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Abstract

This study aims to determine the effect of student engagement on student achievement in the School of Communication and Business, Telkom University. The aspects studied were cognitive engagement, emotional engagement and behavioral engagement in terms of student engagement. And the value of GPA for learning achievement. The method in this study uses descriptive analysis techniques with simple linear regression analysis. To collect the sample using incidental sampling technique through a questionnaire. This questionnaire was distributed to 361 students of the School of Communication and Business Telkom University. From the results of tests conducted, it is found that there is a relationship between student engagement on learning achievement. Where this relationship is perfectly positive correlation. And there is no significant effect between student engagement on learning achievement.
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1. Introduction

Education has a very important role in the development of human life. The importance of the role of education will certainly be able to print quality human resources or not. The quality of a successful education can be measured based on learning achievement (Susilawati et al., 2019). As the opinion of Izzaty et al. (2017) which says that learning achievement is a reflection of mastery of subjects determined by the grades or numbers given by the teacher. Success and learning achievement problems can be caused by several factors of motivation, family, campus environment and active organization (Saleh, 2014).

Achieving learning achievement requires student engagement. This is supported by previous research which results in student engagement as a variable that plays an important role in student learning and achievement (Gunuc, 2014; Wonglorsaichon et al., 2014; Mustika & Kusdiyati, 2015; Bariyah & Pierawan, 2017; Sa’adah & Arianti, 2018).

This study uses the object of students of the School of Business Communication Telkom University. This selection is based on the number of School graduates being ranked lowest in the order of 7 out of 7 Schools with 521 graduates in 2018. But in the following year an increase is in the 6th rank of 7 Schools with 729 graduates in 2019.
Table 1. Number of Graduates of Telkom University in 2018

| School                | Graduation Periods       | Total | Ranking |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------|---------|
|                       | March 2018 | August 2018 | November 2018 |       |
| Economy & Business    | 293         | 273         | 195           | 761   | 4      |
| Industrial Engineering| 68          | 306         | 232           | 606   | 6      |
| Informatics           | 152         | 138         | 357           | 647   | 5      |
| Creative Industries   | 168         | 52          | 559           | 779   | 3      |
| Applied Science       | 60          | 236         | 521           | 817   | 2      |
| Communication & Business | 262      | 146         | 113           | 521   | 7      |
| Electro               | 251         | 95          | 592           | 938   | 1      |

Source: BAA Telkom University

Table 2. Number of Graduates of Telkom University in 2019

| School                | Graduation Periods       | Total | Ranking |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------|---------|
|                       | April 2019 | August 2019 | November 2019 |       |
| Economy & Business    | 301         | 347         | 286           | 934   | 2      |
| Industrial Engineering| 67          | 323         | 365           | 755   | 5      |
| Informatics           | 155         | 124         | 427           | 706   | 7      |
| Creative Industries   | 119         | 47          | 668           | 834   | 3      |
| Applied Science       | 88          | 195         | 477           | 760   | 4      |
| Communication & Business | 242      | 291         | 196           | 729   | 6      |
| Electro               | 312         | 147         | 644           | 1103  | 1      |

Source: BAA Telkom University

Although there was an increase in the number of graduates, this increase was not too significant compared to the School of Economics and Business which in 2018 was ranked 4th with the number of 761 graduates and in 2019 it rose to No. 2 with 934 graduates. Furthermore, the number of graduates in the March 2018 period amounted to 262 people and continued to decline during the next 2 periods, namely in the August 2018 period by 145 people and in the November 2018 period by 113 people. However, in the following period there was a rapid increase during 2 consecutive periods, namely in the April 2019 period by 242 people and in the period of August 2019 there were 291 people but fell again in November 2019 to 196 people.
2. Literature Review

2.1 Student Engagement

Student engagement according to Trowler (2010) relates to the interaction between time, effort and other relevant resources invested by students and their institutions intended to optimize student experience and improve student learning outcomes and development and performance and institutional reputation. Then, Wijnia (2014) said are students who read and discuss problems using previous knowledge and common sense and finally formulate the problem for further independent learning after finding the answer they meet again in groups to discuss their findings. Furthermore, Bender (2017) said student engagement is students involved in learning, cognitive and emotional in the content to be studied.

The dimensions of student engagement are cognitive engagement, affective engagement, and behavioral engagement (Hart et al., 2011). Next in the opinion of Wonglorsaichon et al. (2014) is divided into three namely cognitive engagement, emotional engagement, and behavioral engagement. Other opinions also mention three dimensions of student engagement, namely behavioral engagement, emotional engagement and cognitive engagement (Martin & Torres, 2016). Behavioral engagement focuses on participation in academic and social activities. Emotional engagement focuses on the level and nature of positive and negative reactions to teachers, classmates, academics, and schools. Whereas cognitive engagement focuses on the level of student investment in learning. The following student engagement items will be used in this study (Table.3):

| Dimension               | Indicator                  | Item                                                                 |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Cognitive engagement    | Dedication to problem solving | When I have a problem, I try to solve it without feeling discouraged. |
|                         |                            | I'm not worried despite having a lot of homework.                     |
|                         | Dedication to Learning     | I study every subject as well as possible.                           |
|                         |                            | No matter how difficult the subject is, I never give up and try to understand it. |
|                         | Dedication to study plans  | I attach great importance to setting study goals.                      |
|                         |                            | I intend to plan my studies to achieve my study goals.                |
| Emotional engagement    | Positive Feelings          | I am happy when I go to campus.                                       |
|                         |                            | I am happy and enjoy what the teacher teaches.                        |
|                         | Part of the Campus         | I love my campus and have never thought of moving to another campus.  |
|                         |                            | I am glad that I am a campus member.                                  |
|                         | I realized the value of study | School is a place where I can learn new things.                      |
|                         |                            | I realize the value of learning.                                     |
### 2.3 Learning Achievement

Learning achievement according to Kaanklao & Suwathanpornkul (2018) is a learning achievement is the knowledge and abilities of individuals produced from the learning process that has been arranged by the teacher in accordance with a predetermined plan for a certain period of time. Then there are those who say the work done by someone until they can change their behavior for the better and better (Abdullah, 2019; Alamanda et al., 2019). Furthermore, the understanding belongs to Rosyd et al. (2019) states that learning achievement is the result of a learning activity that is accompanied by changes achieved by someone (students) expressed in the form of symbols, numbers, letters, and sentences as a measure of the level of student success with predetermined standardization and becomes perfection for students are good at thinking and doing.

Achievement of this learning achievement according to Saleh (2014) the success of students in the academic field is marked by academic achievement achieved, shown through the Achievement Index (IP) and the Cumulative Achievement Index (GPA). In addition, other opinions say achievements can be seen from the final exams, mid-year exams, quizzes, lab exams, independent study and tutorials (Al-Hariri & Al-Hattami, 2017). Or the opinion of Ahmed et al. (2018) also the results of other studies that use the CGPA or Cumulative Grade Point Average method to see the high and low achievements. The following learning achievement items are used in this study:

Table 4. Dimensions Learning Achievement

| Dimension          | Indicator     | Item               |
|--------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| Behavioral engagement | Preparation   | I always prepare my study items. |
|                    |               | I discuss lessons in preparation for learning new lessons. |
|                    | Dedication to learning | I listen carefully to my lecturer and get involved in classroom learning. |
|                    | Monitoring and Evaluation | I complete my assignments on time. |
|                    |               | I listen to other people when they give me feedback or comments about my study. |
|                    |               | I learn from my mistakes and try to fix them. |

Source: Wonglorsaichon et al. (2014)

Source: Ahmed et al. (2018)
3. Research Methodology

The research method used in this study is a quantitative method with the type of investigation is causal. The independent variable used in this study is Student Engagement by using the statement of Wonglorsaichon et al. (2014). The dependent variable in this study is Learning Achievement with Ahmed et al. (2018) measuring instrument. Measurements on the Student Engagement variable have 18 statement items and on Learning Achievement have 1 item. This research uses incidental sampling technique to determine the sample used with the population are students of the School of Communication and Business totaling 3680 people with a sample of 361 people based on Slovin sample.

The measurement scale uses a Likert scale of one to four. The use of a scale of one to four is based on the theory of Cooper & Schindler (2014) which says there is a central tendency error because appraisers are reluctant to give extreme assessments. This research uses primary and secondary data. The primary data of this study came from the results of the questionnaire and secondary data from the CPI data. The analysis technique used in this study was descriptive analysis, Spearman correlation test, classic assumption test with normality test, linearity test and heteroskedastic test and linear regression analysis.

4. Result and Discussion

4.1 Respondent’s Profile

Table 5 shows the demographic aspects in this study.

| Criteria     | Sub-criteria                  | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|--------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Gender       | Man                           | 109                   | 31.02%     |
|              | Woman                         | 252                   | 68.98%     |
| Age          | <20                           | 225                   | 63.43%     |
|              | >20                           | 136                   | 36.57%     |
| Major        | Communication science         | 184                   | 50.97%     |
|              | Business administration       | 144                   | 39.89%     |
|              | Public Digital Relation       | 33                    | 9.14%      |
| Force        | 2015                          | 3                     | 0.83%      |
|              | 2016                          | 14                    | 3.32%      |
|              | 2017                          | 61                    | 17.45%     |
|              | 2018                          | 181                   | 43.21%     |
|              | 2019                          | 102                   | 35.18%     |

Source: Processed by Authors, 2020

Based on the data obtained, based on the sex that dominates are women with 252 respondents or 68.98%. When viewed from age, those who dominated were <20 years old with 225 or 63.43%. Then, based on the department, communication science dominated with 184 or 50.97%. And the last, when viewed from the class, more dominated by the 2018 class of 181 or 43.21%.
4.2 Spearman Correlation Test

Spearman Rank Correlation Test, commonly abbreviated as Spearman, is used to measure the relationship between two variables based on rank. This analysis does not require data to be normally distributed, and suitable data to use is ordinal data (Herlina, 2019).

Table 6. Spearman Correlation Test Results

|       | X                  | Y                  |
|-------|--------------------|--------------------|
| X     | Correlation Coefficient | 1.000              |
|       | Sig. (2-tailed)     | 0.970              |
|       | N                  | 361                |
| Y     | Correlation Coefficient | 0.002              |
|       | Sig. (2-tailed)     | 0.970              |
|       | N                  | 361                |

Source: Processed by Authors, 2020

Based on the table above it can be concluded that the data in this study obtained 0.002 results which means that there is a perfect positive correlation, which means there is a direct relationship. Where the purpose of this is when student engagement goes up, learning achievement will also go up.

4.3 Simple Linear Regression Analysis Test

The analysis model in this study uses simple linear regression analysis. The results of the analysis is shown at Table 7.

Table 7. Simple Linear Regression Analysis

|       | B       | Sig  |
|-------|---------|------|
| 1     | (Constant) | 3.457 | .000 |
|       | Student Engagement | 0.002 | .568 |

Source: Processed by Authors, 2020

Based on Table 7 the following equation is obtained.

\[ Y' = a + bX = 3.457 + 0.030X \]

Based on the above equation it can be concluded that the regression coefficient for the independent variable is positive with a constant \( b \) of 3.457 which means an increase in the value of student engagement by one unit, the learning achievement increases by 0.030 one unit, and vice versa.

4.4 Determination Coefficient Test

After conducting the above test, a coefficient of determination test is performed with the aim of finding out how influential the student engagement variable is on learning achievement.
Based on the Table 8 that the value of the correlation coefficient or R is 0.030 and the value of the coefficient of determination or R Square is 0.001. So it can be concluded that the influence of student engagement on learning achievement is 0.1% and the remaining 99.9% is explained by other factors not used in this study.

4.5 **Hypothesis Testing**

The last test carried out was a hypothesis test. Following are the results of data processing using SPSS 25 (Table 9).

| Coefficients |
|--------------|
| Model        | B       | Std Error | Beta | t       | Sig   |
| (Constant)   | 3.457   | .249      |      | 14.421  | .000  |
| Student Engagement | .002    | .004      | .030 | .572    | .568  |

Based on the Table 9, it can be concluded that the value of t table> t arithmetic is 0.572> 1.966, H₀ is accepted, which means there is no significant influence between student engagement on learning achievement at the School of Communication and Business, Telkom University.

5. **Conclusion**

This research was conducted to determine the effect of student engagement on the learning achievements of the School of Communication and Business. The data in this study were obtained by distributing questionnaires to 361 students of the School of Communication and Business. Based on the test results obtained from the response den on student engagement get a percentage of 77.59% and is in the high category. This means that student engagement in the students of the School of Communication and Business is quite high. Furthermore, for learning achievement, the average GPA of students in the School of Communication and Business is 3.59 and is in the high achievement category. This means that learning achievement is good enough.

The results obtained are the relationship between student engagement on learning achievement. Initially this study wanted to examine the effect, but because it did not meet the requirements of one of the classic assumptions tests, namely the normality test, this study was changed to a study to see the relationship. Where research to see this relationship does not require normally distributed data. In addition, it can still be improved because there are still items from student engagement that are still below 70%. optimization can take the form of a quiz that is held suddenly without prior notice and not every meeting. This is done so that the awareness of students to prepare lessons before learning increases.
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