

Student Engagement and Academic Performance of Students of Partido State University

Armando P. Delfino
ardel1975@gmail.com

Faculty of Education, Partido State University, Philippines

Received: 8 January 2019

Accepted: 10 May 2019

Published: 30 May 2019

ABSTRACT

This research determined the extent of student engagement at Partido State University and analyzed the factors affecting student engagement. Moreover, it investigated the correlation between student engagement and academic performance. The study used descriptive-correlational method. A teacher made questionnaire was used to gather data. The general weighted average for two semesters were used to determine the academic performance of the respondents. Focused group discussion was used to validate the data obtained from the questionnaires. A total of three hundred and five students from the College of Education took part in the study. Mean and ranking, Pearson moment correlation, and multiple regression were used to treat the data. The study revealed that the level of student engagement along behavioral, emotional and cognitive engagements were high with a mean of 2.84. It was found out that academic performance of the respondents was very good (GWA=1.83). The correlational analysis found that teacher ($r=.125$, $p=.029$), school ($r=.143$, $p=.013$), and family factors ($r=.106$, $p=.028$) were positively related to student engagement, while the Multiple Linear Regression analysis revealed that there was relatively low percentage of variance (1.8%) but shows that the factors were significant predictors of student engagement $F(3, 301)=2.905$. Furthermore, it was found out that behavioral, emotional and cognitive engagements were positively correlated to the academic performance of the students. The teacher, the school, and the parents should have strong collaboration to provide more opportunities for students to maximize their university engagement.

Keywords: *academic performance, behavioral engagement, cognitive emotional, emotional engagement*

INTRODUCTION

Student engagement is one of the important constructs that is used to understand the behavior of the student towards the teaching-learning process. Understanding the behavior of students in the academic institutions will provide a glimpse of how the instructions and academic practices are going on in the university. As such, it could be used as a powerful tool by the teachers and academic supervisors to design an effective pedagogical techniques to maximize the learning experiences of the students. The data on student engagement has the advantage of providing information on what students are actually doing. The data has a broader significance for the management of institutions, students and academic programmes. Rather than work from assumptions or partial anecdotal reports about student activities, institutions can make decisions based on more objective information. Information about student activities would provide institutions with valuable information for marketing and recruitment and help them become more responsive to student learning needs. Only with accurate and reliable information on what students are actually doing can institutions move beyond taking student activities for granted. (Coates, 2005).

Student engagement refers to a meaningful engagement throughout the learning environment. It is best understood as a relationship between the student and the school, teachers, peers, instruction and curriculum (Martin and Torres). The term has its historic roots in a body of work concerned with student involvement, enjoying widespread currency particularly in North America and Australasia, where it has been firmly entrenched through annual large scale national surveys (Trowler, 2010).

Student engagement has three dimensions which are behavioral, emotional, and cognitive. Behavioral engagement refers to student's participation in academic and extracurricular activities. Emotional engagement refers to student's positive and negative reaction to peers, teachers and school. While cognitive engagement talks about student's thoughtfulness and willingness to master difficult skills (Fredericks, et al., 2004).

The theory of Student Involvement stressed that the greater the student's involvement in college, the greater will be the amount of

student learning and personal development, (Astin, 1984). The productive engagement is an important means by which students develop feelings about their peers, professors, and institutions that give them a sense of connectedness, affiliation, and belonging, while simultaneously offering rich opportunities for learning and development (Bensimon, 2009). The time and energy students devote to educationally purposeful activities is the single best predictor of their learning and professional development. Those institutions that more fully engage their students in the variety of activities that contribute to valued outcomes of college can claim to be of higher quality compared with other colleges and universities where students are less engaged (Kuh, 2001).

It has been identified as a primary variable in understanding dropout, particularly as a gradual process operating in a student's life and influencing that final decision to withdraw (Jimerson et al., 2009) and has also been viewed as one of the keys to addressing problems such as low achievement, boredom and alienation, and high dropout rates, (Frederick, et al, 2004). Moreover, It has been linked to the improved academic performance and it has repeatedly demonstrated to be a robust predictor of achievement and behavior in the schools (Appleton, Christenson, & Furlong, 2008).

Student engagement is not only beneficial to academic status of the school but to its financial life too. As described by Markwell (2007) at a time when universities and colleges are increasingly focused on the importance of outreach to alumni and other potential friends of the institution^[1] for the purpose of greatly increasing philanthropic support for higher education,^[1] it is becoming more widely recognized that how engaged students are and feel themselves to be during their student years will have a great bearing on how connected and supportive towards the institution they are likely to be in later years.

The aforementioned gained will never become a reality without the competent teachers who possessed the expertise of the subject matter, pedagogical knowledge and excellent inter-personal skills. As pointed by Umbach and Wawrzynski (2005), faculty do matter. The educational context created by faculty behaviors and attitudes has a dramatic effect on student learning and engagement. Institutions where faculty create an environment that emphasizes effective educational practices have students

who are active participants in their learning and perceive greater gains from their undergraduate experience. The quality of student relationship with their teachers was found to be the most important factor that affects student engagement (Groves et. al, 2015). Similarly, Umbach and Wawryznski (2005) argued that teacher-student interactions are the most important factor in encouraging student learning and seemed to challenge teachers and institutions to place a higher value on this particular role. Equally important are the institutional supports that are vital in encouraging the student to be actively engaged. As stressed by Coates (2005), institutions need to provide students with the appropriate resources^[1]and opportunities to make possible and promote specific kinds of interactions. This may involve campus libraries having sufficient space for students to work collaboratively, curricula and assessment that compel certain standards of performance or activities around campus that prompt students to reflect on the ethics and practices of their learning.

Coates (2007) stressed that there is growing recognition of the importance of understanding student engagement and the problem of disengagement in tertiary institutions. Investigating factors affecting engagement and disengagement can provide insights into student performance, progression and retention. Assessment of engagement is potentially useful when evaluating the quality of student learning experiences and making decisions about resource provision, course content and delivery.

The seriousness of the university to deliver academic excellence would hardly be realized without a constant review of its academic practices. The review should be done comprehensively and collaboratively with the inputs coming from the important stakeholders of the university. Student engagement survey is one of the best tools that can provide the needed information because it provides a means to examining the whole student experience. Second, there is an important intrinsic value to engagement for university students and teachers. Last but not the least, studying engagement provides a means of getting information on what students are actually doing, as opposed to what they are supposed or presumed to be doing. Information on actual activities is important, as it helps manage the quality and productivity of university education (Coates, 2006).

The growing importance of understanding the learning behaviors of the students and the need to revisit the academic practices of the university in making the instruction responsive to the needs of the students necessitates this study. This study determined the extent and analyzed the correlations between the student engagement and the academic performance of students of Partido State University for school year 2017-2018. Specifically, the study determined the level of the student engagement and the academic performance of students of Partido State University. It also identified and analyzed the factors affecting the engagement of students. In addition, it determined the significant relationship between student engagement and academic performance of students of Partido State University?

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

The study used descriptive-correlational study to describe and determine the relationship between student engagement and their academic performance.

Respondents

The researcher used a purposive sampling method. The respondents of the study were the three hundred and five students from the College of Education (Bachelor of Elementary and Secondary Education programs) of Partido State University.

Instrument

A teacher made questionnaire was used to gather data from the respondents on the level of engagement and the factors affecting their engagement. The questionnaire was subjected validity and to Cronbach Alpha to determine its reliability. The General Weighted Average for two semesters were used to determine the academic performance of the respondents.

Procedure

The researcher distributed the questionnaires to the students after securing approval from the Dean of College of Education. Another letter was given to the University registrar to access the official grades of the respondents for two semesters.

Data Analysis

The data was treated using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Specifically, the following statistical tools were used: frequency count, mean, Pearson moment correlation, and multiple regression. Focused group discussion was used as a means to get additional information and validate the data obtained from the questionnaire.

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

3.1. Level of Student Engagement

Table 1-A shows that the behavioral engagement of the students in the university was high (2.97). Among its indicators, getting a good grade was rated very high with a mean of 3.62. It was followed by staying up on the readings with a mean of 3.27 (high) and received prompt written or oral feedback from faculty on the academic performance with a mean of 3.20 (high). While the three lowest rated indicators were raising my hand in class with a mean of 2.33 (low), participating activity in a small group discussion with a mean of 2.47 (low) and doing all the homework problems with a man of 2.77 (high).

Table 1-A: Level of Behavioral Engagement

| Indicators | Frequency | | | | WM | QI |
|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-------------|-----------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | |
| 1. Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussion. | 5 | 79 | 160 | 61 | 2.91 | H |
| 2. Raising my hand in class. | 26 | 181 | 65 | 31 | 2.33 | L |
| 3. Participating in or small group discussions. | 31 | 134 | 105 | 35 | 2.47 | L |
| 4. Doing all the homework problems. | 12 | 112 | 114 | 67 | 2.77 | H |
| 5. Coming to class every day. | 1 | 58 | 146 | 100 | 3.13 | H |
| 6. Taking good notes in class. | 1 | 64 | 150 | 90 | 3.08 | H |
| 7. Getting a good grade. | 0 | 22 | 74 | 207 | 3.62 | VH |
| 8. Staying up on the readings. | 4 | 45 | 122 | 134 | 3.27 | H |
| 9. Received prompt written or oral feedback from faculty on your academic performance. | 0 | 34 | 177 | 94 | 3.2 | H |
| 10. Come to class without completing readings or assignments | 0 | 48 | 191 | 66 | 3.06 | H |
| 11. Making sure to study on a regular basis. | 1 | 107 | 143 | 53 | 2.82 | H |
| 12. Doing well on a test. | 8 | 64 | 149 | 83 | 3.01 | H |
| Average | | | | | 2.97 | H |

Legend :

| | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|
| 1.0-1.7 – Very Low | 1.8-2.5 – Low | 2.6-3.3 – High | 3.4-4.00 – Very High |
|--------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|

As seen in table 1-B the cognitive engagement of the students in university was high with a mean of 2.77. Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from previous sources was rated very high with a mean of 3.4. It was followed by applying course materials to my life with a mean of 3.3 (high), looking over class notes between classes to make sure I understand the materials with a mean of 3.23 (high), and finding ways to make the course interesting to me with a mean of 3.2 (high). The indicators that received low ratings were used e-mail to communicate with an instructor and discussed ideas from readings or classes with others outside class both with a mean of 2.09 (low), discussed ideas from readings or classes with faculty members outside of class with a mean of 2.3 (low), and used an electronic medium to discuss or complete an assignment with a mean of 2.34 (low).

Table 1-B: Level of Cognitive Engagement

| Indicators | Frequency | | | | WM | QI |
|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-------------|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | |
| 1. Made a class presentation | 2 | 75 | 150 | 76 | 2.99 | H |
| 2. Prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in. | 9 | 93 | 144 | 57 | 2.82 | H |
| 3. Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from previous sources. | 0 | 30 | 132 | 141 | 3.4 | VH |
| 4. Put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussion. | 18 | 111 | 109 | 66 | 2.73 | H |
| 5. Used an electronic medium to discuss or complete an assignment. | 2 | 61 | 84 | 156 | 2.34 | L |
| 6. Discussed ideas from readings or classes with faculty members outside of class. | 53 | 142 | 76 | 34 | 2.3 | L |
| 7. Putting forth effort. | 31 | 173 | 69 | 29 | 2.32 | L |
| 8. Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor. | 71 | 156 | 57 | 21 | 2.09 | L |
| 9. Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor. | 6 | 83 | 160 | 54 | 2.85 | L |
| 10. Work harder than you thought you could do to meet an instructor's standards or expectations. | 12 | 115 | 114 | 63 | 2.76 | L |
| 11. Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class. | 60 | 176 | 50 | 19 | 2.09 | L |
| 12. Going to the professor's office hours to review assignments of tests, or to ask questions. | 10 | 155 | 104 | 33 | 2.53 | L |
| 13. Thinking about the course between class meetings. | 2 | 71 | 145 | 84 | 3.03 | H |
| 14. Finding ways to make the course interesting to me. | 3 | 49 | 153 | 100 | 3.15 | H |
| 15. Looking over class notes between classes to make sure I understand the materials. | 0 | 43 | 149 | 113 | 3.23 | H |
| 16. Applying course materials to my life. | 0 | 37 | 150 | 118 | 3.3 | H |
| 17. Finding ways to make the course relevant to my life. | 1 | 45 | 151 | 108 | 3.2 | H |
| Average | | | | | 2.77 | H |

Legend:

| | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|
| 1.0-1.7 – Very Low | 1.8-2.5 – Low | 2.6-3.3 – High | 3.4-4.00 – Very High |
|--------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|

Table 1-C shows that the emotional engagement of students in the university was high (2.73). Among its indicators, having fun in class was the highest with a mean of 3.29. It was followed by talking about career plans with a faculty member or adviser with a mean of 3.15 (high) and worked with faculty members on activities other than the course work with a mean of 3.14 (high). On the other hand, the three indicators that received lowest rating were having serious conversation with students who are very different in terms of their religious, political opinions or personal values with a mean of 1.99 (low), really desiring to learn the materials with a mean of 2.26 (low) and tutored or taught other students paid or voluntary with a mean of 2.31 (low).

Table 1-C: Level of Emotional Engagement

| Indicators | Frequency | | | | WM | QI |
|---|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-------------|----------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | |
| 1. Included diverse perspective in class discussions or writing assignments. | 7 | 77 | 119 | 96 | 3.02 | H |
| 2. Worked with other students on projects during class. | 23 | 87 | 116 | 74 | 2.8 | H |
| 3. Worked with classmates to prepare class assignments. | 16 | 93 | 114 | 76 | 2.84 | H |
| 4. Tutored or taught other students paid or voluntary. | 51 | 147 | 68 | 38 | 2.31 | L |
| 5. Participated in a community-based project as part of a regular course. | 32 | 147 | 77 | 49 | 2.47 | L |
| 6. Had serious conversations with students who are very different from you in terms of their religious, political opinions, or personal values. | 92 | 144 | 48 | 20 | 1.99 | L |
| 7. Really desiring to learn the materials. | 53 | 141 | 87 | 23 | 2.26 | L |
| 8. Being confident that I can learn and do well in the class. | 12 | 118 | 100 | 75 | 2.78 | H |
| 9. Having fun in class. | 0 | 31 | 160 | 113 | 3.29 | H |
| 10. Worked with faculty on activities other than course work. | 0 | 56 | 146 | 102 | 3.14 | H |
| 11. Talked about career plans with a faculty member or adviser | 3 | 59 | 131 | 111 | 3.15 | H |
| Average | | | | | 2.73 | H |

Legend:

| | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|
| 1.0-1.7 – Very Low | 1.8-2.5 – Low | 2.6-3.3 – High | 3.4-4.00 – Very High |
|--------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|

Table 1-D shows that the overall engagement of students of Partido State University was high with a mean of 2.82. Among its three dimensions, behavioral engagement received the highest mean of 2.97. It was followed by cognitive engagement with a mean of 2.77 and emotional engagement with a mean of 2.73.

Table 1-D: Summary of Level of Student Engagement

| Dimensions of student engagement | Weighted mean | Qualitative Interpretation |
|----------------------------------|---------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Behavioral Engagement | 2.97 | High |
| 2. Cognitive Engagement | 2.77 | High |
| 3. Emotional Engagement | 2.73 | High |
| Average | 2.82 | High |

Legend:

| | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|
| 1.0-1.7 – Very Low | 1.8-2.5 – Low | 2.6-3.3 – High | 3.4-4.00 – Very High |
|--------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|

3.2. Academic Performance

Table 2 shows that the academic performance of students for school year 2017-2018 was very good with a general weighted average of 1.835.

Table 2: Academic Performance of Students

| Course | Average | Qualitative Interpretation |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Bachelor of Elementary Education | 1.86 | Very Good |
| 2. Bachelor of Secondary Education | 1.81 | Very Good |
| Average | 1.835 | Very Good |

Legend:

| | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| 1.00-1.80-Excellent | 1.81-2.61-Very Good | 2.62-3.42-Good | 3.43-4.19-Fair | 4.20-5.00 -Poor |
|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|

3.3. Factors Affecting Student Engagement

Table 3-A shows significant positive relationships between student engagement and the following factors: family factor, $r=.126$, $p=.028$; school factor, $r= .143$, $p= .013$ and teacher factor, $r= .125$, $p=.029$. The results suggest that family, school, and teacher factors positively contributed to higher student engagement. On the other hand, student factor slated no significant relationship to student engagement; $r= .106$, $p= .064$.

Table 3-A: Relationships Between Selected Factors and Student Engagement

| Selected Factors | Pearson Correlation | p-value | Interpretation |
|------------------|---------------------|---------|-----------------|
| Student factor | .106 | .064 | Not Significant |
| Family Factor | .126 | .028 | Significant |
| School Factor | .143 | .013 | Significant |
| Teacher Factor | .125 | .029 | Significant |

As seen in Table 3-B family, school and teacher factors could significantly predict student engagement. Furthermore, the model only explained a relatively low percentage of the variance which is 1.8% only shows that the model was not a significant predictor of student engagement $F(3, 301)=2.905$, $p=.055$. While family factor ($\beta = .083$, $p=.178$), school factor ($\beta = .090$, $p=.230$) and teacher factor ($\beta = .039$, $p=.606$) taken individually as regressors do not contribute significantly to the model.

Table 3-B: Standardized Regression Coefficients Predicting Student Engagement

| Selected Factors | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | p-value |
|------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|---------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| (Constant) | 2.299 | .213 | | 10.79 | .000 |
| Family Factor | .038 | .028 | .083 | 1.350 | .178 |
| School Factor | .064 | .054 | .090 | 1.202 | .230 |
| Teacher Factor | .032 | .061 | .039 | .516 | .606 |
| Adjusted r^2 | | | | .018 | |
| F | | | | 2.905 | |
| p-value | | | | 0.055 | |

3.4. Correlations between Student Engagement and Academic Performance

As seen in table 4 student engagement was found to be positively correlated with academic performance ($r=.166$) at 1% significance level. Furthermore, the behavioral ($r=.208$) and emotional ($r=.163$) engagements were found to be positively correlated with academic performance at 1% significance level, while, cognitive engagement ($r=.115$) was found to be positively correlated to the academic performance of the students at 5% significance level.

Table 4: Correlations between Student Engagement and Academic Performance

| | | Academic Performance | Interpretation |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Student Engagement | P. Correlation | .166** | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .004 | Significant |
| | N | 305 | |
| Dimensions of Student Engagement | | Academic Performance | Interpretation |
| 1. Behavioral | P. Correlation | .208** | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | Significant |
| | N | 305 | |
| 2. Emotional | P. Correlation | .163** | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .004 | Significant |
| | N | 305 | |
| 3. Cognitive | P. Correlation | .115* | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .044 | Significant |
| | N | 305 | |

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Discussion and Recommendation

Findings of the study revealed that the overall engagement of student was high (mean=2.85). Among the three dimensions behavioral engagement received the highest mean of 2.97, cognitive engagement was second with a mean of 2.82 and emotional engagement had the lowest mean of 2.75.

On behavioral engagement, the study revealed that the majority of the respondents were working to get good grades and they attained it by focusing and staying up on the lesson. Thus, they were appreciated by the prompt written or oral feedbacks from their professors on their academic performance. However, the study revealed that the majority of the respondents were not raising their hands during the discussion and had low rate of participation in small group discussion. In the conduct of the focused group discussion the respondents cited the fear of teacher, fear to commit mistakes and fear to be criticized by his/her classmates and teacher as major reasons for it. With regards to the low participation in small group discussion, they said that some teachers did not provide such activities. In subjects where class activities were conducted, majority of them said that they were not encouraged to participate because some of the group members were not contributing ideas and were just relying on to group leaders.

The respondents also mentioned the limited or absence of resources to help them accomplish their homework. They told that most of the times there were no available materials at the library that could be used to complete their assignments and other academic related activities. This observation was confirmed by the result of the latest accreditation process where the library received the lowest rating among the ten areas that were evaluated. They cited also the tasks that they were performing in their homes and the lack of resources in their houses as reasons for failing to do all the home works. Noting that majority of the respondents were living in rural areas and belonging to poor and average families, it is understandable that many of them had no access to Internet that could help them to accomplish their home works.

As revealed by the results, the cognitive engagement of the respondents was high. Specifically, the respondents worked well on papers or projects that required integrating ideas or information from previous sources, applying course materials to their life and looking over class notes between classes to make sure they understand the materials. This behavior is commendable and should receive considerable support from the university. It means that the respondents were determined to learn and try to put in practice what they have learned in their classes. On the other hand, the study suggests that the respondents had low engagement in the use of e-mail to communicate with thr instructor, and discussed ideas from readings with others such as

faculty members, friends and family members. The used email as a means of learning and communication with an instructor was difficult because of their financial situations. Majority of the respondents could not afford to have smart phones to connect to the Internet.

Some of those who owned smartphones have no Internet connection due to high cost and the availability of Internet services at their homes and thus could not use them for educational purposes. Meanwhile, the difficulties that they encountered could be attributed to the existing student-teacher relationships, availability of the faculty and the dedication of the faculty to extend help beyond classroom walls. Furthermore, there were no discussions about the grades and assignments with the faculty members. The low engagements of the respondents on these aspects were due to their fear to their teachers. There were teachers who got mad easily whenever the students approached them on any matter. Some teachers were offended by the queries of their students and sometimes threatened students to lower their grades.

On emotional engagement, the majority of the respondents wished to have fun in the class, talked or sought advised about career plans with faculty members and worked with faculty on activities other than course work. The results suggest that the respondents preferred to have a lively and dynamic classroom discussions. This is a great challenge to the Faculty College of Education to think of innovate teaching strategies that will suit to the changing nature of the learners. Furthermore, there was clear evidence that the students were recognizing the parental role of the faculty in terms of their career plans. The respondents were appreciative of the essence of the wisdom coming from the faculty. It requires that the consultation hours among faculty members should be strengthened in the College of Teacher Education.

It was disclosed further that there were limited opportunities among the respondents to exchange religious, political and personal views with their peers. Obviously, there was a need to encourage and conduct social gathering or academic conversation among students. These activities will not only promote camaraderie but most importantly critical thinking. The respondents did have the motivation to learn their lessons unfortunately the academic support of the university is limited. They complained about

the lack of reference materials at the library and slow Internet services of the university. They also found no time and opportunities to tutor or taught other students in detail at the college of education. The respondents said that they are busy with their academic and family obligations. Indeed there were no programs or initiatives in the college that promotes peer tutoring.

In the conduct of the focused-group discussion among the respondents, they said that they were inspired to participate and understood better the lesson if the teacher has a deep knowledge about the subject matter. If the teachers were not knowledgeable about the topic, they felt that the discussion has no direction, they were disappointed and they lost interest to do their study. They added that they were disappointed to the teachers who were just reading the books in front of the class. Likewise, they felt bored, sleepy and sometimes played games in the cellphones in classes whenever the teachers were lack of expertise of the subject being taught. The worst reaction that they revealed were quit the class or dropping the subject due to their displeasure to the teacher.

It was also disclosed that the instructional techniques that were used by the teachers have positively contributed to their active engagement in the class discussion and helpful in promoting high retention rate of the lessons, while the positive-teacher relationship has contributed to boost self-confidence and encourage them to think critically.

These findings was supported by the study conducted by DeVito (2016), where he found that the students became engaged when learning when they clearly comprehend the teacher's expectations and when they had the opportunity to take part in decision-making. The respondents also pointed out the importance of the teacher's instructional styles as important factor that encouraged them to become actively engaged. The study also revealed that the use of technology of the teachers contributed positively to the student's interest in learning.

This finding was similar to the results of the study conducted by Groves, et al. (2012), where they found that the relationships with their teachers was found to be the most important ones. The quality relationships with their teachers (Russel and Slater, 2011), approachability and the willingness of the teachers to engage with the students in class were among the major reasons (Case, 2007).

The second most influential factor was the school factors such as the accessibility to learning resources (library, technological support, and Internet services). The respondents pointed out that the limited and outdated books in the library have hindered their active engagement. They also said that the reference books listed by their teachers were not available at the library. This situation was worsened by the slow and most of the time no Internet connection in the campus. The respondents stressed that the limited source of information have contributed to their low engagement and disengagement.

The school climate such as tolerance of diversity, prevalence of bullying and so on have been highlighted by the respondents as hindering factors to their engagement. When they felt respected in spite of their physical outlook, religious affiliations, age and marital status they were more motivated to be actively engaged in the school's activities. This finding was consistent with the study of DeVito (2016), where the students said that the sense of belonging, fair treatment, free exercise of thoughts, and fair attitude that they felt in the school encouraged them to become more actively engaged in the school. Hence, the schools should provide high quality libraries and learning to encourage students to be engaged (Russell and Slater, 2011).

The third factor was family factor. The leading parameters identified in this factor were parental participation, family problems (large family size, family conflict, family break-up and parental illness) and separation from the family. The respondents said that the active participation of their parents to school and community activities have inspired them to become actively engaged in the school. This parental action was an indirect encouragement from their parents for them to become actively engaged. DeVito (2016) supported this finding when they found that the parents who held greater expectations regarding their children's academic achievements, were more active during in-class activities and expressed greater interest regarding participation in extra-curricular activities. Mutch and Collins (2012), reported that the importance of family engagement as an amplifier of student engagement. According to Coates and Dollineger (2016), institutional efforts, the role of teachers, student self-efficacy and self-motivation, pedagogy developments, and technology are the five main areas that could improve student engagement.

The study found out that the three dimensions of student engagement (behavioral, emotional and cognitive) were positively correlated to the academic performance of the students of Partido State University. These findings found support from the following studies: Urquijo and Extremera (2017), concluded that the more engaged students demonstrated higher academic achievement; Casuso-Holgado, et. al, (2013) hypothesized that the more engaged students would be more likely to have the best academic achievement; Gunuc (2014), where he found that cognitive, behavioral and emotional engagements predicted academic achievement and explained it with a rate of 10%; Roberts and McNeeze, (2007) discovered that as levels of student involvement/engagement increases, so does student retention in higher education; and Sbrocco (2009) where he was concluded that the student academic engagement can predict student academic achievement and added that the more engaged students demonstrated higher academic achievement.

CONCLUSION

The teacher and the school should have strong collaboration to provide the students avenues where they could maximize their engagement in the university. Maximizing student engagement would be helpful in providing meaningful learning experiences among the students.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of the study and after careful analysis of the data, the researcher recommends the following:

1. The faculty members should use more student-centered teaching strategies. These strategies should provide opportunities to students to maximize their engagement in the teaching and learning process.
2. Faculty members should be given subjects in line with their expertise so that maximum learning experiences could be provided to the students.
3. The university should design a training/seminar on effective student-centered teaching strategies for the faculty members.

4. The teacher should be transparent in computing the grades of the students. It means that the students should be given opportunities to see and challenge the computed grades. The faculty should give proper justification to the students who questioned his/her grades.
5. The university should improved library services by purchasing updated edition of textbooks and reference books. Internet services should also be improved because there are lots of useful information that are available in the worldwide web that could motivate the students to become academically engaged and develop innovative ideas.
6. The College of Education and faculty members should strengthened the consultation hours to accommodate the students who would be seeking clarifications and advises on the their academic endeavors.
7. Conduct a follow-up study, which will include more parameters on student engagement and variables on the factors affecting engagement.

REFERENCES

- Appleton, J. J., Christenson, S. L., & Furlong, M. J. (2008). Student engagement with school: Critical conceptual and methodological issues of the construct. *Psychology in the Schools, 45*(5), 369-386. doi:10.1002/pits.20303
- Astin, A. (1984). Student Involvement: A Developmental Theory for Higher Education. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*(5), 518-529. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/220017441_Student_Involvement_A_Development_Theory_for_Higher_Education.
- Casuso-Holgado, M. J., Cuesta-Vargas, A. I., Moreno-Morales, N., Labajos-Manzanares, M. T., Barón-López, F. J., & Vega-Cuesta, M. (2013). The association between academic engagement and achievement in health sciences students. *BMC Medical Education, 13*(1). doi:10.1186/1472-6920-13-33

- Coates, H. (2005). The value of student engagement for higher education quality assurance. *Quality in Higher Education*, 11(1), 25-36. doi:10.1080/13538320500074915
- Coates, H. (2006). Student Engagement in Campus-Based and Online Education. doi:10.4324/9780203969465
- Coates, H. (2007). A model of online and general campus-based student engagement. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 32(2), 121-141. doi:10.1080/02602930600801878
- DeVito, M. (2016). *Factors Influencing Student Engagement* (Unpublished master's thesis). Sacred Heart University, Fairfield, CT.
- 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. doi:10.3102/00346543074001059
- Groves, M., Sellars, C., Smith, J., & Barber, A. (2015). Factors Affecting Student Engagement: A Case Study Examining Two Cohorts of Students Attending a Post-1992 University in the United Kingdom. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 4(2). doi:10.5430/ijhe.v4n2p27
- Gunuc, S. (2014). The Relationship Between Student Engagement and Their Academic Achievement. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications*, 5(4). Retrieved from <http://www.ijonte.org/FileUpload/ks63207/File/19..gunuc.pdf>
- Handelsman, M., Briggs, W., Sullivan, N., & Towler, A. (2005). A Measure of College Student Course Engagement. *Journal of Educational Research*, 98, 184-191. Retrieved from <http://www.ijlter.org/index.php/ijlter/article/viewFile/367/167>
- Kuh, G. D. (2009). The national survey of student engagement: Conceptual and empirical foundations. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2009(141), 5-20. doi:10.1002/ir.283
- Martin, J., & Torres, A. (n.d.). User's Guide and Toolkit for the Surveys of Student Engagement: The High School Survey of Student Engagement and the Middle Grade School Survey of Student Engagement. *National Association of Independent Schools*. Retrieved from <https://www.nais.org/Articles/Documents/Member/2016/HSSSE-report-full-FINAL.pdf>.

- Mutch, C., & Collins, S. (2012). Partners in Learning: Schools' Engagement with Parents, Families, and Communities in New Zealand. *School Community Journal*, 22(1), 167-187. Retrieved from <http://www.adi.org/journal/2012ss/mutchcollinspring2012.pdf>
- National Survey of Student Engagement. (n.d.). *Encyclopedia of Counseling*. doi:10.4135/9781412963978.n559
- Roberts, J., & McNeese, M. (2010). Student Involvement/Engagement in Higher Education Based on Student Origin. *Research in Higher Education Journal*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242229206_Student_InvolvementEngagement_in_Higher_Education_Based_on_Student_Origin.
- Russell, B., & Slater, G. (2011). Factors that Encourage Student Engagement: Insights from a Case Study of First time' Students in a New Zealand University. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 8(1), 1-15. Retrieved from <https://ro.uow.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1083&context=jutlp>.
- Sbrocco, R. (2009). *Student Academic Engagement and the Academic Achievement Gap Between Black and White Middle School Students: Does Engagement Increase Student Achievement* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 2009). Minnesota: Minnesota Digital Conservancy.
- Trowler, V. (n.d.). Student Engagement Literature Review. *The Higher Education Academy*. Retrieved from https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/studentengagementliteraturereview_1.pdf.
- Umbach, P. D., & Wawrzynski, M. R. (2005). Faculty do Matter: The Role of College Faculty in Student Learning and Engagement. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(2), 153-184. doi:10.1007/s11162-004-1598-1
- Urquijo, I., & Extremera, N. (2017). Academic satisfaction at university: The relationship between emotional intelligence and academic engagement. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, 15(3), 553-573. doi:10.14204/ejrep.43.16064

Urquijo, I., & Extremera, N. (2017). Academic satisfaction at university: The relationship between emotional intelligence and academic engagement. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology, 15*(3), 553-573. doi:10.14204/ejrep.43.16064