JOURNAL OF TECHNICAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING
ISSN: 2229-8932 e-ISSN: 2600-7932

JTET

Vol. 16 No. 1 (2024) 128-147
https://publisher.uthm.edu.my/ojs/index.php/jtet

Examining the Social-emotional Skills of TVET Educators and Students: A Dual Perspective Analysis

Salma Dahri[1]*, Caleb Chidozie Chinedu[2], Mehwish Gull[1], Raquel Virginia Colcha Ortiz[3]

[1] *Department of Education, Faculty of Social Sciences*
The University of Lahore 1-Km Defence Road ؛, Bhuptian Chowk ؛, Lahore, 54590, PAKISTAN

[2] *Department of Education and Graduate Studies, Faculty of Technical and Vocational Education*
Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia (UTHM), Parit Raja Batu Pahat Johor, 86400, MALAYSIA

[3] *Facultad de Ciencias Pecuarias,*
Escuela Superior Politécnica de Chimborazo (ESPOCH), Pan Americana Sur km. 1½, Riobamba, 060155, ECUADOR.

*Corresponding Author: dahrisalma@live.com
DOI: https://doi.org/10.30880/jtet.2024.16.01.010

Article Info

Received: 15 January 2024
Accepted: 30 March 2024
Available online: 30 June 2024

Keywords

Social-emotional skills, empathy, self-efficacy, classroom management, TVET

Abstract

In Technical Vocational Education and Training (TVET), developing a skilled workforce is crucial. However, the effectiveness of TVET educators can be compromised by various challenges, including the insufficient understanding and integration of social-emotional skills (SES) into their scholarship and practice. Despite the importance of SES for enhancing educator efficacy and instructional quality, this area remains underexplored within the TVET context. This study, therefore, aims to evaluate the SES levels among TVET instructors and explore the differences in how instructors and students across various faculties perceive these skills. Additionally, it seeks to understand the impact of these perceptions on educational practices within TVET. Employing a quantitative case study design, this investigation compared the SES reported by 99 instructors and perceived by 373 final-year students, spanning both education and engineering faculties at Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia (UTHM). The findings reveal that both groups generally recognise high levels of SES among the instructors. Nevertheless, notable disparities exist between SES levels of educators from the education and engineering faculties, revealing significant disciplinary differences in social-emotional skill sets. The study underscores the pivotal role of SES in the TVET sector and highlights the necessity of external feedback in SES evaluation. By identifying disparities in SES perceptions across faculties, the study recognises opportunities for enhancing TVET instruction through targeted SES development, thereby potentially improving the efficacy and effectiveness of TVET educators.

1. Introduction

Modern society has always defined the roles and responsibilities of individuals, and this has made teachers responsible for shaping the next generations. Teachers are considered to possess all the qualities required to shape the generations. However, in preparing teachers, more focus is given to teachers' mastery over content knowledge of a particular field and other equally important qualities seem to be ignored.

The problem lies in the common perception of Technical Vocational Education and Training (TVET) as solely focused on technical skill development, overlooking the critical importance of students' social and emotional well-

J. of Technical Education and Training Vol. 16 No. 1 (2024) p. 131-147

being. There is a necessity to ensure that TVET students receive emotional support, understand their environment, benefit from effective classroom management, and experience a positive classroom climate, all of which are vital for their comprehensive development (Ochieng & Ngware, 2022). Nasir *et al.* (2011) argue that while technical skills are crucial, being socially and emotionally adept is equally important for a person's holistic growth. Social and emotional skills include effective communication, empathy, peer relations, problem-solving, and teamwork. In today's complex, evolving, and demanding workplace, merely possessing technical skills is insufficient. Modern industries demand versatile employees who can excel in a variety of tasks and settings (Tennant, McMullen, & Kaczynski, 2009).

Malaysia is currently facing a mismatch in skills, where employers are strong in technical skills but lack non-technical skills. This is seen through negative feedback from employers about the performance of workers. The emphasis on technical skills and lack of focus on non-technical skills is considered a persistent issue that is hard to change (Mohd Kamaruzaman *et al.*, 2019). Therefore, skilled workers are considered high-quality when they possess a combination of both technical and non-technical skills. To produce these skilled workers, it is essential for TVET instructors to have both technical and non-technical skills (Dahri, Yusof, & Jabeen, 2021). This way, they can pass on these skills to their students. According to Social Learning Theory, the behaviors of instructors have a significant impact on the behavior and performance of students. Students learn their instructors' non-technical skills through observing them and receiving reinforcement, which helps them to develop positive behaviors in their environment. This positive behavior improves their academic success and career prospects (Dahri, 2018).

Researchers argue that non-technical skills such as problem-solving, teamwork, interpersonal skills, caring, and communication skills can be improved through empathy and self-efficacy (Wink, LaRusso, & Smith, 2021). Empathy refers to a person's ability to understand and accept others for who they are, to view situations from others' perspectives, and to take a proactive and long-term approach to improving their situation by finding solutions to meet their needs (Cai *et al.*, 2022). On the other hand, self-efficacy is an individual's belief in his ability to take and complete actions that lead to the attainment of a specific goal (Farmer, Xu, & Dupre, 2022). These two concepts come under the umbrella term social emotional skills (SES) (Lozano-Peña *et al.*, 2021).

Instructors with SES tend to share their knowledge while keeping the perspective of their students in mind. They are able to respond to their students' emotional states in a compassionate manner (Lozano-Peña *et al.*, 2021). For example, instead of being rude to a student who is struggling in class, an instructor with SES will identify the reason behind the poor performance, which could be related to personal problems. They will then respond with kindness, taking the student's emotional state into account. This type of behavior fosters a caring and compassionate relationship between the instructor and student. These instructors also create a psychologically safe classroom environment by utilizing effective classroom management skills (Cai *et al.*, 2022). This means that both instructors and students show mutual respect, communicate politely, and work together to solve problems. The curriculum and activities are designed to enhance student learning, achievement, and interest in the subject (Dahri *et al.*, 2021).

One of the primary goals of educational institutions is to prepare students to become competent professionals in their chosen fields. This starts with equipping students to perform well in their academic pursuits. Research has demonstrated that there is a correlation between instructors' SES (empathy and self-efficacy) and students' performance (Dahri, 2018; Dahri *et al.*, 2021; Hen & Goroshit, 2016; Wang, 2022). Jennings & Greenberg (2009) put forth a theoretical model called the "prosocial classroom model," which posits that instructors' SES foster a prosocial classroom environment, leading to improved student performance.

The "prosocial classroom model" states that instructors who possess empathy and self-efficacy are better equipped to create a positive classroom climate, characterized by strong relationships and effective classroom management. This positive climate, in turn, contributes to improved student performance. In support of this idea, Perera & John (2020) found a positive relationship between instructor self-efficacy and student performance. Additionally, Meyers *et al.* (2019) claim that the ability of instructors to be understanding and to foster positive interactions with students is a key factor in increasing student satisfaction and academic performance. Based on these findings, it can be concluded that instructors with SES can positively impact student performance.

Additionally, research suggests that teachers who have received training specifically in education tend to be more effective in their teaching practices and achieve better outcomes with their students compared to teachers in other fields (Dahri, 2018). This is because they have a greater understanding of their students and are more confident in their teaching abilities. This has been shown to hold true across all subjects, including mathematics, science, and vocational education. On the other hand, when teachers lack self-efficacy and empathy, it can negatively impact not only their students' learning and performance, but also their own well-being, motivation, creativity, and overall interest in their profession (Lozano-Peña *et al.*, 2021). Thus, it is crucial for teachers to develop and enhance their SES skills to effectively shape the next generation into skilled workers and better individuals. Therefore, this study will examine the perspectives of TVE educators and students regarding their social-emotional skills and how these nuances contribute to a vivid understanding of the significance of socio-emotional development within educational contexts. More specifically, the following research objectives guided the inquiry.

1. To determine TVET educators' perspective of their SES.
2. To identify students' perspective of TVET educators' SES.
3. To determine the comparative difference of TVET educators' SES from the perspectives of TVET educators and their students.
4. To identify the comparative difference in the TVET educators' level of SES between faculties.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Social-emotional Skills (SES)

Educators' SES refers to a combination of emotional, cognitive, and behavioral traits including self-awareness, social consciousness, responsible decision-making, and self-regulation (Jennings, 2011; Jennings & Greenberg, 2009). Lecturers with SES are in tune with their own emotions and are skilled in harnessing positive emotions like happiness and passion to inspire both themselves and their students. They have a clear understanding of their abilities and exude confidence. These lecturers are also equipped with the ability to understand and respond to the emotions of others, fostering strong, supportive relationships.

Lecturers with high SES possess a unique combination of emotional, cognitive, and behavioral skills that allow them to effectively manage conflicts, build strong relationships with students and colleagues, and make responsible decisions. This includes self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and responsible decision-making. Such lecturers understand their own emotions and tendencies and use them to motivate themselves and their students. They are also culturally sensitive and recognize the emotions and perspectives of others, which helps them to foster trustworthy and respectful relationships. They exhibit prosocial values and take full responsibility for the impact of their decisions on those around them and themselves.

SES is linked to the well-being of lecturers, according to Jennings & Greenberg (2009). When lecturers possess these skills, teaching becomes more enjoyable for them, and they feel more confident in their profession. In this study, SES is separated into empathy and self-efficacy (Hen & Goroshit, 2016; Lozano-Peña *et al.*, 2021). These two concepts will be further explained in detail.

2.1.1 Empathy

Empathy is the ability to understand and share the feelings, emotions, and perspectives of others. The term was introduced by psychologist Edward Titchener in 1909 and translated from the German word "einfühlung," which means "feeling into" (Squier, 2021). Empathy is considered to be a crucial component of emotional intelligence and involves the ability to project oneself into another person's situation and experience their psychological state (Ismail, Nopiah, & Rasul, 2020). Different disciplines have different definitions of empathy, but a large body of research over the past century has shown that empathy is an ability to understand and experience others' emotions, thoughts, and perspectives.

There is another concept, sympathy, which is often mistaken for empathy. However, researchers have stated that the two terms are not synonymous, as sympathy refers to feeling sorrow for someone else and sharing in their pain, while empathy is understanding and experiencing the emotions and perspectives of others. Sympathy arises when a person's emotional response to someone else's distress prompts them to want to help alleviate that distress. For example, seeing a hungry person and wanting to provide them with food would be considered sympathy. Even if the help is not actually given, the desire to do so would still be considered empathy. On the other hand, feeling pity or hopelessness for someone else but not having the desire to alleviate their pain would be considered empathy. Empathy is typically divided into two components: cognitive and affective.

2.1.2 Cognitive Empathy

The cognitive component of empathy refers to the mental process of accurately understanding what others are thinking or feeling. This ability is sometimes referred to as "theory of mind," "mind reading," or "perspective taking" (Konstantakopoulos *et al.*, 2020). It involves setting aside one's own perspective and taking on the mental state of another person, in order to understand and respond to them appropriately. This process can be challenging for TVET lecturers as it requires suppressing their own egocentric perspective and accurately imagining the experiences of their students. Nevertheless, being able to do so can greatly improve the effectiveness of their teaching and lead to more positive outcomes for both the lecturers and their students.

2.1.3 Affective Empathy

Affective empathy, on the other hand, refers to a person's emotional response to another person's emotional state. For example, a person may cry because their friend is crying over the death of their friend. The definitions of affective empathy vary, with some researchers believing that the observer's emotional response should match the

emotional state of the person being observed, while others believe that the emotional response can be any appropriate response. Some researchers believe that the observer's emotional response should be one of care when the person being observed is in distress (Konstantakopoulos *et al.*, 2020). It is important for TVET lecturers to have appropriate emotional responses to their students' emotional states, as it is considered an inappropriate emotion to feel pleasure over a student's sadness. In order for TVET lecturers to be affectively empathetic, they should emphasize the appropriateness of their emotional response to their students.

2.1.4 Self-efficacy

According to Bandura's social cognitive theory, learning occurs through observing others and being influenced by our surroundings and the behavior of those around us (Rumjaun & Narod, 2020). This theory is relevant to understanding teaching and learning, as teaching takes place within a social context. The theory posits that we learn either through actively participating in an experience or through observing others and learning vicariously. When an individual is actively involved, their behavior is based on what they think will help them achieve the desired outcome and what they should avoid in preventing any obstacles. On the other hand, in vicarious learning, a person observes a model either in person or through media, but they do not actively participate. This type of learning can occur more quickly, as the individual does not need to perform the behavior in order to learn it.

Self-efficacy, a crucial aspect of Bandura's social cognitive theory, refers to an individual's belief in their own capability to carry out actions that will result in the achievement of a specific goal (Lyons & Bandura, 2019). This belief significantly affects a person's decision-making, effort, motivation, perseverance, and success (Ismayilova & Klassen, 2019). Self-efficacy is crucial for an individual, as without confidence in their ability to reach a desired outcome, they cannot pursue it. Self-efficacy beliefs are multi-dimensional and vary based on the level, scope, and strength of the belief (Lyons & Bandura, 2019). The level of self-efficacy is dependent on the difficulty of a task, for example, a lecturer may have a high level of self-efficacy in managing a well-mannered student's behavior but a lower level in managing the behavior of a student who lacks manners. Scope refers to how strongly a person believes in their ability to perform a particular task, while the strength reflects how easily an individual can change their belief in performing a particular task. At the start, these beliefs may be weak but can be strengthened over time through practice, experience, and feedback from others.

2.2 Social-emotional Skills of TVET Lecturers

Lecturers are given a specific definition and role as a profession. They are seen as knowledgeable individuals with high skills and the capability to teach in a formal manner. To be considered qualified, they must have expertise in a certain discipline, such as art, mathematics, science, computer engineering, or vocational subjects. However, Thornberg *et al.* (2022) argue that simply having a mastery of a particular subject area is not enough to make a lecturer effective, as this may not necessarily result in better student outcomes.

According to Thornberg *et al.* (2022), a lecturer's mastery of a certain discipline or in-depth knowledge in their field alone is not enough to be an effective teacher and result in better student outcomes. A lecturer must also possess qualities such as being a good listener, caring, understanding, a strong classroom manager, and being able to establish positive relationships with students. These social and emotional skills (SES) help create a supportive and positive learning environment, which is crucial for the healthy development of students. According to Jennings (2011), this relationship is positively related to students' academic and social outcomes. A lecturer with strong SES is confident in their abilities and can effectively manage themselves and their relationships with others. They understand their students' emotions and respond appropriately, building trust and respect-based relationships. Thus, it is important to enhance a lecturer's social and emotional skills, in addition to their technical and vocational abilities, to create a well-rounded workforce.

Omar, Zahar, & Rashid (2020) believe that for a TVET lecturer to be effective, they must possess strong social and emotional skills, including good communication, thinking skills, responsibility, discipline, efficacy, and good management skills. They agree that in order for the TVET field to grow and develop, it must be led by individuals who not only have extensive knowledge and technical skills, but also strong leadership abilities.

A socially and emotionally skilled Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) lecturer must be able to understand their students, cater to their emotional and social needs, establish strong relationships with them, effectively manage the classroom, and have confidence in their own abilities. TVET lecturers play a crucial role in shaping the future generation and need to possess qualities that will produce a competent, responsible, innovative, and creative workforce. Despite differences in their fields and specific tasks, a TVET lecturer still requires the same qualities as a regular lecturer to be effective.

Additionally, Coffey (2010) states that lecturers who have undergone teacher training or have a background in professional education tend to be more effective in their teaching practices and in inspiring students to pursue their studies, compared to those who have academic qualification outside of professional education. This is because lecturers from education faculties are frequently exposed to new teaching methods, while those from other faculties have limited opportunities to learn new teaching techniques (Shakir, 2009).

According to Darling-Hammond (2000), a review of 30 years of research showed that lecturers who are fully trained and certified are more effective in their teaching compared to those who lack such preparation. This is true for lecturers from all fields, such as mathematics, science, or vocational education. Teacher training is crucial for all lecturers as those who have a deep understanding of teaching and learning methods tend to be more effective than those who lack this knowledge (Darling-Hammond, 2000, 2016).

Ololube (2006) conducted a study comparing the strategies and instructional materials used by professionally qualified and academically qualified lecturers in a secondary school. The results showed that the professionally qualified lecturers used more effective instructional materials and strategies than the academically qualified lecturers. Additionally, Gibbs and Coffey (2004) divided university lecturers into two groups, providing teacher training to one group and leaving the other group without training. The researchers found that the group of lecturers who received training showed an improvement in their effectiveness and their students' performance improved as well. On the other hand, the group of lecturers who did not receive training showed little to no improvement or even a negative change.

Andersson, Johansson, and Waldenström (2011) conducted a study to determine the impact of certified and non-certified teachers on student achievement in Swedish schools. They found that students taught by certified teachers had a positive impact on their GPA, whereas students taught by non-certified teachers had a negative impact on their GPA. The study concluded that formal teacher education is essential for student achievement. Therefore, these studies suggest that lecturers with professional qualifications or professional education backgrounds are more effective than those with academic qualifications. Although most of these studies were conducted in schools, they highlight the importance of having professional qualifications for lecturer effectiveness. Additionally, having a high SES (socioeconomic status) is a key quality of an effective lecturer.

3. Methods

3.1 Research Design

The selection of the research design holds significant importance in ensuring the quality of the study, with the utilization of a quantitative case study method being pivotal. This method allows for an in-depth exploration of data within a specific context, analyzing a limited number of individuals, events, and their interrelations. In this investigation, emphasis was placed on Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia (UTHM), a member of the Malaysian Technical Institutes Network (MTUN), to provide a comprehensive understanding of the social-emotional skills (SES) of TVET lecturers. UTHM was chosen for several reasons, including its unique position as the sole institute within the MTUN network housing a Faculty of Technical and Vocational Education. Additionally, it shares similar characteristics with other TVET institutes in Malaysia, boasts the longest tenure among the MTUN varsities, and aligns with the constraints of the researcher's available time and resources. Data was collected from 99 lecturers and 373 students from the Faculty of Technical and Vocational Education (FPTV) and the Faculty of Engineering Technology (FTK) through a survey administered at a single point in time. AN empathy and self-efficacy scale was used to obtained measures of lecturer's empathy and self-efficacy in classroom management.

The researchers specifically selected FPTV and FTK for this study due to two main reasons. Firstly, both faculties offer three similar degree programs in mechanical, electrical, and civil engineering. Secondly, by focusing on faculties with comparable programs, the researcher aimed to examine differences in lecturers' SES despite sharing similar academic programs yet differing in nature. FTK focuses on technical instruction, while FPTV is dedicated to training educators. FPTV lecturers primarily prepare future educators, while FTK lecturers impart technical skills to students. Although FTK lecturers possess some understanding of pedagogy and educational psychology, FPTV lecturers are more extensively exposed to these areas, given their role in shaping future educators.

3.2 Sample and Sampling Method

The population comprised lecturers from both FPTV and FTK across all programs, totaling 80 and 92 lecturers respectively. Similarly, all final year degree students from both faculties were considered for the study's population. Final year TVET students were chosen as they were presumed to have a deeper experience with the TVET lecturers compared to students in lower study years. It was anticipated that their understanding of the lecturers and their responses regarding lecturers' SES would be more insightful due to their extended exposure. Additionally, final year students were expected to offer more mature and appropriate responses compared to their junior counterparts. The total number of final year degree students across both faculties was 648, with 318 in FPTV and 330 in FTK, according to data provided by the administration offices of the faculties.

Given the utilization of a case study approach in this study, careful selection of cases was paramount. In case study methodology, sample sizes are often insufficient for random sampling, making purposive sampling the preferred method (Marrelli, 2007). Purposive sampling is employed when the sample is deemed typical and

J. of Technical Education and Training Vol. 16 No. 1 (2024) p. 131-147

representative of the population, particularly when the researcher aims to investigate individual attitudes, opinions, or perspectives (Ary *et al.*, 2013).

In alignment with this, the study utilized purposive sampling to select lecturers and final year degree students enrolled in civil, mechanical, and electrical engineering programs from two faculties, FPTV and FTK. Figure 1 illustrates the number of lecturers and students chosen as the sample for the study.

Total number of populations in all programmes

	FPTV	FTK	Total
Lecturers	80	92	172
Students	318	330	648

Total number of populations in Civil, Mechanical and Electrical programmes

	FPTV	FTK	Total
Lecturers	47	79	126
Students	245	273	518

Fig. 1 *Sampling frame*

The researcher included all 126 lecturers and all 518 final year degree students from FTPV and FTK enrolled in civil, mechanical, and electrical programs as samples for the study. Figure 1 illustrates that out of the total 172 lecturers across both faculties, 126 (47 from FPTV and 79 from FTK) were selected using total population sampling, a form of purposive sampling. Total population sampling is preferred when researchers aim to study the entire population with specific characteristics, especially when the total population is small (Ary *et al.*, 2013).

Similarly, from the total number of final year students in all programs (648), 518 were chosen, with 245 from FPTV and 273 from FTK. This sampling technique was deemed most suitable for the study due to the small population size and the need for specific characteristics within the population. All lecturers and students were contacted and requested to participate in the study following this sampling technique.

3.3 Instrument and Measures

The data collection tool employed in this research comprised a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire with a total of 44 items, constituting 13 items for self-efficacy scale, and 31 items for empathy scale. aimed at evaluating the self-efficacy skills (SES) of Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) lecturers. Dividing the SES into empathy and self-efficacy in classroom management, the researcher utilized two distinct scales: the Empathy Quotient (EQ) for empathy and the Teacher Interpersonal Self-Efficacy Scale for self-efficacy in classroom management. These scales were selected due to their established validity and reliability in previous research for gauging lecturers' empathy and self-efficacy (Baron-Cohen & Wheelwright, 2004; Bostic, 2006; Gaudreau *et al.*, 2013). Permission to employ these scales in the study was obtained from their creators.

The Empathy Quotient (EQ), developed by Baron-Cohen & Wheelwright (2004), was chosen as the tool to assess empathy among TVET lecturers due to its established reliability and validity in previous research (Stojiljković, Djigić, & Zlatković, 2012; Stojiljković *et al.*, 2014).. This self-report scale measures cognitive and affective dimensions of empathy. To tailor the scale to the study's population, irrelevant items were omitted following established procedures, reducing the original 60 items to 31. Adjustments were made to ensure relevance, such as modifying statements to reflect the perspective of lecturers and students respectively (Matthews-López, 2003). Similarly, the self-efficacy of TVET lecturers in classroom management was measured using a subscale adapted from the Teacher Interpersonal Self-Efficacy Scale by Brouwers, Evers, & Tomic (2001), which has demonstrated validity and reliability in prior studies (Bostic, 2006; Brouwers *et al.*, 2001). This scale, originally comprising three subscales, was adjusted to focus solely on perceived self-efficacy in classroom management. To facilitate administration to both lecturers and students, items were phrased differently while maintaining their intended meaning resulting in two versions of the same questionnaire. For instance, items intended for lecturers were modified and worded to suit lecturer's context. Both adapted scales underwent validation by experts, resulting in two versions of the questionnaire—one for lecturers and another for students. Following validation, the questionnaires demonstrated high reliability, with Cronbach's Alpha values of .81 for the lecturers' version and .83 for the students' version.

3.4 Ethical Considerations

Ethical principles, including obtaining informed consent from participants, ensuring the anonymity of respondents, and maintaining the confidentiality of data, were rigorously upheld throughout the execution of this study. Research following ethical principles and considerations is instrumental to ensuring that the research takes into cognizance the privacy and protection of research participants.

4. Results

Two methods were used to determine the level of lecturers' SES, which were based on the perspectives of both lecturers and students. The researcher employed descriptive statistics to evaluate the level of SES, using a five-point Likert scale. The scale ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), and an established formula, adapted from previous studies, was used to determine the SES level of TVET educators in tandem with each item on the questionnaire. The formula used the highest point in the Likert scale minus the lowest point in the Likert scale, divided by the number of levels used (5-1/3 = 1.33). The resulting values were categorized into low, moderate, and high levels based on specific ranges (1-2.33 labelled as low, 2.34-3.67 labelled as moderate, and 3.68-5 labelled as high) (Obeidat *et al.*, 2016).

4.1 Dual Perspectives of TVET Educators' Cognitive Empathy

In order to ascertain the level of Lecturers' cognitive empathy, respondents (lecturers and students) responded to 19 questions aimed at determining TVET educators' SES. Results are shown in tables 1 and 2.

Table 1 *Lecturers' perspective on their cognitive empathy*

		FPTV			FTK		
No	Item	M	SD	Level	M	SD	Level
1	I can easily notice if any student wants to enter in a conversation.	4.13	.883	High	4.22	.618	High
2	I find it easy to explain the things that I understand easily to students, when they don't understand it the first time.	4.00	1.013	High	4.12	.853	High
3	Students seldom tell me that I went too far in emphasizing an important point in a discussion.	2.00	1.038	Low	3.98	.861	High
4	In a conversation, I tend to focus on my students' thoughts rather than my own strong thoughts.	2.25	.954	Low	2.00	.851	Low
5	I can decode if a student says one thing but means another.	4.03	.800	High	4.10	.635	High
6	I am good at predicting how students feel.	4.08	.730	High	4.08	.726	High
7	I am able to spot a student in a group when he/she is feeling awkward or uncomfortable.	3.78	.832	High	3.98	.861	High
8	I can always see why students could have felt offended by a remark	3.90	.744	High	3.80	.867	High
9	I find it easy to be social with students.	4.15	.893	High	4.22	.744	High
10	I am good at understanding how students feel.	4.00	.679	High	4.08	.772	High
11	I can easily tell if the students are interested or bored with what I am saying.	4.05	.639	High	4.03	.850	High
12	If I see new students in class, I encourage them to join in the class.	3.98	.800	High	4.20	.714	High
13	I can easily work out what a student might want to talk about.	3.85	.864	High	3.92	.836	High
14	I can tell if students are masking their true emotion.	3.92	.730	High	3.88	.745	High
15	I am good at predicting what students will do.	3.95	.815	High	3.95	.879	High
16	I can usually appreciate a student's viewpoint, even if I don't agree with it.	3.95	.714	High	4.22	.767	High

J. of Technical Education and Training Vol. 16 No. 1 (2024) p. 131-147

		FPTV	FTK			FPTV	FTK
No	Item	M	SD	No	Item	M	SD
17	I am an understanding person as students usually talk to me about their problems.	3.65	1.099	Moderate	3.81	.937	High
18	I can easily figure out what things upset students so much.	3.75	.954	High	3.92	.896	High
19	I am not able to make decisions without being influenced by students' feelings.	3.80	.791	High	3.95	.879	High
	Total	3.75	1.016	High	3.92	.931	High

Table 1 illustrates the cognitive empathy results based on lecturers' responses, indicating a high level of cognitive empathy within both faculties. The overall average mean was 3.75 (SD = 1.016) in FPTV and 3.92 (SD = .931) in FTK. Notably, in FPTV, item 9 ("I find it easy to be social with students") scored the highest mean at M = 4.15 (SD = .893), while in FTK, item 1 ("I can easily notice if any student wants to enter in a conversation") had the highest mean at M = 4.22 (SD = .618). However, in FPTV, item 17 ("I am an understanding person as students usually talk to me about their problems") showed a moderate level with a mean value of M = 3.65 (SD = 1.099), whereas no item in FTK exhibited a moderate level. Two items had low overall scores, with item 3 ("Students seldom tell me that I went too far in emphasizing an important point in a discussion") scoring M = 2.00 (SD = 1.038) in FPTV. Furthermore, item 4 ("In a conversation, I tend to focus on my students' thoughts rather than my own strong thoughts") showed low levels in both faculties, with mean values of M = 2.25 (SD = .954) in FPTV and M = 2.00 (SD = .851) in FTK.

Table 2 *Students' perspective on lecturers' cognitive empathy*

		FPTV			FTK		
No	Item	Mean	SD	level	Mean	SD	level
1	The lecturers know when I want into a conversation,	3.90	.757	High	3.87	.792	High
2	The lecturers are able to make me understand any concept when I don't understand it the first time.	4.07	.762	High	3.92	.811	High
3	The lecturers adequately emphasize the important point in a discussion.	4.09	.691	High	3.97	.737	High
4	The lecturers tends to focus on what students might be thinking while having a discussion in class rather than his/her own thoughts.	3.91	.846	High	3.78	.850	High
5	The lecturers decode quickly when students say one thing but mean another.	3.90	.792	High	3.79	.842	High
6	The lecturers are good at predicting our feeling.	3.94	.846	High	3.80	.872	High
7	The lecturers can easily spot me when I feel awkward or uncomfortable in a group.	3.81	.867	High	3.71	.968	High
8	The lecturers can always see why students feel offended by his/her remark.	3.67	.859	Moderate	3.55	.910	Moderate
9	The lecturers become social with students easily.	4.00	.831	High	3.91	.869	High
10	The lecturers are good at understanding feelings.	3.92	.967	High	3.80	1.012	High
11	The lecturers can easily tell if students are bored or interested in what he/she is saying.	3.90	.852	High	3.76	.914	High

No	Item	FPTV Mean	FTK SD			FPTV Mean	FTK SD
12	The lecturers encourage new students to join in the class.	3.88	.857	High	3.78	.992	High
13	The lecturers often know what students want to talk about before they start talking.	3.67	.980	Moderate	3.58	.940	Moderate
14	The lecturers know when students are masking their true emotions.	3.72	.921	High	3.55	.994	Moderate
15	The lecturers are good at predicting students' actions.	3.90	.870	High	3.71	.973	High
16	The lecturers usually appreciate students' viewpoint even if he/she does not agree with the students.	3.92	.831	High	3.84	.869	High
17	I usually share my problems with my lecturers because they are understanding persons.	3.36	1.075	Moderate	3.35	1.039	Moderate
18	The lecturers can easily see why something upset students do much.	3.60	.952	Moderate	3.43	1.037	Moderate
19	The lecturers get influence of students' feeling while making decisions.	3.64	.942	Moderate	2.49	1.006	Moderate
	Total	3.83	.888	High	3.66	.973	Moderate

In Table 2, the results of students' perspectives on their lecturers' cognitive empathy are presented. Lecturers in the Faculty of Technical and Vocational Education (FPTV) are perceived to have a high level of cognitive empathy with a total mean of M = 3.83 (SD = .888), while lecturers in the Faculty of Engineering Technology (FTK) are perceived to have a moderate level of cognitive empathy with a total mean of M = 3.66 (SD = .973). Item 3, which refers to lecturers adequately emphasizing important points in a discussion, has the highest mean in both faculties, with Mean = 4.09 (SD = .691) in FPTV and M = 3.97 (SD = .737) in FTK. Items 8, 13, 17, 18, and 19 are perceived to have a moderate level in both faculties, while item 14, which refers to lecturers knowing when students are masking their true emotions, has a high level with a mean of M = 3.72 (SD = .921) in FPTV and a moderate level with a mean of M = 3.55 (SD = .994) in FTK. It is noteworthy that no item has been rated as low from the students' perspective, although more items are rated at a moderate level when compared to lecturers' perspective.

4.2 Dual Perspectives of TVET Educators' Affective Empathy

This section presents data regarding the level of lecturers' affective empathy, assessed through a 12-item scale. The questionnaire was administered to both lecturers and students, with identical questions adjusted slightly in wording for the student version to enhance relevance. Tables 3 and 4 show the perspectives of lecturers and students on lecturers' affective empathy.

Table 3 displays the lecturers' perspective on their level of affective empathy, with both faculties having a high level of affective empathy. The total average mean for FTPV lecturers is M = 3.83 (SD = .995), and for FTK lecturers, it is M = 3.89 (SD = .87). However, when examined by individual items, item 29 (Students often say that I am sensitive towards them) has a moderate level of mean M = 3.63 (SD = 1.102) in FTPV and M = 3.47 (SD = .953) in FTK. On the other hand, item 25 (Seeing students cry really upsets me) has a high level of mean M = 3.73 (SD = .784) in FTPV, while in FTK, it has a moderate level with a mean value of M = 3.66 (SD = .883). Conversely, Item 26 (I am very polite to my students) has a low level in FTPV with mean, M = 2.18 (SD = .958) and a high level in FTK with a mean value of M = 3.81 (SD = .937).

J. of Technical Education and Training Vol. 16 No. 1 (2024) p. 131-147

Table 3 *Lecturers' perspective on their affective empathy*

		FPTV			FTK		
No	Item	Mean	SD	level	Mean	SD	level
20	I really care about my students	4.38	.807	High	4.41	.619	High
21	It bothers me a lot if I am late when meeting with students.	4.23	.768	High	4.15	.887	High
22	Friendship with students is fun, so I tend to mingle with them.	4.05	1.037	High	3.81	1.008	High
23	I find it easy to put myself in students' shoes.	4.05	.959	High	3.88	.930	High
24	If I say something that students are offended by, I don't say that again.	4.07	.764	High	4.14	.730	High
25	Seeing students cry really upsets me.	3.73	.784	High	3.66	.883	Moderate
26	I am very polite to my students.	2.18	.958	Low	3.81	.937	High
27	When I talk to students, I tend to talk about their experiences rather than my own.	3.92	.656	High	3.88	.811	High
28	It upsets me to see students in pain.	3.95	.677	High	3.83	.874	High
29	Students often say that I am sensitive towards them	3.63	1.102	Moderate	3.47	.953	Moderate
30	I can tune into how students feel rapidly and intuitively.	3.95	.677	High	3.75	.685	High
31	I tend to get emotionally involved with students' problems.	3.88	.853	High	3.86	.798	High
	Total	3.83	.995	High	3.89	.876	High

Table 4 *Students' perspective on lecturers' affective empathy*

		FPTV			FTK		
No	Item	Mean	SD	level	Mean	SD	level
20	The lecturers really care about students	4.04	.840	High	4.00	.806	High
21	The lecturers get upset if he/she is late for meeting with students.	3.88	.846	High	3.69	.874	High
22	The lecturers bother to be friendly and keep good relations with students.	3.85	.922	High	2.45	1.086	Moderate
23	The lecturers easily put himself/herself into students' shoes.	3.79	.938	High	3.58	1.002	Moderate
24	The lecturers avoid saying anything that offends students	3.77	.918	High	3.78	.923	High

No	Item	FPTV Mean	FTK SD			FPTV Mean	FTK SD
25	Seeing students cry make the lecturers upset.	3.51	.927	Moderate	3.36	.934	Moderate
26	The lecturers are very polite towards students.	3.63	.931	Moderate	3.43	.952	Moderate
27	The lecturers tend to talk about students experiences rather his/her own while having a discussion or conversation.	3.80	.809	High	3.62	.858	Moderate
28	The lecturers easily get upset when he/she sees students in pain.	3.66	.812	Moderate	3.54	.818	Moderate
29	The lecturers are sensitive towards students.	3.62	.854	Moderate	3.40	.878	Moderate
30	The lecturers tune into how students feel rapidly and intuitively.	3.75	.803	High	3.62	.766	Moderate
31	The lecturers tend to get emotionally involved with students' problems.	3.72	.895	High	3.54	.959	Moderate
	Total	3.75	.884	High	3.50	.975	Moderate

Table 4 focuses on the students' perspective. Overall, there is a notable difference in the feedback given by the students compared to the lecturers. The students rate the subscale as moderate in FTK and high in FPTV, with a mean of 3.50 and SD of .975 in FTK and a mean of 3.75 and SD of .884 in FPTV. Item 20, which asks if the lecturers care about their students, has the highest mean in both faculties at M = 4.04 in FPTV and M = 4.00 in FTK. However, more than half of the items are rated as moderate in FTK and high in FPTV. Four items (25, 26, 28, and 29) have moderate levels in both faculties, ranging from a mean value of M = 3.36 to M = 3.66.

4.3 Dual Perspectives of TVET Educators' Self-efficacy

This section reports on the mean and standard deviation of 13 items designed to measure the self-efficacy of TVET educators in classroom management, as perceived by both lecturers and students.

Table 5 presents data on the level of lecturers' self-efficacy in classroom management from the perspective of the lecturers themselves. The subscale consists of 13 items, and the table shows that the lecturers in both faculties have a high level of self-efficacy in classroom management, with a total mean of M=3.97 (SD=.980) for FPTV lecturers and M=4.15 (SD=.724) for FTK lecturers. The item with the highest mean score in FPTV is Item 33 (I am able to respond adequately to defiant students) with a mean of M=4.27 (SD=.679). In FTK, items 36 (I can take adequate measures that are necessary to keep activities running efficiently) and 42 (I can convey to students easily that I am serious about getting appropriate behavior) have the highest mean scores of M=4.25 (SD=.685). Overall, all items in both faculties are rated at a high level, except for Item 44 (I am able to execute multiple activities at once most of the time), which has a low-level mean score of M=1.75 (SD=.776) in FPTV.

Table 6 displays the level of lecturers' self-efficacy in managing classrooms as perceived by students. The results indicate that students and lecturers share a similar view of this construct, with students also rating their lecturers' self-efficacy as high. The mean average for FPTV is 4.04, SD = .807, and for FTK it is M = 3.82, SD = .861. Item 35 (The lecturers manage the class well) has the highest mean in both faculties, with M = 4.20 (SD = .754) in FPTV and M = 3.96 (SD = .814) in FTK. All items in both faculties are rated at a high level, except for item 39 (There are very few students that the lecturers cannot handle), which has a moderate level with a mean value of M = 3.69 (SD = 1.023) in FPTV and M = 3.59 (SD = 1.026) in FTK.

J. of Technical Education and Training Vol. 16 No. 1 (2024) p. 131-147

Table 5 *Lecturers' perspective on their self-efficacy in classroom management*

		FPTV			FTK		
No	Item	Mean	SD	level	Mean	SD	level
32	I can keep disruptive students involved in my lectures.	4.23	.733	High	4.05	.775	High
33	I am able to respond adequately to defiant students.	4.27	.679	High	4.15	.761	High
34	I can keep a few problem students from ruining an entire class.	4.13	.791	High	4.08	.677	High
35	I can manage my class very well.	4.25	.670	High	4.14	.706	High
36	I can take adequate measures that are necessary to keep activities running efficiently.	4.20	.723	High	4.25	.685	High
37	If a student disrupts a lesson, I am able to redirect him quickly.	4.05	.783	High	4.19	.776	High
38	I can get through to most difficult students.	4.13	.757	High	4.08	.749	High
39	I can handle almost all students in the class.	3.85	.893	High	4.12	.790	High
40	I am always able to make my expectations clear to my students.	4.18	.781	High	4.22	.645	High
41	If students stop working, I can put them back on track.	4.13	.686	High	4.22	.744	High
42	I can convey to students easily that I am serious about getting appropriate behavior.	4.25	.670	High	4.25	.685	High
43	I know what rules are appropriate for my students.	4.23	.660	High	4.14	.753	High
44	I am able to execute multiple activities at once most of the times.	1.75	.776	Low	4.08	.677	High
	Total	3.97	.98	High	4.15	.724	High

Table 6 *Students' perspective on lecturers' self-efficacy in classroom management*

		FPTV			FTK		
No	Item	Mean	SD	Level	Mean	SD	Level
32	The lecturers can keep me involved in the teaching and learning process.	4.17	.734	High	3.87	.885	High
33	The lecturers respond me adequately.	4.15	.723	High	3.88	.889	High
34	The lecturers manage to keep few problem students from ruining an entire class.	4.05	.744	High	3.82	.847	High
35	The lecturers manage the class well.	4.20	.754	High	3.96	.814	High
36	The lecturers keep ongoing activities efficiently.	4.20	.785	High	3.92	.827	High
37	If a student disrupts the teaching, the lecturers redirect him/her quickly.	3.94	.853	High	3.80	.806	High
38	The lecturers get through to most difficult students.	3.84	.843	High	3.68	.830	High
39	There are very few students that the lecturers cannot handle.	3.69	1.023	Moderate	3.59	1.026	Moderate
40	The lecturers always makes me clear about his/her expectations from me.	3.95	.804	High	3.80	.845	High
41	If I stop working on my learning, the lecturers put me on track.	3.95	.840	High	3.73	.865	High
42	The lecturers clearly communicate to students that he/she is serious about getting appropriate behavior.	4.08	.757	High	3.89	.838	High
43	The lecturers set clear rules for the class.	4.19	.676	High	3.91	.844	High
44	The lecturers are able to carry out multiple activities at once most of the times.	4.11	.745	High	3.86	.809	High
	Total	4.04	.807	High	3.82	.861	High

4.4 TVET Educators' Overall SES

The combined data for lecturers' and students' perspectives on lecturers' social and emotional skills (SES) is presented in Tables 7 and 8. The results indicate that lecturers and students from the Faculty of Technical and Vocational Education (FPTV) generally agree that the FPTV lecturers possess high levels of cognitive empathy, affective empathy, and self-efficacy in classroom management. However, in the Faculty of Engineering Technology (FTK), there is a discrepancy between lecturers' and students' perspectives. FTK lecturers believe that they possess high levels of cognitive and affective empathy as well as self-efficacy in classroom management, while their students perceive them to have moderate levels of cognitive and affective empathy, but high levels of self-efficacy in classroom management.

In summary, when the three subscales are taken together, lecturers from FPTV have a high level of SES as perceived by both themselves (M = 3.85, SD = .993) and their students (M = 3.87, SD = .867). On the other hand, lecturers from FTK have a high level of SES according to their own perspective (M = 3.99, SD = .851), but their students perceive them to have a moderate level of SES (M = 3.66, SD = .945).

J. of Technical Education and Training Vol. 16 No. 1 (2024) p. 131-147

Table 7 *Overall lecturers' perception on their level of SES*

		FPTV			FTK		
No	Item	Mean	SD	Level	Mean	SD	Level
1	Cognitive empathy	3.75	1.016	High	3.92	.931	High
2	Affective empathy	3.83	.995	High	3.89	.876	High
3	Self-efficacy in classroom management	3.97	.980	High	4.15	.724	High
	Total	3.85	.993	High	3.99	.851	High

Table 8 *Overall students' perception on level of lecturers' SES*

		FPTV			FTK		
No	Item	Mean	SD	Level	Mean	SD	Level
1	Cognitive empathy	3.83	.888	High	3.66	.973	Moderate
2	Affective empathy	3.75	.884	High	3.50	.975	Moderate
3	Self-efficacy in classroom management	4.04	.807	High	3.82	.861	High
	Total	3.87	.867	High	3.66	.945	Moderate

4.5 TVET Educators' SES: A Comparison of Educators' and Students' Perspectives

This section presents the findings related to the third research objective, which sought to determine the difference between lecturers' and students' perspectives on TVET educators' SES. The mean values obtained from the data analysis suggest that there might be a difference between the two perspectives, but to confirm this and obtain more reliable results, the Mann Whitney U Test was conducted. This test is an alternative to the T-Test and is used when the data does not meet the assumptions required for a T-Test. Table 9 and 10 show the results for the difference between both the perspectives based on overall items on the questionnaire.

Table 9 *Difference between the perspectives of lecturers and students on TVET educators' SES*

Group	N	Mean rank	Median
Lecturers	99	271.19	174
Students	373	227.29	165
Total	472		

Table 9 displays the mean rank and median for both lecturers and students to investigate the differences in their perceptions regarding TVET educators' socio-emotional skills (SES). The findings reveal that the mean rank and median values for lecturers stand at 271.19 and 165, respectively, which are notably higher than the corresponding values for students, which are 227.29 and 165, respectively. This disparity suggests that lecturers perceive their SES to be higher compared to the perceptions held by their students. Therefore, there is a noticeable and significant gap between the viewpoints of the two groups. This comparison highlights the differing perceptions and potentially underscores the variations in how lecturers and students evaluate socio-emotional skills within the educational environment.

Table 10 *Difference between the perspectives of lecturers and students on TVET educators' SES (overall)*

Mann Whitney U	15029.000
z-value	-2.847
Effect size	-0.1
p-value	.002

Table 10 shows that the p-value is .002, which is less than .05, indicating a significant difference between the perspectives of lecturers and students on SES. The values of U = 15029.000 and z-value = -2.847 further confirm the significant difference. However, the effect size of -0.1 suggests that the difference is small, accounting for only 10% of the total variance.

Furthermore, the difference between the perspectives of lecturers and students regarding lecturers' SES in terms of the subscales of cognitive empathy, affective empathy, and self-efficacy in classroom management is presented in Tables 11 and 12. In these tables, "CE" refers to cognitive empathy, "AE" refers to affective empathy, and "SECM" refers to self-efficacy in classroom management.

Table 11 *Difference between the perspectives of lecturers and students on TVET educators' SES (for each SES dimension)*

	Group	N	Mean rank	Median
CE	Lecturers	99	215.66	70
	Students	373	242.03	71
	Total	472		
AE	lecturers	99	283.68	45
	students	373	223.98	43
	Total	472		
SE	lecturers	99	267.53	53
	students	373	228.27	51
	Total	472		

The information in Table 11 shows the difference between lecturers' and students' perspectives on each subscale of SES. For cognitive empathy, the mean rank and median for lecturers is less than that of students, indicating that students perceive their lecturers to have more cognitive empathy than lecturers think of themselves. Conversely, for affective empathy, the mean rank and median for lecturers are higher than those for students, indicating that lecturers perceive themselves to have more affective empathy than their students perceive. For self-efficacy in classroom management, the mean rank and median for lecturers are higher than those for students, indicating that lecturers have higher levels of self-efficacy in classroom management than their students perceive.

Table 12 *Difference between the perspectives of lecturers and students on lecturers' SES (for each subscale)*

	CE	AE	SECM
Mann Whitney U	16400.000	13792.500	15392.000
z-value	-1.711	-3.876	-2.549
Effect size	-0.1	-0.2	-0.1
p-value	.040	.000	.005

Table 12 shows the results of the Mann Whitney U Test for the three subscales of SES. The p-values for cognitive empathy, affective empathy, and self-efficacy in classroom management are .040, .000, and .005 respectively. These values indicate a significant difference between the perspectives of lecturers and students. The effect sizes for these subscales are -0.1, -0.2, and -0.1 respectively, which show a small effect. The U values for cognitive empathy, affective empathy, and self-efficacy in classroom management are 16400.000, 13792.500, and 15392.000 respectively, while the z-values for these subscales are -1.711, -3.876, and -2.549 respectively.

4.6 Comparative Analysis of TVET Educators' SES by Faculty

This section presents the findings pertaining to the last research question of the study, which focuses on assessing the level of lecturers' SES across two faculties: FTPV and FTK. To ascertain any differences in the levels of lecturers' SES between these two faculties, the Mann-Whitney Test was employed, as the data did not meet the assumptions required to conduct a T-Test. The analysis involved segregating the responses based on the faculties of the respondents, rather than distinguishing between lecturers and students. Hence, all responses from lecturers and students at FPTV were grouped together, while those from FTK were considered as a separate group. Tables 13 and 14 present the overall disparities in lecturers' SES between the two faculties.

Table 13 *Difference in the level of lecturers' SES by faculties (overall)*

Group	N	Mean rank	Median
FPTV	212	256.62	170.50
FTK	260	220.09	163
Total	472		

Table 13 displays that FPTV lecturers have a mean rank of 256.62 and a median of 17.50, while FTK lecturers have a mean rank of 220.09 and a median of 163. This suggests that FPTV lecturers exhibit higher levels of SES compared to their counterparts in FTK.

J. of Technical Education and Training Vol. 16 No. 1 (2024) p. 131-147

Table 14 *Difference in the level of lecturers' SES by faculties (overall)*

Mann Whitney U	23294.000
z-value	-2.895
Effect size	-0.1
p-value	.002

Table 14 indicates that there is a significant difference in the level of lecturers' SES between two faculties. Because the p-value is less than .05 (p-value = 002), U = 23294.000, z-value = -2.895. Hence, the decision is to reject null hypothesis. However, the effect size explains 1% of the total variance that is -0.1. Furthermore, to have a detailed look at the difference between two faculties, table 4.19 and 4.20 shows the results according to each subscale.

Table 15 *Difference in the level of lecturers' SES between faculties (subscales)*

	Group	N	Mean rank	Median
CE	FPTV	212	252.23	72.50
	FTK	260	223.68	70
	Total	472		
AE	FPTV	212	260.66	45
	FTK	260	216.80	43
	Total	472		
SE	FPTV	212	254.38	52
	FTK	260	221.92	51
	Total	472		

Table 15 presents the cognitive empathy scores of FPTV and FTK lecturers. FPTV lecturers have a mean rank of 252.23 and a median of 72.50, whereas FTK lecturers exhibit a higher mean rank (223.68) and median (70). These findings suggest that FPTV lecturers demonstrate a higher level of cognitive empathy compared to their counterparts in FTK.

Similarly, regarding affective empathy, FPTV lecturers show a mean rank of 260.66 and a median of 45, whereas FTK lecturers have a lower mean rank (216.80) and median (43). This indicates that FPTV lecturers rank higher than FTK lecturers in affective empathy.

Furthermore, in terms of self-efficacy in classroom management, FPTV lecturers display a mean rank of 254.38 and a median of 52, surpassing FTK lecturers who have a lower mean rank (221.92) and median (51). These results suggest that FPTV lecturers exhibit higher levels of self-efficacy in classroom management compared to FTK lecturers.

Table 16 *Difference in the level of lecturers' SES between faculties (for each subscale)*

	CE	AE	SECM
Mann Whitney U	24225.500	22438.000	23768.500
z-value	-2.263	-3.479	-2.575
Effect size	-0.1	-0.2	-0.1
p-value	.012	.000	.005

In Table 16, the p-value for cognitive empathy is .012, indicating a significant difference between the levels of cognitive empathy among FTPV and FTK lecturers, with U = 24225.500, Z = -2.263, and r = -0.1. Similarly, for affective empathy, the p-value is .000, signifying a significant difference in affective empathy levels between lecturers from both faculties, with U = 22438.000, Z = -3.479, and r = -0.2. Furthermore, for self-efficacy in classroom management, the p-value of .005 suggests a difference in the levels of self-efficacy between lecturers from both faculties, with U = 23768.500, Z = -2.575, and r = -0.1.

5. Discussion and Implication

The research analyzed data to determine the extent to which TVET educators utilize the three dimensions of Social and Emotional Skills (SES) from the perspectives of lecturers and students and found that TVET educators from both FPTV and FTK faculties generally exhibit high SES levels. Notably, while FPTV students perceive their lecturers to excel across all SES dimensions, FTK students view their lecturers as having moderate levels of cognitive and affective empathy but high self-efficacy in classroom management.

Cognitive empathy refers to the capacity of educators to accurately grasp their students' thoughts and feelings according to Swan & Riley (2012). This skill is crucial as it helps TVET educators understand students' academic

and emotional needs, fostering a supportive educational environment. However, Walter (2012) emphasizes that cognitive empathy does not equate to sharing the same emotional experiences as students, for which affective empathy is necessary. Affective empathy involves a lecturer's compassion and responsiveness to students' emotions, enhancing a nurturing learning atmosphere. Despite TVET educators perceiving themselves as highly empathetic, FTK students report only moderate levels of educators' empathy. This disparity may have arisen from the intricate balance educators must maintain between empathizing with students and enforcing discipline to ensure a conducive learning environment. These actions, while essential, could be misconstrued as a lack of empathy.

The study also underscores lecturers' self-efficacy in managing classroom dynamics effectively, aligning with both lecturers' and students' perceptions of maintaining engagement and discipline. This high level of self-efficacy among lecturers contributes to a positive and focused learning environment. Interestingly, the study reveals a significant disparity between TVET educators and students' perceptions of educators' SES, affirming the initial hypothesis of the study. This aligns with existing literature indicating that lecturers often rate their interpersonal skills and teaching effectiveness higher than their students do, a phenomenon observed across different educational contexts (Maulana et al., 2011; Lalama, 2014; Maulana et al., 2012; Ben-Chaim & Zoller, 2001).

Furthermore, the comparative analysis between FPTV and FTK faculties aims to uncover whether educational focus (pedagogical versus technical) influences lecturers' SES. The findings suggest that FPTV lecturers, who are more immersed in educational psychology and pedagogy, exhibit higher SES levels compared to their FTK counterparts. This supports theories posited by researchers like Darling-Hammond (2000, 2016) and underscores the impact of professional education on enhancing educators' SES. Moreover, the study emphasizes the importance of comprehensive training for all lecturers, regardless of their specialization, to foster enhanced teaching methodologies and interpersonal skills. It also advocates for the establishment of external feedback mechanisms, such as student evaluations, to bridge the perception gap between lecturers and students regarding SES.

Summarily, the study sheds light on the varied perceptions of SES among TVET educators and students, the influence of educational backgrounds on SES, and the critical role of feedback and training in improving teaching effectiveness and interpersonal skills within the educational landscape.

These findings have vivid and profound implications for the educational landscape, particularly in the domains of pedagogy, policy, and professional development. Firstly, the gap between lecturers' and students' perceptions of Social and Emotional Skills (SES) opens a critical dialogue regarding the essence of effective teaching. It prompts an essential question: How well do our educators understand the emotional and social dynamics of their classrooms? This discrepancy underscores the imperative for enhanced training programs. Such programs, enriched with empathy, self-efficacy, and classroom management components, could bridge this perception gap, fostering a more attuned and responsive educational environment. Herein lies a proposition for academia to introspect and innovate, ensuring that educators are not just disseminators of knowledge but also adept facilitators of a supportive learning environment.

The study also calls for a reevaluation of curriculum development, especially in faculties tasked with shaping future educators. The integration of robust SES components within the curriculum could catalyze a paradigm shift, moving beyond traditional academic boundaries to embrace a more holistic educational approach. This transition is not merely an academic exercise but a profound transformation towards nurturing educators who are not only knowledgeable but also emotionally intelligent and empathetically engaged.

Moreover, the study's findings highlight the critical role of feedback systems in the educational framework. The evident mismatch between lecturers' self-assessments and student perceptions invites a reimagining of how feedback is gathered and utilized. Anonymity and candor in student feedback can serve as a lighthouse, guiding educators towards more effective and empathetic teaching practices. Here, we confront a cultural shift, advocating for openness, reflection, and ongoing improvement in teaching methodologies.

The study also provides some policy ramifications in TVET context. Policy revisions naturally follow as a significant implication. The findings serve as a call for policymakers to weave social and emotional competencies into the fabric of educational standards and teacher evaluations. This recalibration would not merely alter evaluation criteria but signify a deeper acknowledgment of the comprehensive nature of teaching effectiveness, aligning policy with the holistic needs of students.

Inter-faculty collaboration emerges as another intriguing discourse. The disparity between FPTV and FTK faculties in terms of SES opens avenues for cross-disciplinary learning. Could the empathetic approaches and classroom management strategies from one faculty enrich the pedagogical practices of another? This inter-faculty dialogue embodies the collaborative spirit of education, promoting a sharing of wisdom and techniques that transcend disciplinary confines.

Professional development and support stand out as pivotal. The journey of an educator is one of continuous learning and adaptation. The researchers recommend and advocate for an environment where educators are not only encouraged but also supported in their pursuit of enhancing SES. Workshops, mentoring, and resource

availability are but facets of a broader culture of professional growth, aligning the personal development of educators with the evolving dynamics of the modern classroom.

6. Limitation and Recommendation for Future Studies

One of the primary limitations that emerges is the scope of the study's demographic. Focusing predominantly on two specific faculties, FPTV and FTK, introduces a nuanced but significant boundary. While this focus allows for a detailed exploration within a controlled setting, it concurrently narrows the generalizability of the findings. A reflective view of this can be inferred by questioning: how might the insights gleaned from these faculties translate across the diverse educational environments? This limitation calls for a broader discourse on the applicability of research findings, urging future studies to bridge this gap through a more expansive demographic reach.

Additionally, the nature of self-reported data, particularly concerning the perception of Social and Emotional Skills (SES), presents its own set of challenges. The subjective nature of self-assessment and the potential for social desirability bias raise questions about the veracity of the data. This introspection leads us to ponder the complexities of measuring intangible qualities such as empathy and self-efficacy. Perhaps future studies can adopt a more diverse means of measurement that address the potential of social desirability bias accrued from self-report measures.

The study's reliance on quantitative methods, while yielding valuable statistical insights, inherently limits the depth of understanding regarding the individual experiences and contexts that shape educators' and students' perceptions. This acknowledgement opens a discourse on the value of mixed-method approaches, integrating qualitative elements that could enrich the narrative, providing a more holistic view of the educational landscape. Lastly, the cultural context within which the study is situated – presumably within a specific geographical and educational setting – presents a limitation in terms of cultural transferability. The intricacies of SES and its perception in educational settings are deeply intertwined with cultural norms and values. This recognition propels a conversation on the importance of cultural sensitivity and the need for research that is mindful of diverse educational ecosystems.

7. Conclusion

TVET is crucial for developing human capital and advancing a nation's economy, particularly in Malaysia. Enhancing the quality of TVET is crucial and largely depends on improving educator competence. Educators play a critical role, extending beyond skill and knowledge transfer to deeply engaging with students, understanding their perspectives, and managing classrooms effectively. They need to be adept in both soft skills (such as SES) and technical knowledge to guide students effectively. The study reveals that while TVET educators exhibit high levels of SES, there is a need for external feedback mechanisms to accurately assess and align educator effectiveness with student perceptions.

The study highlights a significant gap between TVET educators' self-perceived SES and student evaluations, suggesting that without addressing this disparity, student outcomes and teaching effectiveness may suffer. Therefore, feedback from students is crucial for lecturers and should be taken seriously by educational administrators and policymakers to improve teaching and learning environments.

Additionally, the assumption that subject knowledge alone makes one an effective teacher is challenged by the study. Effective teaching, especially in technical programs, requires targeted training to enhance pedagogical skills. Therefore, organizing specific training initiatives for educators is essential to bridge the gap between technical expertise and teaching efficacy, ultimately leading to more effective TVET instruction.

Acknowledgement

Communication of this research is made possible through monetary assistance by Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia.

Conflict of Interest

There is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of the paper.

Author Contribution

The authors confirm their contribution to the paper as follows: ***study conception and design:*** *Salma Dahri, Caleb Chidozie Chinedu;* ***data collection:*** *Salma Dahri;* ***analysis and interpretation of results:*** *Salma Dahri;* ***draft manuscript preparation:*** *Salma Dahri, Caleb Chidozie Chinedu, Mehwish Gull, Raquel Virginia Colcha Ortiz. All authors reviewed the results and approved the final version of the manuscript.*

References

Andersson, C., Johansson, P., & Waldenström, N. (2011). Do you want your child to have a certified teacher?. *Economics of Education Review*, *30*(1), 65-78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2010.07.003

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C., & Walker, D. (2013). Introduction to research in education: Cengage Learning. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 9-22. ISBN- 1285499735, 9781285499734

Baron-Cohen, S., & Wheelwright, S. (2004). The empathy quotient: an investigation of adults with Asperger syndrome or high functioning autism, and normal sex differences. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders*, *34*(2), 163-175. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:JADD.0000022607.19833.00

Bostic, T. B. (2006). Teacher empathy and its relationship to the standardized test scores of diverse secondary students: Virginia Commonwealth University. https://doi.org/10.25772/360R-RV40

Brouwers, A., Evers, W. J., & Tomic, W. (2001). Self-efficacy in eliciting social support and burnout among secondary-school teachers. *Journal of applied social psychology*, *31*(7), 1474-1491. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2001.tb02683.x

Cai, Y., Yang, Y., Ge, Q., & Weng, H. (2022). The interplay between teacher empathy, students' sense of school belonging, and learning achievement. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-022-00637-6

Coffey, H. (2010). "They taught me": The benefits of early community-based field experiences in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *26*(2), 335-342. https://www.learntechlib.org/p/196780/.

Dahri, S. (2018). *Social emotional skills (SES) among lecturers in relation students performance.* Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia. http://eprints.uthm.edu.my/271/1/24p%20SALMA%20DAHRI.pdf

Dahri, S., Yusof, Y., & Jabeen, S. (2021). Role of TVET Lecturers' Self-efficacy Towards Students' Performance. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry, 12*(10). ISSN-13096591

Darling-Hammond, L. (2016). Research on teaching and teacher education and its influences on policy and practice. *Educational Researcher*, *45*(2), 83-91. DOI:10.3102/0013189X16639597

Farmer, H., Xu, H., & Dupre, M. E. (2022). Self-efficacy *Encyclopedia of Gerontology and Population Aging* (pp. 4410-4413): Springer. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.25033-2

Gaudreau, N., Royer, É., Frenette, É., Beaumont, C., & Flanagan, T. (2013). Classroom behaviour management: The effects of in-service training on elementary teachers' self-efficacy beliefs. *McGill Journal of Education*, *48*(2), 359-382. DOI:10.7202/1020976ar

Hen, M., & Goroshit, M. (2016). Social–emotional competencies among teachers: An examination of interrelationships. *Cogent Education, 3*(1), 1151996. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1151996

Ismail, K., Nopiah, Z. M., & Rasul, M. S. (2020). Emotional intelligence and work performance among vocational teachers. *Journal of Technical Education and Training, 12*(3), 106-117. https://penerbit.uthm.edu.my/ojs/index.php/JTET/article/view/5969

Ismayilova, K., & Klassen, R. M. (2019). Research and teaching self-efficacy of university faculty: Relations with job satisfaction. *International Journal of Educational Research, 98*, 55-66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2019.08.012

Jennings, P. A. (2011). Promoting teachers' social and emotional competencies to support performance and reduce burnout. *Breaking the mold of pre-service and inservice teacher education: Innovative and successful practices for the 21st century*, 133-143. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2011.594615

Jennings, P. A., & Greenberg, M. T. (2009). The prosocial classroom: Teacher social and emotional competence in relation to student and classroom outcomes. *Review of educational research, 79*(1), 491-525. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308325693

Konstantakopoulos, G., Ioannidi, N., Patrikelis, P., & Gonidakis, F. (2020). Empathy, mentalizing, and cognitive functioning in anorexia nervosa and bulimia nervosa. *Social neuroscience, 15*(4), 477-488. https://doi.org/10.1080/17470919.2020.1760131

Lozano-Peña, G., Sáez-Delgado, F., López-Angulo, Y., & Mella-Norambuena, J. (2021). Teachers' Social–Emotional Competence: History, Concept, Models, Instruments, and Recommendations for Educational Quality. *Sustainability, 13*(21), 12142. https://doi.org/10.3390/su132112142

Lyons, P., & Bandura, R. (2019). Self-efficacy: core of employee success. *Development and Learning in Organizations: An International Journal, 33*(3), 9-12. https://doi.org/10.1108/DLO-04-2018-0045

Marrelli, A. F. (2007). Collecting data through case studies. *Performance Improvement*, *46*(7), 39-44. DOI:10.1002/pfi.148

Matthews-López, J. L. (2003). *Best practices and technical issues in cross-lingual, cross-cultural assessments: An evaluation of a test adaptation*. Ohio University. http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12424/3990602

Meyers, S., Rowell, K., Wells, M., & Smith, B. C. (2019). Teacher empathy: A model of empathy for teaching for student success. *College Teaching, 67*(3), 160-168. https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2019.1579699

Mohd Kamaruzaman, F., Hamid, R., Mutalib, A., & Rasul, M. (2019). Skills gap analysis: Satisfaction and expectation of engineering educators in Malaysia. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering, 8*(2), 447-454. ISSN: 2277-3878

Nasir, A. N. M., Ali, D. F., Noordin, M. K. B., & Nordin, M. S. B. (2011). *Technical skills and non-technical skills: predefinition concept.* Paper presented at the Proceedings of the IETEC'11 Conference, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. https://people.utm.my/dayanafarzeeha/files/2012/10/Non-technical-skills-for-technical-skilled-workers-in.pdf

Obeidat, B. Y., Al-Suradi, M. M., Masa'deh, R. e., & Tarhini, A. (2016). The impact of knowledge management on innovation: An empirical study on Jordanian consultancy firms. *Management Research Review, 39*(10), 1214-1238. https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-09-2015-0214

Ochieng, V. O., & Ngware, M. (2022). Whole youth development and employment: Exploring the nexus using qualitative data from a Kenyan study of Technical and Vocational Education and Training institutions. *Journal of Adult and Continuing Education, 28*(2), 558-594. https://doi.org/10.1177/14779714211037357

Omar, M. K., Zahar, F. N., & Rashid, A. M. (2020). Knowledge, skills, and attitudes as predictors in determining teachers' competency in Malaysian TVET institutions. *Universal Journal of Educational Research, 8*(3), 95-104. doi: 10.13189/ujer.2020.081612

Perera, H. N., & John, J. E. (2020). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs for teaching math: Relations with teacher and student outcomes. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 61*, 101842. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101842

Rumjaun, A., & Narod, F. (2020). Social Learning Theory—Albert Bandura. *Science education in theory and practice: An introductory guide to learning theory*, 85-99. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-43620-9_7

Shakir, R. (2009). Soft skills at the Malaysian institutes of higher learning. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, *10*, 309-315. DOI:10.1007/s12564-009-9038-8

Squier, R. (2021). The Development of the Concept of Empathy in Freud's Writing. *Academia Letters*, *2*. https://doi.org/10.20935/AL1536

Stojiljković, S., Djigić, G., & Zlatković, B. (2012). Empathy and teachers' roles. *Procedia-social and behavioral sciences*, *69*, 960-966. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.12.021

Stojiljković, S., Todorović, J., Đigić, G., & Dosković, Z. (2014). Teachers' self-concept and empathy. *Procedia-social and behavioral sciences*, *116*, 875-879. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.313

Tennant, M., McMullen, C., & Kaczynski, D. (2009). *Teaching, learning and research in higher education: A critical approach*: Routledge. ISBN 9780415962636

Thornberg, R., Forsberg, C., Hammar Chiriac, E., & Bjereld, Y. (2022). Teacher–student relationship quality and student engagement: A sequential explanatory mixed-methods study. *Research papers in education, 37*(6), 840-859. https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2020.1864772

Wang, L. (2022). Exploring the relationship among teacher emotional intelligence, work engagement, teacher self-efficacy, and student academic achievement: A moderated mediation model. *Frontiers in psychology, 12*, 810559. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.810559

Wink, M. N., LaRusso, M. D., & Smith, R. L. (2021). Teacher empathy and students with problem behaviors: Examining teachers' perceptions, responses, relationships, and burnout. *Psychology in the Schools, 58*(8), 1575-1596. doi: 10.1002/pits.22516