Public School Teachers' Emotional Intelligence Vis-A-Vis Work Performance and Engagement

Venus F. Marquez[1]* & Lalaine P. Catoto [2] & William A. Buquia [3]
[1]*Department of Education*

Abstract — This study researches the relationship between teachers' emotional intelligence and their work performance and engagement, recognizing socio-emotional competence as a key factor for sustaining instructional quality and professional well-being. It pursued a descriptive-correlational design, where data from public secondary school teachers were gathered using Likert-type instruments with established psychometric properties for both emotional intelligence and engagement; for work performance, official ratings were used. The instrument was expert-validated and had excellent internal consistency estimates. Stringent ethical procedures were followed at data collection to ensure confidentiality and voluntariness of participation. Results revealed that teachers have moderate emotional intelligence, although marked by significant difficulties in emotional regulation and social-emotional awareness, and that their levels of engagement were generally low: behavioral, emotional, and cognitive. Despite these trends, teachers obtained very satisfactory performance ratings. Significant positive correlations emerged among emotional intelligence, engagement, and work performance, indicative of higher emotional competence translating to increased professional involvement and productivity. These findings point out the primordial role of emotional intelligence in shaping teachers' motivation, well-being, and effectiveness. The present study concludes that developing the emotional competence of teachers is imperative in enhancing and sustaining engagement and performance and thus calls for a targeted, data-driven intervention framed within the current frameworks of professional development.

Keywords: Emotional Intelligence, Work Performance, Teacher Engagement, Socio-Emotional Skills, Professional Development

I.   INTRODUCTION

This study explored the impact of teachers' emotional intelligence on work performance and engagement in a context where teacher quality, well-being, and professional effectiveness are the focal concerns of policy. Contemporarily, the literature positions EI as one of the prime competencies that underpin adaptability, resilience, and sustained motivation; however, empirical investigation into its direct relation to work performance and engagement in the real-world school ecology is sparse. Using a descriptive-correlational design, the study measured teachers' emotional intelligence, behavioral-emotional-cognitive engagement, and work performance using validated Likert-type scales supplemented by corroborating official rating evidence. The instrument was subject to expert validation and had high internal consistency. Ethical protocols assured confidentiality and voluntary participation, while the testing process was conducted in coordination with the authorities.

Results showed a moderate level of emotional intelligence, with identified weaknesses in emotional regulation and social–emotional awareness, and generally low levels of teacher engagement. However, teachers showed good ratings in performance appraisal. Strong positive correlations have been found among emotional intelligence, engagement, and work performance, which implies that emotionally competent teachers are more likely to become more motivated and productive. The study concludes that emotional intelligence is a fundamental resource that strengthens professional commitment and performance, and it suggests that embedding EI-focused capacity-building into existing professional development systems may usefully enhance teacher engagement and effectiveness.

Literature Review

Emotional intelligence has been widely recognized as an integral part of teacher competency and contributes to instructional quality, classroom relationships, and professional well-being. Some researchers, Valente and Lourenço (2020), have viewed emotional regulation as

critical in mitigating burnout while enhancing empathy and leadership. Valiente et al. (2020) held that emotional literacy serves to support the building of inclusive learning environments; however, these works are only lightly grounded empirically within performance-oriented systems. Poulou and Denham (2022) identified teachers' social and emotional awareness as predictive of a positive classroom climate. Unfortunately, the conceptual model did not extend to observable, measurable outcomes such as work performance or professional engagement. Rahman (2023) highlighted relationship management as central in the prevention of learner disengagement but gave no linkage of EI to productivity indicators. Gaps still occur within the literature on engagement. Sabri (2024) confined engagement to technology-mediated participation; Cortellazzo et al. (2021), Rethman (2020), and Lo (2020) discuss relevant issues with students rather than with the teachers as agents of engagement. Local conceptual works have emphasized the importance of EI for teacher resilience and classroom management. These studies only infrequently link EI into standardized performance systems or into multi-dimensional engagement constructs. Empirical theses and dissertations reinforce the role of EI in predicting teacher effectiveness, coping, and job satisfaction. Still, most of the studies look at EI and performance in isolation, omit engagement as a key variable, or do not use standardized performance metrics. In view of the foregoing, the extant literature corroborates EI as an indispensable aspect of teacher functioning but discloses gaps regarding how it relates to work performance and engagement within an accountability framework-an empirical gap that the present study attempts to address.

II.   METHODOLOGY

A descriptive–correlational design was used to establish teachers' levels of emotional intelligence, work engagement, and work performance and investigate the interrelationships among these constructs without manipulating any variable. Stratified random sampling was conducted by organizing the teachers into subpopulations according to their respective schools and then selecting proportionate samples to ensure proportional representation of every level or stratum. The respondents were measured using a four-part instrument covering: (1) demographic profiling, (2) assessment of emotional intelligence across four domains, (3) evaluation of behavioral–emotional–

cognitive engagement, and (4) collection of official work performance ratings through standardized measures. The instrument had undergone expert review, pilot testing, and refinement to ensure clarity and relevance to yield an excellent validity index with a reliability coefficient of 0.970. After securing formal approvals, orientations had been conducted, and informed consent had been secured before the actual data gathering. The questionnaires had been administered personally by the investigator, with standardized instructions given, ensuring that the respondents would complete the instruments in a conducive environment, while retrieving the official performance rating through authorized channels. All responses had been coded for confidentiality purposes and securely stored for the duration of the study. Scheduling conflicts, hesitancy of some respondents, and external disruptions had been overcome through continuous coordination and reiteration of ethical safeguards. Descriptive statistics had been used to summarize profiles, emotional intelligence, engagement, and performance levels, while nonparametric tests-Spearman's rho, Chi-square, Mann–Whitney U, and Kruskal–Wallis-were run after verifying the non-normality of the data distribution through the Shapiro–Wilk test to determine significant associations and group differences.

Research Design

The research design was descriptive–correlational, aimed at determining the levels of emotional intelligence, work engagement, and work performance among teachers and investigating their interrelationships without intervention on variables. Emotional intelligence was measured by using four dimensions: emotional awareness, emotional management, social–emotional awareness, and relationship management. Engagement was indicated by three dimensions: behavioral, emotional, and cognitive. Teachers' work performance was measured by using official performance ratings of the corresponding school year. This design allowed for the determination of patterns, relationships, and group differences among variables with naturally occurring data. All statistical procedures were calculated at an $\alpha = .05$ level of significance to maintain a conservative and objective assessment of relationships in the dataset.

Sample of the Study

The sample consists of public secondary school teachers who were selected using stratified random sampling to ensure that the proportion allocated to each school was representative and varied in both teacher profiles and working environments. Teachers were first stratified by their institutions, and a proportionate number of respondents was then randomly selected from each stratum to minimize bias in sampling and enhance generalizability. The sampling was suitable, considering that the population exhibits heterogeneous characteristics and the study intended to estimate the relationships between emotional intelligence, work engagement, and work performance with precision. The sample consisted of 151 teachers in total. The frequency, percentage, and mean were used to summarize respondents' profiles, emotional intelligence, engagement level, and performance level descriptively. Spearman's rho was used to examine the relationships among variables due to the ordinal nature of the data and non-parametric distribution, which, therefore, allowed for an objective analysis of the direction and strength of associations.

Measures

This involved using a four-component research instrument that was developed for the quantitative data collection needed on teachers' profiles, emotional intelligence, engagement, and work performance. Profile: Demographic characteristics were gathered using fixed-choice items to ensure uniform and analyzable responses. Emotional Intelligence: It assessed emotional intelligence in four domains: emotional awareness, emotional management, social-emotional awareness, and relationship management. An adapted five-point Likert scale was used, which had its basis in the more well-known EI frameworks. Engagement: It measured engagement through five-point scales in parallel that captured behavioral, emotional, and cognitive involvement in professional tasks. Work performance data were sourced from official performance ratings in the same school year, providing objective indicators using standardized frameworks for evaluation. The instrument developed herein followed an extensive validation process: three expert validators reviewed all the items with respect to clarity and relevance, and a pilot testing involving 30 teachers

from a nearby district was conducted to revise wording and ensure contextual appropriateness. Reliability testing resulted in Cronbach's alpha of .970, which indicates high internal consistency for all the components of the scale and provides justification for the suitability of the instrument for further statistical analyses..

Procedure

The research study was conducted in a systematic way, which first involved the acquisition of institutional approvals and an orientation briefings aimed at informing respondents about the purposes, procedures, risks, benefits, and confidentiality of the research. Informed consent in writing was sought before the actual collection of data commenced. The questionnaires were administered personally by the researcher; standardized instructions were given, and scheduling was arranged in order not to disrupt duties unnecessarily. Workplace performance ratings were retrieved through authorized channels. Completed instruments and performance records were coded for anonymity and data protection, then stored securely. Logistical difficulties imposed by scheduling conflicts, possible respondent reluctance, and extraneous disturbances were minimized through continual coordination and clear explanation of ethical safeguards. Refinement of the instrument took place during the pilot testing of the items, which were revised for clarity and contextual relevance. Its content was validated by three experts; the resultant validity index was 4.87, interpreted as excellent, meaning the instrument had adequate representation of the constructs of interest. All these procedures, taken cumulatively, have ensured the ethical compliance, methodological soundness, and overall credibility of the data collection.

Data Processing

Data analysis was done through descriptive and inferential statistical procedures congruent with the research objectives. Descriptive statistics involved frequency counts and percentages to summarize the demographic profiles of the respondents, while weighted means and standard

deviations described the levels of emotional intelligence, engagement, and work performance based on official rating records. Given the nature of the data as ordinal, from Likert-scaled responses, Spearman's rho was used to explore relationships among variables within this correlational design. Group differences were further assessed through Chi-Square, Kruskal–Wallis, and Mann–Whitney U tests. Before these analyses, data normality was checked using the Shapiro–Wilk test; accordingly, emotional intelligence, engagement, and performance were found to be non-normally distributed, which justified the use of non-parametric methods. The combined descriptive summaries through normality testing, using appropriate inferential tools, ensured methodological rigor in interpreting the dataset for valid relationships and variations.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Teachers' Perceived Level of Emotional Intelligence

The perceived degree of emotional intelligence by the teachers themselves is a crucial factor in shaping classroom interactions, professional development, and student learning outcomes. The four principal dimensions emotional awareness, emotional regulation, social-emotional awareness, and relationship management-are interrelated and taken together illustrate how teachers recognize, regulate, and deploy emotions within their professional practice.

TABLE 1
TEACHERS' PERCEIVED LEVEL OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE IN TERMS OF EMOTIONAL AWARENESS

Item	Mean	Interpretation
6. Recognizing personal emotions during classroom interactions.	2.55	Low Level
7. Identifying triggers that affect teaching behavior.	3.37	Moderate Level
8. Monitoring one's moods while performing school tasks.	2.50	Low Level
9. Acknowledging feelings that influence decision-making.	4.30	Very High Level
10. Observing body language that reflects personal emotions.	3.38	Moderate Level
11. Becoming aware of emotional strengths and weaknesses.	2.44	Low Level
12. Reflecting on how emotions affect professional practice.	2.41	Low Level
13. Realizing the connection between emotions and learner outcomes.	1.62	Very Low Level
14. Accepting feedback regarding emotional expressions.	2.52	Low Level
15. Understanding personal emotional states during stress.	1.54	Very Low Level
Overall Mean	**2.66**	**Moderate Level**

Legend: 4.21-5.00= Very High Level; 3.41-4.20= High Level; 2.61-3.40= Moderate Level; 1.81-2.60= Low Level; 1.00-1.80= Very Low Level

Table 1 shows that teachers' emotional awareness stands at a Moderate level (M = 2.66), reflecting inconsistency in recognizing and reflecting upon their emotions. At the same time, the highest-scoring indicator was recognizing the feelings that drive decision-making (M = 4.30, Very High); this suggests that teachers have a sense of how emotions drive their decisions, which is critical in managing professional practice. On the contrary, the item which was scored lowest was understanding one's emotional state in stress conditions (M = 1.54, Very Low), indicating problems with maintaining emotional clarity when there is pressure. This difference implies that whereas it is possible for teachers to detect emotions within themselves in everyday situations, they struggle when things get stressful, and that constitutes the limitation that can indeed impact classroom management and interpersonal dynamics. Since educators operate in very demanding settings, there is a need to enhance emotional literacy. As Mérida-López and Extremera (2020) argue, high emotional awareness ensures resilience and adaptability, and thus intervention programs-which could include mindfulness, reflective journaling, and guided self-assessment-may improve the emotional awareness of teachers and, therefore, their effectiveness.

TABLE 2
TEACHERS' PERCEIVED LEVEL OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE IN TERMS OF EMOTIONAL MANAGEMENT

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. Regulating emotions when facing classroom challenges.	1.70	Very Low Level
2. Controlling frustration in stressful situations.	1.41	Very Low Level
3. Maintaining composure during conflicts.	2.50	Low Level
4. Managing stress through positive coping strategies.	1.83	Low Level
5. Balancing emotions to remain objective in decisions.	2.59	Low Level
6. Demonstrating patience in dealing with disruptive learners.	3.33	Moderate Level
7. Adjusting emotional reactions to classroom situations.	2.58	Low Level
8. Avoiding impulsive responses during heated discussions.	3.11	Moderate Level
9. Practicing calmness in times of pressure.	3.42	Moderate Level
10. Sustaining optimism when facing difficulties.	2.36	Low Level
Overall Mean	**2.48**	**Low Level**

Legend: *4.21-5.00= Very High Level; 3.41-4.20= High Level; 2.61-3.40= Moderate Level; 1.81-2.60= Low Level; 1.00-1.80= Very Low Level*

Table 2: Teachers' emotional management is at a low level, with an average of 2.48 points, which reflects difficulty in managing emotions in demanding or stressful contexts. The highest-rated indicator-exhibiting calmness under pressure (M = 3.42, Moderate)-suggests a certain capacity for composure, though this is maintained irregularly across contextures. The lowest-rated item-controlling frustration in stressful situations (M = 1.41, Very Low)-highlights the presence of substantial obstacles to keeping negative emotions under control and thus negatively affects classroom climate and student engagement. These findings reveal a pressing need to enhance coping and regulation skills among teachers since deficiencies in emotional management engender burnout and concurrently lead to degraded instructional efficacy. As pointed out by Carvalho et al. (2022), the weaker the emotional regulation among teachers, the greater the psychological stress; thus, structured wellness initiatives in the form of resilience training, counseling support, and stress-reduction programs become highly imperative to build healthier emotional responses and improve professional functioning..

TABLE 3
TEACHERS' PERCEIVED LEVEL OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE IN TERMS OF SOCIAL EMOTIONAL AWARENESS

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. Recognizing learners' emotions through verbal and nonverbal cues.	1.80	Very Low Level
2. Understanding colleagues' feelings during collaboration.	3.44	High Level
3. Showing empathy for learners' personal struggles.	3.36	Moderate Level
4. Considering cultural differences in social interactions.	3.19	Moderate Level
5. Interpreting group dynamics in classroom settings.	1.85	Low Level
6. Responding appropriately to students' emotional needs.	1.90	Low Level
7. Acknowledging teachers' and staff members' perspectives.	3.16	Moderate Level
8. Valuing inclusivity in professional relationships.	2.62	Moderate Level
9. Observing social cues to guide responses.	1.81	Low Level
10. Supporting learners with sensitivity to their situations.	2.43	Low Level
Overall Mean	**2.56**	**Low Level**

Legend: *4.21-5.00= Very High Level; 3.41-4.20= High Level; 2.61-3.40= Moderate Level; 1.81-2.60= Low Level; 1.00-1.80= Very Low Level*

Table 3 indicates that teachers reveal a Low level of social-emotional awareness, with a mean of 2.56, which reflects difficulties in the process of recognizing others' emotions and responding appropriately. Although the item related to understanding colleagues' feelings during collaboration received the highest rating-mean of 3.44, categorized as High-which suggests adequate empathy in peer relations, the item most rarely rated was recognizing learners' emotions through verbal and non-verbal cues, which had a mean of 1.80, Very Low. This indicates a considerable lag in identifying the emotional needs of the students. This is a skill considered problematic because effective teaching relies to a great measure on relational understanding, and not being able to detect the emotions of learners may impede the timely support of disconnected or struggling students. These findings bring into focus the need for improving the skills of teachers in emotional attunement. As Jennings et al. (2020) illustrate, social-emotional competence is a powerful predictor of classroom quality and student engagement. Thus, targeted training in empathy, active listening, and culturally responsive practices may become necessary to enhance the social awareness and responsiveness of teachers.

TABLE 4
TEACHERS' PERCEIVED LEVEL OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE IN TERMS OF RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. Building trust with learners, colleagues, and stakeholders.	3.18	Moderate Level
2. Encouraging teamwork in school activities.	4.13	High Level
3. Promoting collaboration with parents and partners.	4.05	High Level
4. Resolving conflicts constructively among peers.	1.90	Low Level
5. Motivating learners through supportive communication.	1.65	Low Level
6. Developing rapport with teachers and staff.	2.87	Moderate Level
7. Strengthening partnerships with the community.	2.31	Low Level
8. Guiding learners in managing peer relationships.	2.87	Moderate Level
9. Fostering a positive classroom environment.	2.66	Moderate Level
10. Sustaining professional relationships with respect and care.	3.13	Moderate Level
Overall Mean	**2.88**	**Moderate Level**

Legend: *4.21-5.00= Very High Level; 3.41-4.20= High Level; 2.61-3.40= Moderate Level; 1.81-2.60= Low Level; 1.00-1.80= Very Low Level*

Table 4 shows that teachers' relationship management skills are at a Moderate level: the average is 2.88. Such a result testifies that, though educators can create conditions for collaboration in some contexts, their ability to maintain robust, supportive relationships among different stakeholders is variable. The highest-rated item is encouraging teamwork in school activities: the mean equals 4.13, which corresponds to a High score. Such a result demonstrates efficiency within standardized collaborative settings. At the same time, the lowest-rated item is motivating learners through appealing and supportive communication. Its mean of 1.65 corresponds to a Low score, thus revealing difficulties in sustaining positive motivational contacts with students. Such a discrepancy indicates that institutional collaboration is a strong point, while personalized student-centered communication is a weak one. According to De Stasio et al. (2020), effective relationship management strengthens motivation, reduces conflict, and benefits school climates. Therefore, focused training in motivational communication and stakeholder inclusion can enhance teachers' relational competencies and improve learner outcomes.

Level of Teachers Work Performance Based on IPCRF Rating

This section outlines the extent of teachers' work performance as evaluated through the IPCRF. The results provide an overview of the extent to which teachers meet professional standards and carry out their responsibilities in accordance with the established performance appraisal system.

TABLE 5

LEVEL OF TEACHERS WORK PERFORMANCE BASED ON IPCRF RATING

	Frequency	Percentage
Outstanding	-	-
Very Satisfactory	151	100.00
Satisfactory	-	-
Unsatisfactory	-	-
Poor	-	-
Total	**151**	**100.00**

Legend: *4.21-5.00= Outstanding; 3.41-4.20= Very Satisfactory; 2.61-3.40= Satisfactory; 1.81-2.60= Unsatisfactory; 1.00-1.80= Poor*

Table 5 shows that all teachers obtained a "Very Satisfactory" rating on the IPCRF, without any single respondent obtaining an Outstanding or Unsatisfactory rating. The consistency implies a homogenous adherence to standards of performance, but the absence of variation in ratings tends to belie the presence of limited differentiation in appraisal results and possible rater clustering for the evaluators. While such consistency may reassure a minimum competency threshold, it cannot capture best practices nor create incentives for innovation. Similarly, Manalo and de la Cruz (2021) note that performance systems often center on accountability and do not recognize exceptional performance. Qualitative feedback, peer recognition, and evidence-based indicators should add to the developmental function of performance appraisals and encourage teachers to strive for higher levels of excellence.

Teachers' Perceived Level of Engagement

This section describes the levels of teachers' perceived engagement along the dimensions of behavioral, emotional, and cognitive aspects. Looking at these facets provides insights into the degree of commitment a teacher displays to their instructional role, school activities, and motivation to continue within the profession of teaching.

TABLE 6
TEACHERS' PERCEIVED LEVEL OF ENGAGEMENT IN TERMS OF
BEHAVIORAL ENGAGEMENT

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. Attending school regularly and punctually.	3.35	Moderate Level
2. Participating actively in meetings and activities.	2.32	Low Level
3. Completing assigned tasks on time.	1.68	Very Low Level
4. Involving oneself in school committees and projects.	1.55	Very Low Level
5. Demonstrating diligence in classroom responsibilities.	3.12	Moderate Level
6. Supporting extracurricular activities of learners.	2.30	Low Level
7. Volunteering in school and community events.	1.57	Very Low Level
8. Following school rules and professional standards.	4.09	High Level
9. Taking initiative in school-based innovations.	1.40	Very Low Level
10. Contributing effort to achieve school goals.	1.60	Very Low Level
Overall Mean	**2.30**	**Low Level**

Legend: 4.21-5.00= Very High Level; 3.41-4.20= High Level; 2.61-3.40= Moderate Level; 1.81-2.60= Low Level; 1.00-1.80= Very Low Level

Table 6 shows that teachers' behavioral engagement is described as Low (M = 2.30), reflecting compliance limited to merely fulfilling expectations. The highest rated item, which deals with following school rules and professional standards (M = 4.09, High), reflects good adherence to expectations, while the lowest rated item refers to initiative in leading school-based innovations, which teachers had difficulties or were reluctant to lead (M = 1.40, Very Low). This contrast suggests a culture of compliance rather than one that inspires proactive engagement. According to Skinner and Pitzer (2021), teacher-led innovation is critical if schools are to undergo deep and sustained improvement. Hence, providing incentives, recognition, and leadership opportunities may improve teachers' behavioral engagement and engender a more proactive professional climate.

TABLE 7
TEACHERS' PERCEIVED LEVEL OF ENGAGEMENT IN TERMS OF EMOTIONAL ENGAGEMENT

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. Expressing enthusiasm in teaching responsibilities.	1.88	Low Level
2. Showing passion for student learning and growth.	1.77	Very Low Level
3. Demonstrating commitment to the teaching profession.	3.27	Moderate Level
4. Valuing positive relationships with colleagues.	3.18	Moderate Level
5. Enjoying collaboration with parents and stakeholders.	1.93	Low Level
6. Feeling motivated to perform tasks beyond requirements.	1.54	Very Low Level
7. Sustaining a sense of belonging to the school community.	2.38	Low Level
8. Taking pride in learners' achievements.	3.21	Moderate Level
9. Appreciating recognition from peers and superiors.	4.08	High Level
10. Finding fulfillment in daily teaching tasks.	1.46	Very Low Level
Overall Mean	**2.47**	**Low Level**

Legend: 4.21-5.00= Very High Level; 3.41-4.20= High Level; 2.61-3.40= Moderate Level; 1.81-2.60= Low Level; 1.00-1.80= Very Low Level

Table 7 shows that teachers are classified as Low with a mean score of 2.47, reflecting low enthusiasm and greater external than internal motivation. The highest-ranking item—appreciation by colleagues and superiors, with a mean of 4.08, classified as High—suggests the preference for external validation, while the lowest-ranking item—finding satisfaction in teaching routine tasks,

with a mean of 1.46, classified as Very Low—tells of weak intrinsic motivation. This discrepancy is of concern because long-term professional commitment depends on an internalized sense of professional purpose. Emotionally engaged teachers have been found by Collie (2021) to be more effective and remain longer in their jobs. Thus, strategies relating to school culture enhancement, recognition mechanisms, and well-being initiatives could increase emotional engagement among teachers and restore meaning to everyday teaching.

TABLE 8
TEACHERS' PERCEIVED LEVEL OF ENGAGEMENT IN TERMS OF COGNITIVE ENGAGEMENT

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. Applying creativity in designing lessons.	1.67	Very Low Level
2. Reflecting on teaching practices for improvement.	2.33	Low Level
3. Seeking new strategies to enhance instruction.	2.41	Low Level
4. Engaging in continuous professional development.	4.18	High Level
5. Integrating ICT in classroom teaching.	2.37	Low Level
6. Analyzing learners' needs to improve strategies.	1.71	Very Low Level
7. Generating innovative ideas for classroom activities.	2.09	Low Level
8. Adapting teaching methods to learners' differences.	2.18	Low Level
9. Evaluating outcomes of instructional practices.	1.65	Very Low Level
10. Sustaining focus on long-term teaching goals.	1.58	Very Low Level
Overall Mean	**2.22**	**Low Level**

Legend: 4.21-5.00= Very High Level; 3.41-4.20= High Level; 2.61-3.40= Moderate Level; 1.81-2.60= Low Level; 1.00-1.80= Very Low Level

Table 8 shows that teachers' cognitive engagement is at a Low Level, with a mean of 2.22, which reflects little reflection, creativity, and long-term professional planning despite participation in formal development activities. The highest-rated item-participation in continuous professional development-received a mean of 4.18, or High-suggests mere compliance with training requirements, while the lowest-rated indicator-maintaining focus on long-term teaching goals-received a mean of 1.58, or Very Low-points to challenges in maintaining reflective and goal-directed practice. This pattern suggests that professional development is attended but not internalized or translated into sustained improvement. As found by Huang et al. (2021), more fully

engaged cognitive states relate to enhanced adaptiveness and improved student outcomes, underlining the necessity for schools to support professional learning communities, mentoring, and collaborative innovation in order to promote deeper, more sustained cognitive engagement in teachers.

Significant Relationship Between the Teachers' Perceived Level of Emotional Intelligence and Their Work Performance Based on IPCRF Rating, and

Perceived Level of Engagement

This section explores the significant interrelationship among perceived emotional intelligence by teachers, job performance as rated in the IPCRF rating, and their engagement level. An analysis of such interrelationships yields deeper insights into the way in which emotional competencies influence both professional effectiveness and active participation in school responsibilities.

TABLE 9
SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TEACHERS' PERCEIVED LEVEL OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND THEIR WORK PERFORMANCE BASED ON IPCRF RATING, AND PERCEIVED LEVEL ENGAGEMENT

Correlates	n	Rho	Level of Sig	p-value	Interpretation
Teachers' Perceived Level of Emotional Intelligence Teachers' Work Performance Based on IPCRF Rating		-.191		.019	Significant
Teachers' Perceived Level of Emotional Intelligence Perceived Level of Engagement	151	.886	0.05	.000	Significant
Teachers' Work Performance Based on IPCRF Rating Perceived Level of Engagement		-.272		.001	Significant

Table 9 shows nuanced associations within teachers' emotional intelligence and their work performance and engagement. Emotional Intelligence is significantly but negatively associated with work performance, with a Rho of –.191 and a p-value of .019. This means that in this sample, higher self-reported EI does not correspond to higher IPCRF ratings. This is not surprising given the standardized and clustered nature of performance ratings. In contrast, EI is strongly positively related to engagement, with a Rho of .886 and a p = .000. This indicates that emotionally intelligent teachers are much more motivated, committed, and collaborative. A negative correlation between work performance and engagement, though significant at Rho = –.272 and p = .001, further supports that formal performance ratings may not reflect how emotionally invested or enthusiastic teachers are about their jobs. The findings here align with Jennings et al. (2020) and Collie (2021), who argue that emotional intelligence is a significant predictor of engagement and well-being and that performance tools cannot capture the relational and affective dimensions of teaching. This points to the importance of supplementing formal assessments with measures that capture the full range of teachers' contributions.

IV.   CONCLUSION

The study reports that the teaching workforce is dominated by young to mid-career educators who, while meeting institutional performance expectations, need ongoing academic and professional development to consolidate their competence and emotional preparedness. Teachers had functional but suboptimal emotional intelligence, with significant lacunas in emotional regulation and social-emotional awareness that may compromise their ability to manage stress and respond sensitively to learners' needs. Engagement was generally low on behavioral, emotional, and cognitive dimensions, suggesting participation is driven more by obligation than intrinsic motivation. While teachers consistently met performance expectations, the lack of differentiation in appraisal outcomes suggests full recognition and cultivation of excellence in current systems. Most importantly, the robust associations among emotional intelligence, engagement, and work performance underscore emotional intelligence as a foundation resource that adds value to productivity, commitment, and professional well-being overall. The findings reinforce intentional

and continuous efforts aimed at developing teachers' emotional competencies to elevate engagement and optimize performance; implicitly, embedding structured EI-focused capacity-building into existing professional development frameworks would be timely and beneficial.

REFERENCES

[1.] Carvalho, V. S., Chambel, M. J., Neto, M., & Lopes, S. (2022). Teacher stress and burnout: The role of emotional regulation and coping strategies. *European Journal of Education and Psychology, 15*(1), 45–59. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2022.2031542

[2.] Collie, R. J. (2021). Teacher well-being, engagement, and commitment in schools: Exploring the role of school climate. *Educational Psychology, 41*(3), 230–247. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2021.1902119

[3.] Cortellazzo, L., Bruni, E., & Zampieri, R. (2021). Emotional and social competencies gained through extracurricular activities. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12.*

[4.] De Stasio, S., Fiorilli, C., Benevene, P., Boldrini, F., Ragni, B., Pepe, A., & Maldonado Briegas, J. J. (2020). Subjective happiness and compassion are enough to increase teachers' work engagement? *Frontiers in Psychology, 10,* Article 2708. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02708

[5.] Dela Cruz, M. (2021). Emotional regulation strategies of Filipino public school teachers. *Asian Journal of Educational Research, 9*(3), 41–53.

[6.] Gonzaga, A., & Ramos, K. J. (2022). Emotional regulation and classroom discipline practices of junior high teachers. *Visayas Journal of Education, 18*(1), 24–37.

[7.] Huang, S., Yin, H., & Lv, L. (2021). Job characteristics and teacher well-being: The mediation of teacher self-efficacy and the moderation of cognitive engagement. *Educational Psychology, 41*(4), 453–470. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2020.1855638

[8.] Jennings, P. A., Brown, J. L., Frank, J. L., Doyle, S., Oh, Y., Davis, R., Rasheed, D., DeWeese, A., DeMauro, A. A., Cham, H., & Greenberg, M. T. (2020). Impacts of the CARE for Teachers program on teachers' social and emotional competence and classroom interactions. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 112*(8), 1496–1513. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000422

[9.] Lo, A. K. (2020). Volunteer engagement and commitment in crowdsourcing platforms. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing, 32*(1), 15–31.

[10.] Manalo, R. A., & de la Cruz, M. R. (2021). Teachers' performance appraisal in the Philippine context: Issues and prospects of the IPCRF system. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences, 8*(4), 15–23.

[11.] Mérida-López, S., & Extremera, N. (2020). The interplay of emotional intelligence abilities and work engagement on job and life satisfaction: Which emotional abilities matter most for secondary-school teachers? *Frontiers in Psychology, 11,* Article 563634. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.563634

[12.] Poulou, M., & Denham, S. (2022). Teacher emotional skills and classroom climate. *International Journal of Emotional Education, 14*(1), 17–32.

[13.] Rahman, M. M. (2023). Emotional intelligence and student motivation: A university-based study. *Cogent Education, 11*(1).

[14.] Rethman, A. (2020). *Informal science outreach and student identity development* (arXiv Preprint No. arXiv:2020.13981). https://arxiv.org/abs/2020.13981

[15.] Skinner, E. A., & Pitzer, J. R. (2021). Developmental dynamics of student engagement, coping, and everyday resilience. *Developmental Psychology, 57*(9), 1500–1516. https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0001207

[16.] Valente, S., & Lourenço, A. (2020). Emotional regulation and classroom stress in teachers. *Frontiers in Education, 5*(5).

[17.] Valiente, C., Swanson, J., & Lemery-Chalfant, K. (2020). Teacher emotions and student engagement. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 60*, 101833. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2019.101833

[18.] Villanueva, L. M. (2020). *Emotional regulation and burnout among secondary teachers* (Unpublished master's thesis).