

# The Relationship Between Self-Regulated Learning With Student Engagement in College Students Who Have Many Roles

Sherin Setiani<sup>1</sup> & Erik Wijaya<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Tarumanagara, Jakarta, Indonesia

\*Corresponding author. Email: sherin.705160193@stu.untar.ac.id

## ABSTRACT

This research examined the relationship between self-regulated learning with student engagement in college students who have many roles. In performing their roles, college student needs to do self-regulated learning as a strategy in order to keep having student engagement, so they can reach their academic success. Self-regulated learning is a process of planning and controlling student's cognitive, emotion, behavior, and environment to reach academic success. Student engagement is student's involvement in emotion, cognitive, and behavior aspects of doing academic task and still persevere despite obstacles. This research involved 206 college students in X University, that consists of 114 males and 92 females. Researcher used two measuring instruments, those were Self-Regulated Learning instrument from Universitas Tarumanagara which was adapted by Monica (2013) and Student Course Engagement Quotient (SCEQ) by Handelsman et al. (2005). Analysis used pearson correlation technique, and obtained  $r(206) = 0.262$ ,  $p = 0.000 < 0.05$ . The result indicates that there is a positive and significant correlation between self-regulated learning and student engagement.

**Keywords:** *Self-regulated learning, student engagement, and college student*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

College students are important generation for the future of the nation. College students are people who have a special position in society as an agent of change [1]. In this globalization era, it is not only academic knowledge that needs to be mastered. It is also important for college students to develop their soft skills by participating in non-academic activities both inside and outside of institution. The examples of important soft skills are the ability to socialize and communicate with others.

One of non-academic activity that college students can participate in is organizational activities. College student organization is the medium to improve leadership and reasoning skill, interests, hobbies, and welfare in college life [2]. Many college students who are active in organization also have other roles such as working part-time. A part-time worker is someone who works less than 35 hours per week. This work is mostly done by college students because they can adjust the work schedule to the class schedule [3]. Research at Midwestern Public University examined 5,223 respondents who were college students and worked part-time from 2001 to 2009 [4]. In most other countries and Indonesia, part-time job becomes one of the most common activities for young people who are studying, especially for students in high school and institution [5]. The positive things of working part-time are college students can get extra money, work experience, and use time more productively.

In addition to non-academic activities, college students still have their main responsibility which is completing their academic tasks well while in college. In this condition, it is necessary for college students to be able to maximize their learning process. According to research by the National Survey of Student Engagement at Indiana University [6], most college students only use their study time while in classroom. The research also stated that the involvement of college students in emotional, cognitive, and behavioral aspects in learning activities are very important to understand lecture material well, or also called student engagement. Student engagement is an important predictor of determining student success [7].

Student engagement also plays a role in increasing the attractiveness of education and makes learning fun, so can motivate college students in learning process. To encourage and motivate college students in learning, planning and evaluation aspects of learning objectives are needed [8]. Both are aspects of self-regulated learning, so college students who have many roles need to have self-regulated learning to be able to achieve student engagement.

Self-regulated learning is the main concept to understand the cognitive, emotional, and motivational aspects of college students in learning [9]. Self-regulated learning is defined as a process of activating and maintaining thought, feeling, and behavior to achieve academic goals [10]. Previous research stated that students who have many roles need self-regulation in learning [11]. Besides, college

students' role will make the level of self-regulation greater than other students who do not have other roles.

Previous research to students found that important to regulate their behavior and involvement to complete their learning tasks [12]. One aspect of self-regulated learning is time management strategy to plan when and where they must complete their academic tasks. Furthermore, research to 158 students, obtained result that self-regulated learning affected student engagement [13]. Both of these studies showed that students who used self-regulated learning strategies were able to achieve student engagement in learning process. Self-regulated learning is also very suitable for college students because they have great control to regulate their own learning approach [14]. The use of college students who have many roles as research subjects will certainly show a difference in time management compared with students.

Based on the explanations before, researcher is interested to know more about the relationship between self-regulated learning with student engagement in college students who have many roles. This research aims to make college students who have many roles are more able to improve self-regulated learning so they can fulfill their main responsibility in completing their studies. This study also aims to make college students who have many roles increase student engagement as a way to improve their academic achievement.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Definition of Student Engagement**

Student engagement according to Fredrick [13] is the involvement of college students from emotional, cognitive, and behavioral aspects in learning activities. Marks [15] stated that student engagement is a psychological process, especially attention, interest, investment, and student effort in working on learning tasks. Student engagement can be defined as the willingness of college students to actively participate in the learning process and survive despite obstacles [7]. Based on the definitions of several experts, it can be concluded that student engagement is the emotional, cognitive, and behavioral involvement of college students in carrying out learning tasks and persisting despite obstacles. College students who have engagement tend to show an attitude of initiative, work on tasks to practice their abilities, and strive to achieve educational goals [7].

### **Dimension of Student Engagement**

The Student Course Engagement Quotient (SCEQ) divides student engagement into four dimensions [16]. The first dimension is skill engagement. This can be demonstrated by behaviors in order to develop their abilities, both understanding and skills. If college students have good skill engagement, they will have learning targets, try to master the learning material, do the tasks well, have a record of the subject matter, and try to attend in every class. The second dimension is emotional engagement. In this dimension, college students involve their emotions in learning. College students who have good emotional engagement will go

through the learning process with personal desires, be enthusiastic, and apply their knowledge in their daily lives. The third dimension is interaction/participation engagement. In this dimension, college students interact with the lecturer and their friends during the learning process. College students with good interaction/participation dimension will use their time effectively when they meet with the lecturer by asking questions that can develop their understanding of learning. In addition, college students will try to answer lecturer's questions to evaluate their understanding of the material. The fourth dimension is performance engagement. College students with good performance engagement will do their tasks and examinations well. They believe that the results of their learning will be satisfying. They will also evaluate their understanding through the feedback they got.

### **Impacts of Student Engagement**

The impacts of student engagement are divided into three categories: (a) positive engagement; (b) non-engagement; (c) negative engagement [17]. First, positive engagement is when college students are actively involved in the learning process, such as attending every classes, doing tasks, and being able to get the desired results. Second, non-engagement is when college students take classes but are not actively involved in the learning process. For the example, college students just sit quietly in the class and late in collecting tasks. Third, negative engagement shows that college students do not care about the lectures they are going through, such as absence in the class and study over again.

### **Definition of Self-Regulated Learning**

Self-regulated learning is defined as the process of activating and maintaining thought, feeling, and behavior to achieve academic goals [10]. Self-regulated learning is also a learning activity that systematically regulates the learning process to achieve goals in learning, using cognitive, motivational and behavioral strategies [18]. Another definition of self-regulated learning is when college students learn actively, determine learning goals, plan and control their cognitive, motivational behaviors and environment to achieve their goals [19]. Based on the definitions of several experts, it can be concluded that self-regulated learning is the process of planning and controlling cognitive, emotional, behavior, and environment to achieve academic achievement.

### **Dimensions of Self-Regulated Learning**

Viewed from the cognitive aspect, self-regulated learning consists of several dimensions: (a) planning; (b) monitoring; (c) evaluating; and (d) reinforcing [20]. Planning dimension is a process to organize steps, starts from setting the goals, then develop the strategies by analyzing tasks, describing the expected results, and considering obstacles that probably occur. Monitoring dimension involves the ability to observe, report, and measure the learning progress. Evaluating dimension is the process of evaluating the implementation of its tasks and

comparing them with the expectation that have been made before. Reinforcing dimension is a reflection of the learning strategies. In this dimension, college students give reward to themselves as a reinforcement.

### 3. METHODS

#### Research Design and Respondents

This research was non-experimental quantitative research, used non-probability sampling technique that was convenient sampling. This study used statistical correlation techniques to find out the relationship between self-regulated learning with student engagement.

The respondents of this study consisted of several characteristics. First, the respondents were from various faculties at X University, West Jakarta. Second, respondents were active college students who are involved in student organizations. Third, respondents were working part-time. Fourth, respondents were between 18-24 years old.

The total number of respondents who participated in this study were 206 college students, consisted of 114 males and 92 females. The general description of respondents was divided into gender, faculty, semester of study, position in organization, and type of part-time job. The overall description of the respondents can be seen in table 1.

Table 1

*General Description of Respondents*

Respondent Characteristics		N (206)	Percentage (%)	
Gender	Male	114	55.3	
	Female	92	44.7	
Faculty	Economy & Business	40	19.4	
	Law	15	7.3	
	Communication	20	9.7	
	Medical	2	1.0	
	Psychology	33	16.0	
	Fine Art & Design	20	9.7	
	Engineering	55	26.7	
	Information Technology	21	10.2	
	Semester	2	12	5.8
		4	49	23.8
5		1	0.5	
6		95	46.1	
7		3	1.5	
8		45	21.8	
10		1	0.5	
Position in Organization	Chairman	16	7.8	
	Vice Chairman	10	4.9	
	Secretary	7	3.4	
	Treasurer	4	1.9	
	Coordinator	37	18.0	
	Member	114	55.3	
	Others	18	8.7	
Type of Part-Time Job	Barista/Waiter/Waitress	28	13.6	
	Shopkeeper	19	9.2	

Event Organizer/Wedding Organizer	20	9.7
Photographer/Editor	13	6.3
Entrepreneur/Online Shop Owner	24	11.7
Lecturer Assistant	21	10.2
Course Teacher	30	14.6
Others	51	24.8

#### Measurement

#### Reliability of Student Engagement Questionnaire

Student engagement instrument was an adaptation of Student Course Engagement Quotient (SCEQ). SCEQ uses likert scale that consists of interval one to five. SCEQ consists of 25 items to measure four dimensions, those are skill engagement, emotional engagement, interaction/participation engagement, and performance engagement. The reliability test results showed that there were 2 items which had corrected item-total correlation score smaller than 0.2, so these items deleted. In the end, there were 23 items that valid and reliable.

#### Reliability of Self-Regulated Learning Questionnaire

Self-Regulated Learning instrument was from Universitas Tarumanagara and adapted by Monica (2013). Self-regulated learning questionnaire consists of 40 items to measure four dimensions, those are planning, monitoring, evaluating, and reinforcing. It uses likert scale that consists of interval one to five. The reliability test results showed that there were 21 items that had corrected item-total correlation score smaller than 0.2, so these items deleted. In the end, there were 19 items that valid and reliable.

### 4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

#### Hypothetical Test

The hypothetical test used Pearson correlation analysis technique, because the data were normally distributed. The results showed that self-regulated learning variable had a significant and positive relationship with student engagement. This was indicated by the score of  $r(206) = 0.262$  and the score of  $p = 0.000 < 0.05$ . See more details about the hypothetical test result of two variables in table 2.

Table 2

*Hypothetical Test Result between Self-Regulated Learning and Student Engagement*

Self-Regulated Learning and Student Engagement	
r	0.262
p	0.000

Then researcher examined the correlation between self-regulated learning variable with the dimensions of student engagement. The result showed that self-regulated learning was significantly and positively related to all dimensions of student engagement, because  $p < 0.05$ . The correlation test result can be seen in table 3.

**Table 3**  
*Correlation Test Result between Self-Regulated Learning Variable and Student Engagement Dimensions*

Dimensions	r	p
Planning	0.329	0.000
Monitoring	0.333	0.000
Evaluating	-0.153	0.029
Reinforcing	0.060	0.395

The highest average dimension score is reinforcing and the lowest is planning. It can be concluded that the respondents tend to not plan the learning process first, but if they get good learning outcomes, they will strengthen (reinforcing) the learning outcomes.

Next, based on the correlation test of student engagement variable with the dimensions of self-regulated learning, the result showed that there was a significant and positive relationship between student engagement with planning and monitoring dimensions. Furthermore, there was a significant and negative relationship between student engagement with evaluating dimension. There was no significant relationship between student engagement with reinforcing dimension. The correlation test result can be seen in table 4.

**Table 4**  
*Correlation Test Result between Student Engagement Variable and Self-Regulated Learning Dimensions*

Dimensions	r	p
Skill Engagement	0.298	0.000
Emotional Engagement	0.157	0.024
Interaction Engagement	0.168	0.016
Performance Engagement	0.178	0.011

The highest average dimension score is performance engagement and the lowest is interaction/participation engagement. In other words, the respondents are less active in learning interactions, but they believe that their learning outcome will be satisfying and actively evaluate the outcome.

Next, researcher made an additional data analysis with independent sample t-test to test the difference of dimensions of the variable between male and female respondents. First, the difference test was performed on each dimension of the student engagement variable. Only skill engagement dimension which had significant difference between male and female, because  $p < 0.05$ . Emotional engagement, interaction/participation engagement, and performance engagement had no significant differences between male and female, because  $p > 0.05$ . The difference test result can be seen in table 5.

**Table 5**  
*Difference Test of Student Engagement Dimensions Based on Gender*

Dimensions		Gender	
		Male	Female
Skill Engagement	Mean	3.4123	3.6576
	t		-3.027
	p		0.003
Emotional Engagement	Mean	3.4930	3.4348
	t		0.631
	p		0.529
Interaction Engagement	Mean	3.2579	3.1326
	t		1.370
	p		0.172
Performance Engagement	Mean	3.7404	3.8283
	t		-1.083
	p		0.280

The result showed that there were significant differences between males and females in skill engagement dimension, but there were no significant differences in emotional engagement, interaction/participation engagement, and performance engagement dimensions. It can be concluded that females are more likely to make learning targets, take notes, and try to understand the lecture material compared to males. In contrast to previous studies [21] which stated that there were significant differences in each dimension of student engagement. The difference in findings can occur because the theory and measurement instrument that used in previous studies and this research are different.

Second, the difference test was performed on each dimensions of self-regulated learning variable. Only planning dimension that had significant difference between males and females, because  $p < 0.05$ . Monitoring, evaluating, and reinforcing had no significant differences between males and females, because  $p > 0.05$ . The difference test result can be seen in table 6.

**Table 6**  
*Difference Test of Self-Regulated Learning Dimensions Based on Gender*

Dimensions		Gender	
		Male	Female
Planning	Mean	2.3632	2.8000
	t		-3.244
	p		0.001
Monitoring	Mean	2.7772	2.7978
	t		-0.228
	p		0.820
Evaluating	Mean	2.6421	2.6435
	t		-0.14
	p		0.989
Reinforcing	Mean	2.9781	2.8777
	t		1.061
	p		0.290

The result showed that there were significant differences between males and females in planning dimension, but there were no significant differences in monitoring, evaluating,

and reinforcing dimensions. It can be concluded that females are more likely to plan before starting the learning process than males. These findings were less consistent with the result of previous studies which stated that there were significant differences in most dimensions (five of six) self-regulated learning [22]. The difference in findings can occur because the theory and measurement instruments that used in previous studies and this research are different.

## 5. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

### Conclusion

Based on data analysis, it can be concluded that there is significant and positive relationship between self-regulated learning with student engagement among college students who have many roles. Thus, if self-regulated learning score is high, student engagement score will also be high. In the other hand, if self-regulated learning score is low, student engagement score will also be low.

### Theoretical Suggestions

A suggestion from the researcher for further research on similar topic is to use self-regulated learning and student engagement questionnaires that measure cognitive, behavioral, and emotional aspects thoroughly. In addition, further research can link the variables of self-regulated learning and student engagement with other secondary variables. The examples of variables that can be linked are self-efficacy, social support from lecturer or peers, and motivation or goal orientation of college students. Further research can also collect the college student learning outcomes (such as college student's GPA). This aims to measure their academic achievement in implementing self-regulated learning and student engagement. Further research can also be done longitudinally in order to know the development process of student engagement for college students who have many roles.

### Practical Suggestions

**For college students.** It is recommended for college students who have many roles, to be more aware about their academic responsibility, so they are able to balance their roles. Some actions that can college student do are make goals and learning plans, do the tasks, and evaluate their results and interests during the learning process. In that way, college students can develop self-regulated learning strategies that are suitable for them so they can also achieve student engagement and academic success.

**For lecturers in the college.** This research can be a reference for the lecturers, that important to increase student engagement of the class, so college students are more easily understood and applied the learning materials. Researchers suggest that lecturers are able to carry out the learning activities in certain ways that can increase student engagement. For examples, the lecturers can explain the learning material using concrete examples, create a fun learning environment, and do more interactions with the college students.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Al-Adawiyah, R., & Syamsudin, H. (2008). *Agar ngampus tak sekadar status*. Surakarta: Indiva Media Kreasi.
- [2] Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia, Nomor 60, Tahun 1999, Pasal 111, tentang Mahasiswa dan Alumni (June 24<sup>th</sup>, 1999).
- [3] Simanjuntak, J. P. (1985). *Pengantar ekonomi sumber daya manusia*. Jakarta: Lembaga Penerbit Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Indonesia.
- [4] Tessema, M. T., Ready, K. J., & Astani, M. (2014). Does part-time job affect college students' satisfaction and academic performance (GPA)? The case of a Mid-Sized Public University. *International Journal of Business Administration*, 5(2), 1-10. doi:10.5430/ijba.v5n2p
- [5] Meiji, N. H. P. (2019). Pemuda (pe)kerja paruh waktu: Dependensi dan negosiasi (mahasiswa *part time* di Kota Malang, Jawa Timur, Indonesia). *Jurnal Studi Pemuda*, 8(1), 15-28. doi:doi.org/10.22146/studipemudaugm.46133
- [6] Rufaida, A. A., & Prihatsanti, U. (2017). Hubungan efikasi diri akademik dengan *student engagement* pada mahasiswa FSM UNDIP yang bekerja paruh waktu. *Jurnal Empati*, 6(4), 143-148.
- [7] Miller, R. L., Amsel, E., Kowalewski, B. M., Beins, B. C., Keith, K. D., & Peden, B. F. (Eds.). (2011). *Promoting student engagement (Vol 1): Programs, techniques and opportunities*. Retrieved from <http://teachpsych.org/ebooks/pse2011/index.php>
- [8] Gibbs, R., & Poskitt, J. (2010). *Student engagement in the middle years of schooling (years 7-10): A literature review*. New Zealand, AUS: Ministry of Education.
- [9] Panadero, E. (2017). A review of self-regulated learning: Six models and four directions for research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8(422). doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00422
- [10] Zimmerman, B. J. (2015). Self-regulated learning: Theories, measures, and outcomes. *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 541–546. doi:10.1016/b978-0-08-097086-8.26060-1
- [11] Schaie, K. W., & Carstensen, L. L. (2006). *Social structure, aging, and self-regulation in the elderly*. New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.
- [12] Wolters, C. A., & Taylor, D. J. (2012). A self-regulated learning perspective on student engagement. *Handbook of Research on Student Engagement*, 635-651. doi:10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7\_30

- [13] Mukaromah, D., Sugiyo, & Mulawarman. (2018). Keterlibatan siswa dalam pembelajaran ditinjau dari efikasi diri dan *self-regulated learning*. *Indonesian Journal of Guidance and Counseling: Theory and Application*, 7(2), 14-19.
- [14] Mukhid, A. (2008). Strategi self-regulated learning (perspektif teoretik). *Tadris*, 3(2), 222-239.
- [15] Klem, A. M., & Connell, J. P. (2004). Relationships matter: Linking teacher support to student engagement and achievement. *Journal of School Health*, 74(7), 262–273. doi:10.1111/j.1746-1561.2004.tb08283.x
- [16] Handelsman, M. M., Briggs, W. L., Sullivan, N., & Towler, A. (2005). A measure of college student engagement. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 98(3), 184-191.
- [17] Trowler, V. (2010). *Student engagement literature review*. Lancaster University: Department of Educational Research.
- [18] Fasikhah, S. S., & Fatimah, S. (2013). *Self-regulated learning* (SRL) dalam meningkatkan prestasi akademik pada mahasiswa. *Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi Terapan*, 01(01), 145-155.
- [19] Wolters, C. A., Pintrich, P. R., & Karabenick, S. A. (2003, March). *Assessing academic self-regulated learning*. Paper prepared for the Conference on Indicators of Positive Development: Definitions, Measures, and Prospective Validity, Washington DC. Retrieved from [https://www.childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Child\\_Trends-2003\\_03\\_12\\_PD\\_PDConfWPK.pdf](https://www.childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Child_Trends-2003_03_12_PD_PDConfWPK.pdf)
- [20] Yoenanto, N. H. (2010). Hubungan antara *self-regulated learning* dengan *self-efficacy* pada siswa akselerasi Sekolah Menengah Pertama di Jawa Timur. *Insan*, 12(2), 88-94.
- [21] Teoh, H. C., Abdullah, M. C., Roslan, S., & Daud, S. (2013). An investigation of student engagement in a Malaysian Public University. *Procedia Social and Behavior Sciences* 90, 142-151. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.07.075
- [22] Ozan, C., Gundogdu, K., Bay, E., & Celkan, H. Y. (2012). A study on the university students' self-regulated learning strategies skills and self-efficacy perceptions in terms of different variables. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 46, 1806–1811. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.383