International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation.

An Empirical Analysis of Teachers' Use of Technology-Enhanced Instruction and Its Influence on Students' Engagement in EFL Classrooms

Yusra Hassan Kzar
Ministry of Education, General Directorate of Education, Babylon, Iraq

* Corresponding Author: **Yusra Hassan Kzar**

Article Info

ISSN (Online): 2582-7138
Impact Factor (RSIF): 8.04
Volume: 07
Issue: 03
May-June 2026
Received: 12-03-2026
Accepted: 14-04-2026
Published: 16-05-2026
Page No: 694-696

Abstract
As digital tools become ubiquitous in education, understanding their pedagogical impact is critical. This study investigates the correlation between teachers' integration of technology in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms and students' multidimensional engagement (behavioral, emotional, and cognitive). Utilizing an explanatory Sequential Mixed Methods Design involving 50 teachers and 200 students, the study employs the TPACK framework to analyze instructional practices. Quantitative analysis reveals a strong positive correlation (r =.72) between interactive technology use and emotional engagement, but a moderate correlation (r =.41) with cognitive engagement. Qualitative findings suggest that while technology lowers language anxiety, it does not guarantee deep learning unless accompanied by constructivist pedagogical strategies. The study concludes with recommendations for shifting from tool-centric to pedagogy-centric teacher training.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.54660/.IJMRGE.2026.7.3.694-696

Keywords: Technology-Enhanced Instruction, Student Engagement, TPACK, EFL, Mixed Methods

1. Introduction

1.1. Background of the Study

"The 21st-century EFL classroom has transitioned from a static environment relying on textbooks and blackboards to a dynamic, technology-enhanced ecosystem. The integration of tools such as Interactive Whiteboards (IWBs), Learning Management Systems (LMS), AI-driven writing assistants, and gamified applications (e.g., Kahoot!, Duolingo) has redefined instructional delivery. However, the availability of technology does not automatically translate to effective learning outcomes. The "Digital Native" hypothesis suggests students are naturally engaged by tech, yet recent studies indicate a growing "digital fatigue," necessitating a closer look at how teachers utilize these tools.

1.2. Problem Statement

Despite the proliferation of EdTech, a significant gap remains between technology access and meaningful engagement. Many EFL teachers adopt a "Substitution" approach (referencing the SAMR Model), using digital tools merely to replicate traditional methods (e.g., digital worksheets) rather than to transform learning. The core problem addressed in this study is the lack of empirical evidence linking specific types of technology-enhanced instruction (TEI) to the three specific dimensions of student engagement:

Behavioral: Time on task, participation, and adherence to rules.
Emotional: Attitude, interest, and anxiety levels.
Cognitive: Mental effort, self-regulation, and investment in learning strategies.

1.3. Research Objectives

To identify the frequency and pedagogical patterns of technology use among EFL teachers.

To evaluate the impact of TEI on students' behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement.To investigate the relationship between teachers' TPACK (Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge) competency and student engagement levels.

1.4. Research Questions

1. What is the relationship between the frequency of technology use and students' behavioral engagement in the EFL classroom?
2. To what extent does gamified technology influence students' emotional engagement compared to non-gamified instruction?
3. How does the pedagogical strategy (teacher-centered vs. student-centered) affect cognitive engagement in technology-rich environments?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Theoretical Frameworks

2.1.1. The TPACK Model

This study uses the TPACK framework (Mishra & Koehler, 2006) [2] as a lens to evaluate teachers. Effective technology integration is not just about knowing how to use a tool (Technological Knowledge), but knowing how to teach English using that tool (Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge).

2.1.2. The Construct of Engagement

Fredricks *et al.* (2004) [1] define engagement as a meta-construct:

Behavioral Engagement: Observable actions (attendance, participation).

Emotional Engagement: Affective reactions (enjoyment, lack of anxiety).

Cognitive Engagement: Psychological investment (strategic learning, self-regulation).

2.2. Technology and Language Anxiety

Empirical studies consistently show that Technology-Enhanced Instruction can lower the "Affective Filter" (Krashen). For example, computer-mediated communication (CMC) allows shy students to participate in discussions without the pressure of immediate oral production, thereby increasing participation (Behavioral Engagement

2.3. Gamification and Motivation"

Research indicates that gamification elements (points, leaderboards) significantly boost extrinsic motivation. However, the literature is divided on whether this sustains long-term intrinsic motivation required for language mastery(Cognitive Engagement)

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

This study adopts an Explanatory Sequential Mixed Methods Design.

Phase 1 (Quantitative): Surveys administered to teachers and students to establish correlations.

Phase 2 (Qualitative): Classroom observations and semi-structured interviews to explain the statistical findings.

3.2. Participants

Teachers (N=50): Selected via stratified random sampling from secondary schools. Stratification based on years of experience (<5 years vs. >10 years.(

Students (N=200): Randomly selected from the classes of the participating teachers.

3.3. Data Collection Instruments

Teacher Technology Integration Survey (TTIS):

Measures frequency of use (Daily, Weekly, Rarely).

Measures type of use (Instructional vs. Collaborative).

Reliability (Cronbach's Alpha): \alpha =.85

Student Engagement Scale (SES):

Adapted from the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale for Students (UWES-S).

Items include: "I feel happy when using tablets in class" (Emotional), "I try to connect new vocab to what I know using the app" (Cognitive).

Reliability (Cronbach's Alpha): \alpha =.88

Observation Checklist:

Tracks "Active Learning Moments" vs. "Passive Screen Time

3.4. Data Analysis Procedures

Quantitative: SPSS software used for Descriptive Statistics (Mean, SD) and Inferential Statistics (Pearson Correlation, T-tests.(

Qualitative: Thematic Analysis used for interview transcripts (coding for themes like "distraction," "autonomy," "fun.("

4. Results and Data Analysis

4.1. Quantitative Results

4.1.1. Frequency of Technology Use

Descriptive analysis shows that 85% of teachers use technology daily, but 60% use it primarily for presentation (PowerPoint/Projector). Only 25% use it for interactive student production.

4.1.2. Correlation Analysis

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationship between Teacher Tech Use and Student Engagement.

Table 1: Correlation Matrix

Variable	Interactive Tech Use	Behavioral Engagement	Emotional Engagement	Cognitive Engagement
Interactive Tech Use	1.00	.68* (Strong)	.72* (Strong)	.41* (Moderate)
Behavioral Engagement	.68* (Strong)	1.00	—	—
Emotional Engagement	.72* (Strong)	—	1.00	—
Cognitive Engagement	.41* (Moderate)	—	—	1.00

Emotional Engagement: The strongest correlation (r=.72) exists here. Students explicitly prefer tech-enhanced lessons over traditional lectures.

Cognitive Engagement: The moderate correlation (r=.41) suggests that technology does not automatically trigger deep thinking.

4.1.3. Impact of Gamification (T-Test)

An independent samples t-test compared engagement scores in Gamified vs. Non-Gamified lessons.

Result: Gamified lessons showed significantly higher Behavioral Engagement ($t(198) = 4.56$, $p < .001$) but no significant difference in Cognitive Engagement.

4.2. Qualitative Results

4.2.1. Theme 1: The "Novelty Effect"

Interviews revealed that engagement spikes when a new tool is introduced but fades if the tool becomes repetitive.

Teacher Quote: "They loved Kahoot for the first month. Now, they groan if we do it every day. The novelty wears off".

4.2.2. Theme 2: Anxiety Reduction

Students reported feeling safer making mistakes on a device than speaking aloud.

Student Quote: "When I write on the Padlet wall anonymously, I write more complex sentences because I'm not afraid of the teacher correcting my pronunciation in front of everyone".

5. Discussion

5.1. Interpreting the "Engagement Gap"

The findings confirm that technology is a powerful tool for affective regulation (making students feel good) and behavioral compliance (keeping them busy). However, the lower correlation with cognitive engagement aligns with the "shallows" hypothesis—students may be skimming the surface of content rather than deep diving.

5.2. The Role of Teacher Pedagogy (TPACK)

Teachers with high TPACK scores (those who integrated tech into projects rather than just drills) saw higher cognitive engagement scores. This suggests that the method of use matters more than the frequency of use.

5.3. Implications for EFL Instruction

Beyond Substitution: Teachers must move past using screens as "digital blackboards".

Scaffolding: Technology should be used to scaffold complex tasks (e.g., using AI to outline an essay) rather than just for simple recall.

Balanced Approach: A mix of high-tech (apps) and low-tech (face-to-face discussion) is optimal to prevent screen fatigue.

6. Conclusion

6.1. Summary

This empirical analysis demonstrates that while technology-enhanced instruction significantly boosts students' enthusiasm and participation in EFL classrooms, it requires deliberate pedagogical design to foster deep cognitive engagement.

6.2. Recommendations

For Administrators: Invest in training that focuses on pedagogical integration (TPACK) rather than just software tutorials.

For Teachers: Use gamification sparingly to maintain its motivational power, and prioritize tools that require students to create language (blogs, videos) rather than just consume it.

6.3. Future Research

Future studies should investigate the long-term impact of AI tools (like ChatGPT) on EFL students' writing proficiency and critical thinking skills.

References

1. Fredricks JA, Blumenfeld PC, Paris AH. School engagement: potential of the concept, state of the evidence. Rev Educ Res. 2004;74(1):59–109.
2. Mishra P, Koehler MJ. Technological pedagogical content knowledge: a framework for teacher knowledge. Teach Coll Rec. 2006;108(6):1017–54.
3. Stockwell G. Technology and motivation in English language teaching. London: Bloomsbury Academic; 2022.

How to Cite This Article

Kzar YH. An empirical analysis of teachers' use of technology-enhanced instruction and its influence on students' engagement in EFL classrooms. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation. 2026;7(3):694–696.
doi:10.54660/IJMRGE.2026.7.3.694-696

Creative Commons (CC) License