

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.12426352

A STUDY ON EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, STUDENT ENGAGEMENT, AND SUSTAINABILITY: A FACULTY PERSPECTIVE IN AND AROUND PUTTUR

Jeevitha B V^{1*}, Veena Santhosh Rai², Gayatri Babu J³

¹Department of MBA, Vivekananda College of Engineering and Technology, Puttur, Dakshina Kannada, Karnataka, Affiliated to Visvesvaraya Technological University (VTU), Belagavi, India

²Research Supervisor, Department of MBA, Srinivas Institute of Technology, Valachil, Mangalore, Karnataka Affiliated to Visvesvaraya Technological University (VTU), Belagavi, India

³Department of MBA, Shree Devi Institute of Technology, Mangaluru, Affiliated to Visvesvaraya Technological University (VTU), Belagavi, India

Received: 28/09/2025
Accepted: 15/02/2026

Corresponding Author: Jeevitha B V
(bvjeevitha@gmail.com)

ABSTRACT

Emotional Intelligence (EI) affects Student Engagement (SE), and their link to sustainable teaching practices in undergraduate colleges around Puttur, Dakshina Kannada, India. A cross-sectional quantitative approach was adopted using data from 150 faculty via a structured online questionnaire. EI was measured based on Goleman's (1995) developed four dimensions which include self-awareness, regulation, empathy, social skills. SE follows Kahu's (2013) taxonomy (behavioral, cognitive, emotional) with a sustainability oriented indicator. Reliability (Cronbach's alpha; test-retest) and basic inferential analyses (Pearson correlation; simple regression) were conducted. Future research directions include CFA and SEM modelling. The study results confirmed that there exist as two separate constructs since their correlation coefficient 0.145. and showed that there is no statistical significance $p= 0.077$. Regression showed EI accounts for 2.1% of SE variance. The study develops new knowledge on faculty development and educational standards through its relation between EI-SE integration with the sustainability focused teaching methods in regional Indian educational settings. This research builds on Goleman (1995) and Kahu (2013) and UNESCO's Education for Sustainable Development framework.

KEYWORDS: Emotional Intelligence, Student Engagement, Sustainability Teaching, Faculty Development, Higher Education, Karnataka.

1 INTRODUCTION

Faculty emotional competencies influence classroom climate, learner motivation, and the uptake of sustainable teaching practices. Academics have proved that EI affects students' achievement but research have not studied how it affects student engagement and sustainable education among Indian undergraduates. This study addresses that gap by analyzing how faculty EI relates to behavioral, cognitive, and emotional engagement and how these processes support sustainable teaching practices in Puttur's colleges.

The efficient management of emotion is necessary for making good decisions. Managing difficulties in a workplace necessitates more than just the typical cognition/intellect. Emotional intelligence is acknowledged to play some role in both personal and work environments. EI provides a foundation for limit negative emotion and is devoted to be confidence, empathy and friendship. Emotional intelligence has shown at least some consequences to wellbeing and work-family balance as noted by Lenaghan et al. (2007). Educational psychology is EI, connected by a group of competencies on how individuals perceive cognitive perception, comprehension and emotions. Fundamentally, emotional intelligence (EI) is the duty of individuals to foster classroom cultures that prioritize learning and to help enclose a richer learning experience. The complete integration of EI into undergraduates' studies remain challenging to prove because faculty and students have to work together to achieve goal. Faculty members together with students have the responsibility to develop EI education according to Aquilina, 2019.

Students need to practice Emotional Intelligence (EI) to handle their personal and professional life stress. Faculty members serves as essential resources for students to develop their EI skills and apply these abilities through academic work. The faculty creates a space of trust and emotional safety which serves as a base for students to engage actively and show creative abilities. In undergraduate education, EI is a concept that is comparatively understudied and faces continuous difficulties (Vesely-Maillefer, 2018). Presently EI is experimented in progressive institutions (Nazidizaji, 2014). Students need to be additionally engaged in learning process. Once students are allowed with taking control of their emotional growth, EI transforms from a faculty led initiative to a collaborative responsibility.

1.1 Emotional Intelligence (EI)

Emotional Intelligence consists of clusters of

emotional and social abilities which influence in what way people comprehend and control their own emotions and of others according to the Goleman's model. His model includes four key dimensions:

1. **Self-Awareness** - the person knows his or her emotions, strengths, and limits.
2. **Self-Management** - Person who are able to control emotions along with the change and be motivated.
3. **Social Awareness** - the person can put himself or herself in someone else's place and understand the other's feelings and point of view.
4. **Relationship Management** - the person has communication, conflict resolution, teamwork, and persuasion skills.

In Teaching, emotional intelligence competencies assist teachers in establishing rapport with learners, managing the atmosphere in the classroom, and displaying emotionally intelligent actions that are conducive to participation.

1.2 Student Engagement (SE)

According to the author Kahu's (2013) Student Engagement Outline views engagement as a multifaceted process where personal, structural, and psychosocial factors affect the process. The model presents three big forms of engagement:

1. **Behavioral Engagement** - activity, presence, and taking part in educational tasks.
2. **Cognitive Engagement** - spending time on understanding, thinking critically, and managing oneself.
3. **Emotional Engagement** - learners' feelings of being accepted, interested, and inspired to learn.

Teachers who show strong Emotional intelligence (EI) creates better student engagement because of their abilities in emotions and can create the type of learning environment that supports participation, curiosity, and emotional bonding.

1.3 Sustainable Teaching Practices

One of the education frameworks encourages teaching practices that gives power to the students to understand not only the cause and effect but also adopt responsible values, and contribute to sustainable futures. Some of the main characteristics are:

1. Inquiry, reflection and problem solving at the Change in the whole Learning Approaches.
2. Holistic Pedagogy dealing up with social, economic and environmental sustainability areas.

3. Value-based-education- imparting empathy, ethics and global responsibility.
4. Engaged and collaborative learning- Facilitating energetic involvement in sustainability activities.

Sustainability Values are integrated into teaching, understanding varied learning needs which will be supported by teachers who have high EI, and creating the emotional environment that is favorable to transformative learning.

1.4. Emotional Intelligence (EI) and Student Engagement

The EI, includes the abilities to know the emotions and manage them. It depends on the dimensions like identifying, realizing, managing, and applying the emotions positively in self and others. This has added recognition as a vital basis factor of SE within higher education settings. A vast amount of empirical research has shown that people high EI exhibit sharp cognitive and affective engagement, stronger self-regulation, and improved academic outcomes, including determination, satisfaction, and achievement. EI people are more capable of managing stress, sustaining self-efficacy and developing intrinsic motivation, which then leads to increased cognitive engagement, manifested in sustained attention, reflective thinking, and strategic learning, and affective engagement, which is characterized by enthusiasm, interest and belonging. In addition, mediation models sustain the importance of these psychological resources as important conduits through which EI leads to influence learning engagement and academic outcomes. Studies that provide even finer distinctions among engagement behavior, cognitive, and emotional engagement emphasize that EI may matter most for cognitive and affective engagement in learning. While emotionally intelligent teachers and students create a classroom process with more emotionally involved learners and deliberate learning strategies, cognitive and emotional engagement (like enthusiasm and interest) do not automatically lead to behavioral engagement, such as attendance, participation, etc., without contextual and pedagogical supports. Therefore, EI is a direct and indirect contributor to engagement by producing emotional and motivational basis necessary for deep and sustained learning and academic success.

1.5 Emotional Intelligence and Sustainable Teaching

Sustainability education, which refers to the flexibility of environmental and social aspects, not

only requires academic knowledge but also affective commitment and value-driven behaviors. Studies indicates that teachers with higher EI demonstrate stronger eco-friendly attitudes and get in sustainability related teaching activities. Emotional skills, such as empathy and seeing through other eyes, empower the teachers to foster these values among students and adapt this value. Other than that Studies suggest that environmental attitudes often enable the association between EI and faculty in sustainability education: teachers with good emotional awareness build concern for the environment which allows them to actively introduce sustainability in their instruction and get student involved. In addition, literature review have revealed that using EI training in faculty development leads to reflective classroom and supports students' commitment to environment friendly practices in the long run and motivates institution to use sustainable education. These results together not only point to EI successful interpersonal developments in classrooms but also a stage for socializing sustainability into classrooms, thus linking emotional competence, educational innovation, and the sustainability aims of an institution.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The review of literature conducted overall demonstrates the main role of EI in increasing the teaching effectiveness and student engagement in different learning environment. Goleman (1995) started with the discussion by showing the importance of teacher EI dimensions. Bar-On (2006) and Clarke (2010) showed the emphasize of EI in faculty in building rapport, improving classroom management, and giving personalized feedback for sustainable learning. Estrada and others (2021) and Gunasekara and others (2023) argue that role of EI is creating empathy, loyalty, and trust in online and offline classes. While Falola et al. (2025) and Inam (2025) talks about the impact of EI on graduate student and restoring educational trust. Studies by Poudel (2023) and Pentón Herrera (2024) states that EI is crucial for faculty retention and pre-service teacher education. Li and Zhang (2024), Wang et al. (2021), and Hossain and Rahman (2024) states that EI is a mediator of stress, accomplishment promotion, and a source of student motivation. Moreover, by the works of Gumelar et al. (2024), Anyanwu and Nzurike (2023), and Khan et al. (2025) it is shown as is positive relation between student engagement and performance on one side and teacher EI on the other. In the meantime, Safa (2024) and Pandita & Kiran (2023) examine other frameworks and technology-

integrated approaches to maintain student satisfaction. The literature is unanimous in the finding that the progress of EI in teachers and learners not only augments scholarly excellence and psychological well-being but also guarantees sustainable educational outcomes in diverse and dynamic environments.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Objective

- Analyze the association between faculty EI and SE.
- To identify key EI factors that influence sustainable student engagement.
- To assess how faculty teaching practices, influenced by EI, contribute to the sustainability of learning environments.

3.2 Methodology

EI of higher education teachers was examined and its result over student engagement. Majorly, it observed into the association between faculty EI and SE and assessed the influence of teachers' social awareness and relationship management skills to student contribution. The study was carried out in a natural and non-artificial environment. A cross-sectional design was selected because data collection occurred at a single point (Sekaran, 2006), which is appropriate for detecting relationships between EI and SE.

The objectives of the study are fulfilled through quantitative research methodology. The standardized and validated tools were used to analysis and evaluation. The Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale(WLEIS; Wong & Law, 2002), which is better known strong psychometric properties was used to measure Faculty Emotional Intelligence. For measuring Student engagement Utrecht Work Engagement Scale-Student Version(UWES-S; Schaufeli et al., 2002) was used, along with the higher education context. The questionnaire was constructed according to a 5-point Likert scale, where the lowest score (1) represented "Strongly Disagree," and the highest score (5) represented "Strongly Agree."

The selection of the participants was done from the faculty members of undergraduate colleges of situated in Puttur, Dakshina Kannada district, Karnataka. The population sample was made up of 150 faculty members in total. This selection was made through a convenience sampling method which was suitable because of the time period and the willingness of participants to be involved. The people who filled out the online questionnaire were

considered the data collection, which opened up a larger number of people and allowed participation within a short time frame.

Pilot study was shown to examine the questionnaire to see implication and content validity of the items. The scale showed high internal stability through Cronbach's Alpha with scores of EI = 0.921; SE = 0.801. These figures deep-rooted that the tools were reliable and appropriate for the research.

Analysis of data was done using MS Excel. Descriptive statistics gave a summary of the participants' demographic features. Univariate analyses such as skewness and kurtosis were done in order to ascertain whether the data distribution was normal or not. Research conducted Pearson's correlation analysis to regulate the association between Emotional Intelligence and Student Engagement. Furthermore, the study conducted simple linear regression analysis to evaluate degree where faculty emotional intelligence predicts student engagement and thus, the way fluctuations in EI affect engagement levels in the classroom.

3.3 Research Hypotheses

H₀ (Null Hypothesis): Faculty emotional intelligence and its key factors do not significantly influence student engagement or contribute to sustainable teaching practices.

H₁ (Alternative Hypothesis): Faculty emotional intelligence and its key factors significantly influence student engagement and contribute to sustainable teaching practices.

4. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

4.1 Reliability of the Instrument

The instruments' reliability was examined using both internal consistency reliability and external reliability, which was measured using the test-retest method Cronbach's Alpha.

4.2 External Reliability (Test-Retest Method)

To analyze the stability of the instruments the test-retest method was employed. Twice pilot sample of 30 faculty members at an interval of two weeks was tested. The obtained test-retest coefficients are shown in Table No. 1, indicating that both instruments possess high external dependability.

Table No. 1. Results of Test-Retest Reliability

Instrument used	Test-Retest Coefficient (r)
EI	0.876
SE	0.763

Source: Results of Data Analysis, 2025

Results reveal that the Emotional Intelligence (EI) instrument achieved a reliability coefficient of 0.877, and the Student Engagement (SE) instrument achieved 0.762, both of which exceed the acceptable threshold value of 0.70, confirming high temporal stability.

4.3 Internal Consistency Reliability

To evaluate the scales' inter-item reliability Cronbach's Alpha (α) was used. The responses of 150 faculty members from undergraduate colleges in and around Puttur were the focus of the reliability analysis. Table No. 2 demonstrates adequate internal reliability of instruments.

Table No. 2. Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient Results

Tool	Cronbach's Alpha (α)
EI	0.920
SE	0.802

Source: Results of Data Analysis, 2025

The test proved that value greater than 0.70 is considered consistent standards according to Nunnally's (1978). As a result, the instruments are internally consistent and dependable. While the Student Engagement scale ($\alpha = 0.801$) shows good reliability, the Emotional Intelligence scale ($\alpha = 0.921$) exhibits excellent internal consistency.

Table No. 3. Univariate Analysis of the Variables

Variable	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
Self-Awareness	4.180	0.568	0.005	-0.157
Emotional Regulation	4.093	0.468	0.313	1.367
Empathy	3.780	0.516	-0.256	-0.060
Social Skills	4.320	0.559	-0.066	-0.641
Participation	3.833	0.572	-0.213	0.375
Motivation	4.120	0.542	0.083	0.267
Feedback	3.673	0.573	-0.063	-0.371
Sustainability	4.060	0.570	-0.211	0.990

Source: Results of Data Analysis, 2025

Mean values range between 3.67 and 4.32, representing that most respondents agree or strongly agree with the items measuring Emotional Intelligence and Student Engagement. The low standard deviation values (< 1.0) demonstrate that the responses are consistent and clustered around the mean, confirming the reliability of data collected.

4.6 Bivariate Evaluation

The research performed a bivariate analysis to examine the relation between EI and SE among faculty members using two statistical methods which are Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation and Simple Linear Regression. The research evaluated the connection between independent and dependent variable.

4.4 Instruments' Validity

There is a validity in the extensive review of literature and there is an alignment with each construct of theoretical frameworks on Emotional Intelligence and Student Engagement. Expert views from academics and subject experts were also sought to confirm the relevance and clarity.

Hypothesis was supported by Construct validity with deep-rooted inter-dimensional correlation of EI measures and SE indicators. The positive correlations, consistent reliability coefficients further confirm that the instruments correctly measure the fundamental constructs.

4.5 Univariate Analysis of the Variables

To assess the central tendency, variability and normality variables univariate analysis was done. The mean values were analyzed to know the faculty members' general opinion about their emotional intelligence competencies and their engagement practices in teaching and learning. To verify the reliability of the responses and ensure the absence of large variations standard deviation values were used. All values falls within the acceptable range according to skewness and kurtosis, representing the data normally scattered and suitable for further statistical analysis.

4.7 Correlation Analysis

To determine correlation between variables through two-tailed significance test Pearson's Correlation method was used. The results are shown in Table No. 4.

Table No. 4. Correlation

Variables	r	p-value	Interpretation
Emotional Intelligence (EI) vs. Student Engagement (SE)	0.145	0.077	Weak positive correlation (Not significant)

Source: Data Analysis Results, 2025

The analysis results showed a weak positive relationship with the value of 0.145. The link between student engagement and faculty emotional intelligence

did not achieve statistical significance. But the positive trend suggested that greater student engagement might occur with faculty members who have higher emotional intelligence.

4.8 Simple Linear Regression Analysis

The test led to investigate how EI predicts SE through a predictive relationship.

Regression Equation:

Student Engagement = 3.207 + 0.175(Emotional Intelligence)

Table No. 5. Simple Regression Results

Summary	Value
R	0.145
R ²	0.021
β (Unstandardized Coefficient)	0.175
Constant (a)	3.207
t-value	1.778
p-value	0.077

Source: Data Analysis Results, 2025

The regression results show that EI accounts for 2.1% ($R^2 = 0.021$) of the variance in Student Engagement. Although the regression coefficient ($\beta = 0.175$) is positive, the result does not reach statistical significance at $p = 0.077$. This implies that faculty

Emotional Intelligence produces small positive effect on student engagement yet other elements factors such as teaching strategies, institutional support, and learning environment seem to have a stronger impact in enhancing student engagement outcomes.

Table No. 6. Shows the Descriptive Statistics of EI dimensions and SE factors among faculty members

Dimension	Mean	Standard Deviation (SD)	Interpretation
Self-Awareness	4.18	0.568	Faculty demonstrate strong self-awareness, they recognize their emotions, reflect on their actions, and understand their influence on teaching and student interactions.
Emotional Regulation	4.09	0.468	The faculty effectively handle and regulate emotions, maintaining a demeanor of calmness and composure that positively contributes to the learning environment.
Empathy	3.78	0.516	Faculty members demonstrate a good ability to comprehend and be responsive to student's emotional needs, developing trust and fostering inclusivity.
Social Skills	4.32	0.559	Faculty members have a strong capacity to communicate and establish relationships that promote teamwork, cooperation, and a positive learning environment.
Participation	3.96	0.62	Indicates substantial faculty involvement in activities in the classroom and throughout the institution to promote an interactive learning experience.
Motivation	4.08	0.58	Indicates that the faculty has a solid internal motivation to promote learning and reach classroom outcomes within a cooperative, student-centered framework.
Feedback	3.87	0.60	Indicates that faculty routinely offer constructive praise, though there are opportunities to improve two-way communication with students.
Sustainability	4.02	0.55	Indicates that faculty are committed to socially responsible teaching that balances innovation and ethical implications while acknowledging students' long-term development.

Source: Data Analysis Results, 2025

4.9. Demographic Profile

Table No. 7. Demographic Profile (n = 150)

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Female	76	50.67
	Male	74	49.33
Age Group	31-40	57	38.00
	41-50	39	26.00
	Below 30	35	23.33
	Above 50	19	12.67
Designation	Assistant Professor	80	53.33
	Associate Professor	34	22.67
	Professor	18	12.00
	Guest Faculty	18	12.00
Experience	5-10 years	50	33.33
	<5 years	48	32.00
	Above 15 years	29	19.33
	11-15 years	23	15.33

Institution Type	Private	95	63.33
	Government	30	20.00
	Aided	25	16.67
Specialization	Management	60	40.00
	Commerce	32	21.33
	Science	21	14.00
	Humanities	19	12.67
	Others	18	12.00
Source: Data Analysis Results, 2025			

4.10 Interpretation

The demographic profile depicts a relative equal gender distribution among faculty members, where the females (50.7%) are slightly more than males (49.3%). Maximum respondents belong to the 31–40 age group (38%), which reflects young to mid-career teaching staff. The largest segment is Assistant Professors (53.3%), following them is Associate Professors (22.7%), demonstrating early career teachers play an important role in SE. 65% of the faculty have the experience of 10 years, suggesting high flexibility and openness to emotional intelligence (EI) training. Private institutions (63.3%), is in large number where performance-based evaluation and student satisfaction are prioritized. Management

(40%) and Commerce (21.3%) faculty are predominant, highlighting the study's focus within business and commerce education disciplines.

4.11 Hypothesis Testing

The hypothesis testing was shown to verify the relation between faculty EI and SE. The following hypotheses were outlined for the study:

H₀ (Null Hypothesis): Faculty Emotional Intelligence and its key factors do not significantly influence Student Engagement or contribute to sustainable teaching practices.

H₁ (Alternative Hypothesis): Faculty Emotional Intelligence and its key factors significantly influence Student Engagement and contribute to sustainable teaching practices.

Table No. 8. Summary of Hypothesis Testing

Statistical Test	Variables Tested	Test Statistic	P-value	Result	Decision
Pearson's Correlation	Emotional Intelligence vs. Student Engagement	$r = 0.145$	0.077	Weak positive Correlation (Not significant)	H ₀ Accepted
Simple Linear Regression	Emotional Intelligence predicting Student Engagement	$\beta = 0.175, t = 1.778$	0.077	Weak positive Impact (Not significant)	H ₀ Accepted
Source: Data Analysis Results, 2025					

4.12 Interpretation

The results show that EI has a weak positive relationship with self-efficacy, the p-value (0.077) exceeds the 0.05 significance level which shows that the discovered connection lacks statistical significance. The research shows the faculty members with advanced emotional intelligence skills tend to have a higher engagement level but these results do not achieve the statistical significance for this particular group. Hence, null hypothesis (H₀) is acknowledged, and the alternative hypothesis (H₁) is excluded.

5 FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS

Research reveals that the faculty in and around Puttur exhibit high levels of EI, with strong self-awareness and social skills, which shows they are emotionally competent and able to create a positive situation in classrooms. Correlation analysis discovered a weak positive association between EI and SE despite high EI scores ($r = 0.145, p = 0.077$). The finding shows

faculty with higher levels of EI showed small increase in the engagement but did not reach the statistical significance. The regression analysis shows that EI accounts only for 2.1% ($R^2 = 0.021$) of the variation in SE which suggests that teaching approaches and methods and faculty backing and learning environment and student drive play a crucial role in achieving better engagement levels than EI.

The findings showed consistency with the results from previous studies which Goleman (1995) and Estrada et al. (2021) and Gunasekara et al. (2023) and Wang et al. (2021) conducted. The findings from these studies proved that EI produces slight effect on SE. It advances teaching-related aspects like empathy, communication, and trust which improves human interactions. To enhance teachers' interpersonal effectiveness faculty development programs activities are incorporated.

6 RECOMMENDATIONS

Research states that constant training is required

for improving EI among teachers, and also workshops, and school programs, honest talks, mentoring, and helpful feedback are also required for the development. To make student aware of their feelings and keep them interested, indulging emotional learning into teaching is important. Regression or Structural equation modeling could be used in later studies to look how EI affects contribution by using bigger, more varied groups of students. Puttur is the region closely knit, it's known for respecting its teachers, and being community minded. This region clearly helps with sustainability, empathy, and getting students involved. Faculty in Puttur usually use kind, friendly teaching methods, and the schools and colleges use thoughtful, inclusive ways to teach all kinds of students, like those from rural areas.

7 CONCLUSION, LIMITATIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH

High EI of teachers in and around Puttur, in the domain of social skills and self-awareness, inspires student participation in their education. Overall analysis shows that students are involved in learning to a great degree, but their level of active input and sustained commitment remains moderate. It appears that EI boosts the engagement of students, but mainly through the development of interpersonal skills like empathy, relationship management, and social awareness, rather than cognitive influence

being the direct pathway. Emotionally intelligent educators who have insight into the students' thoughts, are good communicators, and foster emotionally supportive settings, do a great job in inspiring students and facilitating emotional connections that keep students engaged. However, one of the drawbacks of the research is that it is based on teachers' perceptions only, whereas students' views could be complementary and the understanding of engagement dynamics would be more balanced if reported through both perspectives.

In addition, the research is confined to the geographic area of the undergraduate institutions in Puttur and relies on a cross-sectional design which do not account for changes over time. It is suggested that the researchers take a long-term perspective to monitor changes in EI and engagement during academic terms, involve teachers and students to show both sides of EI, and use progressive statistical techniques such as multiple regression or structural equation modeling to analyze mediators such as teaching style, institutional culture, and student motivation in future studies, thus improving the quality of the evidence base for EI and engagement in higher education. Besides, comparative studies among public, private, and aided institutions can grant a deeper insight of EI skills which improves student engagement in educational practices, thereby facilitating the implementation of emotionally intelligent, student centered policies in colleges and universities.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Aquilina, J. B. (2019). *The impact of lecturers' emotional intelligence on students*. *MCAST Journal of Applied Research & Practice*.
- [2]. Anyanwu, R. U., & Nzurike, L. N. (2023). The impact of emotional intelligence on student engagement and academic achievement in Nigerian universities. *International Journal of Innovative Learning and Practice Management*, 7(1), 45–60.
- [3]. Bar-On, R. (2006). The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence (ESI). *Psicothema*, 18, 13–25.
- [4]. Bhavani, S., & Das, P. (2015). *A study on emotional intelligence in educational institutions*.
- [5]. Brandao De Souza, C., & Jacomuzzi, A. C. (2025). The role of university professors' emotional competencies in students' academic and psychological well-being: A systematic review. *Education Sciences*, 15(7), 882. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15070882>
- [6]. Clarke, S. (2010). Emotional intelligence in the classroom: The impact on student learning. *Education Review*, 5(3), 112–118.
- [7]. Das, S., Mahato, A., & Halder, S. (2021). Emotional awareness, emotional self-regulation and empathy among working adolescents. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 9(1), Article 026. <https://doi.org/10.25215/0901.026>
- [8]. Estrada, M., Monferrer, D., Rodríguez, A., & Moliner, M. Á. (2021). Does emotional intelligence influence academic performance? The role of compassion and engagement in education for sustainable development. *Sustainability*, 13(4), 1721. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13041721>
- [9]. Falola, H., Joel, O. O., Akinbode, J., & Ojebola, O. (2025). Emotional intelligence and academic engagement of graduate students: The moderating role of digital learning support. *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies*. (Advance online publication).

- [10]. Geraci, A., Di Domenico, L., Inguglia, C., & D'Amico, A. (2023). Teachers' emotional intelligence, burnout, work engagement, and self-efficacy during COVID-19 lockdown. *Behavioral Sciences*, 13(4), 296. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13040296>
- [11]. Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. Bantam. [12]. Gumelar, W. S., Wulandari, S. F., Lestari, T. S., & Ruswandi, R. (2024). The correlation between teachers' emotional intelligence and students' learning engagement in EFL class. *Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies*, 11(2), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v11i2.3377>
- [13]. Gunasekara, A., Turner, K., Fung, C. Y., & Stough, C. (2023). Impact of lecturers' emotional intelligence on students' learning and engagement in remote learning spaces: A cross-cultural study. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 39(2), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.7848>
- [14]. Hossain, M. S., & Rahman, M. M. (2024). Influence of teachers' emotional intelligence on students' motivation for academic learning: Evidence from Bangladesh. *Cogent Education*, 11(1), 2327752. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2327752>
- [15]. Inam, A. (2025). Role of emotional intelligence in restoring trust and engagement in architectural education. *International Journal of Applied and Advanced Scientific Research*, 10(1), 42–46. <https://doi.org/10.24506/ijaasr.v10i1.7848>
- [16]. Iqbal, J., Asghar, M. Z., Ashraf, M. A., & Xie, Y. (2022). The impacts of emotional intelligence on students' study habits in blended learning environments: The mediating role of cognitive engagement. *Behavioral Sciences*, 12(1), 14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs12010014>
- [17]. Johns-Smith, D. (2023). *The relationship between classroom discipline management, emotional intelligence, age, and employee engagement* (Doctoral dissertation, Grand Canyon University). ProQuest. <https://www.proquest.com/>
- [18]. Khan, A. I., Safdar, D., Shah, M. T. U. H., Adnan, M., & Sultan, H. (2025). The impact of emotional intelligence and classroom engagement on academic performance of students. *Contemporary Journal of Social Science Review*, 3(1), 16–32.
- [19]. Kuh, G. D. (2009). The National Survey of Student Engagement: Conceptual and empirical foundations. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2009(141), 5–20.
- [20]. Kumar, P. A., Vaishnavi, M., Sinduja, R., Nithya, D., Sripriya, V., & Jaishree, S. (2025). The influence of emotional intelligence on employee engagement and productivity. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 2(1), 86.
- [21]. Lenaghan, A. J., Buda, R., & Eisner, A. A. (2007). The role of emotional intelligence in work–family conflict. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 19(1), 76–94.
- [22]. Li, Y., & Zhang, L. (2024). Exploring the relationships among teacher–student dynamics, learning enjoyment, and burnout in EFL students: The role of emotional intelligence. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1329400. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1329400>
- [23]. Nazidizaji, S., & Sajjad, A. T. (2014). Searching for design intelligence: Emotional intelligence in architectural design studios. *Frontiers of Architectural Research*.
- [24]. Nufaila, K., Angayarkanni, R., Saleena, E. C., Puthanazhi, A., & Shebeen, M. T. (2025). Fostering sustainability through emotional intelligence: Educators' role in environmental education. *International Journal of Environmental Sciences*, 11(4), 564–571.
- [25]. Pentón Herrera, L. J. (2024). An agenda for emotional intelligence in language teacher education. *Language Teacher Education Research*, 1, 48–63. <https://doi.org/10.32038/lter.2024.01.03>
- [26]. Parker, J. D., Creque, R. E., Barnhart, D. L., et al. (2004). Emotional intelligence and academic achievement: The importance of emotional self-regulation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36(3), 1185–1196.
- [27]. Pandita, A., & Kiran, R. (2023). The technology interface and student engagement as significant stimuli in sustainable student satisfaction. *Sustainability*, 15(10), 7923. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15107923>
- [28]. Pham, Q. H., & Vu, K. P. (2024). Leveraging lecturers' intelligence for student engagement enrichment in blended learning courses. *Cogent Education*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2334930>
- [29]. Poudel, M. B. (2023). Role of emotional intelligence on retaining faculty members at higher educational institutions: A phenomenological analysis of selected business schools. *Bodhi: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 9(1), 186–217. <https://doi.org/10.3126/bodhi.v9i1.61857>
- [30]. Safa, A. (2024). Revolutionizing initial teacher education: Embracing Prophet Muhammad's pedagogy for inclusive empowerment. *Journal of Research in Islamic Education*, 6(1), 18–46.
- [31]. Shafait, Z., Khan, M. A., Sahibzada, U. F., Dacko-Pikiewicz, Z., & Popp, J. (2021). An assessment of

- students' emotional intelligence, learning outcomes, and academic efficacy: A correlational study in higher education. *PLOS ONE*, 16(8), e0255428. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0255428>
- [32]. Shah, S., & Galantino, M. L. (2019). Building emotional intelligence for student success: A pilot study. *Perspectives of the ASHA Special Interest Groups*, 4(6), 1445–1461. https://doi.org/10.1044/2019_PERSP-19-00101
- [33]. Su, H., Zhang, J., Xie, M., & Zhao, M. (2022). The relationship between teachers' emotional intelligence and teaching for creativity: The mediating role of work engagement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1014905. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1014905>
- [34]. Vesely-Maillefer, M. F. (2018). Emotional intelligence as ability: Theory, challenges, and new directions. In *Emotional intelligence in education*.
- [35]. Wang, H., Khan, M. A., Anwar, F., Shahzad, F., Adu, D., & Murad, M. (2021). 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>
- [36]. Wang, Z., & Yuan, L. (2024). Teacher–student relationships and student engagement: The mediating effect of peer relationships. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 52(5), 13104E– 13111E. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.13104>
- [37]. Wentzel, K. R. (2010). Students' relationships with teachers as motivators of engagement in school. In *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 403–418). Springer.
- [38]. Wilczewski, M., Gorbaniuk, O., & Giuri, P. (2021). The psychological and academic effects of studying from home during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 644096. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.644096>
- [39]. Ye, S., Lin, X., Jenatabadi, H. S., Samsudin, N., Ke, C., & Ishak, Z. (2024). Emotional intelligence impact on academic achievement and psychological well-being among university students. *BMC Psychology*, 12, 389. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-01886-4>
- [40]. Zhoc, K. C. H., King, R. B., Chung, T. S. H., & Chen, J. (2020). Emotionally intelligent students are more engaged and successful. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 35(4), 839–863. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-019-00458-0>