

The Relationship between Future Time Perspective, Self-Efficacy, and Self-Regulation on Online Learning Engagement

Resti Fajrin [✉], Sunawan Sunawan, Mulawarman Mulawarman

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info

History Articles

Received:

15 Juny 2021

Accepted:

20 July2021

Published:

30 October 2021

Keywords:

future time

perspective, self-

efficacy, self-

regulation, learning

engagement

Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic urges students to do online learning. However, many were found to have low learning engagement during this condition. Thus, this study intended to examine the effects of Future Time Perspective (FTP), self-efficacy, and self-regulation on online learning engagement. 400 Islamic Senior High School or SMA Islam students in Semarang City participated in this correlational study. Findings showed that there was a positive relationship between future time perspective and self-efficacy on online learning engagement. Unfortunately, self-regulation did not predict the online learning engagement significantly. It indicates that in online learning during the COVID-19 pandemic, students have less control over their learning activities.

[✉] Correspondence address:

Ngesrebalong RT 01/ RT 03, Limbangan, Kendal, Jawa Tengah

E-mail: restifajrin93@gmail.com

p-ISSN 2252-6889

e-ISSN 2502-4450

INTRODUCTION

Individuals are obliged to do physical distancing to prevent the spread of COVID-19. Online learning becomes an alternative of it since it sets individuals to avoid crowds while joining learning process. It needs to be done since it enables learning procedural dimensions at any time within distance and across geographical differences, Pellas (2014).

This immediate condition surely causes students to prepare their mental and adapt to totally different learning process. Mental preparation becomes the concern since it is strongly related to the psychological construct of learning engagement. Learning engagement is part of psychological development which takes part in improving knowledge during learning process, Pellas (2014).

According to Reyes, Brackett, Rivers, White, & Salovey (2012) engaged students are seen from how they pay attention to and involve in online class discussion, fully struggle in online class activities, and show interests and motivation to do online learning. Further, Ludden (2011) states that students' engagement in online learning can reduce juvenile in terms of negative gadget use, such as online game, live streaming, and other useless things.

The researchers found that the current condition of students' online learning engagement was low. According to a preliminary study in SMA IT Bina Amal, covering observation and interviews done to the teachers, students were mostly found to delay their participation in online class, while teachers waited 5 until 10 minutes for the class to be full. In addition, 13.33% of students did not submit their online assignments, had no attention to teachers, and did other unrelated activities during the learning. Teachers also got difficulties to contact students to advise them to wear complete uniforms during the learning. These conditions indicate that students' engagement in learning was varied.

Learning engagement is an attitude which covers several aspects, such as cognitive engagement, active participation, and emotional

engagement in every learning activity, Fredricks, et al (2004). Meanwhile, other experts in Pellas (2014) argue that learning engagement is influenced by three factors, namely cognitive, attitude, and emotion.

The combination of the above three aspects are related to future time perspective, self-efficacy, and self-regulation. Self-regulation and future time perspective are relevant to learning engagement sources coming from cognitive aspect, while self-efficacy is relevant to emotion. Cognitive is students' ability to achieve learning objectives, intrinsic motivation, and explain new knowledge, while emotion is attitude and positive value showed during the learning.

Psychological construct is associated with learning engagement cognitive source, namely future time perspective (FTP). McInerney (2004) states that future time perspective functions as motivational strength for individuals to involve in any activity which supports them to prepare for the future. An individual with high future time perspective will have greater chances in the future and struggle to achieve his goals by developing and improving his current skills (Simon, 2004). These skills link with the skills to implement learning strategies that belong to learning engagement sources in terms of cognitive engagement.

Emotional is one of the sources of learning engagement. It is self-understanding of reactions to interesting and positive things as well as positive beliefs about oneself. One of positive attitudes owned by students is self-efficacy. According to Bandura (1977:193) self-efficacy is self-assessment capacity to successfully realize the desired goals.

Positive beliefs about oneself to be able to successfully complete tasks are one of the realizations of positive attitudes as the manifestation of emotional. Zhang and Lu (2002) underline that self-efficacy has a relationship with motivation to complete tasks. It is in line with a study by Pellas (2014) which concludes that self-efficacy has a significant relationship with learning engagement. It means

that the higher self-efficacy, the higher learning engagement will be.

The ability students must have in order to be able to manage and apply strategies correctly is called self-regulation. Self-regulation refers to strategies in determining learning success. Pintrich and Groot (1990) mention that students need to have “desire” and “skills” to succeed. The same thing goes for one of aspects that build learning engagement on the academic side which is closely related to students' ability to strategize in their learning activities. In addition, findings by Howard, et al (2000) indicate that self-regulation relates to students' cognitive engagement. Similarly, a study conducted by Pardo, Han, and Ellis (2016) shows a significant relationship between student self-regulation and the source of student's engagement. These results indicate that the better the students' ability in self-regulation, the higher the learning engagement of students.

With regards to the previously mentioned explanation, the current study was directed to determine the effects of future time perspective, self-efficacy, and self-regulation on students' learning engagement in online learning. Its findings can contribute to help guidance and counseling teachers formulate techniques and approaches in providing learning guidance that is based on factors influencing student's learning engagement.

METHODS

There were 400 respondents whose age around 17 years involved in this study, consisting of 152 male and 248 female. They were selected using cluster random sampling at SMA Islam in Semarang City. Mostly they came from middle to upper class family economic background.

Students' learning engagement was measured using online learning engagement scale developed by Zhoc, et al., (2016). It

consists of 24 items. In addition, future time perspective data were collected using Future Time Perspective scale which has 22 statement items designed by Zimbardo, et al., (2003), while self-efficacy data of students was obtained using self-efficacy scale developed by Dullas (2018), namely The Development of Academic Self-Efficacy Scale. This scale has 62 statement items, but in this study, there were only 42 items used. Moreover, students' self-regulation was estimated using Self-Regulation scale made by Gaumer Erickson, Soukup, Noonan, & Mc Gun (2015). This Self-Regulation scale is devoted to education with 22 statement items. All four scales used a Likert scale (1=Highly unsuitable – 5=Very appropriate) to measure the tendency

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 presents students' data of learning engagement, future time perspective, self-efficacy, and self-regulation. Each of the variable mean and standard deviation is presented as follows.

Table 1. The Data Description of Students' Ability

Variable	(M)	(SD)	Category
<i>Learning Engagement</i>	3.78	0.36	High
<i>Future Time Perspective</i>	3.39	0.38	High
<i>Self efficacy</i>	3.79	0.41	High
<i>Self Regulation</i>	3.62	0.34	High

Regarding the table above, all students' data were in high category. Thus, each variable data of learning engagement, future time perspective, self-efficacy, and self-regulation by students of SMA Islam in Semarang City was analyzed further using hierarchical regression analysis.

Table 2. The Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis

Predictor	Model 1		Model 2				Model 3		
	B	t	p	β	t	P	B	T	P
<i>Future</i>	.466	10.007*	<.0	.065	1.29	>.05	.030	.535	>.05
		*	1		0				
<i>Hedonistic Present</i>	-.239	-4.232**	<.0	-.136	-	<.01	-.117	-	<.05
			1		2.81			2.317*	
					9**				
<i>Fatalistic Present</i>	-.021	-.374	>.0	-.008	.174	>.05	.015	.304	>.05
			5						
Self-perception control				.442	6.65	<.01	.427	6.281*	<.01
					0**			*	
Competence				.086	1.81	>.05	.089	1.871	>.05
					2				
Perseverance				.160	2.54	<.05	.124	1.813	>.05
					9*				
Plan							.048	.906	>.05
Monitor							-.016	-.311	>.05
Control							.026	.458	>.05
Reflect							.053	1.036	>.05
ΔR	.470		.215				.003		
ΔR^2	.221		.249				.003		
ΔF	37.374**		61.360**				.635		
Δp	<.01		<.01				>.05		
R	.470		.685				.688		
R ²	.221		.249				.473		
F	37.374**		57.912**				34.872**		
P	<.01		<.01				<.01		

Based on table 2, there found a positive and significant relationship between future time perspective, self-efficacy, and self-regulation on learning engagement ($R=.688$, $F(11,399)=34,872$, $p <.01$). Thus, the hypothesis stating future time perspective, self-efficacy, and self-regulation influence online leaning engagement is accepted. In details, self-efficacy, self-regulation, and learning engagement gained determination coefficient or R2 of .473, meaning that learning engagement could be explained by future time perspective, self-efficacy, and self-regulation as much as 47.3%.

Furthermore, there was only hedonistic present of future time perspective which predicted learning engagement negatively ($\beta = -.117$, $t = -2.317$, $p <.05$). Meanwhile, future and

fatalistic present was not related to online learning engagement.

In terms of self-efficacy, self-perception control influenced learning engagement by ($t = 6.281$, $p <.01$), while control, persistence, and competence were not related to Online Learning Engagement.

Regarding self-regulation, plan ($t=.906$, $p >.05$), monitor ($t=-.311$, $p >.05$), control ($t=.458$, $p >.05$), reflect ($t=1.036$, $p >.05$) had no significant effect ($R=.003$, $F(11,399)=.635$, $p > 0.05$) on online learning engagement.

The findings of this study found the relationships between future time perspective, self-efficacy, and self-regulation on learning engagement. This is similar to what was done by Horstmanshof and Zimitat (2007), Denovan, Dagnall, Macaskill, Papageorgiouhasil (2019),

Ganzer, Caltabiano, and Hajhashemi (2015) that future time perspective can support and help improve student academic engagement. In other words, the better the students in their future perspective, the better their learning engagement will be.

Interestingly, the present study found that of all three predictors, namely future time perspective, self-efficacy, and self-regulation, there were only hedonistic present and fatalistic present predictors which showed no relationship with learning engagement.

Hedonistic present is a hedonistic-oriented life orientation practiced by today's people, Zimbardo, et al., (1997). Their life goal is to seek for pleasure, sensation, and unique and new experiences. This study affirmed that the way students participated in online learning during the pandemic situation was not because of their future orientation and beliefs that have become their destiny in the present and the future (fatalistic present).

One thing that influenced learning engagement in this study was students' willingness to leave their fun time to join learning process and do tasks given by teachers. This attitude reflected an aspect of learning engagement, namely behavioral engagement. Fredricks, et al., (2004) state that students with active behavioral engagement tend to be active in teaching and learning process, for example, often asking questions to teacher, doing discussion, paying attention to teacher's explanation, obeying the rules, willing to work on any difficult tasks, and being responsible to submit the tasks based on the deadline. If this aspect is high, it will greatly influence students' learning engagement.

This study also shared the positive and significant relationship between self-efficacy and learning engagement. It is in line with studies by Pellas (2014), Rufaida and Prihatsanti (2017), namely self-efficacy is significantly correlated with learning engagement. This finding shows that the higher the self-efficacy, the higher the learning engagement.

Compellingly, once the data were controlled by self-regulation, there was only the

predictor of self-perception control which showed the relationship with learning engagement, while other predictors of competence and perseverance did not.

According to Dullas (2018) when students have positive self-perception control, they can understand themselves and later grow beliefs to complete their responsible confidently with any efforts they make, be sure of their future, others' view on them, complete any tasks given. Automatically, good perception and beliefs will result in the improvement of learning engagement.

In this study, the relationship between self-regulation and learning engagement was also discussed. Regarding the findings, self-regulation had no influence on online learning engagement. This is in contrast to previous studies by Anggelika and Rahardjo (2019), and Millahwati (2016) which show the relationship between self-regulation and learning engagement.

This study found students' self-regulation during the pandemic did not influence learning engagement. In other words, the same thing happened in their online learning. It might happen because self-regulation in online learning does not deal with learning management, but more like students' willingness and intention to participate in online learning.

Students' willingness to join online class was due to reminder and advice from teachers and parents, and warning of their not useful activities during the pandemic. These reasons motivated students to participate in online learning although the main cause was to minimize conflicts.

The ability to plan, self-monitor, control and reflect online learning process done in online learning did not influence students' learning engagement. It is as opposed to the presence of self-regulation in face-to-face learning.

The presence of self-regulation in face-to-face meeting at school can encourage students' creativity and efforts to decide strategies to be successful in learning, determine their own targets, evaluate success, reward,

monitor time management, and manage physical and social environment from any problems when joining the meeting. These facts prove that face-to-face meeting is still the thing that makes students achieve success in learning.

CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion, it can be concluded that there is the influence of future time perspective and self-efficacy on students' online learning engagement. The part of future time perspective which has the relationship is hedonistic present, while in self-efficacy there is self-perception control. Additionally, self-regulation has no relationship with learning engagement. It means that the more willingness students have to leave their fun time and to understand themselves to be better will result in the high online learning engagement.

School counselors are suggested to provide services that can improve students' learning engagement. In details, to improve future time perspective, counselors can give services to strengthen students' future by designing life mapping, and inviting students to always work hard to achieve better results in learning. For self-efficacy, students can be given suitable learning method for them, such as mind mapping and donkey bridges to improve students' perseverance. Also, it can be done by designing study schedules and providing alternative activities for students' free time.

Self-regulation strategies can be given to improve the quality of online learning, such as determining learning targets, steps to achieve learning targets, monitoring self-performance in online learning, choosing correct gargets to maximize online learning activities, and performing self-evaluation in online learning participation.

Future studies can investigate the specific findings of the current study, namely future, hedonistic present, self-perception control, and perseverance. These can be further elaborated by doing experimental studies.

REFERENCES

- Angelika, F. K. & Rahardjo, W. (2019). Social support, self-regulation learning, and student engagement in high school students. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 43(1). DOI: 100431122019870
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Self-Efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change*. *Psychological Review*. Vol 84. Departement of Psychology. Stanford University. DOI: 10.1037//0033-295x.84.2.191.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.
- Denovan, A., Dagnall, N., Macaskill, A., & Papageorgiou. (2019). Future time perspective, positive emotions and student engagement: a longitudinal study. *Studies in Higher Education* 45(4). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2019.1616168>
- Dullas, A. (2018). The Development of Academic Self Efficacy Scale for Filipino Junior High School Students. *Frontiers in Education* 3:19. DOI:10.3389/feduc.2018.00019
- Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School Engagement: Potential of the Concept, State of the Evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(1), 59–109. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059>
- Friedman, H.S & Schustack, M.W. (2008). *Kepribadian Teori Klasik dan Riset*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Ganzer, J., Caltaabiano, N., Hajhashemi, K. (2015). Time Perspective, Hope, and Learning Strategy among Rural Australian University Students. *Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science* 10(4), 1-10. DOI:10.9734/BJESBS/2015/19449
- Gaumer Erickson, A.S., Soukup, J.H., Noonan, P.M., & McGurn, L. (2015). Self-

- Regulation Questionnaire. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas, Center for Research on Learning.
- Horstmanshof, L., Zimitat, C. (2007)., Future time orientation predicts academic engagement among first-year university students. *Br J Educ Psychol*, 77(3):703-18. DOI:10.1348/000709906X160778
- Howard, B. C.; McGee, S; Shia, R; Hong, N. S. (2000). *Metacognitive Self-Regulation and Problem-Solving: Expanding the Theory Base through Factor Analysis*. American Educational Research Association 2000, New Orleans: Roundtable. Retrived from: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED470973>
- Friedman, H.S., & Schustack, M.W. 2008. *Kepribadian Teori Klasik Dan Riset Modern Edisi Ketiga*. Surabaya: Erlangga
- Krause, K.-L., & Coates, H. (2008). Students' engagement in first year university. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(5), 493-505. doi:10.1080/02602930701698892
- Ludden, A. B. (2011). Engagement in school and community civic activities among rural adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 40(9), 1254–1270. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-010-9536-3>
- McInerney, D.M. (2004). A Discussion of Future Time Perspective. *Educational Psychology Review* 16 (2), 141–151. Retrived from: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1023/B:EDPR.0000026610.18125.a3>
- Millahwati, H; Cahyadi, S; Susanto, H. 2016. *Self Regulation dan Engagementa Mahasiswa dalam Pengerjaan Skripsi*; <http://pustaka.unpad.ac.id>
- Pardo, A., Han, F., & Ellis, R. (2016). Exploring the relation between self-regulation, online activities, and academic performance: A case study. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Learning Analytics and Knowledge Conference*, 422-429. DOI:10.1145/2883851.2883883
- Pellas, N. (2014). The Influence of computer self-efficacy, metacognitive self-regulation, and self-esteem on student engagement in online learning programs. Evidence from the virtual world of Second Life. *Computer in Human Behavior*, 35(1):157-170. DOI: 10.1016/j.chb.2014.02.048
- Pintrich, P.R.& De Groot, E.V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning componet of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Education Psychology*, 82, (1),33-40. Retrived from: <http://www.icmeganisers.dk/tsg20/leiss.pdf>.
- Reyes, M. R., Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., White, M., & Salovey, P. (2012). Classroom emotional climate, student engagement, and academic achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 104(3):700-712. DOI:10.1037/a0027268
- Rufaida, A.A & Prihatsanti., 2018., *Hubungan Efikasi Diri Akademik Dengan Student Engagement Pada Mahasiswa Fsm Undip Yang Bekerja Paruh Waktu*. jurnal EMPATI, 6(4), 143-14. Retrived from: <https://ejournal3.undip.ac.id/index.php/empati/article/view/20003>
- Simon J, Vansteenkiste M, Lens W, Lacante M. (2004). Placing motivation and future time perspective in a teporal perspective. *Educ Psychol Rev*.16(2), 121. DOI:10.1023/B:EDPR.0000026609.94841.2f
- Zhang, A., & Lu, Q. (2002). The regulation of self-efficacy and attributional feedback on motivation. *Social Behavior and Personality: An international journal*, 30(3), 281-288. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2002.30.3.281>
- Zhoc, Karen C. H.; Webster, Beverley J.; King, Ronnel B.; Li, Johnson C. H.; Chung, Tony S. H. (2019). Higher Education Student Engagement Scale (HESES): Development and Psychometric Evidence. *Research in Higher Education*,

60 (2), 219-244. DOI: 10.1007/s11162-018-9510-6

Zimbardo, P. G., Keough, K. A., & Boyd, J. N (1997) Present Time Perspective as a

predictor of risky driving. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 23(6), 1007-1023.