

## **Students' achievement between online and offline English learning**

Nurfitri<sup>1</sup>, Mochtar Marhum<sup>2</sup>, Darmawan<sup>3</sup>, Mawardin M. Said<sup>4</sup>, Ferry Rita<sup>5</sup>, Aminah Suriaman<sup>6</sup>,  
Rofiqoh<sup>7</sup>

Tadulako University Palu Sulawesi Tengah

Email: [Fitriiii.nur97@gmail.com](mailto:Fitriiii.nur97@gmail.com)<sup>1</sup>, [marhum\\_tadulako\\_uni@yahoo.co.id](mailto:marhum_tadulako_uni@yahoo.co.id)<sup>2</sup>, [darmawan.untad@gmail.com](mailto:darmawan.untad@gmail.com)<sup>3</sup>,  
[mawardinmsaid@yahoo.com](mailto:mawardinmsaid@yahoo.com)<sup>4</sup>, [ferryrita@rocketmail.com](mailto:ferryrita@rocketmail.com)<sup>5</sup>, [amisuriaman@gmail.com](mailto:amisuriaman@gmail.com)<sup>6</sup>, [rofiqoh@umtad.ac.id](mailto:rofiqoh@umtad.ac.id)<sup>7</sup>

### **Abstrak**

Perbedaan antara pembelajaran online dan offline berdampak pada prestasi siswa dalam pembelajaran bahasa Inggris. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis perbandingan antara prestasi belajar siswa dalam pembelajaran bahasa Inggris offline dan online. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode penelitian campuran antara metode penelitian kuantitatif dan kualitatif. Populasi dalam penelitian ini adalah 113 siswa. Peneliti menggunakan teknik purposive sampling dan mengambil 28 responden sebagai sampel penelitian. Instrumen penelitian ini adalah data hasil belajar siswa, wawancara, dan observasi. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa siswa yang belajar dalam pembelajaran offline memiliki skor yang lebih tinggi daripada siswa yang belajar dalam pembelajaran online. Hal itu dibuktikan dengan nilai rata-rata yang diperoleh siswa. Siswa yang mengenal offline mendapat skor 78,93. Sedangkan siswa yang belajar online mendapat nilai 75,00 yang menunjukkan bahwa pembelajaran offline lebih efektif daripada pembelajaran online. Data menunjukkan Sig. (2-tailed) nilai adalah 0,000 kurang dari 0,05. Nilai tersebut berbeda nyata antara prestasi belajar online dan offline siswa. Hal ini terjadi karena beberapa masalah yang mempengaruhi prestasi belajar siswa; siswa kurang kohesif, tidak nyaman belajar, kurang perhatian dan motivasi, serta keterbatasan sarana penunjang dalam belajar. Hal ini membuat siswa malas untuk belajar bahasa Inggris.

**Kata Kunci:** prestasi siswa, pembelajaran online, pembelajaran offline.

### **Abstract**

*The difference between online and offline learning impacts the students' achievements in English learning. This study aimed to analyze the comparison between students' achievement in offline and online English learning. This study used mixed methods research between quantitative and qualitative research methods. The population of this research was 113 students. The researcher used the purposive sampling technique and took 28 respondents as the study's sample. The instrument of this study was students' achievement data, interviews, and observation. The result shows that the student who learned in offline learning had a higher score than those who learned in online learning. It was proved by the average score that students obtained. Students who knew offline got a score of 78.93. Meanwhile, students who learned online got a score of 75.00, indicating that offline learning is more effective than online learning. The data showed Sig. (2-tailed) value was 0.000 less than 0.05. That value significantly differed between students' online and offline learning achievement. These happen because of several problems that affect student achievement; students' less cohesiveness, being uncomfortable studying, lacking attention and motivation, and the limitations of supporting facilities in learning. It makes students lazy to learn English.*

**Keywords:** students' achievement, online learning, offline learning.

✉Corresponding author : Nurfitri

Email : [fitriiii.nur97@gmail.com](mailto:fitriiii.nur97@gmail.com)

Jurnal Pendidikan, Sains Sosial, dan Agama

## INTRODUCTION

The learning culture in Indonesia is closer to offline or face-to-face learning in the classroom. However, the Covid-19 pandemic has changed the learning process drastically, changing online teaching and learning. But online learning itself is not new in the world of education, especially in the teaching and learning process. Thompson, Miller, & Franz (2013) stated that online courses are not a new phenomenon; however, virtual learning is emerging in traditional pre-service teacher education programs. Virtual learning has existed for a long time, but its implementation has not been implemented as it is now in the Covid-19 era. During the pandemic, online learning has been carried out almost worldwide. All elements of education are required to meet face-to-face and facilitate learning to remain active, even face-to-face with students. Online learning is learning that is carried out remotely through the help of the internet network and other supporting tools such as telephones, computers, or laptops (Abidin, Hudaya, & Anjani, 2020; Herlina, 2020). According to Putria, Maula, & Uswatun (2020), online learning is learning that focuses on students' thoroughness and skills in receiving and processing the information presented online. It means that students must be able to understand any information given boldly (on the network), which is informed through tools such as cellphones or computers netted by the internet.

However, over time, when the pandemic could be overcome, the government began to slowly try to do offline learning or face-to-face with students in class. Therefore, as stated in Kemendibud (2021), the decision stipulates that education during the Corona Virus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic be carried out with limited face-to-face learning while implementing health protocols. Changes in learning from online to offline can affect student achievement during learning. Besides, it can cause differences in student achievement online and offline. Alseweed (2013) shows a significant difference in achievement test scores in favor of online and offline learning and a significant difference in student attitudes in favor of both learnings.

On the other hand, Kaymak & Esengeldi (2021) argue that there is no significant difference in students' achievement when they take offline or online studies because both methods enhance student understanding and comprehension of the topics equally effectively. However, the difference in results between the achievements of students participating in online and offline learning at university and junior high schools level is not enough to prove its significance in both learnings, so it is only to give priority to one of these learning approaches. Therefore, researchers currently feel the need for research to fill this gap by investigating student achievement between online and offline learning and what factors affect student achievement in learning English at the senior high school level.

Moreover, every learning course always expects to produce maximum learning. Those are what teachers and students at SMAN 1 Sidoan expect. But there are several problems in online and offline learning, where researchers find difficulties during online and offline learning in grade XI MIA 1 at SMA 1 Sidoan. During online learning, there are

three obstacles. First, students find it difficult to understand the material given because it cannot be explained directly or in detail by the teacher. Second, learning is also more likely to lead to training or assignments, making students bored and less motivated to participate in online learning. Third, they are hampered by a weak signal, so they have a little difficulty finding material from other sources and have difficulty submitting assignments. Finally, during offline learning, students become lazy to go to school because they are used to online classes. This fact becomes a problem for this research. From the phenomena above, this research aims to determine the students' achievements in online and offline English learning. So, in this research, the researcher wants to study further by researching "Students' achievement between online and offline English learning."

## METHOD

This research employed a combined research method (mixed methods) between quantitative and qualitative research methods. The design used in this study is sequential explanatory. This research used mixed methods because it matches this research and makes it easier to conduct, and all of the previous studies only used experimental research. In this design, the data that will be collected first is quantitative data and analysis, followed by the collection and analysis of qualitative data (Creswell JW, 2011). By taking mixed methods research, this research emphasized quantitative research while the qualitative in this research was only a compliment. The population used in this study was grade XI, with as many as 113 students. The research sample was taken using a purposive sampling method, namely the sampling method based on specific criteria and considerations (Noor, 2011; Sugiyono, 2016: 85). While the data collection techniques through the collection of students' achievement data, interviews, and observations on grade XI MIA 1 at SMAN 1 Sidoan Parigi Moutong.

In this research, the researcher used quantitative and qualitative data analysis techniques. The tool used in this study was the SPSS software to analyze students' achievement data. In addition, the researcher used statistical calculations, namely the t-test, to answer the research problem. In this research, the researcher used the students' English achievement scores during online learning in odd semesters and after online learning in even semesters. Before testing the hypothesis, the testing assumption of normality and homogeneity are measured to meet the requirements for testing the hypothesis. And also, the data collected from the interview and observation were analyzed qualitatively. According to Creswell JW (2011), analyzing the data comprises gathering data, making interpretations, and writing reports. In this research, the researcher analyzed the data in the following steps. First, the researcher transcribed all the recordings and analyzed the obtained data, representing and interpreting the findings. Lastly, the researcher wrote the reports of the results.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The researcher presented the research finding and discussion in two sections. First, quantitative research findings answer the first problem of comparing students' achievements between online and offline English Learning. The data are shown in the tables. Second, qualitative research findings answer the second problem of factors that affect students' achievement in English learning. The data has transcribed the result of observation and interview, and the researcher showed the data using the text transcript.

### *Findings through Students' Achievement Data*

#### **Students' semester scores in online and offline English learning**

| No | Initials | Students' core  |                  |
|----|----------|-----------------|------------------|
|    |          | Online learning | Offline learning |
| 1  | AA       | 76              | 76               |
| 2  | AD       | 72              | 80               |
| 3  | AH       | 75              | 79               |
| 4  | AY       | 75              | 79               |
| 5  | AZ       | 74              | 79               |
| 6  | FD       | 75              | 79               |
| 7  | FI       | 74              | 78               |
| 8  | GN       | 75              | 78               |
| 9  | HA       | 76              | 79               |
| 10 | HI       | 75              | 80               |
| 11 | IA       | 75              | 82               |
| 12 | IP       | 77              | 80               |
| 13 | JA       | 75              | 78               |
| 14 | LA       | 76              | 79               |
| 15 | LF       | 74              | 80               |
| 16 | MQ       | 76              | 79               |
| 17 | NI       | 76              | 80               |
| 18 | NS       | 73              | 78               |
| 19 | PG       | 77              | 78               |
| 20 | RI       | 75              | 78               |
| 21 | RH       | 74              | 77               |
| 22 | RM       | 74              | 77               |
| 23 | RO       | 74              | 79               |
| 24 | SA       | 77              | 81               |
| 25 | SN       | 73              | 77               |
| 26 | VA       | 79              | 80               |
| 27 | WA       | 76              | 79               |
| 28 | WU       | 75              | 81               |

|             |       |       |
|-------------|-------|-------|
| Mean scores | 75.00 | 78.93 |
|-------------|-------|-------|

It can be seen from the students' semester scores in online and offline English learning above. The mean scores for offline learning were higher than for online learning. The mean score for offline was 78.93, while the mean score for online learning was 75.00. That is in line with research conducted by Ramdani (2021) that the average score of students who study in offline learning is higher than students who study in online learning, where the score of students in offline learning gets a score of 82, while online learning gets a score of 79. However, the researcher must prove whether there was a difference between the two using the hypothesis test (t-test). The hypothesis test used in this research was an inferential statistical test (t-test) paired samples to test, which aims to test paired samples (online and offline pairs) using the SPSS 25 program with testing criteria, the hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was rejected or ( $H_a$ ) was accepted, If the value of  $t_{\text{counted}} > \text{the value of } t_{\text{table}}$  or the value of  $P_{\text{value}} < \alpha 0.05$ . On the other hand, ( $H_0$ ) was accepted if the value of  $t_{\text{counted}} < \text{the value of } t_{\text{table}}$  or the value of  $P_{\text{value}} > \alpha 0.05$ .

#### **Hypothesis test using paired samples test**

| Paired Samples Test |                  |         |    |                 |
|---------------------|------------------|---------|----|-----------------|
| Pair                |                  | t       | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| 1                   | Online - Offline | -12.743 | 27 | 0.000           |

The researcher got the t of  $-12.743 < -2.051$  and  $P_{\text{value}} 0.000 < 0.05$ . Then, according to the dependent Sample t-test, it can be concluded  $H_0$  was rejected, and  $H_a$  was accepted, which means that there was a difference in students' achievement between online and offline English learning. From the results of these calculations, it can be concluded that the average quality of students who study offline was better than online learning. But it is not in line with the research conducted by Kaymak & Esengeldi (2021) in the research title of comparison between offline learning and online learning, where there is no significant difference between offline and online learning; both learnings increase students' understanding of the topic effectively. However, some students got high scores from online learning. Those were evidenced by comparing the values using the t-test to test the hypothesis. Students who study online are more difficult to learn English because of limited media. In this case, smartphones as media users online. However, not all students have smartphones and are constrained by network problems. Those cause students to find it challenging to collect assignments given by the teacher. That is why online learning students have lower scores than offline learning. Previous research stated by Nadyana (2021) that offline learning is more effective than online learning because online learning still has many shortcomings, and student satisfaction in offline learning is higher than in online learning. But some researchers said that the value of students in online learning is higher than in offline learning. Nurhikmah (2021) argues that there are differences in student learning outcomes when online and offline, where the average student learning outcomes in online

learning are higher than in offline learning. Although students who study offline learning get higher scores than online learning. That does not mean online learning is terrible for improving student learning outcomes.

### ***Findings through observation and interview***

The results of this research were obtained using an observation checklist to complete the data that had been found. Then the researcher also used in-depth interviews directly with informants as a form of searching and direct documentation in the field. This research focused on the factors that affect student achievement in English learning. The researcher's observations directly joined the classroom when the teacher started the teaching process. In the classroom, the researcher observed student learning activities. Three activities were observed during the teaching and learning process: pre-activities, while-activities, and post-activities. The interview section focused on learning facilities factors during the English learning process. It talked about their views/opinions regarding learning facilities in English subject of grade XI MIA 1. This section has six informants, namely one English teacher and five students. The researcher interviewed the informants inside/outside the classroom.

Besides, it is associated with the results of observations and interviews on the factors that affect student achievement in learning English. It can be seen that several factors most influence student achievement in learning English. They are environmental factors, lack of motivation, and no interest in learning English. The learning facilities factor is an essential means to improve their English, especially in improving vocabulary and motivating them to learn English. However, limited facilities make them bored and not interested in learning English. But here, they are only learning to use two media, smartphones and textbooks, where the media is still very minimal to meet their learning needs. Only use phones to search for vocabulary; not all students have phones to study.

Achievement is the maximum learning process achieved based on the student's ability in scores or test results. Purwadarminto (1987: 767) emphasizes that student learning achievement is the maximum result students can achieve based on their abilities when carrying out specific learning processes. Some factors, such as internal and external factors, affect students' achievement in English learning. Student interaction is one factor that influences student achievement in learning English. Learning is the core of interaction between teachers and students and students with other students. In these interactions, the teacher carries out an activity called teaching while the students carry out an exercise called learning. According to Sardiman (2011: 2), interaction in learning implies that there are interactive activities between teaching staff who carry out leading tasks on the one hand with learning residents (students, students/study subjects) carrying out learning activities. The results of observations obtained by students interacting with the teacher and other students are pretty good. It is just that there are some students who the teacher should give more attention. The lack of motivation to learn that students get makes them bored to learn, and discovering some of them only interferes with the learning activities of other students.

In addition to the interaction factor in the learning process, the learning facility factor also affects student achievement in learning English. The teaching method that the teacher uses is often assumed as the factor that causes the student's speaking problem (Widodo & Mugiyo, 2021). Even this factor is an essential factor in improving student achievement. According to Ayun (2021), the fulfilment of learning facilities such as learning infrastructure and suitable environmental conditions can support the learning process so that teaching and learning activities take place effectively and efficiently. Complete learning facilities, if appropriately used, will facilitate and expedite the learning process. With these conditions, the learning achievement obtained will also be maximized. It is in line with Djamarah (2002) statement that the existence of learning facilities determines a person's success in learning. Success here is getting learning achievement as expected. Using facilities in teaching and learning activities is very important because learning facilities include all the tools that support student learning activities. In teaching English, the curriculum uses the communicative approach. It means that the teachers are expected to give experience to the students directly in order to use English in making communication both written and spoken (Widodo, 2020).

## CONCLUSION

There is a difference between students' achievement online and students' achievement offline. However, the difference between online and offline is significant. The statistical results of hypothesis testing evidence this. The sign value (2-tailed) is  $-12,743 < -2,051$  using the dependent sample t-test. So, the student's achievement in offline learning is higher than in online learning. It means that the students' online achievement in learning English differs from their offline achievement, with a significant difference in student achievement in learning English. These happen because of several factors and problems that affect student achievement: the first factor is student interaction during the learning process. Among other problems, students were noisy in class and less cohesive, making other students uncomfortable studying, lacking attention and motivation, and using their mother tongue in communicating. Then the second factor affecting student achievement in learning English is learning facilities. There are several problems, namely the limitations of supporting facilities in learning, in this case, the media. Students have a little difficulty in borrowing books. It makes students difficult and lazy to learn, especially learning English. Lack of drive and motivation to learn. For this reason, learning facilities are crucial in supporting student achievement.

## REFERENCES

Abidin, Z., Hudaya, A., & Anjani, D. (2020). EFEKTIVITAS PEMBELAJARAN JARAK JAUH PADA MASA PANDEMI COVID-19. *Research and Development Journal of*

- Education*, 1(1), 131. <https://doi.org/10.30998/RDJE.V1I1.7659>
- Alseweed, M. A. (2013). Students' Achievement and Attitudes Toward Using Traditional Learning, Blended Learning, and Virtual Classes Learning in Teaching and Learning at the University Level. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 6(1), 65–73. <https://doi.org/10.3968/n>
- Ayun, S., M. (2021) Pengaruh fasilitas belajar dan lingkungan pondok pesantren al husna terhadap prestasi belajar mata pelajaran ips siswa kelas vii c di mts. islamiyah malo tahun ajaran 2019/2020. *Aksara: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Nonformal*. 7(1) 2021.
- Djamarah, S. B. (2002). *Rahasia sukses belajar*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta
- Creswell JW, C. V. (2011). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research* - Google Buku. In *California: SAGE*.
- Herlina, N., Studi Manajemen, P., & Ekonomi, F. (2020). Manajemen Pembelajaran Daring Di Perguruan Tinggi Pada Masa Pandemi Covid-19. *Journal Civics and Social Studies*, 4(2), 102–108. <https://doi.org/10.31980/CIVICOS.V4I2.925>
- Kaymak, S., & Esengeldi, M. (2021). Comparison between offline learning and online learning. *Journal. Suleyman Demirel University, Kazakhstan*.
- Nadyana, C.R.D. (2021) Analisis perbandingan antara hasil belajar offline dan online mahasiswa. *Jurnal Pendidikan, Sains dan Humaniora*. 6(9) 2021.
- Noor, Juliansyah, (2011). *Metodologi Penelitian: Skripsi, Tesis, Disertasi, dan Karya Ilmiah*. Jakarta: Prenada Media Group
- Nurhikmah (2021) Perbedaan hasil belajar siswa secara online dan offline di smk at-taqwa 05. Kebalen. *Jurnal Pendidikan, sains dan humaniora. Universitas panca sakti*. 9(7). 2021
- Poerwadarminto, W. J. S. (1987). *Kamus umum bahasa indonesia*. Balai Pustaka. Jakarta
- Ramdani, R. (2021) The comparison between students' learning outcomes in offline and online learning at SMK Negeri 3 Pinrang. *Islamic institute. Parepare*.
- Sardiman, AM. (1992). *Interaksi dan motivasi belajar mengajar*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Rajawali.
- Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: PT Alfabet.
- Putria, H., Maula, L. H., & Uswatun, D. A. (2020). Analisis Proses Pembelajaran dalam Jaringan (DARING) Masa Pandemi Covid- 19 Pada Guru Sekolah Dasar. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 4(4), 861–870. <https://doi.org/10.31004/BASICEDU.V4I4.460>
- Thompson, N. L., Miller, N. C., & Franz, D. P. (2013). Comparing online and face-to-face learning experiences for non-traditional students. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 14(4), 233–251.
- Widodo, U. (2020). AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' SKILL IN IMPLEMENTING PERSONAL PRONOUNS. *Agama Buddha Dan Ilmu Pengetahuan*, 5(January 2019), 62–72.
- Widodo, U., & Mugiyo. (2021). The effectiveness of jigsaw learning strategy to teach speaking. *International Journal of Language Teaching and Education*, 2015, 1–15.