

The Level Of Student Engagement Based On Gender And Grade On History Subject Of Senior High School Students In Jember Regency

Fernanda Prasky Hartono, Nurul Umamah, Sumarno, Rully Putri Nirmala Puji

Abstract: The study aims to analyze the student engagement level based on gender and class on history subjects of high school students in Jember. Student engagement theory refers to Frederick, Blumenfeld, and Paris that consists of three main components, namely behavioral engagement, emotional engagement, and cognitive engagement. Moreover, 354 students of class X, class XI, and class XII in Social Sciences majors from five State Senior High Schools in Jember involved as the reasearch sample. Data were analyzed by usng two-way Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) using the SPSS 23 for Windows program. The findings indicated that there was a significant difference in student engagement level based on gender ($0.05 > 0,000$) and grade ($0.05 > 0,000$). The score of student engagement of female students (mean = 3.66) was higher than that of male students (mean = 3.46). Student engagement score in grade X (mean = 3.71) was higher than in grade XI (mean = 3.53) and grade XII (mean = 3.43). Researchers suggested the educators to do the right learning planning by paying attention to differences of student characteristics to achieve historical learning goal. For further researcher, it recommends to examine the factors causing female students and other students who are in the lower classes to have a higher level of student engagement.

Index Terms: Student Engagement, Gender, Grade, and History subject

1 INTRODUCTION

The 21st century education directing to the development of the Industrial Revolution 4.0 requires students to work hard and independently by having initiative to manage and use time efficiently (Aberšek, 2017). The goal is to produce graduates who are ready to face the challenges of the times and increasingly advanced jobs (Mustapha, 2017). Therefore, it is necessary to have a change in the educational paradigm in order to realize this goal. According to Reigeluth (2009) about education in this information era, the change in the new paradigm have several principles, namely: (1) specific design and diversity; (b) initiative and self-regulation; (c) collaborative and emotional development; and (d) comprehensive and integrated. Educators can apply the new paradigm as an effort to create learning that leads to student centered learning. Learning by applying the student centered learning approach directs students to be able to reconstruct their knowledge independently (Attard, Di Lorio, Geven, & Santa, 2010). The application of student centered learning that has not been optimal has become one of the problems in learning history in Indonesia. In general, educators are constrained in planning learning design, especially in preparing the instrument of authentic assessment and the application of scientific approach (Umamah, 2014). These problems affect the level of student engagement and student learning outcome. Student centered learning is closely related to student engagement. Students who are able to play independently can increase their involvement in learning (Glowa & Goodell, 2016; Goldman, 2017) Based on recommendation from previous studies, this study aims to know the level of student engagement, especially for all components involved in education field. According to Olson and Peterson (2015), by knowing the level of student engagement, the school can create programs that facilitate students to increase motivation, maintain relationships with schools, strengthen ownership of schools, and increase student participation. The educators will get the benefit in the form of guidelines for evaluating learning activities. Therefore, educators will know whether the learning design that has been compiled and applied can make students play an active role or not. Student engagement is a term used to identify the student involvement in activities in the school

environment including the learning process in class (Finn, 1989). Some previous researchers found that the high level of student engagement would positively influence learning outcomes and the quality of education (Coates, 2010; Dotterer & Lowe, 2011; Fredricks, Blumenfeld, & Paris, 2004; Zhang, Hsu, Kwok, Benz, & Bowman -Perrott, 2011). According to Fredricks et al. (2004), the researches over the past 10 years have proven that student engagement is an important factor for the success of student learning and is associated with the risk of dropping out of school. Another opinion says that student engagement is a multidimensional construct which consists of three main components, namely behavioral engagement, emotional engagement, and cognitive engagement (Fredricks, Blumenfeld, & Paris, 2004; Sharkey, Sukkyung, & Schnoebelen, 2008; Zaff et al., 2011). Other researchers then developed three components such as research from Reeve & Tseng (2011) and Veiga 2016 who added agentic engagement as the fourth component in student engagement. Research from van Rooij et al. (2017) also added intellectual engagement as the fourth component in student engagement. Interactive learning, peer relationships, and social skills are one of the influential factors in developing student involvement effectively in learning (Zepke & Leach, 2010). This study used three components of student engagement based on classification (Fredricks et al., 2004) including (1) behavioral engagement; (2) emotional engagement and (3) cognitive engagement. Behavioral engagement is a component that relates to student behavior carried out in the school environment and in the class. According to Hospel et al. (2016), behavioral engagement is shown by participating in the learning process, obeying educator's orders and school rules, carrying out activities that are not useful, disturbing behavior, and skipping. Emotional engagement is related to students' feelings that are internal and usually difficult to be observed (Ansong, Okumu, Bowen, Walker, & Eisensmith, 2017). These feelings include a sense of interested in learning, boredom, happiness, sadness, and anxiety. Emotional engagement also includes a sense of belonging and feeling as a part of the school such as good relations with educators and other students (Fredricks et al., 2004). The relationship between students and educators also

affects emotional engagement whether students feel comfortable and happy as well as having high enthusiasm or vice versa (Conner, 2016). Cognitive engagement refers to the students' flexibility in solving problems, the tendency to work hard, and having a positive way on facing failures (Connell & Wellborn, 1991 in Fredricks et al., 2004). Students with high cognitive involvement will have the desire to be involved in the learning process and try to master certain material and skill (Fredricks et al., 2004). Several factors can affect the high or low level of student engagement. Fredricks et al. (2004) suggested three factors that influence student engagement, namely (1) school-size, (2) classroom context, and (3) individual needs. In addition, the characteristics owned by students can also have an impact on the level of student engagement (Amir, Saleha, Mohd jelas, Ahmad, & Hutkemri, 2014; Shernoff, Csikszentmihalyi, Shneider, & Shernoff, 2003). Previous researches on student engagement showed that the level of student engagement of male and female students has significant differences (Fernández-Zabala, Goñi, Camino, & Zulaika, 2015; Teoh, Abdullah, Roslan, & Daud, 2013; Lam et al., 2012). Female students got a higher student engagement score than male students. Female students did fewer behaviors such as disturbing. In addition, female students also had higher perseverance (Kenney-Benson, Pomerantz, Ryan, & Patrick, 2006). According to Bikar, Marziyeh, & Pourghaz (2017), male and female students have different academic motivations. Another opinion states that these results do not always occur in various countries. According to King's (2016) research result, it was found that there was no significant difference in the level of student engagement between female students and male students in the Philippines. The Grade Level of students affects their student engagement. Previous research found that students with young age and older age had significant differences in the level of student engagement (Amir et al., 2014; Fernández-Zabala et al., 2016). Students in lower grade at young age tend to have a high level of student engagement. According to Amir et al. (2014) as students get older, they feel that the learning process is no longer fun. The researchers were interested in studying student engagement based on gender and grade because this study has not been found in Indonesia, especially in history learning. Many studies on student engagement in Indonesia have been conducted to find out the relationship with other variables, or it is only limited to descriptive studies with small samples. Based on the above arguments, the objectives of this study were: (1) to analyze the level of student engagement on the history subject of senior high school students in Jember regency, (2) to analyze the comparison of student engagement levels based on gender and grade on historical subject of senior high school students in Jember regency.

RESEARCH METHODS

The research type was descriptive comparative. In this study, the researchers used descriptive statistical analysis to obtain information about the level of student engagement with the interpretation of the mean score in the table below.

Table 1. Interpretation of Mean Score

No.	Range of Mean	Level
1.	1.00-2.32	Low
2.	2.33-3.67	Intermediate
3.	3.68-5.00	High

(Ameer, 2013)

Inference statistical analysis was performed to obtain data on the comparison of the dependent variable, namely the level of student engagement on two independent variables, namely gender and grade. The inference statistical analysis technique used to test the research hypothesis was a two-way Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA). The dependent variable of this study was student engagement that consisted of three components, namely behavioral engagement, emotional engagement, and cognitive engagement. The sampling technique used in this study was random sampling technique. The sample was students from five senior high schools in Jember regency. The total sample was 354 students consisting of 177 male students and 177 female students. Whereas based on Grade, that number consisted of 118 students of Grade X, 118 students of Grade XI, and 118 students of Grade XII. The grade chosen is the grade of Social Sciences majors.

Table 2. Description of Research Sample

No	Description	Number of Samples	Percentages %
Gender			
	Male	177	50%
	Female	177	50%
Grade			
	XI	118	33,3%
	XI	118	33,3%
	XIII	118	33,3%

The instrument of this study was adapted from student engagement instruments developed by Blumenfeld and Fredricks (2005), namely School Engagement Measure (SEM) -MacArthur. The statements contained in the School Engagement Measure (SEM) -MacArthur were 19 items, including 5 behavioral engagement statements, 6 emotional engagement statements and 8 cognitive engagement statements. There were 16 items of positive statement and 3 items of negative statement in this instrument. Cronbach's alpha test for 30 samples showed an alpha value of 0.840 > rtable 0.444. It showed that the overall questionnaire items had high reliability.

Table 3. Analysis of Research Instrument Reliability

No.	Component	Statement	Alpha Cronbach Score
1.	Behaviour	Item 1	0.834
2.		Item 2	0.846
3.		Item 3	0.835
4.		Item 4	0.831
5.		Item 5	0.828
6.	Emotional	Item 6	0.835
7.		Item 7	0.825
8.		Item 8	0.833
9.		Item 9	0.827
10.		Item 10	0.834
11.		Item 11	0.846
12.	Cognitive	Item 12	0.830
13.		Item 13	0.827
14.		Item 14	0.840
15.		Item 15	0.828
16.		Item 16	0.829
17.		Item 17	0.829
18.		Item 18	0.828
19.		Item 19	0.834

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Student engagement in this study referred to three components, including (1) behavior engagement; (2) Emotional engagement and (3) Cognitive engagement. Data on student engagement levels are explained in the table below.

Table 3. Student Engagement Level

Component	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Behaviour engagement	354	1,60	5,00	3,86	0,59	High
Emotional engagement	354	1,00	5,00	3,53	0,65	Intermediate
Cognitive engagement	354	1,00	4,88	3,28	0,71	Intermediate
Mean Total	354	2,04	4,82	3,56	0,50	Intermediate

Based on the table above, it is known that behavioral engagement is the highest ability with a mean score of 3.86 (SD = 0.59). While the lowest ability is cognitive engagement with a mean score of 3.28 (SD = 0.71). In total, the student engagement of students in Jember regency is 3.56 (SD = 0.50). This level is still in the intermediate stage. The following will explain the results of the analysis on each student engagement component based on gender and Grade.

Table 4. Student Engagement Level based on Gender and Grade

Student Characteristic	Component	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Male	Behavioural	3.76	0.60	High
	Emotional	3.52	0.74	Intermediate
	Cognitive	3.10	0.71	Intermediate
Total		3.46	0.52	Intermediate
Female	Behavioural	3.97	0.57	High
	Emotional	3.55	0.56	Intermediate
	Cognitive	3.47	0.66	Intermediate
Total		3.66	0.47	Intermediate
Grade X	Behavioural	4.07	0.50	High
	Emotional	3.73	0.56	High
	Cognitive	3.38	0.64	Intermediate
Total		3.71	0.41	High
Grade XI	Behavioural	3.88	0.53	High
	Emotional	3.47	0.62	Intermediate
	Cognitive	3.24	0.73	Intermediate
Total		3.53	0.48	Intermediate
Grade XII	Behavioural	3.68	0.67	High
	Emotional	3.41	0.74	Intermediate
	Cognitive	3.23	0.75	Intermediate
Total		3.43	0.57	Intermediate

Based on gender, statistical descriptive results showed the mean score of female student engagement (mean = 3.66 & SD = 0.47) is higher than male students (mean = 3.46 & SD = 0.52). While based on the grade level, it shows that the mean score of student engagement of grade X students is 3.71 (SD = 0.42). It has the highest level of student engagement compared to Grade XI of 3.53 (SD = 0.48) and Grade XII of 3.43 (SD = 0.58). Based on the table above, the behavior of male students (mean = 3.76 & SD = 0.60) and women (mean = 3.97 & SD = 0.57) have the highest level compared to emotional and cognitive. The next will be discussed the level of student engagement based on the grade level. Grade X has the highest behavioral level (mean = 4.07 SD = 0.50) compared to grade XI and XII. The emotional level of Grade X students is the highest (mean = 3.73 SD = 0.62) compared to Grade XI and XII. While the cognitive stage of grade X (mean = 3.38 SD = 0.64) is the highest, and the lowest is Grade XII.

Table 5. Statistical Description of Student Engagement in each item

No	Statement	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
1.	Obedying all regulations in class and school	354	1	5	3.84	0.97
2.	Involving in school activities	354	1	5	4.16	0.95
3.	Not Serious in accomplishing the tasks	354	1	5	3.70	1.04
4.	Paying attention on learning process well	354	1	5	3.86	0.80
5.	Accomplishing the tasks on time	354	1	5	3.76	0.89
6.	feeling comfortable with the school environment	354	1	5	3.90	0.97
7.	Having passion in doing the school tasks	354	1	5	3.42	0.93
8.	Being happy at school / class	354	1	5	3.83	0.94
9.	Being interested in doing school tasks	354	1	5	3.21	0.93
10.	Being happy at school / class	354	1	5	3.73	0.98
11.	Getting bored at school / class	354	1	5	3.15	1.12
12.	Re-checking the school tasks before submitting	354	1	5	3.34	1.15
13.	Studying at home though there is no exam	354	1	5	2.77	1.08
14.	Trying to watch TV dealing with learning material	354	1	5	3.12	1.32
15.	Trying to understand the content of the book when reading	354	1	5	3.69	1.01
16.	Reading additional book to get information about education (learning material)	354	1	5	3.01	1.06
17.	When they do not understand something when	354	1	5	3.50	1.07

No	Statement	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
18.	they are reading, they try to find out many times to understand the content of the book	354	1	5	3.36	1.02
19.	Communicating about school activities with their family or other people	354	1	5	3.51	1.16

Based on the table above, the level of student engagement is shown in item number two with a mean number of 4.16 (SD = 0.95) regarding the student involvement in school which could be done through the activities of school organization and extracurricular program that were required to follow. The lowest level of student engagement is shown in item number 13 with a mean of 2.77 (SD = 1.08). The lowest item is about the student involvement in learning beside at school. It is a reflection that students had low motivation in an effort to improve their competence. Student engagement is an important factor for students to achieve good learning outcomes (Fredricks et al., 2004). The higher the level of student engagement is, the higher the achievement of their learning outcomes. Low level of student engagement can have an impact on the risk of dropping out of school. According to Fredricks et al. (2004), the level of student engagement can be influenced by several factors including: (1) school-size, (2) classroom context, and (3) individual needs. These factors become the cause of student engagement on historical subject of Senior High School students at the intermediate level Jember regency. The next step is to describe the information about the differences in student engagement based on gender and grade level. The data will be described in the table below.

Table 6. Two-way Multivariate Analysis of Variance

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df
Gender	0.917	10.524 ^b	3.000	348.000
Grade Level	0.912	5.463 ^b	6.000	696.000

Based on the table above, the significance value of differences in student engagement based on gender and grade is 0.000 (<0.05). It can be concluded that there was a significant difference in the level of student engagement based on gender and grade on historical subject of Senior High School students in Jember regency. Furthermore, the result of tests of Between-Subjects Effects will be presented to determine the differences in each student engagement component based on gender and grade.

Table 7. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Gender	Behavioural	4.030	1	4.030	12.604	0.000
	Emotional	0.295	1	0.295	0.711	0.400
	Cognitive	12.800	1	12.80	27.377	0.000
Grade Level	Behavioural	7.801	2	3.901	12.198	0.000
	Emotional	6.983	2	3.492	8.402	0.000
	Cognitive	2.692	2	1.346	2.879	0.058

Based on the table above, focusing on gender variable, the significance value of the behavioral engagement component is 0,000, the emotional engagement component is 0.400, and the cognitive engagement component is 0,000. Male and female students had significant differences in the components of behavioral engagement and cognitive engagement. Whereas, based on the emotional engagement component, there was no significant difference between male and female students. The differences in Grade level show that the significance value of the behavioral engagement component is 0.000, the component of emotional engagement is 0.000, and the component of cognitive engagement is 0.058. Based on these results, it can be concluded that Grade X, Grade XI, and Grade XII students had significant differences in the components of behavioral engagement and emotional engagement. While for the cognitive engagement component, there was no significant difference. Then a Post Hoc test was conducted to compare each student engagement component at each grade level.

Table 8. Post Test of Hoc Tukey HSD

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	
Behavioural Engagement	Grade X	Grade XI	0.144	0.074	0.125
		Grade XII	0.348	0.074	0.000
	Grade XI	Grade X	-0.144	0.074	0.125
		Grade XII	0.203	0.074	0.017
	Grade XII	Grade X	-0.348	0.074	0.000
		Grade XI	-0.203	0.074	0.017
Emotional Engagement	Grade X	Grade XI	0.257	0.084	0.007
		Grade XII	0.321	0.084	0.000
	Grade XI	Grade X	-0.257	0.084	0.007
		Grade XII	0.064	0.084	0.729
	Grade XII	Grade X	-0.321	0.084	0.000
		Grade XI	-0.064	0.084	0.729
Cognitive Engagement	Grade X	Grade XI	0.142	0.089	0.249
		Grade XII	0.161	0.089	0.168
	Grade XI	Grade X	-0.142	0.089	0.249
		Grade XII	0.019	0.089	0.975
	Grade XII	Grade X	-0.161	0.089	0.168
		Grade XI	-0.019	0.089	0.975

Based on the Post Hoc test table, it is known that based on the behavioral engagement component, Grade X and Grade XI students had no significant difference (0.125). Grade X and

Grade XII students had a significant difference (0,000). Furthermore, Grade XI and Grade XII students had a significant difference with a significance value (0.017). Based on component of emotional engagement, Grade X and Grade XI students had significant difference with a significance value (0,007). Grade X and Grade XII students had a significant difference (0,000). Grade XI and Grade XII students did not have a significant difference (0.729). Finally, there was no significant difference in the cognitive engagement component of Grade X and Grade XII students (0.249). There are no significant differences between Grade X and Grade XII students (0.168). Grade XI and Grade XII students also had no significant difference (0.975), so the overall component of cognitive engagement did not have a significant difference between Grade X, Grade XI, and Grade XII students. Previous research found that based on gender, a significant difference was found in the components of behavioral engagement and emotional engagement. However, no significant difference was found in the cognitive engagement component (Amir et al., 2014; Fernández-Zabala et al., 2016). According to Amir et al. (2014), female students were better at doing assignments, paying attention to educators during learning, preparing learning activities, and having better relationships with educators. According to Teoh et al. (2013), female students had more activities during the learning process. A research from Kenney-Benson et al. (2006) found that female students rarely carried out behaviors that disrupted other students in the class. In addition, female students had higher perseverance compared to male students. The low level of student engagement is characterized by a lack of learning strategies owned by male students (Ghazvivi and Khajehpour, 2011). In addition, male students also spend less time to learn compared to female students (Wagner, Schober, & Spiel, 2008; Xu, 2006). Relationships with peers also affect the level of student engagement on male students. According to King (2016), peers who have a negative impact will make these students also have negative behavior in school. Grade X, Grade XI, and Grade XII students had significant differences in the components of behavioral engagement and emotional engagement. While for the cognitive engagement component, there was no significant difference between Grade X, Grade XI, and Grade XII students. These results showed a difference in the component of cognitive engagement. Previous research said that based on grade, a significant difference contained in all components including behavioral engagement and cognitive engagement (Amir et al., 2014; Fernández-Zabala et al., 2016). By increasing their age, students felt that activities in school or learning in class were no longer fun (Amir et al., 2014). According to Fernández-Zabala et al. (2015), young students have good social support from their environment compared to older students. The social support is given from parents and from educators at school.

CONCLUSIONS

The results indicated that (1) there was a significant difference in the level of student engagement based on gender. Female students got higher score compared to male students; (2) there was a significant difference in the level of student engagement based on grade. Students who were at the lower grade level got higher score. Male students needed to use their study time wisely, to avoid behaviors that could harm themselves and others, and to establish good relationships with peers, educators, and their school. Educators, especially

in history subject, had to be able to utilize various appropriate approaches in order to increase the interest and involvement of students in learning. Students at a higher-grade level had less involvement. Therefore, the school and educators needed to create comfortable condition for students in the school environment and in the class. In addition, students at a higher-grade level needed to be given more social support, especially by educators. Thus, a good relationship would be established between students and educators (Puji & Umamah, 2018). The factors of different gender and grade of students had to be considered properly; so that, the historical learning objectives for all students could be achieved. For other researchers, it is recommended to examine the relationship between student engagement and influencing factors, especially on historical subjects.

REFERENCES

- [1] Amir, R., Saleha, A., Mohd Jelas, zalizan, Ahmad, A. R., & Hutkemri. (2014). Students ' Engagement by Age and Gender: A Cross-Sectional Study in Malaysia. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 21(10), 1886–1892. <https://doi.org/10.5829/idosi.mejsr.2014.21.10.85168>
- [2] Ansong, D., Okumu, M., Bowen, G. L., Walker, A. M., & Eisensmith, S. R. (2017). The role of parent, classmate, and teacher support in student engagement: Evidence from Ghana. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 54(February), 51–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2017.03.010>
- [3] Attard, A., Di Iorio, E., Geven, K., & Santa, R. (2010). Student-centred learning - Toolkit for students, staff and Higher Education Institutions. Learning.
- [4] Coates, H. (2010). Development of the Australasian survey of student engagement (AUSSE). *Higher Education*, 60(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-009-9281-2>
- [5] Conner, T. (2016). Relationships: The Key to Student Engagement. *International Journal of Education and Learning*, 5(1), 13–22. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.14257/ijel.2016.5.1.02>
- [6] Dotterer, A. M., & Lowe, K. (2011). Classroom Context, School Engagement, and Academic Achievement in Early Adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 40(12), 1649–1660. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-011-9647-5>
- [7] Fernández-Zabala, A., Goñi, E., Camino, I., & Zulaika, L. M. (2016). Family and school context in school engagement. *European Journal of Education and Psychology*, 9(2), 47–55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejeps.2015.09.001>
- [8] Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School Engagement: Potential of the Concept, State of the Evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(1), 59–109. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059>
- [9] Hospel, V., Galand, B., & Janosz, M. (2016). Multidimensionality of behavioural engagement: Empirical support and implications. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 77, 37–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2016.02.007>
- [10] King, R. B. (2016). Gender differences in motivation, engagement and achievement are related to students' perceptions of peer—but not of parent or teacher—attitudes toward school. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 52, 60–71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2016.10.006>

- [11] Puji, R. P. N., & Umamah, N. (2018). Edmodo Multimedia: Supporting Technology for Media Learning at Higher Education. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.3.1.9>
- [12] Reeve, J., & Tseng, C. M. (2011). Agency as a fourth aspect of students' engagement during learning activities. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 36(4), 257–267. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2011.05.002>
- [13] Shernoff, D. J., Csikszentmihalyi, M., Shneider, B., & Shernoff, E. S. (2003). Student engagement in high school classrooms from the perspective of flow theory. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 18(2), 158–176. <https://doi.org/10.1521/scpq.18.2.158.21860>
- [14] Subakti, Y. R. (2010). Paradigma Pembelajaran Sejarah Berbasis Konstruktivisme. *Journal Seri Pengetahuan Dan Pengajaran Sejarah*, 24(1), 38–70.
- [15] Teoh, H. C., Abdullah, M. C., Roslan, S., & Daud, S. (2013). An Investigation of Student Engagement in a Malaysian Public University. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 90(InCULT 2012), 142–151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.07.075>
- [16] Umamah, N. (2014). Kurikulum 2013 dan Kendala yang Dihadapi Pendidikan dalam Merancang Desain Pembelajaran Sejarah, 172–179.
- [17] van Rooij, E. C. M., Jansen, E. P. W. A., & van de Grift, W. J. C. M. (2017). Secondary school students' engagement profiles and their relationship with academic adjustment and achievement in university. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 54, 9–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2017.01.004>
- [18] Veiga, F. H. (2016). Assessing Student Engagement in School: Development and Validation of a Four-dimensional Scale. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 217(351), 813–819. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.02.153>
- [19] Zaff, J. F., Kawashima-Ginsberg, K., Lin, E. S., Lamb, M., Balsano, A., & Lerner, R. M. (2011). Developmental trajectories of civic engagement across adolescence: Disaggregation of an integrated construct. *Journal of Adolescence*, 34(6), 1207–1220. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2011.07.005>
- [20] Zepke, N., & Leach, L. (2010). Improving student engagement: Ten proposals for action. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 11(3), 167–177. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787410379680>
- [21] Zhang, D., Hsu, H. Y., Kwok, O. man, Benz, M., & Bowman-Perrott, L. (2011). The impact of basic-level parent engagements on student achievement: Patterns associated with race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status (SES). *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 22(1), 28–39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1044207310394447>