EDUKASIA: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran
Vol. 5, 1 (June, 2024), pp. 2581-2602
ISSN: 2721-1150 EISSN: 2721-1169

Identifying Key Predictors of Academic Engagement in Low-Performing Schools: The Interplay Between Social Context and Psychological Factors

Bulqia Mas'ud[1], Zulfianah Sunusi[2], Zuhdiah[3], Okky Naomi Sahupala[4]

[1] STAIN Majene, Indonesia; bulqiamasud@stainmajene.ac.id
[2] STAIN Majene, Indonesia; zulfianah.sunusi@stainmajene.ac.id
[3] STAIN Majene, Indonesia; zuhdiah@stainmajene.ac.id
[4] STAIN Majene, Indonesia; okkynaomi@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Academic Engagement;
Social Context Factors;
Psychological Factors

Article history:

Received 2024-04-27
Revised 2024-05-29
Accepted 2024-06-30

ABSTRACT

Research shows that students' academic engagement is influenced by both social and psychological factors. This study aims to explore which aspects of social context (family, school, and community), and psychological traits (self-efficacy, perseverance, and resilience) affect academic engagement. A quantitative approach with correlational design and multiple regression analysis was used. The research included 437 students from primary and junior high schools, focusing on 15 schools identified as having low to medium academic performance. The findings indicate that within the social context, family-related factors, particularly parental supervision, along with the number of teachers, are significant predictors of academic engagement. Among psychological factors, self-efficacy, perseverance, and resilience all positively influence engagement, with self-efficacy being the most significant. Overall, psychological factors were found to have a stronger impact on academic engagement than social factors. The study concludes that despite challenges such as socioeconomic disadvantages and limited support from schools and communities, students can still achieve better academic outcomes if they develop key psychological strengths. Providing interventions that promote self-belief and motivation can help students cultivate self-efficacy, perseverance, and resilience, which are critical for their future success. This highlights the importance of nurturing these traits to improve academic engagement and achievement.

Corresponding Author:
Bulqia Mas'ud
STAIN Majene, Indonesia; bulqiamasud@stainmajene.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

Academic engagement plays a pivotal role in shaping students' academic success, particularly in low-performing schools where various challenges may hinder students' educational outcomes. For

students in these schools, academic engagement is not merely a factor of individual effort or intelligence, but a complex construct influenced by a combination of psychological characteristics such as motivation, emotional well-being, and self-concept (Lubovsky, 2019) and social-contextual factors including family, peers, and teacher support (Dotterer & Lowe, 2011). Understanding how these factors interact is crucial for identifying effective strategies to foster academic engagement and improve educational outcomes in disadvantaged settings.

Most research about school disengagement analyzed in sociological perspective portrays the problem of educational inequity. A meta-analysis by Sirin (2005) identified low socioeconomic status as a major predictor of school disengagement, as it is closely tied to limited access to educational resources and poor school performance. Chung and Mason (2012) explained that disparities in family resources, including economic factors such as family income and school fees, significantly contribute to school dropout and disengagement. This disadvantaged situation contributes to poor academic achievement and motivation for attending school (Marks & McMillan, 2007).

Finn (1989) argued that engagement has appeared as the major theoretical model for understanding school dropouts. Engagement at school is also driven by students' behavior and attitude. Nevala et al. (2011) noted that disengagement, when accumulated over time, often leads to academic failure. The continuous disengagement initiated poor academic achievement that becomes a reason for students to continue or leave the school (Fredricks, Blumenfield, & Paris, 2004). Emotional, cognitive, and behavioral factors have all been identified as contributors to school disengagement, with motivation playing a critical role in determining whether students persist in or leave school (Fredricks et al., 2004). Some theories of motivation and engagement at school have been studied by many scholars such as Bandura's self-efficacy (Schunk & Pajares, 2009), self-determination theory (Deci and Ryan, 2000) self-theory and motivation (Dweck and Master, 2009), grit (Duckworth, 2007), resilience (Bernard, 2003), and interest (Schiefele, 2009). These theories highlight how students' psychological dispositions, including their sense of competence and emotional resilience, influence their academic engagement.

Hattie and Kang's (2020) integrated model of motivation offer a comprehensive understanding of the various factors influencing academic engagement. Their model encompasses five key dimensions: person, goals, task attributes, benefits, and costs. Personal dimensions such as self-efficacy, social support, and cognitive regulation are essential drivers of students' engagement. According to this framework, factors like self-regulation, motivation, and perceived competence are fundamental for students to stay engaged and motivated in their academic journey.

Reviewing the reasons for school dropouts can inform us of two different perspectives. According to Rumberger and Lim (2008) the two factors can be classified into individual characteristics of students and institutional characteristics such as family, school, and community factors. Individual characteristics or in current research claimed as psychological perspectives can be drawn from the theory of educational psychologies such as students' motivation, perseverance, resilience and self-theory. Meanwhile, institutional characteristics can be seen in the social contexts of the students, such as family socioeconomic status, school support, community factors.

Numerous research has addressed the causes of school engagement or disengagement. However, there has not been adequate research which concludes the major predictor of school engagement between two different perspectives particularly in disadvantaged students. Most research only explored both perspectives separately. Recent research conducted by Thorsen, Hansen, and Johansson (2021) informs us that despite the disadvantaged background, some students manage to succeed at school. Successful students show good academic resilience since they rely on perseverance, effort and

interest in school subjects (Thorsen et al., 2021). Therefore, the current study will specifically explore and compare the major predictor of academic engagement between social and psychological factors in disadvantaged academic circumstances and determine which domain contributes the most.

Research Questions

This study will propose the following research questions: 1) To what extent the individual characteristics influence academic engagement? 2) To what extent do social factors influence academic engagement? 3) Between psychological and social context domain, which is the major predictor of academic engagement

Hypothesis

In this study, the researchers hypothesize: 1) H1: Between three social context predictors, family related factor will be the highest predictor of academic engagement. 2) H2: Between three psychological predictors, resilience will be the major predictor of academic engagement. 3) H3: Psychological factors outweigh the social context factors in predicting academic engagement.

Understanding Academic Engagement

Academic engagement is a psychological investment and effort toward learning processes which involve understanding and mastering certain knowledge and skills (Newman, Wehlage, Lamborn, 1992). In addition, academic engagement is defined as connection of the effort and time students dedicate to educational activities (Conner, 2011). Mahdiuon, Salimi & Raeisy (2020) explained that academic engagement is influential factor of students' academic achievement and psychosocial development. Engagement also refers to the quality of students' concentration, participation and involvement in academic setting (Skinner, Kindermann, & Furrer, 2009). Student engagement is the quality of involvement of students with school activities (Skinner and Pitzer, 2012). In other words, Connell & Wellborn (1991) defined that engaged students are motivated, passionate, and focused. These conditions build an optimal situation for students to acquire more knowledge and skills. The opposed term of engagement has been named as disengagement or disaffection. Furthermore, disengaged students are more likely to perform poorly in their academic experiences and more likely to drop out of school (Connell & Wellborn, 1991).

Psychological Factors on Academic Engagement

The research questions will focus on personal traits such as self-efficacy, perseverance, and resilience. The first aspect to be measured is self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is an individual belief regarding his or her ability to succeed in designated level and situation (Bandura, 1997). Many studies prove that self-efficacy correlates with educational achievement and motivation (Schunk & Pajares, 2009). Students who feel more efficacious in their learning will show an engagement in self-regulation learning (Schunk & Pajares, 2009).

The second psychological aspect to be measured is perseverance. According to Duckworth (2007) perseverance refers to the ability to achieve goals with amount of effort, sticking with it overtime despite challenges and obstacles. Duckworth also argues that perseverance with passion equals grit (2016). A study conducted by Duckworth illustrates that gritty people are more expected to succeed than their peers who do not possess it (Duckworth, Peterson, Matthews, & Kelly, 2007). These results are most obvious in academic settings, where students with grit achieve better grades, higher educational engagement, and greater success in school and competition (Duckworth & Quinn, 2009).

The third aspect is resilience. Resilience is the ability to thrive and "bounce back" after experiencing negative, difficult, challenging situations or adversity and reappear with similar emotional wellbeing (Bernard 1996; Fuller, 1998). In an academic setting, some students can attain high academic achievement despite the difficulties and challenges they face. This type of student shows academic resilience. According to Fallon (2010, p.40), "academic resilience is defined as students' ability to deal effectively with setbacks, challenges, and pressure in the school over time." Academic resilience also refers to the capacity of individuals to sustain effort and act positively to challenging adversities and overcome difficult situations (Duckworth & Gross, 2014). Students who manage to be resilient although they perform poorly in the beginning show continuous improvement in their academic experience (Martin & Marsh, 2006). In addition, low socioeconomic and risk students who manage to be resilient show significant academic achievement (Fallon, 2010).

Social Context on Academic Engagement

The third research question will focus on family resources (financial, human, and social resources), school resources (facilities, teachers, practices), communities (neighborhood, social composition of the residents, community characteristics), and demographic. Chirtes (2010) argues the main causes of school dropouts are family poverty and the low-educational abilities of parents. The capacity of schools to make sure students enjoy learning becomes one of predictors of school engagement. Schools which fail to provide basic needs of students may contribute to the disengagement. School effectiveness is determined by the teacher quality, practices, and other facilities (Hoy, Tarter and Hoy, 2006). Moreover, numerous studies show characteristics of communities were related to dropout rates. Affluent neighborhoods provide better access to community resources which are hardly found in disadvantaged neighborhoods (Rumberger and Lim, 2008).

According to Jessor (1993), families, schools, and communities influence behaviors, attitudes, and educational performance. Moreover, Jessor (1993) argued that school performance such as curriculum, educational activities, school culture influence academic engagement of students. Student outcomes can also be accredited to the schools' characteristics and culture where students learn (Rumberger and Lim, 2008). The location of school (urban, suburban, and rural), school size, and type of school (public vs. private) also affect students' participation at school (Rumberger and Palardy, 2005).

In terms of family factors, parents who are involved in their children's academic experience such as building communication and discussion show better effect on students' academic achievements and behavior (McNeal Jr, 2014). In addition, parent participation, for instance helping to do homework and participating in school activities increases children's motivation at learning (Hill et.al, 2004). Furthermore, family structure also impacts on the students' engagement. Research proved that children who live in single parent families and stepfamilies have less educational monitoring and supervision compared to complete parent families which affect children's academic engagement at school (Astone & Mc Lanahan, 1991). Besides, of 72 research articles, about half of the studies found the dropping out cases were lower in smaller families compared to larger families since larger families may have fewer resources to support education (Rumberger and Lim, 2008).

Meanwhile, the community and neighborhood where students live also affect students' involvement at school. Generally, neighborhoods with poor quality results in higher dropout rates (Crane, 1991). Some studies also include community characteristics, for example socioeconomic status of the populations in the community, such as the composition white, gray, blue-collar jobs, people living in poverty or having high or low incomes (Rumberger and Lim, 2008).

2. METHODS

Research Design

This study applied quantitative research under correlational research design. The study aims to seek whether the independent variables (multiple factors) predict a dependent variable (academic engagement).

Participants, Data Collection and Procedure

The study conducted in West Sulawesi province which involved 437 students from different schools from primary to junior high school. The researcher visited 15 schools which indicate low to medium performance and asked the students to fill in the questionnaires. The data on schools' performances will be obtained from the National Accreditation Board of West Sulawesi.

Instrument and Measures

Academic disengagement as a precursor to dropout will be measured with SEI Scale (Appleton et al., 2006) containing 30 items. In the second research question, self-efficacy variable will be measured with self-efficacy for self-regulated learning scale by Usher, E. L., & Pajares, F. (2008) which contain 7 items. The perseverance predictor will be measured with six perseverance indicators with 5-point Likert scale by Duckworth, A. L., & Quinn, P. D. (2009). Meanwhile, academic resilience will be measured with ARS Scale (6 items) with a 7-point Likert Scale (Martin & Marsh, 2006). In terms of family background, we asked family socioeconomic status, family structure, dropout siblings, and abusive family members and parent supervision. For school background, we asked about school accreditation, operational fund, total teachers and teachers with certification. For community background, we asked about major adult occupation, whether community is exposed to violent behavior, commotion, and easy to find dropout people.

Reliability and Validity

The instrument for academic engagement has been validated, which is proved by the study conducted by Appleton et al. (2006). All the instruments for measuring individual characteristics have also been validated such as self-efficacy for self-regulated learning scale by Usher, E. L., & Pajares, F. (2008); perseverance indicator which is part of the grit scale has been validated in the study of Duckworth & Quinn (2009). Meanwhile, academic resilience, ARS Scale (6 items) has been validated in the study conducted by Martin & Marsh (2006). Furthermore, the instruments used to assess the social context of the students are not based on a Likert scale. These instruments are designed to gather responses about students' demographic backgrounds, including family and neighborhood conditions. For school-related information, responses are collected from school leaders, covering aspects such as school accreditation, the total number of teachers and certified teachers, school operational funds, and other available facilities.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Statistics

Demographic background of the students

Table 1. Gender

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Male	199	45.5
	Female	238	54.5
	Total	437	100.0

Table 2. Age

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	6.00	2	.5
	7.00	5	1.1
	8.00	4	.9
	9.00	5	1.1
	10.00	48	11.0
	11.00	50	11.4
	12.00	39	8.9
	13.00	54	12.4
	14.00	98	22.4
	15.00	105	24.0
	16.00	23	5.3
	17.00	4	.9
	Total	437	100.0

Based on the table above, the ratio between female and male in the population is 54,5%: 45.5 % with 238 girls and 199 boys. The age of the students is mostly between 10-15 years old. This means the sample of the study typically adolescents.

Family Characteristics

Table 3. Father Education

	Frequency	Percent
1.00	83	19.0
2.00	147	33.6
3.00	86	19.7
4.00	81	18.5
5.00	40	9.2
Total	437	100.0

1) not finish primary education,
2) primary education,
3) lower secondary education,
4) higher secondary education,
5) tertiary education.

Table 4. Mother Education

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	1.00	53	12.1
	2.00	165	37.8
	3.00	89	20.4
	4.00	80	18.3
	5.00	50	11.4
	Total	437	100.0

The table shows that predominantly in the population either father or mother only complete primary education with 33,6% and 37,8% people respectively. Only a small portion of fathers and mothers hold tertiary education and the least in the population with 9.2 % and 11.4 % consecutively.

Table 5. Father Occupation

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	1.00	28	6.4
	2.00	324	74.1
	3.00	33	7.6
	4.00	52	11.9
	Total	437	100.0

Table 6. Mother Occupation

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	1.00	119	27.2
	2.00	139	31.8
	3.00	132	30.2
	4.00	47	10.8
	Total	437	100.0

1. not working;
2. *blue collar*: personnel of agriculture, forestry, labor, and fisheries, production workers, operators of transportation equipment and manual workers,
3. *gray collar*: sales force and service workforce,
4. white collar: professionals, technicians; leadership, management and educational personnel and administrative staff;

The table describes the type of occupation that fathers mostly have is blue collar such as fisherman, farmer and hard labor with 74.1 %, while the mothers have relatively spread in the variance. Mothers work as blue collar, gray collar, and housewife with the percentage of 31.8%, 30,2%, and 27.2% consecutively.

Table 7. Father Income

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	1.00	275	62.9
	2.00	90	20.6
	3.00	40	9.2
	4.00	32	7.3
	Total	437	100.0

Table 8. Mother Income

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	1.00	294	67.3
	2.00	75	17.2
	3.00	38	8.7
	4.00	30	6.9
	Total	437	100.0

1. Low: Rp. 0–Rp. 1.500.000,
2. Moderate: Rp.1.500.00- Rp. 2.500.000,
3. High: Rp. 2.500.000- Rp.3.500.000,
4. Very High: more than Rp. 3.500.000.

The table shows that most families in the population have low income. The percentage of both father and mother who accentuate the lowest income, around Rp.0-1,500,000 are 62,9% father and 67.3% consecutively.

Table 9. Family Structure

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Single Parents	49	11.2	11.2	11.2
	Complete Parents	373	85.4	85.4	96.6
	Live with Extended Family	15	3.4	3.4	100.0
	Total	437	100.0	100.0	

The table displays that most students live in complete parents and some live with their single parents and extended family with the portion 85.4%, 11.2%, 3.4% respectively.

Table 10. Have Dropout Siblings

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	345	78.9	78.9	78.9
	Yes	92	21.1	21.1	100.0
	Total	437	100.0	100.0	

The table showed that 21.1% of students have dropout siblings.

School Background

Table 11. School Level

	Frequency	Percent
Junior High School	294	67.3
Primary School	143	32.7
Total	437	100.0

Table 12. School Type

	Frequency	Percent
State School	97	22.2
State Madrasah	35	8.0
Private Madrasah	305	69.8
Total	437	100.0

For the school level, the table displays there are 67.3% Junior High School students and 32.7% primary school students. Meanwhile, 22.2% of students from state school, 8% from state madrasah, and 69.8% from private madrasah.

Table 13. School Operational Fund

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	50M	57	13.0	13.0
	75M	200	45.8	45.8
	100M	145	33.2	33.2
	150M	35	8.0	8.0
	Total	437	100.0	100.0

School operational funds are categorized into 4 groups: 50 million below; 75 million below; 100 million below; and 150 million below. 45.8% of students go to school with operational fund 75 million below and 33.2% go to school with operational fund 100 million below.

Table 14. Total Teachers

	Frequency	Percent
8.00	34	7.8
10.00	53	12.1
12.00	60	13.7
13.00	24	5.5
15.00	65	14.9
20.00	71	16.2
22.00	58	13.3
24.00	37	8.5
25.00	35	8.0
Total	437	100.0

Table 15. Teacher with Certification

	Frequency	Percent
.00	43	9.8
3.00	36	8.2
4.00	24	5.5
5.00	62	14.2
6.00	77	17.6
7.00	10	2.3
9.00	113	25.9
11.00	37	8.5
12.00	35	8.0
Total	437	100.0

The data in Tables 14 and 15 highlight key trends in teacher distribution and certification. The majority of students (16.2%) have 20 teachers, followed by 14.9% with 15 teachers, while the least common count is 13 teachers (5.5%). In terms of certification, the highest proportion (25.9%) have nine certified teachers, whereas only 2.3% have seven. These findings indicate that most students experience a teacher count between 15 and 22, with varying levels of certification, underscoring potential disparities in access to qualified educators.

Community Characteristics

Table 16. Community_Occupation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	26	5.9	5.9	5.9
	2.00	322	73.7	73.7	79.6
	3.00	50	11.4	11.4	91.1
	4.00	39	8.9	8.9	100.0
	Total	437	100.0	100.0	

1. not working;
2. *blue collar*: personnel of agriculture, forestry, labor, and fisheries, production workers, operators of transportation equipment and manual workers,
3. *gray collar*: sales force and service workforce,
4. white collar: professionals, technicians; leadership, management and educational personnel and administrative staff;

Based on the table above, most students live in the neighborhood whose jobs are blue collar jobs with 73.7 % students and only 8.9% students who live in the community with white collar jobs.

Table 17. Exposed to Violent Behavior

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	15	3.4	3.4	3.4
	2.00	137	31.4	31.4	34.8
	3.00	285	65.2	65.2	100.0
	Total	437	100.0	100.0	

1.0 often, 2.00 sometimes, 3.00 seldom and never

The table informs us that most students living in the neighborhood are relatively secure without any violent behavior. Only 3.4% of students responded that they were exposed to violent behavior in the community where they live.

Table 18. Exposed to Commotion

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	89	20.4	20.4	20.4
	2.00	246	56.3	56.3	76.7
	3.00	102	23.3	23.3	100.0
	Total	437	100.0	100.0	

The table indicates that most students responded that they sometimes come across commotion, noise, party, and intoxication in the community. 20.4% of students responded that they often found many people involved in such commotions in their community.

Table 19. Easy To Find Dropout People

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	95	21.7	21.7	21.7
	2.00	146	33.4	33.4	55.1
	3.00	196	44.9	44.9	100.0
	Total	437	100.0	100.0	

The table shows that 21.7% of students chose that they often found dropout students in their neighborhood, 33.4% said that they sometimes found dropout students and 44.9% students never saw dropout people in the community.

Inferential Analysis
Correlational Analysis of Social Factors
Family-Related Factors

Table 20. Bivariate Correlation of All Variables

Variables	Academic Engagement	Edu_F	Edu_M	Occu_F	Occu_M	Income_F	Income_M	Family Structure	Dropout Siblings	Abusive Treat	Parent Supervision
Academic Engagement	1.000										
Edu_F	**.135****	1.000									
Edu_M	**.099***	.567**	1.000								
Occu_F	**.129****	.401**	.263**	1.000							
Occu_M	.064	.150**	.242**	.133**	1.000						
Income_F	-.021	.298**	.280**	.385**	.338**	1.000					
Income_M	-.026	.277**	.279**	.336**	.464**	.919**	1.000				
Fam_Structure	.020	.060	.032	.197**	-.081	-.015	.001	1.000			
Dropout Siblings	**-.105***	.168**	.175**	.046	.044	.043	.020	-.015	1.000		
Abusive Treat	.082	.009	.053	-.034	.075	.060	.064	-.034	.013	1.000	
Parent Supervision	**.216****	.294**	.268**	.132**	.063	.156**	.165**	-.030	.118*	.097*	1.000

The table shows the correlational analysis of family-related factors variables. Among the variables examined, five family-related factors were found to positively correlate with academic engagement: father's education (r = 0.134), mother's education (r = 0.99), father's occupation (r = 0.129), and parent supervision (r = 0.216). Parent supervision exhibited the strongest positive correlation, suggesting that higher levels of parental involvement in supervising their children are associated with greater academic engagement. Although the coefficients for father's and mother's education, as well as father's occupation, are relatively small, they still imply that parental socioeconomic and educational status plays a contributory role in shaping academic outcomes. These relationships emphasize the importance of a supportive and educationally enriched family environment in fostering academic success.

Conversely, the variable "dropout siblings" demonstrated a negative correlation with academic engagement (r = -0.105), indicating that students with siblings who have dropped out of school are less likely to remain engaged in their academic pursuits. This negative association suggests that having dropout siblings might contribute to a less encouraging academic atmosphere, potentially normalizing disengagement from educational activities within the family context. Such findings underline the broader influence of family dynamics on individual student behavior and performance.

While some variables, such as family income, family structure, and abusive treatment, appear to have weaker or nonsignificant relationships with academic engagement, their roles should not be entirely dismissed. It is possible that these factors exert indirect effects or interact with other variables in more complex ways. For example, the lack of a significant relationship between income and engagement might reflect the mediating influence of other variables, such as parental education or supervision.

In summary, the findings highlight the critical role of parental education, occupation, and involvement in fostering academic engagement, as well as the potential adverse effects of dropout siblings on student outcomes. These relationships provide a foundation for further exploration through multiple regression analysis, which can offer a more nuanced understanding of the relative importance and predictive power of each factor. By identifying key contributors to academic engagement, these insights can inform interventions aimed at enhancing student outcomes within diverse family contexts.

School-Related Factors

Table 21. Bivariate Correlational Analysis

Variables	Academic Engagement	School Accreditation	School Fund	Total Teacher	Teacher Certification
Academic Engagement	1				
School Accreditation	-0.029	1			
School Fund	**-0.099***	0.557**	1		
Total Teacher	**-0.177****	0.473**	0.357**	1	
Teacher Certification	0.001	0.358**	0.417**	0.481**	1
N	437	437	437	437	437

The table showed that in school-related factors school operational fund and total teacher that negatively correlated with academic engagement. It means the higher the operational fund the lower the engagement and the more teachers at school, the lower the engagement. The possible reasons why the correlation is surprising are the class- size factors. Schools that have bigger operational funds have large students. When they have large students, it usually impacts the engagement. It also signifies why the more teachers, the lower the engagement or the less teacher, the higher the engagement. A possible reason is more teachers at school means more students to teach.

The table presents a bivariate correlation analysis of school-related factors and their relationship with academic engagement. The variables analyzed include Academic Engagement, School

Accreditation, School Operational Fund, Total Teacher, and Teacher Certification. These findings provide insight into the dynamics between institutional resources, staffing, and student engagement.

Notably, School Operational Fund (r = -0.099, $p < 0.05$) and Total Teacher (r = -0.177, **$p < 0.01$**) exhibit negative correlations with academic engagement. These results indicate that higher operational funding and a greater number of teachers are associated with lower levels of student engagement. While these findings may appear counterintuitive, they could reflect broader structural issues such as class size or resource allocation. Schools with larger operational budgets often serve larger student populations, which may limit personalized learning experiences and reduce individual engagement. Similarly, an increased number of teachers may correspond to higher student-teacher ratios, potentially diluting the quality of interactions between educators and students.

In contrast, the table reveals strong positive correlations among institutional factors. School Accreditation is positively correlated with School Fund (r = 0.557, p < 0.01) and Total Teacher (r = 0.473, p < 0.01), suggesting that accredited schools tend to have better funding and higher staff numbers. Furthermore, Teacher Certification is positively associated with School Accreditation (r = 0.358, p < 0.01), School Fund (r = 0.417, p < 0.01), and Total Teacher (r = 0.481, p < 0.01). These findings indicate that schools with more certified teachers are generally better resourced and adhere to higher institutional standards. However, the correlation between Teacher Certification and Academic Engagement (r = 0.001, $p > 0.05$) is insignificant, implying that teacher qualifications alone do not directly influence student engagement.

These results highlight the complex interplay between school resources and academic engagement. The negative correlation between funding, teacher numbers, and engagement suggests that these resources may not translate into better outcomes without addressing mediating factors such as class size and teacher-student interaction. At the same time, the strong positive relationships between institutional quality indicators (e.g., accreditation, funding, and teacher certification) suggest that these factors are interconnected and collectively reflect school performance and standards.

Community-Related Factors

Table 22. Community Characteristics

Variables	Academic Engagement	Community Occupation	Exposed to Violent Behavior	Exposed to Commotion	Easy to Find Dropout People
Academic Engagement	1				
Community Occupation	**.094***	1			
Exposed to Violent Behavior	.027	.108*	1		
Exposed to Commotion	.074	.015	.157**	1	
Easy to Find Dropout People	.089	.074	.077	.000	1
N	437	437	437	437	437

The presented table provides a bivariate correlation analysis of community characteristics and their relationship with academic engagement. The variables analyzed include Academic Engagement,

Community Occupation, Exposure to Violent Behavior, Exposure to Commotion, and Ease of Finding Dropout Individuals. The results reveal a small but statistically significant positive correlation between Community Occupation and Academic Engagement (r = .094, $p < 0.05$), suggesting that the hierarchical nature of occupations, has a modest influence on students' academic involvement. This implies that communities with a higher proportion of professionals may provide an environment that better supports academic engagement, possibly due to greater emphasis on educational attainment and availability of resources and vice versa.

Correlational Analysis of Motivational-Psychological Factors

Descriptive Statistics of Motivational-Psychological Factors

Table 23. Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Academic_Engagement	3.2078	.33226	437
Self_Efficacy	4.6481	.82380	437
Perseverance	3.6986	.71228	437
Resilience	3.9483	.63778	437

Based on the mean value, overall, the population shows a moderate to good engagement, good self-efficacy, perseverance, and resilience.

Table 24. Correlations

		Academic_ Engagement	Self_Efficacy	Perseverance	Resilience
Academic_ Engagement	Pearson Correlation	1			
Self_Efficacy	Pearson Correlation	**.558****	1		
Perseverance	Pearson Correlation	**.530****	.565**	1	
Resilience	Pearson Correlation	**.538****	.467**	.609**	1
	N	437	437	437	437

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

The correlation analysis reveals significant positive relationships between the three independent variables, **self-efficacy, perseverance, and resilience** and **academic engagement**, indicating that students with higher levels of these motivational-psychological attributes tend to be more engaged in their academic pursuits. Among these factors, self-efficacy exhibits the strongest correlation with academic engagement (r = .558, $p < 0.01$), suggesting that students who have a strong belief in their capabilities are more likely to actively participate in learning activities and persist in achieving their academic goals. This finding underscores the importance of fostering self-efficacy through strategies such as goal setting, positive reinforcement and providing opportunities for mastery experiences.

In addition to self-efficacy, perseverance and resilience also show strong positive correlations with academic engagement. Perseverance (r = .530, $p < 0.01$) reflects a student's ability to maintain effort and focus despite challenges, highlighting the critical role of determination in sustaining academic involvement. Similarly, resilience (r = .538, $p < 0.01$) suggests that students who can adapt to and recover from academic setbacks are more likely to remain engaged and committed to their educational goals.

These findings emphasize the need for educational interventions that promote perseverance and resilience, such as stress management programs and mentorship support, to enhance student engagement and academic performance.

Multiple Regression Analysis of Social Factors

Among the social factors, which one has the strongest influence on academic engagement? What is the highest predictor of academic engagement?

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.296[a]	.088	.071	.32031	.088	5.143	8	428	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Community_Occup, Bos_Fund, Dropout_Siblings, PSMean, Occu_F, Total_Teacher, Edu_M, Edu_F

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	4.221	8	.528	5.143	.000[b]
	Residual	43.912	428	.103		
	Total	48.134	436			

a. Dependent Variable: Academic_Engagement

b. Predictors: (Constant), Community_Occup, Bos_Fund, Dropout_Siblings, PSMean, Occu_F, Total_Teacher, Edu_M, Edu_F

The model summary table presents the results of a multiple regression analysis assessing the influence of social factors on academic engagement. The model yields an R value of .296, indicating a weak relationship between the independent variables and academic engagement. The R-square value of .088 suggests that the independent variables collectively explain only 8.8% of the variance in academic engagement. This relatively low explanatory power implies that other factors outside the examined predictors may play a significant role in influencing students' academic engagement.

The ANOVA table provides further insights into the overall fit of the regression model. The F-ratio of 5.143, with a significance level of $p < .0005$, confirms that the model is statistically significant, meaning that the independent variables, when considered together, have a meaningful impact on academic engagement. However, despite the statistical significance, the low R-square value indicates that the practical significance of the model is limited. These findings suggest the need for additional research to identify other influential factors that could better explain variations in academic engagement.

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	3.048	.100		30.628	.000	2.853	3.244
	Edu_F	.011	.017	.042	.667	.505	-.022	.044
	Edu_M	.001	.016	.004	.062	.950	-.030	.032
	Occu_F	.015	.024	.034	.635	.526	-.032	.062
	Dropout_Siblings	-.040	.038	-.049	-1.044	.297	-.116	.035
	Parent Supervision	**.069**	.020	.173	3.493	**.001**	.030	.108
	Bos_Fund	-.010	.020	-.023	-.467	.641	-.050	.031
	Total_Teacher	**-.009**	.003	-.146	-2.907	**.004**	-.015	-.003
	Community_Occup	.036	.023	.076	1.575	.116	-.009	.082

a. Dependent Variable: Academic_Engagement

The regression analysis presented in the table examines the influence of various social variables on academic engagement. The findings indicate that among the included predictors, **parent supervision** and **total teacher** significantly contribute to explaining variations in academic engagement. Parent supervision exhibits a positive and statistically significant effect on academic engagement (B=0.069, p=0.001), with a standardized coefficient (β=0.173), indicating that increased parental supervision is associated with higher levels of academic engagement. This suggests that family-related factors, particularly parental involvement, play a crucial role in fostering students' academic engagement.

On the other hand, the number of teachers has a negative and statistically significant impact on academic engagement (B=−0.009, p=0.004), with a standardized coefficient (β=−0.146). This finding implies that an increase in the total number of teachers may be associated with a slight decrease in academic engagement, possibly due to variations in teacher-student relationships or classroom management dynamics.

Other variables, such as father and mother education, father occupation, dropout siblings, school funding, and community occupation, did not demonstrate statistically significant relationships with academic engagement, as indicated by their non-significant p-values. These results suggest that while social factors such as parental education and community involvement are important, they may not directly influence academic engagement in the studied context.

The study concludes that family-related factors, particularly parental supervision, serve as the major predictor of academic engagement. This supports the alternative hypothesis (H1), emphasizing the importance of family support in shaping students' academic outcomes. These findings highlight the need for interventions and policies aimed at enhancing parental involvement to improve academic performance and engagement among students.

Multiple Regression of Psychological Factors

Among three psychological factors (self-efficacy, perseverance, resilience) what is the major predictor of academic engagement?

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics: R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.653[a]	.426	.422	.25251	.426	107.299	3	433	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Resilience, Self_Efficacy, Perseverance

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	20.525	3	6.842	107.299	.000[b]
	Residual	27.609	433	.064		
	Total	48.134	436			

a. Dependent Variable: Academic_Engagement

b. Predictors: (Constant), Resilience, Self_Efficacy, Perseverance

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients: B	Unstandardized Coefficients: Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients: Beta	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B: Lower Bound	95.0% Confidence Interval for B: Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	1.716	.085		20.198	.000	1.549	1.883
	Self_Efficacy	**.133**	.018	.330	7.342	**.000**	.097	.169
	Perseverance	**.082**	.023	.175	3.493	**.001**	.036	.127
	Resilience	**.145**	.024	.278	5.952	**.000**	.097	.193

a. Dependent Variable: Academic_Engagement

The model indicates a good level of prediction with R .653. The R Square value .**426** also informs that independent variables explain 42.6% of the variability of our dependent variable, academic engagement. Based on the coefficient table, all variables predict academic engagement, in which self-efficacy shows major contribution to dependent variables. Hence, the study rejects H2, the alternative hypothesis as resiliency is the strongest predictor of psychological aspects toward academic engagement. Research proves that self-efficacy is the strongest predictor among perseverance and resilience ($\beta = 0.330$, $p < 0.001$).

Multiple Regression Analysis of All Variables.

Between social and psychological factors, which predictor contributes the most?

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics: R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.665[a]	.443	.428	.25121	.443	30.704	11	425	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Community_Occup, Bos_Fund, Dropout_Siblings, Resilience, PSMean, Occu_F, Total_Teacher, Edu_M, Self_Efficacy, Edu_F, Perseverance

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	21.314	11	1.938	30.704	.000[b]

Residual	26.820	425	.063		
Total	48.134	436			

a. Dependent Variable: Academic_Engagement

b. Predictors: (Constant), Community_Occup, Bos_Fund, Dropout_Siblings, Resilience, ParentSupervision, Occu_F, Total_Teacher, Edu_M, Self_Efficacy, Edu_F, Perseverance

The multiple regression analysis conducted in this study reveals significant insights into the factors influencing academic engagement. The model explains 44.3% of the variance (R^2 = 0.443, adjusted R^2 = 0.428), indicating a moderate to strong predictive capacity. The ANOVA results (F = 30.704, p < 0.001) confirm that the overall model is statistically significant, suggesting that the predictors collectively contribute to variations in academic engagement. These findings highlight the importance of examining both psychological and social factors to understand students' engagement in learning.

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	1.723	.113		15.223	.000	1.501	1.945
	Self_Efficacy	**.127**	.018	.314	6.891	**.000**	.091	.163
	Perseverance	**.079**	.024	.169	3.310	**.001**	.032	.126
	Resilience	**.141**	.024	.270	5.776	**.000**	.093	.189
	Bos_Fund	.004	.016	.009	.221	.825	-.028	.035
	Total_Teacher	-.003	.002	-.049	-1.237	.217	-.008	.002
	Edu_F	.014	.013	.051	1.045	.297	-.012	.040
	Edu_M	.005	.012	.019	.432	.666	-.019	.030
	Occu_F	-.009	.019	-.020	-.485	.628	-.046	.028
	Dropout_Siblings	-.055	.030	-.067	-1.812	.071	-.114	.005
	PSMean	.017	.016	.041	1.034	.302	-.015	.048
	Community_Occup	.011	.018	.023	.598	.550	-.025	.047

a. Dependent Variable: Academic_Engagement

The coefficient analysis provides further clarity on the relative influence of each predictor. Among the variables analyzed, psychological factors emerge as the strongest contributors to academic engagement. Specifically, Self-Efficacy (β = 0.314, p < 0.001) is the most influential predictor, underscoring the role of students' confidence in their own abilities in driving their engagement. Additionally, Resilience (β = 0.270, p < 0.001) and Perseverance (β = 0.169, p = 0.001) significantly impact engagement, indicating that students who demonstrate persistence and the ability to overcome challenges are more likely to stay engaged in their academic pursuits. These findings suggest that fostering motivational-psychological predictors is crucial in promoting academic success.

The final model demonstrates that psychological factors play a more significant role in predicting academic engagement than social factors, as suggested by Hypothesis 3 (H3). When psychological factors are considered, social factors do not provide a statistically significant contribution to predicting students' academic engagement. This finding emphasizes the critical influence of psychological attributes on students' ability to engage with learning activities. Understanding this dynamic is crucial in exploring both the causes of academic disengagement and strategies to enhance student engagement.

The researcher draws a key conclusion from these findings: despite facing socio-economic challenges and limited support from schools and communities, students can still achieve meaningful educational progress when interventions focus on developing their psychological strengths. Programs that foster intrinsic motivation, such as helping students build self-belief, can empower them to

overcome external barriers. This is particularly important for students who face disadvantages but have the potential to thrive academically when equipped with certain psychological traits.

Characteristics such as **self-efficacy**, **perseverance**, and **resilience** are identified as essential for success. These qualities enable students to maintain engagement and persevere through challenges, even in the face of limited external resources or support. Therefore, enhancing these psychological capacities through targeted interventions can play a pivotal role in supporting students' long-term academic success and overall educational outcomes.

Discussion

The results of this study emphasize the complex interactions between social and psychological factors that influence academic engagement. The correlational analyses and regression models highlight the critical roles of both external support systems and internal student attributes in fostering engagement.

Major Predictor Among Social Context Factors (Hypothesis 1)

Hypothesis 1 posited that among the social factors, parental supervision would be the strongest predictor of academic engagement. The results of the multiple regression analysis strongly support this hypothesis, confirming that parental supervision is indeed the major predictor of academic engagement in the social domain. These results are consistent with previous research, which has emphasized the vital role of parents in fostering an environment conducive to academic success by providing structure, guidance, and emotional support (Khoirunnisa & Purwandari, 2023; Rulida & Dioso, 2024).

Family-Related Factors

The significant positive correlations found between parental education, occupation, and supervision with academic engagement are consistent with prior research that underscores the importance of a supportive home environment in promoting academic success. Studies have shown that parental involvement, including supervision, plays a crucial role in students' academic outcomes by providing structure, resources, and emotional support (Khoirunnisa & Purwandari, 2023; Griffith, 2012). This study's finding that parent supervision has the strongest positive correlation with academic engagement further supports the assertion that engaged and active parenting fosters a better educational environment. On the other hand, the negative correlation between having dropout siblings and academic engagement suggests that family dynamics can create either a supportive or discouraging academic climate, which is aligned with previous studies that have highlighted the detrimental effects of negative family influences on student outcomes (Griffith, 2012).

School-Related Factors

In terms of school-related factors, the surprising negative correlations between school funding, teacher numbers, and academic engagement suggest that larger schools with more resources may face challenges in maintaining high levels of student engagement. This may be attributed to higher student-teacher ratios and reduced opportunities for personalized learning, which is supported by prior research (Rodriguez & Elbaum, 2014). Interestingly, the lack of a significant correlation between teacher certification and academic engagement suggests that while certified teachers may be essential for ensuring educational quality, their direct impact on engagement might be mediated by other factors, such as teaching methods and classroom interactions (Perry et al., 2010).

Community-Related Factors

Community factors also contributed to academic engagement, though their influence was weaker than that of family and school factors. The positive correlation between community occupation and academic engagement aligns with the notion that communities with a higher proportion of professionals may provide a more supportive environment for education. Previous studies have found that community support can influence academic achievement, especially in terms of providing role models and educational resources (Bryce et al., 2019).

Major Predictor Among Psychological Factors (Hypothesis 2)

The research finding indicates that among the three psychological factors—self-efficacy, perseverance, and resilience—self-efficacy is the strongest predictor of academic engagement. The multiple regression analysis reveals a significant contribution of self-efficacy ($\beta = 0.330$, $p < 0.001$) to academic engagement, and the R^2 value of 0.426 indicates that the independent psychological factors explain 42.6% of the variance in academic engagement. Based on these findings, the study rejects Hypothesis 2, which posited that resilience would be the strongest predictor, and instead confirms that self-efficacy plays a dominant role in fostering academic engagement.

Self-Efficacy and Academic Engagement

Self-efficacy, or the belief in one's ability to achieve success, is strongly linked to greater academic engagement. Students with higher self-efficacy are more likely to take on challenging tasks, persist in the face of setbacks, and approach learning opportunities with greater enthusiasm and dedication. This finding is supported by previous studies that have identified self-efficacy as a key driver of student engagement and academic performance (Meng & Zhang, 2023; Doğan, 2015). Self-efficacy influences academic motivation, behavior, and emotional regulation, making it an essential psychological resource for academic success.

For instance, in studies conducted on undergraduate students, academic self-efficacy was found to be positively correlated with both engagement and academic achievement, highlighting that students who believe in their ability to succeed are more likely to be actively involved in their educational experience (Martínez et al., 2019; Bowes, 2018).

Resilience and Perseverance: Secondary Predictors

Although both resilience and perseverance are important psychological factors, they did not exhibit as strong an effect on academic engagement as self-efficacy in this study. This can be attributed to the foundational role of self-efficacy in influencing the ability to persevere and be resilient. Self-efficacy not only helps students believe they can succeed but also fosters perseverance through difficulties and resilience when facing setbacks (Ersoy & Peker, 2020). Research has suggested that while resilience allows students to recover from adversity, it is self-efficacy that motivates them to face challenges proactively and persistently, thereby reinforcing the engagement process.

Resilience and perseverance are often seen as outcomes or byproducts of high self-efficacy, making them secondary predictors in this model. For example, studies have shown that while resilience contributes to maintaining engagement during periods of difficulty, students' initial belief in their abilities (self-efficacy) is what drives their continued effort and engagement in academic tasks (Meng & Zhang, 2023; Cassidy, 2015). All in all, this study is consistent with a large body of research highlighting the importance of psychological attributes in academic success. For example, self-efficacy

has been found to be one of the most robust predictors of student engagement, as students who believe in their ability to succeed are more likely to remain motivated and engaged in their studies (Qudsyi et al., 2020; Yu et al., 2022).

Psychological Factors Outweigh Social Context in Predicting Academic Engagement (Hypothesis 3)

The regression results strongly indicate that students' internal psychological traits, especially self-efficacy, have a more substantial effect on their academic engagement than external social factors. This aligns with the social-cognitive theory, which suggests that students' beliefs in their abilities significantly influence their motivation, behavior, and academic engagement (Perry et al., 2010; Griffith, 2012). Students who believe in their academic abilities are more likely to engage in their studies and overcome obstacles, making self-efficacy a key driver of academic success. Similarly, resilience and perseverance enable students to recover from setbacks and maintain their focus on long-term academic goals, further supporting the central role of these psychological attributes in enhancing academic engagement.

The weaker influence of social factors such as parental supervision and the number of teachers suggests that while they provide important contextual support, their effects may be overshadowed by students' own psychological resources. This is consistent with previous studies that have highlighted the importance of internal motivation and personal agency in academic achievement, especially in contexts where external resources (e.g., family support, school resources) may be limited or less effective (Bryce et al., 2019).

4. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, while social factors such as parental supervision and school resources play significant roles, psychological factors such as self-efficacy and resilience appear to have the most substantial influence on academic engagement. The regression results strongly indicate that students' internal psychological traits, especially self-efficacy, have a more substantial effect on their academic engagement than external social factors such as parents, the number of teachers, certified teachers and schools. This aligns with the social-cognitive theory, which emphasizes the importance of students' beliefs in their abilities as a key driver of motivation and behavior. Students who possess strong self-efficacy and resilience are better equipped to overcome obstacles and maintain focus on their academic goals, even in less supportive environments. The findings of this study suggest that interventions aimed at enhancing students' psychological attributes, particularly self-efficacy and resilience, could be highly effective in improving academic engagement, regardless of the challenges posed by family or school environments. This underscores the need for educational policies and programs to prioritize fostering students' internal psychological resources alongside providing external support systems. By doing so, educators and policymakers can create a more holistic approach to promoting academic success and engagement.

REFERENCES

Appleton, J. J., Christenson, S. L., Kim, D., & Reschly, A. L. (2006). Measuring cognitive and psychological engagement: Validation of the Student Engagement Instrument. Journal of school psychology, 44(5), 427-445.

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: Freeman

Bernard, B. 1993. Fostering resilience in kids. Educational Leadership, 51(3): 444–498.

Bowes, J. (2018). Preferred Learning Style and Academic Self-Efficacy as Predictors of Academic Engagement amongst University Students.

Bryce, C., Bradley, R., Abry, T., Swanson, J., & Thompson, M. (2019). Parents' and teachers' academic influences, behavioral engagement, and first- and fifth-grade achievement.. *School psychology quarterly : the official journal of the Division of School Psychology, American Psychological Association*. https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000297.

Cassidy, S. (2015). Resilience Building in Students: The Role of Academic Self-Efficacy. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01781.

Chung, C., & Mason, M. (2012). Why do primary school students drop out in poor, rural China? A portrait sketched in a remote mountain village. International Journal of Educational Development, 32(4), 537-545.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The" what" and" why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. Psychological inquiry, 11(4), 227-268.

Dotterer, A., & Lowe, K. (2011). Classroom Context, School Engagement, and Academic Achievement in Early Adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 40, 1649-1660. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-011-9647-5.

Duckworth, A. (2016). Grit: The power of passion and perseverance (Vol. 234). New York, NY: Scribner.

Duckworth, A. L., Peterson, C., Matthews, M. D., & Kelly, D. R. (2007). Grit: perseverance and passion for long-term goals. Journal of personality and social psychology, 92(6), 1087.

Duckworth, A. L., & Quinn, P. D. (2009). Development and validation of the Short Grit Scale (GRIT–S). Journal of personality assessment, 91(2), 166-174.

Dweck, C. S., & Master, A. (2009). Self-Th eories and Motivation: Students' Beliefs About Intelligence. In Handbook of motivation at school (pp. 137-154). Routledge.

Ersoy, N. C., & Peker, M. (2020). The relationship between self-efficacy and GPA: The roles of academic engagement and time management. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, *35*(85), 97-99.

Fallon, C. M. (2010). School factors that promote academic resilience in urban Latino high school students (Doctoral dissertation, Loyola University Chicago).

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.

Griffith, C. (2012). Parental engagement on student academic self-efficacy and educational attainment expectation for immigrant youth. . https://doi.org/10.18297/ETD/533.

Hattie, J., Hodis, F. A., & Kang, S. H. (2020). Theories of motivation: Integration and ways forward. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 61, 101865.

Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Hoy, A. W. (2006). Academic optimism of schools: A force for student achievement. American educational research journal, 43(3), 425-446.

Khourunnisa. K., & Purwandari, E. (2023). Student Engagement Models: Parental Support, Academic Self-Efficacy, and the Teacher-Student Relationship. *Jurnal Iqra' : Kajian Ilmu Pendidikan*. https://doi.org/10.25217/ji.v8i2.4010.

Lubovsky, D. (2019). Studies of the psychological well-being of low-performing students in US schools. *Современная зарубежная психология*. https://doi.org/10.17759/jmfp.2019080104.

Mahdiuon, R., Salimi, G., & Raeisy, L. (2020). Effect of social media on academic engagement and performance: Perspective of graduate students. Education and Information technologies, 25(4), 2427-2446.

Marks, G., & McMillan, J. (2007). Stratification in higher education: A comparative study.

In: Y. Shavit, R. Arum, & A. Gamoran (Eds.), Australia: Changes in socioeconomic inequalities in university participation (pp. 351–373). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Meng, Q., & Zhang, Q. (2023). The Influence of Academic Self-Efficacy on University Students' Academic Performance: The Mediating Effect of Academic Engagement. *Sustainability*. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15075767.

Martin, A. J., & Marsh, H. W. (2006). Academic resilience and its psychological and educational correlates: A construct validity approach. Psychology in the Schools, 43(3), 267-281.

Nevala, A. M., Hawley, J., Stokes, D., Slater, K., Souto-Otero, M., Santos, R., & Manoudi, A. (2011). Reducing early school leaving in the EU. Brussels: European Parliament. Retrieved from http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/etudes/join/2011/460048/IPOL-CULT_ET%282011% 29460048%28SUM01%29_EN.pdf

Perry, J., Liu, X., & Pabian, Y. (2010). School Engagement as a Mediator of Academic Performance Among Urban Youth: The Role of Career Preparation, Parental Career Support, and Teacher Support. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 38, 269 - 295. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000009349272.

Qudsyi, H., Husnita, I., Mulya, R., Jani, A., & Arifani, A. (2020). Student Engagement Among High School Students: Roles of Parental Involvement, Peer Attachment, Teacher Support, and Academic Self-Efficacy. , 241-251. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200129.032.

Rimfeld, K., Kovas, Y., Dale, P. S., & Plomin, R. (2016). True grit and genetics: Predicting academic achievement from personality. Journal of personality and social psychology, 111(5), 780.

Rodriguez, R. J., & Elbaum, B. (2013). The Role of Student–Teacher Ratio in Parents' Perceptions of Schools' Engagement Efforts. The Journal of Educational Research, 107(1), 69–80. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2012.753856

Rulida, E., & Dioso, E. (2024). TEACHERS INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIOR AND PARENTAL ENGAGEMENT IN RELATION TO THE STUDENT'S ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE. *EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR)*. https://doi.org/10.36713/epra17723.

Rumberger, R., & Lim, S. (2008). Why students drop out of school: A review of 25 years of research. Santa Barbara: Californian Dropout Research Project.

Schiefele, U. (2009). Situational and individual interest. In Handbook of motivation at school (pp.197-219). Routledge.

Schunk, D. H., & Pajares, F. (2009). Self-Effi cacy Theory. In Handbook of motivation at school (pp. 49-68). Routledge.

Sherer, M., Maddux, J. E., Mercandante, B., Prentice-Dunn, S., Jacobs, B., & Rogers, R. W. (1982). The self-efficacy scale: Construction and validation. Psychological reports, 51(2), 663-671.

Sirin, S. R. (2005). Socioeconomic status and academic achievement: A meta-analytic review of research. Review of Educational Research, 75(3), 417–453. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543075003417

Thorsen, C., Yang Hansen, K., & Johansson, S. (2021). The mechanisms of interest and perseverance in predicting achievement among academically resilient and non-resilient students: Evidence from Swedish longitudinal data. British Journal of Educational Psychology, e12431.

Usher, E. L., & Pajares, F. (2008). Self-efficacy for self-regulated learning: A validation study. Educational and psychological measurement, 68(3), 443-463.

Yu, X., Chen, Y., Yang, C., Yang, X., Chen, X., & Dang, X. (2022). How does parental involvement matter for children's academic achievement during school closure in primary school?. *The British journal of educational psychology*, e12526 . https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12526.