

Emotional Intelligence and Job Satisfaction Among Public Secondary School Teachers: A Quantitative Analysis

Musu W. Davis¹, Dr. Manju Rani²

¹Student, ²Assistant Professor

^{1,2}School of Behavioural Science, Apeejay Styra University, Gurugram, India

Abstract

This study investigates how emotional intelligence relates to job satisfaction among public secondary school teachers. A sample of 50 teachers participated by completing two standardized questionnaires: The Brief Emotional Intelligence Scale and Paul E. Spector's Job Satisfaction Survey. The data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics, including mean, standard deviation, t-test, and Pearson correlation. The results showed a mean emotional intelligence score of 40.72 (SD = 5.34), representing average to above-average levels. The mean job satisfaction score was 118.64 (SD = 32.15), reflecting moderate overall satisfaction. Crucially, a significant positive correlation emerged between the two variables ($r = 0.620$, $p < 0.01$), proving that higher emotional intelligence strongly predicts greater job satisfaction. Furthermore, demographic analyses revealed distinct trends. While gender differences significantly influenced emotional intelligence scores, they had no impact on overall job satisfaction. Conversely, teacher age played a major role, with job satisfaction steadily increasing among older educators.

These findings underscore the critical role of emotional competence in the educational sector. Teachers with strong emotional skills are better equipped to manage classroom stress, resolve workplace conflicts, and maintain a positive outlook. Consequently, this study highlights the urgent need for school boards to implement organizational interventions, such as targeted emotional intelligence training and professional wellness programs. Prioritizing these interventions can foster supportive work environments, ultimately boosting teacher retention and enhancing educational quality.

Keywords

Emotional Intelligence, Job Satisfaction, Teachers correlation, Education and Workplace Psychology.

1. Introduction

In contemporary educational settings, teachers are required to perform complex roles that extend beyond academic instruction, including emotional engagement, classroom management, and interpersonal interaction. These demands highlight the importance of emotional intelligence as a critical psychological construct influencing teachers' effectiveness and well-being. Emotional intelligence, as conceptualized by Daniel Goleman, refers to the ability to recognize, understand, manage, and utilize emotions effectively.

In professional contexts, emotional intelligence plays a crucial role in enhancing interpersonal relationships, reducing stress, and improving overall job performance.

Job satisfaction, on the other hand, refers to an individual's affective response to their job and work environment. According to Paul E. Spector, job satisfaction encompasses multiple dimensions, including pay, promotion, supervision, and working conditions. It is widely recognized as a key determinant of organizational effectiveness and employee well-being. In the teaching profession, job satisfaction is particularly important, as it directly influences teacher performance, student outcomes, and institutional effectiveness. However, teachers often face challenges such as heavy workloads, limited resources, and administrative pressures, which may affect their job satisfaction.

The present study aims to examine the relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction among public secondary school teachers. By exploring this relationship, the study seeks to contribute to the understanding of psychological factors that influence teacher well-being and professional effectiveness.

2. Review of Literature

The relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction has been widely examined in organizational and educational psychology. Emotional intelligence has been identified as a key factor influencing workplace outcomes, including job satisfaction, performance, and organizational commitment.

According to John D. Mayer and Salovey (1990), emotional intelligence is a cognitive ability that enables individuals to process emotional information effectively. This ability is particularly relevant in professions such as teaching, where emotional interaction is a core component of the job.

Empirical studies have consistently demonstrated a positive relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. Carmeli (2003) found that individuals with higher emotional intelligence tend to exhibit greater job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Similarly, Miao et al. (2017) reported that emotional intelligence is positively associated with work attitudes and job satisfaction across various professions.

In the context of education, Yin et al. (2013) found that teachers with higher emotional intelligence are better able to manage emotional labour and experience higher levels of job satisfaction. Mérida-López and Extremera (2017) further highlighted the role of emotional intelligence in reducing burnout and enhancing teacher well-being.

The theoretical framework for job satisfaction is often explained using Frederick Herzberg, which distinguishes between intrinsic motivators and extrinsic hygiene factors. Emotional intelligence may influence both these dimensions by enhancing intrinsic satisfaction and helping individuals cope with external stressors.

Despite the growing body of literature, there is limited research focusing on the combined effect of emotional intelligence and demographic variables such as gender and age on job satisfaction among teachers. The present study seeks to address this gap.

3. Research Objectives

1. To assess the level of emotional intelligence among teachers.
2. To determine the level of job satisfaction among teachers.
3. To examine the relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction.
4. To analyse differences based on gender and age.

4. Research Hypotheses

H1: There is a significant relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction.

H2: There is a significant difference in emotional intelligence based on gender.

H3: There is a significant difference in job satisfaction based on gender.

5. Research Design and Methodology

The present study employed a **quantitative, cross-sectional research design** to examine the relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction among public secondary school teachers. A quantitative approach was considered appropriate as the study aimed to measure variables numerically and analyse relationships using statistical techniques (Creswell, 2014). The cross-sectional design allowed for the collection of data at a single point in time, enabling the assessment of existing levels of emotional intelligence and job satisfaction, as well as their interrelationship. This design is widely used in behavioural and educational research to examine associations between psychological constructs (Field, 2013).

6. Participants

The study was conducted on a sample of **50 public secondary school teachers**. The participants were selected using a **convenience sampling technique**, based on accessibility and willingness to participate. The sample included both male and female teachers across different age groups, specifically:

- **18–25 years (N = 10)**
- **25–35 years (N = 13)**
- **35–45 years (N = 20)**
- **45–60 years (N = 7)**

Gender distribution consisted of:

- **Male teachers (N = 27)**
- **Female teachers (N = 23)**

The inclusion of participants from diverse age groups and both genders enabled comparative analysis and enhanced the generalizability of findings within the study context.

Instruments

Two standardized instruments were used for data collection: Emotional Intelligence Scale (EIS) and Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS).

Emotional Intelligence Scale

Emotional intelligence was assessed using a standardized emotional intelligence scale (Brief Emotional Intelligence Scale / equivalent structured tool), which measures key dimensions such as emotional awareness, emotional regulation, and interpersonal skills.

The scores were interpreted using the following classification:

Score Range	Level
46–50	High
42–45	Above Average
33–41	Average
28–32	Below Average
10–27	Low

Higher scores indicate higher levels of emotional intelligence. The tool is consistent with the theoretical framework proposed by John D. Mayer and Daniel Goleman.

Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS)

Job satisfaction was measured using the Job Satisfaction Survey developed by Paul E. Spector (1985). The instrument consists of **36 items**, divided into **nine facets** of job satisfaction, including pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, rewards, operating procedures, coworkers, nature of work, and communication. Each item is rated on a **6-point Likert scale**, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The total score ranges from **36 to 216**, with interpretation as follows:

Score Range	Interpretation
36–108	Dissatisfied
108–144	Neutral
144–216	Satisfied

The scale includes **19 reverse-scored items**, which were appropriately recoded before analysis.

Procedure

Data were collected through direct administration of questionnaires to the participants. Prior to data collection, participants were informed about the purpose of the study and assured of confidentiality and anonymity.

The questionnaires were administered in a structured format, and participants were instructed to respond honestly based on their personal experiences. The collected data were screened for completeness and accuracy before statistical analysis.

Variables of The Study

- **Independent Variable:** Emotional Intelligence
- **Dependent Variable:** Job Satisfaction
- **Demographic Variables:** Gender and Age

Data Analysis

The collected data were analysed using both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the data, including:

- Mean
- Standard deviation
- Frequency and percentage
- Skewness and kurtosis

These measures helped in understanding the central tendency, dispersion, and distribution of the variables.

Inferential Statistics

The following inferential techniques were applied:

- **Independent samples t-test** to examine gender differences
- **Pearson correlation analysis** to determine the relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction
- **Chi-square test** to examine the association between categorized variables

Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) was used to assess the strength and direction of the relationship between variables, following the guidelines proposed by Cohen (1988).

Ethical Considerations

Ethical standards were maintained throughout the study. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all participants. Confidentiality and anonymity were ensured, and the data were used solely for academic purposes.

Results And Discussion

This section presents a comprehensive statistical analysis of emotional intelligence (EI) and job satisfaction (JS) among public secondary school teachers ($N = 50$). Descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, skewness, kurtosis), categorical distributions, and inferential statistics (t-test and Pearson's correlation) are used to examine (i) central tendencies, (ii) dispersion, (iii) group differences, and (iv) the strength of association between EI and JS. The interpretation is grounded in the theoretical perspectives of Daniel Goleman, John D. Mayer, and Frederick Herzberg, alongside empirical evidence (e.g., Carmeli, 2003; Miao et al., 2017; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2015).

Overall (Group-Level) Analysis

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive Statistics of Emotional Intelligence and Job Satisfaction ($N = 50$)

Variable	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
Emotional Intelligence	40.72	5.34 -0.28	0.28	-0.61
Job Satisfaction	118.64	32.15	-0.15	-0.48

Interpretation

As shown in Table 6.1, the mean emotional intelligence score is 40.72 ($SD = 5.34$), positioning the sample within the **upper boundary of the average range (33–41)** and approaching the **above-average band (42–45)**. This indicates that teachers possess **functional emotional competencies**—not merely baseline capacity but an emerging proficiency in emotion perception, regulation, and utilization. The relatively modest dispersion ($SD = 5.34$) suggests **homogeneity** in EI across respondents, a pattern consistent with occupational socialization processes in teaching, where repeated interpersonal engagement reinforces emotional skills (Brackett et al., 2011; Mérida-López & Extremera, 2017).

The Job Satisfaction Mean of 118.64 ($SD = 32.15$) falls within the **neutral/ambivalent band (108–144)** of the Job Satisfaction Survey developed by Paul E. Spector. The substantially larger dispersion ($SD = 32.15$) compared to EI indicates **greater heterogeneity**, implying that JS is more sensitive to contextual

and institutional variables (e.g., workload, administrative climate, rewards) than EI, which behaves more like a **trait-ability construct** (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2004; Field, 2013).

Distributional diagnostics show near-normality (skewness: EI = -0.28 ; JS = -0.15) and **platykurtic** profiles (kurtosis: EI = -0.61 ; JS = -0.48), supporting the use of **parametric tests** (Field, 2013; Cohen, 1988). The slight negative skew indicates a **tilt toward higher-than-average scores**, especially in EI, suggesting a tendency for teachers to cluster in the upper mid-range—consistent with prior findings in educational samples (Yin et al., 2013).

6.2.2 Frequency Distribution of Emotional Intelligence

Table 6.2: Distribution of Emotional Intelligence Levels

Level	Score Range	Frequency	Percentage
High	46–50	9	18%
Above Average	42–45	14	28%
Average	33–41	22	44%
Below Average	28–32	5	10%
Low	10–27	0	0

Interpretation

Table 6.2 indicates that **44% (n = 22)** of respondents fall in the **average EI band**, while **28% (n = 14)** and **18% (n = 9)** fall in the **above-average** and **high** bands, respectively. Only **10% (n = 5)** are below average, and **0%** fall in the low category. Aggregating the upper tiers, **46%** of the sample demonstrates **above-average to high EI**.

This distribution suggests that a substantial proportion of teachers possess **elevated emotional competencies**, which is theoretically aligned with Daniel Goleman, where professions requiring sustained interpersonal engagement foster higher EI. Empirically, teachers' EI has been linked to **reduced burnout and improved classroom climate** (Mérida-López & Extremera, 2017; Chan, 2006). The absence of “low EI” cases further indicates a **floor effect**, suggesting that entry and retention in teaching may implicitly select for minimum emotional functioning.

6.2.3 Frequency Distribution of Job Satisfaction

Table 6.3: Distribution of Job Satisfaction Levels

Category	Score Range	Frequency	Percentage
Dissatisfied	36–108	12	24%
Neutral	108–144	18	36%
Satisfied	144–216	20	40%

Interpretation

Table 6.3 shows that **40% (n = 20)** are **satisfied**, **36% (n = 18)** are **neutral**, and **24% (n = 12)** are **dissatisfied**. The distribution is **tri-modal**, reflecting a **mixed evaluative stance** toward the job. While a plurality reports satisfaction, the combined **60% neutral/dissatisfied** signals **latent discontent or ambivalence**.

Within Frederick Herzberg, this pattern suggests that **intrinsic motivators** (e.g., meaning of teaching) may be present, but **hygiene factors** (e.g., pay, policies) may be suboptimal, preventing higher satisfaction. Prior teacher research similarly reports **moderate JS with high variance**, tied to organizational climate and support (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2015).

6.2.4 Pearson Correlation Analysis

Table 6.4: Pearson Correlation Matrix

Variables	Emotional Intelligence	Job Satisfaction
Emotional Intelligence	1.000	0.620**
Job Satisfaction	0.620**	1.000

Note: $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed)

Interpretation

The correlation coefficient $r = 0.620$ ($p < 0.01$) indicates a **moderate-to-strong positive association** between EI and JS. The **coefficient of determination** ($r^2 = 0.384$) implies that **38.4% of the variance in JS** is explained by EI—an effect size considered **substantial** in behavioral sciences (Cohen, 1988).

Substantively, this means that teachers with higher EI (e.g., scores ≥ 42) are more likely to fall in the **satisfied category** (≥ 144), while those with lower EI tend toward **neutral/dissatisfied bands**. This aligns with evidence that EI enhances **stress regulation, social functioning, and coping**, which in turn elevate job attitudes (Carmeli, 2003; Miao et al., 2017). The finding directly supports Daniel Goleman, where emotional competencies drive workplace effectiveness and well-being.

6.3 G/ENDER-WISE ANALYSIS

6.3.1 Descriptive Statistics

Table 6.5: Emotional Intelligence and Job Satisfaction by Gender

Gender	N	EI Mean	EI SD	JS Mean	JS SD
Male	27	41.51	5.62	110.37	29.84
Female	23	37.43	5.11	127.74	33.21

Interpretation

Males ($N = 27$) report higher EI ($M = 41.51$, $SD = 5.62$) than females ($N = 23$; $M = 37.43$, $SD = 5.11$), a difference of **4.08 points**. Conversely, females report higher JS ($M = 127.74$, $SD = 33.21$) than males ($M = 110.37$, $SD = 29.84$), a difference of **17.37 points**.

The EI difference suggests **gender-linked variation in measured emotional abilities** within this sample, though literature is mixed, with some studies showing negligible differences when controlling for role and context (Brackett et al., 2011). The higher female JS, despite lower EI means, suggests that **job satisfaction is not solely determined by EI** but also by **contextual and psychosocial factors** (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2015).

6.3.2 Independent Samples T-Test

Table 6.6: t-test Results by Gender

Variable	t-value	Significance
Emotional Intelligence 2.62	2.62	$p < 0.05$ (Significant)

Job Satisfaction	0.68	$p > 0.05$ (Not Significant)
------------------	------	------------------------------

Interpretation

The EI difference is **statistically significant** ($t = 2.62, p < 0.05$), confirming that the observed mean gap is unlikely due to sampling error. In contrast, the JS difference is **not significant** ($t = 0.68, p > 0.05$), indicating that despite higher female means, variability ($SD \approx 30\text{--}33$) attenuates statistical separation. This pattern underscores that **EI differences by gender exist in this sample**, whereas **JS does not significantly differ**, reinforcing the view that **organizational variables overshadow demographic effects** for JS (Judge et al., 2001).

6.3.3 Correlation by Gender

Table 6.7: Pearson Correlation (EI–JS) by Gender

Gender	r	Significance
Male (N = 27)	0.582*	$p < 0.05$
Female (N = 23)	0.653**	$p < 0.01$

Interpretation

The EI–JS relationship remains **positive and significant** for both genders: **males $r = 0.582$ ($p < 0.05$)** and **females $r = 0.653$ ($p < 0.01$)**. The stronger association among females suggests that **emotional competencies may translate more directly into satisfaction** in female teachers, possibly via **relational and affective pathways** emphasized in educational roles (Yin et al., 2013).

6.4 Age Group-Wise Analysis

6.4.1 Descriptive Statistics

Table 6.8: Age-wise Descriptive Statistics

Age Group	N	EI Mean	EI SD	JS Mean	JS SD
18–25	10	40.90	4.92	106.90	22.31
25–35	13	41.85	4.88	100.23	28.44
35–45	20	40.10	5.96	133.95	33.12
45–60	7	37.86	4.87	134.86	20.51

Interpretation

EI shows **relative stability** across age (means from **37.86 to 41.85**), consistent with EI as a **developed ability** rather than a strongly age-dependent trait (Mayer et al., 2004). In contrast, JS shows a **clear upward trajectory** with age: from **100.23 (25–35)** to **134.86 (45–60)**.

This gradient suggests that **experience, role clarity, and career consolidation** enhance satisfaction (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2015). Younger teachers (especially **25–35**) report the lowest JS, potentially reflecting **career uncertainty and workload pressures**.

6.4.2 Correlation by Age Group

Table 6.9: Pearson Correlation (EI–JS) by Age Group

Age Group	N	r	Significance
18–25	10	0.521	n.s.
25–35	13	0.548	n.s.
35–45	20	0.641**	p < 0.01
45–60	7	0.682	n.s.

Interpretation

The EI–JS relationship **strengthens with age**: from $r = 0.521$ (18–25) and $r = 0.548$ (25–35) to $r = 0.641$ (35–45, $p < 0.01$) and $r = 0.682$ (45–60). The only statistically significant coefficient appears in the **35–45 group**, likely due to **adequate sample size** ($N = 20$) and effect magnitude.

The strengthening pattern suggests that **emotional competencies become more functionally leveraged with experience**, enhancing satisfaction through **better coping, regulation, and relational efficacy** (Miao et al., 2017). The non-significance in the oldest group ($N = 7$) is attributable to **low statistical power**, not necessarily weaker effects.

6.5 Integrated Discussion

Across all analyses, a **consistent and robust positive association** between EI and JS emerges: **overall $r = 0.620$, male $r = 0.582$, female $r = 0.653$, and age-group r ranging from 0.521 to 0.682**. This **triangulation across subgroups** strengthens internal validity and indicates that EI is a **generalizable predictor** of JS in teaching contexts.

The findings converge with **meta-analytic evidence** (Miao et al., 2017) and organizational research (Carmeli, 2003), confirming that EI enhances **affective experiences at work**, which translate into higher satisfaction. Within Frederick Herzberg, EI likely operates by **amplifying intrinsic motivators** (e.g., meaning, achievement) and **buffering the impact of poor hygiene factors** (e.g., stressors), thereby elevating overall job evaluations.

In sum, the data demonstrate that while **job satisfaction is context-sensitive and variable** ($SD = 32.15$), **emotional intelligence is comparatively stable** ($SD = 5.34$) and exerts a **substantial, positive, and consistent influence** on job satisfaction across demographic strata.

6.6 Chi-Square Analysis (Categorical Association)

To further examine the association between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction, both variables were categorized into levels and analyzed using chi-square statistics. This approach allows for the examination of **distributional dependency between categorical variables**, complementing the Pearson correlation analysis (Cohen, 1988; Field, 2013).

6.6.1 Emotional Intelligence and Job Satisfaction Categories

Table 6.10: Cross-tabulation of Emotional Intelligence and Job Satisfaction

EI Level	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Total
High	0	2	7	9

Above Average	1	5	8	14
Average	7	9	6	22
Below Average	4	2	1	5
Total	12	15	20	50

Interpretation

Table 6.10 reveals a **clear directional pattern** in the distribution of job satisfaction across emotional intelligence levels. Among respondents with **high emotional intelligence (n = 9)**, the majority (**7 out of 9; 77.8%**) fall within the satisfied category, while none fall within the dissatisfied category. Similarly, among respondents with **above-average emotional intelligence (n = 14)**, **8 respondents (57.1%)** are satisfied, while only **1 respondent (7.1%)** is dissatisfied.

In contrast, among respondents with **average emotional intelligence (n = 22)**, the distribution is more dispersed, with **7 respondents (31.8%)** dissatisfied, **9 respondents (40.9%)** neutral, and only **6 respondents (27.3%)** satisfied. The pattern becomes more pronounced among respondents with **below-average emotional intelligence (n = 5)**, where **4 respondents (80%)** are dissatisfied, and only **1 respondent (20%)** is satisfied.

This distribution indicates a **systematic association** between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction, where higher emotional intelligence corresponds with higher levels of job satisfaction, and lower emotional intelligence corresponds with dissatisfaction.

6.6.2 Chi-Square Test Result

Table 6.11: Chi-Square Test

Test	Value	df	Significance
Chi-square	14.72	6	$p < 0.05$

Interpretation

The chi-square value of **14.72 with 6 degrees of freedom** is statistically significant at the 0.05 level ($p < 0.05$), indicating that there is a **significant association between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction categories**.

This result confirms that the distribution observed in Table 6.10 is not due to chance and supports the earlier correlation findings ($r = 0.620$). The chi-square analysis strengthens the validity of the results by demonstrating that the relationship holds even when variables are categorized.

From a theoretical standpoint, this finding supports the framework of Daniel Goleman, which posits that emotional competencies influence workplace outcomes. Individuals with higher emotional intelligence are better able to manage stress, resolve conflicts, and maintain positive relationships, leading to higher job satisfaction.

6.7 Effect Size and Practical Significance

While statistical significance indicates the presence of a relationship, effect size provides insight into the **magnitude and practical importance** of the findings (Cohen, 1988).

The correlation coefficient of $r = 0.620$ represents a **large effect size** according to Cohen's guidelines, indicating that emotional intelligence has a substantial impact on job satisfaction. The coefficient of determination ($r^2 = 0.384$) suggests that emotional intelligence accounts for **38.4% of the variance** in job satisfaction, which is considerable in behavioral research.

This implies that nearly **two-fifths of job satisfaction** among teachers can be explained by emotional intelligence alone, highlighting its importance as a psychological determinant.

In comparison with previous studies, this effect size is consistent with findings reported by Miao et al. (2017), who identified a strong positive relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction across occupational groups.

6.8 Comparative Analysis with Previous Research

The findings of the present study are consistent with a growing body of literature demonstrating the positive relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction.

Carmeli (2003) reported that individuals with higher emotional intelligence exhibit greater job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Similarly, Miao et al. (2017) found that emotional intelligence is positively associated with work attitudes, including job satisfaction.

In the educational context, Yin et al. (2013) found that teachers with higher emotional intelligence are better able to manage emotional labor and experience higher levels of job satisfaction. Mérida-López and Extremera (2017) further emphasized that emotional intelligence reduces burnout and enhances teacher well-being.

The present study extends these findings by demonstrating that the relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction is consistent across gender and age groups, with correlation coefficients ranging from **0.521 to 0.682**.

6.9 Theoretical Integration

The findings of the study can be integrated within multiple theoretical frameworks.

From the perspective of Daniel Goleman, emotional intelligence enhances workplace effectiveness by enabling individuals to regulate emotions, build relationships, and adapt to challenges. The strong correlation ($r = 0.620$) observed in this study supports this framework.

From the perspective of John D. Mayer, emotional intelligence is a cognitive ability that develops through experience. The increasing correlation with age (from $r = 0.521$ to $r = 0.682$) supports this model, suggesting that emotional intelligence becomes more functional over time.

From the perspective of Frederick Herzberg, emotional intelligence may influence both intrinsic and extrinsic factors of job satisfaction. Individuals with higher emotional intelligence are better able to derive intrinsic satisfaction and cope with external stressors.

6.10 Integrated Interpretation of Findings

The results of the study indicate that emotional intelligence is a **central psychological construct influencing job satisfaction** among teachers. The consistent positive relationship observed across all analyses—group level ($r = 0.620$), gender groups (0.582 and 0.653), and age groups (0.521 to 0.682)—demonstrates the robustness of the findings.

The chi-square analysis further confirms that the association between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction is significant at the categorical level. The effect size analysis indicates that emotional intelligence has a substantial practical impact on job satisfaction.

The findings also reveal that while emotional intelligence remains relatively stable across demographic groups, job satisfaction varies significantly, particularly with age. This suggests that job satisfaction is influenced by both psychological and contextual factors. The analysis clearly demonstrates that emotional intelligence is a significant predictor of job satisfaction among teachers. The findings highlight the importance of emotional competencies in enhancing workplace well-being and professional effectiveness.

6.12 Overall Conclusion of Results and Discussion

The present study provides comprehensive empirical evidence regarding the relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction among public secondary school teachers. The findings consistently demonstrate that emotional intelligence is a significant psychological determinant of job satisfaction, supported by both descriptive and inferential statistical analyses.

The overall analysis revealed that the mean emotional intelligence score of the respondents ($N = 50$) was 40.72 with a standard deviation of 5.34, indicating that teachers generally possess average to above-average emotional intelligence. In contrast, the mean job satisfaction score was 118.64 with a standard deviation of 32.15, reflecting a moderate or ambivalent level of job satisfaction. The comparatively higher variability in job satisfaction suggests that it is influenced by multiple contextual and organizational factors.

The Pearson correlation coefficient of $r = 0.620$ ($p < 0.01$) indicates a moderate to strong positive relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction, with approximately 38.4 percent of the variance in job satisfaction explained by emotional intelligence. This finding was further reinforced by chi-square analysis ($\chi^2 = 14.72$, $df = 6$, $p < 0.05$), which demonstrated a significant association between categorized levels of emotional intelligence and job satisfaction.

The gender-wise analysis indicated that male teachers exhibited higher emotional intelligence ($M = 41.51$, $SD = 5.62$) compared to female teachers ($M = 37.43$, $SD = 5.11$), with a statistically significant difference ($t = 2.62$, $p < 0.05$). However, job satisfaction did not differ significantly between genders ($t = 0.68$, $p > 0.05$), despite females reporting higher mean scores ($M = 127.74$) than males ($M = 110.37$). The correlation between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction remained positive for both genders, with $r = 0.582$ for males and $r = 0.653$ for females.

The age-wise analysis revealed that emotional intelligence remained relatively stable across age groups, with mean scores ranging from 37.86 to 41.85. In contrast, job satisfaction increased with age, with the

lowest mean score observed in the 25–35 age group ($M = 100.23$) and the highest in the 45–60 age group ($M = 134.86$). The strength of the relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction also increased with age, ranging from $r = 0.521$ in younger respondents to $r = 0.682$ in older respondents.

Overall, the findings suggest that emotional intelligence functions as a critical psychological resource that enhances job satisfaction by enabling individuals to manage emotions, cope with stress, and maintain positive interpersonal relationships. The consistency of the results across different analytical approaches and demographic groups strengthens the validity of the findings.

From a theoretical perspective, the results align with the framework proposed by Daniel Goleman, which emphasizes the role of emotional competencies in workplace effectiveness, as well as the ability-based model of John D. Mayer, which conceptualizes emotional intelligence as a cognitive ability that develops through experience. Furthermore, the findings are consistent with Frederick Herzberg, which highlights the role of intrinsic and extrinsic factors in determining job satisfaction.

In conclusion, the results clearly establish that emotional intelligence is a significant and robust predictor of job satisfaction among teachers, and its development can play a crucial role in enhancing professional well-being and organizational effectiveness.

References

1. Carmeli, A. (2003). The relationship between emotional intelligence and work attitudes, behavior and outcomes: An examination among senior managers. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(8), 788–813. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940310511881>
2. Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
3. Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
4. Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
5. Daniel Goleman. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. Bantam Books.
6. Frederick Herzberg. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. World Publishing Company.
7. John D. Mayer., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2004). Emotional intelligence: Theory, findings, and implications. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15(3), 197–215.
8. Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9(3), 185–211. <https://doi.org/10.2190/DUGG-P24E-52WK-6CDG>
9. Paul E. Spector. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the Job Satisfaction Survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13(6), 693–713. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00929796>
10. Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. SAGE Publications.
11. Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., & Salovey, P. (2011). Emotional intelligence: Implications for personal, social, academic, and workplace success. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 5(1), 88–103.
12. Miao, C., Humphrey, R. H., & Qian, S. (2017). A meta-analysis of emotional intelligence and work attitudes. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 90(2), 177–202.

13. Mérida-López, S., & Extremera, N. (2017). Emotional intelligence and teacher burnout: A systematic review. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 85, 121–130.
14. Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2015). Job satisfaction, stress, and coping strategies in the teaching profession. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 49, 181–192.
15. Yin, H., Lee, J. C. K., Zhang, Z., & Jin, Y. (2013). Exploring the relationship among teachers' emotional intelligence, emotional labor strategies and teaching satisfaction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 35, 137–145.