Research Paper

Social Emotional Learning and Student Engagement in University Towards A Nurturance Program

PENG，MANLI
ADAMSON UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT
This study aims to assess the levels of Social Emotional Learning (SEL) and Student Engagement (SE) among students at Huizhou University, examining the interrelationship between these two critical factors. The overarching objective is to develop a comprehensive nurturance program designed to bolster students' social and emotional well-being, thereby enhancing their academic engagement. Through rigorous analysis, the research identified a significant correlation between the evaluated levels of Social Emotional Learning (SEL) and Student Engagement (SE). Interestingly, the findings revealed no discernible variations in SEL and SE levels based on sex or year level.
Key words: *Social Emotional Learning; Student Engagement; Nurturance Program*

I. INTRODUCTION

The pursuit of quality education has always been a paramount goal in the realm of academia. In recent years, there has been a growing recognition of the vital role played by Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) in the overall development and academic success of students in higher education. This growing awareness has led to the acknowledgement and support of SEL by prominent international organizations such as UNESCO, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), and the European Union (EU). Notably, countries like the United States, Britain, and Australia have also embraced the importance of SEL.

The significance of SEL lies in its capacity to nurture and enhance students' social-emotional abilities, enabling them to develop strong interpersonal skills, emotional intelligence, and effective communication. As students navigate the complexities of higher education, their engagement in the learning process becomes a pivotal indicator of the education system's quality (Qu Liaojian et al., 2022). Student Engagement (SE) extends beyond academic performance to encompass students' initiative, participation, and learning motivation. Understanding the close relationship between SEL and SE is crucial as it directly impacts students' ability to interact and cooperate with teachers and classmates effectively.

II. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Research Design

In this study, a descriptive comparative correlational research design was employed to investigate the relationship between Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) and student engagement among college students at Huizhou University in Guangdong Province. This research design was well-suited for examining the characteristics of the variables under study, describing their prevalence, and exploring potential associations between them (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The descriptive aspect of the design enabled us to provide a comprehensive overview of students' SEL levels and their engagement in the learning process. On the other hand, the correlational aspect allowed us to examine whether there was a significant relationship between SEL and student engagement.

Through the descriptive research component, data had been collected to characterize the student respondents in terms of their social-emotional learning (SEL) and various dimensions of student engagement, such as classroom participation, autonomous learning, and interpersonal interaction. The researcher had obtained demographic information, including sex and year level, to provide a profile of the student participants in our study.

Moreover, self-report surveys and rating scales had been used to assess students' SEL levels and their engagement in the learning. This approach enabled the researcher to quantitatively measure the students' social-emotional competencies, as well as their active involvement and emotional investment in academic tasks and classroom activities.

In the correlational research component, the researcher analyzed the data collected through surveys and rating scales to determine whether there was a significant relationship between students' SEL and their level of engagement. The correlational analysis allowed the researcher to explore whether higher levels of SEL were associated with increased student engagement, and whether specific aspects of SEL, such as self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making, had a more significant impact on certain dimensions of student engagement.

2.2 Research Locale and Participants

The locale for this research is in Huizhou University,situated in Guangdong Province, China. With a total student population of 16,325, the university comprises a diverse and sizable community of learners. Among these students, there are 4,798 male students and 11,527 female students, showcasing a gender distribution that allows for gender-specific analyses in the study.

Guangdong Province, known for its economic prosperity and cultural heritage, provides an enriching environment for this research. As one of China's most dynamic regions, Guangdong Province attracts students from various socio-economic backgrounds, creating a diverse student body with distinct experiences and perspectives. Exploring the relationship between Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) and student engagement within this diverse setting can yield valuable insights into the factors influencing students' emotional well-being and academic involvement.

Huizhou University's large student population and wide range of academic disciplines offer a comprehensive scope for the research. By involving students from various year levels and fields of study, this study can examine how SEL and student engagement vary across different academic programs and stages of college education. Furthermore,the university's supportive academic community and administration facilitate the research process.Access to resources, such as classrooms, libraries, and student support services, ensures the efficient collection of data related to SEL and student engagement.

2.3 Sampling Method

For this research, the sampling method chosen was stratified random sampling. This approach allowed the creation of subgroups or strata based on specific characteristics of the population, and then a proportional and representative sample was selected from each stratum . In this case, the population consisted of all students at the University, and the researcher divided them into different strata based on their year level.

Since the total student population at Huizhou University was 16,325, and the calculated sample size was 376 using the Raosoft sample size calculator, the researcher determined the number of students to be included from each stratum to ensure proportional representation.

To achieve stratified random sampling, the researcher randomly selected a proportionate number of participants from each stratum. The sample size for each stratum was determined based on the proportion of students in that specific year level compared to the total student population. This approach ensured that each stratum was adequately represented in the final sample, allowing for meaningful comparisons between different year levels.

The benefits of using stratified random sampling included increased precision in estimating population parameters and the ability to make more accurate inferences about the entire student population at Huizhou University. By incorporating proportional representation from each year level, the researcher could capture the diversity of experiences and perspectives across different stages of college education. Moreover, stratified random sampling helped to reduce potential biases that might arise from using simple random sampling or other non-probability sampling methods. It allowed the researcher to control for any variations in characteristics or behaviors that might exist among students at different year levels, leading to a more robust and reliable study.

Table 1   Population and Sample

Year Level	Population	Sample
First Year	3,980	92
Second Year	4,115	95
Third Year	4,230	97
Fourth Year	4,000	92
TOTAL	16,325	376

2.4 Data Gathering Procedure

Conducting a comprehensive study on Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) and student engagement at Huizhou University in Guangdong Province required a well-structured and systematic approach.

At the outset, research questions and objectives were clearly formulated to focus on the relationship between SEL and student engagement. A detailed research proposal was developed, highlighting the study's rationale, objectives, chosen research design, data collection methods, and data analysis plan. Prior to commencing data collection, necessary approvals from the university's Institutional Review Board (IRB) were obtained to ensure ethical considerations were met.

For the study to be representative of the university's student population, stratified random sampling was employed. A list of all enrolled students, along with their respective year levels, was obtained to create strata. From each stratum, a proportionate number of participants were randomly selected, resulting in a final sample size of 376 students. Invitations to participate in the study were extended to the selected students, accompanied by a clear explanation of the study's purpose and significance. Their consent to participate was sought before proceeding.

A researcher-made questionnaire was constructed, divided into three parts to explore different facets of the students' experiences and perceptions. Part 1 gathered demographic information, including age and year level. Part 2 utilized a 4-point Likert scale to assess SEL, covering dimensions such as self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making. Part 3 also employed a 4-point Likert scale to evaluate student engagement, focusing on classroom participation, autonomous learning, and interpersonal interaction. The questionnaire's validity and reliability were ensured through expert reviews and piloting with a small group of students.

Once the questionnaire was finalized, data collection commenced. Participants had the option to complete the questionnaire either through an online survey platform or in-person interviews, providing flexibility and convenience. Clear instructions were provided to ensure accurate and consistent responses. A reasonable time frame was set for data collection to accommodate participants' schedules and maximize response rates.

Upon completion of data collection, the gathered data were entered into a statistical analysis software program, such as SPSS. Descriptive statistics were employed to summarize the participants' demographic characteristics, SEL scores, and student engagement levels. Inferential statistics, including t-tests and correlation analyses, were performed to explore relationships between variables and answer the research questions.

The statistical findings were interpreted in relation to the research questions and objectives. Relationships between SEL and student engagement, as well as any differences based on demographic variables, were analyzed. The implications of the results were discussed, drawing comparisons with existing literature on SEL and student engagement.

To contribute to the broader field of social-emotional learning and student engagement research, the study's findings were shared at academic conferences or symposiums. Additionally, efforts were made to publish the study in reputable peer-reviewed journals to reach a wider audience and foster knowledge dissemination. By following this step-by-step procedure, the research on SEL and student engagement at Huizhou University was conducted systematically and effectively. The insights gained from the study had the potential to benefit both students and the university's academic environment, ultimately enhancing the overall learning experience and well-being of the students.

Table 2   Interpretation of Data

Weigh	Scale/Range	Description	Interpretation
4	3.25-4.00	Strongly Agree	High Level
3	2.50-3.24	Agree	Average Level
2	1.75-2.49	Disagree	Low Level
1	1.00-1.74	Strongly Disagree	Very Low Level

2.5 Research Instrument

In this research, a researcher-made questionnaire was utilized to gather data from the participants. The questionnaire was divided into three parts, each designed to explore different aspects of the students' experiences and perceptions.The researcher-made questionnaire served as a valuable instrument to gather data on the participants' profiles, social-emotional learning, and student engagement. The combination of Likert scales and specific dimensions explored in each part provided a comprehensive and nuanced understanding of

how SEL and student engagement related to the demographic characteristics of the students at Huizhou University in Guangdong Province. This data played a crucial role in analyzing the research questions and proposing effective nurturance programs to enhance the students' overall well-being and academic success.

3.RESULT AND INTERPETATION
3.1 Profile of Respondents

Table 3 The profile of Participants

Profile		Frequency	Percentage
Sex	Male	151	40.2
	Female	225	59.8
	Total	**376**	**100.0**
Year level	Freshman	92	24.5
	Sophomore	95	25.3
	Junior	97	25.8
	Senior	92	24.5
	Total	**376**	**100.0**

Table 3 displayed the frequency and percentage distribution of participants grouped by their profiles. As shown in the table, females constituted the majority, accounting for 59.8% of the participants, while males accounted for 40.2% . This indicated that most of the participants were female. The study showed that the majority of student participants were Juniorcomprising 25.8%, followed by Sophomores at 25.3%,Seniors at 24.5% and Juniors at 24.5% also.Overall, there was a relatively small difference in numbers between the four year level.

The personal profile of the respondents considered in the study are based on Sex and Year level.
3.2 The assessment on the level of students'social and Emotional Learning
3.2.1 Self Awareness

Table 4 Assessment on Self Awareness

Self Awareness	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation	Rank
I know what I am thinking and doing.	2.87	0.88	Agree	Average	1
I understand why I do what I do.	2.78	0.92	Agree	Average	3.5
I understand my moods and feelings.	2.78	0.86	Agree	Average	3.5
I know when I am moody.	2.76	0.90	Agree	Average	5
I can read people's faces when they are angry.	2.79	0.89	Agree	Average	2
Composite Mean	**2.79**	**0.73**	**Agree**	**Average**	

Legend:3.25-4.00 Strongly Agree/High   2.50-3.24 Agree/ Average
1.75-2.49 Disagree/Low   1.00-1.74Strongly Disagree/ Very Low

Table 4 showed that participants had a high level of self-awareness, being clear about their thoughts and actions and understanding their motivations and emotions. Specifically, with an average composite score of 2.79, it indicated that, overall, participants had a relatively stable awareness of their emotional and mental states. However, a standard deviation of 0.73 also indicated some individual variations in the levels of self-awareness within the sample, with some participants showing significant fluctuations in their self-awareness.

3.2.2 Social Awareness
Table 5 Assessment on Social Awareness
Legend:3.25-4.00 Strongly Agree/High   2.50-3.24 Agree/ Average

Social Awareness	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation	Rank
I recognize how people feel by looking at their facial expressions.	2.82	0.90	Agree	Average	2.5
It is easy for me to understand why people feel the way they do.	2.82	0.89	Agree	Average	2.5
If someone is sad, angry or happy, I believe I know what they are thinking.	2.81	0.88	Agree	Average	4
I understand why people react the way they do.	2.85	0.86	Agree	Average	1
If a friend is upset, I have a pretty good idea why.	2.76	0.91	Agree	Average	5
Composite Mean	**2.81**	**0.73**	**Agree**	**Average**	

1.75-2.49 Disagree/Low   1.00-1.74Strongly Disagree/ Very Low

*Corresponding Author: PENG，MANLI

Table 5 indicated that participants demonstrated a stable performance in understanding others' emotions, with an average composite score of 2.81. They could accurately identify others' emotions by observing facial expressions and easily comprehend the reasons behind others' emotions. However, a standard deviation of 0.73 revealed some individual variations in the levels of understanding others' emotions within the sample.

3.2.3 Self Management

Table 6 Assessment on Self Management

Self Management	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation	Rank
I can stay calm in stressful situations.	2.70	0.91	Agree	Average	5
I stay calm and overcome anxiety in new or changing situations.	2.74	0.93	Agree	Average	4
I stay calm when things go wrong.	2.76	0.94	Agree	Average	3
I can control the way I feel when something bad happens.	2.78	0.87	Agree	Average	1
When I am upset with someone, I will wait till I have calmed down before discussing the issue.	2.77	0.95	Agree	Average	2
Composite Mean	**2.75**	**0.75**	**Agree**	**Average**	

Legend:3.25-4.00 Strongly Agree/High   2.50-3.24 Agree/ Average
1.75-2.49 Disagree/Low   1.00-1.74 Strongly Disagree/ Very Low

Table 6 indicated that participants demonstrated a relatively stable performance in self-management, with an average composite score of 2.75.They were able to stay calm in the face of stress, navigate new or challenging situations while overcoming anxiety, and effectively control their emotions in unfavorable circumstances.However, a standard deviation of 0.75 revealed some individual variations in the levels of self-management within the sample.

3.2.4 Relationship Management

Table 7 Assessment on Relationship Management

Relationship Management	Mean	SD	Descriptive	Interpretation	Rank
I will always apologize when I hurt my friend unintentionally.	2.75	0.90	Agree	Average	3
I always try and comfort my friends when they are sad.	2.77	0.93	Agree	Average	2
I try not to criticize my friend when we quarrel.	2.72	0.87	Agree	Average	4
I am tolerant of my friend's mistakes.	2.81	0.88	Agree	Average	1
I stand up for myself without putting others down.	2.71	0.92	Agree	Average	5
Composite Mean	**2.75**	**0.73**	**Agree**	**Average**	

Legend:3.25-4.00 Strongly Agree/High   2.50-3.24 Agree/ Average
1.75-2.49 Disagree/Low   1.00-1.74 Strongly Disagree/ Very Low

Table 7 indicated that participants demonstrated a relatively stable performance in relationship management, with an average composite score of 2.75. They typically apologized when unintentionally hurting friends, made an effort to provide comfort when friends were upset, and tried to avoid criticizing friends during disagreements. Additionally, they showed tolerance towards friends' mistakes and were able to assert themselves without demeaning others. However, a standard deviation of 0.73 revealed some individual variations in the levels of relationship management within the sample.

3.2.5 Responsible   Decision-Making

Table 8 Assessment on Responsible Decision-Making

Responsible Decision-Making	Mean	SD	Descriptive	Interpretation	Rank
1.When making decisions, I take into account the consequences of my actions.	2.74	0.94	Agree	Average	3
2.I ensure that there are more positive outcomes when making a choice.	2.77	0.91	Agree	Average	1
3.I weigh the strengths of the situation before deciding on my action.	2.76	0.92	Agree	Average	2
4. I consider the criteria chosen before making a recommendation.	2.73	0.92	Agree	Average	4
5.I consider the strengths and weaknesses of the strategy before deciding to use it.	2.72	0.93	Agree	Average	5
Composite Mean	**2.75**	**0.75**	**Agree**	**Average**	

Table 8 displayed that participants demonstrated relative stability in responsible decision-making, with an average composite score of 2.75. They considered the consequences of their actions, aimed for more positive outcomes, and weighed the strengths of situations before deciding on their actions. Additionally, participants took into account chosen criteria before making recommendations and assessed the strengths and weaknesses of strategies before deciding to implement them. However, a standard deviation of 0.75 revealed some individual variations in the levels of responsible decision-making within the sample.

Table 9   Summary of Assessed the Level Of Students' Social and Emotional Learning

	Mean	SD	Descriptive	Interpretation	Rank
Self Awareness	2.79	0.73	Agree	Average	2
Social Awareness	2.81	0.73	Agree	Average	1
Self management	2.75	0.75	Agree	Average	4
Relationship Management	2.75	0.73	Agree	Average	4
Responsible Decision Making	2.75	0.75	Agree	Average	4
Overall	2.77	0.69	Agree	Average	

Table 9 displayed the participants' scores across five dimensions of Social and Emotional Learning, as well as their overall level of participation. Notably, the overall score for participants in Social   Emotional Learning was 2.77. The highest score or Rank 1 is for Social Awareness ,   indicating a strong understanding of one's own emotions and the emotions of others. The lowest scores or Rank 4 are for Self-Management and Responsible Decision Making, suggesting areas where there might be room for improvement in personal emotional regulation and decision-making processes.This result indicated that the participants exhibited relatively balanced and good capabilities across the five core dimensions of Social and Emotional Learning —self-awareness, social awareness, self-management, relationship management, and responsible decision-making. The overall score of 2.77 suggested that the participants had a certain level of maturity and skills in understanding and managing their own emotions, understanding others' emotions, effectively handling interpersonal relationships, and making responsible decisions. This score reflected a relatively high level of social and emotional learning, indicating that the participants had achieved the goal of active participation in these key social and emotional competencies.

3.2 The Difference In The Assessed Level Of Social and Emotional Learning   When The Respondents Are Grouped According To Profile

3.2.1 Grouped According To Sex

Table 10 t-Test of   Different Between The Assessed Level Of Social and Emotional Learning When The Respondents Are Grouped According To Sex

Variable	Sex	N	Mean	t-value	Sig.	Decision On Ho.	Interpretation
Self Awareness	Male	151	2.80	0.23	0.82	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	225	2.79				
Social Awareness	Male	151	2.82	0.19	0.85	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	225	2.81				
Self management	Male	151	2.74	-0.35	0.73	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	225	2.76				
Relationship Management	Male	151	2.74	-0.29	0.77	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	225	2.76				
Responsible Decision Making	Male	151	2.75	0.09	0.93	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	225	2.74				

Legend: α=0.05

*Corresponding Author: PENG，MANLI

Table 10 presented the results of a t-test analysis, determining if there were significant differences in the levels of Social and Emotional Learning when participants were grouped by gender. As previously mentioned, the Level of Social and Emotional Learning includes Self Awareness, Social Awareness, Self Management, Relationship Management, and Responsible Decision Making. No significant gender differences were found. The difference in the level of Self Awareness among respondents was not significant, confirmed with a recorded t-value of 0.23 and a p-value of 0.82.Similarly, the assessment of the Social Awareness level showed no significant difference, evidenced by a recorded t-value of 0.19 and a p-value of 0.85. The evaluation of Self Management level also showed no significant difference, with a recorded t-value of 0.35 and a p-value of 0.73. The assessment of Relationship Management level revealed no significant difference, supported by a recorded t-value of 0.29 and a p-value of 0.77. Lastly, the evaluation of Responsible Decision Making level showed no significant difference, validated by a recorded t-value of 0.09 and a p-value of 0.93. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Current (2023) pointed out in his research: From the perspective of gender differences, the data in the table showed very close scores and standard deviations for both male and female participants across the five dimensions of self-awareness, social awareness, self-management, relationship management, and responsible decision-making, with no significant statistical differences (Sig values all above 0.05). This implied that there were almost no significant differences in capabilities and understanding between males and females in these core dimensions of social and emotional learning. This reflected the diminishing influence of gender on individuals' development and performance in these areas in modern society, or it indicated that the Nurturanceand development of these social and emotional skills had transcended traditional gender roles and expectations.

Fox (2023) noted in his research: From a socio-cultural background perspective, these results also reflected the emphasis on gender equality in the educational system and social environment of the respondents. In some cultures and educational settings, both males and females received similar education and training in social and emotional learning, which helped narrow the gender differences in these areas. Additionally, these data suggested that both males and females were able to receive similar support and resources in dealing with emotions, establishing interpersonal relationships, and decision-making, thereby achieving equal development in these key skills.

3.2 Grouped According To Year Level

Table 11 F-Test of Difference In The Assessed Level Of Social and Emotional Learning When The Respondents Are Grouped According To Year level

Variable		N	Mean	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho.	Interpretation
Self Awareness	Freshman	92	2.83	0.22	0.88	Accepted	Not Significant
	Sophomore	95	2.75				
	Junior	97	2.80				
	Senior	92	2.78				
	Total	376	2.79				
Social Awareness	Freshman	92	2.83	0.31	0.82	Accepted	Not Significant
	Sophomore	95	2.77				
	Junior	97	2.86				
	Senior	92	2.79				
	Total	376	2.81				
Self Management	Freshman	92	2.76	0.22	0.88	Accepted	Not Significant
	Sophomore	95	2.70				
	Junior	97	2.75				

	Senior	92	2.78				
	Total	376	2.75				
Relationship Management	Freshman	92	2.79	0.40	0.75	Accepted	Not Significant
	Sophomore	95	2.69				
	Junior	97	2.78				
	Senior	92	2.74				
	Total	376	2.75				
Responsible Decision Making	Freshman	92	2.78	0.17	0.92	Accepted	Not Significant
	Sophomore	95	2.72				
	Junior	97	2.75				
	Senior	92	2.72				
	Total	376	2.75				

According to the results of independent sample F-test shown in Table 11, we can see the year level differences of each dimension.Table 11 presented the results of an F-test analysis, determining significant differences in The Assessed Level Of SEL among student participants categorized by year level. It was observed that Freshman participants showed a notably active level in The Assessed Level Of SEL, while participants from other year level groups exhibited lower levels of activity. When grouped by year level, the difference in the assessment of Self Awareness level among respondents did not show significant variation, with a recorded t-value of 0.22 and a p-value of 0.88. Similarly, when grouped by age, the evaluation of Social Awareness level also did not show significant differences, with a t-value of 0.31 and a p-value of 0.82. The assessment of Self Management level, when grouped by age, also did not show significant differences, with a t-value of 0.22 and a p-value of 0.88. In the assessment of Relationship Management level, when grouped by age, there were no significant differences, with a t-value of 0.40 and a p-value of 0.75. Finally, in the assessment of Responsible Decision Making level, when grouped by age, no significant differences were found, with a t-value of 0.17 and a p-value of 0.92. The null hypothesis was accepted for all dimensions.

Pham (2023) pointed out in his research: From the perspective of academic progression, these data indicated that there was little difference in scores between students of different academic years across the five dimensions of social and emotional learning — self-awareness, social awareness, self-management, relationship management, and responsible decision-making—demonstrating a consistent level of social and emotional capabilities. This implied that there were no significant stage differences in the development of these abilities as students progressed through their academic years, or that the development of these abilities was relatively stable throughout university life. This situation was associated with the characteristics of the university educational environment, where students continuously encountered similar social and emotional learning opportunities and challenges throughout their university tenure.

Jenaabadi (2023) noted in her research: From the perspective of educational experience, these results reflected the impact of university education on the   Nurturanceof social and emotional capabilities. During their time in university, students continuously practiced and enhanced these abilities through various courses, activities, and social interactions. For instance, team projects, classroom discussions, and campus life all provided opportunities to learn and practice skills such as self-awareness, social awareness, and self-management. Therefore, these data suggested that university education provided support and an environment for the balanced development of these key skills among students.

3.3The Assessment On The Level Of The Selected SE
3.3.1 Classroom participation
Table 12 Assessment on Classroom Participation

Classroom Participation	Mean	SD	Descriptive	Interpretation	Rank
26.I actively participate in classroom discussions and ask questions to enhance my awareness of my own learning progress.	2.78	0.90	Agree	Average	5
27.I am able to plan my study time effectively to ensure that each subject or task receives appropriate attention and management.	2.83	0.91	Agree	Average	1
28.I pay attention to and understand the needs of my classmates in their learning, and I am willing to offer help and support proactively, establishing positive learning interactions with them.	2.79	0.89	Agree	Average	3.5

	Mean	SD	Descriptive	Interpretation	Rank
29.I excel at collaborating with my classmates to complete course projects and tasks, effectively coordinating and communicating to establish good team relationships and achieve learning progress together.	2.79	0.89	Agree	Average	3.5
30.I maintain a high level of focus and motivation during my studies and am capable of making wise learning decisions, such as selecting suitable learning methods and strategies for myself.	2.80	0.90	Agree	Average	2
Composite Mean	**2.80**	**0.73**	**Agree**	**Average**	

Legend:3.25-4.00 Strongly Agree/High   2.50-3.24 Agree/ Average
1.75-2.49 Disagree/Low   1.00-1.74Strongly Disagree/ Very Low

Table 12 displayed the level of participants' evaluation in The Level Of The Selected Student engagement for Classroom Participation.Notably, their scores reached the goal of enhancing the level of classroom participation through active involvement, with average of 2.80.The highest score or Rank 1 is for the effective planning of study time and the ability to understand and address the needs of classmates, indicating strong organizational and collaborative skills.The lowest scores or Rank 4 are for actively participating in classroom discussions, suggesting an area where there may be room for increased engagement and interaction during learning activities.This indicated that the participants successfully enhanced their classroom participation by actively engaging in class discussions, effectively planning study time, attending to classmates' needs, collaborating on project tasks, and maintaining focus and motivation. The overall score of 2.80 reflected their good performance in these areas and a high level of learning participation.

3.3.2 Autonomous Learning
Table 13 Assessment on Autonomous Learning

Autonomous Learning	Mean	SD	Descriptive	Interpretation	Rank
31.I study consciously and can study spontaneously.	2.81	0.95	Agree	Average	1
32.I can make effective use of learning resources and study independently.	2.79	0.87	Agree	Average	3
33.I follow and understand the learning needs of others, and I am willing to provide help and support.	2.80	0.88	Agree	Average	2
34.I am good at learning together with others and building positive learning relationships.	2.78	0.87	Agree	Average	4
35.I am responsible for learning, and I am willing to assume the responsibilities and obligations brought by learning	2.76	0.93	Agree	Average	5
Composite Mean	**2.79**	**0.75**	**Agree**	**Average**	

Legend:3.25-4.00 Strongly Agree/High   2.50-3.24 Agree/ Average
1.75-2.49 Disagree/Low   1.00-1.74Strongly Disagree/ Very Low

Table 13 displayed the evaluation of participants in The Level Of The Selected Student engagement regarding Autonomous Learning. Notably, their scores reached the goal of enhancing The Level Of The Selected Student engagement through Autonomous Learning, averaging 2.79. The highest score or Rank 1s indicate a strong ability to study consciously, make effective use of learning resources, and follow and understand the learning needs of others, showcasing independent learning skills and a supportive attitude. The lowest scores suggest a slightly lower proficiency in assuming responsibilities and obligations brought by learning, indicating a potential area for increased commitment to learning responsibilities.This result indicated that the participants demonstrated significant capabilities in autonomous learning, including conscious learning, independent use of learning resources, understanding and supporting others' learning needs, establishing positive learning relationships with others, and taking responsibility for their learning. The overall score of 2.79 reflected their positive contribution to enhancing student engagement in autonomous learning.

3.3.3 Interpersonal Interaction
Table 14 Assessment on Interpersonal Interaction

Interpersonal Interaction	Mean	SD	Descriptive	Interpretation	Rank
36. I've come to realize that when I actively communicate with my teachers and peers, it has a really positive impact on my study progress.	2.72	0.90	Agree	Average	5
37.I actively seek out the guidance and support of my teachers and peers because it genuinely motivates me in my studies.	2.75	0.95	Agree	Average	3
38.I really appreciate the care and attention that my teachers and peers give to my academic growth. Their support and encouragement are so noticeable, you can really feel it.	2.80	0.91	Agree	Average	1

*Corresponding Author: PENG，MANLI

	Mean	SD	Descriptive	Interpretation	Rank
39.I'm actually really excited about collaborating with both my teachers and peers. I always make it a point to seek their help and guidance because it helps me build strong relationships and makes our learning journey even better.	2.78	0.87	Agree	Average	2
40.Whenever my teachers and peers share their insights and suggestions, I'm able to make smart decisions that push my academic development forward. It's like having a real boost for my learning	2.74	0.95	Agree	Average	4
Composite Mean	**2.76**	**0.73**	**Agree**	**Average**	

Legend:3.25-4.00 Strongly Agree/High   2.50-3.24 Agree/ Average
1.75-2.49 Disagree/Low   1.00-1.74Strongly Disagree/ Very Low

Table 14 displayed the evaluation of participants in The Level Of The Selected Student engagement regarding Interpersonal Interaction. Notably, their scores reached the goal of enhancing The Level Of The Selected Student engagement through Interpersonal Interaction, averaging 2.76. The highest score or Rank 1 suggested a strong recognition of the positive impact of active communication with teachers and peers on study progress, along with genuine motivation derived from seeking guidance and support. The lowest score or Rank 5 indicated a slightly lower level of excitement about collaboration, implying a potential area for increased enthusiasm and engagement in collaborative efforts for an enhanced learning journey.This indicated that the participants successfully improved their interpersonal interaction skills by actively communicating with teachers and peers, seeking guidance and support, appreciating their care, collaborating actively, and effectively utilizing insights and suggestions from others. The overall score of 2.76 reflected their positive outcomes in enhancing learning participation through interpersonal interaction.

Table 15 Summary of AssessedStudent Engagement

	Mean	SD	Descriptive	Interpretatio	Rank
Classroom Participation	2.80	0.73	Agree	Average	1
Autonomous Learning	2.79	0.75	Agree	Average	2
Interpersonal Interaction	2.76	0.73	Agree	Average	3
Overall	**2.78**	**0.70**	**Agree**	**Average**	

Legend:3.25-4.00 Strongly Agree/High   2.50-3.24 Agree/ Average
1.75-2.49 Disagree/Low   1.00-1.74Strongly Disagree/ Very Low

Table 15 displayed the evaluation of participants in The Level Of The Selected Student engagement across three dimensions. Notably, their scores reached the goal of enhancing The Level Of The Selected Student engagement through Classroom Participation, Autonomous Learning, and Interpersonal Interaction, an overall mean of 2.78 with a corresponding standard deviation of .70,which denotes "Average " level of students' student engagement. The highest score or Rank 1 indicated a commendable level of engagement in classroom participation and autonomous learning, showcasing active involvement in class discussions and effective utilization of learning resources. However, there is a slightly lower score in interpersonal interaction, suggesting a potential area for improvement in enhancing social interactions among peers.This result indicated that the participants exhibited high abilities and enthusiasm across the three key dimensions of classroom participation, autonomous learning, and interpersonal interaction. The overall score of 2.78 reflected their success and positive attitude in overall student engagement.

3.4 The Difference In The Assessed Level Of Student Engagement When The Respondents Are Grouped According To Profile

3.4.1 Grouped According To Sex
Table 16 t-Test of DifferenceIn The Assessed Level Of Student Engagement   When The Respondents Are Grouped According To Sex

Items	Sex	N	Mean	t-value	Sig	Decision On Ho.	Interpretation
Classroom Participation	Male	151	2.81	0.32	0.75	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	225	2.79				
Autonomous Learning	Male	151	2.81	0.50	0.62	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	225	2.77				

*Corresponding Author: PENG，MANLI

Interpersonal Interaction	Male	151	2.74	-0.39	0.70	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	225	2.77				

Legend: α=0.05

Table 16 displayed the results of an independent samples t-test analysis, which examined the significance of differences in the level of student engagement among participants categorized by gender. The assessment level of student engagement was found to be at an average level. As shown in the table, the interpretation of statistical data for the dimensions of Classroom Participation, Autonomous Learning, and Interpersonal Interaction was considered not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted, meaning that there were no significant differences in overall student engagement between different genders, as their sig values were all above 0.05.

3.4.2 Grouped According To Year Level
Table 17 F-Test of Difference In The Assessed Level of Student Engagement When The Respondents Are Grouped According To Year Level

		N	Mean	F	Sig	Decision On Ho.	Interpretation
Classroom Participation	Freshman	92	2.8410	.181	.909	Accepted	Not Significant
	Sophomore	95	2.7761				
	Junior	97	2.7890				
	Senior	92	2.7830				
	Total	376	2.7995				
Autonomous Learning	Freshman	92	2.8376	.357	.784	Accepted	Not Significant
	Sophomore	95	2.7304				
	Junior	97	2.7802				
	Senior	92	2.7868				
	Total	376	2.7872				
Interpersonal Interaction	Freshman	92	2.7897	.158	.925	Accepted	Not Significant
	Sophomore	95	2.7196				
	Junior	97	2.7582				
	Senior	92	2.7585				
	Total	376	2.7586				

Legend: α=0.05

Table 17 displayed the results of an F-test analysis, which examined the significance of differences in the level of student engagement among participants categorized by year level. The assessment level of student engagement was found to be at an average level. As shown in the table, the interpretation of statistical data for the dimensions of Classroom Participation, Autonomous Learning, and Interpersonal Interaction was considered not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted, indicating that there were no significant differences in overall student engagement among different year levels, as their significant values were all above 0.05, showing no significant differences.

3.5 The Relationship Between The Assessed Students' Social and Emotional Learning And Student Engagement
Table 18 Test Of Relationship Between The Assessed Students' Social And Emotional Learning And Student Engagement

Students' Social and Emotional Learning	Student Engagement	r	p	Decision on H0.	Descriptive
Self Awareness	Classroom Participation	0.884**	0.00	Rejected H0.	Significant
	Autonomous Learning	0.881**	0.00	Rejected H0.	Significant
	Interpersonal Interaction	0.872**	0.00	Rejected H0.	Significant
Social Awareness	Classroom Participation	0.884**	0.00	Rejected H0.	Significant
	Autonomous Learning	0.874**	0.00	Rejected H0.	Significant
	Interpersonal Interaction	0.874**	0.00	Rejected H0.	Significant
Self management	Classroom Participation	0.863**	0.00	Rejected H0.	Significant
	Autonomous Learning	0.862**	0.00	Rejected H0.	Significant
	Interpersonal Interaction	0.877**	0.00	Rejected H0.	Significant
Relationship Management	Classroom Participation	0.878**	0.00	Rejected H0.	Significant
	Autonomous Learning	0.885**	0.00	Rejected H0.	Significant
	Interpersonal Interaction	0.892**	0.00	Rejected H0.	Significant

Responsible Decision Making	Classroom Participation	0.858**	0.00	Rejected H0.	Significant
	Autonomous Learning	0.857**	0.00	Rejected H0.	Significant
	Interpersonal Interaction	0.872**	0.00	Rejected H0.	Significant

Table 18 displayed the results of tests assessing the relationship between students' Social and Emotional Learning and their level of Engagement, highlighting the significant correlation between students' Social and Emotional Learning and Students' Engagement.Based on the table 18 above, the Ho3 is rejected. This indicated a significant link between students' Social and Emotional Learning and their Engagement.The significant correlation among the elements of Social-Emotional Learning (SEL), such as self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, responsible decision-making, and student engagement elements like classroom participation, autonomous learning, and interpersonal interaction, is primarily attributed to their mutual support and interdependence, forming an organic whole. Firstly, students' self-awareness and self-management skills influenced their classroom participation and autonomous learning, as possessing these emotional intelligence enhances students' awareness of their learning needs, prompting more active engagement in the learning process. Secondly, social awareness and relationship skills positively impacted interpersonal interactions, enhancing students' participation in teamwork and collaborative learning experiences. Finally, responsible decision-making contributed to shaping students' academic and behavioral standards, playing a crucial role in maintaining a positive classroom atmosphere and fostering positive interpersonal relationships. Therefore, these factors interwove to create a comprehensive learning experience, significantly enhancing student engagement.

4.DISCUSSION ANDCONCLUSIONS
4.1 Discussion
1. It can be inferred that the subject respondents involved in the study manifested acceptable Social and Emotional Learning that the develop capacity to interact with others and control and develop thinker allowing them to manage their own emotion and behavior.

2. The inherent personal circumstances like sex and year level has no control over their social and emotional engagement.

3. Now it can said that certain level of student engagement are expression of their being part of social group through independent learning and interpersonal interaction with social age group.

4. The student engagement are independent of their profile but an indication of motivation for acceptance as member of the classroom and contributing member of the school.

5.There is a significant positive correlation between students' social-emotional learning and their levels of participation, indicating that the improvement of social-emotional learning is closely associated with enhanced overall engagement. Through in-depth research, we observed a positive correlation between students' levels of social-emotional learning and their participation levels, emphasizing the constructive relationship between the two. Specifically, as we intensified the cultivation of social-emotional learning, we notably increased students' overall participation in learning activities. Students who actively engaged in classroom learning were often those with high levels of social-emotional learning skills.This correlation underscores the role of social-emotional learning in fostering student engagement. By nurturing students' self-awareness, self-management, and social skills, among other social-emotional competencies, we were able to encourage them to participate more actively in learning activities, establish healthier interpersonal relationships, and effectively cope with emotional challenges. This finding provides educators with compelling evidence, highlighting the importance of integrating elements of social-emotional learning into teaching to create a learning environment that is not only participatory but also conducive to comprehensive development.

4.2 Conclusions And Recommendations
Based on the results, the following recommendations are presented:
1.Strengthen Self-awareness and Emotional Intelligence Training
It is recommended to enhance self-awareness and emotional intelligence training in the curriculum. For students with a lower score in "I know when I am moody," specialized activities and discussions can be introduced to help students better identify and understand their emotional states. By promoting self-awareness, students can effectively manage their emotions, thereby improving their levels of social and emotional learning.

2.Nurturing Self-Awareness and Emotional Balance
Recognizing the average Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) levels, especially in the dimension of Self-Awareness, school authorities should implement programs aimed at enhancing self-awareness and emotional regulation among students. Tailored activities and discussions should be introduced to assist students in recognizing and managing their emotions effectively, thereby fostering improved social and emotional learning outcomes.

3.Promoting Inclusive Strategies for Diverse Student Profiles

School authorities should implement inclusive strategies that recognize and embrace the diversity of student profiles. Such as,Promote Inclusive SEL Initiatives,Encourage Cross-Cultural Understanding,Implement Flexible SEL Assessments and so on.

4.Fostering Engagement: Integrating SEL in Education

In order to create a holistic and conducive learning environment that promotes both social and emotional well-being and active student engagement, school authorities should implement targeted interventions to optimize the synergy between SEL and SE. It is crucial to design initiatives that not only enhance students' social and emotional skills but also directly contribute to increased engagement in their educational journey. The school community should explore innovative approaches, such as integrating SEL principles into the curriculum, organizing engaging workshops, and fostering a positive learning environment that aligns with the goals of both SEL and SE. Additionally, efforts should be directed towards equipping teachers with the necessary knowledge and training to effectively communicate the importance of SEL in fostering student engagement. By bridging the gap between SEL and SE through tailored interventions, school authorities can create a holistic and conducive learning environment that promotes both social and emotional well-being and active student engagement.

5.Emphasize Comprehensive Teaching Methods Implementation

Further promotion of comprehensive teaching methods is recommended. By employing different teaching techniques, increasing classroom participation, and considering individual differences among students, it is possible to better stimulate students' interest and engagement, leading to an overall enhancement of social and emotional learning levels.

6.Enhance Educators' Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) Levels

It is suggested to introduce assessments for educators' social-emotional learning levels. Assessing educators' social-emotional learning levels can deepen their understanding of their own emotional intelligence, thereby improving daily pedagogical practices. This helps ensure that every school-wide initiative related to SEL seamlessly incorporates strategies for achieving school improvement outcomes.

Through regular training and feedback mechanisms, educators can continually enhance their social-emotional learning skills, better addressing students' emotional needs. This contributes to establishing a positive educational environment and promoting the overall development of social-emotional learning throughout the school.The improvement of educators' social-emotional learning levels can serve as a role model for students, inspiring their interest in social-emotional learning and fostering a positive social-emotional learning culture within the school.

REFERENCES

[1]. Creswell, J.W. and Creswell, J.D. (2018) Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. Sage, Los Angeles.
[2]. Current, M. D. . (2023). Tracking student learning outcome engagement at the reference desk to facilitate assessment. Reference services review.
[3]. Fox, G. , Stephens, S. , & Lyons, R. M. . (2023). Gamification to enhance engagement and higher order?learning in?entrepreneurial education. Education + Training, 65(3), 416-432.
[4]. Jenaabadi, H. , & Azarian, A. . (2023). The effectiveness of emotional social learning training on students' academic well-being and spiritual health. Iranian Evolutionary and Educational Psychology.
[5]. O'Neal, C. L. (2021). The Influence of Social-Emotional Learning in High School Advisory Programs on Student Engagement and Success. University of Southern Maine.
[6]. Pham, K. , & Muralles, D. . (2023). Reimagining peer support and engagement. Reference services review.
[7]. Qu Liaojian, Jing Chao Nan & Zhu Zhoulin. (2022). Promoting learning through emotion: the influence of socioemotional ability of undergraduate students in research universities on learning participation. Research on higher Education in China (09), 60-66. Doi:10.16298/j.cnki.1004-3667.2022.09.11