < .05. This indicates a negative, significant relationship between

resilience and burnout. The high resilient counselors (n = 95) are found to have a

significant, negative but weaker correlation coefficient compared to the low resilient

counselors (n = 82). This indicates that high resilient counselors have lower burnout

scores than low resilient counselors. This is consistent with the earlier findings on

relationships between resilience and self-efficacy but in a reversed manner.

Resiliency Components and burnout Correlation

Resilience was found to have a negative but significant correlation with burnout.

A further analysis was carried out to examine the correlation between resiliency

components and burnout. The results are presented in Table 39.

Table 39: Correlation Between Resiliency Components and Burnout (N= 615)

	<i>t</i>	Significance (2-tailed)
Insight	108	.007
Independence	125	.002
Relationship	363	.000
Initiative	363	.000
Creativity	235	.000

Humor	165	.000
Morality	313	.000
As presented in '	Table 30 all the ceven recilionay.	components are found to have a
As presented in	Table 39, all the seven resiliency of	components are found to nave a
negative but significant	correlation with burnout at $p < .$	05. Relationship and Initiative
are found to have the hig	ghest correlation coefficient at36	63. This is followed by Morality

and Creativity at -.313 and -.235 respectively. Earlier, these four components were found

to have the highest correlation with self-efficacy. They were also found to be the best predictors of general resilience.

Although Humor, Independence and Insight are also significantly correlated with

burnout, their correlation coefficients are rather low at -.165, -.125, and -.108

respectively. The order of correlations of these three components is identical with that

found in self-efficacy correlation.

Generally, based on the findings presented, it has been found that counselor

resilience is positively and significantly correlated with counselor self-efficacy (r = .57, p < .05) and negatively and significantly correlated with counselor burnout

$$(r = -.42, p < .05).$$

Summary of Findings

The Malaysian school counselors are found to have a resiliency index (RI) mean

of 71.95 with a standard deviation of 4.40. Male counselors are found to have a RI mean

of 72.16 which is slightly higher than the female counselors' 71.65. However, the mean

difference was found to be not significant. Generally, the counselors are found to be

resilient as the RI mean surpassed 70.00, the cut-off point set to discriminate resilient

counselors from the non-resilient.

The proportion of resilient and non-resilient counselors are found to be 67.30% and 32.70% respectively. The resilient counselors were made up of 58.70% males and 41.30% females. As many as 55.07% of the resilient counselors were found in academically non-performing schools with the remainder 44.93% found in performing schools. In terms of school locations, 55.31% of the resilient counselors are found in rural schools and 44.69% are found in urban schools.

The overall resiliency profile for Malaysian school counselors is found to be Creativity, Morality, Initiative, Relationships, Independence, insight and Humor. The resilient counselors' profile is found to be Creativity, Morality, Initiative, Relationship, Independence, Humor, and Insight. The high resilient counselors' profile is found to be Creativity, Relationships, Morality, Initiative, Independence, Humor and Insight.

There is no significant difference in resilience found between counselor who served in boarding and day schools; rural and urban schools; boy, girl, and co-education schools; technical, religious, Chinese and normal national schools; and academically low, average high performing schools. Different school settings do not seem to make any significant effect on counselor resilience.

The one-way analysis of variance using RI as the dependent variable and academic qualifications as independent variables showed that there is a significant difference in counselor resilience based on their academic qualifications. Counselors with a master degree were found to have a significantly higher resilience than counselors with other academic qualifications. Graduate and non-graduate counselors are found to have a

significant difference in resilience (t(614)=3.54, p < .01) especially in Insight,

Relationships and Creativity component of resiliency.

Similarly, it is also found that there is a significant difference in counselor

resilience based on their professional counseling qualifications. Counselors with a bachelor degree and a master degree in counseling are found to have a significantly higher resilience than counselors with a diploma and a certificate in counseling. Counselors with a professional counseling degree were found to have a significantly higher resilience than those without a professional counseling degree (t (614)=3.47, p<.01) especially in the Insight, Relationship and Creativity component of resiliency.

However, comparisons of resilience between counselors with and without prior

working experience provided a non-significant difference (t (613)=.37, p >.05). Likewise,

between experienced and inexperienced counselors (t(613)=-1.35, p>.05).

Stepwise Multiple Regression using General Resiliency as the dependent variable found that Morality is the best single predictor of Malaysian school counselor resiliency.

Morality alone explained about 24.70% of the total variance of General Resilience. The

next best predictor is Creativity, which together with Morality explained 31.00% of the

total variance of General Resilience. The third best predictor is Initiative, which together

with Morality and Creativity explained 34.20% of the total variance of General resilience.

The last predictor was Relationship which explained 1.00% of the total variance of

35.20%. The remaining 64.80% of the total variance was accounted by other variables which are yet to be identified through further research. The prediction equation of counselors' general resiliency (GR) is as follows:

GR = 27.15 + .29 Morality + .16 Creativity + .20 Initiative + .10 Relationship.

Finally, the counselors' resilience is found to be positively correlated with their self-efficacy (r = .57, p < .05). Whereas, it is found to be negatively correlated with burn-out (r = .42, p < .05).