

To cite this article: Nani Fitriani*, Sri Indah Nikensari, Agung Wahyu Handaru (2023). COMPARISON OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF OFFLINE AND ONLINE LEARNING METHODS IN THE NEW NORMAL ERA, International Journal of Education and Social Science Research (IJESSR) 6 (6): 117-126 Article No. 867, Sub Id 1362

COMPARISON OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF OFFLINE AND ONLINE LEARNING METHODS IN THE NEW NORMAL ERA

Nani Fitriani*, Sri Indah Nikensari, Agung Wahyu Handaru

*Corresponding Author: Nani Fitriani

Postgraduate Program in Management, State University of Jakarta, Indonesia

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37500/IJESSR.2023.6608>

ABSTRACT

This research aims to analyze the effectiveness of offline and online learning in universities, especially private universities in Jakarta, Indonesia, in the new normal era. The research method used is quantitative. Data collection was carried out in October 2023. The research was carried out at the Perbanas Institute, Jakarta. The total sample in this study was 200 respondents, divided into two groups, each consisting of 100 people, namely groups of students who studied offline and online. The data analyzed are the result of the Marketing Planning and Control subject, given to semester 6 students. The student's domiciles are also analyzed, to see whether it influences the learning outcomes. The data was processed using SPSS version 26. The results of the study show that there are differences in the students' outcomes based on the lecturer's teaching methods. The offline method is proven to be more effective than the online method. However, the differences in students' domiciles do not affect student learning outcomes, either in the offline method or in the online method. The results of this research are different from previous studies, which stated that online methods were more effective in the COVID-19 pandemic and post-pandemic era.

KEYWORDS: Offline Learning, Online Learning, Student Learning Outcome, New Normal Era, Covid-19 Pandemic.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Covid-19 pandemic has made many changes in all areas of life, including the learning system. Barriers to conducting physical meetings at school or campus, forcing all educational institutions to maximize the use of technology in order to facilitate teaching and learning activities. The learning system, which was originally carried out offline, has slowly but surely experienced a change in trend to online learning.

At higher education level, the tendency of student learning processes began to be divided into online, offline, or a combination of the two. Higher education institutions try to facilitate people's needs for higher education by providing online, offline, and even hybrid learning platforms.

Undeniably, the difference in the choice of learning methods is due to different views about the effectiveness of the learning process. Some people think that direct interaction in offline learning can trigger learner creativity and affect material mastery because there is a direct interaction between learners and lecturers in face-to-face learning. Therefore, they prefer offline learning even though the distance from RMAH to campus is fairly far. For students who live outside the city, they prefer to live in boarding houses around campus so that they can follow the offline learning process.

The offline learning process is ingrained and has become a part of people's daily lives. In this kind of process, teachers and learners meet face-to-face in the classroom. The learning process aids needed are usually projectors and whiteboards (Hong et, al. 2020). In this process, teaching interaction between teachers and learners occurs directly. In the learning process of this model, teachers can see directly the attitude of students, so many people consider this learning model more effective in directing student attitudes to a more positive direction. This is supported by several studies that state that there is no Asynchronous in offline learning or Face to Face (F2F) learning (Saghafi, Franz, & Crowther, 2014), therefore some researchers still consider that offline learning is still relevant to do because it can avoid asynchronous occurrence. In addition, the F2F experience in the classroom is a valuable part of the student learning process (Tambouris & arabanis, 2014; Israel, 2015; Bolsen et. al., 2016).

Similar results from research conducted by Westermann (2014) and Gonzàles-Gómez et al. (2016), which underlined the F2F learning process in favor of developing specific skills. In Westermann's research, students taught through offline methods have critical thinking. This is because students are more focused on what is conveyed by teachers and peers.

On the other hand, learning with online platforms is increasingly loved by students. They think that this learning platform is more efficient and effective. Students can study wherever they are. In addition, online learning is considered capable of overcoming problems outside the learning process, such as transportation problems and economic limitations.

Online learning is carried out through a variety of digital channels that allow students and lecturers to interact from far apart places. The use of digital channels is undeniably a lot of help for lecturers and students in terms of time and energy efficiency because this teaching model does not require physical movement. The unique thing in the online learning method is that lecturers and students can work hand in hand and synergize to face difficulties in the use of digital instruments (Wityastuti et al., 2022; Juanda & Hendriyani, 2022). In addition, the use of digital media which includes graphics and images, for today's learners has become more attractive to students who are digital natives.

The unpreparedness of switching offline learning methods to online learning methods caused by the Covid-19 Pandemic has become a challenge for the world of education. All educational institutions are challenged to overcome critical situations and continue to strive for the process of knowledge

transfer through digital channels. However, this process does not necessarily work well. Several studies have noted obstacles that occur in the process of implementing online learning. These barriers include auditory learning styles that make it difficult for students, access to the internet, access to learning material resources, communication processes with lecturers, material understanding processes, and online learning media management (Muflih et. al, 2020; Hart, 2012, Song et.al, 2004; Yang et. al, 2013; Ni'mah, F. et al. 2023). However, research conducted by Manurung (2022) proves that the online learning system has a positive influence on student success in terms of the grades obtained.

In the realm of higher education, it turns out that the implementation of the offline method in the new normal era has its own challenges, both for learners and for teachers. On the teaching side, a material giver must always improve his knowledge, both about the material and about how to deliver material to students who are familiar with digital education patterns. In addition, the distance from home to campus is also one of the inhibiting factors in the teaching and learning process. The distance of the house that is too far from campus causes students to be exhausted when they have to seriously follow the learning process in the classroom.

These difficulties if allowed to drag on will have a bad impact on the academic condition of learners. Therefore, educators must ensure that all individuals involved in online learning methods can face the difficulties they face. Resilience to difficulties in the learning process is known as academic resilience or academic resilience. Casidy (2016) explains the academic reciprocity of learners' responses from the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor sides in facing difficulties or failures in the learning process.

However, evaluating the effectiveness of online and offline teaching is still difficult. Evaluation in terms of learning fails to reach consistent conclusions (Cook, 2008; Bartley & Golek, 2004). The effectiveness of online learning is influenced by many factors, such as administrative problems, social interaction, academic skills, technical skills, learner motivation, time and support for learning, technical problems, cost and internet access (Muilenburg & Berge, 2005). Other factors that can result in low quality online learning, such as ineffective design and arrangement of multimedia materials (Mayer, 2002).

Based on the explanation above, the analysis of the effectiveness of online and offline teaching should not only be based on comprehensive consideration of how they are used in all groups, but also must consider other factors that may affect the results of learning evaluation, material readiness, curriculum adaptability, and learning conditions. The condition of learners can be related to the infrastructure owned by both educational institutions, as well as infrastructure owned by students, such as internet access, home atmosphere, and distance from home to campus. Based on the description above, this paper will focus on the differences in student learning outcomes in marketing courses based on two different methods, namely offline and online methods, and to find out whether

student domicile affects the learning outcomes of Marketing courses. The hypotheses in this study can be described as follows.

Ho1: There is no difference in students learning outcomes based on lecturer teaching methods

Ha1: There are differences in students learning outcomes based on lecturer teaching methods.

Ho2: There is no difference in students learning outcomes based on student domicile Ha2: There are differences in students learning outcomes based on student domicile

Ho3: There is no interaction between the lecturer's teaching method and the students' domicile

Ha3: There is an interaction between the lecturer's teaching method and the students' domicile

2. METHODOLOGY

This research is a case study at Perbanas Institute Jakarta, in the Bachelor Degree of Management study program. The research method used is quantitative method. Data collection was conducted during October 2023. The population covered about 8000 students. There were two groups of samples, each consisting of 100 people, given different treatments. One sample group is students who carry out learning through offline methods, while the other group is students who carry out learning by utilizing online methods. The learning outcomes that are analyzed are the learning outcomes in the Marketing Planning and Control subject. This subject is given to semester 6 students. The final value of the marketing course learning process will be seen based on the lecturer's teaching method, namely offline and online. In addition, the score will also be linked to the student's domicile, to see if there is an influence between students' final grades and their domicile which is divided between Jakarta and outside Jakarta. The final score of the Marketing course is a combination of daily activity scores (25%), Midterm Exam scores (35%) and Final Semester Exams (40%). Midterm Exams and Final Exams are given in the form of essay test. In this exam, students are asked to explain the implementation of theory in marketing practices in their environment. The collected research data was processed using SPSS statistical tool, version 26. The analysis was carried out using 2-way Anova.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The picture of respondents in this study can be described by the following targets.

Between-Subjects Factors

Teaching Method	1	Offline	100
	2	Online	100
Students' Domiciles	1	In Jakarta	100
	2	Outside Jakarta	100

The research respondents were divided into 2 large groups, namely 100 students who attended offline lectures, and 100 people who attended online lectures. The two samples were further sorted based on domiciles, so that there were students living in Jakarta and outside Jakarta.

Before conducting a different test using two-way Anova, a normality test was carried out as one of the requirements for data to be processed. The normality test for data can be described as follows.

Tests of Normality

Statistic	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
		df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Standardized Residual for Result	.070	200	.019	.989	200	.148

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Normality test results, on Shapiro-Wilk, significance values are $0.148 > 0.05$, meaning that standard residual values are normally distributed. So, the condition of normality standardized residual in two ways anova is fulfilled.

The results of descriptive statistics can be seen in the following table.

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Result of Marketing Subject

Teaching Method	Students' Domiciles	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Offline	In Jakarta	75.88	7.050	50
	Outside Jakarta	75.12	6.023	50
	Total	75.50	6.534	100
Online	In Jakarta	66.16	6.807	50
	Outside Jakarta	66.32	5.441	50
	Total	66.24	6.132	100
Total	In Jakarta	71.02	8.449	100
	Outside Jakarta	70.72	7.222	100
	Total	70.87	7.842	200

The table above shows the results of descriptive statistics. In the table, it can be seen that the scores of students who use offline learning are better than the scores of students who use online learning methods. The average score for offline learning is 75.50, while the average value for online learning is 66.24. It can be said that the learning outcomes of students in the Marketing Planning and Control course using offline methods are higher than the group of students who use online methods.

In this 2-way inter-variant analysis, there is also a menu to test the homogeneity of the data. The statistical output brings up the following table.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^{a,b}

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Result of Marketing Subject	Based on Mean	1.049	3	196	.372
	Based on Median	.854	3	196	.466
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.854	3	182.534	.466
	Based on trimmed mean	1.036	3	196	.378

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

- a. Dependent variable: Result of Marketing Subject
- b. Design: Intercept + Method + Domicile + Method * Domicile

From the SPSS output above, it can be seen that the homogeneity test also meets the criteria. Significance values of $0.466 > 0.05$, meaning that the variable variants of mathematics learning outcomes are the same, or homogeneous.

The tests between variables can be seen in the table below.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Result of Marketing Subject

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	4302.460a	3	1434.153	35.428	.000
Intercept	1004511.380	1	1004511.380	24814.754	.000
Method	4287.380	1	4287.380	105.912	.000
Home	4.500	1	4.500	.111	.739
Method * Domicile	10.580	1	10.580	.261	.610
Error	7934.160	196	40.480		
Total	1016748.000	200			
Corrected Total	12236.620	199			

- a. R Squared = .352 (Adjusted R Squared = .342)

1. For method (of teaching) variable, a significance value of $0.000 < 0.05$ is seen, then the research hypothesis that states there are differences in learning outcomes of Marketing Planning and Control based on lecturer teaching methods is accepted.
2. For the domicile variable, the significance value is $0.739 > 0.005$, then the research hypothesis that states there are differences in marketing learning outcomes based on domicile is rejected.
3. From the interaction of method and domicile variables, a significance value of $0.610 >$

0.05 was obtained. So, the hypothesis that states there is an interaction between the lecturer's teaching method and the student's domicile is rejected. In other words, the lecturer's teaching method does not affect the student's domicile.

In this case study, it turns out that offline and online teaching methods have an impact on student learning outcomes in the Marketing Planning and Control course. Students who attend lectures offline have better grades than students who attend lectures online. This is because students are more focused on direct interaction or face to face. In addition, digital channel constraints on offline learning can be ignored, because learning is carried out in the same physical room. Therefore, students who do not understand the course material should be able to ask directly to the lecturer in class.

The variable of student residence or domicile was not proven to affect student learning outcomes. In offline learning mode, students who come from outside the Jakarta, Bogor, Tangerang Bekasi area live around the campus area (in the students' dormitory) or in the Jakarta area. While students in the area around Jakarta have many choices of transportation modes, such as private vehicles, trains, or buses. While in online learning mode, most students who attend lectures are students who are already working. These students usually take part in online learning from their offices located in provincial cities or district cities, so obstacles related to internet networks can be minimized. In terms of communication, students who are already working also have good abilities, so when they want to ask something to the lecturer, they can do it confidently and can choose the right words.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the study, it can be concluded that there are differences in learning outcomes using the Offline and Online methods. Students who take part in offline learning have higher scores compared to students who take part in online learning. These findings support the results of research conducted by (Saghafi, Franz, & Crowther, 2014; Tambouris & arabanis, 2014; Israel, 2015; Bolsen et. al., 2016; Westermann, 2014 and Gonzàles-Gómez et al. 2016.

On the other hand, student domicile variables do not affect student learning outcomes, both using offline and online methods. Students who live outside Jakarta can still adapt well to the two learning methods.

REFERENCES

- Bartley SJ, Golek JH. Evaluating the cost effectiveness of online and face-to-face instruction. *J Educ Technol Soc.* 2004; 7(4):167–175.
- Bolsen, T., Evans, M. and Fleming, A. M., 2016. A Comparison of Online and Face-to-Face Approaches to Teaching Introduction to American Government. *Journal of Political Science Education*, 12(3), pp. 302-317.

- Cassidy, S. (2016). The Academic Resilience Scale(ARS-30): A new multidimensional construct measure. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7(Nov) 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01787>
- Cook, D.A., et al. (2008). Internet based learning in the health professions: a meta-analysis. *Jama*. 300(10):1181.
- González-Gómez, D., et al. (2016). Performance and Perception in the Flipped Learning Model: An Initial Approach to Evaluate the Effectiveness of a New Teaching Methodology in a General Science Classroom. *Journal of Science and Education Technology*, 25(3), pp. 450-459.
- Hart, C. (2012). Factors Associated with Student Persistence in an Online Program of Study: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning*, 11(1), 19–42.
- Hong, Y., Li, X., Lin, Y., Xie, J., Yan, X., & Lin, Z. (2020). A comparative study of online education and traditional offline education during COVID-19. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-61593/v1>
- Israel, M. J., 2015. Effectiveness of Integrating MOOCs in Traditional Classrooms for Undergraduate Students. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 16(5), pp. 102-118.
- Juanda, Y. M., & Hendriyani, Y. (2022). Development of Learning Media Based on Video Tutorials In the Visual Programming course with the Addie method. *Javit : Vocational Journal Informatika*. <https://doi.org/10.24036/Javit.V2i1.81>
- Manurung, T. M. S. (2022). Evaluation Of Online Learning And The Impact On Learning Achievement And Student Satisfaction. *JAS-PT (Jurnal Analisis Sistem Pendidikan Tinggi Indonesia)*, 6(1), 9-24. <https://doi.org/10.36339/jaspt.v6i1.579>
- Mayer, R.E. (2002) Multimedia learning. In *Psychology of Learning and Motivation*; Academic Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, Volume 41, pp. 85–139.
- Muflih, S., Abuhammad, S., Karasneh, R., Al-Azzam, S., Alzoubi, K., & Muflih, M. (2020). Online Education for Undergraduate Health Professional Education during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Attitudes, Barriers, and Ethical Issues. 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-42336/v1>
- Muilenburg LY & Berge Z. L. (2005). Student barriers to online learning: a factor analytic study. *Distance Education*. 26(1): pp. 29–48.

- Ni'mah, F., Widiyanto, R., Wahyudi, W., & Gunawan, A. (2023). The effectiveness of offline and online learning on the achievement of student competencies. *Nautical: Indonesian Multidisciplinary Scientific Journal*, 1(10), 1217-1221.
- Nortvig, A. M., Petersen, A. K., & Balle, S. H. (2018). A literature review of the factors influencing elearning and blended learning in relation to learning outcome, student satisfaction and engagement. *Electronic Journal of E-learning*, 16(1), pp46-55.
- Saghafi, M. R., Franz, J. and Crowther, Ph., 2014. A Holistic Model for Blended Learning. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research*, 25(4), pp. 531-549.
- Song, L., Singleton, E. S., Hill, J. R., & Koh, M. H. (2004). Improving online learning: Student perceptions of useful and challenging characteristics. *Internet and Higher Education*, 7(1), 59–70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2003.11.003>
- Tambouris, E., Zotou, M. and Tarabanis, K., 2014. Towards designing cognitively-enriched project-oriented courses within a blended problem-based learning context. 19(1), pp. 61-86.
- Titthasiri, W. (2013). A comparison of e-learning and traditional learning: Experimental approach. In *International Conference on Mobile Learning, E-Society and E-Learning Technology (ICMLEET)–Singapore on November* (pp. 6-7).
- Westermann, E. B. (2014). A Half-Flipped Classroom or an Alternative Approach?: Primary Sources and Blended Learning. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 38(2), pp. 43-57.
- Wityastuti, E. Z., Masrofah, S., Haqqi, T. A. F., & Salsabila, U. H. (2022). Implementation of the use of digital learning media during the Covid-19 pandemic. *Journal of Innovative Research*, 2(1). pp. 9952-9964 <https://doi.org/10.54082/Jupin.39>
- Yang, D. F., Catterall, J. & Davis, J. (2013). Supporting new students from vocational education and training: Finding a reusable solution to address recurring learning difficulties in e-learning. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 29(5), 640–650. <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.196>