STUDENT ENGAGEMENT, ACADEMIC MOTIVATION, AND ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF INTERMEDIATE LEVEL STUDENTS

Harvey G. Fuertes[1], Israel A. Evangelista Jr.[1], Ivan Jay Y. Marcellones[1], Jovenil R. Bacatan[1]

[1]Teacher Education, UM Peñaplata College

Island Garden City of Samal, Philippines

Abstract: **This study aimed to determine the significant relationship among student engagement, academic motivation, and academic performance of the Intermediate Level Students of Licup Elementary School. Utilizing descriptive correlational method of research and validated questionnaires in data analysis with Mean, and Pearson Product–Moment of Coefficient Correlation as statistical tools, results shows that there is no significant relationship among the three variables. In addition, results also indicated that the student engagement and academic motivation of the intermediate level students of Licup Elementary School is low, while the Academic Performance of the intermediate students is Satisfactory. It was also recommended that future researchers be encouraged to conduct this kind of research in a new location and to set to expand this kind of study.**

Keywords: **student engagement, academic motivation, academic performance intermediate-level students, correlation method.**

I. INTRODUCTION

When Lin (2012) examined the connection between academic motivation and student engagement, he thought that academic motivation was a type of discipline that could either positively or negatively influence a person's behaviors. In addition, a person's goals, past experiences, cultural background, and the opinions of their teachers and classmates all have an impact on their academic motivation and level of engagement; Patrick et al. (2007) outlined the effects of these variables on academic performance in a study that looked at the connection between academic performance and student engagement.

Further, student engagement was positively correlated with academic performance. Due to engaged students' high levels of effort and energy investment, dedication to their studies, and frequent immersion in their study activities, engagement is a good predictor of academic performance. Students who consistently focus on their study activities become goal-oriented and more likely to learn effectively (Schaufeli et al., 2002). In addition, O'Connor & Paunonen (2007) stated that one of the essential aspects influencing students' performance is their motivation in school. For the educational system to succeed, learners must be motivated to learn.

Academic achievement is directly related to student engagement. Engaged students are mindful, participate in class conversations, apply exertion in-class exercises, and display learning interest and motivation (Fredricks et al., 2004). Student engagement in learning is seen as a prerequisite for any requirement of motivation; student engagement in learning is not only a goal in and of itself but also a means to the goal of students achieving good academic outcomes (Russell et al., 2005). Genuine engagement may increase academic achievement throughout a student's life (Zyngier, 2008). The researchers would like to conduct the study because there is a need to determine students' engagement, academic motivation, and academic performance at Licup Elementary School. The researchers need to determine if student engagement and academic motivation are significantly related to their academic performance in school.

Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to determine a significant relationship between student engagement, academic motivation, and academic performance of the students in Licup Elementary School.

Especially it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of student engagement in Licup Elementary School in terms of:

1.1 teacher-student relationships;

1.2 control and Relevance of School work;

1.3 peer support for learning;

1.4 future aspiration and goals; and

1.5 family support for learning?

2. What is the level of academic motivation of the students in Licup Elementary School in terms of:

2.1 intrinsic motivation;

2.2 extrinsic motivation; and

2.3 motivation?

3. What is the student's academic performance level in terms of their general weighted average?

4. Is there a significant relationship between student engagement and the academic performance of the students?

5. Is there a significant relationship between academic motivation and the academic performance of the students?

Hypothesis:

The following hypotheses were tested at a 0.05 level of significance:

1. There is no significant relationship between Student Engagement and Academic Performance of the students.

2. There is no significant relationship between the students' Academic Motivation and Academic Performance.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

This section presents reviewed studies and literature establishing the differences in the situation during the conduct of the study.

Student Engagement

The investment that students make in school-related activities and their want to learn is examples of the cognitive engagement of students, which is comparable to enthusiasm and inspiration (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Middle- or high-school students' decisions to miss class frequently, misbehave, or put up little effort are all substantial behavioral indications of a student's rising disengagement from school. They may therefore be highly predictive of leaving school early (Fredricks et al., 2004). Research has consistently shown that student participation in classroom learning activities is strongly related to academic achievement (Chen et al., 2005).

In addition, students who reported higher levels of engagement were more likely to attend class regularly and get higher grades than those who reported lower levels of engagement; they found that engaged students were 75% more likely to get higher grades and attend class regularly than disengaged students (Klem & Connell, 2004). Engaging students in active learning involves a variety of strategies, including group work, problem-solving activities, case studies, and experiential learning. These approaches allow students to work collaboratively, transfer knowledge to new contexts, and develop critical thinking and problem-solving skills (Bowen, 2003). It was out found that students with high levels of engagement have higher test scores and GPAs and are also less likely to drop out (Croninger and Lee, 2001).

On the other hand, disengaged students can display disruptive behavior to get attention or vent their annoyance with the classroom setting (Rimm-Kaufman & Hulleman, 2015). Additionally, disengaged students are less likely to aim for higher educational goals. According to Skinner et al. (2009), Disengagement can result if students' needs, interests, and the learning environment are unsuitable. They contend that broader contextual elements and more personal student traits impact disengagement, which is not just a product of individual student qualities. Disengaged students may also exhibit negative behaviors, such as disruption or disengagement, which can further exacerbate their disengagement and negatively impact the learning environment for them and their peers (Wigfield & Eccles, 2000).

Along with Bryanson and Hand (2007), the same student may exhibit varying degrees of disengagement within a class, task, assignment, module, or entire course. Fredricks et al. (2004) suggested that a student's decision not to attend school regularly, misbehave, or put in little effort are all behavioral indicators of a student's growing disengagement from school. These behaviors may be strongly predictive of dropping out of school. Lack of student engagement impacts a student's final grade, material retention, and the course dropout rate, making it an important research topic (Staikopoulos et al., 2015).

Students must exhibit good behavior and a sense of belonging if they want to stay in school. Because completion of elementary school was prioritized, studies on student participation focused on children in Middle schools are often where disengagement becomes an issue (Willms et al., 2009). Student involvement was viewed as a method to re-engage or reclaim a classroom and a minority of primarily socioeconomically challenged kids in danger of leaving their middle school. Student engagement tactics expanded and were further enhanced over time, implemented to control student behavior in the classroom. Recently, student engagement has been constructed with the hopeful intention of improving every student's capacity to learn or be in a culture focused on knowledge and to become lifelong learners (Gilbert, 2007, p. 1).

The engagement of students has developed into a learning strategy with accountability as a byproduct. Low levels of student engagement have been found in American classrooms throughout the previous 20 years of research (Oakes, 2005; Sizer, 2004). The lack of engagement has primarily been attributed to issues in kids' personal histories and aspects of their institutions, such as fragmented curricula, subpar instruction, and low expectations for student learning. Increasing student engagement is still challenging for educators (Steinberg, 2005).

Academic Motivation

Engagement is seen in literature as crucial for improving students' learning and motivation (Woolfolk & Margetts, 2007). Conforming to the study by Sternberg (2005), motivation is essential for academic success since, with it, a student will put out the effort to learn. Pajares and Valiante (2002) argue that academic motivation is crucial to student success in various academic domains. The authors define academic motivation as "the psychological factors that influence the direction, intensity, and persistence of students' behavior in academic settings."

Dogan (2015) argued that academic motivation is a crucial factor in student engagement and achievement. Palmer (2007) stated that student motivation is essential to high-quality education. How do we recognize motivation in students? They pay attention, start working on duties right away, ask questions, and provide their opinions, and they seem enthusiastic and delighted to be there. Schunk (2012) believes that motivation is a concept that explains why people act in particular ways and is primarily an internal condition that awakens, guides, and sustains behavior (Woolfolk Hoy, 2015). Along with Demir & Budak (2016), motivation is a learning trigger. Students are eager to learn to take part in the class and engage in activities like repeating the material, connecting it to prior knowledge, and asking questions.

When faced with a task, motivated pupils put forth more effort than they do when they give up. They perform jobs without thinking; they read books in their spare time, work on computer projects, and solve issues and riddles (Schunk, 2012). According to Brophy (2013), motivation is "the degree of passion and the amount to which students devote time and energy to learning. Students' academic motivation can change depending on environmental and interpersonal factors (Guay et al., 2010). Even though intellect and aptitude are considered indicators of academic success, there is evidence that personality traits also matter (O'Connor & Paunonen, 2007).

As explained by Sternberg & Williams (2010) and Slavin (2021), motivation is one of the variables that affect how behavior is mentally prepared and manifested as an action. Students that need more motivation have a poor desire to learn, which has a detrimental impact on learning efforts. These pupils cannot confront their issues and abandon their objectives (Demir Güdül, 2015). The lack of motivation occurs when a person does not have a sense of personal causality or intentionality. Along with Deci and Ryan (2013), a continuum of relative autonomy has been proposed for these various motivational styles, ranging from the least to the most autonomous. Research has shown that low academic motivation can significantly affect students' academic achievement, mental health, and future success. Some consequences of low academic motivation include decreased attendance, engagement in classroom activities, decreased academic performance, and an increased risk of dropout (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002).

Academic Performance

Regardless of how challenging a goal may be, when someone is invested and committed to reaching it, performance increases, and success is more likely (Locke & Latham, 2006). Prior studies had suggested that creating goals was mainly related to motivation, but Seijts et al. (2004) discovered that goal-setting was also directly related to academic success. Due to the significance of academic performance in their professional lives, student motivation is a crucial issue in higher education. Education is regarded as the initial stage in all human endeavors in the age of globalization and technological transformation. It is crucial for the growth of human capital and is associated with a person's well-being and prospects for a better life (Battle & Lewis, 2002).

For educators, the standard of student performance continues to be paramount. It is intended to impact locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally positively. Researchers, educators, and trainers have long been curious about the factors that contribute most significantly to the caliber of student performance. These factors, both within and outside the classroom, impact pupils' academic performance. These elements could be classified as peer factors, school factors, family considerations, and student factors (Crosnoe, Johnson & Elder, 2004). For students to succeed academically, their surroundings and personal traits are crucial. Students receive assistance and support from school staff, family members, and community members for the caliber of their academic performance.

Goddard (2003) stated that social support is essential for pupils to reach academic performance goals. The family environment has an impact on student's academic success as well. Parents that are educated can create an environment that is ideal for their children's academic performance. Parents can receive counseling and advice from school officials to improve their home environments and raise their children's academic achievement (Marzano, 2003). To achieve superb academic accomplishment, pupils' academic performance strongly relies on their parent's involvement in their academic activities (Barnard et al., 2004). It is commonly accepted that discipline is crucial for fostering an environment in schools that supports students' ability to do well academically (Masitsa, 2008). Where there is good discipline, academic performance is better.

Studies have shown that a variety of factors, including learning environments, age, and gender inequalities, have an impact on student's performance. The socioeconomic factors that affect kids' academic performance include their involvement in class, family income, the teacher-to-student ratio, the availability of trained teachers in the classroom, and their gender (Hanushek, 2002); peer influence has more significant effects than parental influence in their investigations of the impact of peer influence on student achievement. Student engagement and academic drive are excellent at avoiding issues before they arise. It is believed that student engagement is a result of a motivational process. Additionally, Skinner et al. (2009) stated that a psychological course is helpful for learning and growth even without participation.

ISSN 2394-9686

International Journal of Novel Research in Education and Learning
Vol. 10, Issue 3, pp: (133-149), Month: May - June 2023, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

Accordingly, Dörnyei (2000) argues that students, especially those with high levels of self-efficacy, struggle to see the big picture unless they actively participate in their education. In addition to (Stan, 2012), disciplinary power becomes more effective at motivating students to learn by focusing on students' interests. Students' performance is also affected by socioeconomic factors like attendance in class, family income, mother and father education, teacher-to-student ratio, presence of trained teachers in the school, sex of students, and school distance (Raychauduri et al., 2010).

Pintrich (2004) mentioned that social, contextual, motivational, and cognitive variables influence academic performance outcomes like Grade Point Average (GPA), exam results, or final course grades. Dwsome factors cane some factors can contribute to high academic performance, mind, and set, such as having a growth mindset. Students who believe their abilities can be developed through effort and hard work is likelier to persevere through challenges and achieve academic success (Dweck, 2006).

GPA

The GPA was primarily employed by researchers globally to evaluate student performance (Galiher, 2006). Performance is the degree of success in carrying out a task at a particular time. Different methods evaluate pupils' academic performance (Ganyaupfu, 2013). Grade point averages (GPA) measure academic accomplishment used in some research. The cumulative GPA was also employed in this study to gauge student performance. Through training and courses, study abilities can be enhanced, which raises GPAs. The increase in students' GPAs may result from additional elements linked to course engagement. The grade point average (GPA) is a widely used measure of academic achievement. There are frequently minimal GPA requirements that students must meet. As a result, academic planners continue to utilize GPA as their primary yardstick for assessing students' academic progress.

Throughout their time in school, a student's ability to achieve and maintain a high GPA that accurately reflects their overall academic performance may need to be improved by various issues. These variables could be the focus of methods created by faculty members to enhance student learning and boost their academic success by tracking their performance development (Kifaya, 2009). As explained by House's study from 2000, there was a strong correlation between students' academic success as evidenced by their GPA and their self-beliefs, achievement expectations, and academic background. The academic success of international students is also influenced by their culture, economic performance, and level of competition (Baumann & Hamin, 2011).

Academic success for international students also depends on factors like motivation and attitudes, prior knowledge of a subject of study, prior academic performance, and students' judgments of their accomplishments (Light et al., 1987; Nelson et al., 2004). According to Narad and Abdullah (2016), academic performance is measured by continuous assessment or exam results. Academic performance is the knowledge acquired and is evaluated by marks by a teacher or educational goals set by students and teachers to be achieved over a specific period. Grade Point Average (GPA) has long been used as a standard indicator of students' academic performance since it is believed to have a direct relationship with general intelligence and worldwide impact. The conclusions of how academic performance has been operationalized through GPA are based on a thorough analysis of the currently available literature.

Relationship between Student Engagement and Academic Performance

Rosário et al. (2017) found that while there was a correlation between student engagement and academic achievement, the relationship was weaker than previously thought. The authors suggest this could be because student engagement is not always a direct predictor of academic performance, and other factors may be more critical. However, correlations between academic performance and student engagement are weaker or even nonexistent in other studies. For instance, Carini, Kuh, & Klein (2006) found that although there was a positive correlation between engagement and grades, it was weak and not statistically significant. This was the conclusion of a study published in the Journal of College Student Development.

However, researchers from other studies (Appleton et al., 2006; Chen et al., 2013; Shernoff & Schmidt, 2008; Shernoff, 2010) did not come to the same result, and in other cases, they did not even discover a significant association between student engagement and academic accomplishment. Academic accomplishment and student involvement were not even found to be significantly correlated by any of the studies mentioned above.

Relationship between Academic Motivation and Academic Performance

Several studies (Sivrikaya, 2019; Amrai et al., 2011; Mwaura et al., 2019) have mentioned that academic motivation has a positive relationship with academic performance. However, Wang and Holcombe (2010) also found no significant relationship between academic motivation and performance in a 515 elementary school students sample. The authors found that while there was a positive correlation between the two variables, the correlation was not significant. Wirthwein, Rost, and Sparfeldt (2013) found no significant correlation between academic motivation and academic performance in a sample of German elementary school students.

However, a study by Çetin (2015) revealed that academic motivation does not correlate with academic performance. Concerning the studies of Baker (2003), there is no connection between extrinsic motivation and academic performance. One study that found no significant relationship between academic motivation and academic performance is a meta-analysis conducted by Richardson et al. (2012); they reviewed 79 studies on the relationship between motivation and academic performance and found a correlation coefficient of 0.12, considered a small effect size. They concluded that although motivation is essential for academic success, it is not a strong predictor of performance.

Deci and Ryan (2013) suggested that academic motivation is not a significant predictor of academic performance for all students and that there may be individual differences in the relationship between motivation and performance. Some students may be more motivated by external factors such as rewards and punishments. In contrast, others may be more motivated by internal factors such as a desire to learn and achieve personal goals.

Theoretical Framework

This study was anchored on William James's Achievement Goal Theory (1980), which stated that it is a valuable lens for examining the effects of various classroom setups and learning settings on student motivation. Along with cognitive processes like problem- and decision-solving, this theory seeks to explain aspects of physical activity like task engagement and persistence. This theory most frequently utilizes theorists to explain student activity decision engagement, perseverance, help-seeking, and academic performance. Additionally, motivation is employed as a gauge for academic modifications (Roeser & Eccles, 1998).

This was also supported by the Flow Theory of Csikszentmihalyi (1990), which provided an additional explanation as a theoretical viewpoint on student learning that integrates cognitive, motivational, and emotional factors. It focuses on the concept of flow, which is a state of complete immersion and engagement in an activity. Additionally, it will support teachers in developing classroom settings that foster greater student participation. Most teachers in America concur that students who participate in school are more likely to succeed academically and as adults. Studies on student engagement have revealed a correlation between rising student involvement and good student learning outcomes, such as a better GPA, higher high school credits acquired excellent attendance rates, and higher classroom participation (Appleton et al., 2006).

Lastly, this was also supported by the Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) that was developed by Lent, Brown, and Hackett (1994), which explains and predicts the processes by which vocational and academic interests are developed, vocational and academic choices are made, and various levels of work and academic performance are attained. SCCT's performance model suggests that work and academic performance is a function of five conceptually distinct but interrelated (in a reciprocal manner) cognitive and behavioral variables—general cognitive ability, past performance, outcome expectations, self-efficacy beliefs, and goal mechanisms.

III. METHOD

This part of the study presented the research design, participants, instruments, procedure, and statistical treatment.

Research Design

This study utilized the quantitative-descriptive correlational design to determine the student engagement, academic motivation, and academic performance of intermediate-level students in Licup Elementary School. The researchers used the descriptive correlational design to identify the statistical association of the three variables. As cited in the short article of Seeram (2019), correlational research can uncover interacting variables and the type of interaction occurring, allowing the researchers to make predictions based on the discovered relationships.

ISSN 2394-9686

International Journal of Novel Research in Education and Learning
Vol. 10, Issue 3, pp: (133-149), Month: May - June 2023, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

Research Locale

The respondents of this study were the Intermediate Level Students of Licup Elementary School, the year 2022-2023. The researchers chose this place to prove if student engagement and academic motivation is associated with the academic performance of the students.

Research Respondents

The study's respondents are the officially enrolled Grade 4 to 6 elementary students in Licup Island Garden City of Samal. These respondents are the ones who have enough knowledge to answer the problems posed in this study. The respondents answered the questionnaire the researchers gave them, which supplied the information needed. In choosing the respondents, the researchers employed total population sampling as it involves the entire population of intermediate-level students of Licup Elementary School. Using this kind of sampling can get deep insights into the observable fact the researchers are interested in. It does make it possible to make analytical generalizations about the population being studied (Lund Research Ltd, 2012).

Research Instruments

A survey questionnaire was used as the principal instrument for data gathering. The researcher adapted a questionnaire developed by Appleton et al. (2006) to determine the student engagement, academic motivation, and academic performance of the students of Licup Elementary School. The questionnaire was arranged by variables with responses using 5 Likert scale, 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= neutral, 4= agree, and 5= strongly agree. The questionnaire was printed in a hard copy. It was distributed manually to the respondents to assess the information to help the researcher determine the student engagement, academic motivation, and academic performance of Grade 4-6 elementary students of Licup. The researcher also adapted a questionnaire developed by Losier et al. (1993) to determine the intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and motivation of the students in Licup Elementary School.

Data Gathering Procedure

The following procedures were observed in the gathering of data:

1. **Asking for Permission to Conduct the Study.** The researchers wrote a letter asking permission from the Dean of College. Afterward, the researchers also asked permission from the school principal of Licup Elementary School to conduct the study.

2. **Adapting a Questionnaire**. The researchers adapted and modified a questionnaire from the study of Appleton et al. (2006) to determine student engagement and academic motivation. The researchers also adapted a questionnaire from the study of Losier et al. (1993).

3. **Validation of the Questionnaires.** The researchers presented the questionnaires to the panel of examiners for validation and approval.

4. **Asking for Approval from the Parents.** The researchers formally asked the respondents' parents by sending parent consent if they would allow the respondents to answer the survey questionnaire.

5. **Conducting the Survey**. The researchers manually distributed the survey questionnaires to the intermediate-level students of Licup Elementary School.

6. **Retrieval of the Survey Questionnaires.** After the survey was conducted, the researchers collected the questionnaires from the students.

7. **Tabulation, Analysis, and Interpretation of Data.** The data collected were collated and tabulated. It was presented in tables and figures with a textual explanation. These data were used to interpret and analyze using different applicable statistical tools.

Range Descriptive Rating and Interpretation for Students Engagement

Scale	Range of Means	Verbal Description	Interpretation
5	4.20 – 5.00	Very High	This means that the students strongly agree with the embodied statements. This further means that student engagement is always manifested.
4	3.40 – 4.19	High	This means that the students agree with the embodied statements. This further means that the student engagement is oftentimes manifested.
3	2.60 – 3.39	Moderate	This means that the students neither agree nor disagree with the embodied statements. This further means that the student engagement is sometimes manifested.
2	1.80 – 2.59	Low	This means that the students disagree with the embodied statements. This further means that the student engagement is seldom manifested.
1	1.00 – 1.79	Very Low	This means that the students strongly disagree with the embodied statements. This further means that the student engagement is never manifested.

Range Descriptive Rating and Interpretation for Students' Motivation

Scale	Range of Means	Verbal Description	Interpretation
5	4.20 – 5.00	Very High	This means that the students strongly agree with the embodied statements. This further means that the student's motivation is always manifested.
4	3.40 – 4.19	High	This means that the students agree with the embodied statements. This further means that the student's motivation is oftentimes manifested.
3	2.60 – 3.39	Moderate	This means that the students neither agree nor disagree with the embodied statements. This further means that the student's motivation is sometimes manifested.
2	1.80 – 2.59	Low	This means that the students disagree with the embodied statements. This further means that the student's motivation is seldom manifested.
1	1.00 – 1.79	Very Low	This means that the students strongly disagree with the embodied statements. This further means that the student's motivation is never manifested.

Range Descriptive Rating and Interpretation for Academic Performance

Range of Means	Verbal Description	Interpretation
90 – 100	Outstanding	This means that the student at this level exceeds the core requirements in terms of knowledge, skills, and understanding and can transfer them automatically and flexibly through authentic performance tasks.
85 – 89	Very Satisfactory	This means that the student at this level has developed the fundamental knowledge, skills, and core understandings and can transfer them independently through authentic performance tasks.

ISSN 2394-9686

International Journal of Novel Research in Education and Learning
Vol. 10, Issue 3, pp: (133-149), Month: May - June 2023, Available at: **www.noveltyjournals.com**

80 – 84	Satisfactory	This means that the student at this level has developed the fundamental knowledge, skills, and core understandings and, with little guidance from the teacher and/or with some peer assistance, can transfer these understandings through authentic performance tasks.
75 – 79	Fairly Satisfactory	This means that the student at this level possesses the minimum knowledge and skills, and core understandings but needs help throughout the performance of authentic tasks.
Below 75	Did not meet the expectation	This means that the student at this level struggles with his/her understanding; prerequisite and fundamental knowledge and/or skills have not been acquired or developed adequately to aid understanding.

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This chapter includes the presentation of the results, evaluation, and interpretation of the responses of students in Licup Elementary School in the questionnaire presented and discussed based on the study's objectives. The discussion of the topic well goes as follows, level of Students Engagement and the relationship between Student Engagement, Academic Motivation, and Academic Performance of elementary students.

Level of Student Engagement

The variable student engagement has five indicators: Teacher-student relationship, Control, and relevance of schoolwork, Peer support for learning, Future aspiration and goals, and Family support for learning. Table 1 shows the overall mean score of the student's level of student's engagement is 2.04, with a standard deviation of 0.46. The mean score was described as low, indicating that student engagement rarely manifests.

Table 1 shows students' engagement level in Licup Elementary School, with five indicators: Teacher-student relationship, Control and relevance of schoolwork, Peer support for learning, Future aspirations and goals, and Family support for learning. The first indicator, Teacher-Student Relationship, has a mean score of 2.07 with a standard deviation of 0.58 which was described as low, which means it rarely manifested by the students. This shows a low connection between the teacher and the student. The result shows that the teacher needs to improve in some factors like treating the student fairly able to listen and care to the students, setting fair rules, openness and honesty, and treating students for who they are. This result is supported by Den Brok et al. (2004), which stated that a positive classroom environment is defined by positive teacher-student interaction. In contrast, a negative relationship is detrimental to student growth and outcomes.

The second indicator, Control and Relevance of School Work has a mean score of 2.02 with a standard deviation of 0.46 which was described as low, which means rarely manifested. The result shows a problem between the students and school activities. This means that the students do not highly relate their learnings to the activities given; the activities can be challenging. Fredricks et al. (2004) stated that low controllability and irrelevance of school work can negatively impact student engagement. When students feel disconnected from their learning experiences, they are more likely to disengage and exhibit lower motivation.

The third indicator, Peer Support for Learning, has a mean score of 2.06 with a standard deviation of 0.53, which was described as low and rarely manifested. The result shows a problem between the student and their peer. This means that the students seldom care for each other, seldom have a sense of sympathy, and seldom show respect for each other. As supported by Wentzel et al. (2004), a lack of peer support can lead to feelings of isolation, decreased motivation, and lower academic achievement among students

The fourth indicator, Future Aspirations and Goals, has a mean score of 1.98 with a standard deviation of 0.60, described as low, meaning rarely manifested. The results show a need for more encouragement the students feel toward education. The aspiration and goals of the student could be higher towards the education they received. As supported by Linnenbrink-Garcia & Pekrun (2011), low-level aspirations and goals can lead to reduced academic engagement, resulting in underachievement and lower educational attainment.

ISSN 2394-9686

International Journal of Novel Research in Education and Learning
Vol. 10, Issue 3, pp: (133-149), Month: May - June 2023, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

Table 1. Level of Student Engagement

Indicators	SD	M	Descriptive Level
Teacher-Student Relationship	.58	2.07	Low
Control and Relevance of School Work	.46	2.02	Low
Peer Support for Learning	.53	2.06	Low
Future Aspirations and Goals	.60	1.98	Low
Family Support for Learning	.57	2.06	Low
Overall Mean	.46	2.04	Low

Note: N = 39, M = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation

The fifth indicator, Family Support for Learning, has a mean score of 2.06 with a standard deviation of 0.57. This indicates that the descriptive level is low, which is rarely manifested. The result shows that there is a problem in the family support system of the students. This means that the parent or guardians of the students need more attention to them. The parent or guardian of the students has a considerable amount of time in their businesses to give education to them. With parental support and encouragement, students could perform better academically and maintain motivation (DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005). Overall, the level of Students Engagement got a total mean of 2.04 and a standard deviation of 0.46, which was described as low, meaning that the students rarely manifested it. The result shows that the students at Licup Elementary School need to engage more in their subjects. This means the teacher, parents, and students have something to improve to achieve high results.

Enhancing achievement has been the primary goal of student engagement. Students must exhibit good behavior and a sense of belonging if they want to stay in school. Because completion of elementary school was prioritized, while studies on student participation focused on children in Middle schools are often where disengagement becomes an issue (Willms et al., 2009), Student involvement was viewed as a method to re-engage or reclaim a classroom (Willms et al., 2009), and a minority of primarily socioeconomically challenged kids who are at danger of leaving their school middle school. Student engagement tactics expanded and were further enhanced over time, implemented to control student behavior in the classroom.

The level of student engagement has been constructed to improve every student's capacity to learn or be in a culture focused on knowledge and becoming lifelong learners (Gilbert, 2007). The engagement of students has developed into a learning strategy with accountability as a byproduct. Low levels of student engagement have been found in American classrooms throughout the previous 20 years of research (Goodlad, 1984; Oakes, 2005; Sizer, 2004; Steinberg, 1996). The lack of engagement has primarily been attributed to issues in kids' personal histories and aspects of their institutions, such as fragmented curricula, subpar instruction, and low expectations for student learning. Increasing student engagement is still challenging for educators (Sax, Astin, Korn, & Mahoney, 1997; Steinberg et al., 2005).

Level of Academic Motivation

Table 2 shows students' academic motivation levels at Licup Elementary School. The table has a mean score of 2.58, with a standard deviation 0.29. The mean score belongs to the low descriptive level, indicating that academic motivation rarely manifests. It shows the level of academic motivation in Licup Elementary School, with three indicators: Intrinsic, Extrinsic, and motivation. The first indicator, Intrinsic Motivation (IM), has a mean score of 2.45 with a standard deviation 0.30. This indicates that the descriptive level is low, which is rarely manifested by the students. The result shows that the students are not so intrinsically motivated. This means that the activities they give do not impact the students; the students feel bad about the activity. The activity could be more intriguing to call students' attention, and the students felt no fun. When students lack intrinsic motivation, they may find it difficult to come up with new ideas, exercise critical thinking, and complete problem-solving activities (Hennessey & Amabile, 2010)

ISSN 2394-9686

International Journal of Novel Research in Education and Learning
Vol. 10, Issue 3, pp: (133-149), Month: May - June 2023, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

Table 2. Level of Academic Motivation

Indicators	SD	M	Descriptive Level
Intrinsic Motivation	.30	2.45	Low
Extrinsic Motivation	.69	2.55	Low
Amotivation	.54	2.74	Moderate
Overall Mean	.29	2.58	Low

Note: N = 39, M = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation

The second indicator, Extrinsic Motivation (EM), has a mean score of 2.55 with a standard deviation of 0.69. This indicates that the descriptive level is low, which is rarely manifested. The result shows that the students are not extrinsically motivated. This means that students need to see the importance, benefits, and interest of what they do. Negative extrinsic motivation can result in decreased task performance and perseverance. When external factors primarily drive people, they may become disinterested or easily give up when faced with difficulties or disappointments (Pink, 2011).

The third indicator, Amotivation, has a mean score of 2.74 with a standard deviation of 0.54. This was described as moderate, which means sometimes manifested. The result shows that there is a moderate motivation of the students. This means that the students have a reason for engaging in the activities. Yates (2009) found that motivated students were more likely to exhibit disruptive behaviors in the classroom, such as talking out of turn, being off-task, and engaging in other behaviors that interfere with their learning and that of their peers.

Overall, the level of Academic Motivation got a mean of 2.58 and a standard deviation of 0.29, with a low Descriptive Level, meaning that the students rarely manifest it. The result shows that the students at Licup Elementary School need to be motivated in some instances in their subjects. Teachers must do some activities that will motivate and encourage the learners. As cited by Sternberg & Williams (2010) and Slavin (2021), motivation is one variable that affects how behavior is mentally prepared and manifested as an action. Students that need more motivation have a poor desire to learn, which has a detrimental impact on learning efforts. These pupils cannot confront their issues and abandon their objectives (Demir Güdül, 2015).

Level of Academic Performance

Table 3 shows the level of Academic Performance of students in Licup Elementary School. The table has a total mean score of 86.90, with a standard deviation 3.90. The mean score belongs to the Very Satisfactory descriptive level, which indicates that Academic Performance is highly manifested. The result shows that the students of Licup Elementary School have very satisfactory grades. The results show that the students at Licup Elementary School are academic achievers. Stan (2012) emphasized that by focusing on students' interests, disciplinary power becomes more effective at motivating students to learn.

Table 3. Level of Academic Performance

Indicator	SD	M	Descriptive Level
General Weighted Average (GWA)	3.90	86.90	Very Satisfactory

Note: N = 39, M = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation

Significance of the Relationship between Student Engagement and Academic Performance

The r-value shows that the overall significance of the student engagement and academic performance level was -0.105. Therefore, the degree of correlation was weak and usually distributed with a p-value of .525, which means that the overall p-value shows no significant relationship between the two variables. This tells us that there is no significant relationship between student engagement and academic performance.

Table 4. Significance of the Relationship between Student Engagement and Academic Performance

Student Engagement	Academic Performance
	Overall
Teacher-Student Relationship	.110 (.506)
Control and Relevance of School Work	-.175 (.287)
Peer Support for Learning	-.161 (.327)
Future Aspirations and Goals	.017 (.917)
Family Support for Learning	-.265 (.102)
Overall	-.105 (525)

*p<.05 – Significant

This shows that student engagement does not impact the overall result of Licup Elementary School, which means their relationship is insignificant. Thus, Licup Elementary students can stand amidst the hardships they face in their study journey. Researchers from other studies (Appleton et al., 2006; Chen et al., 2013; Shernoff & Schmidt, 2008; Shernoff, 2010) did not come to the same result, and in other cases, they did not even discover a significant association between student engagement and academic accomplishment. Academic accomplishment and student involvement were not even found to be significantly correlated by any of the studies mentioned above (Appleton et al., 2006; Chen et al., 2013; Shernoff & Schmidt, 2008; Shernoff, 2010). Together, the results of this research show that the connections between various facets of student participation and academic success vary.

Significance of the Relationship between Academic Motivation and Academic Performance

The r-value shows that the overall significance of the academic motivation and performance level was 0.307. Therefore, the degree of correlation was weak and usually distributed with a p-value of .057, which means that the overall p-value shows no significant relationship between the two variables. This tells us that there is no significant relationship between academic motivation and performance.

This shows that academic motivation does not impact the overall result of Licup Elementary students, which means their relationship is insignificant. Thus, Licup Elementary students can stand amidst the hardships they face in their study journey. A study by Çetin (2015) revealed that academic motivation does not correlate with academic performance. Baker's (2003) studies show no connection between extrinsic motivation and academic performance. One study that found no significant relationship between academic motivation and academic performance is a meta-analysis conducted by Richardson et al. (2012). The authors reviewed 79 studies on the relationship between motivation and academic performance and found a correlation coefficient of 0.12, considered a small effect size. They concluded that although motivation is essential for academic success, it is not a strong predictor of performance.

ISSN 2394-9686

International Journal of Novel Research in Education and Learning
Vol. 10, Issue 3, pp: (133-149), Month: May - June 2023, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

Table 5. Significance of the Relationship between Academic Motivation and Academic Performance

Academic Motivation	Academic Performance
	Overall
Intrinsic Motivation	-.243 (.136)
Extrinsic Motivation	.219 (.181)
Amotivation	.351* (.029)
Overall	.307 (.057)

*$p < .05$ – Significant

V. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This section summarizes the findings, conclusions, and recommendations in the research entitled "Student Engagement, Academic Motivation, and Academic Performance." This study employed adapted survey questionnaires and personally disseminated them to the Intermediate Level Students of Licup Elementary School through a manual survey.

Conclusion

Based on the findings, the level of student engagement of the Intermediate Level Students of Licup Elementary School was low. This indicates that the students need more engagement in their classes. Moreover, this means that the students need help in order for them to be engaged in school. The level of student engagement of the 39 intermediate-level students in terms of the teacher-student relationship, control and relevance of school work, peer support for learning, future aspiration and goals, and family support for learning is low. This shows that student engagement in terms of the teacher-student relationship, control and relevance of school work, peer support for learning, future aspiration and goals, and family support for learning rarely manifested and needs more engagement in school. Further, the intermediate-level students' academic motivation level regarding intrinsic and extrinsic motivation is low, while the indicator motivation is moderate. This shows that the academic motivation of intermediate-level students needs motivation. Moreover, teachers, parents, and classmates are crucial in achieving higher student motivation. Students become motivated when teachers, parents, and peers play their respective roles. In addition, the overall academic performance represented by the General Weighted Average of the students, was very satisfactory. The result shows that they are academic achievers and can withstand their trials.

Lastly, it was also indicated in the results in Table 4 that the relationship between student engagement and academic motivation of the intermediate-level students was not statistically significant. This means that student engagement does not have a significant relationship with the student's academic performance. Moreover, the relationship between academic motivation and academic performance of the intermediate-level students was not statistically significant. This means that academic motivation does not have a significant relationship with the student's academic performance. Some factors that might affect academic performance are not included in the study.

Recommendation

This research would be beneficial to the following person: students, teachers, and future researchers.

For the students, this study would benefit them because they will be encouraged to engage more and be motivated. Through this study, students should obtain techniques and strategies to maintain good grades despite adversity. They may equip knowledge of student engagement, academic motivation, and academic performance to understand the importance of its concept and enhance it. The researchers recommend that the students show respect to their classmates for what they say and show acceptance for who they are. Students must be approachable at all times, be helpful to their fellow students, and show friendship and caring to each and every one.

For the teachers, this study would identify if the students will persist in learning, thus, building relationships with students. In addition, teachers should give the students a chance to collaborate and participate in teaching and learning activities. The researchers recommend that teachers listen to and care for every student. Teachers should establish fair school rules, show openness and honesty, and value students as people. The teacher should show an approachable attitude in a way that the students enjoy talking to them.

For future researchers, this study will help them select their new study. This will help them to gather more ideas and especially know the results. It will also guide them if their research is related to this study. The researchers recommend that future researchers continue and broaden the study with many respondents to show more valid results. For future researchers, if you are a teacher or a student. The researchers also recommended that you do your job as a teacher to help students in all aspects, and as a student, you should also help your classmates in all aspects.

REFERENCES

[1] Amrai, K., Motlagh, S. E., Zalani, H. A., & Parhon, H. (2011). The relationship between academic motivation and academic achievement students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *15*, 399-402.

[2] Appleton, J. J., Christenson, S. L., Kim, D., & Reschly, A. L. (2006). Measuring cognitive and psychological engagement: Validation of the Student Engagement Instrument. *Journal of school psychology*, *44*(5), 427-445. *

[3] Baker, S. R. (2003). A prospective longitudinal investigation of social problem-solving *of Undergraduate Research*, *14*(1).appraisals on adjustment to university, stress, health, and academic motivation and performance. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *35*(3), 569-591.

[4] Barnard, W. M. (2004). Parent involvement in elementary school and educational attainment. *Children and youth services review*, *26*(1), 39-62.

[5] Battle, J., & Lewis, M. (2002). The increasing significance of class: The relative effects of race and socioeconomic status on academic achievement. *Journal of poverty*, *6*(2), 21-35.

[6] Baumann, C., & Hamin. (2011). The role of culture, competitiveness and economic performance in explaining academic performance: a global market analysis for international student segmentation. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, *21*(2), 181-201.

[7] Bowen, C. W. (2003). Engaging students in active learning. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education, 2*(1), 1-14.

[8] Brophy, J. E. (2013). *Motivating students to learn*. Routledge.

[9] Bryson, C., & Hand, L. (2007). The role of engagement in inspiring teaching and learning. *Innovations in education and teaching international*, *44*(4), 349-362.

[10] Carini, R. M., Kuh, G. D., & Klein, S. P. (2006). Student engagement and student learning: Testing the linkages. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*(1), 1-19.

[11] Cetin, B. (2015). Academic motivation and self-regulated learning in predicting academic achievement in college. *Journal of International Education Research*, *11*(2), 95-106.

[12] Chen, A. H., Elliott, N., & Drane, D. (2005). The relationship between student learning outcomes from participation in a peer-led group project and the quality of the group interaction. Instructional Science, 33(4), 325-347.

[13] Chen, D., Yang, C., Bear, G., & Zhen, S. (2013). School engagement as mediator between school climate and achievement. *National Association of School Psychologist*.

[14] Croninger, R. G., & Lee, V. E. (2001). Social capital and dropping out of high school: Benefits to at-risk students of teachers' support and guidance. *Teachers college record*, *103*(4), 548-581.

[15] Crosnoe, R., Johnson, M. K., & Elder Jr, G. H. (2004). School size and the interpersonal side of education: An examination of race/ethnicity and organizational context. *Social Science Quarterly*, *85*(5), 1259-1274.

[16] Demir, M. K., & Budak, H. (2016). The relationship between self-regulating, motivation and metacognitive skills and mathematics success of 4th grade students. *Buka Faculty of Education Journal*, *41*, 30-41.

[17] Demir-Güdül, M. (2015). The relationship between university students' academic motivation profiles and psychological needs, academic procrastination and life satisfaction. *Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Eskişehir: Anadolu University Educational Sciences Institute*.

[18] Den Brok, P., Brekelmans, M., & Wubbels, T. (2004). Interpersonal teacher behaviour and student outcomes. *School effectiveness and school improvement*, *15*(3-4), 407-442.

[19] Dogan, U. (2015). Student engagement, academic self-efficacy, and academic motivation as predictors of academic performance. The Anthropologist, 20(3), 553-561.

[20] DuBois, D. L., & Silverthorn, N. (2005). Natural mentoring relationships and adolescent health: Evidence from a national study. *American journal of public health*, *95*(3), 518-524.

[21] Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. Annual review of psychology, 53(1), 109-132.

[22] Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of educational research*, *74*(1), 59-109.

[23] Galiher, S. (2006). Understanding the effect of extracurricular involvement. *A Research Project Report M. Ed., Indiana University, South Bend*.

[24] Ganyaupfu, E. M. (2013). Factors influencing academic achievement in quantitative courses among business students of private higher education institutions. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *4*(15), 57-65.

[25] Gilbert, J. (2007). " Catching the Knowledge Wave": Redefining Knowledge for the Post-Industrial Age. *EDUCATION CANADA-TORONTO-*, *47*(3), 4.

[26] Goddard, R. D. (2003). Relational networks, social trust, and norms: A social capital perspective on students' chances of academic success. *Educational evaluation and policy analysis*, *25*(1), 59-74.

[27] Goodlad, J. 1. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw-Hill.

[28] Guay, F., Ratelle, C. F., Roy, A., & Litalien, D. (2010). Academic self-concept, autonomous academic motivation, and academic achievement: Mediating and additive effects. Learning and Individual Differences, 20(6), 644-653.

[29] Hennessey, B. A., & Amabile, T. M. (2010). Creativity. *Annual review of psychology*, *61*(1), 569-598.

[30] House, J. D. (2000). Relationships between self-beliefs, academic background, and achievement of undergraduate students in health sciences majors. *International Journal of Instructional Media*, *27*(4), 427-427.

[31] Kifaya, S. Q. (2009). Mining Student Evolution Using Associative Classification and Clustering. *Communications of the IBIMA*, *11*(2), 19-24.

[32] Klem, A. M., & Connell, J. P. (2004). Relationships matter: Linking teacher support to student engagement and achievement. *Journal of school health*, *74*, 262-273.

[33] Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Hackett, G. (1994). Toward a unifying social cognitive theory of career and academic interest, choice, and performance. *Journal of vocational behavior*, *45*(1), 79-122.

[34] Light, R. L., Xu, M., & Mossop, J. (1987). English Proficiency and Academic Performance of hternational Students. *Tesol Quarterly*, *21*(2), 251-261.

[35] Linnenbrink-Garcia, L., & Pekrun, R. (2011). Students' emotions and academic engagement: Introduction to the special issue. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *36*(1), 1-3.

[36] Lin, T. J. (2012). *Student engagement and motivation in the foreign language classroom* (pp. 1-78). Washington State University.

[37] Locke, E. (2006). a, & Latham, GP (2006). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American psychologist*, *57*(9), 705-717.

[38] Losier, G. F., Vallerand, R. J., & Blais, M. R. (1993). Construction et validation de l'´echelle des perceptions de comp´etence dans les domaines de vie (EPCDV) [Development and validation of the Perceived Competence in Life Contexts Scale]. Science et comportement, 23, 1–16.

[39] Lund Research Ltd. (2012). Total population sampling. Lærd Dissertation. Retrieved from https://dissertation.laerd.com/total-population-sampling.php.

[40] Marzano, R. J. (2003). What works in schools: Translating *research into action*. ASCD.

[41] Masitsa, G. (2008). Discipline and disciplinary measures in the Free State township schools: unresolved problems. *Acta academica*, *40*(3), 234-270.

[42] Narad, A., & Abdullah, B. (2016). Academic performance of senior secondary school students: Influence of parental encouragement and school environment. *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, *8*(2), 12-19.

[43] O'Connor, M. C., & Paunonen, S. V. (2007). Big Five personality predictors of post-secondary academic performance. *Personality and Individual differences*, *43*(5), 971-990.

[44] Oakes, J. (2005). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality*. Yale university press.

[45] Pajares, F., & Valiante, G. (2002). STUDENTS'SELF-EFFICACY IN THEIR SELF-REGULATED LEARNING STRATEGIES: A DEVELOPMENTAL PERSPECTIVE. Psychologia, 45(4), 211-221.

[46] Palmer, D. (2007). What is the best way to motivate students in science?. Teaching Science, 53(1), 38-42.

[47] Pink, D. H. (2011). *Drive: The surprising truth about what motivates us*. Penguin.

[48] Raychaudhuri, A., Debnath, M., Sen, S., & Majumder, B. G. (2010). Factors Affecting Students' Academic Performance: A case study in Agartala Municipal Council Area. *Bangladesh e-journal of Sociology*, *7*(2).

[49] Richardson, M., Abraham, C., & Bond, R. (2012). Psychological correlates of university students' academic performance: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, *138*(2), 353.

[50] Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., & Hulleman, C. S. (2015). Social and emotional learning in elementary school settings: Identifying mechanisms that matter. *Handbook of social and emotional learning: Research and practice*, 151-166.

[51] Roeser, R. W., & Eccles, J. S. (1998). Adolescents' perceptions of middle school: Relation to longitudinal changes in academic and psychological adjustment. Journal of research on adolescence, 8(1), 123-158.

[52] Rosário, P., et al. (2017). Student engagement and academic achievement: A meta-analysis. Educational Psychology, 37(6), 702-724.

[53] Russell, V. J., Ainley, M., & Frydenberg, E. (2005). Student motivation and engagement. Schooling Issues Digest. Australian Government, Department of Education. *Science and Training*.

[54] Sax, L. J., Astin, A. W., Korn, W. S., & Mahoney, K. (1997). The American college freshman. *Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles*.

[55] Schaufeli, W. B., Martinez, I. M., Pinto, A. M., Salanova, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). Burnout and engagement in university students: A cross-national study. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*, *33*(5), 464-481.

[56] Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness studies*, *3*, 71-92.

[57] Schunk, D. H. (2012). *Learning theories an educational perspective*. Pearson Education, Inc.

[58] Seijts, G. H., Latham, G. P., Tasa, K., & Latham, B. W. (2004). Goal setting and goal orientation: An integration of two different yet related literatures. *Academy of management journal*, *47*(2), 227-239.

[59] Seeram, E. (2019). An overview of correlational research. *Radiologic technology*, *91*(2), 176-179.

[60] Shernoff, D. J. (2010). Engagement in after-school programs as a predictor of social competence and academic performance. *American journal of community psychology*, *45*, 325-337.

[61] Shernoff, D. J., & Schmidt, J. A. (2008). Further evidence of an engagement–achievement paradox among US high school students. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *37*, 564-580.

[62] Sizer, T. R. (2004). *Horace's compromise: the dilemma of the American high school: with a new preface*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

[63] Skinner, E. A., Kindermann, T. A., & Furrer, C. J. (2009). A motivational perspective on engagement and disaffection: Conceptualization and assessment of children's behavioral and emotional participation in academic activities in the classroom. *Educational and psychological measurement*, *69*(3), 493-525.

[64] Slavin, R. E. (2021). *Educational psychology: Theory and practice*. Pearson.

[65] Staikopoulos, A., OKeeffe, I., Yousuf, B., Conlan, O., Walsh, E., & Wade, V. (2015, July). Enhancing student engagement through personalized motivations. In *2015 IEEE 15th International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies* (pp. 340-344). IEEE.

[66] Stan, E. (2012). The role of grades in motivating students to learn. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *69*, 1998-2003.

[67] Steinberg, L. (1996). Beyond the classroom: Why school reform has failed and what parents need to do. New York: Simon and Schuster

[68] Steinberg, L. D., Brown, B. B., & Dornbusch, S. M. (2005). *Beyond the classroom: Why school reform has failed and what parents need to do*. Simon & Schuster.

[69] Sternberg, R. J. (2005). Intelligence, competence, and expertise. *Handbook of competence and motivation*, 15-30.

[70] Sternberg, R. J., & Williams, W. M. (2010). *Educational psychology*. Allyn and Bacon.

[71] Vansteenkiste, M., Simons, J., Lens, W., Sheldon, K. M., & Deci, E. L. (2004). Motivating learning, performance, and persistence: the synergistic effects of intrinsic goal contents and autonomy-supportive contexts. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *87*(2), 246.

[72] Wang, M. T., & Holcombe, R. (2010). Adolescents' perceptions of school environment, engagement, and academic achievement in middle school. *American educational research journal*, *47*(3), 633-662.

[73] Wentzel, K. R., Barry, C. M., & Caldwell, K. A. (2004). Friendships in middle school: Influences on motivation and school adjustment. *Journal of educational psychology*, *96*(2), 195.

[74] Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (2000). Expectancy–value theory of achievement motivation. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25(1), 68-81.

[75] Willms, J. D., Friesen, S., & Milton, P. (2009). *What did you do in school today? Transforming classrooms through social, academic, and intellectual engagement.(First National Report)*.

[76] Wirthwein, L., Rost, D. H., & Sparfeldt, J. R. (2013). Academic self-concept, achievement goals, and academic achievement in elementary school. *Educational Psychology, 33*(1), 14-28.

[77] Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2015). Eğitim psikolojisi [Educational psychology]. (D. Özen çev.). İstanbul: Kaknüs

[78] Woolfolk, A., & Margetts, K. (2007). Educational psychology. NSW, Australia.

[79] Yates, L. (2009). The importance of student motivation in improving student learning and achievement in the classroom. *College Quarterly, 12*(1).

[80] Zyngier, D. (2008). (Re) conceptualising student engagement: Doing education not doing time. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *24*(7), 1765-1776.