



Students' motivation and class engagement during pandemic: Its impact to academic performance

Genevic Be R Galagate¹, Felinita III R Doronio²

¹ Assumption College of Nabunturan, Nabunturan, Philippines

² Faculty of Graduate School, Assumption College of Nabunturan, Philippines

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine the students' motivation and class engagement during pandemic and the impact to their academic performance. Descriptive-correlational method of research was conducted using validated adopted questionnaire on both variables. The extent of students' motivation was measured in terms of the following indicators: intrinsic goal orientation, extrinsic goal orientation, self-efficacy, teacher support, task value and family. While class engagement was measured in terms of affective engagement, behavioral engagement and cognitive engagement. On the other hand, academic performance was measured using a 30-item test. Descriptive statistics revealed that the students' motivation is their family with a mean of 3.29. The students' motivation and class engagement has an overall mean of 3.20 and 3.05, respectively. The null hypothesis was tested at 0.05 level of significance to test the correlation of variables. Results show that there is no significant relationship between the variables reflecting from its p-value of 0.093 and 0.495. In conclusion, the result of test or grades don't prove you're your intelligence. A student can be motivated but still gets low score on a test, and or demotivated but gets high score on a test. It is recommended to encourage them provide assistance when they have difficulties in their studies and appreciate their good works.

Keywords: Motivation, engagement, teaching and learning, descriptive-correlational research

Introduction

Our current situation brought so much challenge, and education has no exception. Teacher's effort should be doubled to do the task given in this new normal set up, especially, motivating the students and engaging in self learning modules. Students who are motivated learn more deeply, produce effort and perform better on test.

Motivation is an essential element in academic performance. High levels of motivation are associated with good academic performance (Kusurkar, Ten Cate, Vos, Westers & Croiset, 2013). Highly motivated students tend to expend more effort in learning, leading to better results (Gottfried, Marcoulidis, Gottfried & Oliver, 2013) [1].

Achievement motivation energizes and directs behavior toward achievement and therefore is known to be an important determinant of academic success (Robbins *et al.*, 2004; Hattie, 2009; Plante *et al.*, 2013; Wigfield *et al.*, 2016).

Christiana (2009) states that teachers' motivation is an important factor in student learning because of a lack of motivation for teaching may result in a low level of teaching effectiveness. Han *et al.* (2015) argue that motivation for teaching has a correlation with teacher methods, effective teaching, and students' achievements. Maintaining a positive, supportive, motivational and intellectually stimulating environment for teaching learning process is the responsibility of a mentally healthy teacher (Oliver & Reschly, 2007; Christiana 2009).

In Liberia, this study is critical because it delves into Liberian students' motivations and strategies as well as factors hampering their learning. Zimmerman (2002) believes that when students monitor their responding and attribute outcomes to their strategies, their learning becomes self-regulated, and they exhibit increased self-efficacy, greater intrinsic motivation, and higher academic

achievement. Gasco *et al.* (2017) noted that motivation plays an important role in learning because it greatly explains academic performance.

In Philippine universities, data from five focus group, Manila, Pampanga, Cavite and Mindanao, discussions among students showed that beyond students' valuing of education for the professional competence it builds, students value education as a means of fulfilling filial and familial responsibilities. The findings that parents and family are a main source of motivation and that positive relationships with peers and teachers are major facilitators of learning show the primacy of personal relationships in students' valuing of and working towards their college degrees (Galang, 2014).

The motivated student has the inner strength to learn, to discover and capitalize on capabilities, to improve academic performance and to adapt to the demands of the school context (Elsevier 2011). Motivation has a great impact on the learning process. Motivation alone can determine if the person will pass or fail. While some people learn more by outside influences, others may achieve more by their personal aspirations. Whatever the situation, everyone involved in any learning process should know how motivation affects learning (Stedul 2022).

In Sta. Monica Elementary School, teachers stood up to the challenging task of transitioning and adapting to the new modes of instruction. They came together with one underlying motive-students' benefits. Teachers need to keep students motivated. While students had to deal with physical and emotional stress and changes brought by Covid-19, the school helped them to adjust to the forced new mode of learning and deal with feelings of isolation due to a lack of physical interaction with peers and teachers. The school was still battling everything from printing modules to low

attendance from releasing and retrieving of modules. Most students were demotivated, due physically, mentally and emotionally tress. Students were exhausted, burned out after hours of modular learning. This was the dilemma that stakeholders experienced during the pandemic.

The current pandemic scenario where teachers must deal with pandemic learning modes, student motivation is of paramount importance thus, this inspired the researcher to explore in order to determine the students’ motivation and class engagement during the pandemic and its impact to the academic performance. The researcher would like to determine whether these factors really affect and have significant connection or relation to the academic performance of the learners.

Materials and Methods

Research Design

This study employed the descriptive-correlational method of research. It is a type of research method, which tests the hypothesis or answer queries of the study. According to Creswell (2012), in descriptive-correlational design the researcher is interested in the extent to which two variables (or more) co- vary, that is where changes in one variable are reflected in changes in the other. Descriptive method of research is a fact finding study with adequate and accurate interpretation of the findings. It describes with emphasis on what is the extent of such current condition, practices, situations, or any phenomena. This quantitative research method would attempt to collect quantifiable information

for statistical analysis of the population sample. Arikunto (2007,) further explains that descriptive research is one that is intended to gather information regarding the trend found in the field.

Research Subject

The respondents of this study were the 22 grade 2 students of Sta. Monica Elementary School and 3 sections grade 2 with 78 students of Brookside Elementary School who were enrolled in the school year 2020-2021. In getting results that reflected the target population as precisely as needed, the researcher used universal sampling technique that *let all* the 100 pupils answered the survey questionnaires assisted by their parents.

Research Instrument

The instrument used in this study was adopted from the study of Fowler (2007) [8] questionnaire based on the instrument developed for a previous study. An adopted questionnaire was used as an instrument for class engagement, Student Engagement in Schools Questionnaire (SESQ). Scholars from more than 19 countries collaborated in the development of the SESQ (see Lam & Jimerson, 2008, for a description of this process and the international scholars who participated).

To aid the statistical interpretation of the research questionnaire, the four-point Likert scale below was used (Fowler 2007) [8].

Weight	Categories	Verbal Description
4	Strongly Agree	The respondent agrees to the maximum of something
3	Agree	The respondent has the same opinion about something
2	Disagree	The respondent expresses a different opinion on something
1	Strongly Disagree	The respondent firmly opposes the opinion or on something

Likert Scale on the level of Students Motivation

Rating	Interval	Rating	Interpretation
4	3.51 – 4.00	Strongly agree	Students motivation among respondents is very high
3	2.51 – 3.50	Agree	Students motivation among respondents is high
2	1.51 – 2.50	Disagree	Students motivation among respondents is low
1	1.00 – 1.50	Strongly disagree	Students’ motivation among respondents is very low

Likert Scale on the level of Class Engagement

Rating	Interval	Rating	Interpretation
4	3.51 – 4.00	Strongly agree	Class engagement among respondents is very high
3	2.51 – 3.50	Agree	Class engagement among respondents is high
2	1.51 – 2.50	Disagree	Class engagement among respondents is low
1	1.00 – 1.50	Strongly disagree	Class engagement among respondents is very low

Under DepEd Order No. 31, five levels of proficiency were identified, namely: Beginning, Developing, Approaching, and Advance. The level of proficiency will be based on the numerical grades earned by the students in a particular quarter at the end of the school year.

Level of Proficiency	Equivalent Numerical Value
Beginning	74% and below
Developing	75-79%
Approaching Proficiency	80-84%
Proficiency	85-89%
Advance	90% and above

Validation of Research Instrument

Content validity involved evaluation of adopted questionnaire in order to ensure that it included all the items that are essential and eliminates undesirable items to a particular construct domain. The instrument was validated by experts. Comments and suggestions were followed and the final questionnaire was finalized. Then, it was pilot tested to 20 non-respondents. Result was analyzed for validity purposes.

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher wrote a request letter to the Schools Division Superintendent for the approval in conducting the study.

When permission was granted, the researcher presented the letter of approval to the District in Charge and when the letter was approved by the district in charge, the researcher went to the School area where the study was conducted and gave the approved letter to the School heads and adviser to conduct the study. The data for the administration of the questionnaire was then set.

On the date that was set, the researcher conducted the data collection activity. A brief orientation was done with the class advisers on the nature and scope of the study, and then the advisers were the one distributed to their parents for the parents and pupils to answer at home. After the given date, the questionnaires were retrieved. The data were tabulated and subject to statistical analysis.

Statistical Treatment of the Data

The data gathered were compiled, sorted out, organized and tabulated. These were subjected to statistical a treatment which is regression analysis to facilitate the presentation, analysis and interpretation of data. The following tests were employed: Frequencies and percentage computation were used to determine the frequency distribution of data at certain levels of ratings. Weighted Mean was used to describe the study habits and teachers factors affecting the Academic Performance. Correlation analysis was used to determine the relationship between the independent variables and dependent variables of the study.

Results and Discussion

Table 1: Level of Students Motivation Intrinsic Goal Orientation. The table below shows the data on the student’s profile in terms of motivation.

Intrinsic Goal Orientation	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Rating
1. I prefer material that really challenges me, so I can learn new things.	3.24	High
2. I prefer material that arouses my curiosity, even if it is difficult to learn.	3.34	High
3. The most satisfying thing for me is trying to understand the content as thoroughly as possible.	3.00	High
4. I choose assignments that I can learn from even if they do not guarantee good grades.	2.90	High
Overall Weighted Mean	3.12	High

Table 1 shows the profile of the intrinsic goal orientation in terms of motivation of the respondents and majority of the respondents prefer the statement “I prefer material that arouses my curiosity, even if it is difficult to learn” which has a mean of 3.34 and has a described rating of “agree”. And the lowest mean was 2.90 with the statement of “I

choose assignments that I can learn from even if they do not guarantee good grades” which also has a described rating of “agree” On the other hand, Intrinsic Goal Orientation has the overall weighted mean of 3.12 which has a descriptive rating of “agree”.

Table 2: Extrinsic Goal Orientation presents the mean of the extrinsic goal orientation.

Extrinsic Goal Orientation	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Rating
1. Getting a good grade is the most satisfying thing for me.	3.45	High
2. The most important thing for me is to improve my overall grade.	3.30	High
3. I want to get better grades than most of the other students in my classes.	3.06	High
4. I want to do well in my classes because it is important to show my ability to my family, friends or others.	2.92	High
Overall Weighted Mean	3.18	High

Table 2 shows the profile of the Extrinsic Goal Orientation in terms of motivation of the respondents and majority of the respondents prefer the statement “Getting a good grade is the most satisfying thing for me” which has a mean of 3.45 and has a described rating of “agree”. And the lowest mean was 2.92 with the statement of “I want to do well in

my classes because it is important to show my ability to my family, friends or others” which also has a descriptive rating of “agree” On the other hand, “Extrinsic Goal Orientation” has the overall weighted mean of 3.18 which has a descriptive rating of “agree”.

Table 3: Self - efficacy. Table 3 shows the mean of the self-efficacy.

Self-Efficacy	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Rating
1.I believe I will receive excellent grades in my classes.	3.17	High
2. I am certain I can understand the most difficult material presented in the readings.	2.95	High
3. I am confident I can learn the basic concepts that are being taught.	3.29	High
4. I am confident I can understand the most complex material presented by the instructor.	3.29	High
5. I am confident I can do an excellent job on assignments and tests.	3.22	High
6. I expect to do well.	3.19	High
7. I am certain I can master the skills being taught.	3.40	High
8. Considering the difficulty of the classes, the teachers, and my skills, I think I can do well.	3.15	High
Overall Weighted Mean	3.21	High

Table 3 shows the profile of the Self-Efficacy in terms of motivation of the respondents and the majority of the respondents prefer to the statement of “I am certain I can master the skills being taught” which has a mean of 3.40 and has a descriptive rating of “agree”. And the lowest mean

was 2.95 with the statement of “I am certain I can understand the most difficult material presented in the readings” which also has a described rating of “agree”. On the other hand, “Self-Efficacy” has the overall weighted mean of 3.21 which has a descriptive rating of “agree”.

Table 4: Teacher support. Shown in Table 4 is the mean of the teacher support.

Teacher Support	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Rating
1. I feel like I can freely communicate with my teacher through text or call.	3.03	High
2. The teacher responds to questions, clearly, completely, and in a timely manner.	3.05	High
3. The teacher provides the guidance I need to be successful in this class.	3.25	High
4. The teacher presents the material in a way that makes it relevant to me.	3.29	High
5. In this year, I have the freedom to guide my own learning.	3.41	High
6. The teacher provides regular feedback that helps me gauge my performance in this class.	3.10	High
Overall Weighted Mean	3.19	High

Table 4 shows the profile of the Teacher Support in terms of motivation of the respondents and the majority of the respondents prefer to the statement of “In this year, I have the freedom to guide my own learning” which has a mean of 3.41 and has a descriptive rating of “agree”. And the lowest

mean was 3.03 with the statement of “I feel like I can freely communicate with my teacher through text or call” which also has a described rating of “agree”. On the other hand, “Teacher Support” has the overall weighted mean of 3.19 which has a descriptive rating of “agree”.

Table 5: Task Value. Presented in Table 5 is the mean of the task value

Task Value	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Rating
1. I think I will be able to use what I learn in this subjects in other subjects.	3.22	High
2. It is important for me to learn the subjects material in this class.	3.29	High
3. I am very interested in the content area of this course.	3.22	High
4. I think the subject material in this class is useful for me to learn	2.97	High
5. I like the subject matter of this course.	3.13	High
6. Understanding the subject matter of this course is very important to me.	3.30	High
Overall Weighted Mean	3.19	High

Table 5 shows the profile of the Task Value in terms of motivation of the respondents and the majority of the respondents prefer to the statement of “Understanding the subject matter of this course is very important to me” which has a mean of 3.30 and has a descriptive rating of “agree”.

And the lowest mean was 2.97 with the statement of “I think the subject material in this class is useful for me to learn” which also has a described rating of “agree”. On the other hand, “Task Value” has the overall weighted mean of 3.19 which has a descriptive rating of “agree”.

Table 6: Family. Table 6 presents the mean of the profile in terms of the family.

Family	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Rating
1. My family appreciate my good works.	3.4	High
2. My family encourage me to study hard.	3.47	High
3. My family teaches me when needed.	3.57	Very high
4. My family comfort me when I are sad and having a difficult time.	2.84	High
5. My family provide my needs financially.	3.17	High
Overall Weighted Mean	3.29	High

Table 6 shows the profile of the Family in terms of motivation of the respondents and the majority of the respondents prefer to the statement of “My family teaches me when needed” which has a mean of 3.57 and has a descriptive rating of “agree”. And the lowest mean was 2.84 with the statement of “My family comfort me when I am sad and having a difficult time” which also has a descriptive

rating of “agree”. On the other hand, “Family” has the overall weighted mean of 3.29 which has a descriptive rating of “agree”.

Summary result of student motivation
Table 7 shows the summary of the student motivation.

Table 7: Summary of Student Motivation

Student Motivation	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Rating
Intrinsic Goal Orientation	3.12	High
Extrinsic Goal Orientation	3.18	High
Self-Efficacy	3.21	High
Teacher Support	3.19	High
Task Value	3.19	High
Family	3.29	High
Overall Weighted Mean	3.20	High

As shown in the table, family has the highest mean of 3.29 and interpreted as agree. This means that students are more motivated when supported by the family especially teaches them when needed. On the other hand, intrinsic goal

orientation has the lowest mean of 3.12. This means that they are not motivated by personal satisfaction or enjoyment. Moreover, the overall weighted mean of student motivation is 3.20 which has a descriptive rating of “agree”.

Level of Class Engagement

The table below shows the data on the student’s profile in terms of class engagement.

Table 8: Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Affective Engagement

Affective Engagement (Liking for Learning)	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Rating
1. I think what we are learning from the module is interesting.	3.17	High
2. I like what I am learning in my module.	2.85	High
3. I enjoy new things in my module.	2.76	High
4. I think learning and answering module is not boring.	2.73	High
Overall Weighted Responses	2.88	High

Table 8 shows the profile of the Affective Engagement in terms of Class Engagement of the respondents and the majority of the respondents prefer to the statement of “I think what we are learning from the module is interesting” which has a mean of 3.17 and has a described rating of

“agree”. And the lowest mean was 2.73 with the statement of “I think learning and answering module is not boring” which also has a descriptive rating of “agree”. On the other hand, “Affective Engagement” has the overall weighted mean of 2.88 which has a descriptive rating of “agree”.

Table 9: Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Behavioral Engagement

Behavioral Engagement (Effort and Persistence)	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Rating
1. I try hard to do well in my module.	3.10	High
2. At home, I work as hard as I can.	3.12	High
3. When I am in our house, I carefully read and do my modular activities.	3.11	High
4. When I am in our house, I just act like I am working.	2.62	High
5. If I have trouble understanding a problem, I go over it again until I understand it.	3.26	High
6. When I run into a difficult homework problem, I keep working at it until I think I have solved it.	3.02	High
Overall Weighted Responses	3.03	High

Table 9 shows the profile of the Behavioral Engagement in terms of Class Engagement of the respondents and the majority of the respondents prefer to the statement of “If I have trouble understanding a problem, I go over it again until I understand it” which has a mean of 3.26 and has a described rating of “agree”. And the lowest mean was 2.62

with the statement of “When I am in our house, I just act like I am working” which also has a descriptive rating of “agree”. On the other hand, “Behavioral Engagement” has the overall weighted mean of 3.03 which has a descriptive rating of “agree”.

Table 10: Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Cognitive Engagement

Cognitive Engagement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Rating
1. When I study, I try to understand the material better by relating it to things I already know.	3.50	High
2. When I study, I figure out how the information might be useful in the real world.	3.09	High
3. I make up my own examples to help me understand the important concepts I learn from school.	2.86	High
4. I try to see the similarities and differences between things I am learning for school and things I know already.	3.23	High
5. I try to think through topics and decide what I’m supposed to learn from them, rather than studying topics by just reading it over.	3.01	High
Overall Weighted Responses	3.14	High

Table 10 shows the profile of the Cognitive Engagement in terms of Class Engagement of the respondents and the majority of the respondents prefer to the statement of “I try to see the similarities and differences between things I am learning for school and things I know already” which has a mean of 3.23 and has a described rating of “agree”. And the lowest mean was 2.86 with the statement of “I make up my own examples to help me understand the important concepts I learn from school” which also has a descriptive rating of “agree”. On the other hand, “Cognitive Engagement” has the overall weighted mean of 3.14 which has a descriptive rating of “agree”.

Table 11: Shows the Summary of Class Engagement

Class Engagement	Weighted Mean	Descripted Rating
Affective Engagement	2.88	High
Behavioral Engagement	3.03	High
Cognitive Engagement	3.14	High
Overall Weighted Mean	3.05	High

Table 11 shows the level of Class Engagement of the respondents. Cognitive Engagement has 3.14 overall mean interpreted as high, that has a described rating of “agree”, Affective Engagement have lowest overall mean of 2.88, which means students do not enjoy modular learning.

And the overall weighted mean is 3.05 that also has a descriptive rating of “agree”, which means students engaged psychologically towards learning and which ranges from memorization to the use of self-regulatory strategies to facilitate deep understanding (Fredricks *et al.*, 2004)^[7]. Deep cognitive engagement has been linked directly to achievement (Greene, 2015).

Table 12: Level of Class Proficiency

Variables	Mean value	Descripted rating
Class Proficiency Academic Performance	92.55	Advanced

Table 12 shows the level of Class Proficiency of the respondents. Academic Performance has 92.55 overall mean with descriptive rating as advance, which means students interpreted as advance in accomplishing their task. The higher education performance is depending upon the academic performance of graduate students Minnesota (2007).

Test of Null Hypothesis

Table 13: Correlation Analysis between Students Motivation and Academic Performance

Variables	p-value	Decision
Students Motivation Academic Performance	.093	Accept Ho; Not significant

Table 13 shows the result of the correlation analysis between students’ motivation and their academic performance. It was conducted to test the relationship of Students motivation and academic performance, p-value is 0.093 greater than 0.05, not related. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted with respect to these profile variables.

The result shows that students motivation and academic performance are not related. Motivation is just one of the factors that affects academic performance. *Class and Curriculum Structure are the number one factor that affects the students’ academic performance.* Children thrive when there is structure and struggle when there is chaos. When students sense or see that classes follow a structure, and the curriculum and class materials have been prepared beforehand, it provides them with a greater sense of security. The feeling of security is one of our basic needs. When that’s provided in a learning environment, it allows students to fully focus on the learning material. To help students feel more secure, educators need to plan classes and curriculums. All materials that will be used in class should be prepared in advance. Educators can also state the objectives of a course or class at the beginning of a semester or a class (Vitor Silva 2020).

Table 14: Correlation Analysis between Students Engagement and Academic Performance

Variables	p-value	Decision
Students Engagement Academic Performance	.495	Accept Ho; Not significant

Table shows the result of the correlation analysis between students’ engagement and their academic performance. It was conducted to test the relationship of Students

engagement and academic performance, p-value is 0.495 greater than 0.05, not significant. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted with respect to these profile variables.

An uncomfortable learning environment, type of surroundings and people a child interacts with during their school phase is responsible for the overall performance, including the academic score. If a child is bullied by his peers, does not have a particular liking towards his teachers, or has difficulty in making friends, it may affect the focus he must have during classes.

Additionally, if the student is not enthusiastic about going to school, it might cause a shortage of attendance, which makes the child miss important lectures of topics that he will probably have difficulty in preparing for, on his own. Interacting in class, talking to fellow students, and taking small steps towards getting involved in the school activities can help the student take a liking for his surroundings, and eventually perform better.

Discussion

Students’ Motivation

The result shows that during this pandemic the students motivation is their family having the highest mean of 3.29. It turned out that their family helps and teaches them when they have difficulty in their activities and encourages them to study hard.

Research finds that students’ motivation to learn reflects class-based differences, such that advantaged families are able to instill high levels of learning motivation in their children by providing high levels of social-emotional support as well as class-based opportunities and resources at home (Eccles 2007, 2009). For example, children from privileged backgrounds are encouraged to value learning and therefore develop higher motivations to master academic subjects compared to their disadvantaged peers (Heckman 2008, 2011).

Moreover, Kim (2002) had emphasized that to study parents’ involvement in education is to identify one aspect of the process by which family background makes a difference in a child’s academic success.

Level of Class Engagement

The extent of class engagement in terms of cognitive engagement of grade 2 has a weighted mean of 3.14 with descriptive rating of “high”. It is evident that they’ve shown value of learning, explore, having strategies in learning, interested in what is being taught in modules and see purposes in learning.

Cognitive engagement is essential for learning and academic achievement. A study conducted by Fredericks *et al.* (2004) showed that the students cognitively engaged tend to utilize various learning strategies. These strategies are essential agents for students’ achievement because they enable the students to learn meaningfully (Yumuşak, 2006). It concerns students’ willingness to expend effort and long period of time to comprehend a subject deeply or master a difficult skill and the type of processing strategies that they use for learning (Fredericks, Blumenfeld & Paris, 2004; Ravindran, Greene, & Debacker, 2005; Rotgans & Schmidt, 2010).

The extent of class engagement in terms of affective engagement of grade 2 has a weighted mean of 2.88 having the lowest mean with descriptive rating of “high”. It is interpreted that the grade 2 students don’t enjoy the modular

learning, that there is no interaction between the learner and the module.

On the other hand, behavioral engagement has a mean of 3.03. Students are still persistent and active in the new normal set up. They still give efforts and tries hard to do well in their module and actively participating in releasing and retrieving of modules.

Thus, engaged students seek out activities, inside and outside the classroom, that lead to success or learning. Student engagement can improve students' academic performance, promote school attendance and inhibit risky youth behaviors (Al-Alwan, 2014; Weiss and Garcia 2012). Based on the work of Fredrick, Blumenfeld, and Paris (2004), emotional engagement refers to the feelings, interests, and attitudes that students have toward learning and school. Emotionally engaged students display curiosity, a desire to know more and positive emotional responses to learning and school.

Students Motivation and Students Engagement and Academic Performance

Evidence suggests that students' engagement and motivation are positively linked to improved quality of learning. Together with motivation, engagement is viewed in the literature as very important for enhanced learning outcomes of all students (Schlechty, 2001; Woolfolk & Margetts, 2007) ^[30].

The finding is in contrast to Doronio (2022), according to him there is no significant relationship among students' motivation, class engagement and academic performance.

According to John Parankimalil (2020) a student has its own intelligence, it is an innate natural endowment of the child, a gift from nature. Motivation does not guarantee in affecting academic performance. The result of test or grades don't prove you're your intelligence. A student can be motivated but still gets low score on a test, and or demotivated but gets high score on a test.

Students may have other priorities that compete for their time and attention. Individual students may suffer from physical, mental, or other personal problems that affect motivation, engagement and academic performance.

Conclusion

Factors explored and determined in this study like students' motivation and class engagement resulted to advanced academic performance of the students. Clearly, with proven results, it revealed that it is not significantly related with the academic performance of the students in the new normal classes, they can still get high score on a test without being motivated, and vice versa. The advance result of academic performance is perhaps an outcome of a home based test. *The number one factor that affects the students' academic performance is Class and Curriculum Structure.*

Recommendation

The following recommendations were offered by the researcher based on the conclusion of the study.

1. Learners must be motivated, emotionally stable and engaged in self leaning modules and responsible in accomplishing the tasks provided in the module.
2. Teachers must be resourceful to provide solutions and give feedbacks to help gauge learners' performance. Maintaining a positive, supportive, motivational and

intellectually stimulating environment for teaching learning process is the responsibility of a mentally healthy teacher.

Teacher must also prepare class curriculum and structure ahead of time to ensure effectiveness and meet all the requirements.

3. Parents are encouraged to provide assistance when they have difficulties in their studies and appreciate their good works.
4. School heads must device varied programs and activities for students learning and promote community linkage for school improvement and learning continuity.

References

1. Appleton J, Christenson S, Kim D, Reschly A. Measuring cognitive and psychological engagement: Validation of the student engagement instrument. *Journal of School Psychology*,2006;44(5):427-445. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2006.04.002>
2. Appleton JJ, Christenson SL, Furlong MJ. Student engagement with school: Critical conceptual and methodological issues of the construct. *Psychology in the Schools*,2008;45:369-386. doi: 10.1002/pits.20303
3. Caraway K, Tucker C, Reinke W, Hall C. Self-efficacy, goal orientation, and fear of failure as predictors of school engagement in high school students. *Psychology in the schools*,2003;40:417-427. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pits.10092>
4. Carte B, Cummings J, Cooper L. An exploration of best practice in multi-agency working and the experiences of families of children with complex health needs. What works well and what needs to be done to improve practice for the future? *J Clin Nurs*,2007;16(3):527-39. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17335529>
5. Deci EL, Ryan RM. Autonomy and need satisfaction in close relationships: Relationships Motivation Theory. In *Human motivation and interpersonal relationships*, 2014, 53-73. Springer Netherlands.
6. Edgar L. Effectiveness of Modular Instruction in Word Problem Solving of BEED Students. : 2278-5728, p-ISSN: 2319-765X.2016;5(7):59-65.
7. Fredricks JA, Blumenfeld PC, Paris AH. School Engagement: Potential of the Concept, State of the Evidence. *Review of Educational Research*,2004;74:59-109.<https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059>
8. Fowler S. *The Motivation to Learn Online Questionnaire* (Unpublished master's thesis), 2007.
9. Froiland JM, Oros E. Intrinsic motivation, perceived competence and classroom engagement as longitudinal predictors of adolescent reading achievement. *Educational Psychology*,2014;34(2):119-132.
10. Glanville J, Wildhagen T. The measurement of school engagement: Assessing dimensionality and measurement invariance across race and ethnicity. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*,2007;67:1019-1041. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013164406299126>
11. Gottfried AE, Marcoulides GA, Gottfried AW, Oliver P, Guerin D. Multivariate Latent Change Modeling of Developmental Decline in Academic Intrinsic Math Motivation and Achievement: Childhood through Adolescence. *International Journal of*

- Behavioral Development,2007:31:317-327.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025407077752>
12. Groenendijk T, Janssen T, Rijlaarsdam G, van den Bergh H. The effect of observational learning on students' performance, processes, and motivation in two creative domains. *British journal of educational psychology*,2013:83(1):3-28.
 13. Schmitt HA, Witmer SE, Rowe SS. Text Readability, Comprehension Instruction, and Student Engagement: Examining Associated Relationships during Text- Based Social Studies Instruction, Literacy Research and Instruction, 10.1080/19388071.2021.2008561, 61,2022:1:62-83. Crossref
 14. Lin-Siegler X, Dweck CS, Cohen GL. Instructional interventions that motivate classroom learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*,2016:108(3):295.
 15. Lotz C, Schneider R, Sparfeldt JR. Differential relevance of intelligence and motivation for grades and competence tests in mathematics. *Learn. Individ. Differ*,2018:65:30-40. doi: 10.1016/j.lindif.2018.03.005.
 16. Marko R. The Relation Between Distance Students' Motivation, Their Use Of Learning Strategies, And Academic Success, 2011.
 17. Marks H. Student engagement in instructional activity: Patterns in the elementary, middle and high school years. *American Educational Research Journal*,2000:37(1):153-184.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00028312037001153>
 18. Martin A, Marsh H. Academic resilience and its psychological and educational correlates: A construct validity approach. *Psychology in the Schools*,2006:43(3):267-281.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pits.20149>
 19. Martin F, Bolliger DU. Engagement matters: Student perceptions on the importance of engagement strategies in the online learning environment. *Online*,2018:22(1):205222.
doi:10.24059/olj.v22i1.1092
 20. Melissa R, Adrienne G. Motivational and social aspects of the Filipino college experience, 2009.
 21. Osbaldiston R, Sheldon KM. Promoting internalized motivation for environmentally responsible behavior: a prospective study of environmental goals. *J. Environ. Psychol*,2003:23:349-357.
 22. Peter Willmot, Glynis Perkin. Evaluating the effectiveness of a first year module designed to improve student engagement, *Engineering Education*,2011:6:2, 57-69.
 23. Pintrich PR. A conceptual framework for assessing motivation and self- regulated learning in college students. *Educational psychology review*,2004:16(4):385-407.
 24. Rugutt J, Chemosit CC. What motivates students to learn? Contribution of student-to-student relations, student-faculty interaction and critical thinking skills. *Educational Research Quarterly*,2009:32:16-28.
 25. Sequeira AH. Employee Engagement and Motivation: A Case Study, 2012.
 26. Shelley, H., Kaitlyn S. & Jimerson., (2008) The Student Engagement in Schools Questionnaire (SESQ) and the Teacher Engagement Report Form-New (TERF-N): Examining the Preliminary Evidence University of California Santa Barbara
 27. Shuja A, Qureshi IA, Schaeffer DM, Zareen M. Effectof m-learning on students' academic performance mediated by facilitation discourse and flexibility. *Knowledge Management & E-Learning*,2019:11(2):158-200.
 28. Steinmayr R, Weidinger AF, Schwinger M, Spinath B, 2019.
 29. Prentice Hall, Zyngier D. Listening to teachers– listening to students: substantive conversations about resistance, empowerment and engagement. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*,2007:13(4):327-347
 30. Woolfolk A, Margetts K. Educational psychology. NSW, Australia: Pearson, 2007.
 31. Zyngier D. Pygmalions, Galateans, and Golems: Why pre-service teacher beliefs about children from diverse backgrounds (still) matters. *International Journal on School Disaffection*,2012:9(1):23-38.