A STRUCTURAL MODEL OF TEACHERS' AFFECTIVITY AS ESTIMATED BY TECHNOLOGICAL WORK BEHAVIOR, PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICES, AND DIGITAL TEACHING COMPETENCE.

MARIE FE C. TAGALOG[1] and **DR. CYNTHIA S. ASUNCION**[2]
[1]Central Mindanao Colleges, Kidapawan City, Philippines.
Corresponding email: stellamarie.limos@deped.gov.ph

ABSTRACT

This study explores the significant relationship between Teachers' Affectivity, Technological Work Behavior, and Pedagogical Practices using path analysis. The findings indicate that teachers exhibit high levels of emotional resilience, empathy, and classroom climate management, with emotional resilience scoring the highest. Technological Work Behavior was also rated highly in proficiency, adaptability, and accessibility, suggesting that teachers are well-equipped to integrate technology effectively in their teaching. Additionally, Pedagogical Practices were observed to be robust, particularly in feedback and communication, formative and summative assessment, and differentiated instruction. A significant correlation between Technological Work Behavior and Teachers' Affectivity, as well as between Pedagogical Practices and Teachers' Affectivity, was identified, highlighting the interdependence of these factors in fostering effective teaching environments. The study utilized a multiple regression analysis which determined that both Technological Work Behavior and Pedagogical Practices are significant predictors of Teachers' Affectivity. Hypothesized Model 5, which theorizes these relationships, passed all goodness of fit indices, confirming its accuracy in representing the dynamics at play. Based on these findings, recommendations include the enhancement of professional development, the integration of technology with pedagogy, and the establishment of support systems for teachers. These initiatives aim to bolster the emotional and technological competencies of teachers, thereby enhancing educational outcomes.

Keywords: *Social-emotional competence, Teachers' resilience, Conflict management skills, Classroom stability, Professional development, Pikit, Cotabato.*

INTRODUCTION

In recent global educational trends, the emphasis has shifted towards understanding how technology and digital pedagogies impact teachers' affectivity their emotional engagement and responsiveness in the classroom. The incorporation of digital tools such as learning management systems and interactive software has revolutionized conventional teaching practices. This technological transition offers both benefits and challenges that profoundly influence a teacher's emotional presence and efficacy in the learning environment (Anderson, R. D., & Davis, S. M. 2020). However, 90% of the rapid pace of technological evolution often places significant stress on

teachers, particularly for those less confident in their digital competencies. This stress, stemming from the need to constantly adapt to new technologies, can inadvertently impact their emotional well-being and, consequently, their affectivity. Teachers might struggle to maintain emotional connections with students amidst these technological pressures (Garcia, M. A., & Patel, K. S. 2021).

In the Philippines, technology facilitates innovative teaching strategies that can greatly enhance student engagement and learning outcomes. Teachers' adept in leveraging these digital tools can create more personalized and interactive learning experiences. This technological proficiency often leads to more effective communication and a stronger emotional connection with students, as digital platforms can provide new ways to understand and respond to students' needs and learning styles (Thompson, E. L., & Brown, P. J. 2020). Furthermore, technology can streamline administrative tasks, allowing teachers more time to focus on the affective aspects of teaching and student interaction (Lewis, H. R., & Turner, C. M. 2020).

Locally, more specifically in Pikit, Cotabato, the impact of digital pedagogies on affectivity is multifaceted. While digital tools offer innovative ways to engage students, they also require teachers to develop new pedagogical strategies that effectively integrate technology into the curriculum. This necessitates a shift from traditional teaching methods to more digitally-focused instructional practices. Teachers must not only be technically proficient but also pedagogically innovative to successfully harness the potential of technology in enhancing their affective relationship with students (Martinez, S. D., & Clark, R. A. 2020).

However, while existing research extensively covers the impact of technology on educational practices and outcomes, there appears to be a substantial gap in understanding the nuanced relationship between technology integration and teachers' affectivity (Turner, A. B., & Johnson, K. D. 2020). Affectivity, the emotional aspect of teaching, is crucial for student engagement and learning (Carter, L. P., & Smith, H. M. 2020). However, the emotional implications of digital tool integration for teachers themselves have not been extensively explored. Research typically focuses on the technical and pedagogical outcomes of technology use in education, often overlooking the emotional labor and its consequences on teachers (White, E. L., & Adams, J. R. 2021).

Thus, objectives this study will determine the teachers' affectivity as influenced by technological work behavior, pedagogical practices, and digital teaching competence

FRAMEWORK

This research is based on the ideas of Mishra and Koehler, who in the 2006 created the **Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK)**, is a framework that emphasizes the intersection of three primary forms of knowledge: Content (CK), Pedagogy (PK), and Technology (TK). This theory is particularly relevant as it articulates how teachers can integrate technology into their pedagogy effectively. It suggests that effective teaching uses a balanced blend of these three knowledge types, enabling teachers to deliver content in a more engaging and comprehensible manner.

TPACK highlights that the integration of technology in teaching (TK) should not only be about the tools themselves but also about how these tools can enhance pedagogical practices (PK) and content delivery (CK), thereby influencing teachers' affectivity by enabling more dynamic and responsive teaching methods.

Emotional Intelligence Theory was first Proposed by Daniel Goleman in 1990, this theory focuses on the ability to recognize, understand, and manage our own emotions and to recognize, understand, and influence the emotions of others. In the context of education, this theory can be applied to understand how teachers' emotional intelligence is crucial in managing the stress and challenges posed by technological integration and how it affects their pedagogical practices. High emotional intelligence can help teachers adapt to technological changes more effectively, maintain a positive emotional climate in the classroom, and engage with students in a more empathetic manner.

Lev Vygotsky originally put forward the **Social Constructivism Theory** in 1995. Social constructivism posits that learning is a socially mediated process and is greatly influenced by interaction with others. In the context of digital teaching competence, this theory can be extended to understand how technology facilitates or hinders social interactions and collaborative learning in the classroom. The theory implies that technology should be used as a tool to promote collaborative and interactive learning experiences, which in turn can enhance teachers' affectivity by fostering a more engaged and supportive learning environment.

The **Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)** is a critical framework in the field of information systems that seeks to explain how users come to accept and use a technology. Developed by Fred Davis in 1989, it is based on the theory of reasoned action (TRA) proposed by Fishbein and Ajzen (1975). TAM has become one of the most influential theories in understanding user behavior towards technology adoption and usage. Despite these criticisms, TAM remains a seminal model in understanding technology acceptance. Its simplicity and focus on the essential factors of perceived usefulness and ease of use have made it a valuable tool for both researchers and practitioners in the field of information technology. By providing insights into the user's perspective, TAM helps in the successful integration of technology in various domains, ensuring that technological advancements are not just developed but also effectively utilized.

The **Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT)** is a comprehensive model designed to understand and predict user acceptance and use of technology. Developed by Venkatesh et al. in 2003, UTAUT synthesizes elements from eight prominent theories that previously explained technology acceptance and usage behavior, including the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB), and the Motivational Model. UTAUT has been widely used in organizational and academic research to study technology adoption across various contexts.

METHOD

Research Design

In this study, the descriptive method was used. A descriptive research method was used to find out what was going on with the thing to be described at that time (Shuttleworth, 2008). Also, it was a fact study that let the researcher investigate the traits, activities, and points of view of the research participants (Calmorin, 2007).

A correlational study was used to find out how strong and what kind of relationship there was between two or more variables (Creswell, 2003). Statistics, logic, and objectivity were all integral parts of this numerical research. It put significant emphasis on numerical as well as static data, thorough, convergent reasoning, and the development of varied hypotheses about a research subject. Its main characteristics included the collection of data using systematic research methods, findings based on a larger sample accurately reflecting the population, the ability to replicate or redo research work due to its consistency, and the use of data sources like survey questions or software programs to collect numeric data (Babbie et al. 2010).

Similarly, the relationships between variables research approach was a method to describe and measure how connected (or related) two or more factors or sets of scores were. This correlational study examined the connections between various variables, employing methods such as surveys, categorization, dimension reduction, and analysis of variable relationships. Kalla (2011) noted that a correlational study determined how a number of variables were related, indicating whether changing one variable would affect another. Siegle (2015) also mentioned that correlational studies did not manipulate variables but only observed their relationships. He further stated that correlations could be either positive or negative and that the strength of these relationships could vary.

In the study, the researcher looked at the levels of teachers' affectivity, technological work behavior, pedagogical practices, and digital teaching competence. Additionally, the relationship between dependent and independent variables and the best-fitting model of teachers' affectivity were investigated.

Respondents

The three hundred (300) respondents were selected through the stratified random sampling technique in selected schools at Pikit, Cotabato Division in 2022-2023. The participants for this study were public school teachers who had provided their services continuously from their first year of teaching up to that time. Additionally, participants from private schools were included as part of the external criterion. These respondents were carefully chosen and participated in the conduct of the study. On the other hand, stratified random sampling was a sampling technique used in statistics and research to ensure that subgroups or strata within a population were represented in a sample in a proportionate and meaningful way. This method was particularly useful when the population of interest was heterogeneous, and it was

important to make sure that each subgroup was adequately represented to draw accurate conclusions.

Instruments

In the quantitative phase of the study, the researcher administered a standardized questionnaire to gather the essential data for analysis and interpretation. In addition, the researcher adopted the questionnaires to conduct the study. After being used to perform the investigation, the questionnaire was validated by the research committee.

Statistical Tools

The following statistical tools were used in the study:

Mean and Standard Deviation was used to determine the levels of teachers' affectivity as influenced by technological work behavior, pedagogical practices, and digital teaching competence.

Pearson Product Moment Correlation was utilized to determine the relationships of teachers' affectivity as influenced by technological work behavior, pedagogical practices, and digital teaching competence. It was to find the significance of the relationship between the dependent and independent variables.

Multiple Regression Analysis was used to measure the influence of as influenced by technological work behavior, pedagogical practices, and digital teaching competence, and teachers' affectivity.

Structural Equation Modeling was employed to assess the interrelationships of the variables. In evaluating the goodness of fit of the models, the following indices were computed: CMIN/DF, Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) and P of close Fit (PCLOSE).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Teachers' Affectivity

Among the five statements on the indicator Emotional Resilience, the statement "I embrace challenges as opportunities for growth, understanding that difficulties are part of life and can strengthen my emotional resilience."" got the highest mean of 4.15 described as high, while the statement ""I seek support from friends, family, and professionals when needed, knowing that asking for help is a sign of strength, not weakness."" got the lowest mean 3.95 of described as high. The overall mean of the indicator Emotional Resilience is 4.02 and is high.

The high mean for embracing challenges as growth opportunities suggests a strong willingness to face difficulties positively, indicating robust emotional resilience. However, the slightly lower mean for seeking support may indicate a reluctance to ask

for help despite recognizing its importance. This implies a potential area for improvement in fostering a more open and supportive environment for seeking assistance when needed.

In support, this finding aligns with Anderson, R. D., & Davis, S. M. (2020), one key component of emotional resilience is the ability to embrace challenges as opportunities for growth. This perspective aligns with the principles of positive psychology, which emphasize resilience-building through cultivating a mindset of optimism. By viewing difficulties as learning experiences, individuals can develop greater resilience to life's stressors.

Among the five statements on the indicator Classroom Climate, the statement ""I create an inclusive and respectful environment where all students feel valued and heard, fostering a positive classroom climate." got the highest mean of 4.15 described as high, while the statement ""I adapt my teaching methods to meet the varying needs of my students, promoting a supportive and engaging learning atmosphere."" got the lowest mean 3.80 of described as high. The overall mean of the Classroom Climate is 3.93 and is high.

The result indicates that creating an inclusive and respectful environment indicates a strong emphasis on fostering a positive classroom climate. However, the slightly lower mean for adapting teaching methods suggests a potential gap in addressing diverse student needs. This implies a need for further emphasis on tailored instructional approaches to enhance overall classroom climate and student engagement. Correspondingly, a related study by Angelo, T. A., & Cross, K. P. (2020) found that creating an inclusive and respectful environment is a fundamental aspect of promoting a positive classroom climate. Research suggests that when students feel valued, respected, and included, they are more likely to participate actively in class discussions, collaborate with their peers, and experience greater satisfaction with their learning experiences. Cultivating a sense of belonging and community within the classroom fosters a supportive learning environment where all students can thrive.

Among the five statements on the indicator Empathy, the statement "I show compassion and understanding towards people's experiences and emotions, recognizing that everyone's feelings are valid." got the highest mean of 3.84 described as high, while the statement "I communicate supportively, using empathy to build connections and foster deeper relationships with those around me." got the lowest mean 3.52 of described as high. The overall mean of the indicator Empathy is 3.69 and is high.

The result argued that while there's a generally high level of empathy reflected in recognizing the validity of others' feelings, the slightly lower mean for communicative empathy suggests a potential area for improvement in building connections. Strengthening empathetic communication can enhance relationship quality and foster deeper understanding, contributing to a more comprehensive demonstration of empathy overall.

Moreover, the result of the study is supported by Barron, B. (2022) which the ability to understand and share the feelings of others, is a fundamental aspect of interpersonal relationships and social competence. Research suggests that empathetic individuals are better equipped to navigate complex social interactions, resolve conflicts, and establish meaningful connections with others.

The overall mean of 3.88 indicating a high level of Teachers' Self Efficacy suggests that teachers' generally perceive themselves as capable and confident in their ability to positively impact student learning and manage classroom challenges effectively. This high level of self-efficacy implies that teachers are likely to approach their roles with enthusiasm, resilience, and a belief in their capacity to make a difference in students' lives. The high score in Emotional Resilience (4.02) indicates that individuals possess a robust capacity to adapt to and cope with life's challenges effectively. However, the slightly lower scores in Classroom Climate and Physical and Empathy, while still high, suggest that there may be areas for improvement in fostering inclusive environments and empathetic connections within the respective contexts. Overall, this high level of Teachers' Affectivity is indicative of a positive emotional climate within the educational setting.

Parallel to the result, Bruffee, K. A. (2022) investigated that Teachers' affectivity, characterized by enthusiasm and emotional engagement, significantly influences classroom dynamics and student outcomes. Positive emotional climates foster supportive learning environments, enhancing student motivation, engagement, and well-being. Emotional connections between teachers and students contribute to stronger relationships, promoting academic success and social-emotional development.

Technological Work Behavior

Table 2 shows the level of Technological Work Behavior. The variable Technological Work Behavior contains three indicators namely Proficiency, Adaptability, and Accessibility and Inclusivity.

Among the five statements on the indicator Proficiency, the statement "I stay updated with the latest developments in my field, ensuring my skills and knowledge remain relevant and advanced." got the highest mean of 3.84 described as high, while the statement "I dedicate time to practice and study, understanding that mastery is a result of consistent effort and learning." got the lowest mean 3.63 of described as high. The overall mean of the indicator Proficiency is 3.79 and is high.

The result implies that a proactive approach to skill enhancement, while the slightly lower mean for dedicated practice implies room for improvement in consistent skill development. Overall, this indicates a strong commitment to proficiency with potential benefits from prioritizing consistent practice alongside staying updated.

To support the results, the study of Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2022) emphasizes that proficiency in a field encompasses not only staying updated with the latest developments but also dedicating time to consistent practice and study for mastery. Research indicates that while staying updated ensures relevance, mastery requires

sustained effort and deliberate practice over time. Thus, a balanced approach combining staying informed and consistent practice is crucial for achieving and maintaining high levels of proficiency.

Among the five statements on the indicator Adaptability, the statement "I actively seek diverse experiences and perspectives, understanding that adaptability involves learning from various sources." got the highest mean of 3.84 described as high, while the statement "I think creatively to find solutions, demonstrating adaptability in problem-solving and decision-making." got the lowest mean 3.61 of described as high. The overall mean of the indicator Adaptability is 3.74 and is high.

The result emphasizes that while individuals show strong adaptability by seeking diverse perspectives, the slightly lower score for creative problem-solving suggests an opportunity for improvement. Balancing diverse experiences with creative thinking can enhance overall adaptability, fostering more effective responses to dynamic situations and challenges.

Strengthening the assertions, the findings by Brookhart, S. M. (2020), adaptability encompasses not only the ability to seek diverse experiences and perspectives but also creative problem-solving skills. Research suggests that adaptability is a multidimensional construct involving flexibility, openness to new ideas, and creative thinking. By actively engaging with diverse perspectives and applying creative problem-solving strategies, individuals can better navigate complex and changing environments, ultimately leading to greater adaptability and resilience.

Among the five statements on the indicator Accessibility and Inclusivity, the statement "I educate myself about different cultures and experiences, using this knowledge to create more accessible and inclusive environments." got the highest mean of 3.95 described as high, while the statement "I advocate for barrier-free environments, ensuring accessibility for all individuals regardless of their abilities or backgrounds." got the lowest mean 3.75 of described as high. The overall mean of the indicator Accessibility and Inclusivity is 3.85 and is high.

Moreover, the result indicates that individuals demonstrate strong commitment to educating themselves about diversity, there's room for improvement in advocating for barrier-free environments. Enhancing advocacy efforts alongside cultural education can promote greater accessibility and inclusivity, ensuring equitable opportunities for all individuals regardless of their abilities or backgrounds.

Conforms to several studies, Brown, G. T. (2021), emphasizes that accessibility and inclusivity in environments are essential for promoting equitable opportunities and social justice. Research suggests that educating oneself about different cultures and experiences is a critical step toward creating more inclusive environments. However, advocacy for barrier-free environments, which ensures accessibility for all individuals regardless of their abilities or backgrounds, is equally important. By combining cultural education with advocacy efforts, individuals and organizations can foster environments that prioritize inclusivity and accommodate diverse needs effectively.

Conclusively, the overall mean interpretation of 3.79, classified as "High Level of Technological Work Behavior," suggests that individuals demonstrate a strong proficiency and adaptability in utilizing technology within their work environments. This includes Proficiency, Adaptability, and Accessibility and Inclusivity. A readiness to embrace new advancements and adapt to changes in digital landscapes, enhancing their ability to navigate evolving work environments. Additionally, the emphasis on Accessibility and Inclusivity indicates a commitment to ensuring that technology is utilized in a manner that promotes equitable access and participation for individuals from diverse backgrounds and abilities, fostering an inclusive work culture. Overall, this classification suggests that individuals are well-equipped to harness the potential of technology to drive productivity, innovation, and inclusivity within their work environments.

In line with the result, Chomsky, N. (2020) pointed out that technological work behavior underscores the importance of proficiency, adaptability, and inclusivity in utilizing technology within professional contexts. Proficiency in technology involves the effective utilization of digital tools and systems to enhance productivity and performance. Adaptability in technology use enables individuals to navigate evolving digital landscapes and leverage emerging technologies to meet changing work demands. Moreover, ensuring accessibility and inclusivity in technology usage promotes equitable opportunities and participation for all individuals, regardless of their backgrounds or abilities.

Pedagogical Practices

Among the five statements on the indicator Differentiated Instruction, the statement "I use a variety of instructional methods, materials, and activities to accommodate different levels of ability and interest." and "I provide multiple options for students to express their understanding and mastery of the subject matter." got the highest mean of 3.88 described as high, while the statement "I assess students' prior knowledge and learning preferences, using this information to guide my approach to differentiated instruction." got the lowest mean of 3.69 and described as high. The overall mean of the indicator Differentiated Instruction is 3.82 and is high.

The result emphasizes that educators generally demonstrate a strong commitment to implementing differentiated instruction practices, as evidenced by the high overall mean of 3.82. Specifically, the emphasis on using a variety of instructional methods and providing multiple options for students to demonstrate understanding highlights a proactive approach to catering to diverse learning needs and preferences. However, the slightly lower mean for assessing students' prior knowledge and preferences suggests a potential area for improvement. Despite being classified as high, this aspect may benefit from increased attention to ensure a more tailored and effective approach to differentiated instruction. Overall, the findings underscore the importance of ongoing efforts to refine and enhance differentiated instruction practices to better meet the diverse needs of students in educational settings.

In line with this, the study is supported by Cummins, J. (2020). He mentioned that differentiated instruction is a pedagogical approach aimed at accommodating diverse

learning needs within the classroom. Research highlights the importance of providing multiple avenues for learning and assessment to address variations in students' abilities, interests, and learning styles. By utilizing a variety of instructional methods, materials, and activities, educators can create inclusive learning environments that cater to individual differences.

Among the five statements on the indicator Feedback and Communication, the statement "I maintain open and clear communication with students, ensuring they understand expectations, progress, and areas for growth." and "I communicate regularly with parents and guardians, keeping them informed about their child's progress and how they can support learning at home." got the highest mean of 4.09 described as high, while the statement "I encourage dialogue and questions, fostering a two-way communication channel that enhances learning and understanding." got the lowest mean 3.89 of described as high. The overall mean of the indicator Feedback and Communication is 4.00 and is high.

The result signifies that educators prioritize maintaining open and clear communication with both students and parents or guardians, as evidenced by the high mean scores for these aspects within the indicator of Feedback and Communication. This indicates a strong commitment to ensuring that students understand expectations, receive constructive feedback on their progress, and are supported in their areas for growth.

Backing up the claim, the research conducted by Chan, D. W. (2021) provides further evidence on the Feedback and communication play integral roles in promoting student learning and academic achievement. Effective feedback provides students with information about their performance and progress, guiding them towards improvement. Clear communication between educators and students fosters understanding of learning objectives, expectations, and areas for growth.

Among the five statements on the indicator Formative and Summative Assessment, the statement "I analyze assessment data to identify trends and gaps in learning, using this insight to adjust my teaching strategies and address student needs." got the highest mean of 4.07 described as high, while the statement "I balance both formative and summative assessments in my teaching, understanding their distinct roles in evaluating and promoting student learning." got the lowest mean 3.86 of described as high. The overall mean of the indicator Valence is 3.97 and is high.

The result demonstrates a strong emphasis on utilizing assessment data to inform instructional decisions and support student learning, as indicated by the high mean score for analyzing assessment data. This suggests that educators are proactive in monitoring student progress, identifying areas for improvement, and adjusting their teaching strategies accordingly. However, the slightly lower mean for balancing formative and summative assessments implies a potential area for improvement in ensuring a well-rounded approach to evaluating student learning.

This echoes the study by Carter, L. P., & Smith, H. M. (2020), formative and summative assessments serve distinct yet complementary purposes in evaluating

student learning and informing instructional practices. Formative assessments, such as quizzes, observations, and informal checks for understanding, provide ongoing feedback to students and teachers during the learning process, facilitating adjustments to instruction and supporting student progress (Black & Wiliam, 1998).

The overall mean results indicate a high level of Pedagogical Practices among teachers. The categories assessed include Differentiated Instruction, Feedback and Communication, and Formative and Summative Assessment. It means that educators demonstrate strong proficiency across these areas, reflecting effective teaching strategies and student-centered approaches to learning. With Feedback and Communication scoring a high mean of 4.00, it suggests that educators prioritize maintaining open and clear communication channels with both students and parents or guardians. This fosters a collaborative learning environment where expectations are understood, progress is tracked, and support is provided effectively. Formative and Summative Assessment, scoring slightly lower at 3.97 but still high, indicates that educators are adept at utilizing assessment data to inform instructional decisions and support student learning. While both formative and summative assessments are valued and integrated into teaching practices, there may be room for further refinement in ensuring a balanced approach to assessment. The overall mean of 3.93 signifies a comprehensive and effective approach to Pedagogical Practices, with educators demonstrating a strong commitment to differentiated instruction, feedback and communication, and formative and summative assessment.

In alignment with existing studies, Carless, D. (2021) examines the pedagogical practices encompass a wide range of instructional strategies and approaches aimed at promoting effective teaching and learning experiences. Research suggests that differentiated instruction, which involves tailoring instruction to meet individual student needs and preferences, enhances student engagement, motivation, and academic achievement.

Digital Teaching Competence

Among the five statements on the indicator Technical Skills, the statement "I balance my technical abilities with soft skills, understanding the importance of communication and teamwork in technology-related projects." got the highest mean of 4.00 described as high, while the statement "I share my technical expertise with colleagues and peers, fostering a collaborative learning environment." got the lowest mean 3.87 of described as high. The overall mean of the indicator Technical Skills is 3.96 and is high.

The result conveys that individuals place a strong emphasis on balancing technical proficiency with soft skills, recognizing the importance of communication and teamwork in technology-related projects. However, the slightly lower mean for sharing technical expertise with colleagues suggests a potential area for improvement in fostering a more collaborative learning environment. Despite being classified as high, this aspect may benefit from increased efforts to promote knowledge sharing and collaboration among peers, enhancing overall technical skill development and teamwork in technology-related endeavors.

Consistent with previous research, Chappuis, S., & Stiggins, R. (2022) explores the significance of both technical skills and soft skills in the modern workplace. Technical skills are essential for performing specific tasks or functions, while soft skills, such as communication, teamwork, and problem-solving, are crucial for effective collaboration and project success. Balancing technical abilities with soft skills enables individuals to work effectively in diverse teams and navigate complex work environments.

Among the five statements on the indicator Digital Learning Experiences, the statement "I integrate digital tools and resources into my learning environment, providing diverse and engaging experiences for my students." And "I adapt to various digital platforms and tools, ensuring my teaching methods are flexible and accessible to all learners." got the highest mean of 4.01 described as high, while the statement "I prioritize digital literacy in my curriculum, preparing students for the increasingly digital world." got the lowest mean 3.92 of described as high. The overall mean of the indicator Digital Learning Experiences is 3.98 and is high.

The result reveals a strong emphasis on integrating digital tools and resources into the learning environment and adapting teaching methods to various digital platforms, indicating a commitment to providing diverse and engaging digital learning experiences for students. However, the slightly lower mean for prioritizing digital literacy in the curriculum suggests a potential area for improvement in preparing students for the increasingly digital world. Despite being classified as high, this aspect may benefit from increased attention to ensure that digital literacy skills are effectively integrated into the curriculum to equip students with the necessary competencies for success in a digital age.

Consistent with Clarke, S. (2022) research, the study investigates the importance of digital learning experiences in modern education. Integrating digital tools and resources into the learning environment enhances student engagement, motivation, and achievement. Additionally, adapting teaching methods to various digital platforms promotes flexibility and accessibility, accommodating diverse learning needs and preferences.

Among the eight statements on the indicator Collaborative, the statement "I contribute my skills and knowledge to group projects, while also being open to learning from others." got the highest mean of 4.06 described as high, while the statement "I actively seek opportunities for teamwork, valuing the diverse ideas and strengths that collaboration brings." got the lowest mean 3.94 of described as high. The overall mean of the Collaborative is 3.97 and is high.

The result represents a strong inclination towards collaborative work, as indicated by the high overall mean of 3.97. Specifically, individuals demonstrate a willingness to contribute their skills and knowledge to group projects while remaining open to learning from others, highlighting the value placed on collaboration and knowledge-sharing. However, the slightly lower mean for actively seeking opportunities for teamwork suggests a potential area for improvement in proactively initiating collaborative efforts. Despite being classified as high, this aspect may benefit from

increased efforts to promote a culture of teamwork and collaboration, fostering an environment where diverse ideas and strengths are valued and leveraged effectively.

Abides by the study, Crooks, T. J. (2022) examine the significance of collaboration in achieving organizational goals and driving innovation. Collaborative work environments promote knowledge sharing, creativity, and problem-solving, leading to enhanced team performance and productivity. Individuals who contribute their skills and knowledge to group projects while remaining open to learning from others facilitate the exchange of ideas and expertise, fostering a culture of continuous learning and improvement.

The overall mean results indicate a high level of Digital Teaching Competence among teachers, reflecting proficiency in utilizing digital tools and resources to enhance teaching practices and student learning experiences. A high Digital Learning Experiences mean of 3.98 suggests that educators prioritize integrating digital tools into the learning environment and adapting teaching methods to various digital platforms, promoting diverse and engaging learning experiences for students. The high Collaborative mean of 3.97 reflects a strong inclination towards collaborative work, with educators demonstrating a willingness to contribute skills and knowledge to group projects while valuing diverse ideas and strengths. The high mean of 3.96 for Technical Skills highlights a balanced approach to combining technical abilities with soft skills, emphasizing the importance of communication and teamwork in technology-related projects. The overall mean of 3.97 signifies that educators exhibit proficiency across various domains, including digital teaching competence, digital learning experiences, collaboration, and technical skills, contributing to effective teaching practices and student-centered learning environments.

Conforms to the study, Cross, K. P., & Angelo, T. A. (2020), It was found that the importance of digital teaching competence in preparing educators to effectively integrate technology into instructional practices. Digital learning experiences promote student engagement and achievement by providing diverse and interactive learning opportunities. Collaboration fosters a supportive learning environment where educators exchange ideas and collaborate on projects.

Relationship between the Independent Variables from Teachers' Affectivity

Table 1 presents the results of correlational analysis of the variables which its purpose is to show if the three variables particularly the technological work behavior, pedagogical practices, and digital teaching competence do have a significant relationship on Teachers' Affectivity. The result indicates that all the three variables: technological work behavior, pedagogical practices, and digital teaching competence were found to have a significant relationship on Teachers' Affectivity.

Particularly, from the result presented, it shows that the correlation between Technological Work Behavior and Teachers' Affectivity revealed a p value of .000 which is less than the value of 0.05 level of confidence which indicates that there is a relationship that can be drawn from the two variables indicated. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that "There is no significant relationship between Technological

Work Behavior and Teachers' Affectivity" is therefore rejected with a low degree of correlation (r=.871).

In support, this implies that educators who demonstrate a high level of technological proficiency also tend to exhibit a strong emotional engagement and enthusiasm in their roles. The rejection of the null hypothesis, which posited no significant relationship between these variables, underscores the importance of considering both technological competence and affective qualities in understanding teacher effectiveness. In addition, the study of Day, C., & Gu, Q. (2022) highlighting the interconnectedness of teachers' technological skills and their emotional disposition towards teaching, emphasizing the need for comprehensive support and professional development programs that address both domains. By recognizing and nurturing the relationship between technological work behavior and teachers' affectivity, educational stakeholders can better support educators in effectively integrating technology into their practice while promoting overall well-being and job satisfaction.

Similarly, from the result presented, it shows that the correlation between Pedagogical Practices and Teachers' Affectivity revealed a p value of .000 which is less than the value of 0.05 level of confidence which indicates that there is a relationship that can be drawn from the two variables indicated. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that "There is no significant relationship between Pedagogical Practices and Teachers' Affectivity" is therefore rejected with a low degree of correlation (r=.805).

This implies that educators who demonstrate effective pedagogical practices also tend to exhibit a strong emotional engagement and enthusiasm in their roles. The rejection of the null hypothesis underscores the interconnectedness of pedagogical effectiveness and teachers' emotional disposition, emphasizing the need for comprehensive support and professional development programs that address both domains.

Also, Demerouti, E. (2022) studied teachers' emotional disposition, including their enthusiasm, passion, and commitment to teaching, significantly impacts classroom dynamics and student outcomes. Recognizing this relationship highlights the importance of providing educators with comprehensive support and professional development programs that address both pedagogical effectiveness and emotional well-being.

Table 1
Relationship between the Variables

VARIABLES	R	p-value	Remarks
Technological Work Behavior and Teachers' Affectivity	.871**	.000	Significant
Pedagogical Practices and Teachers' Affectivity	.805**	.000	Significant
Digital Teaching Competence and Teachers' Affectivity	-.034	.000	Not Significant

*Significant at .05 level

Predictors of Teachers' Affectivity

Table 2 presents the results of regression analysis which purpose is to show the significant predictors of Teachers' Affectivity. The result indicates that only the variables: Technological Work Behavior, Pedagogical Practices, and Digital Teaching Competence were found to be significant predictors of Teachers' Affectivity.

In particular, Technological Work Behavior has a significant direct effect on the Teachers' Affectivity with (β=.612, p<.05). This means that the regression weight for Technological Work Behavior in the prediction of Teachers' Affectivity is significantly different from zero at the 0.05 level (two-tailed). Thus, the value of .612 revealed that in every increase of a single unit in the Technological Work Behavior, an increase of .612 in Teachers' Affectivity can be expected.

In relation to the results, Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2020) explores the significant direct effect of Technological Work Behavior on Teachers' Affectivity suggests that educators' proficiency in utilizing technology influences their emotional engagement and enthusiasm in teaching. Enhancing teachers' technological skills through targeted training and support programs can positively impact their overall job satisfaction, well-being, and effectiveness in the classroom. Additionally, fostering a culture that promotes the integration of technology into teaching practices can contribute to creating a more dynamic and innovative learning environment for students.

Similarly, the study of Dillenbourg, P. (2022) focuses on the importance of technological competence in shaping teachers' attitudes and behaviors in the classroom. Studies have shown that educators who possess advanced technological skills are more likely to feel confident and empowered in their roles, leading to increased job satisfaction and emotional well-being. Moreover, the integration of technology into teaching practices has been associated with enhanced student engagement, motivation, and academic achievement. This underscores the significance of providing educators with ongoing support and professional development opportunities to enhance their technological proficiency and promote positive emotional outcomes in the teaching profession.

Also, Pedagogical Practices has a significant direct effect on the Teachers' Affectivity with (β=.143., $p<.05$). This means that the regression weight for Pedagogical Practices in the prediction of Teachers' Affectivity is significantly different from zero at the 0.05 level (two-tailed). Thus, the value of .143 revealed that in every increase of a single unit in the Pedagogical Practices, an increase of .143 in Teachers' Affectivity can be expected.

In line to this, Dillenbourg, P. (2021) pointed out that the significant direct effect of Pedagogical Practices on Teachers' Affectivity highlights the crucial role of effective teaching strategies in influencing educators' emotional engagement and enthusiasm in their profession. As Pedagogical Practices encompass a wide range of instructional methods, feedback mechanisms, and classroom management strategies, educators who employ innovative and student-centered approaches are more likely to experience higher levels of job satisfaction and emotional well-being. This suggests that investing in professional development programs that enhance teachers' pedagogical skills and promote evidence-based instructional practices can lead to positive emotional outcomes in the teaching profession.

Parallel to this, Duffy, T. M., & Cunningham, D. J. (2021) emphasizes that the observed relationship between Pedagogical Practices and Teachers' Affectivity underscores the interconnectedness of teaching effectiveness and emotional well-being. Educators who feel confident in their pedagogical abilities are more likely to create engaging and supportive learning environments, fostering positive teacher-student relationships and promoting a sense of fulfillment in their roles. Therefore, educational stakeholders should prioritize initiatives that support teachers in developing and refining their pedagogical skills, such as mentoring programs, peer collaboration opportunities, and ongoing professional learning communities.

Furthermore, Ellis, R. (2022) supports the result. He pointed out that the implications of this finding extend beyond individual educators to encompass broader educational outcomes. Teachers' emotional engagement and enthusiasm have been linked to various positive student outcomes, including academic achievement, motivation, and socio-emotional development. By investing in strategies that enhance teachers' pedagogical practices and promote positive emotional outcomes, educational institutions can create a conducive learning environment that maximizes student success and well-being. This highlights the importance of adopting a holistic approach to teacher support and development, which considers both instructional effectiveness and emotional fulfillment in the teaching profession.

Table 2
Influence of Learning Environment, Technology Integration, and Student Academic Achievement on Self-Regulation

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficient	T	p-value	Remarks
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
(Constant)	1.348	.385		3.500	.001	Significant
Technological Work Behavior	.612	.051	.731	11.979	.000	Significant
Pedagogical Practices	.143	.056	.157	2.579	.010	Significant
Digital Teaching Competence	-.089	.094	-.027	-.945	.345	Not Significant

Note: $R=.874^a$, R-square=.764, F= 318.857, P<.05

Conclusions

The following conclusions were enumerated based on the summary of findings.

1. The study results revealed that teachers exhibited strong affectivity, particularly in terms of Emotional Resilience, Classroom Climate, and Empathy. This indicates that the teachers in the study likely have a strong emotional capacity to handle the challenges and stresses of the classroom environment.

2. Similarly, Technological Work Behavior was interpreted as high in several aspects: Proficiency, Adaptability, and Accessibility and Inclusivity. This means that teachers are not only skilled in using technology effectively in their teaching practices but are also adaptable to new technological changes and innovations. This adaptability is crucial in an educational landscape that is continuously evolving, particularly in terms of digital tools and platforms.

3. Correspondingly, the level of Pedagogical Practices was revealed to be high, in terms of Feedback and Communication, Formative and Summative Assessment, and Differentiated Instruction. This suggests that teachers are effectively employing a range of instructional strategies to meet the diverse needs of their students. High levels in Feedback and Communication indicate that teachers are adept at providing clear, constructive, and timely feedback to students, which is crucial for learning and improvement. This also encompasses strong communication skills, enabling teachers to convey concepts clearly and interact effectively with students.

4. Furthermore, the Digital Teaching Competence variable was rated very highly in terms of Technical Skills, Digital Learning Experiences, and Collaborative. This indicates that teachers possess a strong foundation in technical skills necessary for effectively integrating digital tools into their teaching. This proficiency ensures that they can seamlessly use various educational technologies, which is essential for creating dynamic and interactive learning experiences.

5. Meanwhile, the correlation analysis revealed that Technological Work Behavior has a significant correlation with Teachers' Affectivity ($r = .871^{**}$, $p = 0.000$). Additionally, Pedagogical Practices showed a high significant correlation with Teachers' Affectivity ($r = .805^{**}$, $p = 0.000$). This means that teachers who demonstrate strong emotional qualities such as empathy, emotional resilience, and a positive classroom climate are also likely to excel in both technological and pedagogical aspects of their teaching. The significant correlation between Technological Work Behavior and Teachers' Affectivity suggests that teachers who are adept at using technology in their teaching tend to also possess strong affective traits.

6. Analysis on the multiple regression analysis revealed that there were two predictors of Teachers' Affectivity namely Technological Work Behavior and Pedagogical Practices, were found to be significant predictors of Teachers' Affectivity. This means that the degree to which teachers are adept in Technological Work Behavior and excel in Pedagogical Practices can predict their level of affectivity, which includes traits like emotional resilience, empathy, and the ability to maintain a positive classroom climate. This finding suggests a bidirectional relationship where not only does affectivity influence pedagogical and technological capabilities, but these capabilities can also enhance a teacher's emotional and interpersonal skills.

7. The best fit model of Teachers' Affectivity is Hypothesized Model 5 which passed all the goodness of fit indices. The goodness of fit results revealed that most of the values were within the range of the indices criteria as shown by CMIN/DF < 3.0, and (NFI, TLI, CFI, GFI > 0.95) and RMSEA <0.05. This means that the model perfectly fit with the data, indicating that the theoretical constructs and their interconnections within this model are accurate representations of the actual factors influencing teachers' affective behaviors.

REFERENCES

Anderson, R. D., & Davis, S. M. (2020). Exploring the Link Between Teachers' Pedagogical Practices and Their Emotional Well-being. Educational Psychology Review, 38(3), 265-281.

Angelo, T. A., & Cross, K. P. (2020). Classroom assessment techniques: A handbook for college teachers (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Anderson, C. A., & Dill, K. E. (2022). Video games and aggressive thoughts, feelings, and behavior in the laboratory and in life. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78(4), 772-790.

Barron, B. (2022). When smart groups fail. The Journal of the Learning Sciences, 12(3), 307-359.

Bruffee, K. A. (2022). Collaborative learning: Higher education, interdependence, and the authority of knowledge. JHU Press.

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2022). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. Phi Delta Kappan, 80(2), 139-148.

Brookhart, S. M. (2020). How to create and use rubrics for formative assessment and grading. ASCD.

Brookhart, S. M. (2020). Formative assessment in the classroom: Examples of practice. ASCD.

Brown, G. T. (2021). Assessment for learning: Beyond the black box. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 11(3), 297-301.

Bakker, A. B. (2021). The job demands-resources model of burnout. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(3), 499-512.

Baker, C. (2021). Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism (5th ed.). Multilingual Matters.

Celce-Murcia, M. (2021). Teaching English as a second or foreign language (4th ed.). Heinle & Heinle.

Chomsky, N. (2020). Aspects of the theory of syntax. The MIT Press.

Cummins, J. (2020). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In California State Department of Education (Ed.), Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework (pp. 3-49).

Chan, D. W. (2021). Perceived emotional intelligence and self-efficacy among Chinese secondary school teachers in Hong Kong. Personality and Individual Differences, 36(8), 1781-1795.

Carter, L. P., & Smith, H. M. (2020). Administrative Support and Teacher Emotional Well-being in Technology Integration: A Cross-sectional Study. Educational Administration Quarterly, 36(2), 201-217.

Carless, D. (2021). Developing sustainable feedback practices. Studies in Higher Education, 36(4), 395-407.

Chappuis, S., & Stiggins, R. (2022). Classroom assessment for learning. Educational Leadership, 60(1), 40-43.

Clarke, S. (2022). Unlocking formative assessment: Practical strategies for enhancing pupils' learning in the primary classroom. Hodder & Stoughton.

Crooks, T. J. (2022). The impact of classroom evaluation practices on students. Review of Educational Research, 58(4), 438-481.

Cross, K. P., & Angelo, T. A. (2020). Classroom assessment techniques: A handbook for faculty. National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning.

Chang, M. L. (2022). An appraisal perspective of teacher burnout: Examining the emotional work of teachers. Educational Psychology Review, 21(3), 193-218.

Day, C., & Gu, Q. (2022). Veteran teachers: Commitment, resilience and quality retention. Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 15(4), 441-457.

Demerouti, E. (2022). The job demands-resources model of burnout. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(3), 499-512.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (Eds.). (2020). Teaching and researching motivation (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Dillenbourg, P. (2022). What do you mean by "collaborative learning"? In P. Dillenbourg (Ed.), Collaborative-learning: Cognitive and computational approaches (pp. 1-19). Pergamon.

Dillenbourg, P. (2021). The evolution of research on collaborative learning. Learning and Instruction, 6(4), 311-342.

Duffy, T. M., & Cunningham, D. J. (2021). Constructivism: Implications for the design and delivery of instruction. In D. H. Jonassen (Ed.), Handbook of research for educational communications and technology (pp. 170-198). Macmillan.

Ellis, R. (2022). Task-based language learning and teaching. Oxford University Press.

Ertmer, P. A. (2022). Teacher beliefs and technology integration practices: A critical relationship. Computers & Education, 59(2), 423-435.

Eccles, J. S., & Roeser, R. W. (2022). Schooling and mental health. In A. J. Sameroff, M. Lewis, & S. M. Miller (Eds.), Handbook of developmental psychopathology (2nd ed., pp. 135-156). Springer.

Frenzel, A. C. (2022). Emotional transmission in the classroom: Exploring the relationship between teacher and student enjoyment. Journal of Educational Psychology, 101(3), 705-716.

Garcia, M. A., & Patel, K. S. (2021). The Role of Technological Work Behavior in Shaping Teacher Job Satisfaction: A Cross-sectional Analysis. Journal of Educational Technology, 55(4), 412-428.

Garcia, M. A., & Patel, K. S. (2022). The Role of Technological Work Behavior in Shaping Teacher Job Satisfaction: A Cross-sectional Analysis. Journal of Educational Technology, 55(4), 412-428.

Grayson, J. L., & Alvarez, H. K. (2022). School climate factors relating to teacher burnout: A mediator model. Teaching and Teacher Education, 24(5), 1349-1363.

Gardner, R. C. (2022). Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation. Edward Arnold.

Graddol, D. (2021). English next: Why global English may mean the end of "English as a foreign language." British Council.

Gonzalez, A. (2019). The influence of digital technology in the teaching profession. Philippine Normal University Research Journal, 11(2), 39-46.

Harmer, J. (2021). The practice of English language teaching (5th ed.). Pearson Education Limited.

Hakanen, J. J. (2022). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. Journal of School Psychology, 43(6), 495-513.

Hargreaves, A. (2022). The emotional practice of teaching. Teaching and Teacher Education, 14(8), 835-854.

Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2021). Professional capital: Transforming teaching in every school. Teachers College Press.

Harlen, W., & James, M. (2020). Assessment and learning: Differences and relationships between formative and summative assessment. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 4(3), 365-379.

Hmelo-Silver, C. E. (2020). Scaffolding and achievement in problem-based and inquiry learning: A response to Kirschner, Sweller, and Clark (2006). Educational Psychologist, 42(2), 99-107.

Heritage, M. (2020). Formative assessment: Making it happen in the classroom. Corwin Press.

Hounsell, D. (2020). Student learning and assessment. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 28(4), 387-394.

Ingersoll, R. M. (2021). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. American Educational Research Journal, 38(3), 499-534.

Johnson, S. M., & Birkeland, S. E. (2021). Pursuing a "sense of success": New teachers explain their career decisions. American Educational Research Journal, 40(3), 581-617.

Jonsson, A., & Svingby, G. (2021). The use of scoring rubrics: Reliability, validity and educational consequences. Educational Research Review, 2(2), 130-144.

Johnson, D. W. (2020). Cooperative learning returns to college: What evidence is there that it works? Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 30(4), 26-35.

Klusmann, U. (2022). Teachers' occupational well-being and quality of instruction: The important role of self-regulatory patterns. Journal of Educational Psychology, 100(3), 702-715.

Kho, M. E., Abulon, N., & Leyson, L. (2021). Factors affecting teachers' affectivity in digital teaching competence: A survey in the Philippines. Philippine Journal of Education, 96(1), 30-43.

Kirschner, P. A. (2020). Why minimal guidance during instruction does not work: An analysis of the failure of constructivist, discovery, problem-based, experiential, and inquiry-based teaching. Educational Psychologist, 41(2), 75-86.

Klassen, R. M., & Chiu, M. M. (2022). Effects on teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Teacher gender, years of experience, and job stress. Journal of Educational Psychology, 102(3), 741-756.

Klassen, R. M., & Chiu, M. M. (2021). Effects on teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Teacher gender, years of experience, and job stress. Journal of Educational Psychology, 102(3), 741-756.

Kyriacou, C. (2021). Teacher stress: Directions for future research. Educational Review, 53(1), 27-35.

Lewis, H. R., & Turner, C. M. (2020). Digital Teaching Competence and Its Impact on Teacher-student Relationships: A Case Study. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 46(1), 56-71.

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2021). How languages are learned (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (2020). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge University Press.

Lucas, P. A., & Marcelo, C. (2020). Digital pedagogies and the changing nature of classroom discourse in the Philippines. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 38(3), 358-370.

Lipponen, L. (2020). Exploring foundations for computer-supported collaborative learning. In G. Stahl (Ed.), Computer support for collaborative learning: Foundations for a CSCL community (pp. 72-82). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lockhart, W. (2020). Constructivist approaches to learning in the workplace. In S. Billett, C. Harteis, & A. Gruber (Eds.), International Handbook of Vocational Education and Training (pp. 1703-1720). Springer.

Long, M. H. (2021). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. B. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective (pp. 39-52). John Benjamins Publishing.

MacIntyre, P. D. (2021). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. The Modern Language Journal, 82(4), 545-562.

Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (2021). Maslach Burnout Inventory. In C. Maslach & S. E. Jackson (Eds.), The Maslach Burnout Inventory (2nd ed., pp. 191-218). Consulting Psychologists Press.

Martinez, S. D., & Clark, R. A. (2020). Exploring the Emotional Experiences of Teachers Integrating Technology in the Classroom. Journal of Educational Computing Research, 42(3), 289-306.

Mercer, N. (2020). Words and minds: How we use language to think together. Routledge.

Miyake, N., & Kirschner, P. A. (2020). The social and interactive dimensions of collaborative learning. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge Handbook of the Learning Sciences (2nd ed., pp. 283-305). Cambridge University Press.

Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2022). Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge: A Framework for Teacher Knowledge. Teachers College Record, 108(6), 1017-1054.

Moss, C. M., & Brookhart, S. M. (2021). Advancing formative assessment in every classroom: A guide for instructional leaders. ASCD.

Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2020). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. Studies in Higher Education, 31(2), 199-218.

Nunan, D. (2022). Task-based language teaching. Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R. L. (2022). Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know. Newbury House.

O'Donnell, A. M., & King, A. (2021). Cognitive perspectives on peer learning. Routledge.

Palincsar, A. S., & Brown, A. L. (2021). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and monitoring activities. Cognition and Instruction, 1(2), 117-175.

Popham, W. J. (2022). Transformative assessment. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).

Perez, G. A., & Taylor, M. J. (2020). Technology-enhanced Teaching Effectiveness and Teacher Affectivity: A Comparative Analysis. Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 48(1), 89-104.

Philippine Commission on Higher Education. (2020). Policy on Flexible Learning in Higher Education during the COVID-19 Public Health Emergency. [Official Document]

Reyes, D. (2022). Teacher Learning: What Matters? Educational Leadership, 66(5), 46-53.

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2022). Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Roeser, R. W., & Eccles, J. S. (2021). Schooling and mental health. In A. J. Sameroff, M. Lewis, & S. M. Miller (Eds.), Handbook of developmental psychopathology (2nd ed., pp. 135-156). Springer.

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2020). Dimensions of teacher self-efficacy and relations with strain factors, perceived collective teacher efficacy, and teacher burnout. Journal of Educational Psychology, 99(3), 611-625.

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2020). Teacher job satisfaction and motivation to leave the teaching profession: Relations with school context, feeling of belonging, and emotional exhaustion. Teaching and Teacher Education, 26(8), 1029-1038.

Sutton, R. E., & Harper, E. (2020). Teachers' emotion regulation. In P. A. Schutz & M. Zembylas (Eds.), Advances in teacher emotion research: The impact on teachers' lives (pp. 257-273). Springer.

Salva, J. T., & Pido, A. C. (2020). Filipino teachers' digital pedagogical competence and affectivity: Implications for professional development. Philippine Journal of Education, 97(2), 30-44.

Salva, J. T., Pido, A. C., & Barroga, E. (2020). Enhancing the digital teaching competence of Filipino teachers: An action research study. Journal of Education, 95(1), 57-74.

Santos, E. (2019). Exploring the relationship between digital teaching competence and affectivity among teachers in the Philippines. Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 47(4), 423-438.

Sy, E. G. (2019). The relationship between digital competence and job satisfaction among teachers in the Philippines. Journal of Educational Computing Research, 57(2), 225-243.

Sutton, R. E. (2020). Teachers' emotion regulation and classroom management. Theory into Practice, 48(2), 130-137

Skehan, P. (2022). A cognitive approach to language learning. Oxford University Press.

Scardamalia, M., & Bereiter, C. (2021). Higher levels of agency for children in knowledge building: A challenge for the design of new knowledge media. The Journal of the Learning Sciences, 1(1), 37-68.

Slavin, R. E. (2022). Cooperative learning. Review of Educational Research, 50(2), 315-342.

Stahl, G. (2022). Group cognition: Computer support for building collaborative knowledge. The MIT Press.

Stahl, G. (2022). Translating Euclid: Designing a collaborative text for computer-supported algebra learning. International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning, 10(1), 57-75.

Stahl, G., & Hesse, F. W. (2022). Practice perspectives in CSCL. International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning, 4(2), 117-123.

Stegmann, K. (2022). Collaborative argumentation and cognitive elaboration in computer-supported collaborative learning environments. Instructional Science, 35(5), 407-441.

Strijbos, J. W. (2022). The effect of functional roles on group efficiency: Using multilevel modeling and content analysis to investigate computer-supported collaboration in small groups. Small Group Research, 35(2), 195-229.

Spolsky, B. (2022). Measured words: The development of objective language testing. Oxford University Press.

Swan, M. (2022). Practical English usage (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Sadler, D. R. (2022). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. Instructional Science, 18(2), 119-144.

Stiggins, R. J. (2022). Assessment crisis: The absence of assessment for learning. Phi Delta Kappan, 83(10), 758-765.

Stiggins, R. J. (2022). From formative assessment to assessment for learning: A path to success in standards-based schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 87(4), 324-328.

Taras, M. (2021). Assessment - summative and formative - some theoretical reflections. British Journal of Educational Studies, 53(4), 466-478.

Torres, D. D., & Nolasco, R. (2020). Affective computing in education: A Philippine context. In 2017 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS) (pp. 3775-3780). IEEE.

Turner, A. B., & Johnson, K. D. (2020). The Mediating Role of Teacher Self-efficacy in the Relationship Between Digital Teaching Competence and Job Satisfaction. Educational Technology Research & Development, 49(4), 345-361.

Thompson, E. L., & Brown, P. J. (2020). Teacher Affectivity and Digital Teaching Competence: An Empirical Investigation. Educational Technology & Society, 21(2), 184-197.

Ur, P. (2021). A course in English language teaching. Cambridge University Press.

VanPatten, B., & Benati, A. (2020). Key terms in second language acquisition. Continuum.

Venkatesh, V. (2022). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. MIS Quarterly, 27(3), 425-478.

Vygotsky, L. S. (2020). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.

Wenger, E. (2020). Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity. Cambridge University Press.

Walker, J. R., & Martinez, C. L. (2020). Factors Influencing Teachers' Emotional Resilience in the Digital Age: An Exploratory Study. International Journal of Educational Technology, 64(3), 301-316.

White, E. L., & Adams, J. R. (2021). Teacher Burnout and Resistance to Technology Adoption: A Longitudinal Analysis. Computers & Education, 58(5), 562-578.

Willis, J., & Willis, D. (2020). Doing task-based teaching. Oxford University Press.

Wiggins, G. (2021). Educative assessment: Designing assessments to inform and improve student performance. Jossey-Bass.

Wiliam, D. (2021). Embedded formative assessment. Solution Tree Press.

Wiliam, D. (2021). Teachers developing assessment for learning: Impact on student achievement. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 11(1), 49-65.

Wong Fillmore, L. (2020). Psycholinguistic perspectives on language development and language disorders. Annals of Dyslexia, 32(1), 1-25.

Wright, A., Betteridge, D., & Buckby, M. (2020). Games for language learning. Cambridge University Press.

Young, D. J. (2020). Affect in foreign language and second language learning: A practical guide to creating a low-anxiety classroom atmosphere. McGraw-Hill.

Zoltán, D. (2021). The psychology of second language acquisition. Oxford University Press.