

## CHAPTER FIVE

### DISCUSSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

#### **5.1 Introduction**

In this study, the hypotheses were tested using primary data collected from 1232 secondary school students in West Bengal, India. The current study investigated the gender difference in student engagement and the role of students' perceptions of teacher engagement via exploring two routes: (1) the mediating roles of three teacher engagement sub-scales (i.e., perceived cognitive-physical, perceived socio-emotional, and perceived pedagogical engagement) and (2) the moderation effects of teacher engagement components on the association between students' gender and their engagement. Further, this study also examined the gender difference in academic achievement and the role of student engagement via investigating following two routes: (1) the mediating roles of three student engagement dimensions (i.e., cognitive, behavioral, and emotional engagement) and (2) the moderating roles of student engagement for achievement of boys and girls. Doing so, both teacher engagement and student engagement components were gauged from a students' point of view.

#### **5.2 Discussions**

##### **5.2.1 Gender gap in perceived teacher engagement**

Boys perceived lower teacher engagement in all three dimensions (viz. perceived cognitive-physical, perceived socio-emotional and perceived pedagogical engagement) compared to girls. Such gender gap was reported when teacher engagement was gauged using student-reports. These findings are in agreement with previous literature (Oelsner et al., 2011; Vansteenkiste et al., 2012) demonstrating gender difference in learners' perceptions of teacher engagement favoring female students.

Prior research offers several reasons for these gender differences. For example, Marks (2000) reported that the greater degree of engagement in females relative to males was reduced in the presence of social support from their instructors, peers and from their parents. Besides, Viira & Koka, (2010) reported regarding gender differences in

perceived teacher engagement that teachers communicate with their students differently. National Research Council's (2001) findings that males have more regular and scholastically challenging interactions with their instructors than females also provide an interpretation for the findings of this study.

In addition, instructors are often less forgiving of boys' misconduct than of girls' (Younger et al., 1999). Thus, the gender discrepancies may result from instructors' differing attitudes of males and girls. The debate arises as to whether instructors interact with boys and girls differently in reality or if these gender inequalities merely exist in students' perceptions of teacher engagement. Further, previous studies argued that teachers show dual and completely opposite behavior to the male and female students. They treat girls and boys differently in class favoring the girls (Younger et al., 1999). Thus, students' perceptions about their teachers' engagement may perhaps be attributed to the differential teacher behavior for boys and girls. Additionally, According to Younger et al. (1999), instructors perceive the ideal student as 'female' because of the notion that females are highly cooperative, organized, and communicative than boys. Thus, the gender gap in teacher engagement in favor of female students as found in the present study may be attributed to gender stereotype thoughts of the teachers (Ceci, Williams, & Barnett, 2009; Johnson, 2008).

### **5.2.2 Gender gap in student engagement**

It was demonstrated that males reported significantly lower student engagement in all three dimensions (viz. cognitive, behavioral and emotional engagement) as compared to their female counterparts. This gender difference was found when student engagement was measured based on students' self-reports. These findings confirm previous literature (e.g. Engels et al., 2016; Havik & Westergard, 2019; Lam et al., 2012) demonstrating the gender gap in engagement in support of females. However, the findings of the current study are not in line with the studies (e.g. Mohammed, Atagana, & Edawoke, 2014; Jelas et al., 2014) reporting no gender gap in students engagement and the studies (Leraas, Kippen, & Larson, 2018; Rocca, 2010) reporting the gender gap in favor of boys.

Prior research offers several reasons for these gender gaps. For example, it was reported that motivation, interest, and self-regulation are the antecedents of student engagement (Butler, 2014; Skinner & Pitzer, 2012), and use of meta-cognitive strategies (Sierens et al., 2009), girls also score higher than boys. Such gender differences in the determinants of student engagement were explained as the cause behind the gender disparity in three engagement dimensions. On contrary, Meece et al. (2006) reported higher engagement of the male students in Mathematics classes as teachers asked them to interact in class and also provided regular feedback to them.

Interestingly, studies (e.g. Brozo, 2002; Geist and King, 2008) have justified this anomaly with the suggestion that activities in language and related education are full of feminine characteristics that are more compatible with girls' needs and interests which are absent in the domain of Mathematics and related education that is related to more visual and active learning. The current study indeed dealt with students' overall engagement in learning irrespective of subject domains. However, studies on students' subject-specific engagement of the students would be more meaningful in drawing conclusions about how to demolish the gender difference in student engagement.

The association between classroom structure and students' perceptions of engagement was better for males than for females. (Ponitz, Rimm-Kaufman, Brock, & Nathanson, 2009) revealed that boys may be more distracted by chaotic classroom settings and therefore have more difficulties engaging in learning, whereas girls might just have strategies or approaches of self-regulatory skills and need lesser peripheral structures to support their engagement.

### **5.2.3 Gender gap in academic achievement**

Boys showed lower academic achievement than girls. These findings were in conformity with previous studies showing the gender difference in academic achievement (Matthews, Morrison, & Ponitz, 2009; Voyer & Voyer, 2014) in favor of girls. Thus, the findings do not support "The Gender Similarities Hypothesis" (Hyde, 2005) that consider no significant difference in students' academic achievement regarding their gender. The gender-based communications between learners and educators make up an important

component of these disparities (e.g., role-model and Pygmalion effects). In addition, instructors of the same gender may express distinct expectations to boys and girls in their classes (i.e., Pygmalion effects; Dee, 2005).

In addition, gender dynamics in the school are typically depicted as a significant “environmental” driver of gender inequalities in academic achievement (Sommers, 2000). Male and female instructors exhibit distinct biases about how they engage male and female students in the classroom, according to an underlying perspective. Investigations in the classroom indicate, for instance, that teachers are more likely to give criticism in reaction to comments made by males, but just acknowledgment in response to criticisms made by females (Sommers, 2000). Similarly, cognitive process theories (Jones & Dindia, 2004) imply that educators may communicate subtly that they have specific instructional expectations for boys and girls, and that these biased expectations become self-fulfilling when learners responded to them, resulting in a gender gap in students' achievement.

Despite the fact that males and females have comparable general intelligence (Fischer, Schult, & Hell, 2013), several biological correlates, such as brain organization, have been found important to gender inequality in achievement (Gibb, 2008) in favor of girls. Nevertheless, personality characteristics are among the most important non-intellectual factors that contribute to the gender difference in educational success, probably even more so than level of intelligence (Kappe & van der Flier, 2012). Girls' greater adaptive impulse control and adherence to social standards is one cause females outperform boys in school on aggregate (Duckworth et al., 2015; Fischer et al., 2013). This hypothesis is especially pertinent in relation to the fact that girls score moderately lower than males on key personality traits associated with impulsive behavior, specifically lack of restraint and aggression (Duckworth et al., 2015; Steinmayr & Spinath, 2008). Gurian and Stevens (2007) discovered that the emotional regions of the brain are better developed in female children, rendering them calmer and able to remain still for longer classroom periods than their male counterparts. Nevertheless, some researchers (e.g. Majzub & Rais, 2010) propose the ‘maturational hypothesis’ as an explanation for gender disparities in

achievement, arguing that males mature more slowly than girls and, as a result, lags behind in reading comprehension and other fundamental skills for academic success.

About the impact of gender on academic performance, Francis and Skelton (2005) emphasized that the encouragement or discouragement of children in school subjects may depend on the availability of learning opportunities. In general, male students get stronger support in the sciences, while females receive more support in the arts. Gentrup et al. (2018) found similar results, indicating that teachers anticipated girls to perform similarly to boys in mathematics because they observed girls to be keener on learning and to work even harder than boys. In addition, Gibb (2008) demonstrated that instructors indicate that males are more prone to distracted and restless behaviors as well as aggressive and oppositional behaviors than girls. Considering the substantial negative link between externalizing behavior and academic achievement (Hicks et al., 2008), males may be at a greater risk for disciplinary actions, such as suspensions and expulsions, and for dropping out of school (Matthews et al., 2009).

#### **5.2.4 Explaining the gender gap in student engagement through their perceptions of teacher engagement**

The results provided a plausible explanation for the gender difference in student engagement. The results of the study did not support  $H_04$ . Evidence was found for the alternative hypothesis that the gender difference can be explained by students' perceptions of teacher engagement (except PPE). All perceived teacher engagement dimensions (except PPE) play key roles in explaining why boys' engagement (across three engagement dimensions, viz. cognitive, behavioral, and emotional engagement) in learning is significantly lesser than that of the girls'. Further, it can be said that boys perceived teacher engagement significantly lower (in all teacher engagement dimensions, except PPE) that caused lower student engagement in all three engagement dimensions of the boys.

CPE and SEE partially mediated the association between students' gender and their engagement for the three engagement dimensions, indicating that boys' lower perceptions of CPE and SEE help explain the gender difference in student engagement. Further,

mediation effects were comparatively higher in case of emotional and behavioral engagement dimensions than cognitive engagement dimension, showing the emotional and behavioral engagement dimensions were more sensitive to students' perceptions of CPE and SEE. Thus, the results indicated that when teachers modify their teaching behavior in such way that students' perceive their teachers' higher levels of CPE and SEE, they become emotionally and behaviorally more engaged in class.

In contrast, gender inequalities in any of the three involvement measures were not explained by discrepancies in male and female students' perceptions of pedagogical engagement. According to prior research, PPE is the least significant indicator of student engagement, whereas PCPE and PSEE correspond more closely to the three characteristics of student engagement (Jang et al., 2010). Thus, it can be said that engaged teachers (at least in two dimensions, namely cognitive-physical and socio-emotional engagement) can provide ideal learning conditions by implementing appropriate strategies to fulfill students' basic psychological needs (need for autonomy, competence, and relatedness/belonging; Deci & Ryan, 1985) and strengthen their autonomous motivation (Sierens et al., 2009).

### **5.2.5 Differential role of perceived teacher engagement for gender differences in student engagement**

The results did not support the hypothesis H<sub>05</sub>. The investigator found evidence in favor of the rival hypothesis that the differential role of teacher engagement for gender disparity in student engagement. These findings are supported by results of the early researches (e.g. Roorda et al., 2011) that teacher support is more important for males' engagement than for female students' engagement. Perceived socio-emotional engagement (PSEE) was demonstrated to be significantly more related to boys' engagement in all three engagement dimensions (viz. cognitive, behavioral and emotional engagement), than for girls', whereas perceived cognitive-physical engagement (PCPE) and perceived pedagogical engagement (PPE) were equally related to boys' and girls' engagement across all the three engagement dimensions. In contrast, the effect of PSEE on the three engagement dimensions was comparatively lower for girls.

The results regarding PSEE certify hypothesis from the academic risk perspective (Hamre & Pianta, 2001) and are consistent with the literature implying that providing care and a pleasant relationship with educators and providing encouragement may be more important for boys' engagement than for girls' engagement (Geist & King, 2008; Martin, 2003). A possible explanation for this differential role of PSEE could be that girls are more likely than boys to exert effort on tedious tasks (Williams et al., 2002). In order for boys to exert effort and get involved with an activity, the task must be enticing. Hence, the provision of enthusiasm and drive in the activity and the representation of the activity's significance, which are essential parts of PSEE, appear to be considerably more important for boys than for girls.

The associations among PCPE, PPE and student engagement were comparable among boys and girls. Thus, neither the academic risk hypothesis (Hamre & Pianta, 2001) for PCPE and PPE nor the previous findings that teacher engagement is more important for boys' engagement than for girls' engagement could be supported (Roorda et al., 2011; Suldo et al., 2009). In contrast, the results of this research are consistent with the literature that reports no gender differences in the association between these two dimensions of teacher engagement and student engagement (Lam et al., 2012; Wang & Eccles, 2012). Due to the systematic investigation of all three dimensions of teacher engagement, this study provided additional glimpse into the contradictory findings in the literature. However, future studies ought to continue to focus on these differential effects between boys' and girls' engagement to determine whether these results can be replicated in other settings.

### **5.2.6 Explanation of the gender difference in academic achievement through student engagement**

This research presents a reason for the academic achievement difference between boys and girls. that is, the gender gap in academic achievement of students can be explained by student engagement in all dimensions (except behavioral engagement dimension). Therefore, all student engagement dimensions (except, BE) play key roles in explaining why boys' achievement is significantly lesser than that of the girls'. Further, it can be said that boys' lower perceptions of their engagement resulted in their

significantly low academic achievement. CE and EE partly moderated the association between gender and educational achievement, indicating that boys' relatively low perceptions of CE and EE contribute to the explanation of the gender difference in student engagement.

On contrary, gender gaps in academic success were not explained by differences in boys' and girls' perceptions of BE. This is consistent with prior findings that BE is the least significant predictor of academic performance (Hardre & Sullivan, 2008; Urdan & Schoenfelder, 2006), whereas CE and EE relate more directly to academic achievement (Ahmed et al., 2010; Patrick, Ryan, & Kaplan, 2007).

A probable explanation for this moderation effect of student engagement dimensions might be that when students fully concentrate in classroom activities, put their optimal effort in study, devote time in learning task and do their home works regularly, ask questions to teachers, feel interested in class, they perform well in their examinations showing higher achievement. Then, in fact, the provision of mental rigor, striving for better performance, doing home works regularly, enjoying and valuing classroom learning, seeking clarification from the teachers which are core elements of cognitive and emotional engagement, seem highly relevant for students. Future research should investigate the teaching strategies that enhance students' engagement in classroom by creating a healthy classroom environment.

### **5.2.7 Differential role of student engagement for gender gaps in students' academic achievement**

Results did not support H<sub>07</sub>. The study found some evidence for the alternative hypothesis, such as the differential influence of student engagement in explaining gender variations in educational success. EE was shown to be strongly associated with boys' performance relative to girls', but CE and BE were comparably associated with boys' and girls' achievement.



Moreover, significant effect for boys was resulted for EE, indicating that it is a significant predictor of boys' academic achievement. In contrast, the effect of EE on achievement was comparatively lower for girls. Thus, the findings regarding student engagement dimensions could not confirm the hypothesis that "There are no differential effects of student engagement for girls' as opposed to boys' achievement" and are in agreement with the findings implying that putting maximum efforts in learning in the forms of investment of time and energy in study, posing questions, seeking clarification, enjoying and valuing classroom learning, attachment with peers and teachers may be more important for girls' achievement than for boys' (Ahmed et al., 2010; Patrick, Ryan, & Kaplan, 2007; Hardre & Sullivan, 2008; Urdan & Schoenfelder, 2006).

A plausible explanation for this differential impact of EE might be that females are more prone than boys to exert effort on tedious activities (Williams et al., 2002). On contrary, for boys to exert effort and be strongly motivated towards a goal, the activity must be enticing to them. Consequently, the provision of motivation in the activity and the indication of the task's value, which are fundamental elements of EE, appear to be of high significance for boys than for girls.

For cognitive and behavioral engagement, the relationship between achievement and gender were comparable for boys and girls. Thus, the researcher was unable to support the academic risk hypothesis for CE and BE, nor was able to support earlier findings that student engagement is more crucial for males' achievement than for females' achievement. Due to the systematic inspection of all three student engagement components, this study provided additional glimpse into the contradictory findings in the literature.

#### **5.2.8 Explaining role of student engagement on the relationship between teacher engagement and students' achievement**

The current study provides a mechanism for the influence of students' perceptions of teacher engagement on their achievement. Evidences did not confirm the hypothesis that "There is no significant mediation effect student engagement on the relationship between perceived teacher engagement and students' academic achievement". Support was found

for the corresponding alternative hypothesis and thus, the effect of perceived teacher engagement on students' academic achievement can be explained by all three dimensions of student engagement (CE, BE, and EE) i.e. the effect propagates through three dimensions of student engagement. Therefore, all student engagement dimensions play key roles in explaining how students' perceptions of teacher engagement influence their achievement.

All three student engagement dimensions partially mediated the relationship between the three dimensions of perceived teacher engagement (viz. cognitive-physical, socio-emotional, and pedagogical engagement) and academic achievement, suggesting that students who perceived their teachers highly engaged in teaching, were found to be engaged in class and hence, performed well in the examinations. These findings are supported by 'The Trickle-Down Engagement Hypothesis' (Saucier et al, 2022) that states, students who are more extremely interested, or more substantially disinterested in school are affected by how engaged their teachers to be in teaching. So, when students consider their instructors to be more involved in teaching, and then students become more engaged in learning and the students' achievements on examinations would improve. On contrary, students who perceived lower levels of teacher engagement were found to be less engaged in class and resulted in underachievement. One possible explanation for this finding is based on 'The reactive hypothesis' (McNeal, 1999; 2012) that states adolescents who perceived teachers as exerting strict control and monitoring their activities and tasks in class, produce low learning outcomes.

In sum, in this study, all student engagement dimensions (viz. cognitive, behavioral, and emotional engagement) demonstrated distinct consequences in relation to academic achievement. Thus, student engagement becomes critical for better achievement of the students as teachers' socio-emotional skills, pedagogical skills and their mental as well as physical efforts get reflected in students' performance. Thus, teachers must maintain their optimal level of engagement to enhance students' engagement in class and to optimize their learning outcomes in terms of academic achievement.

### **5.3 Implications of the study:**

#### **5.3.1 For teachers:**

##### **A. Relevance to classroom practices**

The results of this research have significance for educational practices within the framework of secondary education. First, gender differences in student engagement and student perceptions of teacher engagement were verified. Teachers should be aware that boys are more prone to demonstrate lesser engagement than girls across all three dimensions (*viz.* cognitive, behavioral, and emotional) and that they perceive teacher engagement to be poorer. Teachers will find it intriguing to learn that boys' poor engagement is correlated with perceived cognitive-physical and socio-emotional engagement. It has been shown that understanding of a particular problem or circumstance may motivate instructors to alter their teaching practices (Spilt, Koomen, Thijs, & van der Leij, 2012). Hence, teacher education courses might force instructors to consider the implications of this occurrence for their own work: Is this gender difference in student engagement present in my classes? What modifications should I perform in my teaching to help boys to engage in my class? How the lessons will be interesting and exciting to students? (*i.e.* cognitive-physical engagement) and Do I care my students, especially boys? Do I interact effectively with my students while teaching in class? Do I motivate boys as compared to girls? (*i.e.* socio-emotional engagement).

Second, the results demonstrate that boys reported lower socio-emotional engagement of teachers in class. This indicates that teachers are less emotional and sociable to the boys. If instructors engage differentially with male and female students (Meece et al., 2006), schooling has the issue of combating potential stereotyped impressions of males as misbehaving and of females as docile. Overall, careful considerations on gender inequalities in instructional practices and increasing instructors' consciousness of gender stereotypes might increase students' classroom participation.

Third, for both males as well as females, all parameters of perceived teacher engagement were identified as being connected to their engagement. For boys, an increased emphasis on cognitive-physical and socio-emotional teacher engagement is important, since the

current research found that these two components of teacher engagement proved to be the protective factors for boys' engagement. Thus, teachers may be able to quench the prevalent gender difference in student engagement when they put more effort on their cognitive-physical and socio-emotional engagement. Teachers might be made aware of the significance of instructors' engagement and active participation for regular classroom practice, as well as the distinction between the cognitive-physical and socio-emotional engagement of boys and girls. It may be prudent to encourage boys' engagement teachers must focus on their cognitive-physical and social-emotional engagement. In this regard, proper training on what precisely constitutes cognitive-physical and socio-emotional engagement is needed.

In addition, owing to the greater focus on providing commitment, care, and inspiration for males, females may suffer emotions of inequality when they realize that instructors are more invested in and related to male students. When creating interventions for teachers to address the gender gap in engagement, it is thus important to give thorough guidelines on the use of cognitive-physical, socio-emotional, and pedagogical engagement components in the classroom.

### **B. For regular classroom transactions**

Classrooms in which student voices are highly valued are those in which instructors directly involve learners in the process of learning by fostering motivation, interest, and communication of their opinions. It has been shown that such classrooms are key determinants of student engagement (Skinner et al., 2008). Students who really are engaged sense a connection to both the instructor and the material. They achieve greater scores than students who are distracted with learning process (Chen, 2005). However, early adolescent engagement is usually declining due to the mismatch between students' psychological needs and the classroom environment accessible to them. The schools frequently place a greater value on competition, personalization, and discipline than on social interactions, despite the fact that the latter are essential for the healthy development of adolescents. Thus, fostering student engagement with lessons by creating a pleasurable and stimulating learning environment may lead to reforms in school education.

### **C. For teachers in general**

Regarding the practical implications for practicing teachers, in order to increase boys' perceptions of teacher autonomy, competence, and relatedness needs support, teachers should communicate with students more regularly, include them in the decision-making process more frequently, let them realize how well they are doing, and show them more appreciation.

The study explored evidence that confirmed a significant gender gap in students' perceived engagement in all dimensions as well as in perceived teacher support in favor of male students. This result conveys to the teachers that the males are more at risk as they are less engaged in classes and perceive teachers' lower engagement in class. Further, the lower level of engagement of males especially in emotional and cognitive dimensions is more strongly related to teacher engagement in teaching. Such awareness of students' perceptions may inspire teachers to reflect upon how to adjust their teaching behavior according to the needs and interests of the of the students (especially, boys') (Spilt et al., 2012). Further, the educators may be motivated to understand gender-specific psychological needs and to plan their teaching strategies, accordingly. Hence, it is a challenge for teachers to build a multipurpose learning environment that on the one hand, would diminish the gender gap in engagement with special care for the boys and on the other hand, would promote students' engagement in all dimensions irrespective of students' gender to enhance their academic achievement.

Besides, results have also demonstrated that less engagement of teachers in teaching is responsible for the lower engagement of boys in class. In this situation, it becomes really a big problem when teachers exhibit biased behavior favoring the female students. Indeed, teachers' stereotypical thoughts like boys are careless and arrogant. This becomes the largest impediment in quality enhancement in secondary education as it contributes to amplifying the gender difference in students' engagement (Martino, Lingard, & Mills, 2004). Hence, student engagement can be promoted by raising the level of awareness among teachers and by motivating them to use appropriate teaching practices.

Teachers might be prone to take proactive measures by conducting action researches to explore which particular teaching practices successfully elicit higher engagement (preferentially emotional and behavioral engagement) from the students. Teachers should manipulate their teaching behaviors to design an appropriate supportive learning environment favoring the students' requirements (Anderman, Andrzejewski, & Allen, 2011; Dar & Resh, 1994). Teachers should make efforts to keep parity between their teaching strategies, the pattern of communication, and other facets of classroom instruction (e. g. connective instruction suggested by Martin and Dowson (2009) with students' psychological and social needs (Virtanen, Lerkkanen, Poikkeus, & Kuorelahti, 2013). This might substantially reduce the gender difference in students' engagement. In sum, teachers are suggested to reflect upon how boys' engagement in all dimensions may be enhanced without disturbing the sustained increment in girls' engagement in learning.

### **5.3.2 Implication for school psychologists**

Clearly, the findings of this study indicate that positive and constructive teacher behavior contributes to a healthy learning environment in the classroom. This calls for pedagogic interventions in redesigning teachers' supportive roles to promote each dimension of student engagement. In this context school psychologists might be interested in finding answers to the following questions: (1) How to identify gender-specific psychological needs of the adolescents? (2) How teachers' engagement in classroom teaching may cater to those gender-specific psychological needs of the adolescents? (3) How to design pedagogy in classrooms to promote and sustain students' engagement irrespective of gender? (4) How to introduce gender-equitable teaching practices in class?

### **5.3.3 For the policy makers**

As an issue of gender equality, the findings of this research may be relevant for the development of educational initiatives, particularly where the gender differences are really larger (Reilly, et al., 2019). The policy planners and the decision makers may devise ways to find the answers to the question: How can teachers assist students in becoming more engaged and, eventually, more academically proficient? Besides, there are several areas in the context of teacher education and school education where

interventions may be engineered by the bureaucrats in order to elevate quality of education.

### **A. Teacher Preparation and In-Service Training**

The teacher training programmes were criticized for thinking repeated 'practice' in the teaching of a predetermined number of isolated lessons to be adequate for the professional advancement of teachers (MHRD, 2012). Additionally, it was also claimed that teacher training and professional development programmes often neglect approaches for integrating healthy emotional climates (Brackett et al., 2009). These are not desirable because teacher emotions are linked to students' engagement, motivation and interest (Zembylas & Schutz, 2009), and to teachers' contentment and boredom. The incompetence of teachers to manage their emotions may lead to burnout, disengagement in teaching, and ultimately, abandoning the job.

In this context, it was suggested that the school internship should be conceptualized by positioning the teaching practice within the wider framework of goal, the teacher's role, and persistent engagement with students and schools (NCTE, 2009). Further, it was also suggested that teachers are to be prepared in such a way that they are able to engage children in the process of learning rather than simply convey facts to them (Arora & Panda, 2002). In fact, these programmes (teacher education programmes) should cultivate in teachers the required orientations and introduce them to the spectrum of skills/activities that influence the quality of classroom interactions (Government of India, Planning Commission, 2013).

The decision makers may work on how the skill of engaging students in class may be introduced in teacher education programs? How to ensure that the prospective teachers as well as the in-service teachers are equipped with the skills of engaging students in their classes? Importantly, what goes on in the classroom in terms of pedagogy is the most critical factor affecting student achievement. Thus, the role of teachers in engaging students in class becomes paramount. There can be numerous forms of orientation and interactions with teachers, including raising their awareness, orienting them to practice, and providing them with the mechanism to generate their own ideas, materials, and

methods. This may build the capacity among teachers to engage students in classroom learning (MHRD, 2009).

### **B. For improving quality of school education**

Policymakers have an obligation to make sure that students receive a higher-quality education. They need to make sure that students are engaged in school by paying attention to the many learning resources that the adolescents use. Policymakers should keep using resources to help teachers help their students do better in school. If the programs are executed properly, they might help improve the relationships between teachers and students, which could help students achieving better grades.