

## ANALYZING THE INTROJECTED REGULATION TOWARDS STUDENTS' LEARNING ACHIEVEMENT IN ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM

Aditya Sahrul Akbar<sup>1</sup>, \*Elysa Hartati<sup>2</sup>

corresponding author's e-mail [\\*elysa@mercubuana-yogya.ac.id](mailto:*elysa@mercubuana-yogya.ac.id)

<sup>1,2</sup>English Language Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education  
Universitas Mercu Buana Yogyakarta

Received: September 30, 2020

Published: November 30, 2020

**Abstract:** Learning achievement is the result of learning achieved by a student. However, students often experience difficulties in achieving good academic achievement. This study aims to analyse the relationship between introjected regulation and academic achievement. Thirty two (32) student samples were involved in this study to respond to the research instrument which was questionnaire compiled based on the theory of Ryan and Deci (2002); students' GPA was documented in order to depict learning achievement, and interview was done to record students' view on introjected regulation. By conducting a correlational study and correlational analysis, the results indicates that  $r = 0.408$  ( $p < 0.05$ ), which means there is a significant relationship between introjected regulation and learning achievement. The results of this study could be a reference for lecturers to form introjected regulation by generating positive feelings, such as happy and enjoy, in order to support the existence of student motivation.

**Keywords:** *English language study program, introjected regulation, learning achievement, motivation*

**How to Cite:** Akbar, A.S., & Hartati, E. (2020). Analyzing the introjected regulation towards students' learning achievement in English education study program. *Journal of English Literacy and Education*, 7(2), 64-73.

### INTRODUCTION

Basically in carrying out students' role in the world of lectures, they are generally confronted with thoughts about how much achievement they have achieved during the lecture process, what they have gained in lectures. Students prefer to find a way or reason to be more advanced and motivated to achieve maximum achievement, especially in their learning. Many things can be done by students to be able to get something more than what they have gotten on their study at campus (Udam, Ranimpi, & Kinasih, 2019).

Students can be said to succeed in learning when they have high achievements. This is supported by a statement of Syah, Wardan, Rakhmat, and Muchlis (1997) who states that learning achievement can provide a picture of the progress that has

been achieved by students, the position of one's ability in the group. Learning achievement is also known as the level of effort that has been done and so on.

According to Emilia's research (2013), the evaluation of learning achievement can be seen based on the Grade Point Average (GPA), both the semester GPA and the cumulative GPA. But the fact is that there are still some students who have problems related to the success in getting their learning achievements. This is motivated by learning achievement which is always closely related to the achievement of the results they have obtained while taking lessons or various activities that have been carried out.

Based on the results of interviews with four English Department students at a private college in Yogyakarta on March 16, 2020, it was found that 2 out of 4 students had GPA under 2.75. They admitted that they feel ashamed of the GPA below 2.75, compared to other friends whose GPA is above 2.75. According to them, they have tried to improve the GPA, but it is very difficult. They feel failure because the target have been made by them are not achieved. They admitted that the low GPA was caused by being lazy to submit assignments or answer random examinations. It was also found that the two students seemed passive in class. They need a long time to answer the questions given by the lecturer. They also never ask, when invited by lecturers in class. However, on the contrary 2 of 4 of these students, had a GPA above 2.75. They have the desire to be able to increase GPA. But, so far they have tried and felt quite able to compete with their classmates. They looked active in class and quick enough to respond the questions given by the lecturer.

Learning achievement discusses academic achievement which is a person's behaviour oriented towards a task based on performance, making it possible to be evaluated and compared with both himself and with others in the field of education (Weiner & Craighead, 2010). In other words, learning achievement is the learning outcome of a student after being evaluated during the learning process. Nasution (1999) argues that there are three aspects of student achievement, namely cognitive aspects, affective aspects, and psychomotor aspects.

Learning achievement reflects mastery of subjects determined through grades or numbers given by the instructor. Learning achievement is important to study considering it can be used to (1) determine the level of mastery of students over the subject matter that has been delivered, (2) know the students' potential, willingness, motivation, and attitudes towards the learning program, (3) know the students' progress and outcomes towards the learning objectives set from the basic competencies, (4) diagnose the strengths and weaknesses of students in participating in learning activities, (5) selection is to choose and determine students in accordance with certain types of education, (6) determine graduation, and (7) place students according to their potential (Arifin, 2001).

There is one factor that affects learning achievement from outside oneself, namely introjected regulation as the part of motivation in Self Determination Theory (SDT) (Dalyono, 2010; Guay, Ratelle, & Chanal, 2008; Syah, Psikologi Belajar, 2003) (Dalyono, 2010; Guay, Ratelle, & Chanal, 2008; Syah, 2003). Introjected regulation is defined as a form of suppressive feelings within oneself, to avoid feeling guilty, anxious or achieving a calmness of self (Ryan & Deci, 2000). There are two indicators of introjected regulation, namely: a) the need to do something to get positive feelings about yourself; b) the need to do something to avoid negative feelings (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

The importance of introjected regulation in research explained by Jang, Kim, and Reeve (2012) is fostering the satisfaction of basic psychological needs, and the satisfaction of these needs in student performance. It also allows individuals to experience self-control, a better sense of belonging, increased self-efficacy, and increased academic development. From this statement, introjected regulation is an important variable to be investigated because it has an impact on a student's basic psychological needs or satisfaction such as the need to achieve their academic or learning achievements. Introjected regulation is the least internalised form of extrinsic motivation and describes engaging in a behaviour for contingent self-worth or to avoid negative outcomes such as shame (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Aside from the possibility that shame prompts a range of maladaptive outcomes through its damaging effects on autonomy, the experience of shame may also impact negatively on well-being by obstructing satisfaction of the need for relatedness. In impairing individuals' ability to establish empathic connections with others (Tangney, Stuewig, & Mashek, 2007), shame may reduce the number of opportunities for feeling involved with and close to other people, thereby diminishing their sense of relatedness (McLachlan, Keatley, Stiff, & Hagger, 2009).

In this study, there are two reference studies regarding to motivation in SDT. These studies measure motivation partially, one of them is Introjected Regulation. Research conducted by Kırkağaç and Öz (2017) revealed that Introjected Regulation correlated positively and significantly with academic achievement of the participants,  $r=0.157$ ,  $p<0.05$ . This is also supported by Eymur and Geban (2011) who shows that all subscales are positively correlated with academic achievement including Introjected Regulation, with Pearson Correlation Coefficient ranging from 0.24 to 0.72. The results of both studies were shown that Introjected Regulation has a positive correlation or relationship with academic achievement. From the background of the problems outlined, this study aims to find whether or not there is any relationship or correlation between Introjected Regulation and student learning achievement.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Subject**

The participants in this study were 32 students in academic year 2017/2018. They were active students in English Language Education study program at one private University in Yogyakarta.

### **Design and Procedure**

This is a correlational study which seeks to understand the relationship between introjected regulation and learning achievement. By using it as research design, this research uses a quantitative approach. It starts with a theory, collects data that either supports or contradicts the theory, makes revisions, and conducts additional tests (Creswell, 2003). Moreover, in this study, qualitative research method was employed in order to complete the result of correlation.

### **Data Collection and Analysis**

In conducting this research, questionnaire, documentation, and interview were employed. The questionnaire was used to measure how Introjected Regulation worked on students' learning achievement. The items in the questionnaire were

arranged based on indicators of introjected regulation by Ryan and Deci (2000). The items in this instrument used 4 alternative answers from the modified Likert scale, Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Strongly Disagree (SD), and Disagree (D). The entire data was obtained from the instruments shared to the subject, in the form of a questionnaire. Table 1 shows the blueprint of the questionnaire.

Table 1. Questionnaire blueprint

No.	Indicator	Statements
1.	Do something to avoid negative feelings.	1) I feel calm when I arrive on time before the class is started. 2) I feel comfortable when I have done my homework assignment. 3) I feel happy when answering questions from the lecturers. 4) I feel happy when submitting the assignments on time. 5) Doing the task before the deadline, make me free from the burden. 6) I feel calm when I have studied the material that will be tested tomorrow. 7) I feel calm if I have mastered the lessons that will be learn tomorrow. 9) I feel calm when I understand the material that the lecturer has given to me. 10) I feel calm when I have attended the class. 11) I feel calm if my GPA surpass or matches the specified target.
2.	Do something to avoid positive feelings.	8) I attend certain subjects of the class with forced conditions. 12) I feel worried when there are things I don't understand in the class. 13) I feel worried if I am not studying for the exam. 14) I feel worried when I came late to attend the class. 15) I feel stupid when I can't answer the questions from the lecturer. 16) I choose to remain silent to avoid embarrassment or fear, when the lecturer asks questions in the class. 17) I feel worried when I haven't completed the assignment. 18) I have to complete the task so I don't feel anxious. 19) I feel anxious when I am not attending a certain class. 20) I feel sad when my GPA does not reach the target.

To gain the learning achievement data, students' GPA was documented. To end, interview was done to several respondents to confirm their opinion and feeling towards the teaching and learning process using. It was done through unstructured interview in order that they could feel relaxed while being interviewed, far from being intimidated.

To analyze the data in this study, Pearson Product Moment correlation test was used, which is one technique developed by Karl Pearson to calculate correlation coefficients. The use of the Pearson Product Moment test or correlation analysis is to see the relationship between the independent variable (X) with the dependent variable (Y) and the data in the form of intervals and ratios. This correlation coefficient is used to measure the closeness of the relationship between two variables whose data are in the form of intervals or ratios and symbolized by *r*. The value of the correlation coefficient (*r*) lies between -1 and +1. (Djudin, 2013). The result of the data collection using questionnaire were analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) 17.0.

Meanwhile learning achievement data or GPA was grouped into categories indicating level 0.00 to 4.00. The results of interview were recorded, transcribed, and codified using Introjected Regulation by Ryan and Deci (2000) and Learning Achievement data using GPA data.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### Questionnaire

#### *Introjected Regulation*

To make categorization of the introjected regulation variable, it was made based on the product of the highest value obtained which is  $4 \times 20 = 80$  and the product of the lowest value obtained is  $1 \times 20 = 20$ . This scale is divided into five categories (highest, high, average, low, and lowest) with a range interval value of 12. The categorization was made with using formula by Azwar (2016).

Table 2. Introjected regulation measurement categorization

Interval	Category	Mean	Sum	Percentage
$68 < x \leq 80$	Highest		0	0%
$56 < x \leq 68$	High		1	3,12%
$44 < x \leq 56$	Average	48,031	22	68,75%
$32 < x \leq 44$	Low		9	28,13%
$20 < x \leq 32$	Lowest		0	0%
	Sum		32	100%
<b>Deviation Standard = 5,070</b>			<b>Min = 41</b>	<b>Max = 59</b>

Based on table 2, it can be seen that there was one subject who has an introjected regulation score in the high category with a percentage of 3.12%. In the average category, there were 22 subjects with a percentage of 68.75%. Introjected regulation scores were owned by 9 subjects with a percentage of 28.13% in the low category. There was no subject who had an introjected regulation score in the highest and lowest categories with a percentage of 0% respectively. With an average of 48,031, it can be said that the average introjected regulation score was in the moderate category, with scores obtained by subjects ranging from the lowest score, 41 to the

highest score, which was 59 and a standard deviation of 5,070. Based on the data description, it can be inferred that students in the English Language Department have sufficient introjected regulation.

### ***Learning Achievement***

To categorize the learning achievement variable, researchers made it based on the highest GPA score of 4.00 and the lowest GPA value of 0.00. This scale was divided into eight categories (10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, and 80) with a range interval value of 0.5.

Table 3. Learning achievement measurement categorization

<b>Interval</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Sum</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
$0,00 < x \leq 0,50$	10	0	0%
$0,50 < x \leq 1,00$	20	0	0%
$1,00 < x \leq 1,50$	30	0	0%
$1,50 < x \leq 2,0$	40	1	3,13%
$2,00 < x \leq 1,50$	50	1	3,13%
$2,50 < x \leq 3,00$	60	8	25%
$3,00 < x \leq 3,50$	70	14	43,74%
$3,50 < x \leq 4,00$	80	8	25%
Sum		32	100%
<b>Deviation Standard = 9,541    Min = 40    Max = 80</b>			

Eight categories were chosen to match the highest value on the IR variable. The largest value on the IR measurement was 80 while the lowest value was 10. From table 3, it was found that none of the subjects had GPA in categories 10, 20, and 30, with percentages of 0% each. There was one subject in category 40 and 50, with percentages of 3.13%, respectively. In category 60, there were eight subjects with a percentage of 25%. In category 70, there were 14 subjects with a percentage of 43.74%. In category 80, there were eight subjects with a percentage of 25%. The largest percentage was in category 70, so it could be stated that several subjects have GPA in the range of 3.00 to 3.50, with a standard deviation of 9.541, the lowest subject GPA in category 40, and the highest subject GPA in category 80.

### ***Testing Prerequisite Analysis***

Testing the prerequisite for analysis is needed before testing the hypothesis. This was done to ensure that the research data is feasible or not further analysed in accordance with the provisions and scientific analysis. The analysis prerequisite test is divided into several types, namely data normality test and linear data test (Supramono & Haryanto, 2003).

Kolmogorov Smirnov test was used to test the normality of research data. In this study, the introjected regulation variable obtained a K-S-Z value of 0.743 with a probability (p) or significance of 0.640 ( $p > 0.05$ ). This means that the introjected regulation variable has a normal data distribution. Meanwhile, the learning achievement variable obtained K-S-Z value of 1.429 with a probability (p) or significance of 0.034 ( $p < 0.05$ ). This means that the learning achievement variable has an abnormal data distribution.

Anova table was used to test the linearity. In this study, the linearity test results obtained a F deviation from linearity value of 0,426 with a probability (p) or

significance of 0.736 ( $p > 0,05$ ), which means that the Introjected Regulation and Learning Achievement variables are linear.

### ***Hypothesis Test***

Based on the results of the calculation of the correlation test obtained correlation coefficient between Introjected Regulation with Learning Achievement of 0.408 with sig. = 0.021 ( $p < 0.05$ ) which means there is a significant relationship between Introjected Regulation and Learning Achievement. The value of 0.408 with a positive sign means that there is a positive relationship between Introjected Regulation with Learning Achievement. Meanwhile, the significance of 0.021 ( $p < 0.05$ ) is the result that the two variables have a significant relationship. In other words, there is a significant positive relationship between Introjected Regulation with Learning Achievement in English Department students at one of private universities in Yogyakarta.

### **Interview Result**

#### ***Respondent 1***

Respondent 1 has a GPA below 2.75. When in the class, the subject feels afraid to be scolded by the lecturer if the subject cannot answer the questions given by the lecturer. When collecting the assignments, the subject prefers to approach deadlines. Even though the subject was afraid that could not collect the task on time.

#### ***Respondent 2***

The GPA that the respondent obtained is below 2.75. The subjects feels disappointed and sad that the GPA as not as the target and choose to silence in class, especially if the subject does not follow the previous class and when the lecturer gives questions to students, the subject chooses to be quiet. In collecting assignments, respondent 2 collects their tasks close to deadlines set by the lecturer.

#### ***Respondent 3***

Slightly different from respondent 1 and respondent 2, respondent 3 gets a GPA above 2.75. When in the class, the subject is quite active and feels happy if could answer the questions from the lecturers. Although sometimes the subject feel a little anxiety when answering questions from the lecturer. When collecting assignments that have been given by the lecturer, the subject chooses to collect before the deadline for calm.

#### ***Respondent 4***

Respondent 4 has a GPA above 2.75. When in class, the subject tends to be active by asking a few questions to the lecturer who is in charge. In addition, the subject can also answer questions from the lecturer. When collecting assignments, sometimes subjects gather their assignments close to deadlines and feels anxiety if could not make it.

### **Discussion**

Based on research analysis of the relationship between Introjected Regulation on learning achievement of students studying at the Faculty of Teacher Training and English Language Education at one of private university in Yogyakarta, the results

quantitatively showed that there was a significant positive relationship between Introjected Regulation on Learning Achievement. Through the correlation test that has been done previously, the correlation coefficient obtained between the Introjected Regulation with Learning Achievement of 0.408 with sig. = 0.021 ( $p < 0.05$ ). In other words, there is a relationship between Introjected Regulation on student learning achievement.

The results of the qualitative data showed that the subject has experienced negative and positive feelings. Positive feelings on the fourth respondent arises when the subject was happy if he could answer questions from the lecturer, then anxious and afraid when unable to answer the questions that had been given which is a form of negative feelings. The form of negative feelings from the other four subjects can be seen when all four respondents were asked a question related to their GPA. All four respondents said they were sad when their GPA dropped or did not reach their expectations or targets. It shows that the presence or emergence of negative and positive feelings in the four respondents which was related to Introjected Regulation itself.

This study are supported by research conducted by Emilia (2013) who found that Introjected Regulation has a positive relationship with academic achievement. Thus, this means that the higher the Introjected Regulation they have, the higher academic achievement can be achieved. In a study by Ayub (2010), it was shown that intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and academic performance were positively correlated. There are two indicators of introjected regulation, namely the need to do something to get positive feelings about yourself and the need to do something to avoid negative feelings (Ryan & Deci, 2000). To cope with the negative feelings, such as shyness, discourage, or afraid of making mistakes in learning, students need to activate their ability (Widyawan & Hartati, 2016).

Many factors cause the level of learning achievement, introjected regulation is one of the supporting factors of all factors that affect the level of learning achievement (Dalyono, 2010; Guay, Ratelle, & Chanal, 2008; Shah, 2003). When viewed as effective contributions, introjected regulation contributes 16.65% and 83.35% is influenced by other factors outside introjected regulation that can affect learning achievement, such as physical and spiritual health, intelligence, talent, family environment and the role of parents, social environment, and so on.

Based on the results of the study, it can be concluded that there is a correlation between Introjected Regulation on learning achievement, which seems clear both of these variables have a positive relationship.

## **CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

Based on the results obtained after researching, it can be concluded that Introjected Regulation does have positive correlation or relation with students' learning achievement. It was proven by several tests that have been done. It also rejects the hypothesis that there is no relationship between Introjected Regulation towards Learning Achievement.

The results of this study could be a reference for lecturers to form introjected regulation by generating positive feelings, such as happy and enjoy, in order to support the existence of student motivation. For further researchers, they can examine other factors of learning achievement, besides introjected regulation, such



as physical and spiritual health, intelligence, talent, family environment and the role of parents, social environment, and so on.

## REFERENCES

- Arifin, Z. (2001). *Evaluasi instruksional: Prinsip, teknik, prosedur*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Ayub, N. (2010). Effect of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on academic performance. *Pakistan Business Review, 12*, 5-8.
- Azwar, S. (2016). *Dasar-dasar psikometrika edisi II*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, mixed method approaches*. London: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Dalyono, M. (2010). *Psikologi pendidikan*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Djudin, T. (2013). *Statistika Parametrik - Dasar Pemikiran dan Penerapannya dalam Penelitian*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Tiara Wacana.
- Emilia, A. (2013). Hubungan motivasi menurut perspektif self determination theory (SDT) dan prestasi akademik. *Skripsi*.
- Eymur, G., & Geban, Ö. (2011). An investigation of the relationship between motivation and academic achievement of pre-service chemistry teacher. *Education aand Science, 36*(161), 246-255.
- Guay, F., Ratelle, C. F., & Chanal, J. (2008). Optimal learning in optimal context: The role of self-determination in education. *Canadian Psychology, 48*(3), 233-240.
- Jang, H., Kim, E. J., & Reeve, J. (2012). Longitudinal test of self-determination theory's motivation mediation model in a naturally occurring classroom context. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 104*(4), 1175-1188. doi:10.1037/a0028089
- Kırkağaç, Ş., & Öz, H. (2017). The role of academic motivation in predicting preservice EFL teachers' achievement. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 13*(2), 96-108.
- McLachlan, S., Keatley, D., Stiff, C., & Hagger, M. (2009). Shame: A self-determination theory perspective. *Psychology of Neuroticism and Shame, 1*-14.
- Nasution, S. (1999). *Berbagai pendekatan dalam proses belajar*. Jakarta: Bina Aksara.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*, 54-67. doi:10.1006/ceps.1999.1020
- Supramono, S., & Haryanto, H. (2003). *Desain Proposal Penelitian Studi Pemasaran*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Andi.
- Syah, M. (2003). *Psikologi Belajar*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Syah, M., Wardan, A. S., Rakhmat, M. F., & Muchlis, M. (1997). *Psikologi pendidikan dengan pendekatan baru*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Tangney, J. P., Stuewig, J., & Mashek, D. J. (2007). Moral emotions and moral behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58*, 345-372.
- Udam, Y. A., Ranimpi, Y. Y., & Kinasih, A. (2019). Hubungan antara keaktifan berorganisasi, motivasi belajar, dengan prestasi belajar dan status kesehatan mental ada mahasiswa FISIP di Universitas Cendrawasih Papua. *Jurnal Keperawatan Respati Yogyakarta, 6*(2), 702-703.

- Weiner, I. B., & Craighead, W. E. (2010). *The corisini encyclopedia of psychology*. New York: Wiley.
- Widyawan, K. W., & Hartati, E. (2016). Improving students' speaking skill by using their spoken audion recording in the middle school. *Journal of English Language and Education*, 2(1), 26-32.

**About the authors:**

Aditya Sahrul Akbar is a student of English Language Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Univeersitas Mercu Buana.

Elysa Hartati is a lecturer at English Language Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Mercu Buana.