

## Type A Behavior, Emotional Intelligence and Social Self-Efficacy as Predictors of Work Motivation among Faculty Members at the Hashemite University

Ghaleb AL-Baddareen\*, Souad Ghaith, Mutasem Akour,  
Hashemite University, Jordan  
& Suhaila Banat  
Amman Arab University, Jordan

Submitted: 3\10\2011

Revised: 12\5\2012

Accepted: 27\5\2012

This study examined the association between type A behavior, emotional intelligence, social self-efficacy, and work motivation among faculty members at the Hashemite University in Jordan. Seventy seven faculty members responded to four measures: Type A behavior scale, emotional intelligence scale, perceived social self-efficacy scale, and work motivation scale. The results of this study revealed that emotional intelligence was positively and significantly related to work motivation. Moreover, this study confirmed the value of emotional intelligence as a significant predictor of work motivation. However, social-self-efficacy and Type A behavior proved to be non significant predictors of work motivation

Keywords: Type A behavior, Emotional intelligence, Social self-efficacy, Work motivation, Career guidance.

### نمط السلوك أ والذكاء الانفعالي والكفاية الذاتية الاجتماعية كمنبئات بدافعية العمل لدى أعضاء الهيئة التدريسية في الجامعة الهاشمية

غالب البدارين\* وسعاد غيث و معتصم العكور

الجامعة الهاشمية، الأردن

وسهيلة بنات

جامعة عمان العربية، الأردن

هدفت الدراسة الحالية إلى فحص العلاقة بين نمط السلوك أ والذكاء الانفعالي والكفاية الذاتية الاجتماعية ودافعية العمل لدى أعضاء الهيئة التدريسية في الجامعة الهاشمية. تألفت عينة الدراسة من 77 عضو هيئة تدريس طبقت عليهم المقاييس التالية: مقياس لنمط السلوك أ، ومقياس للذكاء الانفعالي، ومقياس للكفاية الذاتية الاجتماعية ومقياس للدافعية. أشارت نتائج الدراسة إلى أن الذكاء الانفعالي يرتبط ارتباطاً إيجابياً وذا دلالة إحصائية بدافعية العمل، وبأن الذكاء الانفعالي كانت له قدرة تنبؤية وذات دلالة إحصائية بدافعية نحو العمل. في حين أظهرت النتائج عدم وجود قدرة تنبؤية لنمط السلوك أ والكفاية الذاتية الاجتماعية بدافعية العمل.

الكلمات المفتاحية: نمط السلوك أ، الذكاء الانفعالي، الكفاية الذاتية الاجتماعية، دافعية العمل، التوجيه المهني.

\* [jhjhussien@madison.k12.wi.us](mailto:jhjhussien@madison.k12.wi.us)

## INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, universities represent extremely complex social organizations. This encourages researchers to examine a large number of factors and their numerous interactions in order to approach an understanding of how these organizations function. One cannot minimize the confounding effects that the human factor introduces to these organizations. Here, we will pay attention to a particular group, the academic staff, as a key resource and their major role in achieving the objectives of the university. The work of the academic staff is influenced by a number of situational and environmental factors, such as: massification, deterioration of financial support, low quality of and inadequate materials (Altbach, 2003). In addition, there are personal factors that play a major role in affecting job performance and work motivation among faculty members, such as: personality characteristics, communication skills, and emotions (Kafetsios & Zampetakis, 2008; Ostroff, Kinicki, & Tamkins, 2007).

A large number of personality characteristics are related to motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Ames (1990) suggested that our way in interaction with others can influence not only our motivation for particular tasks, but also our motivation as a personality characteristic. The level of motivation that a person has depends, mainly, on the personality of that person. If a person has the personality of a quite, shy type, their motivation will come from living within that personality (Murphy, 2005).

Modern approaches to motivation may be organized into three related clusters: personality-based views, cognitive choice or decision approach, and goal or self-regulation. The first approach emphasizes the influence of enduring personal characteristics. On the other hand, the cognitive choice approach focuses on two determinants of choice and action: expectation and subjective valuation of the consequences associated with each alternative. The third approach emphasizes the factors that influence goal striving which focuses on the relationship between goals and work behavior (Wiley, 1997). Baum, Locke & Smith (2001) showed that the relationship between personality and performance is mediated by self-efficacy.

Thus, motivation is a psychological process resulting from the interaction between an individual and the environment (Locke & Latham, 2004). Mitchell & Daniels (2003) reported that research on personality is the fastest growing area in the motivation literature. In a review of predictor domains Schmitte, Cortina, Ingerick, & Wiechmann (2003) concluded that personality is the primary predictor of elements of motivation. Tett & Burnett (2003) presented a person-situation *interactionist* model of job performance that lays the groundwork for specifying the conditions under which particular personality traits that predict and explain performance in specific jobs. Their model proposes that employees seek out and are satisfied with tasks, people, and job characteristics that give them opportunities for expressing an array of personality traits.

On the other hand, the performance of academic staff as instructors and researchers determines much of the student satisfaction, and has an impact on student learning and, consequently, the contribution of universities to the society as a whole. Therefore, job satisfaction and work motivation of the academic staff appeared to be important. It is mistakenly believed that paying incentives, only, will create effective levels of motivation and, thus, will create an overly job satisfaction. Previous research indicated that lack of motivation and job satisfaction was due to non-monetary factors: intrinsic factors that are related to personal growth, and extrinsic factors that are associated with security into work environment (Spector, 1997).

Because faculty members play a major role in students learning process, it is necessary to study all of the potential factors that might have an influence on their work motivation and job performance. The present study tries to examine the effect of some of the non-monetary factors on work motivation of faculty members. These factors are: Type A behavior, social self-efficacy, and emotional intelligence.

### Type A behavior and work motivation

Type A behavior is one of a few personality characteristics that has been previously studied in relation to job performance (Jamal, 1990; Jamal & Baba, 2001; Halberge, Johansson & Schaufeli, 2007; Lee, 1992). Individuals who exhibit Type A behavior are characterized as

being ambitious, competitive, impatient, and aggressive reported as Type B behavior (Wyk, Boshoff, VanVuuren & Pretorius, 2009; Spence, Helmreich & Pred, 1987). Individuals with Type A behavior may experience sense of time urgency, more likely to be involved in conflict with co-workers, more overloaded at work, and more likely to be over committed than Type B individuals (Strube, 1991). Similarly, Burk and Werr (1980) found that Type-A-behavior supervisors supervised more subordinates than Type-B-behavior supervisors.

Type A behavior is a multi-dimensional construct that has differential relationships with other variables (Jamal & Baba, 2001; Williams, Barefoot & Schneiderman, 2003). Spence, Helmreich and Pred (1987) described two dimensions of Type A behavior; the first is labeled achievement strivings (AS). Individuals who are high on the (AS) dimension are described hard working, active, and serious persons. The second dimension is called impatience irritability (II). Individuals who are high on the II dimension are characterized as impatient, irritable, and prone to anger. Research has shown that the II dimension is more associated with health complaints whereas the AS dimension is associated with greater productivity.

Lee (1992) studied the relationship between type A behavior and job and class performance on a sample of 104 juniors and part-time workers in a business administration course. Results of that study indicated that Type A behavior were positively related to class performance. Achievement strivings (AS) were positively related to class performance and the impatience/irritability (II) factor did not relate to class performance. Matteson (1984) studied the relationship among Type A behavior patterns, sales performance and sub satisfaction of 355 life assurance agents. The study revealed that there were no significant relationships between Type A agents and sales performance.

On the other hand, different findings have been reported with regard to employee's personality characteristics and their job performance; Jamal & Baba (2001) found that Type A behavior was positively correlated with burnout and turnover motivation, and negatively correlated with perceived social support and job satisfaction. Nowack and Pentkowski (1994) findings were consistent with Jamal's

(1990) findings in that Type A behavior and life style habits were correlated with burnout, and that Type A behavior was positively associated with job stress, role ambiguity, and psychosomatic health problems. The findings of Hallberg, Johanson, Schaufeli (2007) indicated that both work situation and Type A behavior were positively correlated with burnout. However, Adeoye (1998) found no significant relationship between employee's job and their personality characteristics.

### **Emotional intelligence and work motivation**

In an attempt to understand the differences in abilities and competencies among individuals, authors have begun to focus on theories of intelligence other than the traditional ability based general intelligence like emotional intelligence (Cole & Rozell, 2011). The study of emotional intelligence evolved from works by shown theorists as Gardener (1983) and Williams and Sternberg (1988). They proposed broader approaches to understand intelligence. Mayer and Salovey (1995) coined the term emotional intelligence and included Gardner's intrapersonal and interpersonal components in the construct. Goleman (1998) popularize emotional intelligence in the business realm by describing its importance as an ingredient for successful business careers and as a crucial component for effective group performance.

These theorists and many others defined and explained the concept of emotional intelligence. Emotional Intelligence (EI) can be considered as a type of social intelligence and a domain of performance consisting of the ability to monitor one's own and other's feelings and emotions; the ability to discriminate among them; the ability to use the information to guide one's thinking and behaviors; and the ability to appraise and express emotions (Faye, Kalra, Swamy, Shukla, Subramanyam & Kamath, 2011; Follesdal & Hagtvvet, 2009; Mayer & Salovey, 1993; Mayer, Roberts & Barsade, 2008). Thus, the definition of emotional intelligence as the range of abilities, talent's and skill that are non-cognitive but can affect a person's ability to manage the environmental demands and pressure successfully.

Emotional-social intelligence is a cross-section of inter-connected and articulate ourselves, recognize others and communicate with team while manage our daily demands (Bar-On, 2005). It's important to understand

the role of motivation in the workplace because of its impact on work. People are not exclusively motivated by money but most people's motivation to work is to gain experience, education and satisfaction (Christie, Jordan, Troth & Lawrence, 2007).

Motivation can be affected by emotions because emotional intelligence represents the ability of a person to manage his own emotions and to take the emotional state of others into consideration, and how a person reacts to an emotional state can determine his success or failure in the workplace (Hur, Berg & Wilderom, 2010). A team with good emotional intelligence would demonstrate this by working together to achieve their goals (Dulewicz & Higas, 2003). A good team understands and appreciates one another's situation. A lesser team will not be well equipped to deal with conflict which can impact a person's feelings and thus could impact his motivation to do work (Poskey, 2009).

In service occupations, employees are dealing with high emotion work. They are required to effectively manage their emotions so that they can perform to their jobs well. Work motivation plays its role in urging the employees to use emotional intelligence to achieve effective performance on their jobs. Those with high work motivation tend to have higher emotional intelligence than those who don't. (Christie et al, 2007).

Previous research has shown that emotional intelligence directly or indirectly affects employees' motivation through their attitudes, behaviors and outcomes. Wong and Law (2002) found that employees' emotional intelligence affects their job satisfaction and performance. Similarly, Petrides and Furnham (2003) showed that emotional intelligence contributed significantly to the explanation of the variance in happiness after the personality traits had been accounted for. In his study on senior managers with high emotional intelligence employed in public sector organization, Carmeli (2003) found that emotional intelligence augments and moderates the effects of work-family conflict on career commitment but not the effect on job satisfaction. However, in a study conducted at nine restaurants, Sy, Tram & O' Hara (2006) found that food service employees' emotional intelligence was positively associated with job satisfaction and performance. Job satisfaction was found to be re-

lated to regulation of emotion and use of emotion but not to other dimensions of emotional intelligence. It was also found that job satisfaction is a mediator between emotional intelligence and organizational commitment (Guleyuz et al., 2008).

Many research like those of Goleman (1998) and Lanser (2000) have showed a relationship between emotional Intelligence and motivation. They reiterated that through the positive and negative aspects of working life we can comprehend motivation which is an essential factor of emotional intelligence. Also Dijk and freedman (2007) proved the relationship between emotional intelligence and motivation in a study that those who require extrinsic support for motivation are always are helpless without the consent or reward system of other. Some of the studies that deal with emotional intelligence and have examined the role that emotional intelligence play in motivation, self-regulation and variety of achievement behaviors were by Frjda (1994) and Zurbruggen and Sturman(2002).

Most of these studies showed a relationship between emotional intelligence and motivation. Thus, the literature review by Young & Youn (2011) conclude that emotionally intelligent employees are efficient enough to distinguish emotions, control them and employ them to improve performance in others as compared to those employees that possessed lower emotional intelligence capabilities. In addition, employees who possessed emotional intelligence found to be able to look at their responsibilities in a constructive manner so as to enhance.

In short, faculty member's emotional status and actions do affect how the students or colleagues they lead will feel and therefore perform. Thus, Goleman (2001) believes that if a leader have a high emotional intelligence and hence an understanding of how emotions work, it will result in higher morale, motivation, and commitment in an organization.

### **Social self-efficacy and work motivation**

Bandura's theory contains the postulate that self-efficacy expectations, our beliefs concerning our competence in specific behavioral domains, influence our choices of, performance in, and persistence in areas of endeavor requiring or utilizing those behavioral competences. This theory contains postulates regard-

ing the initial development of self-efficacy expectations from four experimental sources of efficacy information: personal performance accomplishments, vicarious learning, emotional arousal, and social persuasion and encouragement from others. These sources of efficacy information are important because they also form the theoretical foundation for the design of interventions which can increase and strengthen self-efficacy percepts. Thus, for researchers in the field of career psychology, self-efficacy theory may help to explain individuals' career decisions and performance. In terms of individual behavior, self-efficacy is the sense of confidence in an ability to overcome obstacles and to therefore persist in their presence (Bandura, 2000). Greater self-efficacy should be positively related to employees' perception that they successfully contributing to meaningful work and therefore foster enhanced work motivation.

A growing number of studies have revealed the relationship between self-efficacy and social behavior (Caprara, & Steca, 2005). Social self-efficacy refers to individuals' beliefs that they are capable of initiating social contact, participating in a social group or activity, receiving and getting help from others, and developing new friendship (Bilgin, 2011; Brackett, Mayer & Warner, 2004).

Social self-efficacy can also be defined as an individual's self-expectation regarding the exhibited performance depending on individual's skills in interpersonal relationships (Koparan, Ozturk, Ozkine, & Senisik, 2009). Also it is a belief activating individual's motivation and cognitive resources and it develops as a result of individual's evaluation regarding his or her life experience as well (Rodebaugh, 2006). Moreover social self-efficacy is understood as individual's own judgment regarding his or her capacity to perform a specific task successfully by organizing necessary activities (Dilorio, Shafer, Letz, Henry, Schomer, & Yeage, 2006).

Relatedly, Social self-efficacy can be considered in motivation through its effect on the direction and persistence of behavior (Wright, 2001). Social self-efficacy expectation is an important factor helping an individual to evaluate his/her self as successful in his/her social relationship (Bilgin & Akkapulu, 2007).

Payne (2005) found that job performers have significantly higher levels of communica-

tion skills (empathizing, adapting communication, and managing relationships). In social situations, individuals have varying perceptions of their ability to successfully interact with others. In other words, their self-efficacy beliefs reflect their level of social confidence (Bandura, 2000).

Previous research fundamentally focused on factors that are related to context, environment, more than on factors that are related to personality. Salaries or other material incentives are not the only motivators. There are other factors which can also serve as motivators. Because there is little research done on personality factors, this study is trying to relate three personality traits to work motivation. Moreover, previous research studied the combined effect of factors, whereas this study is trying to study the individual effect of the personality factors on work motivation and find the importance of these variables in inducing academic staff's motivation to engage in their work.

### Statement of the problem

The main purpose of the study is to explore the relationship between work motivation and three personality variables: Type A behavior, social self-efficacy, and emotional intelligence for faculty members at the Hashemite University in Jordan. In addition, the ability of Type A behavior, social self-efficacy, and emotional intelligence to predict work motivation is also investigated. To the researchers' best knowledge, no similar studies were conducted on such population using the above important factors. Motivated faculty members are crucial for optimal human functioning in the workplace because faculty members who are highly motivated are more satisfied and more engaged in their work (Levesque, Blais & Hess, 2008), and their motivation is associated with students' motivation.

In particular, this study is trying to answer the following research questions:

- 1- Is there a significant relationship among the four variables: Type A behavior, emotional intelligence, social self-efficacy, and work motivation for faculty members at the Hashemite University?
- 2- How well does the combination of Type A behavior, emotional intelligence, and social self-efficacy predict

work motivation for faculty members at the Hashemite University?

- 3- Which of Type A behavior, emotional intelligence, and social self-efficacy is the best predictor of work motivation for faculty members at the Hashemite University?

## METHOD

### Participants

**Table 1**  
**Demographic Information of Participants**

Independent variables	Levels	N	%
Gender	Male	40	51.9
	Female	37	48.1
Faculty	Scientific	37	48.1
	Art	40	13.0
Experience	At 1-2 Years	10	13.0
	At 3-5 Years	23	29.9
	At 6-10 Years	16	20.8
	At 11Years and more	28	36.4
	Total		77

According to the registrar office, there were 551 faculty members at the Hashemite University in Jordan for the academic year 2011/2012. Of all faculty members, 138 were females and 413 were males. A sample of 25% (n = 135) of all faculty members were chosen at random from all faculties to participate in this study. The total number of returned instruments that were valid for the analysis was 77, which constitutes the sample of this study of the participants, 37 were females and 40 were males. Their ranks ranged from full-lecturer to professor, and their average age was 37 years old. Table 1 shows some descriptive statistics for the sample.

### Instrumentation

Four instruments were utilized in this study:

#### Emotional intelligence scale (EIS)

The emotional intelligence scale (EIS) developed by Schutte, Marlouf, Hall, Haggerty, Cooper, Golden, & Dornheim (1998) was used in this study. This scale assesses emotional intelligence based on self-report responses to 33 items tapping the appraisal and expression of emotions in self and others, regulation of motions in self and others, and utilization of emotions in solving problems. Participants

respond by indicating their agreement to each of the 33 statements using a five-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Examples of items in this scale, "I have control over my emotions," and "I know why my emotions change."

One of the authors of the present study translated the scale from English to Arabic. Another author, independently, translated the Arabic version back into English. Next, the back-translated English version was compared with the original English version, and both translators discussed any discrepancies and came to a consensus on the best wording when there were any discrepancies. Then, the original English version and the back-translated version were then evaluated by three faculty members, who were fluent in English and Arabic, to ensure that the items have equivalent meanings in both versions.

This process of translation and back translation was also applied to other two scales: the social self-efficacy scale, and the work motivation scale.

EIS has demonstrated high internal consistency with Cronbach's alpha ranging from 0.87 to 0.90 and a two week test-retest reliability coefficient of 0.78 (Schutte et al., 1998). In the present study, reliability of the scale was estimated using a convenience pilot sample of 25 faculty members, who were not included in the final sample of this study. Cronbach's alpha was 0.90, and the test-retest method resulted in an estimate of reliability of 0.85.

#### Type A behavior scale

The scale of Type A behavior was developed by Atoum and Farah (1999). This scale assesses Type A behavior in adults based on self-report responses to 28 items tapping Type A behavior patterns such as time urgency and achievement strivings. Participants respond to the scale by indicating their agreement to each item using a three-point scale ranging from 1 (never) to 3 (always). Examples of items in this scale, "I try to complete more than one task in the same time," and "I feel that I am in competition with time." In the present study, reliability of the scale was estimated using the same convenience pilot sample of 25 faculty members. Cronbach's alpha was found to be 0.88, and the test-retest method resulted in an estimate of 0.86.

### Social self-efficacy scale

The scale of perceived social self-efficacy by Smith & Betz (2000) measures an individual's degree of perceived social self-efficacy, which is defined as an individual's degree of self-efficacy or confidence involving social behavior. The instrument consists of 25 rationally derived items that measure the level of confidence in a variety of social situations. Responses are obtained using a five-point like Likert scale ranging from 1 (no confidence at all) to 5 (complete confidence). Examples of items in this scale, "find someone to go to lunch," and "put yourself in a new and a different social situation."

Smith and Betz (2000) reported an internal consistency reliability coefficient of 0.94 and a test-retest reliability value of 0.82. In the present study, reliability of the scale was estimated using the same convenience pilot sample of 25 faculty members. The internal consistency reliability estimate for the scale was ( $\alpha = 0.96$ ), and the test-retest method resulted in an estimate of 0.87.

### Work motivation scale

This study used five items from the scale of work motivation by Baldwin (1990). This scale measures direction, intensity, and persistence of work-related behaviors desired by the organization. In addition, one item was adapted from Wright (2001) which is used to assess the degree of persistence in an employee's work-related behavior. This item is: "I am willing to start work early or start late to finish a job." The researchers my job," "I feel the importance of what I do," "I am looking for vacations and holidays impatiently," "I enjoy everything related to my job." A total of ten items constituted the scale of work motivation, where all items were measured on a five-point likert-type scale.

positively with work motivation,  $r = 0.46$ ,  $p \leq 0.01$ ; this is a medium-to-large size correlation according to Cohen (1988). This means that faculty members who had relatively high levels of emotional intelligence were likely to have high work motivation. Knowing that emotional intelligence had a significant correlation with work motivation, we might expect that emotional intelligence would be a statistically significant predictor of work motivation, which was the case as can be seen from Table 3.

The reliability of this scale was estimated using the same convenience pilot sample of 25 faculty members. Cronbach's alpha was found to be 0.72, and the test-retest estimate was 0.86.

## RESULTS

To answer the first research question, Pearson correlation coefficients were computed among the four variables: Type A behavior, emotional intelligence, social self-efficacy, and work motivation; Table 2 shows these correlations.

Table 2 shows that two of the predictor variables, social self efficacy and emotional intelligence were significantly and positively correlated with  $r = 0.40$ ,  $p \leq 0.01$ . The other combinations of the predictor variables had small and non significant correlations. This significant correlation might suggest for the presence of collinearity. Tolerance values of all predictor variables were checked and found to be close to 1.0, which indicates that collinearity was not a problem in this data. Thus all predictor variables can be entered into the regression equation. Moreover, Table 2 shows that only one variable out of the three predictor variables was significantly correlated with work motivation. Emotional intelligence correlated

**Table 2**  
Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for Work Motivation and Predictor Variables (N=77)

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3
Work motivation	39.468	5.22	0.12	0.46*	0.12
Predictor variables					
1. Type A behavior	59.195	8.78	-	-	-
2. Emotional intelligence	152.831	17.60	0.03	-	-
3. Social self-efficacy	97.909	17.27	-0.11	0.40*	-

Regarding the other two variables, social self-efficacy and Type A behavior, Table 2 shows that these two variables did not correlate significantly with work motivation. Thus, we might expect that self-efficacy and Type A behavior wouldn't be statistically significant predictors in predicting work motivation, which was the case as can be seen from Table 3.

To answer the second research question, simultaneous multiple regression analysis was conducted, and the results are shown in Table

3. The predictors were emotional intelligence, social self-efficacy, and Type A behavior, while the criterion variable was work motivation. Table 3 shows that the combination of Type A behavior, emotional intelligence, and social self-efficacy significantly predicted work motivation,  $F_{(3, 73)} = 7.2, p < .001$ . The adjusted R squared value was 0.195. This indicates that 20% of the variance in work motivation was explained by the model. According to Cohen (1988), this is very close to a large effect. The beta weights, presented in Table 3, suggest that high levels of emotional intelligence contribute most to predicting work motivation. On the other hand, Type A behavior and social self-efficacy do not contribute to this prediction.

Since the most parsimonious models are favored in multiple regression analysis, stepwise multiple regression analysis was conducted on the same data set to answer the third research question. Table 4 shows that, using stepwise multiple regression, emotional intelligence predicted work motivation,  $F(1,75) = 20.1, p < .001$ . The adjusted R squared value 0.20; this indicates that 20% of the variance in work motivation was explained by emotional intelligence. Stepwise multiple regression analysis excluded the other two variables, type A behavior and social self-efficacy, from the model.

**Table 3**  
**Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Type A Behavior, Emotional Intelligence, and Social Self-Efficacy Predicting Work Motivation (N=77)**

Variable	B	SEB	beta
Type A behavior	0.061	0.062	0.103
Emotional intelligence	0.143	0.033	0.483*
Social self-efficacy	-0.020	0.034	-0.065

Note.  $R^2 = 0.23$ ; Adjusted  $R^2 = 0.195$ ;  $F(3,73) = 7.149$ ,  
 \* $p < 0.001$

**Table 4**  
**Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Type A Behavior, Emotional Intelligence, and Social Self-Efficacy Predicting Work Motivation (N=77)**

Predictors	B	SEB	B
Emotional intelligence	0.136	0.030	0.460*

Note.  $R^2 = 0.21$ ; Adjusted  $R^2 = 0.201$ ;  $F(1,75) = 20.094$ ,  
 \* $p < 0.001$

## DISCUSSION

This study revealed that emotional intelligence and work motivation are positively and significantly related, and that emotional intelligence is an important factor in predict-

ing work motivation for faculty members at the Hashemite University. This agrees with the findings of previous studies (Young, & Youn, 2011; Frjda 1997; Zurbriggen and Sturman, 2002; Dijk and Freeman, 2007; Lanser, 2000; Goleman, 1998; Guleryuz et al., 2008; Sy et al., 2006; Carmeli, 2003; Christie et al., 2007) in that employees with high emotional intelligence are more apt at recognizing their own emotions as well as others' emotions, regulating them and using them to facilitate performance as compared to employees with low emotional intelligence. Thus, employees with high emotional intelligence are able to develop positive thoughts towards their job which, significantly, leads to an improved motivation.

To ensure that faculty members show outstanding performance in teaching, they must be highly motivated and be committed to their occupation. Therefore, they need to have emotional intelligence skills because the emotional intelligence play a major role in stimulating professor's motivation through manage their relationships with others, which is an ability closely tied to emotional intelligence, as result they feel belong and are valued.

Maslow's hierarchy of needs shows that belongingness and love is complex need require from persons treat each other with respect and kindness. This can contribute to manage conflict, create suitable climate to work and achieve their goals and thus their comfort in workplace motivate them. On the contrary, if professors have poor emotional intelligence, they will not treat one another with respect and kindness may negatively affect their morale and thus their discomforts de-motivate them (Jha, 2012).

Moreover, research findings revealed that social self-efficacy and Type A behavior were not significant predictors of work motivation. The researchers relate that to the nature of each variable. We can consider that social self-efficacy and Type A behavior are contributory factors not an essential or major factors, such as incentives or organization climate could impact directly work motivation. The social self-efficacy is an individual's beliefs about his capability of initiating social contact or organizing social activities (Lin & Betz, 2009) and thus isn't major aspects that can play a pivotal role in formulate or construct or even positively impact motivation.



Furthermore, there are no direct studies indicating the correlation between work motivation and social self-efficacy. This lacking of predictive value of Type A behavior regarding work motivation may refer to the life style of Type A behavior individuals which is the main cause of their stress they suffer from (always running, having lots of things to do and racing with time). This might negatively impact on their work motivation and job satisfaction. This is consistent with study of (Hallberg et al., 2007), which indicated that Type A behavior was correlated with burnout, because Type A behavior people report more work load and tend to report higher levels of stress and role conflict. Thus, Type A behavior as a distinct coping style in response to perceived work, and life stressors would appear to contribute to feelings of emotional exhaustion, poor interpersonal relations and lack of personal and professional accomplishment.

Many studies indicated to the relationship between Type A behavior and stress or burnout, for example Nowack and Pentkowski (1994) and Jamal (1990). All of these studies confirmed on the negative role of burnout or stress on job satisfaction and job performance or work context as whole which is one of characteristics of Type A behavior.

Finally, the purpose of this study was to explore the relationship among four variables: Type A behavior, emotional intelligence, social self-efficacy, and work motivation for faculty members at the Hashemite University, and to see if work motivation can be predicted using a combination of the other three variables. Further studies are needed to investigate this relationship using bigger and more diverse sample that represents more universities, public and private, in Jordan.

It is also recommended to explore the relationship using all levels and dimensions of all variables to get a more detailed picture of the possible significant relationships, and to check if this would also affect the prediction of work motivation.

## REFERENCES

Adeoye, E. (1998). Predictors of stress in Nigerian executives. *Nigerian Guidance and Counseling*, 6, 43-66.

Altbach, P. G. (2003). *The decline of the guru: the academic profession in developing and middle-*

*income countries*. New York: Palgrave/Macmillan, .

- Ames, C. A. (1990). Motivation: What teachers need to know?. *Teacher's College Record*, 91, 3, 409-422.
- Atoum, A. & Farah, A. (1999). Constructing Type A behavior Scale. *Abhath Al-Yarmouk*, 5, 29-40.
- Baldwin, J. N. (1990). Perception of public versus private sector personnel and informed red tape their impact on motivation. *American Review of Public Administration*, 20, 7-28.
- Bandura, A. (2000). Self-efficacy. In A.E. Kazdin (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of psychology*. New York. Oxford University Press.
- Bar-On, R. (2005). *The Bar-On Model of Emotional –Social Intelligence (ESI)*. *Issues in Emotional Intelligence*, 1-28. Retrieved on 5/5/2005 from: [www.Eiconsortium.org](http://www.Eiconsortium.org).
- Baum, J.R., Locke, E.A., Smith, K. G. (2001). A multi-dimensional model of venture growth. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 2, 292-300.
- Bilgin, M (2011). Relation among proposed predictors and outcomes of social self efficacy in Turkish late adolescents. *Cukurova University Faculty of Education Journal*, 40, 1, 1-18.
- Bilgin, M., & Akkapulu. E. (2007). Some variables predicting social self-efficacy expectation. *Social Behavior and Personality*. 35, 6, 777-788.
- Brackett, M., Mayer, J., & Warner, R. (2004). Emotional intelligence and its relation to everyday behaviour. *Personality and Individual Differences* 36, 1387-1402. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(03)00236-8.
- Burke, K.J & Werr. T. (1980). Type A experience: Occupational and life Satisfaction and Well-beings. *Journal of Human Stress*, 6, 28-38.
- Caprara, G. V., & Steca, P. (2005). Self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of prosocial behavior conducive to life satisfaction across ages. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 24, 2, 191-217.

- Carmeli, A., (2003). The Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Work Attitudes, Behavior and Outcomes: An Examination among Senior Managers. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18, 788-814 .
- Christie, A, Jordan, J.P, Troth, A. & Lawrence, S. (2007). Testing the links between emotional intelligence and motivation. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 13, 3, 212-226.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power and analysis for the behavioral sciences*. (2nd Ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cole, A., & Rozell, E. (2011). Emotional intelligence and impression management: A theoretical framework. *Insights Journal*, 1, 93-114.
- Deci, E, & Ryan, R.(2000). The "What "and "Why" of goal pursuits human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 4, 227-268.
- Dijk, C., & Freedman, J. (2007). Differentiating emotional intelligence in leadership. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 1, 2, 8-20.
- Dilorio, C., Shafer, P., Letz, R., Henry, T., Schomer, D., & Yeage, k. (2006). Behavioral, social, and factors associated with self- efficacy for self- management among people with epilepsy. *Epilepsy & Behavior*, 9, 1,158-163.
- Dulewicz v. & Higas, M. (2003). Leader at the top: The need for emotional intelligence in organization. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 11, 3, 193-210.
- Faye A, Kalra G, Swamy R, Shukla A, Subramanyam A, Kamath R.(2011). Study of emotional intelligence and empathy in medical postgraduates. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, 53, 140-144.
- Follesdal, H., & Hagtvvet, K. (2009). Emotional intelligence: The MSCEIT from the perspective of generalizability theory. *Intelligence* 37, 94-105. doi:10.1016/j.intell.2008.08.005.
- Frjda, N. (1994). Emotional are functional most of the time, in P. Ekamn & R.J. Davidson (Eds.) *The nature of Emotion: Fundamental Questions*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gardener, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligence*. New York: Basic Books.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D. (2001). An EI-Based Theory of performance. In D. Goleman (Ed.). *The Emotionally Intelligence workplace: How to select for, measure and improve Emotional intelligence in individuals and Groups and organization* (pp 27-44). San Francisco: Jossey –Bess.
- Guleryuz, G., Guny, S., Aydin, E.M, and Asan, O. (2008). The Mediating Effect of Job Satisfaction between Emotional Intelligence and Organizational Commitment of Nurses: A questionnaire survey. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 11, 45, 1625-1635.
- Hallberg, U., Johansson, G. & Schaufeli, W. (2007). Type A behavior and work situation: associations with burnout and work engagement. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 48, 2,135-142.
- Hur, Y., Berg, V., & Wilderom, C. (2010). Transformational leadership as a mediator between emotional intelligence and team outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 91-603. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.05.002.
- Jamal, M. (1990). Relationship of job stress and Type A behavior to employee's job satisfaction, Organizational commitment, psychosomatic heath problem, and turnover motivation. *Human relations*, 43, 8, 727-730.
- Jamal, M., & Baba.V. (2001). Type – A behavior, job performance and well being in college teachers. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 8, 13, 231-240.
- Jha, S. (2012). Need for growth, achievement, power and affiliation: determinants of psychological empowerment. *Global Business Review*, 11(3), 379-393.
- Kafetsiose, K., Zampetakis, L. A. (2008). Emotional intelligence and job satisfaction: Testing the mediatory role of positive and negative affect at work. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 44, 712-722.
- Koparan, S., Ozturk,. F, Ozkine, R, & Senisik, Y. (2009). An investigation of social self-

- efficacy expectation and assertiveness in multi-program high school students. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1, 623-629.
- Lanser, E. (2000). Why you should care about your emotional intelligence. *Health care Executive*, Nov/Dec, 6-11.
- Lee, C. (1992). The relations of personality and cognitive styles on job and class performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 2, 175-185.
- Levesque, M. Blais, M.R., & Hess, U. (2008). Motivational dynamic of burnout and well-being among African teachers. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 36, 3, 199-201.
- Lin, Sh & Betz, N. (2009). Factors Related to the Social Self-Efficacy of Chinese International Students. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 37, 3, 451-471.
- Locke, E.A, Latham, G.P. (2004). What should we do about motivation theory? Six recommendations for the twenty-first century. *Academy of Management Review*, 29, 3, 388-404.
- Matteson, M. (1984). Relation of Type A behavior to performance and job satisfaction among sale personnel. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 25, 2, 203-204.
- Mayer, J., & Salovey. P. (1995). Emotional Intelligence and the construction and regulation of feelings. *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, 11, 197-208.
- Mayer, J., & Salovey. P. (1993). The intelligence of emotional intelligence. *Intelligence*, 17, 433-442.
- Mayer, J., Roberts, R., & Barsade, S. (2008). Human abilities: Emotional intelligence. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 59, 507-536.
- Mitchell, T.R., & Daniels, D. (2003). Motivation. In W.C .Borman, D.R. Ilgen , & R.J.Klimoski ( Eds) . *Handbook of Psychology: Industrial organizational psychology*, 2, 225-254. New York: John Wiley.
- Murphy, P. (2005). *What Type are you*. Available online at <http://petermurphy.articlesbase.com>.
- Nowack, K. & Pentkowski, A. (1994). Lifestyle habits, substance use and problems of burnout in professional working women. *Work and Stress*, 8 ,1, 19-35 .
- Ostroff, O.R, Kinnicki , S.N , & Tamkins , U.O. (2007) . Relationships between psychological perceptions and work outcomes: A Meta – Analytic Review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 389 416.
- Payne, H. (2005). Reconceptualizing social skills in organization: Exploring the relationship between communication competence, job Performance, and supervisory roles. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 11, 2, 63-77.
- Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2003). Trait emotional intelligence: Behavioural validation in two studies of emotion recognition and reactivity to mood induction. *European Journal of Personality*, 17, 39\_57.
- Poskey, M. (2009). The importance of emotional intelligence in the work place: Why it matters more than personality. Available Online at: [www.Zerorisk.hr.com](http://www.Zerorisk.hr.com).
- Robert, C., Everly, G., & Girdano, D. (1986). *The stress mess solution: The causes and Cures of stress on the job*. Maryland.
- Rodebaugh, T. (2006). Self-efficacy and social behavior. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 44, 12, 2006, 1831-1838.
- Schutte, N., Marlof, J., Hall, L., Haggerty, D., Cooper, J., Golden, C. & Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and Validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 25, 167-172.
- Schmitte, N. Cortina , J.M , Ingerick , M.J, Wiechmann, D. (2003). Personnel selection and employee performance. In W.C Borman, & L. J. Klimoski (eds.). *Handbook of psychology* , 12 , 77-106 . New York: Wiley.
- Smith, H, & Betz, N. (2000). Development of a scale of perceived social self-efficacy. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 8, 283-301.
- Spector, D.E. (1997). Job satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes and consequences . Thousand Oaks, CA Sage.

- Spence, J., Helmreich, R., & Pred, R. (1987). Impatience versus achievement strivings in the Type A Pattern: Differential effects on student's health and academic achievement. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72*, 522-528.
- Strube, M. (1991). *Type A behavior*. New York, CA: Sage.
- Sy, T., Tram, S., and O` Hara, L. A. (2006). Relation of Employee and Manager Emotional Intelligence to Job Satisfaction and performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68*, 3, 461-473.
- Tett, R.P, & Burnett, D. D. (2003). A personality trait –based interactionist model of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 170-188.
- Wiley, C. (1997). What motivates employees according to over 40 years of Motivation Surveys. *International Journal of Manpower, 1*, 3, 264-280.
- Williams, R., Barefoot, J., & Schneider man, N. (2003). Psychosocial risk factors for cardiovascular disease: More than one culprit at work. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 290*.16, 2190–2193.
- Williams, W, & Sternberg, R. (1988). Group intelligence: Why some groups are better than others. *Intelligence, 12*, 351-377.
- Wong, C.S., & Law. K.S. (2002). The effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitudes: An exploratory Study. *The Leadership Quarterly, 13*, 3, 243-274.
- Wright, B. (2001). Public sector work motivation: Review of current literature and a revised conceptual model. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 11*, 4, 559-586.
- Wyk, R., Boshoff, A., Nieman, G., VanVuuren, J., & Pretorius, M. (2009). Prediction of type A behaviour: A structural equation model. *Journal of Industrial Psychology*35, 1, 48-66 doi:10.4102/sajip.v35i1.758.
- Young, H., & Youn, H.(2012). The effects of emotional intelligence on counterproductive work behaviors and organizational citizen behaviors among food and beverage employees in a deluxe hotel. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 31*, 376-378. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2011.06.008.
- Zurbrigeen, E. & Sturman, T. (2002). Linking Motives and Emotions: A test of McClelland's hypotheses. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*, 521-535.