



Students' Perception on Online vs. Offline Learning at English Department of UNP

Ira Lestari¹ and Yati Aisya Rani²

^{1,2}Universitas Negeri Padang

Correspondence Email: lestariira06@gmail.com

Article History

Published: 2024-06-06

Keywords:

Student Perception, Online Learning, Offline Learning

Abstract

This study aimed to determine students' perceptions of the implementation of online and offline learning experiences. This research used a quantitative method. The sample of this study was students of 2021 at English Department of UNP who were selected through a proportional random sample. Questionnaires were used to collect data. Students' perceptions were analyzed from several dimensions namely Course Structure and Organization, Learner Interaction, Instructor Presence, Student Engagement, Student Satisfaction and Perceive Learning. The results of the analysis showed that there was a negative perception of Learner Interaction, while the other aspects of the dimension showed positive results.

©2024 The Author(s) Publish by Jurusan Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris FBS UNP. This is an open access article under the CC-BY-NC license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

How to Cite: Lestari, I., & Rani, Y. A. (2024). Students' Perception on Online vs. Offline Learning at English Department of UNP. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 13(2): pp. 695-704, DOI: [10.24036/jelt.v13i2.128994](https://doi.org/10.24036/jelt.v13i2.128994)

INTRODUCTION

English learning outcomes can be seen based on the skills and contents of the English learning curriculum. Learning outcomes for English students can be achieved by mastering four fundamental skills. Likewise, the content in English learning such as TEFL, ELTMM and ICT for language learning is also part of the English curriculum. The development of comprehensive learning objectives for English Department students is critical in addressing the evolving challenges in language and literature education.

English students achieve significant learning outcomes across four critical language skills: reading, writing, listening, and speaking. In reading, students develop advanced comprehension skills that enable them to analyze and interpret a wide range of texts effectively. Students also achieve proficiency in writing, mastering the skills necessary to compose clear, coherent, and well-structured texts. In listening, students cultivate the skills necessary to comprehend spoken language accurately and efficiently. In the area of speaking, students develop the ability to communicate fluently and confidently in oral interactions.

Nevertheless, learning content for English students such as TEFL, ELTMM and ICT for language learning can be a matter for learning outcomes as part of curriculums in the English Department. In TEFL, students develop advanced capabilities in designing and delivering effective English instruction tailored to non-native speakers. Therefore, in the area of English Language Teaching Materials and Media (ELTMM), students gain expertise in developing and evaluating teaching materials and instructional methodologies. Furthermore, the integration of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) into language learning is another critical component of the curriculum.

English language learning encompasses two distinct modalities: online learning and offline learning. E-learning is the outcome of the convergence of technical advancements and education, enabling learning to take place online. The integration of technological advancements with the process of acquiring knowledge leads to the development of a learning approach known as e-learning (Ramadhan et al., 2018). A well-designed application utilized in this approach serves as an encouragement for technology advancements in education. Meanwhile, offline learning is learning that is done face-to-face. Moreover, offline learning uses external terms that are not connected to computer networks and is done using teacher and student handbooks (Malyana, 2020)

There was a study related to the perception of online and offline learning. The study was done by (Dewanto, 2021). The study aims to determine college students' perceptions of their experiences in attending lectures during the Pandemic with two different methods; those are offline at the beginning of the Pandemic and online at a later time during the Pandemic. The results show that, in general, Universitas Pekalongan students prefer to take lectures offline rather than online.

Based on a preliminary interview with some students at the English Department of UNP, it was found that they felt significant differences between online and offline learning. Therefore, this research is carried out by several dimensions of aspects in online and offline learning. According to (Gray & Diloreto, 2016) there are six dimensions: Course Structure and Organization, Learner Interaction, Instructor Presence, Student Engagement, Student Satisfaction and Perceived Learning. Course structure and organization refers to how the course content is laid out, sequenced, and presented to students. It includes considerations such as the clarity of learning objectives, the logical progression of topics, the availability of resources, the ease of navigation within the learning platform, and the coherence of assessments. Learner interaction involves how students engage with each other, with the instructor, and with the course content. Instructor presence refers to the visibility, accessibility, and involvement of the instructor in the course. Student engagement refers to the extent to which students are actively involved and invested in the learning process. Student satisfaction measures how content students are with their learning experience. Perceived learning refers to students' subjective assessment of how much they have gained from the course in terms of knowledge, skills, and understanding.

METHODS

This study used a descriptive quantitative method. The population of this research was the class of 2021 students in English Department. The class of 2021 students were chosen because they had experienced online and offline learning in English Department of UNP. This research was conducted in the academic year of 2023/2024. In this research, the quantitative research samples were collected using proportional random sampling. The questionnaire of this research was close-ended. The questionnaire items were adopted from (Gray & Diloreto, 2016). Closed-ended questions were evaluated on a four-point Likert scale, from strongly disagreeing to strongly agreeing. The questionnaires discussed six significant aspects such as; course structure and organization, learner interaction, instructor presence, student engagement, student satisfaction, and perceived learning of online and offline learning. Moreover, the validator for the questionnaire was from a lecturer in English Department that was Mr. Rifki Oktoviandry, S.Pd, M.Hum. The researcher used SPSS ver. 29 to analyze the data and then the data can be described.

Table 1. Likert Scale Score Criteria

Scale	Score
Strongly Agree	4
Agree	3
Disagree	2
Strongly Disagree	1

The researcher also classified the score to obtain the mean score. According to (Dwipayana, 2013), there were four categories of mean scores based on the following table below:

Table 2. Mean Score of Perception

No.	Mean Score	Perception
1.	1,0 - 1,7	Very Negative
2.	1,8 - 2,5	Negative
3.	2,6 - 3,2	Positive
4.	3,3 - 4,0	Very Positive

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research Findings

The data were collected from the students via questionnaires. The questionnaire consists of 34 statements for online and 33 statements for offline with a Likert Scale with four scales; 4 (Strongly Agree), 3 (Agree), 2 (Disagree), and 1 (Strongly Disagree). In statements for online learning, 1-5 are related to course structure and organization, 6-12 are related to learner interaction, 13-16 are related to instructor presence, 17-21 are about student engagement, 22-27 are related to student satisfaction, and 28-33 are related to perceived learning. Likewise, in statements for offline learning, 1-5 are related to course structure and organization, 6-12 are related to learner interaction, 13-17 are related to instructor presence, 18-22 are about

student engagement, 23-28 are related to student satisfaction, and 29-34 are related to perceived learning.

Table 3. Mean Score of Course Structure and Organization in Online Learning

	N	Mean	Category
Item01	102	2.83	Positive
Item02	102	2.49	Negative
Item03	102	2.56	Negative
Item04	102	2.90	Positive
Item05	102	2.84	Positive
Valid N (listwise)	102		
Total Mean		2.72	Positive

Based on the table, several statements got positive response in items 1,4, and 5 with total mean 2.72 which meant that most of the students agree with the course structure and organization in online learning. Besides, there were also negative response in items 2 and 3. It meant that there were also students who disagree with course structure and organization in online learning.

Table 4. Mean Score of Course Structure and Organization in Offline Learning

	N	Mean	Category
Item01	102	3.28	Positive
Item02	102	2.42	Negative
Item03	102	2.46	Negative
Item04	102	3.43	Very Positive
Item05	102	3.39	Very Positive
Valid N (listwise)	102		
Total Mean		2.99	Positive

Based on the table, most of the statements got positive response in item 1 and very positive response in items 4 and 5 with total mean 2.99 which mean that most of the students agree with the course structure and organization in offline learning. However, there were also negative response in items 2 and 3. It meant that there were also students who disagree with course structure and organization in offline learning.

It can be compared that in offline learning, course structure and organization got higher result in offline than online learning. It meant that students prefer offline learning in course structure and organization. Therefore, both online and offline learning had positive response.

Table 5. Mean Score of Learner Interaction in Online Learning

	N	Mean	Category
Item06	102	2.64	Positive
Item07	102	2.64	Positive
Item08	102	2.50	Negative
Item09	102	2.75	Positive
Item10	102	2.46	Negative
Item11	102	2.44	Negative
Item12	102	2.70	Positive
Valid N (listwise)	102		
Total Mean		2.59	Negative

Based on the table, several statements got positive response in items 6,7, 9 and 12 with total mean 2.59 which meant that most of the students agree with the learner interaction in online learning. Besides, there were also negative response in items 8, 10 and 11. It meant that there were also students who disagree with learner interaction in online learning.

Table 6. Mean Score of Learner Interaction in Offline Learning

	N	Mean	Category
Item06	102	3.49	Very Positive
Item07	102	2.26	Negative
Item08	102	3.43	Very Positive
Item09	102	3.35	Very Positive
Item10	102	3.47	Very Positive
Item11	102	3.25	Positive
Item12	102	3.25	Positive
Valid N (listwise)	102		
Total Mean		3.21	Positive

Based on the table, most of the statements got very positive response in items 6,8, 9 and 10; in items 11 and 12 got positive response with total mean 3.21 which meant that most of the students agree with the learner interaction in offline learning. Besides, there were also negative response in item 7. It meant that there were also students who disagree with learner interaction in offline learning.

It can be compared that in offline learning, learner interaction got higher result in offline than online learning. It meant that students prefer offline learning in learner interaction. Therefore, online learning had a negative response and offline learning had a positive response.

Table 7. Mean Score of Student Engagement in Online Learning

	N	Mean	Category
Item13	102	2.47	Negative
Item14	102	2.43	Negative
Item15	102	2.66	Positive
Item16	102	3.19	Positive
Item17	102	2.64	Positive
Valid N (listwise)	102		
Total Mean		2.67	Positive

Based on the table, several statements got positive response in items 15, 16 and 17 with total mean 2.67 which meant that most of the students agree with the student engagement in online learning. Besides, there were also negative response in items 13 and 14. It meant that there were also students who disagree with student engagement in online learning.

Table 8. Mean Score of Student Engagement in Offline Learning

	N	Mean	Category
Item13	102	3.14	Positive
Item14	102	3.38	Very Positive
Item15	102	3.31	Very Positive
Item16	102	2.51	Negative
Valid N (listwise)	102		
Total Mean		3.08	Positive

Based on the table, several statements got very positive response in items 14 and 15; in item 13 got positive response with total mean 3.08 which meant that most of the students agree with the student engagement in offline learning. Besides, there were also negative response in item 16. It meant that there were also students who disagree with student engagement in offline learning.

It can be compared that in offline learning, student engagement got higher result in offline than online learning. It meant that students prefer offline learning in student engagement. Therefore, both online learning and offline learning had a positive response.

Table 9. Mean Score of Instructor Presence in Online Learning

	N	Mean	Category
Item18	102	2.64	Positive
Item19	102	2.74	Positive
Item20	102	2.53	Negative
Item21	102	2.57	Negative
Item22	102	2.81	Positive
Valid N (listwise)	102		
Total Mean		2.65	Positive

Based on the table, several statements got positive response in items 18, 19 and 22 with total mean 2.65 which meant that most of the students agree with the instructor presence in online learning. Besides, there were also negative response in items 20 and 21. It meant that there were also students who disagree with instructor presence in online learning.

Table 10. Mean Score of Instructor Presence in Offline Learning

	N	Mean	Category
Item17	102	3.25	Positive
Item18	102	2.64	Positive
Item19	102	3.12	Positive
Item20	102	3.22	Positive
Item21	102	3.37	Very Positive
Valid N (listwise)	102		
Total Mean		3.12	Positive

Based on the table, most of the statements got positive response in items 17, 18, 19 and 20; in item 21 got very positive response with total mean 3.12 which meant that most of the students agree with the instructor presence in offline learning. Therefore, there were still students who disagree with the instructor presence in online learning.

It can be compared that in offline learning, instructor presence got higher result in offline than online learning. It meant that students prefer offline learning in instructor presence. Therefore, both online learning and offline learning had a positive response.

Table 11. Mean Score of Student Satisfaction in Online Learning

	N	Mean	Category
Item23	102	2.65	Positive
Item24	102	2.92	Positive
Item25	102	2.51	Negative
Item26	102	2.60	Positive
Item27	102	2.59	Negative
Item28	102	2.68	Positive
Valid N (listwise)	102		
Total Mean		2.65	Positive

Based on the table, several statements got positive response in items 23, 24, 26 and 28 with total mean 2.65 which meant that most of the students agree with the student satisfaction in online learning. Besides, there were also negative response in items 25 and 27. It meant that there were also students who disagree with student satisfaction in online learning.

Table 12. Mean Score of Student Satisfaction in Offline Learning

	N	Mean	Category
Item22	102	3.41	Very Positive
Item23	102	2.10	Negative
Item24	102	3.41	Very Positive
Item25	102	3.38	Very Positive
Item26	102	3.29	Positive
Item27	102	3.23	Positive
Valid N (listwise)	102		
Total Mean		3.13	Positive

Based on the table, several statements got very positive response in items 22, 24 and 25; in item 26 and 27 got positive response with total mean 3.13 which meant that most of the students agree with the student satisfaction in offline learning. Besides, there were also negative response in item 23. It meant that there were also students who disagree with student satisfaction in offline learning.

It can be compared that in offline learning, student satisfaction got higher result in offline than online learning. It meant that students prefer offline learning in student satisfaction. Therefore, both online learning and offline learning had a positive response.

Table 13. Mean Score of Perceived Learning in Online Learning

	N	Mean	Category
Item29	102	2.84	Positive
Item30	102	2.69	Positive
Item31	102	2.77	Positive
Item32	102	2.74	Positive
Item33	102	2.71	Positive
Item34	102	2.71	Positive
Valid N (listwise)	102		
Total Mean		2.74	Positive

Based on the table, all statements got positive response with total mean 2.74 which meant that most of the students agree with the perceived learning in online learning. Therefore, there were still students who disagree with the perceived learning in online learning.

Table 14. Mean Score of Perceived Learning in Offline Learning

	N	Mean	Category
Item28	102	3.34	Very Positive
Item29	102	3.46	Very Positive
Item30	102	2.63	Positive
Item31	102	3.46	Very Positive
Item32	102	3.43	Very Positive
Item33	102	3.41	Very Positive
Valid N (listwise)	102		
Total Mean		3.28	Positive

Based on the table, all statements got positive response with total mean 3.28 which meant that most of the students agree with the perceived learning in offline learning. Therefore, there were still students who disagree with the perceived learning in offline learning.

It can be compared that in offline learning, perceived learning got higher result in offline than online learning. It meant that students prefer offline learning in perceived learning. Therefore, both online learning and offline learning had a positive response.

Discussion

According to the findings above, it can be discussed that most of the dimensions that the researcher found in the data analysis had positive results. However, one dimension which was the learner interaction got into the negative category in online learning. Recent studies have corroborated these negative aspects of online learner interaction. For instance, Yang et al. (2021) found that feelings of isolation and lack of social presence were common complaints among online learners, negatively impacting their overall learning experience. This study emphasized the need for strategies to enhance social presence in online courses. This result in line with (Lestari, 2021) who revealed that students have low internet access, lack of serious participation in online learning interaction and lack of motivation. In addition, Alqurashi (2022) explored the issue of passive participation, noting that online learning environments need to implement more engaging and interactive activities to encourage active participation.

CONCLUSION

1. In course structure and organization, the results showed that positive category in both online and offline learning.
2. In learner interaction. The results showed a negative category in online learning and a positive category in offline learning.
3. In student engagement, the results showed that positive category in both online and offline learning.
4. In instructor presence, the results showed that positive category in both online and offline learning.

5. In student satisfaction, the results showed that positive category in both online and offline learning.
6. In perceived learning, the results showed that positive category in both online and offline learning.

REFERENCES

- Alqurashi, E. (2022). Predicting student satisfaction and perceived learning within online learning environments. *Distance Education*, 43(1), 91-109.
- Dewanto, A. C. (2021). *College Students ' Perception On Offline Versus Online Learning In The Time Of Pandemic (A Quantitative Descriptive Study In Universitas Pekalongan)*. 2020, 127–132.
- Gray, J. A., & Diloreto, M. (2016). *The Effects of Student Engagement , Student Satisfaction , and Perceived Learning in Online Learning Environments*. 11(1).
- Lestari, D. (2021). Investigating English teacher and students' classroom interaction in online learning during pandemic (Undergraduate thesis, Sarjana Pendidikan). IAIN Bengkulu.
- Malyana, A. (2020). Pelaksanaan Pembelajaran Daring Dan Luring Dengan Metode Bimbingan Berkelanjutan Pada Guru Sekolah Dasar Di Teluk Betung Utara Bandar Lampung. *Pedagogia: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar Indonesia*, 2(1), 67–76.
- Ramadhan, R., Chaeruman, U. A., & Kustandi, C. (2018). Pengembangan pembelajaran bauran (blended learning) di universitas negeri jakarta. *Jurnal Pembelajaran Inovatif*, 1(1), 37–48.
- Yang, C., Yin, H., & Wang, W. (2021). Learner interaction in online learning environments: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 59(4), 733-760.