To improve the effectiveness of teachers, it is very important to have a thorough understanding of their Emotional intelligence (EI) which is a very imperative psychological construct. In Pakistan, this chief aspect could not catch the attention of researchers. Current policy for teacher’s hiring and firing puts an emphasis on content expertise only. The passionate or emotive face of teaching is still being disregarded. So, it was an ultimate goal of the study to explore the association between EI and university teachers’ teaching effectiveness in the Punjab, Pakistan. A sample of the study was selected in two phases. In the first phase, from six private universities and seven public universities, 879 teachers were conveniently selected as a sample. In the second phase 170 teachers were selected as a sample on the basis of their raw mean EI score. Pupils of the following 170 teachers (n= 3551) gave data about the teaching effectiveness of their respective teachers. For the purpose of data collection, Bar-On EQ-i: Short and teaching effectiveness scale were used. It is exposed that the emotional and social capacity among the teachers in higher education sector is somewhat unformed and low, and needs improvement. It is concluded that teachers’ EI has a positive but moderate relationship with their teaching effectiveness. Teachers’ EI and all of its sub-factors are positively correlated with their teaching effectiveness including all its sub factors. Current study endows with an observed fact that EI skills contribute a lot in teaching effectiveness. It might be helpful in shifting their overemphasis on EQ rather than IQ.
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Introduction

It is a fact, universally acknowledged, that rules for work are no longer the same as they were before. According to Goleman (1995), they are ever changing. One’s performance is no more judged with his/her capability to complete the given task. It is not the only parameter to evaluate one’s work performance but the ability to handle oneself and others is also considered. Unsurprisingly, academic distinction is not parameter for job excellence anymore which once was used to be a guarantee of workplace success. At the present time, employers give the impression that they consider it outside of educational excellence to get employees who can give their best at their job place. They think it is something additional than IQ which is of more importance. It is emotional quotient (EQ) or emotional intelligence (EI) (Bar-On, 2007; Goleman, 1998).

Researchers have affirmed that EQ is a better predictor of success (27-45%) at the workplace than IQ is (1-20%) (Coetzee & Jansen, 2007; Stein & Book, 2000). It does not simply mean that EQ alone can guarantee life success. In fact, EQ and IQ both complement each other and can co-exist effectively and safely. IQ works as a foundation for EQ. Goleman (2000b) clarifies this statement with reference to workplace success. He considers IQ as a more influential predictor for categorising people for different professions to enter in, whereas EQ outperforms IQ when it comes to individuals’ success or failure within the opted profession.

Similarly, teachers’ workplace success is also no further associated with only flexibility of their approach, innovation in their attitudes and ownership of up-to-date knowledge of their subject area, but also with understanding the multiple needs of pupils, capability of recognising the significance of their potentials and enrichment of the environment for their development. To cut it short, their success depends on professional, intellectual and socio-emotional skills (Adilogullari, 2011; Chechi, 2012) as teaching is both an intellectual and emotional endeavor (Hargreaves, 1998). He beautifully argues that “good teachers are not just well-oiled machines. They are emotional passionate beings who connect with their students and fill their work and their classes with pleasure, creativity, challenge and joy” (p. 835). Fer (2004) declares socio-emotional skills to be helpful for teachers in accepting their limits and in working towards their potentials. It is supported by literature and we get the theatrical basis for the argument that teachers’ professional life is positively affected by their emotional intelligence. The existing literature provides a platform to get empirical evidence for the association between teachers’ EI and their teaching effectiveness.
Literature Review

It was 1990 when Salovey and Mayer initially familiarised the term “Emotional Intelligence”. Then, in 1995, it gained popularity from the book “Emotional Intelligence” published by Daniel Goleman. Bar-On coined the term “Emotional Quotient,” in 1985. For Bar-On (2006), “emotional-social intelligence is a cross-section of interrelated emotional and social competencies, skills and facilitators that determine how effectively we understand and express ourselves, understand others and relate with them, and cope with daily demands”.

The Encyclopedia of Applied Psychology commends three main theoretical EI models (Spielberger, 2004): the Bar-On model, the Goleman model and the Salovey-Mayer model (Bar-On, 1997; Goleman, 1998; 2000a; Mayer & Salovey, 1997) on which most of the modern research on EI is based. It can be declared after reviewing all these EI models, that emotional intelligence, in general, covers two major areas. On one side, it involves recognition and management of person’s own emotions to expedite his emotional competency. On the other side, it involves his/her competency to deal with other persons’ emotions so as to develop good social relationships. Effective teaching requires both of these competences. Effective mentors not only need to regulate their personal emotions and feelings but also need to deal with their colleagues, parents, students and officers. Therefore, the effective teacher is expected to be emotionally intelligent as well (Viin, Juust&Tooman, 2010).

To sustain a balance between their power and responsibility, a teachers’ emotional intelligence is very helpful for them(Fer, 2004). A great pile of research is evident that high EQ among teachers results in strong student-teacher relations (Adilogullari, 2011; Brackett &Katulak, 2007; Kremenitzer& Miller, 2008; Sutton & Harper, 2009), effective communication skills and practices (Nelson, Low & Nelson, 2005) active management of the classroom (Bay &McKeage, 2006; Chechi, 2012; Sutton & Harper, 2009), conflict and stress management (Brackett &Katulak, 2007), increased retention rate (Chechi, 2012), decision making and problem solving (Bay &McKeage, 2006; Salovey & Mayer, 1990), high energy and motivation (Brackett &Katulak, 2007), better dealing with individual learners and their potentials, (Mortiboys, 2005) responsible behaviour, job satisfaction, self-management in goals achievement and time management (Nelson et al., 2005), optimism, hopefulness and adaptability (Bar-On, 2006).

Conversely, low EQ may lead them towards burnout (Bono & Vey, 2005), student-teacher conflict, unjust behaviour (Fer, 2004), difficulty in managing students’ misbehaviour and ultimately towards leaving the job (Tye& O’Brien, 2002). Their students, in return, absorb and demonstrate similar negative behaviours. They become de-motivated, impertinent and obstinate (Kremenitzer& Miller, 2008).
Positive consequences of high EQ and negative consequences of low EQ may have encouraged researchers to explore the relationship between EQ and teaching effectiveness. Since 2006, these two variables have emerged as a workable premise of knowledge. Several researchers have been studying it from diverse perspectives.

Review of these studies shows that teachers included in the sample were from different levels; for instance, there were school teachers (Bala, 2017; Joshi, 2015; Kauts & Kumar, 2015; Kumar, 2016; Sharma, 2015; Turculeţ, 2015; Yadav, 2016), college teachers (Hwang, 2007; Jha & Singh, 2007; Joyce & Magesh, 2016; Kumar, 2016; Tajudin et al., 2014), prospective teachers (Adeyemo & Chukwudi, 2014; Drew, 2007; Kauts & Kaur, 2015; Todd, 2006), nursing teachers (Ali, Ali, & Jones, 2017; Allen, Ploeg, & Kaasalainen, 2012) and university teachers (Asrar-ul-haq, Anwar, & Hassan, 2017; Ghanizadeh&Moafian, 2010; Haskett, n.d; Hassan, Jani, Som, Hamid, & Azizam, 2015; Mohamadkhani , 2011; Nikoopour, 2017).

Sample size in the reviewed studies mentioned in the preceding paragraph ranged from 36 (Turculeţ, 2015) to 739 teachers (Kauts & Kumar, 2015) with an average of 253 teachers. Findings of almost all the studies reveal that there is a significantly positive relationship between teachers’ EI and their teaching effectiveness. The Pearson r value ranged from 0.24 (Nikoopour, 2017) to 0.70 (Yadav, 2016) with an average of 0.45. It was only Kumar (2016a) and (2016b) who repeatedly discovered no relationship between the variables under review.

Most of the researchers used self report measures to assess both the constructs i.e. EI and teaching effectiveness with an exception of a few (for example, Ghanizadeh&Moafian, 2010; Jha & Singh, 2007; Nikoopour, 2017; Yadav, 2016;), who collected data on teaching effectiveness from students of the concerned teachers whose EI was measured through self report scales. However, their student teacher ratio was very low. In short, small sample size, use of self report measures for teaching effectiveness and very low student teacher ratio in case of student rating of teacher effectiveness, are major limitations of previous studies which are being addressed in the present study. This study intends to (i) measure university teachers’ emotional intelligence level, (ii) measure their teaching effectiveness level through student evaluation and (iii) explore the relationship of university teachers’ emotional intelligence with their teaching effectiveness.

**Methodology**

**Sampling**

Data for this study were collected in two phases from two samples: at first, from university teachers and then from their students.
Sample for the first phase

In the first phase of data collection, sample comprised 879 teachers from six private and seven public sector universities in the Punjab, Pakistan. They belonged to social (54%), natural (32%) and administrative (14%) science faculties. Their teaching experience ranged from 2 years to 24 years (M=9.5 years). Both female (45%) and male (55%) teachers participated in the study. Their age range was from 24 to 60 years (M=37.45). At first, their EI level was measured.

Sample for second phase

Before proceeding to next step, teachers’ (N=879) raw mean EI score was calculated (M= 161.37, SD= 22.211) which ranged from 85-221. It is possible the range was 45 to 225. Based on the raw score, 170 teachers were selected for further data collection from their students. The selected sample covered the whole range of EI scores from lowest to highest. The teachers were contacted again in the second phase of the study. Their students were contacted after seeking their consent for student evaluation of their teachers’ effectiveness measured through the teaching effectiveness scale. There were 1605 (45%) females among the students (N=3551), and 1946 (55%) males. The mean of their age was 20.7 years that varied from 20 years to 25. Either they were students of a master’s degree program or they were the students of BS Honors in the final year of a 4 year program. As data were collected from all the students enrolled in classes of selected teachers, class size ranged from 10 to 91 students per class (M=34.7).

Instruments of the Study

Bar-On (2002) EQ-i: Short. EQ-i: S, a 51 items self-report questionnaire, is used to quantify the university teachers’ emotional intelligence. It is on the 5 point Likert-type scale to assess total EQ along with five composite factors: adaptability (7 items), general mood (10 items), interpersonal (10 items), stress management (8 items) and intrapersonal (10 items). In addition, it includes six items as a positive impression scale. EQ-i: S carries 22 negative items. Its scoring structure resembles cognitive intelligence tests that generate an IQ or Intelligence Quotient. Internal Reliability Coefficient of EQ-i: S; in this study it was 0.93.

Teaching effectiveness scale (TES). TES, a 32 items scale on 6 point Likert-type scale, was a self-developed questionnaire to quantify teaching effectiveness. It comprises four sub scales, i.e., classroom management (CM), content and pedagogical skills (CPS), facilitative classroom environment (FCE) and student teacher relationship (STR). Internal Reliability Coefficient of TES sub-scales ranges from 0.87 to 0.96 in this study.
Data Collection

The researcher collected the data in two stages. In the first stage, the researcher collected the data from the teachers of university on Bar-On EQ-i: Short. By keeping in mind ethical considerations, the researcher took permission by the competent authorities like registrars and rectors in private universities chairpersons in public sector universities to collect the data. 74% of respondents gave their response. Data was collected from 879 teachers about their EI, after that 170 teachers having a different score on their EI were selected as a sample in next step of data collection, and were once again contacted to seek their consent. Their pupils were asked in this stage to give data on the TES forms for pupils’ evaluation of teacher effectiveness. In the 2nd stage of data collection, it was kept in view that students were asked to give data in the end of semester so that they could give a fearless and better rating about their teachers for teaching effectiveness.

Findings

Overview of the EI Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability skills</td>
<td>26.10</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>10.00-35.00</td>
<td>7-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General mood</td>
<td>36.12</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>16.00-50.00</td>
<td>10-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>38.86</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>10.00-50.00</td>
<td>10-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal skills</td>
<td>33.58</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>12.00-50.00</td>
<td>10-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress management</td>
<td>26.69</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>08.00-40.00</td>
<td>8-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total EQ score</td>
<td>161.37</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>22.21</td>
<td>85.00-221.0</td>
<td>45-225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total EQ</td>
<td>32.27</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>17.00-44.20</td>
<td>9-45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Firstly, for the better perception of the data a comprehensive but brief description of all major variables of the study has been presented. Table 1 shows the range, potential as well as genuine, for each factor. It also depicts the mean score of teachers on different sub factors of EI; the teacher’s score was compared with that of normative data given in the manual of EQ-i: S. The comparison of university teachers’ raw mean EQ score with norm group shows that the emotional and social capacity among the university teachers of the Punjab is very stumpy and immature, and needs improvement. The whole sample showed an unsatisfactory position. To beat the standard for a high level of EI with strongly developed social and emotional capacity, they could not exceed the middling level of EI, and they hardly attain the average EI level.
Effectiveness of University Teachers

Table: 2 Descriptive Analysis of TES Sub-Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STR</td>
<td>50.6764</td>
<td>3551</td>
<td>9.296</td>
<td>26.67-65.38</td>
<td>12-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCE</td>
<td>29.9642</td>
<td>3551</td>
<td>5.513</td>
<td>16.50-39.00</td>
<td>7-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>30.5940</td>
<td>3551</td>
<td>5.996</td>
<td>15.24-39.92</td>
<td>7-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>26.4535</td>
<td>3551</td>
<td>4.777</td>
<td>13.76-34.27</td>
<td>6-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TES</td>
<td>137.688</td>
<td>3551</td>
<td>24.56</td>
<td>78.00-177.5</td>
<td>32-192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows the mean score and standard deviation values of teachers on TES and the actual and potential range of the raw score. It is shown through the table that the university teachers plunge in the middling range of TES score and additionally to the sub-scales when interpreted against normative data.

Correlation between Teachers’ EI and their Teaching Effectiveness

Table: 3 Correlations among the Sub-Scale of EI and TES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>CPS</th>
<th>FCE</th>
<th>STR</th>
<th>TES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adaptability skills</td>
<td>.252(**)</td>
<td>.290(**)</td>
<td>.302(**)</td>
<td>.268(**)</td>
<td>.289(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general mood</td>
<td>.248(**)</td>
<td>.293(**)</td>
<td>.290(**)</td>
<td>.248(**)</td>
<td>.279(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpersonal skills</td>
<td>.289(**)</td>
<td>.332(**)</td>
<td>.326(**)</td>
<td>.295(**)</td>
<td>.322(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intrapersonal skills</td>
<td>.280(**)</td>
<td>.304(**)</td>
<td>.257(**)</td>
<td>.275(**)</td>
<td>.290(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stress management skills</td>
<td>.169(*)</td>
<td>.190(*)</td>
<td>.220(**)</td>
<td>.178(*)</td>
<td>.196(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall emotional intelligence</td>
<td>.310(**)</td>
<td>.353(**)</td>
<td>.347(**)</td>
<td>.315(**)</td>
<td>.344(**)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ** 0.01 level and * 0.05 level

To investigate the association between teachers’ teaching effectiveness and their emotional intelligence, Pearson r was applied. Table 3 indicates that the correlation between all the sub-scales of EI with all the sub-scales of TES are positive and statistically significant either on the level of 0.05 or 0.01. It ranges from 0.17 for the relationship between stress management skills and classroom management, to 0.35 for the relationship between overall EI score and content and pedagogical skills. The value of correlation for overall EI and TES score is 0.34 which shows a moderately positive relationship between the variables under study.
Discussion

Through the results of the study, it can be concluded that the teachers’ EI level falls at the bottommost line of effectiveness which points out that some expected areas are there for relative strength in addition to areas that also need development for enhanced social and emotional performance.

Results and outcomes of the study can be verified with the sketch drawn by Hoodbhoy (2009) of the work environment in Pakistani Universities in regard to teacher’s activities. He declared that the teachers replicate what they have experienced in their student life when they were studying in public schools. It is a controlled and authoritarian teaching environment. Teachers are likely to exert their vast authority and students do not hold any right to appeal for unfair marking. Only few teachers are regular in taking their lectures and make students thoroughly understand the courses. Teachers who are not competent or are less competent and who feel insecure discourage the students and do not allow them to ask questions. Mostly teachers do not consult textbooks or extra sources. They are used to recoding the notes they had taken in the past when they were students of the same department in which they are teaching now.

Joseph and Brown (2001) requested the pupils to state the features of teachers who possess low EI. They revealed that before making a decision for them, teachers do not pay attention to all sides. They show favouritism in the class. They are not ready to explain things and content to students properly, call students with different names, pressurise them, are not confident to deal with hard-hitting conditions, do not provide feedback or provide unjust reports. Such teachers are not really caring, throw things at students, use excessive power, do not bother to be aware of students’ feeling and hurt their emotional state occasionally. The results of the study confirmed all those behaviours which had been observed in the classroom.

If the teachers are not stable and intelligent emotionally, they can definitely misuse their authority. Teachers might punish pupils in terms of insulting remarks, might show signs of verbal aggression and might deduct their marks, as a result of losing their impulse control. Low EQ causes job burnout (Bono & Vey, 2005; Tye & O’Brien, 2002), unjust teacher behaviour and teacher student conflict (Fer, 2004). In return, pupils of such teachers also tend to display negative behaviours. They become rude and stubborn and show low motivational level (Kremenitzer & Miller, 2008).

The emerging situation is worrisome and distressing. Therefore, finding out the reasons for teacher’s low emotional intelligence is very important. It is reality that universities and educational standards in universities have improved in Pakistan with the establishment of HEC.
In the past, universities did not ever enjoy such a high budget as they are doing now. But, it is also a reality that the budget assigned to a sole top ranked university in the world, is higher than that spent on all Pakistani universities. In such pitiable circumstances, how is it possible to make all the facilities and services available to a university which are necessary for its successful functioning?

Consequently, Pakistani universities are distinguished by acute deficiency of scholarship, intellectual coyness and regular corporeal violent behaviour (Hoodbhoy, 2009). There is a huge lack of suitablenetworking and substantial facilities in Pakistani universities which aredeclared in the National education Policy (2009). Reports have shown that, “it is a great challenge to provide sufficient resources to ensure required infrastructure including teaching aids, libraries, scientific apparatus, laboratories, and high speed internet connection” (p.55). Additionally, teachers have to face psychological, financial, and social problems which are the reason for their discomfort and disappointment in their career.

Secondly, their low EI could be justified with the reason that they get very low chances for the development of their EI and other associated skills. In developed countries, development of EI is considered most important. Most of their organisations are arranging trainings and seminars for the development of EI. As stated by Goleman (1995) “the work rules are being changed” (p. 1). Employees’ work presentation could not be evaluated only on the basis of their capability to complete the given task but ability to handle one self and others is also considered. Disappointedly it is stated that in Pakistan, not even a single workshop, training session, conference or seminar is arranged to increase teachers’ EI.

As far as teaching effectiveness of university teachers is concerned, their TES score cascades in the medium range. Their students are told that teachers working in the universities were performing their duties satisfactorily but not very efficiently.

To conclude, it is to say that teachers’ EQ-i Short all the sub-factors such as adaptability, general mood, interpersonal skill, intrapersonal skill, stress management and overall EI have positive and moderate relationship with all the sub-scales of teaching effectiveness scale such as content and pedagogical skills, classroom environment, classroom management, teacher students relationship and overall teaching effectiveness. Findings of the current study are in accordance with those of previous studies (Adeyemo & Chukwudi, 2014; Ali, Ali, & Jones, 2017; Allen, Ploeg, & Kaasalainen, 2012; Asrar-ul-haq, Anwar, & Hassan, 2017; Bala, 2017; Ghanizadeh&Moafian, 2010;Hassan, Jani, Som, Hamid, & Azizam, 2015; Hwang, 2007; Jha & Singh, 2007; Joshi, 2015; Joyce & Magesh, 2016; Kauts & Kaur, 2015; Kauts & Kumar, 2015; Mohamadkhani ,
It is originated from the study that teachers’ EI has a positive correlation with the student-teacher relationship. It is also in line with many other research studies (e.g. Adilogullari, 2011; Brackett & Salovey, 2004; Fer, 2004; Lopes, Salovey, Cote & Beers, 2005; Nelson et al., 2005). Lopes et al. (2005) affirmed that quality of the individuals’ social interactions has a direct impact on emotion regulation abilities. Lopes (2011) stated that the capacity to assess emotional situations and to make out useful reaction strategies to administer such situations is related to the quality of social interaction and interpersonal relationships. In a prescribed learning setup like universities, students and teacher interaction is frequent and constant. Both inside the classroom and outside the classroom, students bring their problems to teachers. Emotionally intelligent teachers respect the individuality of the students, care for them and are always ready to resolve their issues. It ultimately causes attachment between a student and a teacher.

Findings of the study showed a positive connection flanked by teacher’s EI and effective classroom management. Similar findings are also verified by many other researchers (Chechi, 2012; Nelson et al., 2005). Another research affirmed a positive relationship between teachers’ EI and five classroom disciplinary approaches: aggression, discussion, recognition or reward, hinting and involvement (Jeloudar, Yunus, Roslan & Nor, 2011). Insignificant relationship was found only with one approach, i.e., punishment. In the university environment, student’s troublesome behaviours are observed only when they are free to wander here and there; only when they have nothing attention gaining and well-to-do activity in the classroom, which allows them to bother other students and the teacher. They will definitely prove themselves as an active and productive part of teaching learning process, if teacher values their presence and positively involves them in the teaching/learning procedure in the classroom. Crescent (2007) asserts that to keep away from disciplinary problems in the class, an emotionally intelligent teacher keeps the pupils busy in learning process through different activities. To lessen classroom disturbance, she/he makes best use of students’ instructional experience. S/he clearly knows how to handle disobedient and unmotivated pupils.

There is a positive relationship between a supportive classroom environment and EI in teachers. Many other researchers have also argued in accordance with the current study that a teacher who is emotionally healthy is better able to build a safe and emotionally strong learning environment categorised by respect and trust (Fernandez-Berrocal & Ruiz, 2008). It will promote active engagement, affirmative social communication, and studious achievement (Brackett & Katulak, 2007; Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2004). A survey carried out by a renowned indigenous website revealed that, bunking a class (truancy) is ranked at the second number in top ten behaviours of
students in universities (ilmkidunya, 2012). Either a very lenient or very strict attitude of the teacher is very first and major reason of truancy. In distinction, students like to attend the classes where they think they are safe emotionally and physically. Crescent (2007) stated that the teacher who is emotionally and psychologically strong exhibits patience, encourages them to make use of their efforts on productive tasks, does not use abusive language, and instead of blaming the students for their weaknesses, his centre of attention is their strengths.

The EI of teachers is also relatatable to their pedagogical skills and content related skills. This finding is not confirmed by many studies. It is just Ghanizadeh and Moafian(2010) who made a study to find out the relationship between teacher’s success in pedagogical skills and their emotional quotient (EQ) and originated that that there is significantly positive relationship between teacher’s EQ and their success in pedagogical skills. Crescent (2007) also stated that only an emotionally intelligent teacher gives importance to the individual differences of students. An emotionally intelligent teacher selects the instructional objective and learning material wisely and plans the learning activities accordingly. To motivate the students and to enhance their educational experience, s/he finds out new-fangled and creative instructional techniques. S/he is always willing to find out and learn new techniques, if s/he has any problem in his/her instructional experiences. To bring the discussion to the conclusion it is stated that the teachers who are aware of their students, who understand and express themselves in point of fact and deal with the hassle of their profession of teaching, are better in the student-teacher relationship, and can manage their classrooms positively, can bring their content knowledge and pedagogical skills up to date and in due course prove themselves to be efficient teachers.

**Recommendations**

Teachers showed deficient socio-emotional skills in this study. Therefore, teachers’ EQ should also be considered during their recruitment, along with their IQ and qualification.

Already selected teachers should be given opportunity to conquer their weak points and improve their skills. It is affirmed through literature that EI skills could be improved with training (Bar-On, 2006; Dolev & Leshem, 2016; Dulewicz&Higgsdeclares, 2004; Jaeger, 2004; Nelis, Quoidbach, Mikolajczak&Hansenne, 2009). So, seminars, training sessions, conferences and workshops should be conducted which could address their individual socio-emotional needs.

HEC should assure to include social skills development in their faculty development programs. In-service and pre-service teacher’s education should include EI and related skills as part of their training programs.
A positive correlation between teachers’ teaching effectiveness and their EI calls for focus on blend of IQ and EQ. A knowing place must be given to teachers’ EQ while making all the HRM decisions related to teachers, e.g. staffing, worker’s protection, professional development, benefits and rewards, appraisal and even termination.
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