

THE INFLUENCE OF ONLINE TO OFFLINE LEARNING METHODS ON LEARNING MOTIVATION IN MUSLIM DOCTORS, FACULTY OF MEDICINE, YARSI UNIVERSITY

Ayudhia Salsabila^{*}, Citra Fitri Agustina¹

¹Yarsi University

email: ayudhiasalsabila01@gmail.com

email: citra.fitri@yarsi.ac.id

Article Info:

Submitted: June 7, 2024

Accepted: Dec 30, 2024

Published: Dec 30, 2024

ABSTRACT

Handling Editor:

*Coass; Learning;
Motivation; Online;
Offline*

Background: Online learning is implemented as an effort to reduce the spread of Covid-19. In the medical education, coass, online learning affects the learning motivation of students. Motivation is the drive to perform an action with a specific goal. The goal of this research is to understand the learning motivation of Muslim doctors during the transition from online to offline learning methods during clinical clerkship. Method: This research is quantitative, using the Wilcoxon test by distributing the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) online. The research sample consists of Muslim doctors from the Faculty of Medicine, YARSI University in 2022, learning with the transition from online to offline methods during clinical, selected through simple random sampling. Result: The results obtained in this study show that the learning motivation during online learning is mostly categorized as very good compared to offline learning Conclusion : The score of learning motivation from online to offline does not show significant changes, with a significance value of $0.812 > 0.05$, indicating no increase in learning motivation during the transition from online to offline learning methods.

1. INTRODUCTION

The activity restrictions implemented to reduce the increase number of Covid-19 cases. The Minister of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia published a letter No. 36962/MPK.A/HK/2020 regarding to Online Learning and Working from Home in the Context of Preventing the Spread of Covid-19 and a Letter was also published regarding to Covid-19 prevention in college education, stated that the implementation of distance learning (online) must be adjusted to the

conditions of the higher education institution (Anugrahsari, 2021). As a result of the restrictions on teaching and learning activities, medical education was also change to online platforms. The changed from offline to online learning and otherwise affect the learning environment, including the learning motivation of medical students and medical professional students. The existence of online learning methods made medical professional education, which should involve more practical experience but change to learn more

*** Author Correspondence: Ayudhia Salsabila, Universitas Yarsi**

ayudhiasalsabila01@gmail.com, 081380001303

theory, similar to medical education (pre-clinical). This situation caused students's interest in learning to decrease. The differences in motivation were the focus of this research. If there was a clear difference in learning motivation between online and offline learning methods, this can be used as a benchmark in determining the most effective teaching methods in medical professional education, until improvement in the quality of learning and student learning outcomes.

In the research by (Sur et al., 2020), online lectures affected learning motivation by 28.3%, resulting in increased motivation among students. Otherwise, the research by (Djafar et al., 2022) indicated that online learning less effective seen from decrease in GPA. The research by (Susani et al., 2022) explained that clinical clerkships using online methods impact social interaction, both formal and informal, negatively. This was due to limited opportunities for direct participation in health services, cause that decrease in motivation among clinical students. The lack of direct learning experiences in the professional education environment for medical students has resulted in decreased motivation to learn.

On previous research conducted by (Susani et al., 2022) and (Anugrahsari, 2021) revealed that learning motivation was only examined in clinical clerkship students experiencing a transition from offline (face-to-face) to online learning. This served as the basis for this study to further explore changes in learning motivation among clinical clerkship students due to this shift in teaching methods. Discuss about learning motivation is a psychological factor that plays a significant role in enhancing enthusiasm for learning. It serves as a driving force for individuals to take action and achieve specific goals (Khodijah, 2017). Low motivation can lead to poor learning outcomes, which in turn affects academic performance (Octavia, 2020).

Learning motivation can be assessed through the variables of intrinsic goal orientation, extrinsic goal motivation, task value, control of learning beliefs, and test anxiety. First, intrinsic goal orientation refers to the internal state of students that drives them to learn, such as interest in the subject matter. Second, extrinsic goal motivation involves students's perceptions of learning to achieve positive outcomes or avoid negative ones, such as striving for rewards or avoiding punishment. Third, task value represents students's perception of the course material in relation to its relevance to tasks. For instance, students may be interested in a subject because it significantly influences their grades or learning outcomes. Fourth, control of learning beliefs refers to an individual's belief that learning outcomes are the result of their own efforts. Fifth, the self-efficacy for learning and performance component relates to the expectation of success in completing tasks and mastering knowledge. This is illustrated by students's confidence in completing tasks, such as finishing a thesis (Perdana, 2021). The last, test anxiety is the emotional state that arises during tests or other cognitive assessments, such as feelings of fear and anxiety when taking an exam (Pintrich, 2015) (Dr. Darmiany, 2012).

2. METODE

This study uses a quantitative research approach with a cross-sectional design, which evaluates a group of individuals at a single point in time. The study utilizes the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) and a Likert scale as assessment instruments. These instruments were chosen because they include questions capable of evaluating an individual's learning motivation and have been validated by (Ningrum, 2021). The population and sample for this study consist of Muslim doctors from the Faculty of Medicine at Universitas Yarsi in 2022, specifically from the 2015-2016 cohorts who participated in

clinical clerkship during the transition from online to offline learning methods. The sample was selected using a simple random sampling technique. Data was collected by filling out a questionnaire via Google Forms. The population comprised 319 individuals, and the sample meeting the study criteria totaled 83 participants. Data from the questionnaires were processed using SPSS, and the study employed the Wilcoxon test for analysis.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 Descriptive of Respondents by Age

Criteria	Number (n)	Percentage (%)
≤ 25 years	42	50.6
> 25 years	41	49.4
Amount	83	100.0

Based on Table 1, there are (50.6%) respondents aged under 25 years to 25 years,

while respondents aged over 25 years are (49.4%).

Table 2 Respondent Descriptives by Gender

Criteria	Number (n)	Percentage (%)
Male	25	30.1
Female	58	69.9
Amount	83	100.0

In Table 2, there are (30.1%) male respondents and (69.9%) female respondents.

Table 3 Descriptive Respondents based on Faculty Batch of Medicine Class

Criteria	Number (n)	Percentage (%)
2015	31	37.3
2016	52	62.7
Amount	83	100.0

Table 3 shows the medical faculty batch that participated in the research, namely (37.3%) respondents came from the 2015 batch and (62.7%) came from the 2016 batch.

Table 4 Respondent Descriptive Based on Research Sub Variables

Data Group	Sub Variable	Bad		Poor		Good		Very Good		Amount	
		(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)
Online	Intrinsic Goal Orientation	0	0.0	5	6.0	45	54.2	33	39.8	83	100.0
	Extrinsic Goal Orientation	0	0.0	0	0.0	25	30.1	58	69.9	83	100.0
	Task Value	0	0.0	0	0.0	14	16.9	69	83.1	83	100.0
	Control of Learning Beliefs	0	0.0	2	2.4	28	33.7	53	63.9	83	100.0
	Self-Efficacy for Learning and Performance	0	0.0	1	1.2	33	39.8	49	59.0	83	100.0
	Test Anxiety	4	4.8	16	19.3	50	60.2	13	15.7	83	100.0
Offline	Intrinsic Goal Orientation	0	0.0	5	6.0	42	50.6	36	43.4	83	100.0
	Extrinsic Goal Orientation	0	0.0	0	0.0	28	33.7	55	66.3	83	100.0
	Task Value	0	0.0	0	0.0	19	22.9	64	77.1	83	100.0
	Control of Learning Beliefs	0	0.0	0	0.0	32	38.6	51	61.4	83	100.0
	Self-Efficacy for Learning and Performance	0	0.0	1	1.2	37	44.6	45	54.2	83	100.0
	Test Anxiety	3	3.6	25	30.1	39	47.0	16	19.3	83	100.0

Table 4 the online implementation, the intrinsic goal orientation sub-variable shows that there are 5 people in the poor category, 45 people in the good category, and 33 people in the very good category. The extrinsic goal orientation sub-variable shows 25 people in the good category and 58 people in the very good category. In the task value sub-variable, there are 14 people in the good category and 69 people in the very good category. There are 2 people in the poor category, 28 people in the good category, and 53 people in the very good category in the control of learning beliefs sub-variable. The self-efficacy for learning and performance sub-variable shows 1 person in the poor category, 33 people in the good category, and 49 people in the very good category. In the text anxiety sub-variable, there are 4 people in the bad category, 16 people in the poor category, 50

people in the good category, and 13 people in the very good category.

In offline implementation, in the intrinsic goal orientation sub-variable, there were 5 people in the poor category, 42 people in the good category, and 36 people in the very good category. In the extrinsic goal orientation sub-variable, there were 28 people in the good category and 55 people in the very good category. In the task value sub-variable, there were 19 people in the good category and 64 people in the very good category. There were 2 people in the poor category, 32 people in the good category, and 51 people in the very good category in the control of learning beliefs sub-variable. The self-efficacy for learning and performance sub-variable showed 1 person in the poor category, 37 people in the good category, and 45 people in the very good category. In the

text anxiety sub-variable, there were 3 people in the bad category, 25 people in the poor

category, 39 people in the good category, and 16 people in the very good category.

Table 5 Respondents's Descriptive Based on Learning Motivation

Data Group	Bad		Poor		Good		Very Good		Amount	
	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)
Online	0	0.0	0	0.0	32	38.6	51	61.4	83	100.0
Offline	0	0.0	0	0.0	36	43.4	47	56.6	83	100.0

Table 5 shows that 32 respondents had good learning motivation, and 51 respondents had very good learning motivation during online learning. In contrast, during offline learning, 36 respondents had good learning motivation, and 47 respondents had very good learning

motivation. When focusing on the number of respondents with very good learning motivation, more respondents exhibited very good motivation during online learning compared to offline learning.

Table 6 The Effect of the Transition from Online to Offline Learning Methods on Learning Motivation in Muslim Doctors

Variable	Data Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	Z	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	Explanation
Intrinsic Goal Orientation	Online	20.446	3.877	-2.701	0.016	significant
	Offline	21.145	4.173			
Extrinsic Goal Orientation	Online	23.108	3.231	1.460	0.068	not significant
	Offline	22.735	3.265			
Task Value	Online	35.542	4.678	0.496	0.563	not significant
	Offline	35.422	4.929			
Control of Learning Beliefs	Online	22.614	3.492	-0.061	0.813	not significant
	Offline	22.627	3.421			
Self-Efficacy for Learning and Performance	Online	43.976	6.639	0.112	0.524	not significant
	Offline	43.928	6.930			
Test Anxiety	Online	20.446	6.226	-0.261	0.885	not significant
	Offline	20.554	6.811			
Learning Motivation	Online	166.133	18.209	-0.239	0.812	not significant
	Offline	166.410	19.905			

Table 6 shows that the intrinsic goal orientation score online versus offline has a significance value of $0.016 < 0.05$ so that from the data there is a significant difference. Then the online versus offline score on extrinsic goal orientation has a significance value of $0.068 > 0.05$, therefore there is no significant

difference in value. The task value score online versus offline has a significance value of $0.563 > 0.05$ so that there is no significant difference in value. The control of learning beliefs score online versus offline has a significance value of $0.813 > 0.05$ so that there is no significant difference in value. The self-

* Author Correspondence: Ayudhia Salsabila, Universitas Yarsi

ayudhiasalsabila01@gmail.com, 081380001303

efficacy for learning and performance score online versus offline has a significance value of $0.524 > 0.05$ so that there is no significant difference in value. While the anxiety test score online versus offline, there is a significance value of $0.885 > 0.05$, so from the data it was found that there was no significant difference in value. In the online versus offline learning motivation score section, the significance value is $0.812 > 0.05$, so it is known that there is no significant difference in value.

The respondents were aged between 23 and 29 years. According to (Depkes RI, 2009) the late adolescence age category is 17–25 years, while the early adulthood category is 26–35 years. Adult learners are generally more motivated to learn when the material studied is relevant and beneficial to daily life. In contrast, children and adolescents tend to focus on mastering the material as their primary learning orientation. Based on the data from this research, the majority of respondents aged ≤ 25 years (50.6%) demonstrated high learning motivation in mastering the material (Dr. Mohammad Al Farabi, 2018). These findings align with the sub-variable self-efficacy for learning and performance, both in online and offline learning, which falls into the very good category. This sub-variable addresses learners's ability to master knowledge.

The study results showed that (23.4%) of the respondents were male, while (76.6%) were female. Learning motivation differs based on gender. Males tend to approach problem-solving more critically and realistically, making it easier for them to absorb knowledge. In contrast, females involve emotions more often, which may result in lower knowledge acquisition compared to males. Based on this, it can be concluded that males have higher learning motivation than females (Firmansyah et al., 2019).

A study conducted by (Irma, La Ode Liyaumi Azim, 2022) found that learning motivation during offline learning was more

frequently categorized as good compared to online learning. However, this finding is not consistent with the results of this study. The data indicate that learning motivation during online learning was more frequently categorized as very good compared to offline learning, with (61.4%) for online learning and (56.6%) for offline learning. Therefore, it can be concluded that learning motivation is higher during online learning.

Learning motivation was influence by both intrinsic and extrinsic factors. A study by (Zain et al., 2023) found that extrinsic motivation was greater than intrinsic motivation. This aligns with the results of this study, where the sub-variable extrinsic goal orientation was categorized as very good during both online and offline learning. In contrast, intrinsic goal orientation was categorized as good in both settings. When comparing the scores of intrinsic goal orientation in online versus offline learning, there was a significant difference, indicating that intrinsic factors influenced respondents' learning motivation during the transition between learning methods.

In this study, learning motivation between online and offline learning did not show a significant change, with a score of $0.812 > 0.05$, indicating no increase in learning motivation. This finding contradicts the study by (Irma, La Ode Liyaumi Azim, 2022), which reported a decline in learning motivation during online learning due to student fatigue and lack of interest in the learning process. However, this study aligns with the research conducted by (Susani et al., 2022), which found that medical professional students had a strong awareness of their reduced competency mastery, motivating them to continue improving their learning competence during online learning. It can be concluded from this study that the transition from online to offline learning methods did not enhance respondents' learning motivation, and there was no significant difference observed. This insignificant difference could be attributed to students already having adapted, possessing a high

interest in learning, and being aware of their limitations in mastering material during online learning. As a result, learning

motivation during online learning was not significantly different from offline learning.

4. CONCLUSION

Learning motivation during online learning falls into the very good category, with no significant differences in learning motivation between online and offline learning methods. Additionally, there was no increase in learning motivation during the transition from online to offline learning methods.

5. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

As an expression of gratitude for the completion of this journal, I, as the author, would like to extend my heartfelt thanks to Dr. Citra Fitri Agustina, Sp.KJ, who has greatly providing guidance and offering valuable insights. I also extend my gratitude to everyone who has supported the preparation of this journal

6. REFERENCES

- Anugrahsari, S. (2021) 'Pembelajaran Jarak Jauh Pada Kepaniteraan Klinis Program Studi Profesi Dokter Di Rumah Sakit Pendidikan', *JAMBI MEDICAL JOURNAL 'Jurnal Kedokteran dan Kesehatan'*, 9(1), pp. 220–229. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.22437/jmj.v9i1.12031>.
- Depkes RI. (2009). *Klasifikasi umur menurut kategori*. Jakarta: Ditjen Yankes
- Djafar, H. et al. (2022) 'Dampak pembelajaran daring dan luring pada mahasiswa', *Educational Leadership*, 2(1), pp. 100–109.
- Dr. Darmiany, M.P. (2012) *Self Regulated Learning (SRL) Riset dan Aplikasi*. Mataram: Arga Puji Press.
- Dr. Mohammad Al Farabi, M.A. (2018) *PENDIDIKAN ORANG DEWASA DALAM AL-QUR'AN*. Jakarta:

KENCANA.

- Firmansyah, W. et al. (2019) 'Analisis motivasi berprestasi pada mahasiswa Prodi Manajemen Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Jambi', *Jurnal Dinamika Manajemen*, 7(3), pp. 111–122. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.22437/jdm.v7i3.16802>.
- Irma, La Ode Liyaumi Azim, K. (2022) 'Pengaruh Kuliah Daring dan Tatap Muka Terhadap Motivasi Belajar Mahasiswa pada Masa Pandemi COVID-19', *JURNAL ILMIAH OBSGI*, 14(4), pp. 230–237.
- Khodijah, N. (2017) *Psikologi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Ningrum, R.K. (2021) 'Validitas dan Reliabilitas Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) pada Mahasiswa Kedokteran', *PENDIPA Journal of Science Education*, 5(3), pp. 421–425. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.33369/pendipa.5.3.421-425>.
- Octavia, S.A. (2020) *Motivasi Belajar dalam Perkembangan Remaja*. Jakarta: Deepublish.
- Perdana, K.I. (2021) 'Hubungan Antara Regulasi Diri Dalam Belajar Dan Resiliensi Akademik Pada Mahasiswa Yang Sedang Menyusun Skripsi', *Psycho Idea*, 19, pp. 1–5.
- Pintrich, dkk. (2015) *Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) Manual*. USA: Deacon Hill Research Associates LLC.
- Sur, W.A.A. et al. (2020) 'Analisis Motivasi Belajar Mahasiswa dengan Sistem Pembelajaran Daring Selama Masa Pandemi Covid-19', *Jurnal EQUATION Teori dan Penelitian*

Susani, Y.P. *et al.* (2022) 'How Does
Clinical Learning Environment
Changes During Pandemic Affect on
Professional Identity?', *Jurnal
Pendidikan Kedokteran Indonesia:
The Indonesian Journal of Medical*

Education, 11(3), p. 272. Available at:
<https://doi.org/10.22146/jpki.71483>

Zain, I.M. *et al.* (2023) 'Hubungan
Motivasi Belajar Dan Self Regulated
Learning Pada Mahasiswa S1
Pendidikan Geografi Fish Unesa
Pasca Pandemi Covid-19', pp. 1–8.