

Original Research Article

Student Course Engagement and Academic Life Satisfaction of College Students

ABSTRACT

Student course engagement and academic life satisfaction are two determinants of student success. In university courses, student course engagement holds the power to shape numerous results, including learning, achievements, retention rates, satisfaction levels, and overall academic success. Academic life satisfaction, on the other hand, is defined as the student's attitude and sense of well-being with regard to their learning activities. Academic life satisfaction also plays a significant role in shaping student course engagement. This study utilized descriptive-correlational research design which provides insights into the levels of student course engagement and academic life satisfaction. The research aims to identify correlations and predictors, particularly the impact of academic life satisfaction on student course engagement. The study was particularly joined by 350 college students using a simple random sampling comprising first-year to fourth-year level students. The data interpretation is performed by Jamovi software together with Excel. The gathered data go through the test of normality using the Shapiro-Wilk Test which shows not normally distributed data because of the outliers. The result shows that student course engagement and academic life satisfaction have a significant relationship. Moreover, using Linear Regression Analysis, personal satisfaction is the only predictor that contributes to student course engagement among the respondents. Linear regression analysis indicates a positive correlation between two variables: as the student becomes satisfied, the more they will engage themselves in certain activities. Lastly, this study is beneficial to the current student enrollee in the institution by knowing one of the factors that predict academic success and this study provides elaborated detail about a specific factor that gives them the perceived state of stopping the attainment of bachelor's degree.

Keywords: Academic Life Satisfaction, College Students, Correlation, Student Course Engagement

1. INTRODUCTION

In higher education, academic excellence is tied to student course engagement and overall satisfaction with academic life. In university courses, student engagement holds the power to shape numerous results, including learning, achievements, retention rates, satisfaction levels, and overall academic success (Géraldine Heilporn et al., 2024). As per Pan and Cutumisu (2023), life satisfaction affects both academic performance and long-term health, it is an important aspect of a student's general well-being. For Kahu and Nelson (2018), the engagement of students is also essential to their achievements in higher education. Research investigating the engagement of college students with their institutional experiences indicates the effects of their education are significantly shaped by the extent and nature of their involvement in the learning process (Nasir et al., 2020).

A wide range of factors affecting college student's involvement in learning are examined in numerous studies. According to Newton and colleagues (2020), applied engagement is a motivational state that reflects how much a person devotes their physical, mental, and emotional energies. This active participation is also defined as the quantity and quality of the involvement given by students in specific tasks and activities (Hiver et al., 2021). In fact, the practical involvement that comes from student's individual interests directly and positively influences their school engagement (Bautista et al., 2023). Applied engagement in both academic and extracurricular pursuits on campus plays a vital role in fostering success for students, encompassing both academic achievements and social development (Helianny Kiswantomo et al., 2023).

Another aspect to focus on is goal-oriented engagement which positively predicts academic engagement, mediated by perceived educational environment and academic self-efficacy (Zhang et al., 2022). Inferred by Alasqah (2022), the university students with high goal orientations performed better academically during the COVID-19 pandemic. Studies have shown that a student's perception of mastery goal orientation, consistency of interest, and perseverance of effort positively impacts the student's engagement (Huang et al., 2024). Furthermore, Miller and his colleagues (2021) have explored how goal orientation impacts student's engagement in postsecondary education, resulting in students with mastery-approach orientation being highly engaged in learning.

The other specific factor that adds to the engagement of students is self-discipline, where having high self-discipline leads to positive outcomes, such as task completion, GPA, job performance, and affect, by reducing off-task thoughts and behaviors (Moon et al., 2020). According to Lone (2021), having the self-control to consistently practice better study habits leads to improved academic performance for students, with consistent practices resulting in better grades on exams. In addition, Yang and his colleagues (2024) revealed that self-control certainly affects college student's knowledge acquisition engagement; second, the relationship between self-control and learning engagement was partially mediated by resilience; third, a portion of the relationship between self-control and learning engagement was mediated by positive emotions; and fourth, the relationship between self-control and learning engagement was sequentially mediated by resilience and positive emotions. In fact, self-regulated learning positively and significantly correlates with student engagement in college students with multiple roles (Setiani, S., & Wijaya, 2020). Academic self-efficacy positively impacts academic engagement, with its effects varying significantly depending on various regions (Fatima et al., 2024).

In addition, interactive engagement, specifically cooperative learning, is another factor that improves student's academic achievement and academic self-concept in certain subjects (Agwu & Nmadu, 2023). This approach integrates participation, collaboration, and technology to enhance learning experiences. Through hands-on activities, group collaboration, and technological tools, interactive learning aims to captivate student's attention and maintain engagement throughout the learning process (Martin, 2021). Additionally, Miao and Ma (2022), explore the relationships between online interaction, self-regulated learning, social presence, and learning engagement in online environments. The study revealed that online interaction influenced social presence, which in turn affected learning engagement.

Furthermore, student engagement may be influenced by life satisfaction, as university students content with their lives tend to direct their attention toward campus activities (Heliany Kiswantomu et al., 2023). Presented in the study by Ramos and his colleagues (2022), descriptive research was conducted in the Philippines where the study focused on analyzing responses from college students about how interested and satisfied they were with the online courses in mathematics. Through a mediation analysis of responses from 512 students using a 35-item survey created by researchers, it was evident that the learners conveyed interest in and contentment with their virtual math classes. The same study conducted by Kiswantomu, Savitri, and Tambun (2023) in Bandung City, Indonesia, involving 397 active university students, found that life satisfaction had a positive impact on university student's engagement either simultaneously or partially.

A local study by Baloran and colleagues (2021), conducted a study that established a notable connection between student's satisfaction with their courses and their participation in distance education at Bansalan College, University of Mindanao, Philippines, amidst the global outbreak. The findings indicated that students exhibited a high degree of satisfaction with their courses and demonstrated active participation in online education methods. While pupils expressed similar satisfaction degrees with relation to the standard of offering online learning, variations were observed in their engagement levels based on their academic year. The research disclosed a strong relationship between student participation and the satisfaction of online courses.

Life satisfaction, on the other hand, is defined as a person's overall analysis of life (Burgos-Videla, 2022). More specifically, academic life satisfaction (ALS) is defined as a student's attitude and sense of well-being with regard to their learning activities (MJ, 2019). Academic Life Satisfaction's first indicator is personal satisfaction which is defined as the satisfaction of one's own needs or desires, a beneficial impact, and an optimistic outlook, which improves well-being, standard of living, and performance (Ashgar, 2022). Based on the study of Pekdoğan & Yurtcu (2022), university student's personal satisfaction is mainly influenced by self-regulation, environmental discomfort, and teaching style, with the teacher-student relationship being the most significant factor. Satisfaction with one's chosen field is the most crucial factor affecting personal satisfaction, with other factors like college life, learning outcomes, and social self-confidence also playing a role (Danisman et al., 2023). Desired major selection and satisfaction positively impact college life adjustment and dropout intention, putting more emphasis on their autonomy to freely develop their skills and acquire personal achievements (Shin et al., 2023). According to Lupu (2020), 97.30% of students are satisfied with the professional skills formed by the study program they personally decided to attend, with 50.7% very satisfied and 25.8% relatively satisfied.

Satisfaction with the academic environment is the second indicator for life satisfaction which is defined as the material surroundings and the mental climate that plays a vital part in the health of both employees and students. (Hawkins et al., 2023). The academic environment includes classroom design, creative space, and available resources, which signifies supported and fulfilled academic pursuits of students (Abe & Hayashi, 2023). According to Allam & Malik (2020), improving the learning environment at higher education institutions like faculty, infrastructure, and campus life will promote student satisfaction. A good learning environment positively influences college student's academic motivation, learning strategies, and engagement in the classroom, contributing to their achievement and success (Cayubit, 2021).

The results if an institution fails to meet the needs of students for quality and suitable service that is in line with their courses, it could bring negative effects. Based on the study of Romero & Nalangan (2023), graduated business students from the University of Mindanao suggest the need for further curriculum development to enhance their entrepreneurial skills. Unpleasant treatment of workers and insufficient student facilities are the prevalent comments of undergraduate student's feedback regarding services in private university education causing learner's contentment with their academic lives to deteriorate (Prasetyo et al., 2022). The poor student quality services at a Philippine state university generally fall short of students' expectations, leading to poor student engagement (Sarsale, 2020). This means that when tertiary schools prioritize their academic services, the institution will probably have positive feedback from the students (Gul et al., 2019). Despite the increasing recognition of the importance of both course engagement and contentment in academic life, there is an apparent absence of empirical studies exploring their interconnectedness, especially within the unique context of this institution. The primary objective is to investigate whether the level of academic life satisfaction among students serves as a significant determinant influencing their course engagement, thus contributing valuable insights to seal the prevailing gap in the scholarly literature. Furthermore, this study is important since it offers reliable data on college student's course involvement and academic life satisfaction. Due to the rampant reviews about college course engagement and academic life satisfaction, this research is relevant in addressing the challenges and issues faced nowadays. The study's findings will primarily give advantage to students by knowing one of the factors that predict academic success.

This study specifically determined the following:

1. To determine the level of the Students' Course Engagement of students in terms of:
 - 1.1. Applied Engagement;
 - 1.2. Goal-Oriented Engagement;
 - 1.3. Self-Disciplined Engagement; and
 - 1.4. Interactive Engagement.
2. To analyze the level of Academic Life Satisfaction of students in terms of:
 - 2.1. Personal Satisfaction; and
 - 2.2. Satisfaction with the Academic Environment.
3. To understand if there is any significant relationship between the Academic Life Satisfaction and Students Course Engagement of students.
4. To examine to what extent Academic Life Satisfaction predicts changes in the Student's Course Engagement.

2. METHODOLOGY

This section explains the various methods that were used in gathering data and analysis which are relevant to the study. It includes aspects such as the location and selection of respondents, the statistical instruments utilized, the procedure for data collection, and ethical considerations.

2.1 Research Respondents

The research respondents of this study were exclusively college students within Davao Region in all year levels and departments. The researchers used a simple random sampling upon the selection of respondents which helps promote reliable statistical inferences in the population. Random selection of the respondents is one of the methods that negate the possible confounding variable that may exist. Additionally, using this method is both convenient and fair because it ensures that everyone in the larger group has an equal chance of being chosen for the sample (Hayes, 2023). The overall population had a number of 3,868 students, using the Slovin's formula a total of 350 students are needed to respond in the study. A total of 350 respondents voluntarily included themselves in the study with the freedom to withdraw at any time when they felt uneasy.

Table 1. Characteristics of Respondents (n=350)

Profile	f	%
----------------	----------	----------

SEX		
Male	149	42.6
Female	201	57.4
YEAR LEVEL		
1 st	187	53.4
2 nd	115	32.9
3 rd	31	8.9
4 th	17	4.9
AGE		
18-21	298	85.1
22-25	47	13.4
26-29	5	1.4
DEPARTMENTS		
DAS	112	32.0
DCJE	84	24.0
DAE	31	8.9
DBA	32	9.1
DTP	25	7.1
DTE	66	8.9
TOTAL	350	100.0

Table 1 shows the majority of the respondents were aged 18-21 (n=298, 85.1%), followed by 22-25 years old (n=47, 13.4%), and for the least respondents came from the category of 26-29 (n=5, 1.4%). In terms of sex, most respondents are female (n=201, 57.4%) and the least is male (n=149, 42.6%). With departments, it is ranked from the greatest to least starting with DAS (n=112, 32.0%), followed by DCJE (n=84, 24.0%), DTE (n=66, 18.9%), DBA (n=32, 9.1%), DAE (n=31, 8.9%), and DTP (n=25, 7.1%). Lastly, respondents who joined in terms of year level are mostly 1st year (n=187, 53.4%), followed by 2nd year (n=115, 32.9%), then 3rd year (n=31, 8.9%), and 4th year (n=17, 4.9%).

2.2 Research Instruments

The data interpretation primarily undergoes the test of normality using the Shapiro-Wilk Test to see if the data is normally distributed and to spot the presence of outliers. The findings showed not normally distributed data with a p-value of <0.05 which suggests the use of Spearman Rho. Furthermore, the descriptives had been utilized to measure the relationship between the two variables, and it portrays a significant relationship. By seeing the significant relationship between course engagement and academic life satisfaction, the researcher continued analyzing the data using the linear regression analysis.

The research instruments used in data gathering are survey questionnaires adapted from the Development and Psychometric Study of the Academic Life Satisfaction Scale (ALS) and Student Course Engagement Questionnaire-Modified for use with online course survey questionnaires. Before any further steps take place, the researchers first request the permission of the authors to use their questionnaire in this study. The Academic Life Satisfaction Scale from the study of Mj, (2019) is an 8-item questionnaire with two indicators: Satisfaction with Academic Environment and Personal Satisfaction. The Course Engagement from Azrin et al. (2024), is a 23-item questionnaire with four indicators: Applied Engagement, Goal-Oriented Engagement, Self-Disciplined Engagement, and Interactive Engagement.

The researchers merged and modified the questionnaire from the academic life satisfaction scale and course engagement which is validated by having a pilot testing within the school premises. The researcher's inference upon analyzing the pilot-testing results of ALS questionnaire, shows .89 Cronbach's α with a small gap to its original study having ($\alpha = .80$) SCE on the other hand, depicted .95 Cronbach's α compared to its initial study that the internal consistency reliabilities vary between .71 and .81. The overall reliability index with the modified questionnaires portrays a ($\alpha = .96$).

Moreover, the questionnaire in this study used a 5-point response category for Likert-type scales and provides advantages in reliability, test information perspective, and easier responding for respondents (Aybek & Toraman, 2022). The Student Course Engagement rates are (5= Very characteristic of me; 4= Characteristic of me; 3= Moderately characteristic of me; 2= Not really characteristic of me; 1= Not at all characteristic of me) (Mj, 2019). In addition, the Academic Life Satisfaction questionnaire rates in a 5-point Likert-type scale, all positive (range from: 1= Strongly disagree; 2= Disagree; 3= Neither agree or disagree; 4= Agree; 5= I totally agree) (Azrin et al., 2024).

Depicted in the table below are the interpretations used to evaluate the mean scores of student course engagement and academic life satisfaction of the college students. The mean scores collected were evaluated using the mean ranges from Denny (2024). The three columns in the table represent mean interval, description, and interpretation.

Table 2. Student Course Engagement Mean Interpretation

Mean Interval	Description	Interpretation
4.21 - 5.00	Very characteristic of me	Very positively engaged
3.41 - 4.20	Characteristic of me	Positively Engaged
2.61 - 3.40	Moderately characteristic of me	Moderately Engaged
1.81 - 2.60	Not really characteristic of me	Negatively Engaged
1.00 - 1.80	Not at all characteristic of me	Very Negatively Engaged

Table 3. Academic Life Satisfaction Mean Interpretation

Mean Interval	Description	Interpretation
4.21 - 5.00	I Totally Agree	Satisfaction is always evident
3.41 - 4.20	Agree	Satisfaction is oftentimes evident
2.61 - 3.40	Neither Agree or Nor Disagree	Satisfaction is sometimes evident
1.81 - 2.60	Disagree	Satisfaction is seldom evident
1.00 - 1.80	Strongly Disagree	Satisfaction is not evident

2.3 Design and Procedure

The study utilized the quantitative approach and portrayed descriptive-correlational research design. Primarily, the researcher formulated related literature from the conglomerated study. The researchers made use of a prior tested and validated research questionnaire from Mj, (2019) and Azrin et al. (2024), that aims to reveal the influence of academic life satisfaction and course engagement on the general well-being of an individual. As the questionnaires are modified, it is again tested for their reliability index by running a pilot test that results in .89 Cronbach's α for Academic Life Satisfaction and .95 Cronbach's α for Student Course Engagement.

Before administering the dissemination of survey questionnaires, the researchers provided a letter of permission to be signed by the adviser and further submitted to the dean's office. After the letter was approved, the researchers started to distribute their modified questionnaires to the respondents together with their informed consent. The respondent's freedom to withdraw at any time and their right to fully know the possible risks and benefits is stated in the informed consent. The data collected from the respondents was then stored in an exclusive room that only the researchers could access. In addition, the data interpretation was carried out through Jamovi software. As per Şahin & Aybek (2019), Jamovi is a statistical software designed for social scientists, facilitating the creation of modules for meta-analysis.

2.4 Statistical Treatment

The interpretation of the data primarily goes through the testing of normality which is tested by the Shapiro-Wilk Test for possible outliers that affect the normality of the data. According to Zach (2021), to conclude that the data is normally distributed, it must show a bell curve or form a straight line at a 45-degree angle upon the calculation of the value of interest or sample means. However, the data interpretation results show not normally distributed data with ($\rho = .168$, p -value = .001). In this case, the researchers decided to apply Standard Deviation, Mean, Spearman Rho, and Linear Regression Analysis. The Spearman's correlation was utilized in the data interpretation by the researchers since it is the alternative to the Pearson correlation (Frost, 2021). Furthermore, the average score emerges as the most influential predictor of life satisfaction, mental health, self-esteem, and counterproductive work, productive work behavior, and social orientation (Nielsen et al., 2023). Additionally, standard deviation used to calculate the extent to which a set of values varies or is scattered. Both play a role by evaluating and measuring the levels of the variables.

Anderson (2022) explains that the correlation coefficient quantifies the strength of a relationship, ranging from -1 to 1. A value near 1 indicates a strong positive correlation, close to -1 signifies a strong negative correlation, while proximity to 0 suggests a lack of a clear relationship. This technique is very helpful in figuring out how explanatory factors and criteria measures relate to one another. Another is, reporting the p -value and the effect size is crucial. Pearson correlation reveals

if there is a significant difference between the two variables and the effect size that tells how big is the difference between the treatment and control group (Emerson, 2022).

The researchers proceed with a linear regression analysis to determine which factor affects the dependent variable. As per Maulud & Abdulazeez (2020), linear regression analysis is used to determine how one or more independent variables influence or predict changes in a dependent variable. P values in linear regression are used to conclude statistically significant group differences, while predictive analysis tools aim to forecast an individual's future (Bzdok, 2020).

2.5 Ethical Consideration

*Voluntary Participation.*All respondents in this study were informed of their rights to withdraw at any time during the dissemination of the survey questionnaires. The respondent's decision to be involved in the study is respected as it is an autonomous individual.

*Informed Consent Process.*Before the survey questionnaires were disseminated, the researchers informed the respondent by reading the study's main objective, the contents of the questionnaire, and the contribution of the findings to the body of knowledge. The respondents are also informed that the procedures performed by the researcher were approved by the institution.

Privacy and Confidentiality. The respondents who voluntarily joined in the study are kept anonymous by giving them the freedom to freely proceed in taking the survey questionnaire without putting their names. Additionally, all data collected from the respondents were stored in a private place that only researchers can access.

*Risk.*The researchers stated the possible triggering factor that the respondents could encounter upon answering. Their individual active engagement contributes and creates concrete information about the satisfactory level of students that predicts the academic success of a student.

*Benefits.*The respondents were all informed about the contribution of the study to the body of knowledge. The research findings will benefit them by providing factors that contribute to the perception of dropping out, which is an important consideration in achieving academic success.

*Plagiarism.*Each part of the study goes through consistent peer review and revisions, considering the production of authentic information following the proper method imposed by the institution.

*Falsification.*The cited literature was examined if it gives reliable information before including in the study.

*Conflict of Interest.*The study was created without alteration of the statistical inferences that could promote biases. The integrity of the researcher is practiced by following the instructions provided by the institution. The making of each research part is without the inclusion of researchers' subjective ideas.

*Deceit.*The research study was created with direct instructions leaving no confusion to the respondents during and after their involvement. The researcher ensured that no deception could harm the respondents.

*Permission from Organization/Location.*Before any further procedures happen, the researchers primarily obtain the signatures from the adviser and most importantly from the school dean. Stated in the signed letter the objectives, procedures, and involvement of the students in the University of Mindanao Digos College.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section reports the data, analysis, and interpretation based on the results given from the responses of students in their course engagement and academic life satisfaction. The tables are followed with subheadings: Level of Student Course Engagement and Level of Academic Life Satisfaction of Respondents, Summary of Spearman rho Correlation between Student Course Engagement and Academic Life Satisfaction of Respondents, and Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Student Course Engagement (n=350).

3.1 The Level of Student Course Engagement of College Students

Table 4 shows the statistical analysis results in the utilization of specific criteria to measure the levels of Student Course Engagement among college students. The assessment covers four criteria; Applied Engagement, Goal-Oriented Engagement, Self-Disciplined Engagement, and Interactive Engagement.

Table 4. Level of Students Course Engagement of Respondents

Indicators	\bar{x}	SD	Interpretation
Applied Engagement	3.82	.782	Positively engaged
Goal-Oriented Engagement	3.80	.686	Positively engaged
Self-Disciplined Engagement	3.52	.656	Positively engaged
Interactive Engagement	3.69	.727	Positively engaged
Total	3.72	.736	Positively engaged

Table 4 shows the level of student course engagement of the college students across four categories. Among the indicators, Applied Engagement had the highest mean score ($\bar{x}= 3.82$, $SD= .782$). This suggests that college students show a positive engagement in Applied Engagement activities. This suggests that college students have a positive engagement in their applied engagement, in which the students are more likely to be involved in making connections between what they have learned and their interest and goals, and applying it in their life. Hence, when students' could see the relevance of their course material to their own lives, they are more likely to engage with it actively and apply it academically or personally. This may be explained by students with strong learning objectives finding particular aspects of the learning material engaging and directing their attention primarily towards those aspects (Daumiller et al., 2023). Conversely, Self-Disciplined Engagement had the lowest mean score ($\bar{x}= 3.52$, $SD= .656$). Despite being the lowest among the indicators, it is still considered positively engaged based on the analysis. It appears that the students tend to show a reasonable level of self-control, organization, and well established study habits. It is possible that the students who are inclined in making a well established organization of their notes and following a strict study behavior, could be high in self-discipline and could positively affect their academic success. This study is supported by the study conducted by Chica-Alva (2017), stating that study habits do influence academic performance of the students. Şimşir & Dilmaç (2020) additionally discovered that individuals with high levels of self-discipline are inclined to undertake more endeavors to attain their objectives, such as engaging in work, acquiring professional skills, reading, and conducting research, even when faced with challenges . Furthermore, the overall student course engagement of the college students had a mean score ($\bar{x}= 3.72$, $SD= .736$) reflecting an overall positively engaged analysis. This suggests that those students who are more likely to demonstrate active involvement, motivation, and commitment across various factors of engagements. This finding is supported by a study conducted by Zhang & Zhang (2024), their research revealed that the behavioral, cognitive, emotional, and social dimensions of learner engagement experienced ongoing evolution influenced by various factors such as language, cultural differences, course mode, technical support, language proficiency, and motivation.

3.2 Level of Academic Life Satisfaction of College Students

The table presents the statistical analysis findings regarding the assessment of Academic Life Satisfaction among college students using specific criteria. The evaluation encompasses 2 aspects: Personal Satisfaction, and Satisfaction with Academic Environment.

Table 5. Level of Academic Life Satisfaction of Respondents

Indicators	\bar{x}	SD	Interpretation
Personal satisfaction	3.77	.783	Satisfaction is oftentimes evident
Satisfaction with Academic Environment	3.73	.777	Satisfaction is oftentimes evident
Total	3.75	.628	Satisfaction is oftentimes evident

Table 5 illustrates the level of Academic Life Satisfaction of the college students. The results show that among the indicators a high level of Personal Satisfaction ($\bar{x}= 3.77$, $SD= .783$) was shown, the results shows that the satisfaction is oftentimes evident. The results show that the students have high personal satisfaction suggesting that the students feel content, happy, and fulfilled in their lives. This could imply that the college students have fulfilling relationships, engaged in enjoyable leisure activities, achieve personal goals, and experience overall well-being. The study by Furlong et al. (2013) shows that positive school experiences, like good relationships with peers and teachers, feelings of safety, and engagement in learning, enhance the students' satisfaction. Similarly, Oberly et al (2011) find that mindfulness practices

improve students' self-regulation, leading to greater satisfaction, reduced stress, and improved well-being. Both studies suggest that creating positive environments and implementing mindfulness practices benefit students satisfaction and well-being in education. Additionally, the mean score for Satisfaction with Academic Environment is the lowest (\bar{x} = 3.73, SD = .777), indicating frequent observation of satisfaction. Despite the disparity in mean scores between the two indicators, their ranges are similar. Moreover, a high score of Satisfaction with Academic Environment could indicate a greater satisfaction with the academic environment, suggesting that individuals feel supported, engaged, and fulfilled in their educational pursuits. This possibly means that when students have a positive perception of their academic environment, they are more likely to demonstrate higher levels of motivation, engagement, and overall well-being. The study of Liu et al. (2023) finds out that enhancing academic environment satisfaction can improve learning motivation. In addition, the overall Academic Life Satisfaction of the college students has a mean score of (\bar{x} = 3.75, SD = .628) shows that the satisfaction is oftentimes evident, indicating a generally positive perception of their personal and academic circumstances. According to the study of Antaramian (2017), while both sets of students expressed contentment with their lives, those with exceptionally high life satisfaction enjoyed notable benefits to those with average life satisfaction. Individuals' self-efficacy beliefs, which include positive outcome expectations and a sense of support, play a role in influencing their judgments of academic satisfaction (Lent, 2004).

3.3 Relationship between Students Course Engagement and Academic Life Satisfaction

The table presents the summary of the correlation between the factors of Student Course Engagement, namely Applied Engagement, Goal-Oriented Engagement, Self-Disciplined Engagement, Interactive Engagement, and Academic Life Satisfaction, namely, Personal Satisfaction, and Satisfaction with the Academic Environment.

Table 6. Summary of Spearman Rho Correlation between Student Course Engagement and Academic Life Satisfaction of Respondent

Variables	Overall Academic Life Satisfaction		
	rho	p-value	Remarks
Students Course Engagement	.168	<.002	Significant

This table presents the correlation between overall academic life satisfaction and students' course engagement. The Spearman rho correlation coefficient (rho) is 0.168, indicating a positive relationship between the two variables. The P =.002, suggesting that the correlation is statistically significant. In summary, there is a significant positive correlation between overall academic life satisfaction and students' course engagement, highlighting the potential influence of course engagement on academic satisfaction. The findings demonstrated a positive and significant correlation between the three aspects of academic involvement and life satisfaction. This indicates that as the students' academic life satisfaction increases, their level of student course engagement also increases, hence students who have high levels of academic life satisfaction are also more likely to be actively involved and engaged in their coursework. Maintaining student engagement is crucial for retaining their interest in the course, thereby enhancing their overall learning experience (Barkley & Major, 2020; Lee et al., 2019; Rogers-Stacy et al., 2017). In addition, Gilman and Huebner (2006) study observed that adolescents with elevated life satisfaction demonstrated a positive correlation with superior academic performance, as well as enhanced interpersonal and intrapersonal functioning compared to those with lower life satisfaction. Their findings also underscored the interconnectedness of high life satisfaction levels with positive behavioral and psychological adjustment indices.

3.4 Regression Analysis for Variables

This table presents the regression analysis results for students' course engagement, revealing that among the two predictors considered, only one variable demonstrates statistical significance in relation to students' course engagement.

Table 7. Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Student Course Engagement (n=350)

VARIABLE	B	SE B	t	p-value
Intercept	2.826	.167	16.851	<.001
PERSONAL SATISFACTION	.193	.065	2.929	.004
SATISFACTION WITH ACADEMIC ENVIRONMENT	.043	.066	.661	.509
R²		0.081		

Results show that 8% of the variance is explained by the three predictors, $F(2,347)= 15.4, P= .001$. Specifically, Personal Satisfaction ($B= .19, t= 2.92 .004$) is positively correlated with the Students Course Engagement. On the other hand, Satisfaction with Academic Environment ($B= .043, t= .661, P= N.S$). This suggests that those students who are more likely to have a high Personal Satisfaction could influence the Students Course Engagement compared to Satisfaction with Academic Environment. This suggests that the students who are satisfied with their internal factors such as their relationship with other students, their academic performance, happiness, and motivation in their course, are most likely to have a high student course engagement. This could mean that when students feel content in their personal matters therefore it influences the student course engagement. According to Salikhova et al. (2024), when students are internally motivated, they are most likely to maintain interest in learning, to persevere in their learning, and to experience greater academic success. This suggests that while personal satisfaction plays a role in shaping student course engagement, there are numerous other factors, accounting for the remaining 92% of the variance. Additionally, Baloran et al. (2021) highlighted that satisfaction with online courses is notably associated with students' engagement in various dimensions including skills engagement, emotion engagement, participation engagement, and performance engagement. According to Wang (2021), college students' cognitive engagement is influenced by six key factor dimensions: attention and motivation, behavior and value attainment, interest and practicality, personality and will, evaluation and time management, and knowledge and strategy.

4. CONCLUSION

This study assessed the relationship between Student Course Engagement (SCE) and Academic Life satisfaction (ALS) among college students. The data shows a slight majority of female students, with first-year students comprising the largest group. Most students fell within the age of 18-21 years, and DAS had the highest number of respondents.

Mean and standard deviation were used to assess the level of Student Course Engagement and Academic Life Satisfaction, with Applied Engagement scoring highest and Self-Disciplined Engagement lowest in Student Course Engagement. Among Academic Life Satisfaction indicators, Personal Satisfaction scored highest and Satisfaction with Academic Environment is the lowest. The statistical inferences portray ranking among the variables but each indicator is considered the same since all of their interpretation belongs to the positively engaged category. This implies that despite being categorized as the lowest level of engagement, Self-disciplined Engagement still measures student's levels of self-control, consistency in study habits, and organizational skills which is mostly high. Contrastly, the indicator having the greatest mean, which is Applied Engagement, concludes that most students in the institution have high levels of effort into tasks, activities, or responsibilities. These high scores in applied engagement suggest that the individual could be diligent, committed, and actively participates in various endeavors and they are likely taking initiative and working conscientiously towards their goals.

For Academic Life Satisfaction, sample mean and standard deviation was used in the analysis. Depicted in table 5 the difference between two indicators, personal satisfaction with the greatest mean together with its standard deviation and Satisfaction with Academic Environment being the least. The two indicators being categorized are the same by looking at their interpretation showing both satisfaction is oftentimes evident. College students having high levels of Personal Satisfaction indicates that individuals might feel content, happy, and fulfilled in their lives by the match of their self and passion. It simply focused on the student's established intrinsic aspects that could be influenced by motivation level towards the course or primarily because of their interest. Furthermore, students with high levels of Satisfaction with Academic Environment pertains to the degree of their contentment or fulfillment experienced within the academic setting, such as peers, teachers or overall facilities. A higher score might indicate greater satisfaction with the academic environment, suggesting that individuals feel supported, engaged, and fulfilled in their educational pursuits.

The Shapiro-Wilk test indicated non-normal distribution, leading to the use of Spearman rho Correlation, which showed a significant relationship between Student Course Engagement and Academic Life Satisfaction. Linear regression revealed that personal satisfaction significantly predicted SCE, where it indicates a positive correlation with the two variables. The

researcher inferred a positive correlation between two variables, as they observed that as the level of Student Course Engagement increases, so does the level of Academic Life Satisfaction.

Furthermore, institutions should consider strategies to enhance Student Course Engagement, especially in areas related to Applied Engagement and Personal Satisfaction, as these positively impact Academic Life Satisfaction. In addition, Educational programs and support systems should be designed to address the specific needs and preferences of students, especially those in the early years of their academic journey. Efforts to foster a supportive academic environment and promote Personal Satisfaction among students can contribute to higher levels of course engagement and academic satisfaction. Lastly, further research could explore additional factors influencing Student Course Engagement and Academic Life Satisfaction, considering variables such as socio-economic background, cultural differences, and institutional policies. Another mediating factor that adds up to the student course engagement could be the motivation level among students that is a complete conglomeration of different factors.

REFERENCES

1. Abe, C., & Hayashi, T. (2023). *Relationship Between Subjective Evaluation of School Environment and Learning Motivation*. E3S Web of Conferences. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202339601022>.
2. Agwu, U. D., & Nmadu, J. (2023). *Students' interactive engagement, academic achievement and self concept in chemistry: an evaluation of cooperative learning pedagogy*. Chemistry Education Research and Practice. <https://doi.org/10.1039/D2RP00148A>
3. Allam, Z., & Malik, A. (2020). *Exploring the Predictors of Student Satisfaction: A Case of Undergraduate Business School in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia*. Universal Journal of Educational Research, 8, 5760-5767. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.082210>.
4. Alasqah, S. (2022). *Goal Orientation and Its Impact on University Students' Academic Achievement During the COVID-19 Pandemic*. SAGE Open, 12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221093617>.
5. Anderson, C. (2022). *Canonical Correlation Analysis. Statistical Methods for Climate Scientists*. <https://doi.org/10.3888/TMJ.16-6>.
6. Ashgar, R. (2022). *Personal satisfaction: A concept analysis*. Nursing forum. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nuf.12692>.
7. Aybek, E., & Toraman, Ç. (2022). *How many response categories are sufficient for Likert type scales? An empirical study based on the Item Response Theory*. International Journal of Assessment Tools in Education. <https://doi.org/10.21449/ijate.1132931>.
8. Azrin, M., Nasir, M., & Wang, C. (2024). *Modifying The Student Course Engagement Questionnaire For Use With Online Courses*. Retrieved March 7, 2024, from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1241583.pdf?fbclid=IwAR3jMZsVL1gMzG7BTzfsQbrFFKg4fII3hd5QgNyivfZwhVUdPjR8YhqKT-I>
9. Baloran, E. T., Hernan, J. T., & Taoy, J. S. (2021). *Course satisfaction and student engagement in online learning amid COVID-19 pandemic: A structural equation model*. Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education, 22(4), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.17718/tojde.1002721>
10. Bautista, C., Dios, D., & Lobo, J. (2023). *The Nexus between individual interest and school engagement in bolstering Physical Culture for a habitual healthy régime: a case of a state university*. Physical Education of Students. <https://doi.org/10.15561/20755279.2023.0104>.
11. Burgos-Videla, C., Jorquera-Gutiérrez, R., López-Meneses, E., & Bernal, C. (2022). *Life Satisfaction and Academic Engagement in Chileans Undergraduate Students of the University of Atacama*. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19(24), 16877. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192416877>
12. Bzdok, D., Engemann, D., & Thirion, B. (2020). *Inference and Prediction Diverge in Biomedicine*. Patterns, 1. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2020.100119>.

13. Cayubit, R. (2021). *Why learning environment matters? An analysis on how the learning environment influences the academic motivation, learning strategies and engagement of college students*. Learning Environments Research, 25, 581-599. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-021-09382-x>.
14. Chilca-Alva, M. L. (2017). *Autoestima, hábitos de estudio y rendimiento académico en estudiantes universitarios*. Propósitos Y Representaciones, 5(1), 71. <https://doi.org/10.20511/pyr2017.v5n1.145>
15. Danisman, F., Kilic, I., Sarul, G., Aktas, S., Amini, N., & Ada, O. (2023). *METU Students' college life satisfaction*. ArXiv, abs/2305.15320. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.15320>.
16. Daumiller, M., Rinas, R., & Dresel, M. (2023). *Relevance of Students' Goals for Learning Engagement and Knowledge Gains in an Online Learning Course*. Behavioral Sciences, 13(2), 161. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13020161>
17. Emerson, R. (2022). *Digging into p Values*. Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness, 116, 857 - 858. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0145482x221144443>.
18. Fatimah, S., Murwani, F., Farida, I., & Hitipeuw*, I. (2024). *Academic Self-Efficacy and Its Effect on Academic Engagement: Meta-Analysis*. International Journal of Instruction. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2024.17115a>.
19. Frost, J. (2021). *Spearman's Correlation Explained*. Statistics by Jim. <https://statisticsbyjim.com/basics/spearmans-correlation/>
20. Frost, J. (2023). *Likert Scale: Survey Use & Examples*. <https://statisticsbyjim.com/basics/likert-scale>.
21. Furlong, M. J., You, S., Renshaw, T. L., Smith, D. C., & O'Malley, M. D. (2013). *Preliminary Development and Validation of the Social and Emotional Health Survey for Secondary School Students*. Social Indicators Research, 117(3), 1011–1032. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-013-0373-0>
22. Géraldine, H. Raynault, A., & Frenette, É. (2024). *Student engagement in a higher education course: A multidimensional scale for different course modalities*. Social Sciences & Humanities Open, 9, 100794–100794. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2023.100794>
23. Gul, S., Jan, S., & Shah, F. (2019). *The Impact of Service Quality on Students Satisfaction in higher Education Institutes of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa*. Review of Economics and Development Studies. <https://doi.org/10.26710/READS.V5I1.589>.
24. Hawkins, G., Chung, C., Hertz, M., & Antolin, N. (2023). *The School Environment and Physical and Social-Emotional Well-Being: Implications for Students and School Employees*. The Journal of school health, 93 9, 799-812 . <https://doi.org/10.1111/josh.13375>.
25. Heliany Kiswantomo, Savitri, J., & Grace Naulee Tambun. (2023). *The Role of Self-Esteem and Life Satisfaction on University Students' Engagement*. Journal An-Nafs: Kajian Penelitian Psikologi, 8(2), 249–263. <https://doi.org/10.33367/psi.v8i2.4236>
26. Huang, J., & Sang, G. (2024). *Effect of Students' Perceived Mastery Goal Orientation on Engagement in Chinese Rural Schools: Mediator Role of Grit*. The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-024-00826-5>
27. Kahu, E. R., & Nelson, K. (2018). *Student engagement in the educational interface: Understanding the mechanisms of student success*. Higher Education Research and Development, 37(1), 58–71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2017.1344197>
28. Khan, H., Gul, R., & Zeb, M. (2023). *The Effect of Students' Cognitive and Emotional Engagement on Students' Academic Success and Academic Productivity*. Winter 2023, 3(1), 322–334. <https://doi.org/10.54183/jssr.v3i1.141>
29. Liu, C., Tang, J., Zhou, J., Zhan, X., Shen, J., Wang, M., Shen, C., & Liu, X. (2023). *The influence of academic stress on college students' learning motivation: the mediating role of academic environment satisfaction and the*

- moderating role of learning adaptability*. Research Square (Research Square). <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-2911124/v1>
30. Lone, R. A. (2021). *Study Habits and Academic Performance among Students: A Systematic Review*. RESEARCH REVIEW International Journal of Multidisciplinary. <https://doi.org/10.31305/rrijm.2021.v06.i05.019>.
 31. Lupu, D. (2020). *Choosing an Academic Path, A True Act of Responsibility*. Journal Plus Education, 27, 200-210.
 32. Martin, A. (2021, May 19). *Using Interactive Learning to Improve Student Engagement*. TeachHUB. <https://www.teachhub.com/professional-development/2021/05/using-interactive-learning-to-improve-student-engagement/>
 33. Maulud, D., & Abdulazeez, A. (2020). *A Review on Linear Regression Comprehensive in Machine Learning*. <https://doi.org/10.38094/jastt1457>.
 34. Miao, J., & Ma, L. (2022). *Students' online interaction, self-regulation, and learning engagement in higher education: The importance of social presence to online learning*. Frontiers in Psychology, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.815220>
 35. Miller, A. L., Fassett, K. T., & Palmer, D. L. (2021). *Achievement goal orientation: A predictor of student engagement in higher education*. Motivation and Emotion, 45(3), 327–344. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-021-09881-7>
 36. MJ, N. (2019). *Development and Psychometric Study of the Academic Life Satisfaction Scale (ALSS) in a Higher Education Students Sample*. Nursing & Healthcare International Journal, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.23880/nhij-16000183>
 37. Moon, N., Converse, P., Merlini, K., & Vaghef, K. (2020). *The role of off-task thoughts and behaviors in linking self-control with achievement-related and well-being outcomes*. Journal of Research in Personality, 86, 103935. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2020.103935>.
 38. Nasir, M. A. M., Janikowski, T., Guyker, W., & Wang, C. C. (2020). *Modifying the Student Course Engagement Questionnaire for Use with Online Courses*. Journal of Educators Online, 17(1). <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1241583>
 39. Newton, D., Lepine, J., Kim, J., Wellman, N., & Bush, J. (2020). *Taking engagement to task: The nature and functioning of task engagement across transitions..* The Journal of applied psychology. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000428>.
 40. Nielsen, Y., Thielmann, I., & Pfattheicher, S. (2023). *Beyond the Mean: Can We Improve the Predictive Power of Psychometric Scales?*. Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science, 6. <https://doi.org/10.1177/25152459231177713>.
 41. Oberle, E., Schonert-Reichl, K. A., Lawlor, M. S., & Thomson, K. C. (2011). *Mindfulness and Inhibitory Control in Early Adolescence*. The Journal of Early Adolescence, 32(4), 565–588. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431611403741>
 42. Pekdoğan, S., & Yurtcu, M. (2022). *Analysis of life satisfaction level of university students using hierarchical linear modeling*. Research in Pedagogy. <https://doi.org/10.5937/istrped2201147p>.
 43. Prasetyo, Y., Regondola-Bolata, L., Nadlifatin, R., Persada, S., Chuenyindee, T., & Ardiansyahmiraja, B. (2022). *A Classification Scheme in Evaluating Undergraduate Students' Feedback Towards Service Quality of Private University*. Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Management Science and Industrial Engineering. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3535782.3535811>.
 44. Romero, R., & M.Nalangan, R. (2023). *Assessment of Personal Entrepreneurial Competencies of University of Mindanao Graduating Business Students*. International Journal of Industrial Management. <https://doi.org/10.15282/ijim.17.1.2023.9213>.

45. Salikhova, N. R., Lynch, M. F., Salikhova, A. B., & Fakhrutdinova, A. R. (2024). *Basic Psychological Need Satisfaction among Students in Higher Education*. *Obrazovanie I Samorazvitie*, 19(1), 50–65. <https://doi.org/10.26907/esd.19.1.05>
46. Şahin, M., & Aybek, E. (2019). *Jamovi: An Easy to Use Statistical Software for the Social Scientists*. *International Journal of Assessment Tools in Education*, 6, 670-692. <https://doi.org/10.21449/ijate.661803>.
47. Sarsale, M. (2020). *Exploring Quality of Student Services of a Philippine State University Satellite Campus Using Servqual and Service Improvement Matrix*. , 8, 59-71. <https://doi.org/10.22452/MOJEM.VOL8NO2.5>.
48. Setiani, S., & Wijaya, E. (2020). *The Relationship Between Self-Regulated Learning With Student Engagement in College Students Who Have Many Roles*. *Proceedings of the 2nd Tarumanagara International Conference on the Applications of Social Sciences and Humanities (TICASH 2020)*. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.201209.045>.
49. Shin, A., Ha, M., & Shim, H. (2023). *Effect of Major Selection Motivation and Major Satisfaction on College Life Adjustment and Dropout Intention under the COVID-19 Situation*. *Korean Association For Learner-Centered Curriculum And Instruction*. <https://doi.org/10.22251/jlcci.2023.23.14.385>.
50. Şimşir, Z., & Dilmaç, B. (2020). *Self-discipline in the life of university students: a qualitative research*. *Research on Education and Psychology (REP)*, 4(2), 153–171.
51. Wang, M., & Hofkens, T. (2019). *Beyond Classroom Academics: A School-Wide and Multi-Contextual Perspective on Student Engagement in School*. *Adolescent Research Review*, 5, 419 - 433. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40894-019-00115-z>.
52. Yang, Y.-D., Zhou, C.-L., & Wang, Z.-Q. (2024). *The relationship between self-control and learning engagement among Chinese college students: the chain mediating roles of resilience and positive emotions*. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1331691>
53. Zach, B. (2021). *What is the Assumption of Normality in Statistics?* *Statology*. <https://www.statology.org/assumption-of-normality/>
54. Zhang, F., & Zhang, Z. (2024). *Exploring Chinese college students' engagement in an online EAP course*. *System*, 120, 103214–103214. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103214>
55. Zhang, Y., Guan, X., Ahmed, M., Jobe, M., & Ahmed, O. (2022). *The Association between University Students' Achievement Goal Orientation and Academic Engagement: Examining the Mediating Role of Perceived School Climate and Academic Self-Efficacy*. *Sustainability*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14106304>.