The Role of Teachers’ Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy in Decreasing Students’ Separation Anxiety Disorder
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Abstract

Background: teachers are as responsible for personal progress of children as parents are for their nurturing. The purpose of this study is to examine the role of EI and self-efficacy of teachers in reduced SAD of primary school students in Tehran. In other words, this study evaluates the effective role of teachers in reducing SAD in students. Methods: This study used a descriptive-correlational methodology. The sample consisted of 345 teachers and 280 students with SAD selected by stratified proportional to size sampling by Cochran formula. Bar-on’s EQ-i, Schwarzer’s GSE and evaluation forms were used to evaluate teachers; Espada’s CSAS and Spence Children’s Anxiety Scale (SCAS) were used to measure SAD in children. Finally, post-test was taken from students with SAD. Results: The results showed a significant positive correlation between EI and self-efficacy of teachers. On the other hand, EI and self-efficacy of teachers significantly influenced students, so that a significant difference was found in the pre-test and post-test scores of students. SAD significantly decreased in students. Conclusion: positive teacher-student interactions can reduce the symptoms of SAD in students. Thus, teaching profession is a serious responsibility which should not be considered only as a job.
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1. Introduction

Importance of education and its key role is undeniable in social, economic and political development of societies. A significant portion of teaching activities takes place in schools; thus, schools are of great importance as an important sensitive social system (Beykzad et al., 2012). The beginning of formal education is a source of great change in the lives of children. In first days of school, a child may have many questions in mind for which he needs clear answers; otherwise, he will feel irrational and intense fear. This may manifest as school refusal or separation fear and distress, and even separation anxiety disorder (SAD). This unrealistic and extreme separation anxiety (APA, 1994) causes discomfort and performance degradation; it is even associated with physical symptoms in occurring or pending separation (Kaplan & Sadock, 2008). Children who suffer emotional pains do not leave their problems behind in home, resulting in a dramatic increase in prevalence of behavioral problems in schools (Guttmann, 1998). SAD is prevalent in 3.5% of young adolescence. SAD is twice more common in boys than girls. This type of disorder is manifested as excessive anxiety on separation from home or the one to whom the subject is attached. Children with SAD are at risk of developing mental illnesses such as depression and other anxiety disorders such as social anxiety disorder. One of the long-term consequences of SAD is a high risk of dropping out of school. A child who suffers from SAD may not be able to be independent and direct his life in adulthood (Meyer, 2008). Therefore, teachers are responsible to foster social and emotional skills of children. Teachers play an important role in the scientific future and success of students. Situations which are not predicted and planned in school require proper emotional adjustment (Kremenitzer, 2005).

Emotional intelligence (EI) is effective on individual health and all human relations, particularly for jobs which require more communication and influence. Since teachers are responsible for directing and nurturing generations (Fatemi, 2006), only high IQ does not lead to success; instead, other factors improve and modify professional activities. One of these factors is emotional intelligence, i.e., one’s ability to monitor feelings and emotions of himself and others, ability to distinguish different emotions, and ability to use this information to direct thought and action. EI refers to one’s ability to recognize his emotions and others’ and regulate emotions
in social situations. EI refers to getting along with people, inhibiting emotions in human relationships and encouraging or directing others to lead people to self-control based on self-awareness (Kazemi et al., 2009). One of the scientific definitions of EI is the ability to harness emotions and balance between emotions and logic for maximum happiness (Hein, 1996).

The teaching profession requires higher EI. According to the research done in the classrooms, closer motion coordination between teachers and students suggests the fact that they feel more friendship, happiness, enthusiasm, interest and comfort when interacting. According to Goleman (2000), management of a class by the teacher is a model by itself and a de facto lesson in emotional competence or its absence. On the other hand, research shows that teachers’ self-efficacy is positively related to their effort and persistence in the face of problems (Cakiroglu, 2008). Teachers who feel more efficacies provide students with more opportunities for progress (Soleimani & Hoveyda, 2013). Liaw (2009) and Jose et al. (2011) believed that the expected efficacy could affect people in two areas; first, the amount of effort made and, second, activities to be done. Self-efficacy may notably motivate the individual. People with high perceived self-efficacy will participate in activities which accelerate the development of their skills and capabilities. Teachers who feel high efficacy believe that they can effectively deal with incidents and situations. Because they expect to succeed in overcoming barriers, they preserve in their works and often operate at a high level. Compared to those who feel lower efficacy, these teachers are more confident in their capabilities. They see problems as challenges, rather than threats; they are actively looking for new opportunities. The feeling of high efficacy reduces the fear of failure, raises aspirations and improves problem-solving ability and analytical thinking (Soleimani & Hoveyda, 2013). People with high efficacy personally make the future, rather than just predicting it. Self-efficacy refers to one’s beliefs about his capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required for management and situations which will happen in the future. Self-efficacy is a constructive power by which cognitive, social, emotional and behavioral skills can be effectively organized to achieve different objectives (Bandura, 1997; Kirk, 2012). The tasks performed by different people with similar skills in different situations depend on changes in their self-efficacy beliefs. For this reason, the feeling of self-efficacy enables people to do extraordinary things using skills in dealing with obstacles. Self-efficacy is a key factor for successful performance. During the last 25 years, self-efficacy of teachers has been an important construct of teaching (Cakiroglu, 2008). Feeling of efficacy is the only characteristic of the teacher which is strongly correlated with student achievement (Woolfolk, Davis, & Pape, 2007). Studies conducted by Soleimani and Alibeygi (2009), Aghdami et al. (2009), Hafezian (2009), Rathi and Rastogit (2008), Adeyemo and Ogunyemi (2008), Penrose, Perry, and Ball (2007) and Salami (2010) suggest the consistency of EI and self-efficacy.

Little is known regarding the effect of these personal models in education system on the students; therefore, the innovation of this study is to examine the relationship between reduced SAD in children and EI and self-efficacy of teachers. This represents teacher-student interaction which is followed by improved personal abilities and problem solving capabilities of students. This study can provide a context for reform efforts in schools by senior management of the education system.

2. Theoretical Framework

The goal of theoretical framework is to determine the variables and hypotheses by reviewing theories of relevant scientists and researchers. The present study examines the relationship between EI and self-efficacy of teachers and the reduced SAD of students in the first year of the school. Considering the relationships between different factors and phenomena, this study does not rely on a single theoretical approach but a combination of theories. This requires capable, efficient human resources with high EI to be able to serve in line with principles and enhance the performance and effectiveness of future Iran. Accordingly, the conceptual model as shown in Figure 1 and Table 1 is developed based on the hypotheses:

1) There is a relationship between EI, its components, self-efficacy and evaluation of teachers.
2) There is a significant relationship between EI of teachers and reduced SAD in first-grade students.
3) There is a significant relationship between self-efficacy of teachers and reduced SAD in first-grade students.

3. Research Methods and Design

The research design of the study is a quantitative survey researches to investigation the relationship between teachers’ emotional intelligence, self-efficacy and students’ separation anxiety disorder. Thus, this study employed a corelational design. Corelational research allows the researchers to examine whether two or more variables co-vary, and if so, to establish the directions, magnitudes, and forms of the observed relationships. The
The multiple correlation method was chosen over other statistical designs considered based on its specific purpose and applicability. Purpose of this study as mentioned in introduction was the study of relationship between teachers’ emotional intelligence, self-efficacy and students’ separation anxiety disorder. The multiple correlation method is appropriate when trying to determine if more than one variable correlates with other variables. This method was therefore used in the present study in attempting to establish whether the teachers’ emotional intelligence and self-efficacy has positive or negative correlation with students’ separation anxiety disorder. Moreover, the multiple regression method is appropriate when trying to determine if more than one variable predicts a particular behavior (Huberty, 2003). Using this method, multiple predictor variables are used to predict one criterion variable. This method was therefore used in the present study in attempting to establish whether the predictor variables teachers’ emotional intelligence, self-efficacy could predict students’ separation anxiety disorder.

3.1 Participants
This study used a descriptive-correlational methodology. The population consisted of all first-grade teachers and students in Tehran during 2013-2014. According to the Department of Education in Tehran, there are 3433 primary school teachers and 97241 primary school students in Tehran. The sample size was determined by Cochran formula (345 teachers and 280 students). Stratified sampling method was used for sampling. The proportional allocation was used to divide the sample size into classes, depending on the size of the classes. Random sampling was used to select participants per class. Variables were evaluated by scales used for teachers and teachers.

4. Research Questioners
4.1 Emotional Intelligence
Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i): this study used the 90-question form consisting of 15 items and normalized by Samouei (2003) in Iran. Reliability of EQ-I was determined by calculating Cronbach’s alpha (ranging from 0.69 to 0.86; mean = 0.76). Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) was completed by 2,868 subjects in six countries. Additionally, to providing cross-cultural norms for the inventory, this preliminary piloting of the inventory was important for item selection and modification, continued scale development and validation, and establishing the final response format (Wijetunge, 2012).

4.2 Self-Efficacy
For assessing the Self-Efficacy the scale of Schwarzer and Jerusalem has been used. This test is used to predict adjustment after life changes or as a representation of life in any level of growth for clinical works and behavioral changes. The test consists of 10 items scored on a 4-point Likert scale. Reliability of GSE was determined by calculating Cronbach’s alpha (ranging from 0.75 to 0.90). Rajabi (2006) reported Cronbach’s alpha as 0.82. The scale is valid and reliable which that many researchers have used for assessing the Self-Efficacy.

4.3 Separation Anxiety
Espada’s Children Separation Anxiety Scale (CSAS): this 26-item scale is scored on a 5-point Likert scale and measures SAD in children in three dimensions including distress from separation, worry about separation and calm at separation. Talebpour (2012) reported Cronbach’s alpha ranging from 0.63 to 0.85 for subscales of CSAS. Spence Children’s Anxiety Scale (SCAS): This 45-item scale includes 38 items which are scored and 6 positive statements which are not calculated. There is also one open-ended question to which children explain their answers. The scale contains 6 subscales, one of which is SAD in children; this study used this subscale. The scale is scored on a 5-point Likert scale. Davoodi et al. (2009) reported reliability by Cronbach’s alpha as 0.89.
Figure 1. Conceptual model

Table 1. Analytical model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Basis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced SAD</td>
<td>Leading to better performance in situations and positive relationships with students</td>
<td>Providing an environment for emotional, social and physical development for first-grade students</td>
<td>High EI</td>
<td>School teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Results

First, the collected data was classified using descriptive statistics; then, inferential statistics were used to examine hypotheses.

Table 2 calculates univariate statistics such as mean and standard deviation and measures the correlation coefficients of the selected variables by forming the matrix. The significance level was corresponding to the correlation matrix (P < 0.05). A coefficient of correlation close to 1 indicates a strong relationship between
variables. Since the results of Bartlett’s test of sphericity are significant and the observed significant level is <0.05, there is a significant correlation between variables (Approx. Chi-Square: 1339.405; Df: 120; Sig: 0/00).

To examine the hypothesis on the significant relationship between EI of teachers and the reduced SAD in first-grade students, the data related to students with SAD was examined in two phases after visiting the teacher and receiving feedbacks to evaluate the difference in means of the trait (SAD).

Calculating the total variance in EI of teachers and SAD in students, ssb = 1285.958 and ssw = 7657.610 in the first phase and ssb = 496.107 and ssw = 1365.879 in the second phase; moreover, MSb = 24.730 in the first phase and MSb = 9.541 in the second phase (Note 1). Therefore, there is a significant difference in the second phase. The difference in SAD scores of the second phase is not caused by chance, but by EI of the teacher. In the following table, the obtained correlation explains higher variance in the second phase (Table 4).

Table 2. Mean and standard deviation and correlation matrix of EI scores, components, self-efficacy and evaluation of teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean and st.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problemsolving</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.1±1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.0±1.9</td>
<td>0.4*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.3±2.9</td>
<td>0.3*</td>
<td>0.4*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress tolerance</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.6±4.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-actualization</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.1±2.1</td>
<td>0.5*</td>
<td>0.4*</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional self-awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.3±2.5</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realism</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.5±2.4</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
<td>0.3*</td>
<td>0.4*</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.8±3.2</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
<td>0.6*</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.1±3.2</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td>0.4*</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
<td>0.4*</td>
<td>0.3*</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td>0.3*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.5±3.4</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulse control</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.3±3.3</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.1±2.2</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.4±2.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.9±1.8</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-expression</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.3±2.1</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td></td>
<td>405.4±14.2</td>
<td>0.4*</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td>0.4*</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td>0.6*</td>
<td>0.8*</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
<td>0.4*</td>
<td>0.7*</td>
<td>0.6*</td>
<td>0.5*</td>
<td>0.3*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.2±1.1</td>
<td>0.4*</td>
<td>0.5*</td>
<td>0.4*</td>
<td>0.4*</td>
<td>0.5*</td>
<td>0.3*</td>
<td>0.4*</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
<td>0.4*</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>0.9*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>93.7±2.6</td>
<td>0.5*</td>
<td>0.5*</td>
<td>0.3*</td>
<td>0.3*</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
<td>0.4*</td>
<td>0.3*</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td>0.4*</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>0.9*</td>
<td>0.8*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05
Table 3. ANOVA for total EI of teachers and total SAD in students in two phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total SAD (Espada)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1285.9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>7657.6</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8943.5</td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI of teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1861.9</td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SAD (Espada)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>496.1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1365.8</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Correlation obtained from ANOVA for total EI of teachers and total SAD of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eta</th>
<th>Eta-squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total SAD of Espada in phase 1 * EI of teachers</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SAD of Espada in phase 2 * EI of teachers</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures 2 and 3 show the mean of EI in teachers and SAD in students in the first and second phases.

Figure 2. Mean of EI in teachers and total SAD in students in phase 1

Figure 3. Mean of EI in teachers and total SAD in students in the phase 2
To examine the relationship between self-efficacy of teachers and SAD in students (third hypothesis), Table 5 lists the descriptive indexes of self-efficacy in teachers and SAD in students in the first and second phase. Table 6 presents the results of regression for self-efficacy of teachers and SAD in students in the second phase.

Table 5. Descriptive indexes for self-efficacy of teachers and SAD in students in two phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>st. NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy of teacher</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>1.23769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SAD of Espada in phase 1</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>5.66178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SAD of Espada in phase 2</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>2.58337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the tables show, the mean of SAD has been reduced in the second phase.

Table 6. The results of regression for self-efficacy of teachers and SAD in students in the second phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>SEE</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>P &lt; 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>100.64</td>
<td>21.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the above table shows, there is a significant relationship between self-efficacy of teachers and SAD in students. The negative value indicates a negative correlation resulting from effective role of self-efficacy in predicting the regression equation. Considering the significance level which is equal to zero and less than the acceptable level of error (0.05), the overall accuracy of the model can be confirmed. The coefficient of determination (R²), indicating the effects of variations in the dependent variable by changes in the independent variable, shows that self-efficacy of teachers explains 19% of the difference in SAD of students.

5. Discussion

According to the findings, it can be concluded that the teaching profession requires high EI and positive self-efficacy. These two factors will be effective on the relationship and interaction between teachers and students. Since the first grade of primary school is the first social and formal experience of children, teachers are the second most important factor, following family, to solve problems of students, particularly SAD.

According to the first and second hypotheses, the teaching profession requires high EI which is very effective in personal and professional success. High EI of teachers who play a major role in communicating with first-grade students can influence their individual and collective behavior and performance. This is consistent with Jafari-Malek (2012) in assessing EI and performance. As Difabio and Palazzeschi (2008) showed, high EI facilitates team collaboration, reduces conflict and improves efficacy. These findings are consistent with Falahati and Rostami (2012), Rath and Rastogit (2008), Beykzad (2012) and Salami (2010), who showed a positive relationship between EI and efficacy. Chesnut and Cullen (2014) argued that EI and self-efficacy are a set of skills, potentials and abilities which increase one's ability to cope with environmental pressures and demands successfully.

Self-efficacy score is effective in the evaluation of teachers; higher self-efficacy reflects better performance. This is consistent with Zahed (2009), Jha and Singh (2012), Yazice et al. (2011), and Jerusalem an Hessling (2009). Self-efficacy beliefs are positively related to actions. Teachers who are adjusted with themselves and others have a positive attitude toward their jobs; this psychologically satisfies them and enhances the mental calm and responsibility of teachers. This is consistent with Nouri (2009) who showed a significant relationship between teacher-student interaction and self-efficacy of teachers. Perceived effectiveness in workplace influences on efficiency and productivity. Thus, people with higher self-efficacy and positive attitude toward their effectiveness are more efficient. These studies also emphasized the effect of EI on communication skills and ethical behaviors which underlie interpersonal relationships. By definition, the increased control on emotions leads to realization; proper realization leads to better ways to deal with realities, which provides the context for optimal performance. In this case, feedbacks will be positive whereby confidence will be improved. Consistent with cognitive theories of Bandura, this will form belief system in one’s abilities and improves self-efficacy. Regression analysis showed that motivation is a significant predictor of self-efficacy. Overall results indicate a
positive significant correlation between EI and its components and self-efficacy. In this study, the teachers with higher EI were more realistic and more successful in solving problems. Those with lower scores on stress tolerance, interpersonal relationships, optimism, and self-esteem and impulse control had lower EI than others. EI improves relationships and increases creativity in solving conflicts and problems.

The third hypothesis assumed a significant relationship between EI of teachers and reduced SAD in first-grade students. The mean of SAD considerably decreased in the second phase. ANOVA results showed a significant reduction in the sum of squares and the estimation of variance (between group and within group). As shown in Table 2, $ss_b = 1285.958$ and $ss_w = 7657.610$ in the first phase and $ss_b = 496.107$ and $ss_w = 1365.879$ in the second phase; moreover, $MS_b = 24.730$ in the first phase and $MS_b = 9.541$ in the second phase. The mean estimation error variance within group is equal to 33.734 in the first phase and 6.017 in the second phase. For a significant F-value at 0.05 in 52 degrees of freedom between group and 227 degree of freedom within group, significance needs to be $\geq 1$. Obviously, there is a significant difference in the second phase. Therefore, the difference in SAD scores of the second phase is not caused by chance, but by EI of the teacher. Considering the coefficient of correlation, there is a significant relationship between EI of teachers and SAD of students; the obtained negative value indicates a negative correlation of EI in predicting the regression equation.

As shown in Table 4, the mean self-efficacy (37.546) of 280 teachers could reduce the mean SAD of students from 104.860 to 85.20. Table 5 indicates a negative correlation between self-efficacy of teachers and SAD in students. The correlation coefficient of 280 teachers with the correlation coefficient of SAD was -0.05 in the first phase and -0.19 in the second phase (sig = 0.01), indicating 0.00 significance. Therefore, there is a significant relationship between self-efficacy of teachers and SAD in students. ANOVA table shows the overall accuracy of the regression equation; the division of variance explained by the regression line on the variance unexplained by the regression line is equal to 11.218. Given that the significance level (zero) is <0.05 acceptable error, the overall accuracy of the model can be confirmed. Table 5 shows a significant relationship between self-efficacy of teachers and SAD in students. The negative value shows a negative correlation of self-efficacy in predicting the regression equation. Thus, findings show an inverse relationship between self-efficacy and SAD.

6. Conclusion

EI involves a series of interconnected skills for accurate perception, assessment and expression of emotions, access to feelings to facilitate thinking, the ability to understand emotions and emotional knowledge as well as the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and rational growth. Self-efficacy beliefs determine how people think, how they deal with problems, decide and behave. This highlights the effectiveness of these two factors in the improvement of students. Emotional skills play a critical role in working life of people, particularly teachers. These skills can considerably influence their success and generally education system. Children with SAD reflect their problems by inconsistency. This problem, if not solved, may cause anxiety in adulthood. Thus, teachers need their EI skills and self-efficacy to succeed.

7. Limitations

For teachers, a large part of professional success depends on emotional skills. Now, there are academic interests in these skills for managers, employees, entrepreneurs and learners; however, this has been neglected in the Iranian education system.

This study ignored the follow-up test for parents before the start of the school and training effects for better procedure.

Despite the effective role of teachers in behavioral changes of students, literature lacks studies conducted on this role of teachers.

8. Remarks

Emotional relationship is an important factor in the teacher-student interaction. A successful or failed relationship can reflect the extent to which teachers are successful in their profession. Despite their extensive knowledge, there are teachers who have failed in teaching because they ignored emotional aspects of learners. Therefore, it appears that the following remarks can contribute to the objectives of this study and enhance the quality of future works:

Leaders of the education system are recommended to consider in-service courses on EI training for both novice and experienced teachers. The teaching profession is a stressful job; thus, the ability to regulate and manage emotions in the classroom is a very important, efficient and effective factor. Unlike other skills of a teacher, responsibility to unforeseen situations may be challenging. When the time is short for reaction, the teacher should be able to make a quick emotional adjustment, even in the midst of a very negative situation; thus,
in-service courses can promote EI in teachers and enable them to act reasonably in unforeseen situations which require high emotional adjustment.

It is recommended to consider therapy sessions together with parents in order to acquaint them with SAD in children and the ways to deal with anxiety issues.

It is recommended to consider training courses and therapy sessions for pre-school and primary school teachers to represent problems of children focusing on growth process in childhood, provide solutions for mental health services, realize the emotional shortcomings, defects and needs of children, and treat their separation anxiety.
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Note

Note 1. ssb: sum of squares between groups; ssw: sum of squares within groups; MSb: mean square between groups.
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