

Pedagogical Evaluation and Motivation as Predictors of Teacher Engagement in English

Ryan R. Poliran¹, Celso L. Tagadiad²

¹Department of Education, Davao del Norte, Philippines

²UM Panabo College, Panabo City, Philippines

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.9010391>

Received: 14 January 2025; Revised: 25 January 2025; Accepted: 29 January 2025; Published: 24 February 2025

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to evaluate the level of pedagogical evaluation, motivation, and teacher engagement of English teachers in the Division of Davao del Norte. It determined the significant relationship and the singular and combined influence between pedagogical evaluation and teacher engagement, and motivation and teacher engagement. Descriptive correlational design was employed in this study and targeted a total of 300 respondents using a random stratified sampling. Teacher-respondents perceived very high levels of pedagogical evaluation and teacher engagement, and high motivation. There was a significant relationship between pedagogical evaluation and teacher engagement, and motivation and teacher engagement. Regression analysis showed the first indicator of pedagogical evaluation influenced teacher engagement. Meanwhile, no indicators of motivation indicated an influence on teacher engagement. Examining the singular and combined influence of pedagogical evaluation and motivation on teacher engagement, the results revealed that the first indicator of pedagogical evaluation significantly influenced teacher engagement. Similarly, pedagogical evaluation significantly influenced teacher engagement as revealed in the multiple regression analysis. Overall, the study's results suggest that pedagogical evaluation predicts teacher engagement. It implied that English teachers who attribute their pedagogical evaluation to internal factors like teaching skills, knowledge, and effort are more likely to feel empowered and confident in their abilities.

Keywords: education, pedagogical evaluation, motivation, teacher engagement, English teachers, multiple correlation, Philippines

INTRODUCTION

Teacher engagement is essential for cultivating a positive school culture (Owens & Valesky, 2014). Disengaged teachers exhibit diminishing enthusiasm, creativity, and perseverance, hindering the establishment of significant student relationships essential for learning (White, 2019). Research, such as the 2014 Gallup survey and the work of Tiongson and Gempes (2018), indicates that diminished teacher involvement adversely affects productivity, even among individuals who express job satisfaction. Globally, 85% of employees are disengaged, comprising 18% who are actively disengaged and 67% who are not engaged (Musenze, Mayende, Wampande, Kasango, Emojong 3; Oehler & Adair, 2020). In the Philippines, 247 public school teachers report diminishing engagement, leading to adverse opinions of the profession (Bravo, Buenaflor, Baloloy, Guarte, Osinaga, Salartin, & Tus, 2021).

Recognizing the importance of teacher engagement mentioned, the researcher performed a comprehensive literature analysis to identify potential characteristics that could influence or predict teacher engagement. Educators' capacity to engage with, comprehend, and implement evidence-based knowledge in their instruction and pedagogy is increasingly associated with high-quality teaching engagement considering welfare level within the school and the degree of cooperation among staff incentivize teachers to enhance their instructional practices (Tripney, Gough, Sharples, Lester, & Bristow, 2011); Thoonen, Slegers, Oort, Peetsma, & Geijsel, 2011).

Given these factors, the researcher decided to undertake this study to ascertain which of the variables may affect or predict the impact of one variable on teacher engagement. Engagement as a motivating notion refers to the voluntary investment of personal resources in the many tasks associated with a particular vocational function (Christian, Garza, & Slaughter (2011). Research indicates that teachers' attitudes and motivation levels are conveyed to students highlighting teacher engagement as pivotal to students' achievement as engaged teachers take full responsibilities to their tasks (Cohen, Moed, Shoshani, Roth, & Maymon, 2019; Christian, Garza, & Slaughter, 2011).

Considering the context, this study determined which of the variables may affect or may predict the effect of the two independent variables on the dependent variable teacher engagement. Although there are already existing studies on the association between pedagogical evaluation and teacher engagement, motivation and teacher engagement, those considered with bivariate relationships failed to cover three variables. This study examined three variables contributing to the body of knowledge within the Division of Davao del Norte.

Accordingly, the workforce quality within a school or school district directly impacts student performance outcomes (Phillips, 2016). According to the research of Nation at Risk as cited by Phillips (2016), teacher quality plays a vital role in student achievement. It further stipulated that teachers' engagement and competence surround more than content and pedagogy. Hence, students' motivation and engagement are intrinsically connected to the pedagogy, motivation, and engagement of teachers in the classroom.

Over the last several decades, interest in research on measuring cognitive elements of teachers' professional competence and pedagogy has been fueled by the assumption that teacher knowledge contributes significantly to effective teaching and student learning. Teachers' pedagogical evaluation is defined as their learning ability, including planning, implementing, and evaluating learning outcomes. To achieve success in learning and teaching, every teacher should possess these competencies as pedagogical evaluation refers to a teacher's capacity to fulfill their responsibilities effectively and appropriately (Gitomer & Zisk, 2015 ; Ada 1; Wijaya, Sholeh, & Mispandi, 2022).

Similarly, teachers' competence encompasses a range of personal, scientific, technological, social, and spiritual abilities that define the standard competency within the teaching profession. This includes mastery of subject matter, understanding of students, educational methodologies, personal development, and adherence to professionalism (Pratama & Simamora, 2021). Hakim (2015) emphasized that teachers must possess various competencies to effectively implement the learning process, including pedagogical, personality, social, and professional competencies. A critical competency for teachers to acquire and excel in is pedagogic competence. This pedagogic competence refers to the teacher's capacity to analyze student learning, acquired through structured learning processes and dedicated efforts.

Additionally, Murkatik, Harapan, Wardiah (2) indicated that proficient educators are anticipated to guide and enhance their students' potential while effectively addressing learning challenges. Gufron, et al. further explained (2024) that pedagogical competence is an essential ability for teachers when planning and implementing the learning process. The teacher's role involves guiding student learning activities to meet educational objectives, necessitating effective communication of the lesson content. Professional teachers possess personal competence, which is essential for effectively conveying learning and demonstrating professional proficiency.

A study by Lukiianchuk, Kharahirlo, Sakhno, Tataurova-Osyka, and Stadnik (2021) identifies the pedagogical component as encompassing the primary motivations that facilitate the development of personal qualities, including the structure of personal abilities and character traits as aspects of general culture. Hakim emphasized (2015) that the central focus of pedagogical competence encompasses the understanding of learners, instructional design and implementation, diagnosis and evaluation of learning, and the development of learners. Nellitawati concluded (2020) in her study "The Influence of Teacher Pedagogical Competence on Teachers' Work Morale" that high pedagogical competence correlates with increased work morale among employees. Work spirit, discipline, and initiative enhance due to a deeper understanding of students, effective instructional design, evaluation, and employee development of students' potential.

Numerous factors influence teacher engagement and the way teachers interact within educational organizations. Teachers interact in four specific capacities: as professionals and practitioners within the school as a social entity, with students, in relation to academic achievement, and concerning content. Teachers who are deeply engaged in their work and experience feelings of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge demonstrate the second emotional characteristic of engagement (White, 2019). Klassen et al. noted (2013) that prior research has highlighted teacher engagement as both a rational and emotional construct, with fluctuations over time due to environmental triggers, thus exhibiting characteristics of both trait-like and state-like components.

Data indicates that teacher engagement levels fluctuate based on their needs and experiences throughout various stages of their professional lives. Gallup found (2014) that the engagement levels of teachers were directly correlated with those of their students, as noted by Klassen et al. (2013), who indicated that teachers' attitudes and motivation are conveyed to their students. Exceptional teachers consistently exhibit the protective factors necessary for fostering an engaging connection with students, characterized by high expectations, supportive relationships, and active student participation within a robust instructional culture. Bakker and Schaufeli, as referenced by White (2019), examined the physical, cognitive, and emotional dimensions of work engagement. Engagement encompasses a behavioral aspect referred to as vigor, characterized by elevated energy levels and mental resilience during work.

Numerous research studies have been conducted on the relationship between motivation and engagement (Ainley et al., 2004). Ainley examined (2004) the educational aspects of student motivation and engagement, identifying the dispositions and characteristics linked to elevated levels of motivation and engagement. The study focused on two points of view. The first was that motivation was caused by specific characteristics closely related to engagement and learning. The second point of view was the importance of creating appropriate learning conditions to influence engagement. According to Liem and Martin, as cited by Phillips (2016), motivation and engagement are closely related to outcome success.

Furthermore, educators involved in content commit to personal development through participation in training activities, attendance at conferences, or enrollment in continuing education courses to enhance their skills and knowledge. These educators maintain a balance between innovation and discipline, creating a pedagogical experience that offers ample opportunities for student learning and discovery (White, 2019). Similarly, pedagogical evaluation is closely associated with teacher engagement, as indicated by Davies et al. (2018), who suggested that teachers' beliefs regarding engagement affect their pedagogical practices and motivation.

METHODOLOGY

Research Respondents

The respondents of this study were 300 English teachers from the 11 districts in Davao del Norte Division, both private and public schools, who accepted the request to participate. Proportionate quota sampling determined the number of teachers per district. This sampling method was employed as Creswell (2017) emphasized that the size significantly differs due to the population's composition of several subgroups. The determination of each subgroup was based on its numerical representation within the total population.

The researcher established criteria for selecting respondents. Teachers from public and private schools were the respondents of this study. The selection of respondents was independent of gender, religion, teaching positions, and grade-level assignments. They were selected due to their adequate knowledge and understanding of the subject matter. The study similarly excluded elementary school teachers and those assigned to teaching positions outside the designated research locale, as they operate in distinct work environments and supervisory contexts. Teachers in supervisory or managerial positions within their schools were also excluded from the study.

The respondents were selected to complete the survey questionnaire while ensuring confidentiality. Participants in the survey had the option to decline involvement. The participants were not compelled to respond to the research questionnaire. Participants had the option to withdraw from the research process at any

time if they felt uncomfortable, as their participation was entirely voluntary and free from penalties or consequences. The target respondent must notify the researcher of their desire to withdraw without the obligation to provide reasons for their decision. Additionally, respondents may be withdrawn from the research study if they engage in falsification, plagiarism, or other ethical violations or have health conditions or special needs.

The research was carried out in the Division of Davao del Norte. It is in the southeastern part of the Davao Region. The researcher conducted the study using data from the division office, with the following distribution: 10% in District A (30 respondents), 8% in District B (24 respondents), 11% in District C (33 respondents), 9% in District D (27 respondents), 9% in District E (27 respondents), 4% in District F (12 respondents), 13% in District G (39 respondents), 9% in District H (27 respondents), 8% in District I (24 respondents), 14% in District J (42 respondents), and 5% in District K (15 respondents).

Materials and Instrument

This research employed three survey questionnaires to collect data. The survey served as an effective tool for assessing large populations, facilitating comparing and analyzing relationships among multiple variables. A survey requires careful planning, adequate time, and dedicated effort to enhance response rates (Creswell, 2017). This approach yields significant results. Survey instruments from web sources and related studies were adapted and modified for application in the current local context. The Likert scale survey instrument identified three components of the study variable: pedagogical evaluation, motivation, and teacher engagement.

Contextualized questionnaires underwent expert review and pilot testing, involving the participation of 30 respondents. The reliability test for independent variable 1 (pedagogical evaluation) yielded a Cronbach Alpha of 0.987, exceeding the minimum threshold of 0.70 established during the pilot testing of the scale administered to respondents. The independent variable 2 (motivation) yielded a Cronbach Alpha of 0.927, exceeding the acceptable threshold of 0.70. Similarly, the dependent variable (teacher engagement) achieved a Cronbach Alpha of 0.972, surpassing the 0.70 criterion. The University of Mindanao Ethics Research Committee approved the study's conduct with its respondents under Protocol Number UMER-2023-148 for ethical considerations.

The first independent variable, pedagogical evaluation, was measured using questions adapted from Berlian et al., (2020). It contained ten indicators, namely: knowing student characteristics based on physical, moral, spiritual, social, cultural, emotional, and intellectual aspects; mastering learning theory and principles of educative learning; developing a curriculum related to the subjects being taught; utilizing information and communication technology for learning purposes; facilitating the development of potential learners to actualize the various potentials they have; communicating effectively, empathically, and politely with students; carrying out assessment and evaluation of the process and learning outcome; utilizing the results of assessment and evaluation for the benefit of learning; designing and carrying out relevant research according to scientific research principles; and performing reflective actions to improve the quality of learning.

It has 44 statements describing pedagogical practices to the respondent-teachers. Participants were provided with these responses: 1 – Never Observed; 2 – Rarely Observed; 3 – Sometimes Observed; 4 – Oftentimes Observed; 5 – Always Observed. The descriptive analysis of pedagogical evaluation among English teachers was categorized into five levels. A mean score between 4.20 and 5.00 denotes a high level, indicating that the pedagogical evaluation is consistently observed.

Meanwhile, a mean score ranging from 3.40 to 4.19 indicates a high level, implying that the pedagogical evaluation is frequently noted. A score between 2.60 and 3.39 indicates a moderate level, whereby pedagogical evaluation is occasionally noted. A low level is designated for scores between 1.80 and 2.59, signifying that the pedagogical evaluation is rarely observed. Finally, a score ranging from 1.00 to 1.79 indicates a very low level, signifying that the pedagogical evaluation is never observed.

The second independent variable, motivation, was measured using questions adapted from Obunadike (2013). It has five indicators: attitude, commitment, reward, punishment, and interest. It has 22 statements describing

the motivation aspect among respondents. Participants were provided with these responses: 1 – Never Observed; 2 – Rarely Observed; 3 – Sometimes Observed; 4 – Oftentimes Observed; 5 – Always Observed.

The descriptive analysis of motivation among English teachers was categorized into five levels. A mean score between 4.20 and 5.00 denotes a very high level, indicating that motivation is consistently observed. A mean score ranging from 3.40 to 4.19 indicates a high level, implying that motivation is frequently noted. A score between 2.60 and 3.39 indicates a moderate level, whereby motivation is occasionally noted. A low level is designated for scores between 1.80 and 2.59, signifying that motivation is rarely observed. Finally, a score ranging from 1.00 to 1.79 indicates a very low level, signifying that motivation is never observed.

Finally, a standardized instrument adapted from Klassen et al. (2013) about the dependent variable teacher engagement includes cognitive engagement, emotional engagement, social engagement: students, and social engagement: colleagues as indicators were employed. This section contains 16-item statements with available responses of 1 – Never Observed; 2 – Rarely Observed; 3 – Sometimes Observed; 4 – Oftentimes Observed; 5 – Always Observed.

To elaborate on teacher engagement among English Teachers, a mean score between 4.20 and 5.00 denotes a very high level, indicating that teacher engagement is consistently observed. A mean score ranging from 3.40 to 4.19 indicates a high level, implying that engagement is frequently noted. A score between 2.60 and 3.39 indicates a moderate level, whereby teacher engagement is occasionally noted. A low level is designated for scores between 1.80 and 2.59, signifying that teacher engagement is rarely observed. Finally, a score ranging from 1.00 to 1.79 indicates a very low level, signifying that teacher engagement is never observed.

Design and Procedure

This research employed a quantitative, descriptive correlational design, which Creswell defines (2017) as a systematic method for comprehending correlations between variables via measurable and numerical data. This design was chosen as it closely corresponds with the study's objectives and problem statement, emphasizing the precise representation of the relationships between dependent and independent variables without alteration.

This study employed descriptive methods to generate raw data for both dependent and independent variables, facilitating the comprehension of their characteristics. Additionally, this study employed correlation to examine and quantify the relationship among two or more variables. The correlational design further advanced the study's objectives by analyzing the strength and direction of correlations, providing insights without experimental intervention (Creswell, 2017).

Likewise, this study involved several procedures. A letter requesting permission to conduct the research was prepared, signed by the adviser, and endorsed by the Dean of Professional Schools. The University of Mindanao Ethics Review Committee granted consent for the study's administration in February 2022. This established the data collection phase of the research. Due to the threats posed by COVID-19, the researcher utilized Google Forms as the primary tool for collecting responses. The researcher subsequently submitted a letter to the Schools Division Superintendent of the Department of Education, Division of Davao del Norte, seeking permission to conduct the study involving private and public secondary English teachers across the 11 districts within the division. Upon receiving permission from the superintendent and district supervisors, the researcher distributed the Google Form link to the respondents.

Data analysis and interpretation necessitate several statistical techniques, such as calculating the mean, Pearson correlation coefficient (r), and multiple regression analysis. The mean determined the pedagogical evaluation, motivation, and teacher engagement level. Pearson (r) was utilized to distinguish the significant relationship between pedagogical evaluation and teacher engagement, as well as motivation and teacher engagement. Meanwhile, multiple regression analyses were employed to determine the singular and combined Influence of pedagogical evaluation and motivation on teacher engagement. Creswell emphasizes (2017) that regression analysis is a robust statistical method for investigating the relationships between dependent and independent variables. This method predicted the pedagogical evaluation and motivation regarding teacher engagement in English within the Davao del Norte Division.

This research undertaking received the utmost attention and care. This considers the planning, implementation processes, and supervision of research personnel to guarantee secure data archiving. All data collected in this study were consistently safeguarded, addressing confidentiality, security, and preservation concerns. The researcher obtained data from Excel spreadsheets integrated within Google Forms and subsequently sent them via email to the university statistician for statistical analysis. Finally, the analysis and interpretation of data were conducted in alignment with the objectives of this study.

Ethical considerations in research pertaining to the methods of information collection and the way this information is communicated to the intended audience. Ethical norms enhance the functions of research, including knowledge acquisition, truth-seeking, and error prevention. Consequently, adherence to the university's protocol-established ethics policies and guidelines through the University of Mindanao Ethics Review Committee (UMERC) was rigorously followed, observed, and monitored throughout all phases of the research. Participation in this study was voluntary, and participants received information regarding the study's objectives.

Additionally, participants were permitted to pose questions regarding the survey or the research procedures. Participants had the option to withdraw from the survey at any time without incurring penalties or losing study benefits if they experienced discomfort with the questions. Furthermore, the participants' information was kept confidential and received appropriate consideration. Access to the information was restricted to individuals requiring it for the research project.

The respondents were requested to participate by accepting the consent included in the Google Forms. This mechanism was essential for ensuring respect for individuals by facilitating informed consent for voluntary actions. Thus, the principle of proportionality was upheld by collecting only the data essential for the research objectives. Eligible participants were permitted to engage in this study. This implies that only English teachers from private and public secondary schools were permitted to participate in the study, provided they possessed adequate knowledge and understanding of the subject matter.

Data and samples were systematically collected and stored throughout the research process. Data protection measures were established and conveyed to research participants to ensure public trust. The researcher exhibited an awareness of public concerns and communicated a strong assurance that ethical values were protected. The implementation of risk reduction measures aimed to safeguard shared values, ensuring that participants do not compromise their intrinsic worth as individuals for the advantage of the research.

Upholding academic integrity, this document underwent evaluation by the Turnitin plagiarism detection system. The results of this study were presented in a manner that maintains context, avoids misleading readers, and refrains from exaggerating claims. The survey questions were designed to avoid bias and did not aim to manipulate results or produce a predetermined outcome. Affiliations with research sponsors were disclosed to ensure transparency. All elements significant to respondents' participation were fully disclosed.

Finally, approval was obtained from the Schools Division Superintendent (SDS) for the research conducted. The research authorship accurately represented individuals' contributions to the work and its reporting. Thus, the author demonstrated adequate involvement in the study and accepted public accountability for relevant sections of the content.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter outlines the data and conclusions drawn from respondents regarding pedagogical evaluation, motivation, and teacher engagement in public and private secondary schools within the Division of Davao del Norte. The subheadings for the tables include level of pedagogical evaluation, level of motivation, level of teacher engagement, significance of the relationship between pedagogical evaluation and motivation, pedagogical evaluation and teacher engagement, motivation and teacher engagement, and the assessment of singular and combined Influence of pedagogical evaluation and motivation on teacher engagement.

Level of Pedagogical Evaluation

Presented in Table 1 are descriptive statistical results on assessing the level of pedagogical evaluation of English Teachers, which has an overall mean of 4.43 and $SD=0.61$, described as Very High, meaning always observed among respondents. Among the ten indicators, *communicating effectively, empathically, and politely with students* got the highest mean score of 4.54 and $SD=0.57$, described as Very High. Three indicators yielded the same mean score of 4.48 and $SD=0.58$, also described as Very High, namely *facilitating the development of potential learners to actualize the various potentials they have, carrying out assessment and evaluation of the process and learning outcome, and utilizing the results of assessment and evaluation for the benefit of learning*.

The indicator *mastering learning theory and principles of educative learning* got a mean score of 4.46 and $SD=0.59$, described as Very High. It was followed by an indicator *utilizing information and communication technology for learning purposes* with a mean score of 4.45 and $SD=0.60$, described as Very High. Meanwhile, the indicator *developing a curriculum related to the subjects being taught* garnered a mean score of 4.43 and $SD=0.59$, also described as Very High.

Meanwhile, the indicator *of knowing student characteristics based on physical, moral, spiritual, social, cultural, emotional, and intellectual aspects* got a mean score of 4.42 and $SD=0.61$, described as Very High. Still described as Very High, two indicators placed at the bottom, namely: *perform reflective actions to improve the quality of learning* with a mean score of 4.38 and $SD=0.63$ and *able to design and carry out relevant research according to scientific research principles* with a mean score of 4.24 and $SD=0.68$.

Table 1. Pedagogical Evaluation

Indicators	SD	Mean	Descriptive Level
Knowing student characteristics based on physical, moral, spiritual, social, cultural, emotional, and intellectual aspects	0.61	4.42	Very High
Mastering learning theory and principles of educative learning	0.59	4.46	Very High
Developing a curriculum related to the subjects being taught	0.59	4.43	Very High
Utilizing information and communication technology for learning purposes	0.60	4.45	Very High
Facilitating the development of potential learners to actualize the various potentials they have	0.58	4.48	Very High
Communicating effectively, empathically, and politely with students	0.57	4.54	Very High
Carrying out assessment and evaluation of the process and learning outcome	0.58	4.48	Very High
Utilizing the results of assessment and evaluation for the benefit of learning	0.58	4.48	Very High
Able to design and carry out relevant research according to scientific research principles	0.68	4.24	Very High
Perform reflective actions to improve the quality of learning	0.63	4.38	Very High
Overall	0.61	4.43	Very High

The findings indicate that educators in both private and public secondary schools within the Division of Davao del Norte exhibit a high level of awareness regarding their pedagogical practices. These teachers demonstrated mastery in pedagogical evaluation, assuming full responsibility for their teaching competence. *Communicating effectively, empathically, and politely with students*, which received the highest mean score, suggests that these teachers cultivate students' psychological readiness for participation through persuasion and examples, actively engage with students, and respectfully instruct them.

Conversely, English teachers require additional development to design and conduct relevant research in accordance with scientific principles. They must systematically prepare class action research proposals that include appropriate variables, precise problem formulation, and accurate hypotheses.

This finding demonstrates teachers' awareness of the implementation of classroom practices that influence students' characteristics, mastery of learning theories, curriculum development, use of information and communication technology, facilitation of student potential, communication with students, execution of evaluation and assessment, application of evaluation results, design of scientific research, and execution of tasks aimed at enhancing learning.

Notably, Gitomer and Zisk (2015) underscored that teachers' professional competence and pedagogy have been fueled by the idea that teacher knowledge contributes significantly to effective teaching and student learning. Consequently, Ada (2016) highlighted that to achieve success in learning and teaching, every teacher must be a critical player in classroom instructional activities that create an impact on students. On the contrary, the result showed that they need more exposure to designing and carrying out relevant research according to scientific research principles; although the result is very high, it came out at the bottom level.

The findings indicate that English teachers may engage more actively in scientific and educational research, such as action research, to improve the quality of learning and teaching. Beyond finding effective practices, educational research aims to discover causal correlations among diverse aspects influencing education. Comprehending these causal connections is essential for formulating solutions that tackle the root causes of educational issues (Singh & Gelat, 2022).

Level of Motivation

Presented in Table 2 are the descriptive statistics for the motivation levels of English teachers, yielding an overall mean of 3.77 and a standard deviation of 0.87, categorized as High, indicating frequent observation among respondents. Among the five indicators, attitude items received the highest mean score of 4.15 (SD = 0.66), categorized as high, followed by commitment items with a mean score of 4.08 (SD = 0.72), also categorized as high. The indicator reward items received a mean score of 3.76 with a standard deviation of 0.93, categorized as High. The indicator interest items exhibit a mean score of 3.64 with a standard deviation of 0.79, categorized as High. The indicator punishment items received a mean score of 3.35 with a standard deviation of 0.93, categorized as Moderate.

Table 2. Motivation

Indicator	SD	Mean	Descriptive Level
Attitude items	0.66	4.15	High
Commitment items	0.72	4.08	High
Reward items	0.93	3.76	High
Punishment items	0.93	3.35	Moderate
Interest items	0.79	3.64	High
Overall	0.87	3.77	High

The findings indicate that English teachers exhibit high motivation across all five indicators, which is oftentimes observed. The data indicates that respondents exhibit a high level of motivation. It was confirmed that the conditions of service for teachers are optimized to improve their performance. Furthermore, sufficient instructional facilities are consistently provided to improve job performance, while the administration typically motivates and supports teachers to achieve higher work efficiency and ensures equitable consideration for all teachers in the distribution of responsibilities.

Conversely, English teachers exhibit moderate motivation regarding punitive measures. Observations indicate a deficient relationship between educators and school administration; teachers who err are excluded from financially beneficial school activities; and educators are not provided with current information regarding their roles, while basic allowances for additional responsibilities remain inaccessible.

The findings align with Özkan and Akgenç (2022) research, indicating that teachers seek security, comfortable living conditions, favorable working environments, a sense of belonging, equitable treatment, a feeling of accomplishment, recognition, and involvement in policy formulation.

Level of Teacher Engagement

Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics for evaluating teacher engagement, revealing an aggregate mean of 4.51 and a standard deviation of 0.64. This indicates a very high level of engagement, as consistently reported by the respondents in their respective schools. Of the four indicators, cognitive engagement received the highest mean score of 4.52 (SD = 0.62), categorized as Very High. Social engagement among students was closely followed by a mean score of 4.51 (SD = 0.62), which was also classified as Very High. The indicator of emotional engagement received a mean score of 4.50 with a standard deviation of 0.64, categorized as Very High. The lowest indicator of social engagement among colleagues received a mean score of 4.40 with a standard deviation of 0.68, categorized as Very High.

Table 3. Teacher Engagement

Indicators	SD	Mean	Descriptive Level
Cognitive engagement	0.62	4.52	Very High
Emotional engagement	0.64	4.50	Very High
Social engagement (<i>students</i>)	0.62	4.51	Very High
Social engagement (<i>colleagues</i>)	0.68	4.40	Very High
Overall	0.64	4.51	Very High

The findings indicate that English teachers in both public and private secondary schools in Davao del Norte exhibit consistently high levels of engagement within their respective institutions. The results indicate favorable views of teachers regarding their cognitive, emotional, and social engagement with students and colleagues. Cognitive engagement is the highest-scoring indicator, indicating that teachers exert significant effort, strive for high performance, and maintain considerable focus during instruction.

The mean score for social engagement with colleagues was the lowest among the indicators assessed. Despite ranking the lowest, it nonetheless indicates that respondents consistently observed concern for their colleagues' issues. The respondents demonstrated a commitment to assisting their colleagues while valuing established relationships. The findings of this study indicate that respondents exhibit confidence in their teaching engagement. They demonstrate effective teaching practices, exhibit enthusiasm for their role, and prioritize the well-being of both students and colleagues. A strong sense of social engagement among students arises, suggesting that teachers contribute to a shared objective that significantly impacts a positive teaching environment.

This concept aligns with the research conducted by Johnston and Taylor (2018), which posits that social engagement results can serve as an empowerment framework, positioning the learning community at the core of engagement to benefit students. Teacher engagement is essential for achieving a positive school culture and climate and for the success of school improvement initiatives. Engagement in education represents a reciprocal relationship between educators and institutions, defined by teachers' dedication to pedagogy, professionalism in attendance and task completion, and self-efficacy attitudes, all of which correlate with student success (White, 2019).

Correlation between Pedagogical Evaluation and Motivation and between Motivation and Teacher Engagement

Table 4. Significant relationship between pedagogical evaluation and teacher engagement and between motivation and teacher engagement

Pair	Variables	Correlation Coefficient	p-value	Decision
IV 1 and DV	Pedagogical evaluation and Teacher Engagement	.328**	0.000	Reject
IV 2 and DV	Motivation and Teacher Engagement	.122**	0.035	Reject

Correlation Analysis of the Variables

Table 4 shows the relationship between the pedagogical evaluation, motivation, and teacher engagement variables. A bivariate correlation study with Pearson product-moment correlation was used to ascertain the relationship between the variables. The computed r -value of .328 with a probability value of $p < 0.000$, which is significant at a 0.05 significance level, was found in the first zero-ordered correlation analysis between teacher engagement and pedagogical evaluation. The outcome shows that the two variables are positively correlated. Consequently, the null hypothesis—which holds that there is no significant connection—is disproved. At the 0.05 significance level, the second correlation study between teacher engagement and motivation produced a significant r -value of .122 with a probability value of $p < 0.035$. The results suggest a strong link between the two variables. As a result, the null hypothesis—which holds that there is no meaningful relationship—is rejected.

Pedagogical evaluation significantly correlates to teacher engagement. The finding implies that effective pedagogical evaluation systems are critical for improving teacher engagement. It is congruent with the claims of Klassen et al. (2013) that when teachers have strong pedagogical skills, they are better able to manage classrooms and provide high-quality instruction, which increases job satisfaction and engagement. Moreover, the findings affirmed the study of Skaalvik (2016) that effective pedagogical strategies not only improve student learning outcomes but also help teachers achieve professional fulfillment, reduce burnout, and increase overall engagement.

Similarly, motivation significantly relates to teacher engagement, which implies that motivation determines how engaged teachers are in their professional duties. This is in consonance with the findings revealed by Day and Gu (2009) that motivated teachers, for example, are more likely to use innovative teaching methods, pursue professional development opportunities, and maintain a positive attitude toward their profession.

Furthermore, the results aligned with the findings of Martin (2009) that teachers who work in schools that offer a supportive work environment and opportunities for advancement are more likely to be motivated and engaged. Furthermore, professional recognition and incentives can boost teachers' extrinsic motivation, which increases their engagement.

Regression Analysis of Pedagogical Evaluation and Motivation on Teacher Engagement

Table 5. Significance of the Influence of pedagogical evaluation on teacher engagement

Pedagogical Evaluation	Teacher Engagement				
	<i>B</i>	<i>B</i>	Std. error	<i>t</i>	<i>Sig</i>
Constant		2.435	.347	7.007	.000
Knowing student characteristics based on physical, moral, spiritual, social, cultural, emotional, and intellectual aspects	0.189	.222	.098	2.271	.024
Mastering learning theory and principles of educative learning	0.015	.016	.095	0.168	.867
Developing a curriculum related to the subjects being taught	0.082	.090	.092	0.973	.331
Utilizing information and communication technology for learning purposes	-0.023	-.023	.080	-0.292	.771
Facilitating the development of potential learners to actualize the various potentials they have	-0.020	-.021	.093	-0.223	.824
Communicating effectively, empathically, and politely with students	0.003	.003	.091	0.035	.972
Carrying out assessment and evaluation of the process and learning outcome	0.098	.101	.091	1.105	.270
Utilizing the results of assessment and evaluation for the benefit of learning	-0.001	-.001	.078	-0.016	.987
Able to design and carry out relevant research according to scientific research principles	0.089	.073	.060	1.228	.220
Perform reflective actions to improve the quality of learning	0.006	.005	.068	0.081	.936
R 0.346 R ² 0.120 ΔR 0.089 F 3.909 P 0.000					

Shown in Table 5 are the indicators of pedagogical evaluation. The correlation coefficient (0.346) indicates the relationship between the observed and projected values of teacher engagement. The model's independent variables, pedagogical evaluation and motivation, account for approximately 12% of the variance in the dependent variable ($R^2 = 0.120$). The adjusted coefficient of determination (0.089) accounts for the number of predictors and yields a slightly lower result. The F-statistic (3.909) and p-value (.000) demonstrate that the total regression model is statistically significant, suggesting that the predictors together have a substantial predictive effect on the dependent variable. Indicator one of pedagogical assessment exhibits a positive unstandardized coefficient of 0.189, indicating that teacher engagement is anticipated to increase by 0.189 units for each unit improvement in indicator one.

This indicates that the indicator of knowing student characteristics based on physical, moral, spiritual, social, cultural, emotional, and intellectual aspects strongly affects teacher engagement, with a probability value of $p < 0.24$, which is significant at the 0.05 level. Therefore, only indicator one exerts a statistically significant positive effect on the dependent variable. The other indicators exert no significant influence, indicating that their effects on the dependent variable are statistically indistinguishable from zero.

The research finding aligns with the results of Klassen et al. (2013), indicating that teacher engagement is associated with teachers' commitment and involvement in their professional roles, which is closely tied to their understanding of student characteristics. Engaged teachers are more likely to devote time and effort to creating meaningful learning experiences, which improves student outcomes. They discovered that teacher engagement is influenced by their perceived ability to meet students' diverse needs, implying that understanding student characteristics improves teacher engagement.

Accordingly, the findings are in line with the claims of Durlak et al. (2011) that teachers who are aware of physical development can better tailor their instructional strategies. It added that students with better physical health have higher academic achievement, and teachers who recognize and address physical health issues can increase student engagement and participation in class activities. Similarly, the findings connect with the conclusion of Berkowitz and Bier (2007) that teachers who understand their students' moral and spiritual backgrounds can create a welcoming and respectful learning environment.

Also, the results relate to the findings of Wentzel (209) that teachers who understand their students' social needs can foster more collaborative and supportive learning environments. It is observed that teachers' awareness of their students' social contexts aids in developing better student-teacher relationships, which are linked to increased motivation and engagement. Culturally responsive teaching, which includes understanding and incorporating students' cultural contexts into the curriculum, has increased student engagement and achievement. Results are similar to Gay (2018) that teachers who understand and value cultural diversity can provide more engaging and relevant learning experiences for their students.

Similarly, the findings relate to Brackett et al. (2011) that teachers sensitive to their students' emotional states and needs can provide more effective support and foster a positive learning environment. Emotionally intelligent teachers are better at managing classroom emotions, which leads to increased student engagement and academic performance.

Lastly, data reveals a connection with the findings of Tomlinson (2001) that understanding students' cognitive abilities and learning styles enables teachers to develop more effective instructional strategies. Teachers who tailor their instruction to students' intellectual characteristics can increase student engagement and learning outcomes.

Table 6. Significance of the Influence of Motivation on Teacher Engagement

Motivation	Teacher Engagement				
	B	B	Std. error	t	Sig
Constant		3.894	.232	16.788	0.000
Attitude items	0.083	.071	.071	1.003	0.317
Commitment items	0.074	.057	.071	0.804	0.422

Reward items	-0.134	-.094	.060	-1.560	0.120
Punishment items	0.071	.044	.046	0.951	0.342
Interest items	0.093	.074	.063	1.178	0.240
R 0.173	R ² 0.030	ΔR 0.013	F 1.807	P 0.000	

Presented in Table 6 are the results of a multiple regression analysis investigating the impact of various motivation indicators on teacher engagement. The correlation coefficient of 0.173 suggests a weak relationship between the observed and predicted values of the dependent variable. The independent variables explain merely 3% of the variance in the teacher engagement variable ($R^2 = 0.030$). The Adjusted R^2 value of 0.013 indicates a limited fit of the model. The F-statistic of 1.807 and a significance level of 0.000 demonstrate that the overall regression model is statistically significant, suggesting that the predictors collectively affect the dependent variable. Attitude items exhibit a positive unstandardized coefficient of 0.083, indicating that each unit increase is associated with an expected rise in teacher engagement of 0.083 units. The p-value of 0.317 indicates that this relationship lacks statistical significance. Commitment items exhibit a positive coefficient but lack statistical significance (p-value=0.422).

Additionally, reward items exhibit a negative coefficient of -0.134, suggesting an inverse relationship with teacher engagement. The p-value of 0.120 indicates that this relationship lacks statistical significance. Consequently, punishment items exhibit a positive coefficient; however, this result is not statistically significant (p-value = 0.342). Finally, interest items exhibit a positive coefficient but lack statistical significance (p-value=0.240). All individual indicators lack statistical significance as predictors of the dependent variable, evidenced by p-values exceeding 0.05. This indicates that these indicators do not significantly influence teacher engagement.

The findings align with the claims of Klassen et al. (2013) that attitude items alone do not significantly predict teacher engagement. It is argued that while having a positive attitude is beneficial, it does not necessarily lead to increased teacher engagement. Their research discovered that other factors, such as school environment and administrative support, are more important. Similarly, the findings are congruent with the arguments of Day and Gu (2009) that teacher commitment, when viewed in isolation, may not significantly impact engagement. It is proven that while committed teachers are more engaged, the relationship is moderated by other factors such as job satisfaction and professional development opportunities. Thus, commitment does not guarantee engagement.

The results link to the findings of Zhang, He, and Fu (2021) that rewards can enhance teacher performance in the short term, but they may fail to maintain long-term engagement. Conversely, cultivating a supportive and independent work environment has proven more efficacious in augmenting teacher motivation and engagement. They also investigated the correlation between teachers' perceived autonomy support and their work engagement. The study revealed that perceived autonomy support significantly affected work engagement by fulfilling basic psychological needs and enhancing intrinsic motivation. This indicates that fostering an environment where educators feel supported and autonomous can enhance engagement.

The results relate to Deci and Ryan's Self-Determination Theory (2008), which states that punitive measures can reduce intrinsic motivation and engagement. The findings indicate that punitive approaches are ineffective in promoting sustained teacher engagement and may be harmful. This indicates that interest alone does not significantly influence engagement without professional development opportunities and a supportive school culture.

Presented in Table 7 are the aggregated indicators of pedagogical evaluation and motivation. The correlation coefficient of 0.362 signifies a moderate correlation between observed and predicted levels of teacher engagement. The aggregate indicators from pedagogical evaluation and motivation explain 13.1% of the variance in teacher engagement ($R^2 = 0.131$). The Adjusted R^2 (0.085) is marginally lower, suggesting a satisfactory model fit after considering the number of predictors. The F-statistic of 2.836 and its significance level of 0.000 demonstrate that the overall regression model is statistically significant, implying that the predictors, when considered together, significantly predict teacher engagement.

Table 7. Significance of the Combined Influence of the Domains of Pedagogical Evaluation and Motivation on Teacher Engagement

Indicators	Teacher Engagement				
	<i>B</i>	<i>B</i>	Std. error	<i>t</i>	<i>Sig</i>
Constant		2.352	0.367	6.400	0.000
Knowing student characteristics based on physical, moral, spiritual, social, cultural, emotional, and intellectual aspects	0.193	0.227	0.099	2.307	0.022
Mastering learning theory and principles of educative learning	0.028	0.029	0.096	0.305	0.760
Developing a curriculum related to the subjects being taught	0.079	0.087	0.093	0.932	0.352
Utilizing information and communication technology for learning purposes	-0.025	-0.025	0.081	-0.311	0.756
Facilitating the development of potential learners to actualize the various potentials they have	-0.029	-0.030	0.094	-0.321	0.749
Communicating effectively, empathically, and politely with students	0.006	0.006	0.092	0.070	0.944
Carrying out assessment and evaluation of the process and learning outcome	0.101	0.104	0.092	1.133	0.258
Utilizing the results of assessment and evaluation for the benefit of learning	0.000	0.000	0.079	-0.006	0.995
Able to design and carry out relevant research according to scientific research principles	0.076	0.063	0.061	1.024	0.307
Perform reflective actions to improve the quality of learning.	0.000	0.000	0.070	0.000	1.000
Attitude items	-0.040	-0.035	0.072	-0.483	0.630
Commitment items	0.054	0.042	0.070	0.601	0.548
Reward items	-0.097	-0.068	0.059	-1.167	0.244
Punishment items	0.082	0.050	0.045	1.124	0.262
Interest items	0.055	0.044	0.063	0.702	0.483
R 0.362 R ² 0.131 ΔR 0.085 F 2.836 P 0.000					

The results indicate that the pedagogical evaluation indicator knowing student characteristics based on physical, moral, spiritual, social, cultural, emotional, and intellectual aspects —significantly affects teacher engagement, with a probability value of $p < 0.24$, which is significant at the 0.05 level. This indicator exhibits a positive unstandardized coefficient of 0.193, indicating that a one-unit increase in this indicator is associated with an expected increase of 0.193 units in teacher engagement. In contrast, indicators 2-10 from pedagogical evaluation and 1-5 from motivation exhibit p-values exceeding 0.05, suggesting no statistically significant relationships with teacher engagement. This indicates that when considered separately, these indicators do not significantly influence teacher engagement.

The results align with the findings of Alannasir (2020) that comprehending student characteristics across multiple dimensions informs educators' strategies, thereby enhancing engagement and allowing for tailored approaches that effectively address diverse needs and potentials.

Table 8. Significance of the Influence of Pedagogical Evaluation and Motivation on Teacher Engagement

Predictors	Teacher Engagement				
	<i>B</i>	<i>B</i>	Std. error	<i>t</i>	<i>Sig</i>
Constant		2.386	.356	6.700	.000
Pedagogical Evaluation	0.320	.446	.080	5.601	.000
Motivation	0.033	.032	.054	.584	.559
R 0.331 R ² 0.110 ΔR 0.104 F 18.197 P 0.000					

Table 8 shows the results of a multiple regression analysis to determine the influence of pedagogical evaluation and motivation on teacher engagement. Generally, the correlation coefficient (0.331) indicates that the observed and predicted values of the independent variables are moderately correlated. The coefficient of

determination (0.110) indicates that the combined Influence of pedagogical evaluation and motivation can explain the 11.0% variance in teacher engagement. The adjusted R^2 (0.104) is slightly lower, while the F-statistic (18.197) and significance (0.000) indicate that the overall regression model is statistically significant, implying that the predictors, when combined, significantly predict teacher engagement.

Specifically, the results indicate that pedagogical evaluation significantly affects teacher engagement, with a probability value of $p < 0.000$, which is significant at the 0.05 level. In contrast, motivation does not significantly influence the dependent variable, as indicated by a probability value of .599, which exceeds the 0.05 significance threshold. The findings indicate that, although the overall model is significant, only pedagogical evaluation predicts teacher engagement. Hence, the results link with the findings of Hargreaves and Fullan (2012), emphasizing that engaged teachers are more likely to seek professional development opportunities and incorporate new knowledge and skills into their teaching. This dynamic relationship suggests promoting teacher engagement can improve pedagogical competence, increasing teaching effectiveness.

On the other hand, results on motivation without significant influence on teacher engagement are congruent with the findings of Hakanen et al. (2005) as they investigated the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model regarding teacher engagement. The findings revealed that motivation has little long-term impact unless adequate job resources accompany it. The study concludes that motivation must be combined with supportive working conditions to be effective in fostering long-term engagement. This supports the notion that motivation alone is not a significant predictor of engagement, as Deci and Ryan (2008) emphasized in self-determination theory (SDT).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section presents the conclusions derived from the study's findings. English teachers in Davao del Norte, from both private and public schools, exhibited high levels of pedagogical evaluation and teacher engagement while also perceiving high levels of motivation. The results indicate a significant relationship between pedagogical evaluation and teacher engagement among English teachers. Similarly, a significant relationship existed between motivation and teacher engagement among the respondents.

The regression analysis findings showed that indicator one of pedagogical evaluation influenced teacher engagement. Meanwhile, no indicators of motivation indicated an influence on teacher engagement. Examining the singular and combined Influence of pedagogical evaluation and motivation variables on teacher engagement, the results revealed that indicator one of pedagogical evaluation significantly influenced teacher engagement. Similarly, pedagogical evaluation significantly influenced teacher engagement, as the multiple regression analysis revealed. Overall, the study's results suggest that pedagogical evaluation predicts teacher engagement.

Accordingly, the result substantiated the Weiner's Attribution Theory used by Bernard Weiner in the mid-1970s. Teachers who attribute their pedagogical competence to internal factors like teaching skills, knowledge, and effort are more likely to feel empowered and confident in their abilities. In contrast, attributing competence to external factors can undermine their sense of efficacy. Viewing pedagogical evaluation as stable (for example, inherent teaching talent) implies that competence remains consistent over time. If pedagogical evaluation is viewed as unstable (e.g., based on daily fluctuations in energy or mood), teachers' teaching effectiveness may be inconsistent. Thus, teachers who believe they have control over the factors that influence their pedagogical competence (for example, through professional development and reflective practice) are more likely to engage in teaching-enhancing behaviors. If they consider these factors uncontrollable, they may feel helpless in improving their teaching methods.

Since the study found out that pedagogical evaluation and teacher engagement have a significant relationship, the researcher recommends that the Department of Education and Private School Administrators in the Division of Davao del Norte organize intensified professional research and training sessions on action and scientific research as one of the indicators of pedagogical evaluation. The researcher recommends that administrators ensure teachers access relevant research resources, such as academic journals, databases,

statistical software, and other research tools. Providing access to these resources can help teachers conduct high-quality research.

The study also revealed a significant relationship between motivation and teacher engagement. The researcher recommends that professional development in positive behavior management and discipline framework among teachers and administrators may take place through the Learning Action Cell and Midyear Program Review and Evaluation to improve teacher-administrator relationships, reduce reliance on punitive measures, and result in better educational outcomes for the learning community.

Meanwhile, the study reveals that pedagogical evaluation predicts and significantly influences teacher engagement; the researcher recommends school administrators develop and implement professional development programs that are not rehashed and specifically tailored to address the needs and challenges faced by English teachers in the Division of Davao del Norte. Focus on enhancing instructional strategies, classroom management skills, research and development, and subject matter expertise. Also, provide training and support for incorporating technology into teaching practices, which can improve pedagogical competence by allowing teachers to use innovative teaching methods and tools.

Finally, the results on the singular and combined influence of pedagogical evaluation, motivation, and teacher engagement reveal that motivation does not predict teacher engagement; hence, the researcher recommends a further study considering the study's variables and highlighting the best practices of each variable among future respondents.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher expresses gratitude to his adviser, Dr. Celso Tagadiad who shared his expertise in research that led the researcher's full understanding and appreciation of UM's research culture. Dr. Tagadiad's patience and demeanor were instrumental in completing this study. To the panel members: Dr. Ana Helena R. Lovitos, Dr. Rowella R. Parrucho, Dr. Rovie Cuarte, and Dr. Jocelyn B. Bacasmot who imparted their knowledge and wisdom; their constructive suggestions paved the way for the success of this academic journey. Also, to Dr. Liezel V. Chan, the statistician, for the thorough data analysis to make this research endeavor come to fruition.

To Davao del Norte's English teachers both from public and secondary schools who proactively responded the research questionnaire; to educational leaders who did not hesitate to approve the conduct of this study.

Above all to Almighty God for the sovereign guidance and strength.

REFERENCES

1. Ada, J. H., & Azisah, S. (2016). The Contribution of Teachers' Pedagogical Competence Toward the Effectiveness of Teaching of English at Mtsn Balang-Balang. *Eternal (English Teaching Learning and Research Journal)*, 2(2), 238–251. <https://doi.org/10.24252/eternal.v22.2016.a5>
2. Ainley, M., Psychology Department, University of Melbourne, Russell, Ainley, Frydenberg, Willms, Eccles, Wigfield, Hidi, Harackiewicz, Fullarton, & Finn. (2004). What do we know about student motivation and engagement? In Australian Association for Research in Education, Programme for International Student Assessment, & OECD, Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Melbourne. <https://www.aare.edu.au/data/publications/2004/ain04760.pdf>
3. Alannasir, W. (2020). Characteristic-Based Development Students aspect. *International Journal of Asian Education*, 1(1), 29–36. <https://doi.org/10.46966/ijae.v1i1.18>
4. Berkowitz, M. (2007). What works in character education. www.academia.edu/52985883/What_works_in_character_education
5. Berlian, M., Vebrianto, R., & Nurhasnawati. (2020). Mentoring and developing pedagogical evaluation instrument for preservice teacher to overcome teaching misconception. In *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research* (Vol. 9, Issue 01, pp. 1170–1171) [Journal-article]. <https://www.ijstr.org>

6. Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., & Salovey, P. (2011). Emotional intelligence: Implications for personal, social, academic, and workplace success. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 5(1), 88–103. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2010.00334.x>
7. Bravo, A. K., Buenaflor, N. B., Baloloy, J. I., Guarte, L., Osinaga, A. M., Salartin, A., Research Students, Psychological Statistics, Tus, J., & Jesus is Lord Colleges Foundation, Inc., Bocaue, Bulacan, Philippines. (2021). Amidst The Covid-19 Pandemic: The Job Burnout and Job Satisfaction of Public School Teachers in The Philippines [Journal-article]. *IJARIE*, Vol-7(Issue-3), 2979–2980. <https://www.ijarie.com>
8. Channa, W. M., & Sahito, Z. (2022). Effect of pedagogical competences of English language teachers on their students' academic achievement: a qualitative study. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 12(11), 2274–2281. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1211.06>
9. Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work Engagement: A Quantitative Review and Test of Its Relations with Task and Contextual Performance. In *Personnel Psychology* (pp. 89–136). <https://mikechristian.web.unc.edu/wpcontent/uploads/sites/13307/2016/11/Christian-et-al-2011-PPsych-Engagement.pdf>
10. Cohen, R., Moed, A., Shoshani, A., Roth, G., & Kanat-Maymon, Y. (2019). Teachers' conditional regard and Students' need satisfaction and agentic engagement: a multilevel motivation mediation model. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 49(4), 790–803. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-019-01114-y>
11. Creswell, John W., and J. David Creswell. (2017). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Sage Publications
12. Davies, L., Newton, D., Newton, L., & School of Education, Durham University, UK. (2018). Teachers' Pedagogies and Strategies of engagement. In *International Journal for Talent Development and Creativity* (Vols. 6–6, Issue 1, p. 169). <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1296857.pdf>
13. Day, C., & Gu, Q. (2009). Veteran teachers: commitment, resilience and quality retention. *Teachers and Teaching*, 15(4), 441–457. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540600903057211>
14. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Self-determination theory: A macrotheory of human motivation, development, and health. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne*, 49(3), 182–185. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012801>
15. Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The Impact of Enhancing Students' social and Emotional Learning: A Meta-Analysis of School-Based Universal Interventions. *Child Development*, 82(1), 405–432. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01564.x>
16. Gay, G. (2018). *Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research, and Practice*. Third edition. Multicultural Education Series. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED581130>
17. Gitomer, D. H., & Zisk, R. C. (2015). Knowing What Teachers Know. *Review of Research in Education*, 39(1), 1-53. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X14557001>
18. [18] Gufron, M., Ningsih, P. R., & Winarto, W. (2024). Strategic Evaluation in Development Teacher Competency. *Technium Education and Humanities*, 9, 66–72. <https://doi.org/10.47577/teh.v9i.11593>
19. Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2005). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. In *Society for the Study of School Psychology, Journal of School Psychology* (Vols. 43–43, pp. 495–513) [Journal-article]. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2005.11.001>
20. Hakim, A. (2015). Contribution of competence teacher (Pedagogical, personality, professional competence and social) on the performance of learning. In *The International Journal of Engineering and Science (IJES)* (Vol. 4, Issue 2, p. PP.01-12) [Journal-article]. <https://www.theijes.com/papers/v4-i2/Version-3/A42301012.pdf>
21. Hargreaves, A., Fullan, M., Sir Ken Robinson, Dan Domenech, Dennis Van Roekel, Steve Munby, Randi Weingarten, Pasi Sahlberg, Ben Levin, & Christopher Harrison. (2012). *Professional Capital: Transforming teaching in every school*. Teachers College Press. <https://www.principals.ca>
22. Johnston, Kim A., and Maureen Taylor (2018)., eds. *The Handbook of Communication Engagement*. In Wiley eBooks. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119167600>
23. Klassen, Robert M., et al. University of York, University of Alberta, Middle East Technical University, & Kafkas University. (2013). Measuring Teacher Engagement: Development of the Engaged Teachers Scale (ETS). In *Frontline Learning Research* (Vol. 2, pp. 33–52) [Journal-article].

24. Lukiianchuk, A., Kharahirlo, V., Sakhno, O., Tataurova-Osyka, G., & Stadnik, N. (2021). Conditions for the development of psychological and pedagogical competence of teachers of vocational (professional and technical) education. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S3), 678–696. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5ns3.1552>
25. Martin, A. J. (2009). Motivation and Engagement Across the Academic Life Span: A Developmental Construct Validity Study of Elementary School, High School, and University/College Students. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 69(5), 794-824. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164409332214>
26. Murkatik, K., Harapan, E., & Wardiah, D. (2020). The influence of professional and pedagogic competence on teacher's performance. In SMP Negeri 2 Prabumulih, Universitas PGRI Palembang, & Universitas PGRI Palembang, *Journal of Social Work and Science Education* (Vol. 1, Issue 1, pp. 58–60).
27. Musenze, I. A., Mayende, T. S., Wampande, A. J., Kasango, J., & Emojong, O. R. (2020). Mechanism between perceived organizational support and work engagement: explanatory role of self-efficacy. *Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences.*, 37(4), 471–495. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jeas-02-2020-0016>
28. [28] Nellitawati, N. (2020). The influence of teacher pedagogical competence of teachers' work morale. *Journal of Counseling and Educational Technology*, 3(1), 29. <https://doi.org/10.32698/0931>
29. Obunadike, J. (2013). Development and validation of teacher Motivation Assessment scale for quality assurance in universities in Anambra State. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*. <https://doi.org/10.5901/jesr.2013.v3n6p95>
30. Owens, R. G., & Valesky, T. C. (2014). *Organizational Behavior in Education: leadership and school reform* (Tenth Edition). Pearson Education Limited.
31. Özkan, U. B., 1, & Akgenç, E. (2022). Teachers' Job Satisfaction: Multilevel Analyses of Teacher, School, and Principal Effects. *FIRE: Forum for International Research in Education*, Vol. 7(Iss. 3), 1–23. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1353601.pdf>
32. Phillips, C. A. (2016). A correlational study of the motivation and engagement in teachers: Experience and effectiveness. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/A-correlational-study-of-the-motivation-and-in-and-Phillips/e343ad1466090e18e0c02fe58e79265745feaac4>
33. Pratama, Indra Mulya, and Santa Lorita Simamora (2021). Teacher Communication Competence in Teaching Through Online Processes at Smk Satria Jakarta Academic Year 2021/2022. In *Jurnal Media Kom: Vol. XI* (Issue No.1, pp. 52–62).
34. Singh, R., & Gelat, V. K. (2022). Importance and necessity of research in education. In Sarvajanik College of Education, Shri Govind Guru University & Sarvajanik College of Education, Shri Govind Guru University, *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews* (Vol. 3, Issue 9, pp. 894–901) [Journal-article]. <https://ijrpr.com/uploads/V3ISSUE9/IJRPR6996.pdf>
35. Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2016). Teacher stress and Teacher Self-Efficacy as predictors of engagement, emotional exhaustion, and motivation to leave the teaching profession. *Creative Education*, 07(13), 1785–1799. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2016.713182>
36. Tiongson, Gideon P., and Gloria P. Gempes (2018). "The Moderating Effect of Reflective Practice on the Relationship between Career Adapt-Abilities and Teacher Engagement of Junior High School Teachers in Davao Region." *Novelty Journals*. <https://www.noveltyjournals.com/upload/paper/The%20Moderating%20Effect-1562.pdf>
37. Tomlinson, C. A. & Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (2001). *How to differentiate instruction in Mixed-Ability Classrooms* (2ND EDITION, pp. v–117). Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. <https://rutamaestra.santillana.com.co/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Classrooms-2nd-Edition-By-Carol-Ann-Tomlinson.pdf>
38. Tripney, J., Gough, D., Sharples, J., Lester, S., Bristow, D., & Wales Centre for Public Policy. (2018). *Promoting Teacher Engagement with Research Evidence*.
39. Tyson-White, C. (2019). *The Association Between Teacher Engagement and School Performance: A Correlational Study of Climate Surveys and School Accountability Grades from Middle Schools Within a Large Urban School District*. In University of Florida.

40. US News and World Report (2014). "Most teachers are not engaged in their jobs, Gallup finds." <https://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2014/04/09/most-teachers-are-not-engaged-in-their-jobs-gallup-finds>
41. Wentzel, K. R. (2009). Students' relationships with teachers as motivational contexts. In K. R.
42. Wentzel, K. R., & Wigfield, A. (2009). Handbook of Motivation at School. In Routledge eBooks. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203879498>
43. Zhang, D., He, J., & Fu, D. (2021). How can we improve teacher's work engagement? based on Chinese experiences. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.721450>