

# The Role of Psychodrama Techniques in Group Guidance to Improve Students' Learning Activeness: A Quasi-Experimental Study

Rinda Octa Hestida Putri<sup>1a</sup>, Ikke Yuliani Dhian Puspitarini<sup>2b</sup>, Yuanita Dwi Krisphianti<sup>3c</sup>

Guidance and Counseling Study Program, PGRI Nusantara University Kediri, Kediri 64112, Indonesia <sup>1, 2, 3</sup>

<sup>a</sup>rindahstda96@gmail.com\*; <sup>b</sup>ikkeydp@unpkediri.ac.id; <sup>c</sup>ju.wahyu@gmail.com

\* Corresponding author: Rinda Octa Hestida Putri

**Abstract:** Learning activeness is an important factor in learning success, yet many students remain reluctant to ask questions, take part in discussions, or express opinions. This study examined the effectiveness of group guidance with psychodrama techniques in improving students' learning activeness. A quasi-experimental study with a non-equivalent control group design was conducted at SMAN 3 Kediri, East Java, between 29 April and 13 May 2026. From a population of 69 tenth-grade students (classes X-11 and X-12), 14 students whose screening scores fell in the low category were selected through purposive sampling and allocated by intact class: seven students from X-12 formed the experimental group (group guidance with psychodrama) and seven students from X-11 formed the control group (group guidance with Focus Group Discussion). Both groups received four sessions on identical themes, led by the same group facilitator. Learning activeness was measured with a four-point Likert scale adapted from Ummah (2019); item analysis on a separate tryout sample of 72 students ( $df = 70$ ; critical  $r = .232$ ) retained 35 of 38 items, with item-total correlations of .276-.702 and Cronbach's Alpha of .907. The data met the assumptions of normality (Shapiro-Wilk, all  $p > .05$ ) and homogeneity of variance (Levene's  $F = 3.369$ ,  $p = .091$ ), and the two groups were equivalent at pre-test,  $t(12) = -0.784$ ,  $p = .448$ . The experimental group's mean rose from 68.29 to 109.43,  $t(6) = -29.652$ ,  $p < .001$ , whereas the control group showed no significant change,  $t(6) = 1.050$ ,  $p = .334$ . Mean N-Gain was 57.39% (moderately effective) for the experimental group and -1.01% (not effective) for the control group. The post-test difference between groups was significant,  $t(12) = 25.918$ ,  $p < .001$ , MD = 41.286, 95% CI [37.815, 44.756]. Psychodrama can therefore serve as an effective alternative technique within group guidance services, although the small sample limits generalisation.

**Keywords:** Group Guidance, Psychodrama, Learning Activeness, Quasi-Experiment, Senior High School Students.

## INTRODUCTION

Education is an important process in helping students develop intellectually, socially, and emotionally. Within schools, guidance and counseling services support students in facing problems and in developing personally and socially. One of the services most frequently used for this purpose is group guidance, which draws on group dynamics to help students gain understanding, experience, and skills through interaction with peers (Folastri et al., 2021). Through group activities, students share experiences, express opinions, and learn to appreciate the perspectives of others, thereby building mutual support in dealing with problems (Romlah, 2020). The service rests on the principles of confidentiality, openness, voluntariness, and normativeness.

In the learning process itself, activeness is a crucial factor. Active students understand material more readily, ask questions, express opinions, and participate in discussions and group work (Prasetyo & Abduh, 2021; Rokhanah et al., 2021). In practice, however, a substantial proportion of students remain passive. Karimah et al. (2022) found low learning activeness among junior high school students in Jambi, while Farida Payon et al. (2021) identified low self-confidence and fear of making mistakes as dominant causes. Septiawati et al. (2022) reported similar patterns in thematic learning. Passive students receive information without processing it, which restricts opportunities to develop knowledge, critical thinking, and social skills.

Group guidance services can be combined with a range of techniques so that the service is engaging rather than monotonous. Psychodrama is one such technique: a role-playing method that helps individuals express thoughts, feelings, and experiences through enacted scenes (Amanah et al., 2024). Because students are involved in the situations they enact rather than merely observing them,

psychodrama is expected to create a participatory atmosphere in which communication skills, courage to speak, self-confidence, and cooperation can develop (Khairi & Yustiana, 2018).

Previous studies support the potential of the technique across several outcomes. Psychodrama has been shown to develop students' self-concept (Nurfaizal, 2016) and self-control (Sari, 2017), to address smoking behaviour (Febrianti & Irmayanti, 2019), to improve emotional intelligence (Oktarina et al., 2022), emotional regulation (Choirun & Setiawati, 2019), academic resilience (Satun & Setiawati, 2020), and self-efficacy (Fitriani et al., 2024). Group guidance in general has also been shown to improve learning response activity (Pohan, 2020).

Two gaps remain. First, existing psychodrama studies have concentrated on affective and social outcomes such as confidence, emotion, and resilience, rather than on learning activeness as a directly measured behavioural outcome. Second, most studies compare psychodrama against a group that receives no service at all, which makes it impossible to tell whether any gain came from the technique or simply from the experience of being in a group. Comparing psychodrama against another active group guidance technique, such as Focus Group Discussion, addresses that ambiguity. FGD is itself an established group guidance technique that improves communication ethics (Hermanita et al., 2020) and critical thinking (Setiawan et al., 2025), which makes it a demanding rather than a token comparison condition.

This study therefore tests empirically whether group guidance with psychodrama techniques is more effective than group guidance with the FGD technique in improving the learning activeness of tenth-grade students at SMAN 3 Kediri. The hypothesis tested is that there is a significant difference in learning activeness between students who receive group guidance with psychodrama techniques and students who receive group guidance with the FGD technique (H1).

## METHOD

### A. Research Design

This study used a quantitative approach with a quasi-experimental method, specifically a non-equivalent control group design (Hastjarjo, 2019; Zakiyah, 2017). This design was chosen because the researcher could not assign students to groups at random: class composition had already been set by the school. Both groups were measured before and after treatment. The experimental group received group guidance with psychodrama techniques, and the control group received group guidance with the Focus Group Discussion technique as an active comparison condition.

| Group            | Pre-test       | Treatment                    | Post-test      |
|------------------|----------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Experimental (E) | O <sub>1</sub> | X <sub>1</sub> (psychodrama) | O <sub>2</sub> |
| Control (K)      | O <sub>3</sub> | X <sub>2</sub> (FGD)         | O <sub>4</sub> |

The independent variable was group guidance with psychodrama techniques; the dependent variable was students' learning activeness, defined as the extent of a student's active physical and mental involvement in learning, observable through participation in discussion, initiative in asking questions, ability to express opinions, diligence in completing tasks, and overall involvement in learning activities.

### B. Setting and Time

The study was conducted at SMAN 3 Kediri, Jl. Mauni No. 88, Bangsal, Pesantren District, Kediri, East Java. Site selection followed preliminary observation and an interview with the school counselor, both of which indicated low learning activeness in several tenth-grade classes. Data collection ran from 29 April to 13 May 2026. All sessions took place in a classroom at the school.

### C. Population and Sample

The population comprised 69 tenth-grade students in the 2025/2026 academic year: 35 students in class X-11 and 34 students in class X-12. A screening administration of the learning activeness scale was given to both classes. Fourteen students whose scores fell in the low category (35-70) were

selected as the research sample through purposive sampling (Firmansyah & Dede, 2022) using three criteria: (1) a pre-test score in the low category; (2) low classroom participation as indicated by observation and the school counselor's report; and (3) willingness to take part in the full sequence of sessions.

Consistent with the non-equivalent control group design, allocation followed intact classes rather than random assignment: seven students from X-12 formed the experimental group and seven students from X-11 formed the control group. Allocating by class kept group members familiar with one another, which supports group dynamics, and simplified scheduling within the school timetable.

#### D. Instrument

Learning activeness was measured with a scale of 38 items in a four-point Likert format (Strongly Appropriate = 4 to Strongly Inappropriate = 1 for favourable items, reversed for unfavourable items), adapted from Ummah (2019) and organised around eight aspects: participation, critical thinking, social interaction, learning independence, cooperation, contribution to the group, self-reflection, practice and skills, and application of knowledge.

Item analysis was carried out on a separate tryout sample of 72 tenth-grade students from classes X-5 and X-6 of the same school, that is, students who did not take part in the experiment. With  $n = 72$  ( $df = 70$ ), the critical Pearson product-moment value at  $\alpha = .05$  (two-tailed) is  $r = .232$ . Thirty-five of the 38 items were retained, with item-total correlations ranging from .276 to .702. Three items were discarded because their coefficients fell below the critical value (item 26 = .096; item 35 = .179; item 36 = .005); their wording overlapped with that of other items in the same indicator. Internal consistency of the 35 retained items was high, Cronbach's Alpha = .907 (Subhaktiyasa, 2024; Hidayatullah & Shadiqi, 2020).

The final 35-item scale yields a theoretical range of 35 to 140. Dividing that range into three equal intervals of 35 points produced the categories used throughout this study: low (35-70), moderate (71-105), and high (106-140).

#### E. Intervention Procedure

Each group received four sessions delivered according to a written service plan (Rencana Pelaksanaan Layanan). Sessions 1 to 3 delivered the treatment; session 4 was used for reflection, reinforcement, and the post-test. Both groups covered the same three themes in the same order, so that the two conditions differed only in technique.

**Table 1.** Schedule and Content of the Intervention Sessions

| Session  | Experimental group<br>(psychodrama) | Control group<br>(FGD)     | Theme                                          |
|----------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Pre-test | 29 April 2026, periods 3-4          | 29 April 2026, periods 5-6 | Learning activeness scale                      |
| 1        | 30 April 2026                       | 5 May 2026                 | Learning activeness and initiative             |
| 2        | 4 May 2026                          | 6 May 2026                 | Participation and responsibility in discussion |
| 3        | 6 May 2026                          | 7 May 2026                 | Completing and evaluating learning tasks       |
| 4        | 13 May 2026                         | 13 May 2026                | Reflection, reinforcement, post-test           |

In the experimental group, each session followed the four stages of group guidance: opening, transition, core, and closing. The core stage integrated the three phases of psychodrama, namely warming up (preparing members, clarifying the scenario and roles), action (enacting a scene relating to the session theme, such as hesitating to ask a question in class), and sharing (group discussion and reflection on the experience). In the control group, each session followed the same four stages, but the core stage consisted of guided small-group discussion: identifying causes of low participation, formulating solutions, presenting group conclusions, and reflecting.

Both groups were led by the same group leader, the first author, under the supervision of the school counselor. Holding the facilitator constant means that differences between the groups cannot be attributed to differences in facilitator skill or style.

## F. Data Analysis

Data were analysed with IBM SPSS Statistics. Descriptive statistics (minimum, maximum, mean, standard deviation) described each group before and after treatment. Assumption testing comprised the Shapiro-Wilk test of normality, chosen because each group contained fewer than 50 cases, and Levene's test for homogeneity of variance. Baseline equivalence was examined with an independent sample t-test on pre-test scores. Within-group change was tested with a paired sample t-test. Effectiveness was quantified with the N-Gain score, computed as  $(\text{post-test} - \text{pre-test}) / (\text{maximum score} - \text{pre-test}) \times 100\%$ , and interpreted using Hake's categories (Hake, 1999): below 40% not effective, 40-55% less effective, 56-75% moderately effective, above 76% effective. The hypothesis was tested with an independent sample t-test on post-test scores, and effect size was reported as Cohen's d with the Hedges' g correction.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### A. Descriptive Statistics and Baseline Equivalence

All 14 participants entered the study in the low category. In the experimental group every student's score increased after treatment: two students moved to the moderate category and five to the high category. In the control group all students remained in the low category, with a small increase for one student, no change for two, and small decreases for four.

**Table 2.** Descriptive Statistics

| Group and measurement  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean   | Std. Deviation |
|------------------------|---|---------|---------|--------|----------------|
| Experimental pre-test  | 7 | 65      | 70      | 68.29  | 1.799          |
| Experimental post-test | 7 | 103     | 115     | 109.43 | 3.867          |
| Control pre-test       | 7 | 68      | 70      | 68.86  | 0.690          |
| Control post-test      | 7 | 65      | 70      | 68.14  | 1.676          |

Before treatment the two groups did not differ significantly,  $t(12) = -0.784$ ,  $p = .448$ . Because Levene's test on pre-test scores fell exactly at the conventional threshold ( $F = 4.753$ ,  $p = .050$ ), the comparison was repeated with the Welch correction, which produced the same conclusion,  $t(7.73) = -0.784$ ,  $p = .456$ . The groups were therefore equivalent at baseline, and post-test differences can reasonably be attributed to the treatment rather than to pre-existing differences.

### B. Assumption Testing

**Table 3.** Shapiro-Wilk Test of Normality

| Group        | Measurement | Statistic | df | Sig.  |
|--------------|-------------|-----------|----|-------|
| Experimental | Pre-test    | 0.893     | 7  | 0.292 |
| Experimental | Post-test   | 0.988     | 7  | 0.989 |
| Control      | Pre-test    | 0.840     | 7  | 0.099 |
| Control      | Post-test   | 0.885     | 7  | 0.250 |

All significance values exceed .05, so the pre-test and post-test distributions in both groups may be treated as normal.

**Table 4.** Levene's Test for Homogeneity of Variance (Post-test)

| Variable                    | F     | Sig.  | Conclusion  |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------------|
| Student learning activeness | 3.369 | 0.091 | Homogeneous |

Because  $p = .091 > .05$ , the variances of the two groups are homogeneous and the assumptions for parametric testing are satisfied.

### C. Within-Group Change

**Table 5.** Paired Sample T-Test

| Group                     | Mean difference | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% CI Lower | 95% CI Upper | t       | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|---------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|---------|----|-----------------|
| Experimental (pre - post) | -41.143         | 3.671          | 1.388           | -44.538      | -37.748      | -29.652 | 6  | 0.000           |
| Control (pre - post)      | 0.714           | 1.799          | 0.680           | -0.950       | 2.379        | 1.050   | 6  | 0.334           |

In the experimental group the mean rose by 41.14 points, from 68.29 to 109.43, a statistically significant change,  $t(6) = -29.652$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d_z = 11.21$ . In the control group the change was not significant,  $t(6) = 1.050$ ,  $p = .334$ ; the mean in fact decreased slightly, from 68.86 to 68.14.

### D. Between-Group Difference

**Table 6.** N-Gain Scores

| Group        | Mean N-Gain (%) | Std. Deviation | Minimum | Maximum | Category             |
|--------------|-----------------|----------------|---------|---------|----------------------|
| Experimental | 57.39           | 5.19           | 47.89   | 64.29   | Moderately effective |
| Control      | -1.01           | 2.52           | -5.63   | 2.78    | Not effective        |

The experimental group's mean N-Gain of 57.39% falls in Hake's moderately effective band, whereas the control group's negative mean indicates no improvement at all. Every student in the experimental group recorded a gain of at least 47.89%; no student in the control group exceeded 2.78%.

**Table 7.** Independent Sample T-Test on Post-test Scores

|                             | Levene F | Levene Sig. | t      | df    | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | CI 95% Lower | CI 95% Upper |
|-----------------------------|----------|-------------|--------|-------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Equal variances assumed     | 3.369    | 0.091       | 25.918 | 12    | 0.000           | 41.286          | 1.593                 | 37.815       | 44.756       |
| Equal variances not assumed |          |             | 25.918 | 8.178 | 0.000           | 41.286          | 1.593                 | 37.626       | 44.945       |

Because Levene's test was not significant, interpretation follows the equal-variances-assumed row. The post-test means differ significantly,  $t(12) = 25.918$ ,  $p < .001$ , with a mean difference of 41.286 points in favour of the experimental group.  $H_1$  is therefore supported. The associated effect size is Cohen's  $d = 13.85$  (Hedges'  $g = 12.97$ ), and group membership accounts for 98% of the variance in post-test scores ( $r$ -squared = .98).

### E. Discussion

The hypothesis was supported on all three lines of evidence. Within the experimental group, learning activeness rose significantly after four sessions of group guidance with psychodrama. Within the control

group, four sessions of FGD produced no significant change. Between groups, the post-test difference of 41.29 points was significant, and the N-Gain analysis placed the experimental group in the moderately effective band against a negative gain for the control group.

The comparison between the two conditions is what makes the finding informative. Both groups met for the same number of sessions, worked through the same three themes, and were led by the same facilitator. The only difference was the enactment component present in psychodrama and absent in FGD. That the FGD group's mean did not rise at all suggests that group membership and structured discussion were not, in themselves, sufficient to change behaviour within four sessions. This is consistent with the action-method premise underlying psychodrama, in which behavioural change follows direct experience rather than verbal insight alone (Corey, 2020; Amanah et al., 2024), and with experiential learning theory, in which learning becomes meaningful when the learner obtains experience first-hand.

A mechanism can be traced through the sessions themselves. In session 1 several students still appeared embarrassed and lacked confidence when enacting their assigned roles; after direction and encouragement from the group leader they began to perform the roles adequately. By session 2 the group atmosphere was noticeably more conducive: members knew one another, spoke more readily, and participated more actively. This trajectory matches Satun and Setiawati (2020), who reported that active involvement in role-play reduces students' fear of speaking in front of others, and Pohan (2020), who found that group guidance improves learning response activity through realistic and meaningful group experience.

The direction of the result is also consistent with earlier work on other outcomes. Fitriani et al. (2024) obtained an N-Gain of 77.5% for psychodrama applied to self-efficacy; Choirun and Setiawati (2019) reported gains in emotional regulation; Nurfaizal (2016) and Sari (2017) reported gains in self-concept and self-control respectively. The present study extends this line of evidence to learning activeness measured as a behavioural outcome, and does so against an active rather than a passive comparison condition.

For practice, the implication is specific rather than general. School counselors facing passive classes need not abandon discussion-based services, but where the target is behavioural, such as willingness to ask questions, to speak in front of peers, or to take responsibility in group work, a technique that requires students to perform the behaviour in a safe setting appears more productive than one that asks them to talk about it. The four-session structure used here is short enough to fit an ordinary school term.

## **F. Limitations**

Four limitations qualify these findings. First, the sample is small (7 per group, 14 in total) and drawn from a single school, so the results cannot be generalised beyond a comparable setting. Second, the design lacks random assignment; although the groups were statistically equivalent at pre-test, unmeasured class-level differences cannot be excluded. Third, learning activeness was measured only by self-report; observational or teacher-report data would strengthen the conclusion, and the fact that the facilitator and the researcher were the same person raises the possibility of demand characteristics in post-test responses.

Fourth, the effect sizes obtained are extremely large and should be read with caution. They arise from a small sample whose scores were highly homogeneous by design: all participants were screened into the low category, and the pooled post-test standard deviation was only 2.98 points. Effect sizes of this magnitude are unlikely to replicate in larger and more heterogeneous samples. Future research should use larger samples, randomised allocation where the school context permits, multiple measurement sources, and a follow-up measurement to establish whether the gains persist after the service ends.

## **CONCLUSION**

Group guidance with psychodrama techniques significantly improved the learning activeness of tenth-grade students at SMAN 3 Kediri. Before treatment, all participants scored in the low category. After four sessions, the experimental group's mean rose from 68.29 to 109.43 (paired  $t(6) = -29.652$ ,  $p < .001$ ) with a mean N-Gain of 57.39%, categorised as moderately effective, while the control group

receiving FGD showed no significant change ( $t(6) = 1.050$ ,  $p = .334$ ; mean N-Gain = -1.01%). The difference between groups at post-test was significant,  $t(12) = 25.918$ ,  $p < .001$ , MD = 41.286, 95% CI [37.815, 44.756], so H1 is accepted.

Because both groups received an equal number of sessions on identical themes from the same facilitator, the advantage is attributable to the enactment component of psychodrama rather than to group participation as such. Psychodrama may therefore be used by school counselors as an alternative technique within group guidance services aimed at increasing students' learning activeness. Given the small sample and the single-site design, the finding should be treated as promising rather than conclusive, and warrants replication on a larger scale.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author thanks God Almighty for the completion of this article. The author expresses deep gratitude to Dr. Ikke Yuliani Dhan Puspitarini, M.Pd. as first supervisor and Yuanita Dwi Krisphianti, M.Pd. as second supervisor for their guidance and direction throughout the research, and to the principal, the school counselor, and the students of SMAN 3 Kediri for their cooperation during data collection.

### REFERENCES

- Amanah, S. N., Silva, N., & Muna, N. R. (2024). Penerapan bimbingan dan konseling dengan teknik psikodrama dalam lingkup pendidikan. *Merpsy Journal*, 16(1), 15. <https://doi.org/10.22441/merpsy.v16i1.24515>
- Choirun, N. M., & Setiawati, D. (2019). Penerapan bimbingan kelompok teknik psikodrama untuk meningkatkan regulasi emosi peserta didik SMA Negeri 2 Lamongan. *Jurnal Bimbingan dan Konseling UNESA*, 1-7.
- Corey, G. (2020). *Theory and practice of counseling and psychotherapy* (10th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Farida Payon, F., Andrian, D., & Mardikarini, S. (2021). Faktor yang mempengaruhi keaktifan belajar peserta didik kelas III SD. *Jurnal Ilmiah Kontekstual*, 2(2), 53-60. <https://doi.org/10.46772/kontekstual.v2i02.397>
- Febrianti, C., & Irmayanti, R. (2019). Teknik psikodrama dalam bimbingan kelompok untuk mengatasi perilaku merokok siswa SMA. *FOKUS (Kajian Bimbingan & Konseling dalam Pendidikan)*, 2(3), 105. <https://doi.org/10.22460/fokus.v2i3.4631>
- Firmansyah, D., & Dede. (2022). Teknik pengambilan sampel umum dalam metodologi penelitian. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Holistik*, 1(2), 85-114.
- Fitriani, Samsudin, A., & Sari, R. O. (2024). Efektivitas bimbingan kelompok dengan teknik psikodrama untuk meningkatkan efikasi diri siswa kelas VIII MTs. *Fokus*, 7(2), 121-128. <https://doi.org/10.22460/fokusv7i2.20174>
- Folastri, S., Rangka, I. B., & Rahmania, A. (2021). *Prosedur layanan bimbingan dan konseling kelompok* (Vol. 4).
- Hake, R. R. (1999). *Analyzing change/gain scores*. Indiana University.
- Hastjarjo, T. D. (2019). Rancangan eksperimen-kuasi. *Buletin Psikologi*, 27(2), 187. <https://doi.org/10.22146/buletinpsikologi.38619>
- Hermanita, W., Asyah, N., & Lisma, E. (2020). Pengaruh layanan bimbingan kelompok teknik Focus Group Discussion (FGD) terhadap etika berkomunikasi siswa SMK Negeri 1 Perbaungan. *Empaty: Guidance and Counseling Journal*, 1(1), 1-9.
- Hidayatullah, M. S., & Shadiqi, M. A. (2020). *Konstruksi alat ukur psikologi*. Universitas Lambung Mangkurat.
- Karimah, N., Rasimin, & Andiyaksa, R. (2022). Identifikasi tingkat keaktifan belajar siswa di SMP Negeri 1 Kota Jambi. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, 6(2), 12972-12977.

- Khairi, A., & Yustiana, Y. R. (2018). Bimbingan kelompok teknik psikodrama untuk meningkatkan keyakinan diri akademik peserta didik. *International Conference on Islamic Guidance and Counseling*, 1(1), 104-112.
- Nurfaizal. (2016). Penggunaan teknik psikodrama untuk meningkatkan konsep diri siswa. *Jurnal Fokus Konseling*, 2(2), 160-172.
- Oktarina, V., Mulyani, R. R., & Triyono. (2022). Efektivitas layanan bimbingan kelompok menggunakan teknik psikodrama terhadap kecerdasan emosional peserta didik di SMAN 1 Lintau Buo Kabupaten Tanah Datar. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Konseling*, 4(6), 6597-6609.
- Pohan, R. A. (2020). Efektivitas layanan bimbingan kelompok dalam meningkatkan aktivitas respon belajar. *Jurnal Bimbingan Konseling*, 4(1), 17-30. <https://doi.org/10.29240/jbk.v4i1.1280>
- Prasetyo, A. D., & Abduh, M. (2021). Peningkatan keaktifan belajar siswa melalui model discovery learning di sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 5(4), 1717-1724. <https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v5i4.991>
- Rokhanah, N., Widowati, A., & Sutanto, E. H. (2021). Peningkatan keaktifan belajar siswa dengan menerapkan model pembelajaran kooperatif tipe Student Team Achievement Divisions (STAD). *Edukatif: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 3(5), 3173-3180. <https://doi.org/10.31004/edukatif.v3i5.860>
- Romlah, T. (2020). Teori dan praktek bimbingan dan konseling. Universitas Negeri Malang.
- Sari, S. P. (2017). Teknik psikodrama dalam mengembangkan kontrol diri siswa. *Jurnal Fokus Konseling*, 3(2), 123. <https://doi.org/10.26638/jfk.386.2099>
- Satun, C., & Setiawati, D. (2020). Meningkatkan resiliensi akademik pada siswa dengan prestasi belajar rendah di SMK Negeri 5 Surabaya. *Jurnal Bimbingan dan Konseling UNESA*, 214-220.
- Septiawati, Halidjah, S., & Ghasya, D. A. V. (2022). Deskripsi keaktifan belajar siswa dalam pembelajaran tematik kelas V. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran Khatulistiwa*, 11(6), 168. <https://doi.org/10.26418/jppk.v11i6.55276>
- Setiawan, D., Mukromin, & Firdaus. (2025). Metode Focus Group Discussion (FGD) dalam peningkatan kemampuan berpikir kritis siswa kelas VIII pada mata pelajaran PAI. *Reflection: Islamic Education Journal*, 2(3), 10-28.
- Subhaktiyasa, P. G. (2024). Evaluasi validitas dan reliabilitas instrumen penelitian kuantitatif: Sebuah studi pustaka. *Jurnal Pendidikan*, 5(4), 5599-5609.
- Sugiyono. (2023). Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D. Alfabeta.
- Ummah, M. S. (2019). Kisi-kisi tingkat keaktifan belajar siswa.
- Zakiyah, S. (2017). Metodologi penelitian quasi eksperimen. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Penelitian*, 1(1), 25-36.