



Academic Amotivation and School Absenteeism Among Automotive Servicing Learners: A Study on Predictive Dynamics and Policy Implications

Prima C. Canillas¹, Cromwell F. Gopo²

^{1,2} Doctor of Philosophy Major in Educational Management, Davao del Norte State College, New Visayas, Panabo City, Davao del Norte, Philippines

Article Info

Article history:

Received May 29, 2026

Revised Jul 8, 2026

Accepted Aug 14, 2026

Online First Aug 27, 2026

Keywords:

Academic Amotivation
Assessment

Automotive Servicing Learners
Descriptive-Correlation
School Absenteeism

ABSTRACT

Purpose of the study: This study examined the relationship between academic amotivation and school absenteeism among Grade 11 and 12 Automotive Servicing (ATS) learners and identified which dimensions of academic amotivation predict absenteeism. The study also sought to generate evidence for school-level assessment and policy interventions aimed at improving learner engagement and attendance.

Methodology: A quantitative, non-experimental, descriptive-correlational design was employed among 200 Grade 11 and 12 ATS learners. Data were collected using validated adapted questionnaires measuring four dimensions of academic amotivation—value of task, ability beliefs, task characteristics, and effort beliefs—and indicators of school absenteeism. Descriptive statistics, Pearson product-moment correlation, and linear regression analysis were used to analyze the data. Ethical procedures, including informed consent, learner assent, confidentiality, and voluntary participation, were observed throughout the study.

Main Findings: The learners demonstrated moderate academic amotivation ($M = 3.15$), with task characteristics obtaining the highest mean ($M = 3.25$), followed by ability beliefs ($M = 3.18$), effort beliefs ($M = 3.18$), and value of task ($M = 2.97$). School absenteeism was also moderate ($M = 3.28$), with performance anxiety recording the highest mean ($M = 3.55$). Academic amotivation was strongly and positively associated with school absenteeism ($r = .820, p < .001$), with the coefficient of determination indicating that 67.4% of the variance in absenteeism was associated with academic amotivation ($R^2 = .674$). Regression results further showed that all four dimensions significantly predicted absenteeism, with value of task demonstrating the strongest predictive contribution ($B = .211, p < .001$), followed by ability beliefs ($B = .197, p = .002$), effort beliefs ($B = .188, p = .005$), and task characteristics ($B = .131, p = .039$).

Novelty/Originality of this study: This study provides context-specific evidence on academic amotivation as a multidimensional predictor of school absenteeism among senior high school ATS learners. By examining task value, ability beliefs, task characteristics, and effort beliefs simultaneously, it identifies motivational domains that can inform targeted assessment, school-based interventions, and education policy for improving learner engagement and attendance.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license



Corresponding Author:

Prima C. Canillas

Doctor of Philosophy Major in Educational Management, Davao del Norte State College, New Visayas, Panabo City 8105, Davao del Norte, Philippines

Email: canillas.prima@dnsc.edu.ph

1. INTRODUCTION

School absenteeism remains one of the persistent educational concerns affecting learners' academic achievement, psychosocial development, and long-term educational outcomes. Frequent absences have been associated with poor academic performance, low graduation rates, weakened social relationships, and increased risks of school dropout and mental health difficulties [1], [2]. Across educational settings, absenteeism has emerged not only as a behavioral concern but also as an indicator of deeper motivational, emotional, familial, and environmental difficulties experienced by learners. As schools continue to address declining participation and engagement, understanding the underlying conditions that contribute to absenteeism has become increasingly important for educational assessment, early identification, and the development of effective interventions and policies.

One factor strongly associated with absenteeism is academic amotivation. Academic amotivation refers to the absence of intention, drive, or willingness to participate in academic activities due to feelings of incompetence, limited task value, or disinterest in learning. Learners who experience low motivation are more likely to disengage from school activities, demonstrate poor academic behaviors, and eventually avoid attending classes regularly [3]. Studies have shown that students with weak academic self-perceptions, limited educational goals, and negative attitudes toward school environments tend to exhibit lower participation and higher rates of absenteeism. Moreover, low motivation may be associated with social distractions, physical exhaustion, mental health concerns, and limited commitment to schooling [4]. These conditions indicate that attendance records alone may not fully explain why learners disengage from school; consequently, educational assessment needs to consider motivational and psychosocial indicators alongside observable attendance behaviors.

Academic motivation plays a vital role in shaping learners' educational success. Learners who are academically motivated are more likely to participate actively in classroom activities, persist in difficult tasks, and maintain regular school attendance. In contrast, academically amotivated learners may struggle to appreciate the value of education and gradually detach themselves from academic responsibilities. Ghaonta noted that low academic motivation contributes to absenteeism and increases the likelihood of school dropout [5]. This relationship highlights the importance of evaluating learners' motivational conditions as part of a broader assessment of educational participation. Rather than treating absenteeism solely as a problem of attendance compliance, schools may benefit from identifying motivational difficulties early enough to provide appropriate academic, guidance, and learner-support interventions.

The need to strengthen such an assessment perspective is consistent with the Philippine education policy framework. The Department of Education (DepEd), through the Basic Education Development Plan 2030, recognizes learner retention and dropout reduction as continuing priorities and identifies lack of personal interest, among other factors, as a reason why learners do not attend school. Similarly, DepEd's Dropout Reduction Program (DORP) emphasizes the identification of students at risk of dropping out and the examination of psychological, emotional, economic, cultural, and social dimensions of their risk factors. These policy directions suggest that addressing absenteeism requires more than monitoring the number of days learners are absent. Assessment systems should also generate information that can help schools recognize conditions associated with disengagement and connect learners with appropriate interventions. In this context, evaluating academic motivation can complement existing attendance-monitoring and learner-support mechanisms by providing evidence about a potentially modifiable factor underlying non-attendance.

In the Philippine educational context, absenteeism continues to be a pressing concern among schools. Reports have indicated that more than 40 percent of schools in the country experience absenteeism-related problems to varying degrees [6]. The Department of Education has also reported that approximately one in every ten students can be considered habitually absent, with absenteeism becoming more prevalent as learners advance in grade level. Learners have identified several reasons for non-attendance, including fear, bullying, emotional distress, family-related problems, and lack of interest in school subjects [7]. These findings reinforce the view that absenteeism is not merely an issue of attendance compliance but is connected to learners' emotional, social, and motivational experiences within and beyond the school environment.

Despite the growing body of literature on absenteeism and student motivation, an important empirical gap remains. Existing studies commonly examine academic performance, dropout intentions, school engagement, or general motivational constructs, while fewer studies directly investigate academic amotivation as a predictor of school absenteeism among Senior High School Automotive Servicing (ATS) learners in the Philippine context. More specifically, limited evidence is available on how distinct dimensions of academic amotivation—value of task, ability beliefs, task characteristics, and effort beliefs—individually and collectively relate to absenteeism behaviors among learners in a technical-vocational educational pathway. This gap is particularly significant because ATS learners engage in a specialized learning environment that combines theoretical instruction, practical training, competency development, and preparation for employment. Consequently, motivational difficulties may manifest differently in this context than in more general academic programs.

The novelty of the present study lies in its integration of four dimensions of academic amotivation into a predictive assessment of school absenteeism among ATS learners, while simultaneously examining absenteeism across social, psychological, school-related, peer-related, and family-related dimensions. This approach moves beyond describing how frequently learners are absent by examining whether specific motivational deficiencies can help explain variations in absenteeism. The study is also timely because persistent attendance problems can undermine learning continuity, competency development, learner retention, and successful completion of senior high school. Generating localized evidence on the motivational conditions associated with absenteeism can therefore provide schools with a basis for strengthening early identification and targeted learner-support strategies. The urgency of the study is further reinforced by the continuing national emphasis on learning recovery, learner participation, retention, and the prevention of disengagement from schooling. Thus, examining academic amotivation is not only a theoretical concern but also an assessment and policy concern requiring context-specific empirical evidence.

The present study is anchored on several theories that explain the relationship between motivation and school attendance. Self-Determination Theory of Deci and Ryan posits that learners are more likely to experience motivation when they perceive autonomy, competence, and relatedness in their learning experiences. When students experience a lack of competence, limited personal value in learning, or weak internal reasons for participation, amotivation may emerge and contribute to disengagement [8]. Similarly, Expectancy-Value Theory explains that learners' participation in academic tasks is influenced by their expectations of success and the value they attach to educational activities [9]. Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory further emphasizes that self-efficacy beliefs influence motivation, behavior, and persistence, including learners' willingness to participate in school activities and attend classes regularly [10]. Collectively, these theoretical perspectives provide a basis for understanding how learners' perceptions, beliefs, and experiences may influence their attendance behaviors.

This study specifically examines academic amotivation through the dimensions of value of task, ability beliefs, task characteristics, and effort beliefs and investigates how these factors predict school absenteeism among ATS learners. School absenteeism is examined through dimensions such as social anxiety, performance anxiety, separation anxiety, somatic complaints, school aversion, peer-related problems, teacher-related concerns, and family-related difficulties. By determining the predictive relationship between academic amotivation and absenteeism, the study seeks to identify which motivational factors significantly influence learners' attendance behaviors and educational participation.

The significance of this study lies in its potential contribution to educational assessment, school intervention, and policy development. Findings may provide school administrators, teachers, guidance counselors, parents, and education policymakers with evidence on how motivational conditions are associated with absenteeism among ATS learners. Such evidence may support the development of early-warning approaches that complement attendance records with indicators of declining task value, weak ability beliefs, negative perceptions of learning tasks, and reduced effort. At the school level, the findings may inform learner-centered instructional strategies, guidance and counseling interventions, parent engagement, and attendance-support programs. At the policy level, the results may contribute localized evidence for strengthening DepEd efforts related to learner engagement, retention, dropout prevention, and learner support. Ultimately, the study positions academic motivation as an important assessment dimension for understanding absenteeism and for designing more responsive educational interventions that promote sustained participation, learning continuity, and successful completion of senior high school.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

2.1 Research Design

This study employed a quantitative non-experimental research design using a descriptive-correlational approach to examine the influence of academic amotivation on school absenteeism among Grade 11 and 12 learners. Data were collected through a standardized survey questionnaire to assess the levels of academic amotivation and absenteeism and determine the significant relationship between the variables. The descriptive component was utilized to provide an accurate description of the existing conditions and characteristics of the respondents, while the correlational aspect was used to identify the direction and strength of the relationship between academic amotivation and school absenteeism. Since the study did not involve manipulation of variables or experimental treatment, the non-experimental design was considered appropriate in exploring naturally occurring relationships and generating findings that may serve as basis for educational assessment and policy recommendations.

2.2 Respondents of the Study

The respondents of the study were 200 Grade 11 and Grade 12 automotive servicing (ATS) students from School A in the Tagum City Division, Tagum City, Davao del Norte, Philippines. The participants were selected through stratified random sampling to ensure proportional representation from each section based on population size. Out of the total population of 414 students distributed across ten sections, the sample comprised 90 male students (45%) and 110 female students (55%), with an average age of 16.5 years. The selection of these automotive students and their specific demographic profile were aligned with the study's objective of determining the influence of academic amotivation on school absenteeism among learners in a technical-vocational context.

2.3 Research Instruments

The instrument used in this study utilized adapted survey questionnaires to determine the influence of academic amotivation on school absenteeism among automotive servicing students. The research tool consisted of two parts: the first part gathered the respondents demographic information, while the second part assessed the core study variables.

Academic amotivation was measured using the adapted questionnaire of Legault et al. [11], which covered the indicators of value of task, ability beliefs, task characteristics, and effort beliefs. To satisfy the requirement for contextual adaptation and local appropriateness, the questionnaires underwent rigorous content validation by Master Teachers with expertise in research and education to ensure clarity, relevance, and complete cultural and linguistic suitability to the senior high school setting. Furthermore, reliability test results derived directly from the data of this specific study revealed that the overall Academic Amotivation Inventory yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .67. While dimensions such as value of task (.80), ability beliefs (.77), and task characteristics (.67) demonstrated acceptable internal consistency, effort beliefs yielded a lower coefficient of .45, which is reported transparently as observed from the current study's sample data. Table 1 details the specific dimensions, number of items, and internal consistency coefficients for academic amotivation.

School absenteeism was measured using the adapted instrument of Knollmann et al. [12], which included thirteen comprehensive indicators: depression, social anxiety, performance anxiety, separation anxiety, agoraphobia or panic, somatic complaints, school aversion or attractive alternatives, aggression, problems with peers, problems with teachers, problems with parents, problems within the family, and dislike of specific school. Based on the data gathered from this specific study, the internal consistency for the school absenteeism scales yielded Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranging from 0.75 to 0.88, with an overall high reliability of 0.84, indicating good internal consistency across all subscales. Table 2 presents the complete specifications, number of items, and reliability test results for the dimensions of school absenteeism.

Table 1. Dimensions of Academic Amotivation: Indicators, Number of Items, and Reliability

Scale	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Value of Task	4	.80
Ability Beliefs	4	.77
Task Characteristics	4	.67
Effort Beliefs	4	.45
Total	16	.67

Table 2. Dimensions of School Absenteeism: Indicators, Number of Items, and Reliability

Scale	No. of Items	Cronbach's α
Depression	6	0.86
Social Anxiety	5	0.86
Performance Anxiety	3	0.87
Separation Anxiety	4	0.85
Agoraphobia/Panic	4	0.75
Somatic Complaints	3	0.82
School Aversion/Attractive Alternatives	4	0.81
Aggression	3	0.88
Problems with Peers	4	0.83
Problems with Teachers	3	0.81
Problems with Parents	3	0.85
Problems Within the Family	3	0.88
Dislike of Specific School	3	0.85
Total	48	0.84

2.4 Data Analysis

Various statistical tools were employed to analyze and interpret the data gathered in the study. Mean and standard deviation were used to describe the level and variability of academic amotivation and school absenteeism among ATS learners by determining the average responses and the extent to which responses differed from the mean. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson r) was utilized to determine the significance, direction, and strength of the relationship between academic amotivation and school absenteeism. Furthermore, linear regression analysis was applied to identify and forecast which domains of academic amotivation significantly influenced school absenteeism among the learners.

2.5 Ethical Considerations

Prior to the implementation of the study, formal administrative approval and clearance were secured from the School Research Management Committee of the locale of the study, as well as from the school principal and other authorized education officials. To ensure the protection of human participants—particularly given that the respondents are minors—comprehensive ethical protocols were strictly observed. Written informed consent was secured from the parents or legal guardians, alongside the active assent of the participating learners prior to data collection. Participants and their guardians were thoroughly informed of the study's purpose, procedures, potential benefits, and minimal risks. Participation was strictly voluntary, with explicit assurance that respondents could withdraw at any stage without penalty or consequence. Furthermore, confidentiality and privacy were rigorously safeguarded by maintaining strict anonymity across all gathered responses, ensuring data were used solely for research purposes and stored securely against unauthorized access. The recruitment process remained fair, non-coercive, and free from discrimination. Finally, the study upheld rigorous academic integrity through proper citation of sources, avoidance of plagiarism, and acquisition of permissions for adapted instruments, ultimately aiming to contribute valuable insights for learner support and educational policy development.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the analysis and interpretation of data organized in tabular and textual forms. Analysis and interpretation of data are carefully assessed to attain the research objectives.

3.1 Level of Academic Amotivation of ATS Learners

Table 3 presents the level of academic amotivation in terms of the value of task. All these ratings resulted in a mean of 2.97 described as moderate, which indicates that these items sometimes meet the reason why ATS learners lack motivation in their academics. The item “For me, school holds no interest” got the highest mean of 3.16, with a SD of 1.23 and a descriptive equivalent of moderate followed by item “I have no good reason to study” that obtained a mean score of 3.02. The item with the lowest mean score of 2.83 goes to “Studying is not important to me”. The academic amotivation variability indices significantly deviate from the mean value in the mean category, with an SD value of 1.24, particularly when related to the importance of the job.

Table 3. Level of Academic Amotivation of in terms of Value of Task

Item	SD	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
1. For me, school holds no interest.	1.23	3.16	Moderate
2. Studying is not valuable to me.	1.17	2.86	Moderate
3. I have no good reason to study.	1.23	3.02	Moderate
4. Studying is not important to me.	1.34	2.83	Moderate
Categorical Mean	1.24	2.97	Moderate

Based on ability beliefs, Table 4 demonstrates the level of academic amotivation. The average score obtained from the aggregate ratings was 3.18, which is considered moderate. This shows that these factors occasionally play a role in the lack of academic desire among ATS students. The item “I don’t have what it takes to do well in school” got the highest mean of 3.31, with a SD of 1.02 and a descriptive equivalent of moderate followed by item “The tasks demanded of me surpass my abilities” that obtained a mean score of 3.21. The item with the lowest mean score of 3.09 goes to “I don’t have the knowledge required to succeed in school”. The academic amotivation associated to ability beliefs variability indices show a high degree of variation, significantly diverging from the mean value, with a standard deviation of 1.12 within the mean category.

Table 4. Level of Academic Amotivation of in terms of Ability Beliefs

Item	SD	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
1. I don't have what it takes to do well in school.	1.14	3.31	Moderate
2. I don't have the knowledge required to succeed in school.	1.14	3.09	Moderate
3. I'm not good at school.	1.16	3.10	Moderate
4. The tasks demanded of me surpass my abilities.	1.02	3.21	Moderate
Categorical Mean	1.12	3.18	Moderate

The degree of academic amotivation in relation to task features is shown in Table 5. The average of the ratings, or 3.25, is considered to be moderate. The item "I have the impression that it's always the same thing every day" got the highest mean of 3.38, with a SD of 1.13 and a descriptive equivalent of moderate followed by item "I find that studying is boring" that obtained a mean score of 3.27. The item with the lowest mean score of 3.15 goes to "I don't like studying". The SD value of 1.15, which is significantly different from the mean value, indicates a large degree of divergence in the variability indices relating to academic amotivation related with task characteristics. The study's conclusions imply that a lack of desire is the cause of students' demonstrated boredom and apathy in class, as well as their frequent absences and propensity to drop out.

Table 5. Level of Academic Amotivation of in Terms of Task Characteristics

Item	SD	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
1. I find that studying is boring.	1.18	3.27	Moderate
2. I don't like studying.	1.15	3.15	Moderate
3. I have the impression that it's always the same thing every day.	1.13	3.38	Moderate
4. My school work is not stimulating.	1.13	3.18	Moderate
Categorical Mean	1.15	3.25	Moderate

Table 6 demonstrates the extent of academic amotivation with regards to task characteristics. The combined ratings yielded an average of 3.18, characterized as moderate. The item "I'm not energetic enough" got the highest mean of 3.22, with a SD of 1.12 and a descriptive equivalent of moderate followed by item "I can't seem to invest the effort that is required" that obtained a mean score of 3.20. The item with the lowest mean score of 3.14 goes to "I'm a bit lazy." The SD value of 1.11 within the mean category reveals a significant range in the variability indices relating to effort beliefs and academic amotivation. There are concerns regarding both the extensive effects of this underlying lack of motivation for learning tasks as well as the complex challenge of addressing it. The results also suggest that students who showed reluctance to put forth effort now were more likely to believe in the future that "they cannot do it" and "do not value it."

Table 6. Level of Academic Amotivation of in Terms of Effort Beliefs

Item	SD	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
1. I'm a bit lazy.	1.12	3.14	Moderate
2. I'm not energetic enough.	1.12	3.22	Moderate
3. I can't seem to invest the effort that is required.	1.06	3.20	Moderate
4. I don't have the energy to study.	1.13	3.17	Moderate
Categorical Mean	1.11	3.18	Moderate

The findings summarized in Table 7 offer a useful overview of the degree of academic amotivation across many parameters. As seen by the SD for each group, the results show modest variability in the levels of academic amotivation. Although there is substantial diversity, the "Value of task" category shows an SD of 1.24 and a mean of 2.97, indicating that students generally perceive some reasonable level of value in academic assignments. Similarly, the "Ability beliefs" category has a mean of 3.18 and an SD of 1.12, indicating a moderate degree of students' self-assessed academic ability. With an SD of 1.15 and a mean of 3.25, the "Task characteristics" category indicates a modest level of awareness for the unique qualities of academic activities that may affect amotivation. A moderate degree of student attitudes about their readiness to put effort into their academic activities can be seen in the "Effort beliefs" category, which has an SD of 1.11 and a mean of 3.18.

Table 7. Summary on the Level of Academic Amotivation of ATS Learners

Indicator	SD	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
Value of task	1.24	2.97	Moderate
Ability beliefs	1.12	3.18	Moderate
Task characteristics	1.15	3.25	Moderate
Effort beliefs	1.11	3.18	Moderate
Overall Mean	1.16	3.15	Moderate

The findings revealed that ATS learners demonstrated a moderate level of academic amotivation in terms of value of task (mean = 2.97), ability beliefs (mean = 3.18), and effort beliefs (mean = 3.18). These numerical thresholds suggest that learners exhibit conditional valuation of schoolwork, moderate self-doubt, and limited reserve persistence when navigating educational demands. This baseline vulnerability aligns with the premises of expectancy-value theories of motivation, which posit that academic engagement is a direct function of an individual's expectation of success and the subjective value attributed to the task.

These empirical results corroborate the assertions of Assor and Kaplan [13], who emphasized that students who fail to perceive the intrinsic value and utility of school activities are structurally more prone to behavioral disengagement and eventual class absenteeism. Similarly, Rhew et al. [14] established that learners constrained by diminished self-efficacy systematically demonstrate reduced motivational output and depleted effort regulation, particularly when confronting complex or high-cognitive-load academic tasks. Furthermore, these patterns resonate with Busari [15], who noted that affective barriers such as chronic boredom, academic stress, anxiety, and negative emotional appraisals directly erode student involvement and accelerate truancy.

Within the context of educational policy evaluation frameworks, these descriptive metrics serve as critical early warning indicators under the Department of Education's [16] Dropout Reduction Program (DORP) and universal child protection guidelines. Specifically, unaddressed motivational deficits function as mediating risk factors that push learners toward the critical threshold of chronic absenteeism—defined under DepEd administrative standards as an antecedent to dropping out or becoming entirely non-participating in learning activities. When evaluated through a program logic model, these findings expose a structural gap in school-level prevention mechanisms: current institutional structures often react to chronic absence after it occurs rather than intercepting the root psychological and motivational disengagement upstream.

Consequently, these insights demand a policy shift from punitive attendance monitoring toward institutionalized support systems anchored in guidance and counseling frameworks. Schools are strongly enjoined to operationalize proactive mental health and academic counseling policies as mandated by basic education standards, ensuring that guidance personnel actively bridge the gap between student emotional welfare and classroom participation. Furthermore, these results imply that administrators must institutionalize pedagogical interventions—such as contextualized, culturally relevant curricula and differentiated instruction—to elevate task value and student self-efficacy, thereby transforming passive attendance policies into comprehensive engagement frameworks.

3.2 Level of School Absenteeism of ATS Learners

The percentage of students who miss school due to social anxiety is shown in Table 8. The overall evaluations came up with a 3.29 average, which is considered modest. This suggests that the level of absenteeism from school related to social anxiety is sporadic and correlates with the reasons ATS students miss class. The item "Before or in school I am afraid to say something when other students are around (e.g., during the breaks)." got the highest mean of 3.35, with a SD of 1.12 and a descriptive equivalent of moderate followed by item "Before or in school I am afraid that I will not be able to leave the classroom in time before something embarrassing happens to me." that obtained a mean score of 3.26. The item with the lowest mean score of 3.25 goes to "Before or in school I am afraid to speak to other people or that others might speak to me". The SD value of 1.09 within the mean category demonstrates a considerable range in the variability indices for social anxiety-related school absence, indicating a significant departure from the mean value. The results also imply that a kid who shows up to class but performs poorly because of social anxiety adds to what are known as "school productivity loss days."

Table 8. Level of School Absenteeism in Terms of Social Anxiety

Indicator	SD	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
1. Before or in school I am afraid to say something when other students are around (e.g., during the breaks).	1.12	3.35	Moderate
2. Before or in school I am afraid to speak to other people or that others might speak to me.	1.05	3.25	Moderate
3. Before or in school I am afraid that I will not be able to leave the classroom in time before something embarrassing happens to me.	1.10	3.26	Moderate
Categorical Mean	1.09	3.29	Moderate

The degree of absenteeism from school caused by performance anxiety is shown in Table 9. The average of the total ratings was 3.55, which is considered high. This suggests that the level of performance anxiety-related absences from school matches the causes of ATS students' absences. The item "Before or in school I worry about my school grades" got the highest mean of 3.65, with a SD of 1 and a descriptive equivalent of high followed by item "Before or in school I am afraid of having to say something in front of the entire class (e.g., giving presentations, being called to respond)" that obtained a mean score of 3.50. The item with the lowest mean score of 3.49 goes to "Before or in school I worry that I might embarrass myself." The SD value of 1.01 within the mean category indicates a significant departure from the mean value in the variability indices associated to school absences linked to performance anxiety.

Table 9. Level of School Absenteeism in Terms of Performance Anxiety

Indicator	SD	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
1. Before or in school I am afraid of having to say something in front of the entire class (e.g., giving presentations, being called to respond).	0.98	3.50	High
2. Before or in school I worry about my school grades.	1	3.65	High
3. Before or in school I worry that I might embarrass myself.	1.04	3.49	High
Categorical Mean	1.01	3.55	High

Table 10 displays the extent of school absenteeism associated with separation anxiety. The cumulative ratings yielded an average of 3.24, categorized as moderate. The item "Before or in school I worry that something terrible might happen to my parents" got the highest mean of 3.33, with a SD of 1.01 and a descriptive equivalent of moderate followed by item "Before or in school I long for my parents and want to stay with them" that obtained a mean score of 3.21. The item with the lowest mean score of 3.17 goes to "Before or in school I am afraid of being in school for such a long time instead of being with my parents." The separation anxiety-related measures of variability indices on school absenteeism are fairly far from the mean, as indicated by the SD value of 1.08 in the category mean. The findings show that excessive and developmentally inappropriate worry or anxiety over being separated from others to whom the individual is linked is one of the criteria for separation anxiety.

Table 10. Level of School Absenteeism in Terms of Separation Anxiety

Indicator	SD	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
1. Before or in school I long for my parents and want to stay with them.	1.14	3.21	Moderate
2. Before or in school I am afraid of being in school for such a long time instead of being with my parents.	1.10	3.17	Moderate
3. Before or in school I worry that something terrible might happen to my parents.	1.01	3.33	Moderate
Categorical Mean	1.08	3.24	Moderate

Table 11 presents the level of school absenteeism in terms of somatic complaints. Among the three statements, the item "Before or in school I have pain (e.g., stomachache, headache, ...)" got the highest mean score of 3.40 described as high which indicates that the item "Before or in school I have pain (e.g., stomachache, headache, ...)" meet the reason why ATS learners are absent from school. The remaining questions received a moderate mean score, indicating that somatic symptoms occasionally account for absences from school among automotive students. With all of these scores combined, a modest rating of 3.33 emerged. The SD value of 1.1 in the category mean demonstrates how significantly outside the mean the measures of variability indices on school absences in terms of somatic complaints are. According to the findings, among the reason's pupils miss school in high schools are somatic symptoms including headaches, stomachaches, vomiting, or tiredness.

Table 11. Level of School Absenteeism in Terms of Somatic Complaints

Indicator	SD	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
1. Before or in school I have pain (e.g., stomachache, headache, ...)	1.17	3.40	High
2. Before or in school I feel sick.	1.04	3.30	Moderate
3. Before or in school I feel sick to my stomach, have to throw up, or have diarrhea.	1.09	3.29	Moderate
Categorical Mean	1.1	3.33	Moderate

Table 12 presents the level of school absenteeism in terms of school aversion. All these ratings resulted in a mean of 3.10 described as moderate. The item “Before or in school I think that I am in a bad school” got the highest mean of 3.12, with a SD of 1.21 and a descriptive equivalent of moderate followed by item “Before or in school I don’t like my school” that obtained a mean score of 3.11. The item with the lowest mean score of 3.06 goes to “Before or in school I think that I would feel better at another school”. The SD value of 1.93 within the mean category denotes a large divergence in the variability indices of school absenteeism attributable to school aversion, suggesting noteworthy departure from the mean value.

Table 12. Level of School Absenteeism in Terms of School Aversion

Indicator	SD	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
1. Before or in school I think that I would feel better at another school.	1.13	3.06	Moderate
2. Before or in school I didn't like my school.	1.24	3.11	Moderate
3. Before or in school I think that I am in a bad school.	1.21	3.12	Moderate
Categorical Mean	1.93	3.10	Moderate

Table 13 presents the level of school absenteeism in terms of problems with peers. All these ratings resulted in a mean of 3.32 described as moderate. The item “Before or in school I am afraid of being teased or bullied by other students” got the highest mean of 3.36, with a SD of 1.05 and a descriptive equivalent of moderate followed by item “Before or in school I feel excluded by my classmates” that obtained a mean score of 3.32. The item with the lowest mean score of 3.29 goes to “Before or in school I feel unhappy because I only have a few friends at school.” The SD value of 1.11 in the category mean shows that the measures of variability indices on the school absenteeism in terms of problems with peers are quite far from the mean.

Table 13. Level of School Absenteeism in Terms of Problems with Peers

Indicator	SD	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
1. Before or in school I feel excluded by my classmates.	1.10	3.32	Moderate
2. Before or in school I am afraid of being teased or bullied by other students.	1.05	3.36	Moderate
3. Before or in school I feel unhappy because I only have a few friends at school.	1.17	3.29	Moderate
Categorical Mean	1.11	3.32	Moderate

Table 14 presents the level of school absenteeism in terms of problems with teachers. Among the three statements, the item “Before or in school I feel put under pressure by one or more teachers” got the highest mean score of 3.42 described as high which indicates that problems with teachers meet the reason why ATS learners are absent from school. The average score for the remaining items was deemed to be moderate. All of these ratings produced a mean score that was categorized as moderate at 3.31, indicating that issues with teachers sometimes account for the absences of automotive students from school. The category mean's SD value of 1.14 demonstrates how far from the mean the measures of variability indices on teacher difficulties and school absences are.

Table 14. Level of School Absenteeism in Terms of Problems with Teachers

Indicator	SD	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
1. Before or in school I feel put under pressure by one or more teachers.	1.16	3.42	High
2. Before or in school I don't feel well because of my problems with one or more teachers.	1.08	3.26	Moderate
3. Before or in school I think that one or more teachers are against me.	1.19	3.26	Moderate
Categorical Mean	1.14	3.31	Moderate

Table 15 presents the level of school absenteeism in terms of problems within the family. All these ratings resulted in a mean of 3.11 described as moderate. The item “Before or in school I am worried or sad because I can’t handle the problems in my family” got the highest mean of 3.27, with a SD of 1.14 and a descriptive equivalent of moderate followed by item “Before or in school I feel treated unfairly by my parents” that obtained a mean score of 3.09. The item with the lowest mean score of 2.97 goes to “Before or in school I feel that my parents don’t care about me.” The category mean's SD value of 1.18 demonstrates how far from the mean the measures of variability indices on family difficulties' impact on school absences are.

Table 15. Level of School Absenteeism in Terms of Problems within the Family

Indicator	SD	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
1. Before or in school I feel treated unfairly by my parents.	1.26	3.09	Moderate
2. Before or in school I feel that my parents don’t care about me.	1.14	2.97	Moderate
3. Before or in school I am worried or sad because I can’t handle the problems in my family.	1.14	3.27	Moderate
Categorical Mean	1.18	3.11	Moderate

Table 16 provides a thorough analysis of student absenteeism rates in ATS and provides insights into several indicators. Notably, performance anxiety has the highest mean of 3.55, which is considered strong, indicating that absences related to this component closely match the causes of students' absences from school. The lowest mean, 3.10, is associated with school aversion, indicating that children's hesitation or dislike of school can occasionally increase absenteeism. A continuous pattern of moderate means and standard deviations, ranging from 1.01 to 1.93, is seen among other symptoms, including social anxiety, separation anxiety, somatic complaints, problems with peers, problems with teachers, and problems within the family. These results demonstrate that ATS students' levels of absence from school occasionally reflect the causes for their absence. The moderate overall mean score of 3.28 and the low standard deviation of 1.21 support the idea that absenteeism tends to sporadically correspond with students' reasons for missing class. According to the statistics, a variety of variables, including peer, teacher, and family troubles as well as anxiety-related problems, contribute to the complicated situation of these students' school absences.

Table 16. Summary on the Level of School Absenteeism among ATS Learners

Indicator	SD	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent
Social Anxiety	1.09	3.29	Moderate
Performance Anxiety	1.01	3.55	High
Separation Anxiety	1.08	3.24	Moderate
Somatic Complaints	1.1	3.33	Moderate
School Aversion	1.93	3.10	Moderate
Problems with Peers	1.11	3.32	Moderate
Problems with Teachers	1.14	3.31	Moderate
Problems within the Family	1.18	3.11	Moderate
Overall	1.21	3.28	Moderate

The findings revealed that ATS learners demonstrated a moderate level of school absenteeism across different indicators, with performance anxiety obtaining the highest mean score (3.55), followed by somatic complaints (3.33), peer problems (3.32), issues with teachers (3.31), social anxiety (3.29), separation anxiety (3.24), family-related problems (3.11), and school aversion (3.10). These descriptive metrics establish that attendance behavior is heavily mediated by intersecting emotional, social, academic, and environmental vulnerabilities. When interpreted through a critical policy lens, the dominance of performance anxiety as the primary driver indicates that systemic academic pressures outweigh structural safety nets, pushing learners toward avoidance coping mechanisms. When evaluated through a Theory of Change framework [17], these descriptive metrics illustrate a structural breakdown along the educational results chain: psychosocial stressors (performance anxiety, somatic complaints, and peer conflicts) act as negative behavioral inputs that disrupt the intended pathway of consistent school participation, ultimately resulting in chronic absenteeism and heightened dropout risk.

These empirical results strongly corroborate the findings of van Loon et al. [18], who emphasized that severe academic stress, fear of failure, and unrelenting pressure to meet institutional expectations directly fuel performance anxiety and subsequent truancy. Similarly, Nordh et al. [19] explained that learners grappling with social anxiety frequently encounter psychological barriers that impede help-seeking behaviors and active classroom participation, culminating in systemic disengagement. Furthermore, these patterns align with Havik et

al. [12], who identified somatic complaints such as stress-induced headaches and stomachaches as physiological warning signs strongly associated with school refusal and chronic absenteeism.

The presence of moderate scores in peer difficulties, teacher-related concerns, family problems, and school aversion highlights how relational breakdowns across multiple ecologies undermine attendance stability. Olagbaju and Nnorom [20] stressed that negative peer dynamics, bullying, and social conflicts exacerbate disengagement, while Sahin et al. [21] noted that authoritarian teacher attitudes and punitive climates alienate learners from regular attendance. Correspondingly, Fornander and Kearney [22] underscored that fragile family cohesion, poor domestic communication, and inconsistent parental monitoring serve as primary catalysts for chronic school non-attendance.

Within the framework of institutional policies, these empirical results expose critical gaps that must be addressed through established administrative mandates. The high prevalence of socio-emotional stressors directly implicates the Department of Education's Child Protection Policy (such as DepEd Order No. 40, s. 2012) [23] and institutional guidance protocols, signaling that existing safe-school initiatives must evolve from reactive disciplinary measures to proactive mental health interventions. Under a systemic program evaluation model, these findings demonstrate that current dropout reduction frameworks (DORP) fail to intercept absenteeism early if they ignore underlying affective and relational determinants. Consequently, mitigating truancy among ATS learners requires an integrated, multi-stakeholder strategy that operationalizes robust counseling services, restorative anti-bullying enforcement, supportive teacher-student interactions, and systematic family-school partnerships to safeguard student emotional well-being and secure consistent educational participation.

3.3 Relationship Between Academic Amotivation and School Absenteeism among ATS Learners

Prior to conducting the correlation analysis, preliminary assumption tests were performed to ensure that the data met all necessary statistical requisites. For the correlation analysis, bivariate normality was verified using the Shapiro-Wilk test, yielding a non-significant statistic ($W = 0.968$, $p = 0.142$), which confirms that the assumption of normal distribution was successfully met. Furthermore, scatterplot inspection confirmed homoscedasticity, showing an even and consistent dispersion of residuals along the regression line, alongside a confirmed linear relationship between academic amotivation and school absenteeism.

The correlation study between academic amotivation and school absenteeism among students in ATS is shown in Table 17 using Pearson product-moment correlation. The average academic amotivation was 3.1452, while the average school absenteeism rate was 3.2821. With an r -value of 0.820, the association between academic amotivation and absenteeism from school is strongly favorable. The variable in academic amotivation can be expected to account for around 67.4 percent (67.4%) of the variance in school absenteeism, according to the coefficient of determination (r^2) of 0.674. The p -value of .000, which is less than the specified significance level of 0.05, indicates that this association is statistically significant. The findings indicate that there is a strong positive link between academic amotivation and student absenteeism among Grade 11 and 12 students, and the null hypothesis is thus rejected.

Table 17. Correlation Analysis Between Academic Amotivation and School Absenteeism among ATS Learners

Variables	Mean	r-value	r^2	*p-value	Decision @ $\alpha = 0.05$
Academic Amotivation	3.1452	0.820	0.674	.000	Rejected
School Absenteeism	3.2821				

*Significant at $p < .05$

The findings revealed a strong and significant positive relationship between academic amotivation and school absenteeism among ATS learners ($r = 0.820$, $p = .000$), leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. This indicates that learners with higher academic amotivation are more likely to exhibit increased absenteeism, consistent with [3], which reported that students with poor academic self-perceptions and low motivation are more prone to frequent absences. Similarly, high amotivation has been associated with class absenteeism and lower academic achievement, particularly among students who perceive little benefit in attending classes [24], [25].

Although Kang et al. [26] did not directly examine absenteeism, the study found that amotivation negatively predicted learning engagement, suggesting that reduced engagement may contribute to decreased school participation. Moreover, unmet needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness may lead to disengagement and alienation from school, increasing the risk of chronic absenteeism [27]. In general, the findings suggest that academic amotivation is an important factor associated with absenteeism, highlighting the need for learner-centered interventions, motivational support, and positive learning environments that strengthen students' autonomy, competence, relatedness, and engagement.

3.4 Predicting which Domain of Academic Amotivation Influences the School Absenteeism among ATS Learners

Prior to performing the regression analysis, classical assumption tests were rigorously evaluated to guarantee the validity and reliability of the model. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test confirmed the normality of the unstandardized residuals, yielding a non-significant result ($Z = 0.842$, $p = 0.215$), which verifies that the error terms are normally distributed. Additionally, the independence of residuals was established with a Durbin-Watson statistic of 1.854, safely falling within the acceptable range of 1.5 to 2.5 to rule out autocorrelation. Furthermore, multicollinearity diagnostics demonstrated that all predictor variables maintained Tolerance values well above 0.10 and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values ranging from 1.245 to 1.682—substantially below the conservative threshold of 10.0—thereby confirming the complete absence of multicollinearity and verifying the overall robustness and stability of the regression model.

Using regression analysis presented in Table 18, the dependent variable (school absenteeism) was regressed on predicting variable's indicators value of task, ability beliefs, task characteristics, and effort beliefs. The independent variable significantly predicts school absenteeism, $F(4,200) = 101.432$, $p < .000$, which indicates that the two factors under study have significant impact on school absenteeism. Moreover, the $r^2 = .674$ depicts that the model explains 67.4% of the variance of school absenteeism. Additionally, the coefficients were further assessed to ascertain the influence of each factor on the criterion variable (school absenteeism). The results revealed that value of task ($B = .211$, $t = 4.344$, $p = .000$), ability beliefs ($B = .197$, $t = 3.099$, $p = .002$), task characteristics ($B = .131$, $t = 2.082$, $p = .039$) and effort beliefs ($B = .188$, $t = 2.866$, $p = .005$) have significant impact on school absenteeism. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 18. Regression Analysis on the Domain of Academic Amotivation which Influences the School Absenteeism of ATS Learners

Indicators	Unstandardized Coefficients		r^2	t-value	p-value	Decision @ $\alpha = .05$
	B	Std. Error				
(Constant)	1.008	.122	.674	8.292	.000	
Value of Task	.211	.048		4.344	.000	Rejected
Ability Beliefs	.197	.063		3.099	.002	Rejected
Task Characteristics	.131	.063		2.082	.039	Rejected
Effort Beliefs	.188	.065		2.866	.005	Rejected

Dependent Variable: School Absenteeism

*Significant at $p < .05$

These findings suggest that absenteeism is associated with learners' perceptions of the value and relevance of academic tasks, their beliefs about their abilities, their experiences with learning tasks, and their willingness to exert effort. The results are consistent with [3] and [23], which linked low academic motivation, weak academic self-perceptions, and negative attitudes toward school with poor attendance and disengagement. Specifically, İler [28] found that low value placed on academic tasks was associated with higher absenteeism, while Bianchi et al. [29] reported that low self-efficacy was associated with increased absenteeism and that the relationship was bidirectional over time.

The significant effects of task characteristics and effort beliefs further indicate that learners' experiences with academic activities and motivation-related behaviors may influence their school attendance. This is supported by Bowen et al. [30], which found that absenteeism was associated with reduced student engagement, including lower rates of attending class on time, being prepared to learn, following directions, and participating in discussions, although the study did not directly measure amotivation. Moreover, Kearney et al. [31] emphasized that absenteeism is influenced by both student-related and environmental factors, highlighting the importance of supportive school interventions.

These findings can be explained through Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory [10], which emphasizes the reciprocal interaction of personal beliefs, behavior, and environmental conditions. The significant role of ability beliefs reflects self-efficacy, suggesting that learners who doubt their academic capabilities may show less persistence and greater disengagement, while effort beliefs influence their willingness to sustain effort and participate in learning activities. The strongest contribution of value of task indicates that when learners perceive academic activities as lacking relevance, usefulness, or personal meaning, they may be less motivated to invest effort and maintain regular attendance, while task characteristics may further shape how learners respond to academic demands. Thus, consistent with Bandura's theory, school absenteeism among ATS learners may result from the interaction of self-beliefs, perceptions of academic tasks, and environmental conditions, highlighting the need to strengthen self-efficacy, provide meaningful learning experiences, and create opportunities for successful academic engagement.

Further, the findings further support the view that academic motivation should be considered an important component of school attendance interventions. Previous research has established that motivation, academic self-perception, attitudes toward school and teachers, and perceived value of educational goals are associated with learners' attendance behaviors [16], [23]. Thus, the present findings extend previous evidence by demonstrating that these motivational dimensions remain relevant within a technical-vocational context, particularly among ATS learners. The results are important because technical-vocational learners engage in both theoretical and practical learning experiences; consequently, strengthening the perceived relevance of academic subjects and explicitly connecting classroom learning with workplace competencies, employment opportunities, and learners' career aspirations may increase the perceived value of schooling.

From a policy perspective, the findings have implications for the Department of Education (DepEd), particularly in strengthening existing attendance, learner protection, dropout prevention, and guidance and counseling mechanisms. The results suggest that attendance monitoring should not be limited to identifying whether a learner is absent but should also consider why the learner is repeatedly absent. In this regard, schools may incorporate motivational and psychosocial indicators into their existing learner-monitoring and early-warning mechanisms. Learners who demonstrate recurring absences alongside low task value, weak academic self-beliefs, declining effort, or negative perceptions of learning tasks may be identified for early assessment and appropriate intervention. Such an approach would complement DepEd's dropout-reduction and learner-support initiatives by shifting attendance management from a predominantly reactive response to a more preventive and learner-centered process.

The findings also have practical implications for school administrators, teachers, guidance personnel, and parents. School administrators may use the results as a basis for developing school-level attendance intervention plans that integrate academic, motivational, and psychosocial support. Teachers, particularly those handling technical-vocational subjects, may strengthen contextualized and authentic learning activities that demonstrate the connection between academic competencies and real-world applications. Career-oriented activities, project-based learning, workplace simulations, and authentic performance tasks may help learners recognize the immediate and future value of their studies. At the same time, teachers may provide structured feedback, attainable learning goals, and opportunities for successful task completion to strengthen learners' academic self-beliefs and willingness to exert effort. Guidance personnel may complement these classroom strategies through individual counseling, attendance conferences, motivational support, and referral mechanisms for learners experiencing anxiety, peer difficulties, family concerns, or other barriers to attendance. Parent-school collaboration should likewise be strengthened so that attendance concerns can be addressed through coordinated rather than purely disciplinary responses.

The findings also suggest an important implication for program evaluation. Attendance interventions should not be evaluated solely on the basis of reduced absenteeism. DepEd schools may also monitor intermediate outcomes such as learners' perceived value of school tasks, academic self-confidence, classroom engagement, effort, and sense of belonging. These indicators can provide evidence of whether an intervention is addressing the underlying conditions associated with absenteeism. In a theory-of-change perspective [17], improving the relevance of learning experiences, strengthening academic self-beliefs, and increasing learner engagement may serve as intermediate mechanisms through which schools can improve regular attendance and reduce the risk of prolonged disengagement. Thus, attendance programs may become more responsive when schools evaluate both immediate attendance outcomes and the motivational conditions that contribute to those outcomes.

Despite these contributions, the findings should be interpreted in light of several limitations. First, the study employed a quantitative, non-experimental, descriptive-correlational design; therefore, the significant relationships and predictive effects identified in the regression analysis should not be interpreted as definitive causal relationships. Although academic amotivation significantly predicted school absenteeism statistically, the study cannot establish that amotivation directly causes absenteeism. Second, the respondents were limited to 200 Grade 11 and Grade 12 ATS learners from a single school in the Tagum City Division. Consequently, the findings may not be generalizable to learners from other grade levels, schools, divisions, regions, or technical-vocational specializations. Third, the study relied on self-reported questionnaire responses, which may be affected by recall difficulties, social desirability, or differences in how learners interpret the items. Fourth, the study focused primarily on academic amotivation and selected absenteeism-related factors; other possible determinants of attendance, such as socioeconomic conditions, transportation difficulties, workload, employment responsibilities, health conditions, school climate, and community factors, were not comprehensively examined. Finally, although the instruments demonstrated generally acceptable reliability across most dimensions, the relatively low internal consistency of the effort beliefs subscale (Cronbach's $\alpha = .45$) warrants caution in interpreting findings involving this dimension and suggests the need for further refinement and validation of the instrument in similar populations.

Future studies may therefore employ longitudinal, mixed-methods, or multi-site research designs to examine how motivational conditions and absenteeism develop over time and to identify the mechanisms

underlying this relationship. Intervention studies may also determine whether strategies designed to increase task value, academic self-efficacy, engagement, and effort can produce measurable improvements in school attendance. Future research may further examine how learner characteristics, family conditions, school climate, teacher practices, and socioeconomic factors interact with academic amotivation in predicting absenteeism. Such evidence could provide DepEd and schools with a stronger empirical basis for designing targeted, preventive, and context-responsive attendance interventions.

4. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that academic amotivation is an important factor associated with school absenteeism among Grade 11 and Grade 12 Automotive Servicing learners. The significant relationship and predictive influence of the academic amotivation domains, particularly the value learners place on academic tasks, indicate that improving learners' motivation, perceived competence, and engagement should be central to school attendance interventions. The findings also suggest that absenteeism should not be addressed solely as an attendance problem but as an issue influenced by motivational, emotional, interpersonal, and school-related conditions.

Accordingly, school principals and school heads should strengthen school-based attendance monitoring and early-warning systems and ensure that learners identified as frequently absent are promptly referred to appropriate interventions. Guidance counselors should provide targeted counseling, motivational support, and early intervention for learners experiencing anxiety, low academic confidence, disengagement, or other concerns affecting attendance. Teachers should provide meaningful, learner-centered, and relevant learning experiences that strengthen the perceived value of school tasks and encourage active participation. Parents and guardians should maintain regular communication with schools, monitor attendance, and provide support for learners experiencing academic or personal difficulties.

At the education-agency level, DepEd should strengthen policies and programs that integrate attendance monitoring with learner motivation, guidance and counseling, psychosocial support, family engagement, and school-based intervention. Resources, training, and implementation guidance should be provided to enable schools to identify at-risk learners and respond to the underlying causes of absenteeism. A coordinated approach among school heads, teachers, guidance personnel, parents, and DepEd is therefore essential to promote sustained attendance, learner engagement, and retention.

Future studies may further examine absenteeism using qualitative or mixed-method approaches and consider additional factors such as family circumstances, socioeconomic conditions, school climate, and learner well-being to inform more comprehensive and context-responsive interventions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank Dr. Malou D. Junsay, PH-EM Program Chair, for the support and guidance.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. W. Allen, S. Diamond-Myrsten, and L. K. Rollins, "School absenteeism in children and adolescents," *American Family Physician*, vol. 98, no. 12, pp. 738–744, 2018.
- [2] G. Keppens, D. B. Johnsen, and M. Gallé-Tessonneau, "The relationship between mental health and school absenteeism in a community sample of French secondary school students: Four profiles derived from cluster analysis," *European Journal of Education and Psychology*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 77–90, 2019.
- [3] M. Balkis, G. Arslan, and E. Duru, "The school absenteeism among high school students: Contributing factors," *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 1819–1836, 2016.
- [4] Y. L. Khan, S. K. Lodhi, S. Bhatti, and W. Ali, "Does absenteeism affect academic performance among undergraduate medical students? Evidence from Rashid Latif Medical College (RLMC)," *Advances in Medical Education and Practice*, vol. 10, pp. 999–1008, 2019.
- [5] I. Ghaonta, "Intrinsic and extrinsic academic motivation of school students of Shimla district," *International Journal of Scientific Engineering and Science*, vol. 1, no. 7, pp. 24–28, 2017.
- [6] J. E. Trinidad, "Material resources, school climate, and achievement variations in the Philippines: Insights from PISA 2018," *International Journal of Educational Development*, vol. 75, Art. no. 102174, 2020.
- [7] C. M. P. Cepada and B. G. S. Grepon, "Absenteeism and parental involvement in home and school among middle school students of public school in Northern Mindanao, Philippines: Basis for intervention," *Online Submission*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 17–37, 2020.
- [8] E. L. Deci and R. M. Ryan, "The general causality orientations scale: Self-determination in personality," *Journal of Research in Personality*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 109–134, 1985.
- [9] E. Q. Rosenzweig, A. Wigfield, and J. S. Eccles, "Expectancy-value theory and its relevance for student motivation and learning," in *The Cambridge Handbook of Motivation and Learning*, K. A. Renninger and S. E. Hidi, Eds. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2019, pp. 617–644.
- [10] A. Bandura, *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA: Prentice-Hall, 1986.

- [11] L. Legault, I. Green-Demers, and L. Pelletier, "Why do high school students lack motivation in the classroom? Toward an understanding of academic amotivation and the role of social support," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, vol. 98, no. 3, pp. 567–582, 2006.
- [12] M. Knollmann, V. Reissner, and J. Hebebrand, "Towards a comprehensive assessment of school absenteeism: Development and initial validation of the inventory of school attendance problems," *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 399–414, 2019.
- [13] A. Assor and H. Kaplan, "Mapping the domain of academic motivation and emotion regulation in late adolescence," *Educational Psychology Review*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 413–439, 2017.
- [14] E. Rhew, J. S. Piro, P. Goolkasian, and P. Cosentino, "The effects of a growth mindset on self-efficacy and motivation," *Cogent Education*, vol. 5, no. 1, Art. no. 1492337, 2018.
- [15] A. O. Busari, "Motivation, stress, anxiety and emotions as predictors of academic boredom among degree students of National Teachers' Institute Osogbo, Osun State, Nigeria," *World Scientific News*, vol. 112, pp. 165–179, 2018.
- [16] Department of Education (DepEd), Republic of the Philippines, "Guidelines on mainstreaming the dropout reduction program (DORP) in the public secondary schools: DepEd Order No. 74, s. 2010," Manila, Philippines, Jun. 4, 2010.
- [17] D. H. Taplin, H. Clark, E. Collins, and D. C. Colby, "Theory of change," in *Technical Papers: A Series of Papers to Support Development of Theories of Change Based on Practice in the Field*. New York, NY, USA: ActKnowledge, 2013.
- [18] A. W. G. van Loon, H. E. Creemers, S. Vogelaar, N. Saab, A. C. Miers, P. M. Westenberg, and J. J. Asscher, "The effectiveness of school-based skills-training programs promoting mental health in adolescents: A study protocol for a randomized controlled study," *BMC Public Health*, vol. 19, Art. no. 712, 2019, doi: 10.1186/s12889-019-6999-3.
- [19] M. Nordh *et al.*, "Therapist-guided internet-delivered cognitive behavioral therapy vs internet-delivered supportive therapy for children and adolescents with social anxiety disorder: A randomized clinical trial," *JAMA Psychiatry*, vol. 78, no. 7, pp. 705–713, 2021.
- [20] O. O. Olagbaju and S. T. Nnorom, "Effects of class size and peer influence on senior secondary students' achievement," *Journal of Research in Education, Science and Technology*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 61–69, 2019.
- [21] S. Sahin, Z. Arseven, and A. Kiliç, "Causes of student absenteeism and school dropouts," *International Journal of Instruction*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 195–210, 2016.
- [22] M. J. Fornander and C. A. Kearney, "Family environment variables as predictors of school absenteeism severity at multiple levels: Ensemble and classification and regression tree analysis," *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 10, Art. no. 2381, 2019.
- [23] Department of Education (DepEd), Republic of the Philippines, "DepEd child protection policy: DepEd Order No. 40, s. 2012," Manila, Philippines, May 14, 2012.
- [24] E. Ramos and C. I. Magallanes, "Social support and academic motivation of students at risk of dropping out," *Philippine Social Science Journal*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 43–52, 2021.
- [25] F. Della Utari and A. E. Ginanjar, "Proportion of amotivation learning students who work and do not work on academic achievement," *Journal of Psychology and Culture Behavior in SDGs*, vol. 1, no. 3, p. 000104, 2025.
- [26] X. Kang, D. Hu, Y. Wu, and J. Luo, "Evaluating academic motivation among Chinese secondary EFL learners: Validation and measurement invariance," *BMC Psychology*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 235, 2025.
- [27] M. D. Toth and M. E. Lyons, "The most powerful intervention for chronic absenteeism is making school worth attending," 2025.
- [28] İ. İltir, "Which types of amotivation affect school absenteeism and academic performance of middle school students? A structural equation modeling analysis," *RMLE Online*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 1–20, 2023.
- [29] D. Bianchi, E. Cavicchiolo, S. Manganelli, F. Lucidi, A. Chirico, L. Girelli, *et al.*, "School absenteeism and self-efficacy in very-low-income students in Italy: Cross-lagged relationships and differential effects of immigrant background," *Children and Youth Services Review*, vol. 136, p. 106446, 2022.
- [30] F. Bowen, C. Gentle-Genitty, J. Siegler, and M. Jackson, "Revealing underlying factors of absenteeism: A machine learning approach," *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 13, no. 958748, 2022.
- [31] C. A. Kearney, L. Benoit, C. González, and G. Keppens, "School attendance and school absenteeism: A primer for the past, present, and theory of change for the future," *Frontiers in Education*, vol. 7, p. 1044608, 2022.