

*Alimkhanova D.¹, Sembayev T.², Taibolatov K.³, Nauryzbayev B.⁴

^{1,2}Astana IT University,

³Maqsut Narikbayev University

⁴Alikhan Bokeikhan University

^{1,2,3}Kazakhstan, Astana

⁴Kazakhstan, Semey

¹ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-3114-170X>

²ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2360-8767>

³ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4027-0203>

⁴ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4935-5972>

*d.alimkhanova@astanait.edu.kz

PERCEPTIONS OF ARTIFICIAL EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE (AEI) AMONG TEACHERS IN KAZAKHSTAN

Abstract

The current study investigates teachers' perceptions and acceptance of Artificial Emotional Intelligence (AEI) in teacher education. It particularly focuses on the role of demographic and professional patterns, drawing on data from a sample of 1.100 educators collected across Kazakhstan. The study employed a quantitative research design, including descriptive statistics, reliability analysis, group comparisons, and multiple regression analysis.

The study results demonstrate a generally high level of AEI acceptance among teachers ($M = 4.37$), particularly regarding its potential to enhance emotional assessment and support in professional development. The AEI scale itself revealed a strong internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.923$), confirming the reliability of the measurement. However, comparatively lower levels of trust in AI-generated results suggest a gap between positive attitudes and full confidence in the technology.

The findings suggest that teachers' attitudes toward AEI are generally consistent across participating groups. In turn, it challenges traditional assumptions about the extent to which demographic attributes may influence technology adoption in education. In addition, the observed gap between acceptance and trust shows the need to address ethical issues. The current study contributes to research in an emerging field of AI in education by emphasizing the role of contextual and trust-related factors in shaping perceptions of emotionally intelligent technologies.

Keywords: AEI acceptance, AEI perceptions, artificial emotional intelligence, AI tools, Kazakhstan, professional development, teacher education.

Introduction. Today's world is experiencing dramatic shifts due to the development of machine learning systems. There is no doubt that one of them is Artificial Intelligence (AI), which, according to the Cambridge Dictionary, is "the use of computer programs that have some of the qualities of the human mind, such as the ability to understand language, recognise pictures, and learn from experience" [1]. With its emergence, AI provokes the reconfiguration of many other fields, including emotional intelligence. Therefore, AI systems are becoming highly embedded within educational platforms to maintain emotional awareness and psychological resilience [2]. However, Schuller & Schuller [3] highlight that the development of AI still lacks creativity from emotional and social perspectives. In this sense, current educational landscapes are shifting from traditional, "one-size-fits-all" training to personalised, data-driven professional development. International studies [4], [5], [6] reveal that while AI is widely used across various educational dimensions, its role in teacher training still remains emerging. In this sense, emotional and psychological aspects of learning are known to affect motivation, engagement, self-regulation, and academic performance [7], [8]. Therefore, emotional intelligence is a critical component in teacher education that influences overall classroom management [4, p. 117], [5, p. 7], [9], student engagement [10], and teacher well-being [11], [12].

In this sense, according to the literature, emotional intelligence (EI) is a significant capability of a person to "understand and respond to feelings, both in oneself and others" [13], while artificial intelligence is a "technique of creating computer systems that can perform tasks that require human intelligence" [14]. Although AI has been criticised for its inability to understand emotions, ethics, and morality, this led to the merger of the two disciplines of AI and EI, which created a new path for

the AEI in 1995 [14, p. 1]. However, different concepts and definitions exist related to the merger of artificial and emotional intelligence. In this sense, according to Kambur [15], emotional AI is the capability of AI systems to detect and interpret human emotions.

However, traditional approaches to evaluating emotional intelligence tend to rely more on self-report measurement [16], often undermining other methods that enable more dynamic and longitudinal assessments. In this sense, AEI is assumed to be a transformative tool for assessing learners' emotional intelligence by providing data-driven, evidence-based fundamentals [17]. There are AI-driven systems that are capable of analysing facial expressions, vocal tone, gaze direction, EEG (Electroencephalography) signals, and written input to infer emotional states with increasing precision [18], [19], [20]. These technologies are becoming significant since they enable adaptive learning experiences, providing real-time feedback and tailored interventions that align with a learner's emotional needs [21], [22].

Regardless of its potential benefits, Vistorte et al. [17, p. 2] acknowledge potential ethical risks while integrating AI in a learning environment. Particularly, data privacy and protection, transparency, and cyber threats remain significant implications for research.

In the Kazakhstani context, ongoing educational reforms and the government's intention to become an AI Hub [23] might imply the acceleration of innovative technologies in educational settings. However, there is limited research that evaluates stakeholders' perceptions of AI adoption for emotional intelligence, including teachers. In this sense, understanding teachers' acceptance of AEI is important for informing effective educational policies. The current study attempts to fill the knowledge and evidence gap by analyzing the perceptions of teachers on AEI.

Therefore, this study aims to examine teachers' perceptions and acceptance of Artificial Emotional Intelligence (AEI) in professional development and to assess whether demographic and professional characteristics influence these perceptions.

The study addresses the following three research questions:

1. What is the overall level of teachers' acceptance of AEI in teacher training?
2. Do demographic characteristics (gender, age, and education level) significantly influence teachers' perceptions of AEI?
3. Do professional characteristics (teaching experience, qualification category, school location, salary range) affect AEI acceptance?

Methods and Materials. The study employed a quantitative, cross-sectional study to identify relationships between teachers' demographic and professional characteristics and their perception of AEI.

Sampling. The current study adopted a purposive volunteer sampling design (Jupp, 2006). In-service secondary school teachers were invited to participate via an online survey link across Kazakhstan. Although the sampling strategy was purposive, targeting these individuals, their participation ultimately relied on the willingness of respondents that align with the features of a volunteer sample framework (Jupp, 2006). Participants were recruited voluntarily and included teachers of various age groups and levels of professional experience, ensuring sufficient data variability to address the research objectives. The final sampling size included 1,100 teachers, with a high concentration of respondents from Turkestan (58.7%) and Ulytau (15.3%) regions. Thus, while the sample provides sufficient variability, it does not claim national representativeness.

The research instrument is a structured, multidimensional questionnaire consisting of 50 items (variables) (appendix), categorized into four primary thematic blocks. Block I (Questions 1 to 10) covered socio-demographic background; Block II (Questions 11 to 40) included the Hall Emotional Intelligence Test; Block III (Questions 41 to 44) covered professional development; and Block IV (Questions 45 to 50) addressed perceptions of artificial emotional intelligence (AEI) in teacher education. The survey was administered via the Google Forms platform. Participation was voluntary and anonymous, and the average time to complete the questionnaire was 20-25 minutes.

Statistical processing of data was carried out using the R programming 4.6.0 software and included the calculation of descriptive statistics, Welch t-test, One-way ANOVA (Analysis of Variance), and Multiple linear regression analysis.

The study was conducted in accordance with international and national ethical standards, including the principles of the Kazakhstan Code of Ethics for Research in Education [24] and received confirmation from IRB of Astana IT University. Respondents received informed consent, whereas confidentiality and voluntary participation were ensured. The survey was designed to be bilingual (Kazakh and Russian) to ensure accessibility and clarity for a diverse cohort of educators in Kazakhstan.

Results and Discussion.

Descriptive findings for demographic and professional items

The study involved 1.100 educators, of whom 17.4% were men ($n = 191$) and 82.6% were women ($n = 909$). The participants' ages varied from 20 to older cohorts. In particular, those aged 20-30 years old composed 14.0% ($n = 154$), 30-40 years old 29.5% ($n = 324$), 40-50 years old 31.3% ($n = 344$), and 50 years old and older 25.3% ($n = 278$).

Regarding the educational level, the majority possessed a bachelor's degree - 84% (923 people), suggesting a highly standardized professional environment. This was followed by 10% of Master's degree holders, while teachers with vocational education (5.5%) and PhD holders (1%) remained the smallest portion.

The teaching experience of participants is remarkably well-balanced. While the novice teachers (<5) represented 14%, 5-9 years experienced were 12%, 10-14 year experienced were 17%, 15-19 and 20-24 year experienced were 14%, 25-30 year experienced were 11%, and the most experienced (30<) teachers composed 17% of the sampling.

Geographically, the majority of participants work in rural areas 74.7% ($n = 822$), and 25.3% of teachers ($n = 278$) work in urban schools. The vast majority of participants are from the Turkestan 58.7% ($n = 646$) and Ulytau regions 15.3% ($n = 168$), Shymkent city 9.5% ($n = 105$). Among other regions, Pavlodar region 2.6% ($n = 29$), North Kazakhstan region 3.0% ($n = 33$), East Kazakhstan region 3.4% ($n = 38$), Karaganda region 2.4% ($n = 26$), Kostanay region 2.9% ($n = 32$), Abay region 0.8% ($n = 9$), Astana city 0.9% ($n = 10$), Almaty city 0.2% ($n = 2$), Aktobe region and Zhetysu region 0.1% ($n = 1$).

The professional qualification category was characterized by a high level of expertise, with over 75% of the group holding advanced designations such as Teacher Expert (29%), Teacher Moderator (27%), or Teacher Researcher (22%). Standard Teachers make up a smaller portion at 18%, while those at the very beginning of their journey Teacher trainees account for just 1.8%, indicating a workforce that is heavily weighted toward experienced, senior-level practitioners rather than entry-level staff.

By the type of educational organization, the majority of participants reported working in public schools, 96.9% ($n = 1065$), and lyceums and gymnasiums, 3.1% ($n = 35$).

Regarding salary distribution, the majority (40%) receive 200.000-300.000 Kazakhstani tenge. Slightly more than one-fifth (22%) receive the lowest salary, between 100.000 and 200.000 tenge, while about one-third (28%) receive 300.000-400.000 tenge. The smallest share of participants (6.5%) reported the highest salary of more than 400.000 tenge, whereas 3.5% preferred not to answer.

Descriptive findings for AEI

Overall, the reliability analysis showed that the AEI scale has excellent internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.923$), indicating that the items (Questions 45-50) consistently measure the same underlying construct, which is the perception of AEI in teacher training. These items were rated using a six-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 ("Strongly disagree") to 6 ("Strongly agree"), with no neutral midpoint. Table 1 presents descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation). Overall, the results indicate moderately high acceptance, with some variability in responses.

Items 45–50 were rated using a six-point Likert scale ranging from 1 ("Strongly disagree") to 6 ("Strongly agree"), with no neutral midpoint.

The first item, 'Support for innovative technologies in assessing teachers' emotional intelligence' was the most strongly supported item (Mean = 4.52 (highest), SD = 1.51). This implies that the survey respondents strongly support technological innovation for assessing their emotional intelligence.

For the second item, ‘Familiarity with emotional artificial intelligence’ (Mean = 4.49, SD = 1.46), results showed that respondents overall illustrate familiarity about AI tools, suggesting that AI tools are not entirely new to them. Still, the SD indicates uneven levels of awareness across participants.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Artificial Emotional Intelligence Acceptance Items

#	Item	Mean	SD
1	Support for innovative technologies in assessing teachers' emotional intelligence	4.52	1.51
2	Familiarity with emotional artificial intelligence	4.49	1.46
3	Emotional AI enables a deeper assessment of future teachers' emotional stability.	4.33	1.51
4	Emotional AI can improve the professional preparation of future teachers	4.40	1.50
5	Emotional AI can help prevent professional burnout among teachers	4.30	1.50
6	Trust in the results of data obtained through emotional artificial intelligence	4.15	1.52
7	Composite Emotional AI acceptance score	4.37	1.28

Source: Compiled by the authors

The third item findings showed that Emotional AI enables a deeper assessment of future teachers' emotional stability (Mean = 4.33, SD = 1.51). Participants generally believe Emotional AI can provide more nuanced insights into emotional stability, though opinions vary.

The fourth item results showed that participants overall agree that ‘Emotional AI can improve the professional preparation of future teachers’ (Mean = 4.40, SD = 1.50).

The results for the fifth item showed that respondents believe that ‘Emotional AI can help prevent professional burnout among teachers’, though slightly less strongly than for training improvement (Mean = 4.30, SD = 1.50).

The sixth item, although still positive, was the least endorsed item among the six questions related to AEI perceptions among teachers (Mean = 4.15 (lowest), SD = 1.52). This suggests that teachers show some skepticism or caution towards the AI-generated data on emotional intelligence.

The seventh item, which shows the composite Emotional AI acceptance score (M = 4.37, SD = 1.28), suggests that, on average, respondents agree with the use of Emotional AI in teacher preparation.

To sum up, the findings demonstrate an overall positive perception of Emotional AI among respondents (M = 4.37). The highest level of agreement pertained to the support of innovative technologies (M = 4.52) in assessing EI, while trust in AI-generated results demonstrated comparatively lower agreement (M = 4.15). Despite overall favorable attitudes, the relatively high standard deviations indicate variability in perceptions, suggesting that while Emotional AI is widely accepted, users remain less confident when it comes to fully trusting its results.

Model findings

This section summarizes the results of inferential statistical tests examining whether different demographic and professional characteristics are associated with teachers’ AEI acceptance. The group differences were first examined using independent-samples t-tests and one-way ANOVA (Table 2). This was followed by a multiple linear regression model that included all predictors simultaneously. The key takeaway is that the overall regression model was not statistically significant, three individual regression coefficients were statistically significant after controlling for the remaining variables.

Table 2. Summary of Group Comparisons and Regression Analysis

#	predictor	test	statistic	p value	interpretation
1	Gender	Welch t-test	t(259.78) = -0.03	.978	Not significant
2	Age	One-way ANOVA	F(3, 1097) = 2.36	.070	Trend-level only
3	Education level	One-way ANOVA	F(4, 1096) = 1.99	.095	Trend-level only
4	Teaching experience	One-way ANOVA	F(6, 1094) = 1.97	.067	Trend-level only

#	predictor	test	statistic	p_value	interpretation
5	School location	Welch t-test	$t(536.22) = 0.10$	.924	Not significant
6	Salary range	One-way ANOVA	$F(5, 1095) = 1.82$	.105	Not significant
7	Subject group	One-way ANOVA	$F(8, 1092) = 1.74$	.085	Trend-level only
8	Institution type	One-way ANOVA	$F(7, 1093) = 1.58$	.138	Not significant
9	Qualification category	One-way ANOVA	$F(8, 1092) = 1.12$	.345	Not significant
10	Full regression model	Multiple linear regression	$F(43, 1056) = 1.34$	.075	Model not significant

Source: Compiled by the authors

As demonstrated in Table 2, the t (t -statistic) is used in t -tests to compare the means of two groups (e.g., male and female, urban and rural), while the F (F -statistic) is used in ANOVA and regression to assess differences among multiple groups or the overall model fit. In both cases, larger values indicate stronger differences or effects, but statistical significance is determined by the p (p -value), which reflects the probability that the observed results occurred by chance. Typically, $p < .05$ indicates statistical significance, $p < .10$ suggests a trend, and $p \geq .05$ indicates non-significance.

A multiple linear regression (Table 3) examined the association between demographic and professional characteristics and teachers' AEI acceptance. The regression model was not statistically significant, $F(43, 1056) = 1.34$, $p = .075$, explaining 5.2% of the variance in AEI acceptance ($R^2 = .052$, adjusted $R^2 = .013$). Variables including gender, age, education level, teaching experience, school location, salary range, and qualification categories were not statistically significant ($p > .05$) after controlling for the remaining variables. However, teachers in social sciences ($B = 0.89$, $p = .042$) and in Arts ($B = 0.45$, $p = .041$) and respondents employed in institutions classified as "Other" ($B = 0.61$, $SE = 0.295$, $p = .039$) showed significantly higher AEI acceptance than those in the reference groups.

Table 3. Multiple Linear Regression Predicting Teachers' Emotional AI Acceptance

Predictor	Reference Category	Significant Comparisons (B, 95% Ci)	Overall p-value
Gender	Female	None	.879
Age	20–30 years	None	.069
Education level	Secondary	None	.052
Teaching experience	<5 years	None	.275
School location	Rural	None	.576
Salary range	100–200k KZT	None	.366
Subject group	STEM/ Natural Sciences	Arts/Technology: B = 0.45 (0.02, 0.89); Social Sciences: B = 0.89 (0.14, 1.63)	.050
Institution type	General Secondary School	Other: B = 0.61 (0.03, 1.19)	.399
Qualification category	Administrative/Other Professional Role	None	.791

Source: Compiled by the authors

Overall, the findings suggest that although three individual categories exhibited statistically significant positive associations with teachers' AEI acceptance, the overall regression model was not significant explaining a small proportion of the variance. Therefore, other factors than demographic and professional characteristics may play a decisive role in shaping teachers' AEI acceptance.

It is important to note that only nine predictors were included in the regression model (Table 4). However, because these nine predictors were categorical variables with multiple levels, they were entered as factors using R's default treatment (or dummy) coding. The first category served as the reference group (Table 3).

Consequently, in this model, the nine predictors were expanded into 43 regression parameters (dummy variables), explaining the numerator degrees of freedom reported for the overall model, $F(43,1056)$.

Table 4. Coding of Categorical Predictors Included in the Regression Model

#	Predictor	Number of Categories	Dummy Variables
1	Gender	2	1
2	Age	4	3
3	Education level	5	4
4	Teaching experience	7	6
5	School location	2	1
6	Salary	6	5
7	Subject group	9	8
8	Institution type	8	7
9	Qualification category	9	8

Source: Compiled by the authors

Since the model included multi-level categorical predictors, multicollinearity among the predictors was evaluated using Generalized Variance Inflation Factor (GVIF) (Table 5).

Table 5. Generalized Variance Inflation Factor results

#	Predictor	Adjusted Gvif
1	Gender	1.20
2	Age	1.40
3	Education level	1.11
4	Teaching experience	1.23
5	School location	1.12
6	Salary range	1.10
7	Subject	1.06
8	Institution type	1.15
9	Qualification category	1.18

Source: Compiled by the authors

As shown in Table 5, adjusted GVIF values ranged from 1.06 to 1.40 well below commonly accepted thresholds (< 5). This means that multicollinearity showed no evidence of problematic collinearity among the nine predictors.

Overall, while a few predictors in this dataset show significant tendencies (p-value between .05 and .10), signaling possible weak relationships, but these are not robust enough to draw conclusions. Relatively, the full regression model is not significant ($p = .134$), explaining 5.2% of the variance in AEI acceptance ($R^2 = .052$, adjusted $R^2 = .013$). This indicates that all demographic and professional items combined do not meaningfully explain variation in the AEI perception (dependent variable). These could be important findings, which mean that overall AEI perception is not substantially driven by demographic and professional characteristics but by other individual and structural features. To sum up, the inferential analysis revealed no statistically significant differences across demographic and professional variables towards the dependent variable, perceptions of AEI. While age, teaching experience, and subject group demonstrated trend-level associations ($p < .10$), these effects were not robust. Furthermore, the overall regression model was not significant ($F(43, 1056) = 1.34$, $p = .075$), indicating that the included predictors do not meaningfully explain variation in the dependent variable. These findings suggest that the observed attitudes are relatively consistent across different teacher groups.

The findings of this study reveal a consistently positive perception of Artificial Emotional Intelligence (AEI) among teachers, with a relatively high overall acceptance score ($M = 4.37$). Concurring with international literature [5, p. 5], [17, p. 2], the study findings show that teachers

generally welcomed the use of AEI technologies. Therefore, the high level of support for innovative technologies, particularly in assessing emotional intelligence, may reflect an increasing recognition of the role of digital tools in enhancing pedagogical practices across the country. It is important to note that statistically significant differences across most demographic and professional characteristics were relatively homogeneous. This potentially could be explained by a centralized structure of the national education since the results had consistent expectations and practices across almost all variables [25]. Moreover, Kazakhstan has recently implemented nationwide strategies aimed at digitalization of the education sector, including AI-initiatives, expanding digital tools, and professional development [26]. While these initiatives may contribute to consistent positive perceptions of AEI among teachers in Kazakhstan, future studies should consider more accurate selection of participants across all regions to ensure generalized results.

In addition, the fact that many teachers already have access to various AI platforms may reduce, for instance, the gender gap in AEI acceptance. Many education practitioners may already have experienced perceived usefulness through their regular interaction with generative AI tools [27]. This, in turn, may have contributed to the homogeneous results observed in this study.

Nevertheless, the study results indicate a notable gap between acceptance and trust among the participants. This is revealed by the results, where trust in AI-generated results was comparatively lower among teachers, despite their high support for the use of AEI. This divergence suggests that although educators are willing to engage with AI-based tools, they may still hold reservations regarding the accuracy, transparency, and ethical implications of such technologies [14, p. 12]. This aligns with broader concerns in the literature on AI in education, where trust is often identified as a critical factor influencing adoption and sustained use [28].

One of the most important findings of this study is the absence of statistically significant differences across demographic and professional variables. Factors such as gender, age, education level, teaching experience, and school context did not significantly predict teachers' perceptions of AEI. This challenges common assumptions in technology adoption research, which often emphasize the role of individual characteristics in shaping attitudes toward innovation.

Conclusion. This study examined teachers' perceptions of Artificial Emotional Intelligence (AEI) by exploring whether demographic and professional factors might be associated with these perceptions. The findings demonstrate that teachers possess generally positive attitudes toward AEI to enhance emotional assessment and professional preparation.

Nevertheless, the study results revealed a gap between acceptance and trust since teachers had cautious attitudes toward the reliability of AI-generated results. Therefore, despite its successful adoption and positive attitudes shown by participants, AEI's application needs to consider its ethical usage.

Importantly, the absence of statistically significant differences across demographic and professional variables shows that AEI perceptions are relatively consistent among participants. Therefore, this may question the application of traditional assumptions about technology adoption, suggesting that attitudes toward AEI may be shaped by institutional or broader contexts rather than by individual characteristics.

The current study contributes to an emerging field of research on AI in education pointing out to the need to explore issues of transparency, ethics, and trainings beyond demographic attributes. Practically, policymakers, researchers, and educational institutions may consider prioritizing building trust in AEI systems by ensuring particularly ethical challenges while integrating AEI in the process. Further implications may explore underlying reasons for consistent perceptions towards AEI and investigate how teachers' lived experiences with AI shape their attitudes over time.

Acknowledgment. This research has been funded by the Science Committee of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Grant No. AP27510633)

REFERENCES

- 1 Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d.). Artificial intelligence. [Electronic resource] – URL: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/artificial-intelligence> (date of access: April 28, 2026)
- 2 Deckker, D., & Sumanasekara, S. (2025). The role of artificial intelligence in education: Transforming learning and teaching. *EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)*, 10(3), 5-15. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra20429>
- 3 Schuller, D., & Schuller, B., W. (2018). The Age of Artificial Emotional Intelligence, 38-46. DOI: <https://d-nb.info/1248484215/34>
- 4 Kumari, D.A., Begum, D.S., Paunikar, M. S., Kaur, A., & Verma, D.S. (2025). The role of Artificial Intelligence in teacher training: Enhancing pedagogical effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing & Social Research*, 2(5), 116-122. [Electronic resource] – URL: <https://jmsr-online.com/article/the-role-of-artificial-intelligence-in-teacher-training-enhancing-pedagogical-effectiveness-252/>
- 5 Oh, S. Y., & Ahn, Y. (2024). Exploring teachers' perception of artificial intelligence: The socio-emotional deficiency as opportunities and challenges in human-AI complementarity in K-12 education. In Olney, A.M., Chounta, I.A., Liu, Z., Santos, O.C., Bittencourt, I.I. (eds) *Artificial Intelligence in Education. AIED 2024. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol 14830, 439-447. Springer, Cham. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-64299-9_41
- 6 Tan, X., Cheng, G., & Ling, M. H. (2025). Artificial intelligence in teaching and teacher professional development: A systematic review. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 8, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100355>
- 7 Mega, C., Ronconi, L., & De Beni, R. (2014). What makes a good student? How emotions, self-regulated learning, and motivation contribute to academic achievement. *Journal of educational psychology*, 106(1), 121-131. DOI: <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0033546>
- 8 Pekrun, R., Lichtenfeld, S., Marsh, H. W., Murayama, K., & Goetz, T. (2017). Achievement emotions and academic performance: Longitudinal models of reciprocal effects. *Child development*, 88(5), 1653-1670. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12704>
- 9 Shi, Y., Cheng, Q., Wei, Y., Liang, Y., & Zhu, K. (2025). Effects of peer and teacher support on students' creative thinking: Emotional intelligence as a mediator and emotion regulation strategy as a moderator. *Journal of Intelligence*, 13(5), 53. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/jintelligence13050053>
- 10 Szpunar, G., Mannola, C., Cannoni, E., Grigore, M., & Di Norcia, A. (2024). Intelligenza emotiva dell'insegnante e relazione insegnante-alunno nella scuola primaria. Uno studio esplorativo [Teacher emotional intelligence and teacher-student relationship in primary school. An exploratory study]. *Ricerche di psicologia* [Psychology research], 3, 57-80. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3280/rip2024oa18870> [in Italian]
- 11 Karakus, M., Toprak, M., Caliskan, O., & Crawford, M. (2024). Teachers' affective and physical well-being: emotional intelligence, emotional labour and implications for leadership. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 38(2), 469-485. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-07-2023-0335>
- 12 Lavy, S., Eshet, R. (2018). Spiral effects of teachers' emotions and emotion regulation strategies: evidence from a daily diary study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 73, 151–161. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.04.001>
- 13 Narimisaei, J., Naeim, M., Imannezhad, S., Samian, P., & Sobhani, M. (2024). Exploring emotional intelligence in artificial intelligence systems: a comprehensive analysis of emotion recognition and response mechanisms. *Annals of medicine and surgery*, 86(8), 4657-4663. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1097/MS9.0000000000002315>
- 14 Vicci, D. H. (2024). Emotional intelligence in artificial intelligence: A review and evaluation study. Available at SSRN 4818285. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4818285>
- 15 Kambur, E. (2021). Emotional intelligence or artificial intelligence?: Emotional artificial intelligence. *Florya Chronicles of Political Economy*, 7(2), 147-168. [Electronic resource] – URL: https://fcpe.aydin.edu.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/fcpe_v07i2004.pdf

16 Su, H., Zhang, J., Xie, M., & Zhao, M. (2022). The relationship between teachers' emotional intelligence and teaching for creativity: The mediating role of working engagement. *Frontiers in psychology*, 13, 1014905. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1014905>

17 Vistorte, A. O. R., Deroncele-Acosta, A., Ayala, J. L. M., Barrasa, A., López-Granero, C., & Martí-González, M. (2024). Integrating artificial intelligence to assess emotions in learning environments: a systematic literature review. *Frontiers in psychology*, 15, 1387089. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1387089>

18 Alzu'bi, S., Elbes, M., & Mughaid, A. (2024). Emotion Unveiled: A Deep Learning Odyssey in Facial Expression Analysis for Intelligent HCI. *International Journal of Advances in Soft Computing & Its Applications*, 16(2), 315-333. [Electronic resource] – URL: <https://www.i-csrs.org/Volumes/ijasca/2024.2.19.pdf>

19 Aly, L. A. T. (2024). *Emotion-Driven Physiological Actor Dynamics for Interactive Theatre Sound* (Doctoral dissertation, Universidade do Porto (Portugal)). [Electronic resource] – URL: https://sigarra.up.pt/flup/en/pub_geral.pub_view?pi_pub_base_id=681147

20 Chowdary, M. K., Nguyen, T. N., & Hemanth, D. J. (2023). Deep learning-based facial emotion recognition for human-computer interaction applications. *Neural Computing and Applications*, 35, 23311-23328. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00521-021-06012-8>

21 Taub, M., Azevedo, R., Rajendran, R., Cloude, E. B., Biswas, G., & Price, M. J. (2021). How are students' emotions related to the accuracy of cognitive and metacognitive processes during learning with an intelligent tutoring system? *Learning and Instruction*, 72, 101200. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2019.04.001>

22 Daouas, T., & Lejmi, H. (2018). Emotions recognition in an intelligent elearning environment. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 26(8), 991-1009. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2018.1427114>

23 Autonomous Cluster Fund «Astana Hub». (2025). *Kazakhstan is building its own AI ecosystem*. [Electronic resource] – URL: <https://astanahub.com/en/article/kazakhstan-formiruet-sobstvennuu-ai-ekosistemu> (date of access: April 28, 2026).

24 Rakisheva, A., Sagintayeva, A., Ibrasheva, A., Jumakulov, Z., Ashirbekov, A. (2020). *Eticheskij kodeks issledovatelej obrazovania Kazahstana* [The Code of ethics for educational researchers in Kazakhstan]. Nur-Sultan: Kazahstanskoe obshchestvo issledovatelej v oblasti obrazovaniya [Kazakhstan Educational Research Association], 68 p. [Electronic resource] – URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/365360078_ETICESKIJ_KODEKS_ISSLEDOVATELEJ_OBRAZOVANIA_KAZAHSTANA [in Russian]

25 Vaculik, J., & Satanov, A. (2019). The comparative historical analysis of education systems in the Czech Republic and Kazakhstan (1990–2000). *Czech-polish historical and pedagogical journal*, 11(2). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5817/cphpj-2019-01726>

26 Nurbekova, Z.K., & Nurbekov, B. (2023). Digitalization of the education system in Kazakhstan: experience, problems, and perspectives. *Strategii na obrazovatel'nata i nauchnata politika* [Strategies for Policy in Science and Education], 31(4), 218-226. [Electronic resource] – URL: <https://www.cceol.com/search/article-detail?id=1168927>

27 Ghimire, A., Pather, J., & Edwards, J. (2024). Generative AI in education: A study of educators' awareness, sentiments, and influencing factors. In 2024 IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference (FIE), Washington, DC, USA, pp. 1-9. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1109/FIE61694.2024.10892891>

28 Kontis, S., & Anastasiadou, S. (2026). AI-based emotional intelligence in education: ethical integration of affective technologies in inclusive teacher training. In: *INTED2026 proceedings*, 0301. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21125/inted.2026.0301>

*Алимханова Д.¹, Сембаев Т.², Тайболатов К.³, Наурызбаев Б.⁴

^{1,2} Astana IT University,

³ Maqsut Narikbayev University

⁴ Әлихан Бөкейхан университеті

^{1,2,3} Қазақстан, Астана

⁴ Қазақстан, Семей

ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ МҰҒАЛІМДЕРДІҢ ЖАСАНДЫ ЭМОЦИОНАЛДЫ ИНТЕЛЛЕКТКЕ (ЖЭИ) ҚАТЫСТЫ ҚАБЫЛДАУЛАРЫ

Аңдатпа

Бұл зерттеу Жасанды Эмоционалды Интеллекттің (ЖЭИ) мұғалімдерді оқытудағы демографиялық және кәсіби сипаттамаларды негізге ала отырып, олардың ЖЭИ қабылдауын зерттейді. Қазақстандағы 1100 педагогтың арасынан алынған деректерге сүйене отырып, зерттеуде сипаттамалық статистика, сенімділік талдауы, топтық салыстырулар және көптік регрессиялық талдауды қамтитын сандық зерттеу дизайны қолданылады.

Зерттеу нәтижелері мұғалімдер арасында ЖЭИ-ді қабылдаудың жалпы жоғары деңгейін көрсетеді ($M = 4.37$), әсіресе оның эмоционалды бағалауды жақсарту және кәсіби дамуды қолдау әлеуетіне қатысты. ЖЭИ шкаласы жоғары ішкі сәйкестікті көрсетті (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.923$), бұл өлшеудің сенімділігін растайды. Дегенмен, ЖЭИ жасаған нәтижелерге деген сенімнің салыстырмалы түрде төмен деңгейі оң көзқарастар мен технологияға толық сенімділік арасындағы алшақтықты көрсетеді.

Зерттеу нәтижелері мұғалімдердің ЖЭИ-ге деген көзқарасы әртүрлі топтарда салыстырмалы түрде тұрақты екенін көрсетеді, бұл технологияны енгізуге демографиялық әсер ету туралы дәстүрлі болжамдарға күмән келтіреді. Сонымен қатар, қабылдау мен сенім арасындағы байқалған алшақтық ашықтыққа, сенімділікке және этикалық пайдалануға қатысты мәселелерді шешудің маңыздылығын көрсетеді. Бұл зерттеу эмоционалды интеллектуалды технологияларды қабылдауды қалыптастырудағы контекстік және сенімге байланысты факторлардың ролін атап өту арқылы білім берудегі жасанды интеллект бойынша зерттеулердің дамуына үлес қосады.

Түйінді сөздер: ЖЭИ қабылдау, ЖЭИ туралы түсініктер, жасанды эмоциялық интеллект, жасанды интеллект құралдары, Қазақстан, кәсіби даму, мұғалімдерді оқыту.

*Алимханова Д.¹, Сембаев Т.², Тайболатов К.³, Наурызбаев Б.⁴

^{1,2} Astana IT University,

³ Maqsut Narikbayev University

⁴ Университет имени Алихана Бөкейхана

^{1,2,3} Казахстан, Астана

⁴ Казахстан, Семей

ВОСПРИЯТИЕ ИСКУССТВЕННОГО ЭМОЦИОНАЛЬНОГО ИНТЕЛЛЕКТА (ИЭИ) СРЕДИ УЧИТЕЛЕЙ В КАЗАХСТАНЕ

Аннотация

В данном исследовании изучается восприятие и принятие учителями искусственного эмоционального интеллекта (ИЭИ) в педагогическом образовании, с особым вниманием к роли демографических и профессиональных характеристик. На основе данных выборки из 1100 педагогов Казахстана использовался количественный метод исследования, включавший описательную статистику, анализ надежности, сравнение групп и множественный регрессионный анализ.

Количественные результаты данного исследования показали, в целом, высокий уровень принятия ИЭИ учителями. Это было особенно выражено в отношении его потенциала для улучшения эмоциональной оценки и поддержки профессионального развития. Сама шкала ИЭИ продемонстрировала высокую внутреннюю согласованность (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.923$), что в свою очередь подтверждает надежность измерения. Тем не менее, сравнительно низкий уровень доверия к результатам, полученное с помощью ИИ, указывает на наличие разрыва между положительным отношением и высокой уверенностью использования ИЭИ.

Результаты также показали, что отношение респондентов к ИИ несет относительно согласованный характер, ставя под сомнения влияние каких-либо профессиональных или демографических факторов на внедрение технологии. Кроме того, существующий разрыв между принятием ИЭИ и доверием, в свою очередь указывает на важность вопросов о прозрачности, надежности и этичным интегрированием ИЭИ в сфере образования. Результаты и интерпретация данного исследования вносит вклад в развивающуюся область исследований по ИЭИ в образовании, подчеркивая важную роль контекстуальных и структурных факторов.

Ключевые слова: принятие ИЭИ, восприятие ИЭИ, искусственный эмоциональный интеллект, инструменты ИИ, Казахстан, профессиональное развитие, педагогическое образование.

Received: 06.05.2026

Approved after peer review: 22.07.2026

Accepted for publication: 25.09.2026