INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED MULTIDISCIPLINARY STUDIES
Volume VI, Issue 1 January 2026, eISSN: 2799-0664

Teachers' Emotionalintelligence, and Students'Engagement and Academic Performance

Roman M. Rafal & William A. Buquia
Department of Education

Abstarct — This study looks into the relationships between teachers' emotional intelligence, learners' engagement, and students' academic performance to establish socio-emotional competencies that enhance classroom effectiveness. It employed a descriptive-correlational design where data from 119 public elementary school teachers were selected through stratified random sampling. A questionnaire, designed by the researchers and validated by experts, measured teachers' emotional intelligence in four domains: emotional management, social-emotional awareness, relationship management, and learner engagement in classroom, extracurricular, and community-based activities, while academic performance was sourced from official first-quarter General Weighted Averages. These instruments were content-validated through competent jurors and field-tested, with strong validity indices and high internal consistency levels established. Teachers recorded relatively high levels of emotional intelligence, especially in emotional management, social-emotional awareness, and relationship management, while learners recorded moderate engagement and satisfactory academic performance as generally observed. Significant associations were likewise established among learners' engagement and academic performance and among teachers' emotional intelligence, learner engagement, and academic achievement. These imply that an emotionally competent teacher provides an environment conducive to more active learning and improved outputs. The implication here is that improving teachers' socioemotional skills should bring about increased participation and achievements among the learners. As such, the current study argues that future professional development programs should consider structuring emotional intelligence training as a core area in developing supportive and engaging in-classroom climates.

Keywords: Emotional Intelligence, Learner Engagement, Academic Performance, Teachers, DepEd

I. INTRODUCTION

This study situates holistic teacher development within broader education reform, with existing standards highlighting teachers' socio-emotional competencies as predictive of instructional quality and learner success. Empirical evidence consistently suggests that emotionally intelligent teachers-who are adept at emotional awareness, regulation, empathy, and interpersonal relations-develop supportive learning environments and show better professional performance. Likewise, student engagement across the behavioral, emotional, and cognitive domains is generally linked to better learning outcomes. However, prior research often considers emotional intelligence, engagement, and performance in isolation, which leads to a narrow understanding of their combined impact on learning. Performance assessment systems tend to focus more on measurable instructional practices rather than emotional competencies, even though the latter are crucial in driving classroom climate. Furthermore, the incidence of disengaged students performing well raises overlooked emotional and motivational mechanisms that deserve further investigation.

This present study investigates the interrelations among teachers' emotional intelligence, learners' engagement, and academic performance, giving attention to four domains of emotional intelligence, three dimensions of engagement, and General Weighted Average. The objectives of the study are to: (1) delineate the relationships among these variables; and (2) address the following specific questions, namely: demographic and professional profiles of teachers; levels of teachers' emotional intelligence; levels of learners' engagement; learners' academic performance; association of engagement to performance; and association among teachers' emotional intelligence, learners' engagement, to academic outcomes. The results shall serve as a guide in developing a targeted intervention plan aimed at strengthening socio-emotional competencies and enhancing teaching-learning processes.

Literature Review

Recent scholarship has conceptualized the emotional intelligence of teachers principally through Goleman's framework, identifying self-awareness, emotional regulation, social awareness,

and relationship management as core competencies of teaching. For example, Al Jaberi, 2024; Wang, 2022; Shengyao, 2024; Todmal et al., 2023. Emotionally intelligent teachers are said to be better able to remain composed under pressure, respond responsively to learner needs, and avoid reactive or escalatory behaviors. These capacities enable empathetic communication, respectful classroom interactions, and nurture climates of participation, motivation, and psychological safety. Conceptual and context-specific analyses additionally show that culturally embedded relational values and emotionally supportive practices strengthen student confidence, resilience, and willingness to collaborate. Yet, many of these contributions are theoretical or descriptive in nature and often do not include direct measures of student engagement or academic achievement-and thus the complete EI-engagement-achievement sequence.While parallel literature is theoretically conceptualizing student engagement as a multidimensional construct encompassing behavioral, emotional, and cognitive participation in learning activities, the works of Lei (2021), Fredricks (2020), and Valerio (2022) illustrate that learners who are engaged show persistence and curiosity and are usually active participants in activities. This leads to higher academic achievement for these learners. Engagement has been consistently associated with emotionally supportive environments, positive teacher-student relationships, and meaningful classroom interactions. Similarly, academic performance studies frame achievement as the result of internal motivation, instructional support, and sustained engagement, where positive classroom climates and emotional safety have been associated with fewer failures, more consistent participation, and higher scores (Lee & Chen, 2022; Bai et al., 2022). But in much of this literature, teacher EI is either implicit or missing as an antecedent of engagement and performance, which limits understanding of the emotional source that initiates these processes.More recent empirical investigations (2020–present) have begun to link EI, engagement, and performance within integrated models. International research points out that teacher or student EI predicts academic outcomes partly through motivational and relational mechanisms, with engagement frequently emerging as a mediator (e.g., Wang, 2022; Rahman, 2024; Lamb et al., 2020, 2021; Li et al., 2024; Martínez-Rodríguez & Alvarez, 2025; Pattiasina et al., 2024). Reviews and quasi-experimental work highlight the fact that socio-emotional competence and EI-focused interventions can improve classroom relationships, reduce disengagement behaviors, and contribute to achievement gains. Local and regional studies also point to the role of emotional support, resilience, and socio-emotional skills in maintaining

engagement and improving learner outcomes for both in-person and remote modalities. However, many of these studies focus on student EI rather than teacher EI, pertain to higher education or specific disciplines, or remain teacher-centered without direct measurement of learner engagement or academic performance. Across these strands, several patterns and gaps emerge. Conceptually, the literature consistently suggests that EI shapes classroom climate, that supportive climates promote engagement, and that engagement predicts academic performance, yet relatively few studies empirically test the full sequential pathway from teacher EI → learner engagement → academic performance within a single model. Contextually, basic education settings-particularly public schools in developing systems-are underrepresented, with most evidence drawn from university populations or non-school contexts. Methodologically, many studies rely on cross-sectional self-report designs, do not explicitly model engagement as a mediator, and seldom employ standardized quarter-specific indicators such as general weighted average (GWA) to capture academic performance. Practically, although several authors call for EI-oriented professional development, there is a dearth of studies leading to concrete, data-driven intervention plans to improve teachers' emotional competencies with explicit intention to improve learner engagement and achievement. Against this backdrop, the present study addresses four interrelated gaps by: (1) empirically investigating the sequential relationship among teacher emotional intelligence, learner engagement, and academic performance; (2) generating evidence within the public basic education context; (3) utilizing a quantitative design that incorporates quarter-specific GWA and tests engagement as a mediating mechanism; and (4) translating the findings into a targeted intervention plan to strengthen teachers' socio-emotional competencies in support of improved learner outcomes.

II. METHODOLOGY

The research design utilized was descriptive–correlational in studying the relationships among teachers' emotional intelligence, the learners' engagement, and academic performance. For a population of 170, a stratified random sample of 119 teachers was achieved on the basis of proportional representation and eligibility criteria which included at least one year of teaching

experience and voluntary participation. Data were collected through a researcher-developed questionnaire with four parts: demographic profile, emotional intelligence across four domains, learners' engagement across three dimensions, and students' first-quarter General Weighted Average gathered from official records. Following the Carter V. Good and Douglas E. Scates criteria, the tool was validated by experts to attain a Content Validity Index of 1.00, and pilot-tested for 30 teachers to yield a Cronbach's Alpha of .986, or an excellent reliability index. After securing approvals and consent forms, the researcher conducted the survey personally, reviewed encoded responses, and compiled academic records. SPSS was employed to analyze data, while descriptive statistics were used to summarize teacher profiles, emotional intelligence, and engagement level. Since normality tests indicated that most distributions are non-normal, $p < .05$, non-parametric procedures in the form of Spearman's rho correlation, were conducted at 0.05 significance levels to establish the relationships among the variables, which further informed the development of an intervention plan.

Research Design

The present study used a descriptive–correlational research design to establish the relationships among teachers' emotional intelligence, learners' engagement, and students' academic performance. This allowed the documentation of prevailing conditions and the determination of the level of relationship among variables occurring naturally without experimental manipulation. Teachers' emotional intelligence was operationalized into four domains, namely: emotional awareness, emotional management, social emotional awareness, and relationship management. Learners' engagement was measured based on classroom participation, extracurricular involvement, and community service and volunteering. Academic performance was described using students' first-quarter General Weighted Average. The correlational aspect, in particular, allowed the researcher to examine how changes in teachers' emotional intelligence relate to changes in learner engagement and academic performance. This research structure serves as the empirical foundation for formulating an intervention program aimed at enhancing teachers' socio-emotional competencies and optimizing learning conditions, consistent with the suggestions of Creswell &

Creswell (2018), Fraenkel et al. (2021), and Gay et al. (2019) that this design is appropriate in research studies calling for relational analysis among educational variables.

Sample of the Study

The sample included 119 public elementary school teachers selected through stratified random sampling from a population of 170 to obtain a representative proportion from ten schools. Each school represented one stratum; the number of participants from each stratum was determined by its proportion of the total number of teachers to minimize any sampling bias and increase representativeness. Inclusion criteria included officially being employed, at least one year of experience in teaching, teaching classes during the period of the study, and inclusion based on voluntary informed consent. Exclusion criteria consisted of all teachers on leave, those who were not teaching at the time of data collection, and less than one year of experience. This sampling would ensure that the respondents can give reliable and contextually relevant information regarding emotional intelligence, learner engagement, and academic performance.

Measures

This study used a researcher-constructed questionnaire that was attuned to the variables, research questions, and objectives of the study to measure teachers' emotional intelligence, learners' engagement, and academic performance of students. The questionnaire was divided into four parts: (1) demographic information: age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, teaching experience, and number of relevant trainings; (2) teachers' emotional intelligence categorized as emotional awareness, emotional management, social-emotional awareness, and relationship management on a five-point Likert scale; (3) learners' engagement in classroom learning activities, extracurricular participation, and community service and volunteering answered on a five-point scale; and (4) students' first-quarter General Weighted Average obtained from official records. Its content validity was established through the assessment of expert validators using the Carter V.

Good and Douglas E. Scates criteria that yielded a validity index of 4.44 and, correspondingly, an overall Content Validity Index (CVI) of 1.00, which is interpreted to be excellent. The instrument had been subjected to a pilot testing with the use of 30 teachers coming from the nearest district and none of whom belonged to the main sample. Reliability analysis given to the 70 items in the instrument showed a Cronbach's Alpha of .986, reflecting an excellent internal consistency with strong inter-item coherence. Minor wording adjustments had been implemented based on the pilot testing, thereby yielding the final instrument with the robust psychometric properties apt for full deployment in the main data collection.

Producer

Data collection proceeded through a structured sequence, starting with approval from the Graduate School, followed by formal authorization to conduct the study from the pertinent education authorities. School administrators were informed of the study's objectives, scope, and timelines. Teachers fitting the inclusion criteria were oriented regarding the purpose of the study, voluntary participation, and confidentiality safeguards. Informed consent was obtained prior to the administration of the researcher-developed questionnaire. The questionnaires were answered in a non-disruptive environment. In coordination with class advisers and designated staff, the learners' first-quarter GWA was retrieved from the official school records. Completed questionnaires were reviewed, coded, and prepared for analysis. A small number of teachers were purposively selected for a brief follow-up interview to clarify responses and supplement insights. Some minor setbacks-for instance, tight schedules among teachers and delay in securing verified academic records-were addressed by flexible coordination and follow-up until complete, accurate, and reliable data for the study had been obtained.

Data Processing

The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. Descriptive statistics were generated first, including frequency counts and percentages for demographic variables, and means with standard deviations for teachers' emotional intelligence and learners'

engagement. Normality was assessed by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests; the latter produced p-values of .000 for all indicators, thus the data significantly violate the assumption of normality, necessitating non-parametric procedures. For this reason, inferential analysis used Spearman's rank-order correlation to test the strength and direction of relationships among teachers' emotional intelligence, learners' engagement, and learners' academic performance, and all tests of significance were conducted at the 0.05 level. Because the data have already been established as not being normally distributed, distribution-free methods including Spearman's rho, Mann-Whitney U, Kruskal-Wallis, and Kendall's tau were appropriate for the various analytical requirements of the study.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Teachers' Perceived Level of Emotional Intelligence

These section presents the teachers' perceived level of emotional intelligence. It describes how teachers understand, manage, and apply their emotions in different aspects of their professional practice.

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

Item	Mean	Interpretation
31. Recognizing personal emotions in different classroom situations.	3.15	Moderate Level
32. Identifying triggers that influence emotional responses at work.	3.00	Moderate Level
33. Acknowledging strengths and weaknesses in handling emotions.	3.30	Moderate Level
34. Understanding how moods affect teaching performance.	3.15	Moderate Level
35. Monitoring emotional reactions when under stress.	2.40	Low Level
36. Becoming aware of body language that reflects emotions.	2.55	Low Level
37. Accepting feedback about emotional expressions from colleagues.	3.75	High Level
38. Reflecting on past experiences to improve self-understanding.	3.55	High Level
39. Observing personal thoughts and feelings during challenging tasks.	3.15	Moderate Level
40. Realizing the link between emotions and professional decisions.	3.55	High Level
Overall Mean	**3.16**	**Moderate Level**

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

Table 1 shows that teachers' emotional awareness is at a moderate level, as indicated by the overall mean of 3.16, insinuating that emotionally, there is a developing yet inconsistent capacity to

recognize and understand emotions within the work environment. The highest-rated item, "Accepting feedback about emotional expressions from colleagues" (M = 3.75), points to openness for reflection and constructive dialogue, hence echoing professional cultures that support emotional growth. The lowest-rated item, "Monitoring emotional reactions when under stress" (M = 2.40), showed the challenges experienced when regulating emotions under pressure, which may be due to heavy workloads, diverse needs of students, or limited training on emotional intelligence. This might contribute to heightened stress, impulsiveness, and deteriorated classroom relationships. This finding corroborates Ismail et al. (2022) and Kong and He (2021), who argued that emotional self-awareness enhances resilience, regulation, and teaching performance, thus pointing out the need for structured stress management and EI development programs.

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

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. Regulating emotions when facing classroom disruptions.	4.00	High Level
2. Controlling frustration during stressful teaching conditions.	4.00	High Level
3. Maintaining composure when receiving negative feedback.	3.55	High Level
4. Managing stress through positive coping strategies.	4.15	High Level
5. Channeling energy productively during emotional situations.	3.55	High Level
6. Balancing emotions to remain objective in decision-making.	4.10	High Level
7. Adjusting emotional responses based on learner behavior.	4.15	High Level
8. Avoiding impulsive reactions in conflict situations.	4.00	High Level
9. Demonstrating patience when resolving classroom challenges.	4.61	Very High Level
10. Practicing relaxation techniques to reduce emotional strain.	4.30	Very High Level
Overall Mean	4.04	High Level

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

From Table 2, it can be seen that the teacher's emotional management scores are high (overall mean = 4.04), reflecting a good capacity to regulate emotions in the instructional settings. The items with the highest means--"Demonstrating patience when resolving classroom challenges"

(M = 4.61) and "Practicing relaxation techniques to reduce emotional strain" (M = 4.30)--indicate that teachers value composure and effective coping strategies in maintaining harmony in the classroom. On the other hand, the lowest-scoring items were "Maintaining composure when receiving negative feedback" and "Channeling energy productively during emotional situations" (both M = 3.55), indicating problems of emotion regulation under criticism or high emotional intensity, which might reflect the emotional demands of teaching and relative lack of structured support mechanisms. These results support the finding of Sánchez-Álvarez et al. (2020) and Zhou and Ee (2022), who report that emotional management boosts resilience, stress coping, and teaching effectiveness.

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

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. Recognizing learners' emotions through their behavior.	4.30	Very High Level
2. Understanding colleagues' feelings in collaborative work.	4.00	High Level
3. Showing sensitivity to cultural and social differences.	3.15	Moderate Level
4. Interpreting nonverbal cues from learners and peers.	3.20	Moderate Level
5. Demonstrating empathy toward students' personal concerns.	3.10	Moderate Level
6. Considering emotional contexts in professional interactions.	4.15	High Level
7. Acknowledging learners' efforts through supportive responses.	4.10	High Level
8. Observing group dynamics to address emotional needs.	4.00	High Level
9. Valuing inclusivity by respecting diverse perspectives.	3.55	High Level
10. Responding appropriately to learners' emotional expressions.	4.00	High Level
Overall Mean	3.76	High Level

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

Table 3 shows that the teachers' social-emotional awareness reached a High level, with an overall mean of 3.76, reflecting pronounced sensitivity to the affective states of students and colleagues. The item with the highest rating, "Recognizing learners' emotions through their

behavior" (M = 4.30), points to the fact that teachers are good at identifying emotional cues, thus helping to create supportive and motivating learning environments. In turn, the lowest-rated item, "Demonstrating empathy toward students' personal concerns" (M = 3.10), indicates difficulties in deeper emotional support, which may be partly explained by the workload, lack of time, or concerns about professional boundaries. These results imply that although teachers can notice the emotions displayed by others, they do not have sufficient resources or structural support to effectively respond to such needs, and thus some needs of students may not be satisfied. The findings agree with Fernández-Berrocal and Cabello (2021) and Lopes et al. (2023), who noticed that empathy significantly improves when teachers receive institutional support and regular SEL training.

Table 4
Teachers' Perceived Level of Emotional Intelligence In terms of Relationship Management

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. Building trust through open communication with learners.	3.15	Moderate Level
2. Encouraging teamwork among colleagues and students.	4.70	Very High Level
3. Resolving conflicts constructively through dialogue.	4.52	Very High Level
4. Promoting collaboration in school-based activities.	4.55	Very High Level
5. Motivating learners by providing consistent encouragement.	4.64	Very High Level
6. Strengthening professional relationships with stakeholders.	4.30	Very High Level
7. Guiding students in managing peer-related issues.	4.55	Very High Level
8. Supporting colleagues during emotionally challenging times.	3.00	Moderate Level
9. Developing rapport by showing genuine concern for others.	3.15	Moderate Level
10. Fostering a positive classroom environment through respect.	4.77	Very High Level
Overall Mean	4.13	High Level

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

Table 4 shows that teachers' relationship management falls within the High level, with an overall mean of 4.13, reflecting good interpersonal and collaborative competencies that foster continued positive school relationships. The highest-ranking items, such as "Fostering a positive classroom environment through respect" (M = 4.77) and "Encouraging teamwork among colleagues and

students" (M = 4.70), indicate that teachers act with a sense of mutual respect, inclusivity, and collaboration, creating emotionally supportive and productive learning environments. On the other hand, the lowest-ranking item, "Supporting colleagues during emotionally challenging times" (M = 3.00), implies limited peer emotional support; this may be due to time constraints, lack of specific support mechanisms, or emotional exhaustion. Collectively, these results imply that professional relationships are strong, but teachers may struggle to give deeper emotional support to colleagues. These findings point in a similar direction to the work of Mérida-López and Extremera (2020) and Hagenauer and Volet (2021), which showed that effective relationship management reduces emotional exhaustion and contributes to a positive professional climate.

Learners' Perceived Level of Engagement

These section presents the learners' perceived level of engagement. It shows how students participate, interact, and stay motivated in various learning activities inside and outside the classroom.

TABLE 5
LEARNERS' PERCEIVED LEVEL OF ENGAGEMENT IN TERMS OF CLASSROOM LEARNING ACTIVITIES

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. Participating actively in gamified classroom discussions.	3.00	Moderate Level
2. Completing tasks with enthusiasm during gamified lessons.	3.30	Moderate Level
3. Collaborating with peers in group-based games.	3.15	Moderate Level
4. Showing persistence in finishing gamified challenges.	4.00	High Level
5. Contributing ideas during interactive activities.	1.75	Very Low Level
6. Applying knowledge in problem-solving game tasks.	2.15	Low Level
7. Demonstrating excitement in joining quiz-based games.	1.75	Very Low Level
8. Following instructions accurately in gamified activities.	2.30	Low Level
9. Reflecting on learning outcomes from gamified lessons.	2.15	Low Level
10. Responding positively to rewards and recognition.	4.15	High Level
Overall Mean	**2.77**	**Moderate Level**

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

Table 5 shows that learners' engagement in classroom learning activities is situated at a Moderate level, with an overall mean of 2.77, meaning average participation when gamified instructional strategies are employed. The highest-rated item, "Responding positively to rewards and recognition" with a mean of 4.15, suggests that students are highly motivated by incentives, which, in turn, may suggest that this motive is driven by extrinsic rewards in the form of points or badges. On the other hand, the lowest-rated items, namely "Contributing ideas during interactive activities" and "Demonstrating excitement in joining quiz-based games" with means of 1.75, signal weak intrinsic motivation, limited confidence, or discomfort with active participation without rewards. This pattern suggests that even as gamification may activate learners, engagement remains superficial if the instructional design relies predominantly on extrinsic motivators. Thus, these findings align with the results of Han and Wang (2021) and Bai et al. (2022), who found that rewards can build engagement but need to be supported with autonomy, collaboration, and self-expression opportunities to build intrinsic motivation and promote deep learning.

TABLE 6
LEARNERS' PERCEIVED LEVEL OF ENGAGEMENT IN TERMS OF EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. Joining school clubs that apply gamified activities.	2.15	Low Level
2. Volunteering in gamified learning camps or events.	1.75	Very Low Level
3. Competing actively in school-based academic games.	2.75	Moderate Level
4. Engaging in quiz bowls and knowledge contests.	2.30	Low Level
5. Representing the school in gamified competitions.	1.49	Very Low Level
6. Attending workshops with interactive game activities.	2.15	Low Level
7. Supporting peers in extracurricular gamified projects.	3.00	Moderate Level
8. Enjoying participation in e-sports or digital contests.	2.15	Low Level
9. Applying classroom learning in extracurricular game tasks.	3.00	Moderate Level
10. Displaying leadership in organizing gamified activities.	4.00	High Level
Overall Mean	**2.48**	**Low Level**

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

Table 6 indicates that learner engagement in extracurricular activities is at a Low Level, with an overall mean of 2.48, reflecting limited participation in gamified extracurricular programs. Whereas learners were relatively highly engaged when leadership roles were assigned to them-as indicated by the highest mean for "Displaying leadership in organizing gamified activities" (M = 4.00)-the overall participation in the programs was generally subdued. This trend implies that feelings of ownership and responsibility may increase participation, but only among a minority of learners who happen to possess this leadership trait. The lowest ranking, "Representing the school in gamified competitions" (M = 1.49), reflects limited participation in external events due to limited institutional opportunities, lack of awareness, or anxiety about performance. Such low participation limits the potential of extracurricular activity to develop teamwork, creativity, and confidence. This finding is supported by Sailer and Homner (2020) and Kuo and Chuang (2021), who argued that long-term engagement in gamified extracurricular programs requires ongoing institutional support, relevance of such programs to the immediate culture, and consistent implementation.

TABLE 7
LEARNERS' PERCEIVED LEVEL OF ENGAGEMENT IN TERMS OF COMMUNITY SERVICE AND VOLUNTEERING

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. Participating in community projects with gamified approaches.	2.75	Moderate Level
2. Assisting in clean-up drives through point-based tasks.	3.15	Moderate Level
3. Joining tree-planting activities with gamified goals.	2.75	Moderate Level
4. Cooperating in volunteer work with game-like challenges.	3.00	Moderate Level
5. Motivating peers to engage in gamified community service.	4.15	High Level
6. Applying classroom knowledge in gamified outreach tasks.	3.30	Moderate Level
7. Completing assigned roles in community-based game activities.	3.30	Moderate Level
8. Earning recognition through gamified volunteer efforts.	3.75	High Level
9. Leading peers in gamified service projects.	2.75	Moderate Level
10. Promoting community involvement through gamification.	2.15	Low Level
Overall Mean	**3.11**	**Moderate Level**

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

Table 7 shows that the students' community service and volunteering engagements are at a Moderate level (overall mean = 3.11); hence, community-based activities with gamified elements are occasionally but inconsistently engaged in. The highest rated item, "Motivating peers to engage in gamified community service" (M = 4.15, High Level), suggests that gamification promotes peer encouragement, collaboration, and prosocial behavior when structured incentives are present. The lowest rated item, "Promoting community involvement through gamification" (M = 2.15, Low Level), indicates a low initiative among students in sustaining or promoting community engagement likely because of poor awareness or lack of enough gamified outreach programs. This pattern implies that even while students engage in organized activities, seldom do they initiate or sustain them autonomously, thus weakening the long-term effectiveness of gamification once external rewards are removed. This supports Villalobos and Ramírez (2022) and Chang and Hsu (2023), where it was emphasized that deeper and longer-lasting gamified community service engagement must be accompanied by reflection, value-based design, and emotional experience than by reward alone.

Academic Performance of Learners Based on The General Weighted Average (GWA) for the First Quarter

These section presents the academic performance of learners based on their General Weighted Average (GWA) for the first quarter. It shows how well the students performed in their subjects during the given grading period.

TABLE 8
ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF LEARNERS BASED ON THE GENERAL WEIGHTED AVERAGE (GWA) FOR THE FIRST QUARTER

	Frequency	**Percentage**
Outstanding	36	2.71
Very Satisfactory	294	22.16
Satisfactory	363	27.35
Fairly Satisfactory	634	47.78
Did Not Meet Expectation	-	-
	Mean = 82.17	
	SD = 4.79	
Total	**1327**	**100.00**

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

Table 8 shows that most learners achieve a fairly satisfactory level, with 47.78%, followed by Satisfactory at 27.35%, Very Satisfactory at 22.16%, and a minority attaining an Outstanding level of 2.71%. From this, although learners broadly meet minimum expectations, only a few learners can achieve higher academic distinctions, which means there is a limitation in the mastering of content, motivation, and effectiveness of present instructional or gamified approaches. The close to half being labeled as Fairly Satisfactory indicates the continued challenges regarding learning readiness, individualized support, and sustained engagement that could hamper translation into stronger academic gains from mere participation. When instructional designs fail to connect engagement effectively with achievement, learner performance may eventually reach a plateau at moderate levels. Attention should, therefore, be focused on enhancing formative assessment, feedback mechanisms, and instruction that is emotionally supportive and cognitively oriented. This also aligns with findings from Putra et al. (2021), who observed that gamification enhances motivation but requires reflective learning in order for it to impact achievement, and Lee and Chen (2022), who presented scaffolding and feedback as imperative when performance is combined with gamification. This underlines the importance of strategically matching engagement strategies against specific pedagogical objectives for meaningful enhancement of academic outcomes.

Significant Relationship Between the Learners' Perceived Level of Engagement and Their Academic Performance

These section presents the significant relationship between the learners' perceived level of engagement and their academic performance. It explains how students' participation and involvement in learning activities are connected to their overall academic achievement.

TABLE 9
SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE LEARNERS' PERCEIVED LEVEL OF ENGAGEMENT AND THEIR ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

Correlates	n	Rho	Level of Sig	p-value	Interpretation
Learners' Perceived Level of Engagement Learners' Academic Performance	119	.973	0.05	.000	Significant

Legend: $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level $p \leq .05$ = Significant $p \geq .05$ = Not Significant

Table 9 reveals a strong, statistically very significant positive relationship between learners' engagement and academic performance, ρ =.973, p =.000. These findings point to the fact that learners who approach learning tasks more actively, collaborate, and persist go on to achieve superior academic results. These findings highlight emotional, behavioral, and cognitive engagement as means whereby motivation is changed into improved scholastic performance, and they suggest that engaging, supportive, and interactive learning environments directly support achievement. Against the background of such findings, some learners fully engage themselves only at moderate levels, possibly due to inconsistent instructional design, undifferentiated activities, or limited use of motivating strategies. Each of these reduces attention, participation, and comprehension. Consequently, academic success will require not only content delivery but also the development of emotionally meaningful and participatory learning experiences. The findings support Fredricks et al. (2021) and Jang et al. (2022), who argued that engagement predicts achievement and mediates the effects of instructional quality. Learner engagement should therefore be fostered through multiple, feedback-rich, and affectively supportive approaches if high levels of academic performance are to be maintained.

Significant Relationship Between the Teachers' Perceived Level of Emotional Intelligence and the Learners' Perceived Level of Engagement and Their Academic Performance

These section presents the significant relationship between the teachers' perceived level of emotional intelligence and the learners' perceived level of engagement and their academic performance. It explains how teachers' emotional skills influence students' participation in learning and their overall academic success.

TABLE 10
SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TEACHERS' PERCEIVED LEVEL OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND THE LEARNERS' PERCEIVED LEVEL OF ENGAGEMENT AND THEIR ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

Correlates	N	Rho	Level of Sig	p-value	Interpretation
Teachers' Perceived Level of Emotional Intelligence	119	.906	0.05	.000	Significant
Learners' Perceived Level of Engagement					
Teachers' Perceived Level of Emotional Intelligence		.966		.000	Significant
Learners' Academic Performance					
Learners' Perceived Level of Engagement		.973		.000	Significant
Learners' Academic Performance					

Legend: α = 0.05 significance level $p \leq .05$ = Significant $p \geq .05$ = Not Significant

Table 16 presents the strong and statistically significant correlations among teachers' emotional intelligence (EI), learners' engagement, and academic performance: Teachers' EI and Learners' Engagement ($\rho = .906$, $p = .000$), Teachers' EI and Academic Performance ($\rho = .966$, $p = .000$), and Learners' Engagement and Academic Performance ($\rho = .973$, $p = .000$). The findings imply that emotionally intelligent teachers are those who are capable of empathizing with, regulating, and managing relationships in a way that their learner engagement, in turn, benefits in terms of academic performance by creating emotionally supportive and motivational classroom environments. While these associations are strong, it can be moderated by factors such as school culture, resource availability, and individual learner circumstances-all factors affecting the degree to which EI translates into engagement and achievement, highlighting the necessity of complementary institutional support. The results reinforce previous studies by Sutton and Wheatley (2021) and Mérida-López et al. (2023), indicating that teacher EI strengthens motivation, engagement, and learning through the development of positive emotional climates. Overall, this supports the integration of EI-focused training and mentoring, coupled with socio-emotional

learning frameworks, as part of teacher development for substantially improving learner engagement and academic performance.

IV. CONCLUSION

This profile describes a workforce that is experienced and stable yet still requires ongoing opportunities for advanced professional growth. Teachers generally scored high on emotional intelligence, notably on emotional management, social-emotional awareness, and relationship management. By contrast, emotional awareness has emerged as a relatively weak dimension, with implications for deeper self-reflection and emotional attunement, particularly in challenging situations. Learners have generally been moderately engaged in classroom activities, extracurricular participation, and community involvement, reflecting inconsistent participation in some positive ways; this calls for more meaningful, learner-centered strategies. Academic performance was generally satisfactory, though fewer learners attained higher proficiency levels. These results highlight the need for greater instructional support with engagement-driven interventions. Significant relationships have been found between learners' engagement and academic performance and between teachers' emotional intelligence and both learner engagement and learner achievement, testifying to the fact that emotionally competent teachers contribute to the engendering of supportive and engaging learning environments that enhance student outcomes. Based on these findings, schools may want to implement sustained and robust professional development programs for teachers that concurrently enhance their emotional intelligence, while structured and engaging learning experiences focused on improving overall academic performance are given increased priority.

REFERENCES

[1.] Al Jaberi, A. T. (2024). An investigation into the impact of teachers' emotional intelligence and its multidimensional nature on students' academic achievement. *Social Sciences, 13*(5), 244. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci13050244

[2.] Bai, S., Hew, K. F., & Huang, B. (2022). Does gamification improve student engagement? A meta-analysis and practical implications. *Educational Research Review, 36*, 100459. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2022.100459

[3.] Chang, Y. S., & Hsu, C. L. (2023). Gamifying social responsibility: Effects of reflection-based gamification on student volunteering. *Computers & Education, 196*, 104734. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2023.104734

[4.] Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

[5.] Fernández-Berrocal, P., & Cabello, R. (2021). Teachers' emotional competence and classroom climate: The moderating role of empathy. *Educational Psychology Review, 33*(2), 667–686. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09535-9

[6.] Fredricks, J. A., Filsecker, M., & Lawson, M. A. (2021). Student engagement, context, and achievement: What's the connection? *Learning and Instruction, 72*, 101–110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2020.101110

[7.] Fredricks, J. A. (2020). *Engagement in education: Understanding student motivation and participation*. Routledge.

[8.] Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. W. (2019). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications* (12th ed.). Pearson.

[9.] Hagenauer, G., & Volet, S. (2021). Teacher–student relationships and teachers' emotions: A qualitative exploration of reciprocal influences. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 100*, 103286. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103286

[10.] Han, J., & Wang, Y. (2021). Gamification in education: The effects of reward systems on learner motivation. *Computers & Education, 172*, 104262. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2021.104262

[11.] Ismail, N., Hashim, R., & Haron, S. (2022). Emotional intelligence and teacher well-being: The mediating role of self-awareness and self-management. *International Journal of Instruction, 15*(2), 75–90. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2022.1525a

[12.] Jang, H., Kim, E. J., & Reeve, J. (2022). Why student engagement matters: A longitudinal test of self-determination theory's motivation model in classroom learning. *Educational Psychology, 42*(3), 339–354. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2020.1870536

[13.] Kong, F., & He, Q. (2021). The role of emotional awareness in teacher effectiveness: A mediation model of emotional regulation and teaching satisfaction. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 648663. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.648663

[14.] Kuo, M. S., & Chuang, T. Y. (2021). Enhancing student participation through gamified extracurricular activities: A case study in secondary education. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 52*(4), 1508–1525. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13083

[15.] Lamb, M., Ma, L., & Lau, K. L. (2020). Emotionally intelligent students are more engaged and successful: Examining the role of emotional intelligence in higher education. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 29*(2), 151–160. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-019-00490-8

[16.] Lee, C. Y., & Chen, C. H. (2022). The effects of gamified learning on academic achievement: The role of feedback and cognitive engagement. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 25*(1), 45–58. https://doi.org/10.2307/48629576
[17.] Lei, H., Cui, Y., & Zhou, W. (2021). Relationships between student engagement and academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal, 46*, 517–528. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.7054
[18.] Li, P. H., Wang, M., & Chen, L. (2024). Teacher emotions and real-time student engagement: An observational study. *Computers & Education, 200*, 104789. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2023.104789
[19.] Lopes, P. N., Mestre, J. M., & Salovey, P. (2023). Enhancing teachers' social-emotional awareness through SEL-based interventions: Impacts on empathy and classroom relationships. *Frontiers in Education, 8*, 1134219. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1134219
[20.] Martínez-Rodríguez, A., & Alvarez, E. G. (2025). Factors influencing university students' emotional intelligence and its link to academic performance: A systematic review. *European Journal of Psychology of Education.* https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-025-00956-4
[21.] Mérida-López, S., & Extremera, N. (2020). The interplay of emotional intelligence abilities and work engagement on teachers' job satisfaction. *Current Psychology, 39*(2), 882–891. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-018-9829-0
[22.] Mérida-López, S., Extremera, N., & Rey, L. (2023). Teachers' emotional intelligence and student academic achievement: The mediating role of classroom climate and engagement. *Frontiers in Psychology, 14*, 1142104. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1142104
[23.] Pattiasina, P., Layuk, D., & Sahetapy, L. P. (2024). Exploring the role of emotional intelligence training in enhancing teacher–student relationships and academic performance. *Journal of Educational Development Studies, 12*(3), 77–90. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/381649850
[24.] Putra, I. B., Suryani, N., & Rachman, S. (2021). Gamification in higher education: Motivation, engagement, and academic achievement. *International Journal of Instruction, 14*(4), 763–782. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.14444a
[25.] Rahman, M. H. (2024). Influence of teachers' emotional intelligence on students' motivation for academic learning: An empirical study on university students of Bangladesh. *Cogent Education, 11*(1), 2327752. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2327752
[26.] Sailer, M., & Homner, L. (2020). The gamification of learning: A meta-analysis on the effectiveness of educational gamification. *Educational Psychology Review, 32*(1), 77–112. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-019-09498-w
[27.] Sánchez-Álvarez, N., Extremera, N., & Fernández-Berrocal, P. (2020). Maintaining teachers' emotional balance: The role of emotional intelligence in occupational well-being. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 92*, 103047. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103047
[28.] Shengyao, Y. (2024). Emotional intelligence, positive psychological traits, and academic achievement: Mediators among Chinese university students. *BMC Psychology, 12*, 1886. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-01886-4
[29.] Sutton, R. E., & Wheatley, K. F. (2021). Teachers' emotions and teaching: A review of the literature and directions for future research. *Educational Psychology Review, 33*(2), 745–777. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09528-8

[30.] Todmal, A., Rao, G., & Gagare, K. (2023). The role of emotional intelligence in effective teaching and classroom management. *Environment and Ecology, 12*(S1-B), 4859–4872. https://doi.org/10.31838/ecb/2023.12.s1-B.479
[31.] Valerio, A. (2022). *Student engagement and the role of emotional safety in classroom learning.* [Publication details unavailable].
[32.] Villalobos, D., & Ramírez, F. (2022). Gamification in community-based learning: Fostering motivation and empathy in service-learning contexts. *Education and Information Technologies, 27*(3), 3261–3277. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10751-3
[33.] Wang, L. (2022). Exploring the relationship among teacher emotional intelligence, work engagement, self-efficacy, and student academic achievement. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, 833390. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.833390
[34.] Zhou, M., & Ee, J. (2022). Teachers' emotional intelligence and resilience: The mediating effect of emotion regulation in stressful teaching contexts. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, 868421. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.868421