

Scores of Brunei Lower Secondary School Students on Emotional Intelligence Variables: Exploring the Differences

Norfaezah Masri¹

¹ Sultan Hassanal Bolkiah Institute of Education, Universiti Brunei Darussalam, Jalan Tungku Link, Gadong BE 1410, Bandar Seri Begawan, Brunei Darussalam

Correspondence: Norfaezah Masri, Sultan Hassanal Bolkiah Institute of Education, Universiti Brunei Darussalam, Jalan Tungku Link, Gadong BE 1410, Bandar Seri Begawan, Brunei Darussalam. E-mail: faezah.hjmasri@gmail.com

Received: June 12, 2015 Accepted: July 21, 2015 Online Published: July 30, 2015

doi:10.5539/gjhs.v8n4p22

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/gjhs.v8n4p22>

Abstract

The survey compared the emotional intelligence of 254 (128 females) randomly selected Year 11 Brunei Cambridge General Certificate of Education (BCGCE) Ordinary Level students using the six subscales of the BarOn Emotional intelligence scale – youth version. Females scored significantly higher on the intrapersonal variable than males. However, males scored much higher on the positive impression subscale. In addition, students aged 16 scored significantly higher on the interpersonal scale than all others. However, the 15-year olds scored highest on the adaptability and positive impression scales than their peers. Furthermore, participants who reported that they were not so much satisfied with their personal life scored significantly higher on the interpersonal scale than their counterparts. Moreover, participants who consult friends when faced with problems scored significantly higher on the interpersonal variable while those who search the internet for solutions to problems scored higher than others on the adaptability scale. No significant differences were obtained on any subscale when participants were compared on the basis of their parents' marital status as well as the type of guardian they stayed / lived with. Implications of the findings are discussed and mixed-methods research was recommended.

Keywords: emotional intelligence, adolescent, secondary school, coping

1. Introduction

Emotional Intelligence (EI) is a distinctive social intelligence that involves the aptitude to monitor one's own and other's feelings and emotions to distinguish among them and to use the information to guide one's own thinking and actions (Bar-On & Parker, 2000; Salovey, Brackett, & Mayer, 2004). At one point in time, Intelligence Quotient (IQ) was viewed as the primary determinant of success. People with high IQs were assumed to be destined for a life of accomplishment and achievement and previous researchers have debated whether IQ was the product of genes or the environment or both. People with high IQs typically do well in school. However, today experts recognize it is not the only determinant of life success. Instead, it is part of a complex array of influences that include emotional intelligence among other things (Cherry, 2014).

Salovey (2003) defined EI as "the ability to perceive and express emotion, assimilate emotion in thought, understand and reason with emotion, and regulate emotion in the self and others." According to Goleman (1995) EI consists of five components: knowing your emotions (self-awareness), managing them, motivating ourselves, recognizing emotions in others (empathy), and handling relationships. Segal and Smith (2014) version of EI is "the ability to identify, use, understand, and manage emotions in positive ways to relieve stress, communicate effectively, empathize with others, overcome challenges, and defuse conflict." EI is the area of cognitive ability involving traits and social skills that facilitate interpersonal behavior. Intelligence can be broadly defined as the capacity for goal-oriented adaptive behavior; emotional intelligence focuses on the aspects of intelligence that govern self-knowledge and social adaptation (Rouse, 2010). Ultimately, being emotionally and socially intelligent means to effectively manage personal, social and environmental change by realistically and flexibly coping with the immediate situation, solving problems and making decisions. To do this, we need to manage emotions so that they work for us and not against us, and we need to be sufficiently optimistic, positive and self-motivated (Bar-On, R., 2006).

1.1 Research on Psychological Wellbeing of Brunei Secondary School and Tertiary Students

Studies that investigate the psychological and mental health states of Brunei secondary school students were still rare due to a variety of problems. Finding suitable research instruments is one of the main problems facing educational researchers in Brunei. Most of the good instruments are written in advanced English and many tend to be too long (Mundia & Bakar, 2010; Mundia, 2011). However, one related recent study that dealt with Brunei student teachers of different personality-orientation found that the trainee teachers had psychological problems of an emotional nature such as depression, anxiety and stress (Mundia, 2010a, 2010b). There is also evidence from research that depression, anxiety and stress were experienced by Brunei secondary school students due to a variety of problems they face in their everyday life (see Hamid et al., 2013; and Matzin et al., 2013). Quantitative subjects (such as mathematics, statistics, econometrics, or psychometrics) and English language are some of the courses or disciplines that students in the Brunei education system find challenging and distressful although they enjoy studying these subjects (Shahrill et al., 2013; Keaney & Mundia, 2014). If these emotionally-loaded personal problems were prevalent in small groups of Brunei trainee teachers and secondary school students, they may by extrapolation, also be numerous and common in the general Brunei society or population. Often, students do not know how to resolve their academic and personal problems satisfactorily and rarely sought help from mental health professionals such as school counselors and school psychologists (Mundia, 2010c, 2013; Shahrill & Mundia, 2014). Lack of emotional skills to resolve problems peacefully sometimes leads to physical fighting between the student and teacher (Mundia, 2006). Students who either drop out of school early or leave school early also need assistance to determine suitable careers for them so as to prevent them from becoming delinquents (Mundia, 1998). Some of the problems that occur at the lowest level of education such as the preschool, need to be resolved jointly by teachers and parents (Mundia, 2007). These findings suggest that there might be some sort of relationship between personality and other attributes such as EI. Under the ongoing SPN21 educational reforms in Brunei, teachers are required to play a central role in assessing learning not only quantitatively but also qualitatively by examining students' personal traits that might impact learning either positively or negatively (Mundia, 2010d). In view of this, Brunei teacher education was also reformed to ensure that trainee teachers received adequate psychometric skills required in assessing students both qualitatively and quantitatively (Mundia, 2012). Furthermore, efforts are also currently being made to prepare teachers who have high self-efficacy in special education (Bradshaw & Mundia, 2005; Bradshaw & Mundia, 2006; Haq & Mundia, 2012; Tait & Mundia, 2012a; Tait & Mundia, 2013). Research has also revealed that Brunei trainee teachers of both genders have good interpersonal trust and interaction skills that may be helpful in assisting emotionally disturbed students with high support needs (Mahalle et al., 2013). Good social skills are essential in all ideal teachers (Omar et al., 2014). Since children are brought up in under two environments, home and school, research suggests that parents of children with challenging emotional behaviors should also receive training in handling effectively the emotions of children (Tait & Mundia, 2012b; Tait et al., 2014a; Tait et al., 2014b).

1.2 Objectives of the Study

Research has shown that EI is a better predictor of a student's academic performance than the more traditional measures of cognitive intelligence (Hettich, 2000). EI is one such factor which is instrumental in situations that call upon students to adjust successfully from one environment to another (Hettich, 2000). The purpose of the present study was to determine the extent or degree to which Brunei Year 11 students' EI scores differ by demographical factors such as gender, age, student's satisfaction with her/his life, marital status of parents, source of help when faced with distress, and type of guardian they stayed/lived with.

2. Method

The design, sample, instruments, data analyses, and procedures used are briefly described in Sections 2.1-2.5.

2.1 Design

The study used the field survey method to collect data to address the research objectives. The research approach allowed the investigator to involve many Year 11 students in the study.

2.2 Sample

Participant students were selected randomly. The researcher invigilated the students so that the questionnaires could be collected on the spot. The researcher also made sure that the students checked and answered all the items prior to collection to ensure getting a good number of usable returns. The participants' bio-data (gender and age) are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic information (N=254)

Variable	Group	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Males	126	49.6
	Females	128	50.4
Age	Group	Mean	SD
	All	16.602	0.740
	Males	16.698	0.707
	Females	16.507	0.763

2.3 Instruments

The researcher used the BarOn Emotional Quotient Inventory: Youth Version (BarOn EQ-i: YV) to collect the research data. The BarOn EQ-i: YV (BarOn & Parker, 2000) consists of 60 items that are distributed across six scales: Intrapersonal (6 items); Interpersonal (12 items); Stress Management (12 items); Adaptability (10 items); General Mood (14 items); and, Positive Impression (6 items). Each item is rated on a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = Very seldom true of me, 2 = Seldom true of me, 3 = Often true of me, and, 4 = Very often true of me.

The interpretations and meanings attached to criterion scale scores are as follows:

- Intrapersonal: less than a score of 20 suggests that these individuals may not understand their emotions and are not able to express and communicate their feelings and needs.
- Interpersonal: less than a score of 35 suggests that these individuals are likely to have satisfying interpersonal relationships. They are good listeners and are able to understand and appreciate the feelings of others.
- Stress Management: less than a score of 30 suggests that these individuals are generally calm and work well under pressure. They are rarely impulsive and can usually respond to a stressful event without an emotional outburst.
- Adaptability: less than a score of 30 suggests that these individuals are flexible, realistic, and effective in managing change. They are good at finding positive ways of dealing with everyday problems.
- General Mood: less than a score of 35 suggests that these individuals are optimistic. They also have a positive outlook and are typically pleasant to be with.
- Positive Impression: less than a score of 20 suggests that these individuals may be attempting to create an overly positive self-impression.

The descriptive statistics and reliability of the instruments are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics and reliability of the instrument (N = 254)

Scales	Items	Means	SE Mean	SD	Alpha
Intrapersonal	6	14.283	0.218	3.484	0.698
Interpersonal	12	33.299	0.478	7.623	0.865
Stress Management	12	30.677	0.379	6.044	0.742
Adaptability	10	26.547	0.295	4.703	0.733
General Mood	14	35.889	0.491	7.831	0.867
Positive Impression	6	14.984	0.175	2.791	0.640

The correlations in Table 3 may be interpreted in many ways. The low and non-significant correlations suggest that the paired scales assessed different constructs and did not replicate each other. For these scales, the correlations provide good quantitative evidence for the discriminant validity of the scales. The low but

significant correlations imply that the scales (to a small extent) might be overlapping and measuring the same construct but the amount of duplication or common variance is little and negligible. The paired scales can thus be said to have satisfactory discriminant validity and low convergence validity. The high and significant positive correlations (0.500-0.700 and above) suggest that the scales concerned had good convergence/concurrent validity.

Table 3. Convergence and discriminant validity of the instruments (N = 254)

Scale†	A	B	C	D	E
A	1				
B	-0.165**	1			
C	-0.096	0.095	1		
D	-0.009	0.583**	-0.042	1	
E	-0.071	0.730**	0.238**	0.552**	1
G	0.269**	0.185**	-0.006	0.362**	0.365**

**p < .01 (two-tailed)

†[A – Intrapersonal Scale, B – Interpersonal Scale, C – Stress Management Scale.

D – Adaptability Scale, E – General Mood Scale, G – Positive Impression Scale].

2.4 Data Analysis

The quantitative data were analyzed by both descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, mean and standard deviation) and inferential statistics (t-test for independent samples incorporating ANCOVA F, Pearson's correlation, and One-Way ANOVA including Eta squared values). The rationale and justification for using these techniques is two-fold. First, the procedures were deemed to be appropriate for addressing the research objectives. Second, the data were obtained from a random sample and there was no evidence of violation of the statistical assumptions.

2.5 Procedures

Prior to collecting the data, a permission to conduct the study in schools was obtained from the Ministry of Education in the Government of Brunei. The participants were told about the purpose and the objectives of the study. No dishonesty was involved in the study. The participants were told verbally about the ethical conditions or requirements for being involved in the study. The discussion on this topic centered on issues of voluntary participation, privacy, anonymity, confidentiality, physical and psychological harm, debriefing, and informed consent. Students were given ample time to reflect on and withdraw from the study if they felt uncomfortable about participating. With regard to English language problems, the meanings of difficult English words, sentences and phrases on the instruments were verbally explained to the participants. The researcher therefore considered it not necessary to translate the instruments into Bahasa Melayu (Brunei's main and official language). Although most participants required only 30 minutes to complete the instruments, those with reading problems were allowed longer time.

3. Results

The findings are presented below under separate subheadings.

3.1 Differences by Gender

Females scored significantly higher on the intrapersonal variable than males (Table 4). However, males scored much higher on the positive impression subscale (Table 4).

Table 4. Differences by gender (N=254)

Factors	Male (n=126)		Female (n=128)		ANCOVA	T	P	ES
(Scales)	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F	(df=252)	(2-tailed)	
A	14.063	2.927	14.500	3.956	12.726***	-0.998	0.319	0.063
B	33.269	7.419	33.328	7.848	0.771 ns	-0.061	0.952	0.004
C	31.357	6.393	30.007	5.625	1.836 ns	1.787	0.075	0.112
D	26.801	4.710	26.296	4.701	0.000 ns	0.855	0.394	0.054
E	37.190	7.736	34.609	7.742	0.567 ns	2.658	0.008	0.165
G	15.230	2.614	14.742	2.946	3.853*	1.395	0.164	0.088

[A – Intrapersonal Scale, B – Interpersonal Scale, C – Stress Management Scale, D – Adaptability Scale, E – General Mood Scale, G – Positive Impression Scale].

3.2 Differences by Age

According to Tukey HSD, students aged 16 scored significantly higher on the interpersonal scale than all the others (Table 5). The 15-year olds scored highest on the adaptability and positive impression scales than others (Table 5).

Table 5. Differences by age (N=254)

Factors	Age 15 (n=10)	Age 16 (n=110)	Age 17 (n=105)	Age 18 (n=29)	F	P	Eta
(Scales)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	(df=3)	(2-tailed)	
A	15.100 (4.067)	14.027 (3.905)	14.581 (3.115)	13.896 (2.820)	0.753	0.521	0.095
B	32.000 (8.819)	34.609 (7.625)	32.933 (7.395)	30.103 (7.222)	3.030	0.030*	0.187
C	29.800 (5.633)	31.109 (6.481)	30.438 (5.982)	30.206 (4.693)	0.368	0.776	0.066
D	29.200 (3.119)	26.845 (5.142)	26.552 (4.033)	24.482 (5.110)	3.148	0.026*	0.191
E	38.100 (7.475)	36.463 (7.833)	36.000 (7.557)	32.551 (8.398)	2.259	0.082	0.162
G	16.500 (2.273)	15.236 (2.908)	14.990 (2.431)	13.482 (3.236)	4.234	0.006**	0.220

*p < .05 (2-tailed); **p < .01 (2-tailed).

[A – Intrapersonal Scale, B – Interpersonal Scale, C – Stress Management Scale, D – Adaptability Scale, E – General Mood Scale, G – Positive Impression Scale].

3.3 Differences by Satisfaction With Personal Life

Participants who reported that they were not so much satisfied with personal life scored significantly higher on the interpersonal scale than the others (see Table 6). There were no other significant differences.

Table 6. Differences by satisfaction with personal life (N=254)

Factors (Scales)	Very much (n=22)	Not so much (n=122)	Little (n=110)	F (df=2)	P (2-tailed)	Eta
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)			
A	14.590 (3.275)	14.204 (3.622)	14.309 (3.393)	0.119	0.888	0.031
B	29.590 (7.142)	33.139 (7.646)	34.218 (7.516)	3.497	0.032*	0.165
C	30.181 (6.814)	30.262 (5.516)	31.236 (6.443)	0.831	0.437	0.081
D	24.727 (3.088)	26.336 (4.854)	27.145 (4.719)	2.695	0.069	0.145
E	32.000 (5.789)	35.016 (7.228)	37.636 (8.420)	6.477	0.002**	0.222
G	13.409 (2.938)	14.672 (2.540)	15.645 (2.865)	7.741	0.001**	0.241

*p < 0.05 (2-tailed); **p < .01 (2-tailed).

[A – Intrapersonal Scale, B – Interpersonal Scale, C – Stress Management Scale, D – Adaptability Scale, E – General Mood Scale, G – Positive Impression Scale].

3.4 Differences by Parents' Marital Status

No significant differences were obtained on this factor as indicated in Table 7.

Table 7. Differences by parents' marital status (N=254)

Factors (Scales)	Single (n=5)	Married (n=219)	Divorced (n=26)	Widow (n=4)	F (df=3)	P (2-tailed)	Eta
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)			
A	15.000 (2.738)	14.219 (3.550)	14.538 (2.983)	15.250 (4.573)	0.242	0.867	0.054
B	31.800 (3.701)	33.301 (7.642)	32.961 (8.204)	37.250 (7.228)	0.437	0.727	0.072
C	29.800 (3.271)	30.648 (5.991)	30.807 (7.310)	32.500 (2.645)	0.160	0.923	0.044
D	25.800 (2.588)	26.557 (4.687)	26.230 (5.171)	29.000 (5.228)	0.441	0.724	0.073
E	39.000 (1.870)	35.666 (7.889)	36.230 (8.086)	42.000 (5.416)	1.152	0.329	0.117
G	16.200 (2.683)	14.844 (2.783)	15.884 (2.916)	15.250 (1.707)	1.419	0.238	0.129

[A – Intrapersonal Scale, B – Interpersonal Scale, C – Stress Management Scale, D – Adaptability Scale, E – General Mood Scale, G – Positive Impression Scale].

3.5 Differences by Sources of Help When Distressed

Participants who consult friends when faced with problems scored significantly higher on the interpersonal variable than the others (Table 8). Those who search the internet for solutions to problems scored higher than others on the adaptability scale (Table 8).

Table 8. Differences by source of help (N=254)

Factors (Scales)	Family (n=80)	Prayers (n=59)	Yourself (n=54)	Friends (n=42)	Internet (n=11)	Other (n=8)	F (df=5)	P (2-tailed)	Eta
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)			
A	14.537 (3.325)	13.762 (3.554)	14.407 (3.647)	14.881 (3.415)	14.000 (3.162)	12.000 (3.817)	1.319	0.256	0.161
B	31.525 (7.577)	35.186 (6.986)	32.000 (8.018)	35.642 (7.505)	32.727 (6.466)	34.375 (7.595)	2.841	0.016*	0.233
C	30.050 (4.854)	32.101 (5.668)	30.777 (6.433)	29.119 (6.783)	33.272 (7.295)	30.375 (9.085)	1.828	0.108	0.189
D	25.587 (4.154)	26.762 (4.095)	26.314 (5.344)	27.381 (4.411)	30.454 (4.885)	26.547 (4.703)	2.580	0.027*	0.222
E	34.275 (7.655)	38.101 (7.063)	35.074 (7.686)	36.238 (8.400)	38.454 (8.664)	35.875 (9.311)	2.032	0.075	0.198
G	14.487 (2.774)	15.016 (2.763)	15.074 (2.662)	15.381 (3.059)	15.818 (2.088)	15.875 (3.313)	1.049	0.389	0.144

* P<0.05 (2-tailed).

[A – Intrapersonal Scale, B – Interpersonal Scale, C – Stress Management Scale, D – Adaptability Scale, E – General Mood Scale, G – Positive Impression Scale].

3.6 Differences by Type of Guardian They Stay/Live With

No significant differences were found on this factor as shown in Table 9.

Table 9. Differences by whom they stay/live with (N=254)

Factors (Scales)	Parents (n=219)	Mother (n=22)	Other (n=13)	F (df=2)	P (2-tailed)	Eta
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)			
A	14.205 (3.543)	14.318 (2.868)	15.538 (3.406)	0.898	0.408	0.084
B	33.278 (7.545)	34.409 (8.033)	31.769 (8.555)	0.494	0.611	0.063
C	30.684 (5.973)	31.409 (6.456)	29.384 (6.801)	0.457	0.634	0.060
D	26.529 (4.664)	26.818 (5.653)	26.384 (3.884)	0.45	0.956	0.019
E	35.748	37.545	35.461	0.545	0.581	0.066

	(7.860)	(8.140)	(6.995)			
G	14.872	15.818	15.461	1.352	0.261	0.103
	(2.802)	(3.289)	(0.967)			

[A – Intrapersonal Scale, B – Interpersonal Scale, C – Stress Management Scale, D – Adaptability Scale, E – General Mood Scale, G – Positive Impression Scale].

4. Discussion

The present study found that there were not many significant differences between Brunei male and female secondary school students in terms of emotional intelligence. Several theorists have previously pointed out the importance of the ability to differentiate among these feelings, and to normalize one's feelings as facades of emotional processing that are important in order to adaptively use the information conveyed by one's emotions and enhance psychological well-being (Heck & Oudsten, 2008; Salovey et al., 2004). According to the literature, adolescents with high expectations regarding their ability to understand and manage their moods experience and savor more positive emotions and tend to be more satisfied with their life (Salovey et al., 2009). Similarly, feelings of self-worth and self-acceptance play an important role in the process of psychological adaptation and emotional well-being in adolescents (Leary, 1999). The findings of the present study may be beneficial in developing more empirically-authenticated positive psychology intervention programs to facilitate well-being in young adolescents. Emotionally intelligent adolescents might be taught how to employ specific strategies for repairing negative moods and increasing positive ones to help them to increase their feelings of self-worth. This in turn might assist them in increasing feelings of satisfaction with their life during adolescence. Understanding adolescents in all their diversity is fundamental to improving their lives. Adolescents experience intense physical, psychological, emotional and economic changes as they make the transition from childhood to adulthood. Risk-taking is part of adolescence, and it is the obligation of society both to prevent risk and to moderate any audacious consequences such risk-taking was bound to have.

Adolescence is a developmental period during which children grow into their rightful place as full citizens and agents of change in their own lives and the lives of their societies. As they physically and psychologically mature, they form their values, core beliefs, sense of identity and understanding their place in the world. Adolescence was also a time when children's and young people's relationships with the people and communities that surround them can change dramatically. They leave behind childhood and take on new roles such as earners, holders of adult rights, and duty bearers in their communities and societies. Thus adolescents must be valued as an asset to society. It is time to invest in them to ensure that they have the opportunity to fully realize their potential and that of their communities - a future in which adolescents are healthy, educated, protected, and empowered (UNICEF, 2012).

5. Conclusion

A few significant differences were found among the participants on some demographical factors and EI variables as indicated in results section above (Tables 4-9). The identified EI variables and demographical factors could be included into intervention workshops and counselling sessions for needy students both individuals and groups. The relationship between students and teachers and the interactions between students and the school environment all have direct effects on learning and behavior.

6. Limitations

The study had three main limitations. First, due to time constraints, only 254 randomly selected students were used as participants. Thus the relatively small sample did not represent all the secondary students' emotional intelligence in Brunei. Second, as a survey, the results of the present study could not establish cause-effect relationships among the variables investigated. Third, a qualitative interview component was missing but necessary to supplement findings from the quantitative survey. The findings imply that the present study was worth replicating to confirm the results.

References

- Bar-On, R., & Parker, J. D. A. (2000). *BarOn Emotional Quotient Inventory: Youth Version (BarOn EQ-i: YV) Technical Manual*. Toronto, ON: Multi-Health Systems Inc.
- Bar-On, R. (2006). The BarOn Model of Social and Emotional Intelligence (ESI). *Psicothema*, 18(supl), 13-25. Retrieved from http://www.eiconsortium.org/reprints/bar-on_model_of_emotional-social_intelligence.htm

- Bradshaw, L., & Mundia, L. (2005). Understanding preservice teachers' construct of disability: A metacognitive process. *Disability and Society*, 20(5), 563-574. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09687590500156329>
- Bradshaw, L., & Mundia, L. (2006). Attitudes to and concerns about inclusive education: Bruneian inservice and preservice teachers. *International Journal of Special Education*, 21(1), 35-41.
- Busari, A. O. (2011). The relationship between self-efficacy, motivation and critical thinking disposition to achievement of sandwich degree students. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 1(1), 1-9.
- Carlson, N. R., & Heth, C. (2010). *Psychology--the science of behaviour* (4th Canadian ed.). Toronto: Pearson.
- Cherry, K. (2014). *What is Emotional Intelligence? Definitions, History, and Measures of Emotional Intelligence*.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Hamid, M. H. S., Shahrill, M., Matzin, R., Mahalle, S., & Mundia, L. (2013). Barriers to mathematics achievement in Brunei secondary school students: Insights into the roles of mathematics anxiety, self-esteem, proactive coping, and test stress. *International Education Studies*, 6(11), 1-14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v6n11p1>
- Haq, F. S., & Mundia, L. (2012). Comparison of Brunei pre-service student teachers' attitudes to inclusive education and specific disabilities: Implications for teacher education. *Journal of Educational Research*, 105 (5), 366-374. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2011.627399>
- van Heck, G. L. & den Oudsten, B. L. (2008). *Emotional intelligence: Relationship to stress, health, and well-being*. In: *Emotional regulation. conceptual and clinical issues* (pp.97-121). New York, NY: Springer. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-29986-0_7
- Hettich, P. (2000). *Transition process from college to career*. Eric document no.: ED447368.
- Keaney, M., & Mundia, L. (2014). Foreign Language Learners' Motivation and Its Effects on Their Achievement: Implications for Effective Teaching of Students Studying Japanese at Universiti Brunei Darussalam. *International Education Studies*, 7(9), 122-135. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v7n9p122>
- Law, F. F., Shahrill, M., & Mundia, L. (2015). Investigating students' conceptual knowledge and procedural skills in the learning of college level trigonometry. *Research Journal of Applied Sciences, Engineering and Technology*, 9(11), 952-962.
- Leary, M. R. (1999). The Social and Psychological Importance of Self-Esteem. In: *The Social Psychology of Emotional and Behavioral Problems* (pp. 197-221). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/10320-007>
- Mahalle, S., Matzin, R., Hamid, M. H. S., Shahrill, M., & Mundia, L. (2013). Brunei Student Teachers' Selected Personal Attributes, Attitudes to Women and Interpersonal Trust: Brief Psychological Report. *Asian Social Science*. 10(1), 151-157. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v10n1p151>
- Matzin, R., Shahrill, M., Mahalle, S., Hamid, M. H. S., & Mundia, L. (2013). A Comparison of Learning Styles and Study Strategies Scores of Brunei Secondary School Students by Test Anxiety, Success Attributions, and Failure Attributions: Implications for Teaching At-risk and Vulnerable Students. *Review of European Studies*, 5(5), 119-127. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/res.v5n5p119>
- Mundia, L. (1998). The Status of Technical Subjects in Papua New Guinea Provincial High Schools: A survey of attitudes. *Science, Technology and Development*, 16(2), 104-111.
- Mundia, L. (2006). Aggressive behaviour among Swazi upper primary and junior secondary school students: implications for ongoing educational reforms concerning inclusive education. *International Journal of Special Education*, 21(3), 58-67.
- Mundia, L. (2007). Early childhood education in Swaziland and Brunei Darussalam: goals, achievements and challenges. *Early Child Development and Care*, 177(2), 151-158. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03004430500375885>
- Mundia, L. (2010a). Prevalence of depression, anxiety and stress in Brunei student teachers. *Internet Journal of Mental Health*, 6(2). Retrieved from http://www.ispub.com/journal/the_internet_journal_of_mental_health.html
- Mundia, L. (2010b). Problems in learning mathematics: Comparison of Brunei junior high school students in classes with and without repeaters. *Journal of Mathematics Research*, 2(3), 150-160.

- <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/jmr.v2n3p150>
- Mundia, L. (2010c). Problems in learning mathematics: Comparison of Brunei junior high school students in classes with and without repeaters. *Journal of Mathematics Research*, 2(3), 150-160. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/jmr.v2n3p150>
- Mundia, L. (2010d). Implementation of SPN21 curriculum in Brunei Darussalam: A review of selected implications on school assessment reforms. *International Education Studies*, 3(2), 119-129. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v3n2p119>
- Mundia, L., & Bakar, H. (2010). The suitability of the EPQ-R short scale for counseling Brunei student teachers when administered in English and Malay languages. *Compare*, 40(5), 641-658. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03057920903478654>
- Mundia, L. (2011). Social desirability, non-response bias and reliability in a long self-report measure: Illustrations from the MMPI-2 administered to Brunei student teachers. *Educational Psychology*, 31(2), 207-224. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2010.545049>
- Mundia, L. (2012). Policy changes in Brunei teacher education: Implications for the selection of trainee teachers. *The Education Forum*, 76(3), 326-342. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2012.682489>
- Mundia, L. (2013). *Relationship Between Mental Health and Teaching: Evidence from Brunei Trainee Teachers*.
- Omar, N. A., Matarsat, S. R., Azmin, N. H., Wei, V. C. A., Nasir, M. M. M., Sahari, U. K. S., Shahrill, M., & Mundia, L. (2014). The Ideal Psychology Teacher: Qualitative Analysis of Views from Brunei GCE A-Level Students and Trainee Psychology Teachers. *Asian Social Science*, 10(12), 184-194. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v10n12p184>
- Rouse, M. (2010). *Emotional Intelligence (EI)*.
- Salovey, P. (2003). How Emotional Intelligence Emerged. *Monitor on Psychology*, 34(9), 64.
- Salovey, P., Brackett, M.A., & Mayer, J.D. (2004). Emotional Intelligence and its relation to everyday behavior. *Personality & Individual Differences*, 36, 1387-1402. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(03\)00236-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(03)00236-8)
- Segal, J. & Smith, M. (2014). *Emotional Intelligence Pt 1 Get Control of Your Life*.
- Shahrill, M., & Mundia, L. (2014). Coping Behavior of International Late Adolescent Students in Selected Australian Educational Institutions. *Global Journal of Health Science*, 6(1), 76-91. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/gjhs.v6n1p76>
- Tait, K., & Mundia, L. (2012a). Preparing teachers to meet the challenges of inclusive education in Negara Brunei Darussalam. In C. I. Forlin (Ed.), *Future directions for inclusive teacher education: An international perspective* (pp. 60-69). Hong Kong: Routledge/Francis & Taylor.
- Tait, K., & Mundia, L. (2012b). The impact of a child with autism on the Bruneian family system. *International Journal of Special Education*, 27(3), 1-14.
- Tait, K., & Mundia, L. (2013). *A Comparison of Brunei and Hong Kong - SAR Student*.
- Teachers' Self-efficacy in Implementing Inclusive Education Practices: Implications for Teacher Education. *Asian Social Science*. 10(1), 51-60. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v10n1p51>
- Tait, K., Mundia, L., Fung, F., & Wong, C. (2014a). The impact of traditional Chinese beliefs, stigma and local school service provision on the coping strategies of parents of children with Autism Spectrum Disorders in Hong Kong. *Journal of the International Society for Teacher Education*, 18(1), 16-25.
- Tait, K., Mundia, L., & Fung, F. (2014b). Raising Young Children with Autism Spectrum Disorders in Hong Kong: The Impact of Cultural Values and Stigma on Chinese Parents' Coping strategies. *International Journal of Advances in Social Science and Humanities*, 2(1), 7-15. Retrieved from www.ijassh.com
- United Nations Children's Educational Fund, UNICEF. (2012). *Progress for Children a Report*. Retrieved from http://www.unicef.org/adolescence/files/PFC2011_lowres.pdf

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).