

## Comparison of Learning Outcomes Based on Identity Statuses

Zuhyati Aryani Tlonaen<sup>1\*</sup>, Aniq Hudiyah Bil Haq<sup>2</sup> 

<sup>1</sup> English Education Study Program, Artha Wacana Christian University, Kupang, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> Department of Psychology, University of Muhammadiyah East Kalimantan, Samarinda, Indonesia

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received June 13, 2021

Revised June 15, 2021

Accepted December 22, 2021

Available online March 25, 2022

#### Kata Kunci:

Perbandingan, Status Identitas, Hasil Belajar

#### Keywords:

Comparison, Identity Status, Learning outcomes



This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.

Copyright © 2022 by Author. Published by Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha.

### ABSTRAK

Status identitas merupakan pengkategorian identitas diri yang membantu seseorang untuk membuat pilihan berdasarkan hasil eksplorasi dan komitmen. Hasil belajar setiap siswa berbeda-beda. Beberapa siswa mencapai nilai yang sangat baik, yang lain rata-rata atau bahkan buruk. Status identitas dapat berpengaruh terhadap hasil belajar siswa. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk membandingkan hasil belajar siswa berdasarkan status identitasnya. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kuantitatif. Untuk menguji hipotesis, peneliti menggunakan uji ANOVA satu arah untuk menjawab pertanyaan penelitian tentang perbedaan yang signifikan antara hasil belajar siswa dan status identitas mereka. Sampel penelitian ini adalah 74 mahasiswa semester tiga dari Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris. Data status identitas diperoleh dengan menggunakan kuesioner dengan 40 pernyataan. Data hasil belajar diperoleh dari nilai ulangan akhir semester. Hasil uji ANOVA menunjukkan adanya perbedaan yang signifikan antara hasil belajar siswa dengan status identitasnya. Dengan demikian, penelitian ini membuktikan bahwa terdapat perbedaan hasil belajar berdasarkan status identitas. Oleh karena itu, sangat penting untuk mengetahui status identitas siswa untuk meningkatkan hasil belajar siswa. Siswa dengan status identitas difusi berada dalam masalah serius. Guru harus mencari solusi agar status identitasnya dapat berkembang menuju status identitas yang tinggi.

### ABSTRACT

Identity status is a categorization of self-identity that helps a person to make choices based on the results of exploration and commitment. Learning outcomes vary for each students. Some students achieve excellent grade, others are average or even poor. Identity status may have an effect on students' learning outcomes. This study aims to compare students' learning outcomes based on their identity statuses. This research used a quantitative approach. To examine the hypothesis, researchers used the one-way ANOVA test to answer the research question about a significant difference between students' learning outcomes and their identity status. The samples were 74 third semester students from the English Education Study Program. Data for identity statuses were obtained using a questionnaire with 40 statements. Data for learning outcomes were obtained from final semester test scores. ANOVA test result indicated a significant difference between students' learning outcomes and their identity status. Thus, this study proved that there is a difference between learning outcomes based on identity Status. Therefore, it is vital to know the students' identity status to improve student learning outcomes. Students with a diffusion identity status are in a serious problem. Teachers must find a solution so that their identity status can develop towards a high identity status.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Identity status is a categorization of self-identity that helps a person to make choices based on the results of exploration and commitment. In other word, The term identity statuses classifies one's commitment and exploration and as the identity formation (Marcia in Arnold, 2017; Mutttaqin, D., & Ekowarni, 2016; Sorouphim, K.M., & Issa, 2020). These options are categorized into four; identity achievement is the individuals with high commitment and exploration. This identity is the highest status at the identity level. *Moratorium identity* is an individual with low commitment but high exploration. *Foreclosure identity* is individuals with high commitment and low exploration (Huhtala et al., 2019; Olga et

\*Corresponding author

E-mail addresses: [zuhyatitlonaen@ukaw.ac.id](mailto:zuhyatitlonaen@ukaw.ac.id) (Zuhyati Aryani Tlonaen)

al., 2020). *Diffusion identity* is individuals with low commitment and exploration (Meulemeester et al., 2017; Penner et al., 2019).

The achievement identity is the individuals with strong commitments after period of explorations (Sznitman, Zimmermann & Petegem, 2019). Moratorium is those who explore alternatives with out current strong commitments. Foreclosure is those with strong commitments with out active exploration, while diffusion is those with lack of active exploration and commitments. So that people with high identity status have a high commitment and exploration to look for crises or problems that they get in learning activities in the form of tasks and trying to overcome the crisis. Leading to a low identity status, a person increasingly loses his commitment and exploration when encountering a crisis or problem. Thus, we can detect a student's learning outcomes based on her identity status (Oyserman et al., 2021; Valdez et al., 2022).

Having a good academic performance requires high commitment and high exploration to lead students to achieve good learning outcomes (Blegur, 2020; Korpershoek, 2016). Learning outcomes that become benchmarks are students' scores based on assessment instruments within a certain period (Anthonysamy et al., 2020; Kazu & İş, 2018; Ristanti & Arianto, 2019). The grades obtained are then compared with the specified completeness criteria. From the result, we can see whether the students perform successful outcomes or not (Alhefnawi, 2021; Sriyanti et al., 2021). Thus, academic performance is required in learning to complete all subjects. Furthermore, other research added that learning outcome is not a measured skill for a relatively short and partial time but is a long process that involves a comprehensive range of elements (cognitive, affective, and psychomotor) (Batlolona & Mahapoonyanont, 2019; Mardiana, 2019).

Learning outcomes also help students understand why knowledge and skills will be useful to them (Mahajan, M., & Singh, 2017; Ristanti & Arianto, 2019). They focus on context and potential applications of knowledge and skills, help students relate learning in various contexts, and help guide assessment and evaluation. Good learning outcomes emphasize applying and integrating knowledge (Huda et al., 2019; Pratama et al., 2019). Learning outcomes can be tested through tests to determine the effectiveness of teaching and the success of students or teachers in the teaching and learning process. To know the completeness of student learning, the teacher must conduct a test of learning outcomes (Muhammad, 2018; Nurlia et al., 2017).

There are two reasons the researchers conducted this research. Firstly, the researchers believe that learning outcomes has strong connection to identity status. The rationale is that students who are in the highest status of identity will perform good learning outcome because they do active effort in studying such as diligently working on assignments given by teachers, have self-encourage to develop, have high self-confidence, and can make decisions when dealing with crisis or unstable situation that affects individuals (Subaryana, 2015). Otherwise, students with poor performance is resulted from a lack of commitment and no exploration (Pop, et al., 2016; Tanudjaya & Doorman, 2020). Identity status contains two key parts as the core of identity development; commitment and exploration (Kunnen, & Metz, 2015; Sorouphim, & Issa, 2020).

Secondly, research on identity status and learning outcomes is still limited in Indonesia. A research that is similar to this study was conducted by (Sorouphim & Issa, 2020). However, the research investigated the identity statuses of male and female students in Lebanese youth and tried to see their relation to gender and academic achievement. It used ego identity questionnaires and used only 32 statements with 6-points likert-type scale. The result found that there was no significant achievement differences. Our research is simpler that to compare learning outcomes and identity status, using 40 statements of Ego identity questionnaires with 5 points likert-type scale. Other related studies showed a relationship between academic identity status, goal orientation, and different academic achievements of men and women (Hejazi, et al., 2009). If someone has a high identity status, then the goal orientation is good and will also produce good academic performance (Denney, 2021). Women have more achievement identities, while men have diffusion identities. This study aims to compare students' learning outcomes based on their identity statuses.

## 2. METHOD

This study uses a quantitative approach. The data collection technique is by filling out a questionnaire that aims to identify the four identity statuses. The questionnaire was adopted from Marcia (1966). There are 40 statements consist of 10 statements for achievement, 10 statements for foreclosure, 10 statements for the moratorium, and 10 statements for diffusion. The alternative answers in the questionnaire use the Likert-scale (1- 5); strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), neutral (3), agree (4), and strongly agree (5). After collecting the data, we did a description to map and classify the identity status into four; achievement identity, moratorium identity, foreclosure identity, and diffusion identity. We then

conducted the One-way ANOVA test to see the learning outcomes' difference based on students' identity status. The learning outcomes were the student's final score got at the end of the semester. The samples were 74 students from the 3rd semester of the English Education study program, Artha Wacana Christian University, Kupang. Samples were taken using a purposive sampling technique. We conducted this research for one semester (five months) until the final test of the semester.

### 3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

#### Result

We compared the four groups with the learning outcomes; the group with achievement identity was 24 samples, the moratorium was 22 samples, foreclosure was 17 samples, and diffusion was 11. The Total of samples was 74 samples. The research results are presented in [Table 1](#) and [Table 2](#).

**Table 1. Descriptive Analysis**

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Achievement	24	78.42	7.021	1.433	75.45	81.38	65	99
Moratorium	22	66.09	5.748	1.225	63.54	68.64	48	75
Foreclosure	17	60.71	5.347	1.297	57.96	63.46	50	71
Diffusion	11	50.00	8.729	2.632	44.14	55.86	31	62
<b>Total</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>66.46</b>	<b>11.718</b>	<b>1.362</b>	<b>63.74</b>	<b>69.17</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>99</b>

**Table 2. Learning Outcomes**

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	6977.197	3	2325.732	53.427	0.000
Within Groups	3047.181	70	43.531		
<b>Total</b>	<b>10024.378</b>	<b>73</b>			

The mean value of the learning outcomes of students with identity achievement was 78.42, students with moratorium identity were 66.09, those with foreclosure were 60.71, and those with diffusion identity were 50.00. The data has shown that the achievement group has a mean value greater than the moratorium, foreclosure, and diffusion. The moratorium has a mean greater than foreclosure and diffusion, and diffusion has the lowest mean of the three identity statuses. According to [Marcia \(1966\)](#) the identity status levels are started from the highest, the identity achievement, to the lowest status, the diffusion identity. The data showed that the Sig value > 0.05. Thus, there is a significant difference between learning outcomes and identity status.

This study has proved that identity status greatly influence the students' learning outcomes. Students with achievement identity got higher scores with a mean of 78.42 because of having high commitment and high exploration ([Marcia in Sorouphim & Issa, 2020](#); [Kroger & Marcia, 2011](#)). The characteristics of students with an achievement identity status based on Marcia's questionnaire are that they fight for what they believe in and be carefully selecting close friends. Close friends that they consider are those who have values and similarities with them personally. Besides, they try to build relationships with different people so they can have something to believe in and learn from past failures to decide which is good so that the same mistakes do not reoccur. Everything is through consideration. After considering, they decide and believe in it without the need for interference from other people such as parents or friends. It shows that they find out or learn something first before settling as an option. These characteristics indicate strong commitment and exploration.

#### Discussion

Successful students are if they achieve good learning outcomes due to integrating and applying skills and knowledge represented in the scores obtained ([Kazu & İş, 2018](#); [Maman & Rajab, 2016](#); [Purnamasari et al., 2020](#)). Students are measured through their final exam scores. If getting average, below-average scores, they need to complete what is lacking in their learning effort leading to the excellent learning results. If getting unsatisfied or very insufficient scores, they must be more committed and have exploration as a learning process to improve their learning outcomes ([Subagia & Wiratma, 2016](#); [Wildan, 2017](#)). Those with an identity achievement status show that they attained the highest identity status. They achieve this

through a process of active exploration and a strong commitment to a specific set of values, beliefs, and life goals that arise from active and healthy exploration and commitment (Tlonaen, Dharma, & Mustofa, 2018). These learners can decide what values and goals are most important to them in learning or what mission needs to achieve excellent or good learning outcomes. Their learning outcomes show that they prioritize what is important to them (Adjii, 2019; Friantary & Martina, 2018). They believe that to be successful; they need commitment and exploration. They experiment with their belief. To fully achieve this type of identity, students must feel positive and confident about their decisions and values. Students with this identity will succeed in their learning, proved by excellent or good learning outcomes.

Students with moratorium identity status with a mean value of 66.09 are in second place. They have high exploration but low commitment (Kroger & Marcia, 2011; Marcia in Sorouphim & Issa, 2020). The results showed that by doing more exploration, student learning outcomes are also better than having a commitment without exploration as students with foreclosure identity. Those with moratorium identity show an effort to consider everything and do self-reflection to a decision. For instance, try to find the right job and measure how capable he/she is for the job. However, they do not commit their self into it. In other words, they spend much time thinking and considering what to do before actually doing and enjoying it. In matters of belief, for example, religion, they continue to explore what they believe before making a decision. They cannot decide what is best for them. Hold discussions to find out a view and do more exploration related to that view. In relationship building, they have not decided whom they are going to make friends with. It is such a complicated thing determining a life partner or friendship. At work, they are unable to decide what to do with their job. They are in the midst of an identity "crisis" that encourages them to explore and experiment with different values, beliefs, and goals. However, they have not made the final decisions about which beliefs and values are most important to them and which principles should guide their lives.

In learning, students with a moratorium identity prefer to do exploration first before making decisions. They do not consider setting a learning goal or committing to what they should do to achieve good learning outcomes importantly (Yamin et al., 2020; Yuan & Mak, 2018). They are more likely to be active in various activities, whether learning activities, organizational activities, or other activities that ultimately draw them from their priority to focus on learning goals. Those who are studying while being involved in organizations or are active in various activities spend more than four years (the standard length of study for the undergraduate program). It happens because they are not able to determine priorities through commitments (Alvarez et al., 2021; Chen & Mensah, 2018). Because of that, exploration alone does not guarantee that someone can achieve better learning outcomes than those who have high commitment and exploration.

Students with a foreclosure identity occupy the third position. Their learning outcomes have an average score of 60.71, lower than achievement and moratorium. Students with a foreclosure identity have a high level of commitment but a low-level of exploration (Kroger & Marcia, 2011). The characteristics have shown that they have a strong desire yet cannot be channeled because others' intervention shakes them (Blesia et al., 2021; Zee & Koomen, 2016). For example, they have many jobs, but they do not enjoy anything. They listen more to what other people say, such as their parents or friends. More follow the flow of other people's thoughts than the self. Parents mostly direct their life choices. For example, make friends with friends whose parents prefer to. They do not question what they believe. Those with a foreclosure identity depend on the choices of their parents compared to their preferences. This characteristic proves that the absence of exploration without commitment will affect student learning outcomes, which is lower than those who have an identity status, achievement, and moratorium (Fitriani, 2017; Hagenauer et al., 2018). A person with this status does not actively determine what is important to them, especially in university learning. They do not question the values and beliefs they have taught. Instead, they acquire their identity only by accepting the beliefs and values of their family, community, and culture.

If the students only have commitment but no exploration, their learning outcomes will be lower than those with high exploration (moratorium) (Blegur, Tlonaen, Lumba, & Leko, 2021; Novitasari et al., 2020). In this sense, the student may have many goals, have a mature plan for his future, and commit to studying diligently, but when there are other options offered to him, he tends to abandon his early commitment. For example, if A has to submit an assignment whose deadline is close (tomorrow), but a friend asks him to go out, then he ends up and follows his friend instead of staying at home and doing his homework. Many external factors can influence him so that he no longer sticks to his commitment. Some committed themselves to not dating during the college and focus on studying to finish on time, but they heard that if they did not have a partner, they were said to be out of date. She started to build relationships and ended up having more failures in studying because she spends more time dating than studying.

The lowest identity status is diffusion identity. Students with a diffusion identity status have a low level of commitment and low exploration (Kroger & Marcia, 2011; Marcia in Sorouphim & Issa, 2020). This status identity brings students have poor outcomes. The result revealed that they have the lowest learning



outcomes (mean 50.00) of the three other identity statuses. The characteristics of students with diffusion identity are that they have low awareness of the importance of learning. They tend not to do something they want, yet purposeless or wait for something good comes to not chase everything and have to wait. Besides, they do not concern about relationships with others. Having friends or not is not necessary, and there is no need to look for close friends. Having faith in something is unimportant and unobtrusive, and their belief is unsteady. They are not interested in exploration. For example, they are not interested in finding learning strategies if they have failed in learning and just let it go. They have not considered their identity at all and have not set any goals in life. They are reactive, passively floating through life, and dealing with every situation that arises. This identity is what ultimately makes them fail in their learning.

Students with this identity status will experience failure in their learning outcomes. They did not pass the courses they took because of the lack of two main components in forming his identity. B comes to the class to attend lectures, listens to the teacher when teaching. When the task is given, he does not do it optimally. He prefers to wait for his friend to do the assignment first so that he can cheat his friend's work. He also will not do anything if when he knows he fails one or more subjects. Otherwise, those with an achievement identity will look for a solution if they fail (Chua & Don, 2013; Saprudin et al., 2020). They commit not to deal with the same failure. Those with diffusion identity consider it normal. There is nothing to worry about, and it can be seen that many of them have failed to achieve the passing standard.

Studies to see the relationship or compare identity status and student learning outcomes are still rare, as described in the introduction. However, one of the studies showed slight similarities but differences (Hejazi, Shahraray, Farsinejad, & Asgary, 2009; Sorouphim, & Issa, 2020). If their study looks at the relationship between identity status and academic achievement, this study compares student learning outcomes based on their identity status. Is there a difference in learning outcomes between students with achievement, moratorium, foreclosure, or identity diffusion is the purpose of this study. The results of previous studies and this study are different. The research results show no significant relationship between identity status and academic achievement of both male and female students (Sorouphim & Issa, 2020). Meanwhile, this study shows that there is a significant difference between identity status and student learning outcomes. The research show a relationship between identity status and academic achievement between men and women (Hejazi, Shahraray, Farsinejad & Asgary, 2009). Still, the previous study looks at the relationship, not comparing.

This study proves that identity status contributes to student learning outcomes. Students who have a high identity status (achievement identity) can show their commitment to learning. They make use of time and opportunities to complete assignments on time. It strengthens their commitment to their duties and responsibilities as students to follow instructions or collaborate with colleagues to complete their tasks. We can also observe that those with high identity status can explore various tasks and assessment strategies. It means that they do not just wait for the task to be completed with the help of their peers but also contribute by exploring the sources, materials, or indicators assigned by the lecturer to carry out the learning program. What students with achievement identity have, students with low identity status do not have, so it impacted their learning outcomes.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

Students' learning outcomes vary starting from the lowest to the highest, indicating the position of their identity status. Students with the highest scores occupy the highest identity status, achievement identity. Students with the average scores have moratorium identity status. Those with scores below the average have foreclosure status. Students with low scores have the lowest status, identity diffusion. Therefore, it is vital to know the students' identity status to improve student learning outcomes. Students with a diffusion identity status are in a serious problem. Teachers must find a solution so that their identity status can develop towards a high identity status.

#### 5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researcher would like to thank to the Directorate General of Higher Education, Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia for funding this research through the 2019/2020 Beginner Lecturer Research scheme. The research team also thanks you. Andreas J. F. Lumba, the Dean of Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, and Mr. Yakob Metboki, the Head of the English Language Study Program, who has given permission and supported us during the research process publication.

## 6. REFERENCES

- Adjii, K. (2019). Instrumen penilaian kedisiplinan siswa sekolah menengah kejuruan. *Assessment and Research on Education*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.33292/arisen.v1i1.19>.
- Alhefnawi, M. A. M. (2021). Assessing the efficacy of online handouts and active lectures in learning outcomes at the engineering undergraduate level. *Ain Shams Engineering Journal*, 40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asej.2021.02.012>.
- Alvarez, A., Teeters, L. P., Hamm-Rodríguez, M., & Dimidjian, S. (2021). Understanding children's funds of identity as learners through multimodal self-expressions in Mexico City. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2021.100513>.
- Anthonyamy, L., Koo, A. C., & Hew, S. H. (2020). Self-regulated learning strategies and non-academic outcomes in higher education blended learning environments: A one decade review. *Education and Information Technologies*, 1. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-020-10134-2>.
- Arnold, M. E. (2017). Supporting Adolescent Exploration and Commitment: Identity Formation, Thriving, and Positive Youth Development. *Journal of Youth Development*, 12(4), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.5195/jyd.2017.522>.
- Batlolona, J. R., & Mahapoonyanont, N. (2019). Academic Learning Outcome And Creative Thinking Skills On Projectile Motion Topic. *JPI*, 8(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpi-undiksha.v8i1.14524>.
- Blegur, J., Tlonaen, Z. A., Lumba, A. J. F., & Leko, J. J. (2021). The Importance of Self-Esteem to Students Learning Responsibilities and Group Learning Commitment of Physical Education Students. *Journal of Education, Teaching, and Learning*, 6(1), 53–61. <https://doi.org/10.26737/jetl.v6i1.2355>.
- Blegur, J. (2020). *Soft skills untuk prestasi belajar: Disiplin, percaya diri, konsep diri akademik, penetapan tujuan, tanggung jawab, komitmen, kontrol diri*. Scopindo Media Pustaka.
- Blesia, J. U., Iek, M., Ratang, W., & Hutajulu, H. (2021). Developing an Entrepreneurship Model to Increase Students' Entrepreneurial Skills: an Action Research Project in a Higher Education Institution in Indonesia. *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, 34(1), 53–70. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11213-019-09506-8>.
- Chen, J. L., & Mensah, F. M. (2018). Teaching Contexts That Influence Elementary Preservice Teachers' Teacher and Science Teacher Identity Development. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 29(5), 420–439. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2018.1469187>.
- Chua, Y. P., & Don, Z. M. (2013). Effects of computer-based educational achievement test on test performance and test takers' motivation. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(5). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.03.008>.
- Denney, S. M. (2021). Student perceptions of support for civic identity development and identity exploration in a discussion-based U.S. government course. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jssr.2021.06.003>.
- Fitriani. (2017). Student Commitment to do Lecture Task Observed from Motivation to Achievement. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 66, 176–180. <https://doi.org/10.2991/yicemap-17.2017.30>.
- Friantary, H., & Martina, F. (2018). Evaluasi Implementasi Penilaian Hasil Belajar Berdasarkan Kurikulum 2013 oleh Guru Bahasa Inggris dan Bahasa Indonesia di MTS Ja-Alhaq Kota Bengkulu. *Silampari Bisa: Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Bahasa Indonesia, Daerah, Dan Asing*, 1(2), 76–95. <https://doi.org/10.31540/silamparibisa.v1i2.202>.
- Hagenauer, G., Gläser-Zikuda, M., & Moschner, B. (2018). University students' emotions, life-satisfaction and study commitment: a self-determination theoretical perspective. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 42(6), 808–826. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2017.1323189>.
- Hejazi, E., Shahraray, M., Farsinejad, M., & Asgary, A. (2009). Identity styles and academic achievement: mediating role of academic self-efficacy. *Social Psychology of Education*, 12(1), 123–135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11218-008-9067-X>.
- Huda, A. K., Reffiane, F., & Untari, M. F. asri. (2019). Keefektifan Model Pembelajaran Tebak Kata Terhadap Hasil Belajar Ipa Siswa Kelas III SD Negeri Rejosari 03 Kota Semarang. *Malih Peddas (Majalah Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar)*, 8(2), 171. <https://doi.org/10.26877/malihpeddas.v8i2.3072>.
- Huhtala, M., Lämsä, A.-M., & Feldt, T. (2019). Applying the Identity Status Paradigm to Managers' Moral Identity. *Scandinavian Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.16993/sjwop.50>.
- Kazu, İ. Y., & İş, A. (2018). An Investigation About Actualization Levels of Learning Outcomes in Early Childhood Curriculum. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 6(3), 66. <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v6i3.2928>.
- Korpershoek, H. (2016). Relationship Among Motivation, Commitment, Cognitive Capacities and Achievement in Secondary Education. *Frontline Learning Research*, 4(3), 28–43.

- <https://doi.org/10.14786/flr.v4i3.182>.
- Kroger, J., & Marcia, J. (2011). The identity statuses: Origin, meanings, and interpretations. In & V. L. V. (eds) S.J.Schwartz, K. Luyckx (Ed.), *Handbook of identity theory and research* (pp. 32–53). Springer.
- Kunnen, E. S., & Metz, M. (2015). Commitment and Exploration: The Need for A Developmental Approach. In K. C. M. & M. S. (Eds.) (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of identity development* (pp. 115–131). <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199936564.001.0001>.
- Mahajan, M., & Singh, M. K. S. (2017). Importance and Benefits of Learning Outcomes. *Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 22(3), 65–67. <https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-2203056567>.
- Maman, M., & Rajab, A. A. (2016). The Implementation of Cooperative Learning Model 'Number Heads Together (NHT)' in Improving the Students' Ability in Reading Comprehension. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 5(2), 174. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v5i2.4536>.
- Marcia, J. E. (1966). Development and validation of ego-identity status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 3(5), 551. <https://doi.org/10.30595/dinamika.v7i2.929>.
- Mardiana. (2019). Meningkatkan Hasil Belajar Matematika Model Think Pair and Share Pada Kelas VIII.5 SMP Negeri 2 Bangkinang Kota Tahun Pelajaran 2015/2016. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, 3(1), 14–23. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jptam.v3i1.199>.
- Meulemeester, C. De, Lowyck, B., Vermote, R., & Verhaest, Y. (2017). Mentalizing and interpersonal problems in borderline personality disorder: The mediating role of identity diffusion. *Psychiatry Research*, 258.
- Muhammad, H. M. (2018). Keefektifan Model Pembelajaran Tebak Kata Terhadap Hasil Belajar Pada Tema 7 “Indahnya Keragaman Di Negeriku” Siswa Kelas Iv. *Mimbar Ilmu*, 23(3), 200–207. <https://doi.org/10.23887/mi.v23i3.16436>.
- Muttaqin, D., & Ekowarni, E. (2016). Pembentukan Identitas Remaja di Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 4(3), 231–247. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jpsi.12338>.
- Novitasari, K. T., Hidayati, F., & Setyowati, R. (2020). Relationship between Social Support and Commitment to the Task with Academic Flow to Students. *Jurnal Psikologi Pendidikan & Konseling*, 6(1), 21–28. <https://doi.org/10.26858/jppk.v6i1.10792>.
- Nurlia, Hala, Muchtar, Jumadi, & Taiyeb. (2017). Hubungan Antara Gaya Belajar, Kemandirian Belajar, Dan Minat Belajar Dengan Hasil Belajar Biologi Siswa. *Jurnal Pendidikan Biologi*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.24114/jpb.v6i2.6552>.
- Olga, S., Irina, S., Andrey, C., & Venera, M. (2020). Research and assessment of the level of self-determination of the student's personality for future professional activity. *E3S Web of Conferences*, 210. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202021019031>.
- Oyserman, D., O'Donnell, S. C., Sorensen, N., & Wingert, K. M. (2021). Process matters: Teachers benefit their classrooms and students when they deliver an identity-based motivation intervention with fidelity. *Contemporary Educational Psychologist*, 66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2021.101993>.
- Penner, F., Gambin, M., & Sharp, C. (2019). Childhood maltreatment and identity diffusion among inpatient adolescents: The role of reflective function. *Journal of Adolescence*, 76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2019.08.002>.
- Pop, E.I., Negru-Subtirica, O., Crocetti, E., Opre, A., & Meeus, W. (2016). On The Interplay Between Academic Achievement and Educational Identity: A Longitudinal Study. *Journal of Adolescence*, 47(2016), 135–144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2015.11.004>.
- Pratama, F., Firman, & Neviyarni. (2019). Pengaruh Motivasi Belajar IPA Siswa Terhadap Hasil Belajar Di Sekolah Dasar Negeri 01. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 1(3), 280–286. <https://doi.org/10.31004/edukatif.v1i3.63>.
- Purnamasari, N., Siswanto, S., & Malik, S. (2020). E-module as an emergency-innovated learning source during the Covid-19 outbreak. *Psychology, Evaluation, and Technology in Educational Research*, 3(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.33292/petier.v3i1.53>.
- Ristanti, F. F., & Arianto, F. (2019). Flash Card Media Utilization To Improve Student Activity and Learning Outcomes of Fauna Distribution Subtopic in Class Xi Ips I Sma Xin Zhong Surabaya. *Geosfera Indonesia*, 4(2), 90. <https://doi.org/10.19184/geosi.v4i2.9968>.
- Saprudin, S., Liliarsari, L., Setiawan, A., & Prihatmanto, A. (2020). Optical Gamification (OG); Serial Versus Random Model to Improve Pre-Service Physics Teachers' Concept Mastery. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (IJET)*, 15(9), 39–59. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v15i09.11779>.
- Sorouphim, K.M., & Issa, N. (2020). Investigating Identity Statuses Among Lebanese Youth: Relation with Gender and Academic Achievement. *Youth and Society*, 52(1), 119–138. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X17732355>.

- Sriyanti, I., Almafie, M. R., Marlina, L., & Jauhari, J. (2021). The effect of Using Flipbook-Based E-modules on Student Learning Outcomes. *Kasuari: Physics Education Journal (KPEJ)*, 3(2), 69–75. <https://doi.org/10.37891/kpej.v3i2.156>.
- Subagia, I. W., & Wiratma, I. G. L. (2016). Profil Penilaian Hasil Belajar Siswa Berdasarkan Kurikulum 2013. *JPI (Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia)*, 5(1), 39–54. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpi-undiksha.v5i1.8293>.
- Subaryana. (2015). Konsep Diri dan Prestasi Belajar. *Jurnal Dinamika Pendidikan Dasar*, 7(2), 21–30. <https://doi.org/10.30595/dinamika.v7i2.929>.
- Sznitman, G.A., Zimmermann, G., & Petegem, S. V. (2019). Further insight into adolescent personal identity statuses: Differences based on self-esteem, family climate, and family communication. *Journal of Adolescence*, 71, 99–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2019.01.003>.
- Tanudjaya, C. P., & Doorman, M. (2020). Examining higher order thinking in Indonesian lower secondary mathematics classrooms. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, 11(2), 277–300. <https://doi.org/10.22342/jme.11.2.11000.277-300>.
- Tlonaen, A. Z., Dharma, B., & Mustofa, A. (2018). Investigating students' identity statuses through short memoirs. *Proceeding Icon-ELite*, 281–286.
- Valdez, J. P. M., Datu, J. A. D., & Chu, S. K. W. (2022). Gratitude intervention optimizes effective learning outcomes in Filipino high school students: A mixed-methods study. *Computers & Education*, 176. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2021.104268>.
- Wildan, W. (2017). Pelaksanaan Penilaian Autentik Aspek Pengetahuan, Sikap Dan Keterampilan Di Sekolah Atau Madrasah. *Jurnal Tatsqif*, 15(2), 131–153. <https://doi.org/10.20414/jtq.v15i2.3>.
- Yamin, M., Saputra, A., & Deswila, N. (2020). Enhancing Critical Thinking in Analyzing Short Story "The Lazy Jack" Viewed from Identity Theory. *Indonesian Journal on Learning and Advanced Education (IJOLAE)*, 3(1), 30–39. <https://doi.org/10.23917/ijolae.v3i1.9948>.
- Yuan, R., & Mak, P. (2018). Reflective learning and identity construction in practice, discourse and activity: Experiences of pre-service language teachers in Hong Kong. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.05.009>.
- Zee, M., & Koomen, H. M. Y. (2016). Teacher Self-Efficacy and Its Effects on Classroom Processes, Student Academic Adjustment, and Teacher Well-Being. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 981–1015. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315626801>.