GUIDENA: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan, Psikologi, Bimbingan dan Konseling
ISSN : 2088-9623 (Print) - ISSN: 2442-7802 (Online)
2019, Vol 9, No 2, 57-67
DOI: 10.24127/gdn.v9i2.1973

GUIDENA

Research Article

Internal Motivation of College Attendance for Instructional Design Course

David Firna Setiawan

{1} Universitas PGRI Semarang

Abstract

Attendance is considered as a form of participation in learning. One form of participation that becomes a study among researchers is the presence of students in lectures. However, the difference regarding the motives for the presence of students in lectures is still a question. This study aims to explain the relationship between internal motivation towards student attendance in lectures. This knowledge is important related to the strategies that can be carried out by the department of economic education to increase attendance in an effort to achieve certain academic goals. Furthermore, the strategy to increase attendance can be a preventive measure to anticipate or reduce the occurrence of student deviant behavior. The results showed that the proposed independent variables, namely, (1) enjoyment, (2) challenges and (3) awareness did not affect the presence of students in instructional design courses either partially or simultaneously so that in this study, these variables were not well used as predictor of attendance. Therefore, the next study can propose variables, differences in student characteristics and other methods to explain the motive for attendance.

Keywords: internal motivation; attendance; instructional design.

Abstrak

Kehadiran dianggap sebagai bentuk partisipasi dalam pembelajaran. Salah satu bentuk partisipasi yang menjadi kajian di kalangan peneliti adalah kehadiran mahasiswa dalam perkuliahan. Namun, perbedaan motif kehadiran mahasiswa dalam perkuliahan masih menjadi pertanyaan. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menjelaskan hubungan antara motivasi internal dengan kehadiran mahasiswa dalam perkuliahan. Pengetahuan tersebut penting terkait dengan strategi yang dapat dilakukan oleh jurusan pendidikan ekonomi untuk meningkatkan kehadiran dalam upaya mencapai tujuan akademik tertentu. Lebih lanjut, strategi peningkatan kehadiran dapat menjadi langkah preventif untuk mengantisipasi atau mengurangi terjadinya perilaku menyimpang siswa. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa variabel bebas yang diajukan yaitu, (1) kenikmatan, (2) tantangan dan (3) kesadaran tidak berpengaruh terhadap keberadaan mahasiswa dalam mata kuliah desain pembelajaran baik secara parsial maupun simultan sehingga dalam penelitian ini variabel tersebut tidak baik digunakan sebagai prediktor kehadiran. Oleh karena itu, penelitian selanjutnya dapat mengajukan variabel, perbedaan karakteristik siswa dan metode lain untuk menjelaskan motif absensi.

Kata kunci: motivasi internal; kehadiran; desain instruksional.

GUIDENA: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan, Psikologi, Bimbingan dan Konseling
Website : https://ojs.fkip.ummetro.ac.id/index.php/bk

Received: 2019-10-16 Published: 2019-12-30 *Corresponding Email: davidfirnasetiawan@gmail.com

Introduction

One important variable that is considered by some lecturers in conducting assessments is student participation in lectures. The statement was based on the results of previous studies which showed that students considered several types of involvement, not just class discussions, to participate (Bippus & Young, 2000). These findings led researchers to observe various forms of behavior that reflect student participation in learning. One variable that is the object of study is the presence (Dancer & Kamvounias, 2005). In addition to being the object of observation of teachers and lecturers, the presence of students in learning is also a concern among researchers. Even in a broader scope some researchers link student attendance to school quality (Gottfried, 2010). The statement is supported by the results of research that show that although not a determining factor, increasing attendance is a direct indicator of school success.

The notion of the relationship between attendance and learning achievement does not always seem to be the case. One interesting phenomenon that happened to the students of the Department of Economic Education at the University of PGRI Semarang from 2015/2016 to 2017/2018 was the gap between attendance and UAS values. The facts show that the presence of students in lectures is not directly proportional to the acquisition of scores or UAS scores. The results of observations on the average attendance of students in 16 meetings and UAS values in the learning evaluation subjects are presented in the following table.

Table 1. Attendance and Average Score of the Final Semester Exam

Years	Class	Student attendance from 16 meet	Score of the Final Semester Exam
2015/2016	A	12.34	85.08
	B	13.77	71.06
	C	11.19	58.86
	D	13.10	72.26
2016/2017	A	14.41	60.87
	B	14.39	56.19
	C	14.08	52.65
	D	13.80	48.92
2017/2018	A	13.81	27.64
	B	12.64	70.59
	C	12.78	78.58

Source: attendance card and learning achievement card for economic education students at the University of PGRI Semarang

Table 1. shows that the high attendance rate is not directly proportional to the acquisition of the final semester exam score. This condition can be seen for example in class A 2018 academic year having attendance rates far above 50% or almost the same as the attendance of other classes but only getting the lowest average scores compared to other classes. This phenomenon raises questions about the motives for the presence of students.

By several researchers, attendance was also associated with socio-economic factors. Researchers who link the absence as a social factor assume that the absence of students in school is often associated with deviant behavior that occurs at this time or that has the opportunity to occur in the future such as smoking, drinking and drugs (Xia Wang, Thomas G. Blomberg, 2005). Whereas from an economic point of view, researchers assume that students who are often absent are more likely to experience economic difficulties when they are of working age (Kane, 2006). However, some results of the study also show a trend that is less well related to student attendance rates (Credé, Roch, & Kieszczynka, 2010). This condition has caused some educational researchers to seem rather skeptical about the importance of class attendance. This is motivated by the trend of increasing student absence rates ranging from 18.5% (Marburger, 2001) and 25% (Friedman, Rodriguez, & McComb, 2001) to 40% (Romer, 1993) and even as high as 59% and 70% (Moore, 2003) A study at Lincoln University in 1992 (Fleming, 1992) found that the main reason given by students for not attending college was the pressure of competition in the process (24%), poor quality of lectures (23%), lecture time (16%) and poor quality of lecture content (9%).

This trend certainly has an impact on institutional concerns to intervene. One form of intervention is through regulation of 75% attendance as a condition for taking the final semester exam. Expectations of these regulations may influence decisions present in lectures (Romer, 1993). However, this certainly will get a negative response, especially for some students who have worked. Therefore, researchers seem to need to do a more in-depth review of the factors that influence student decisions present in lectures.

Differences regarding the motives for student attendance in lectures are still questions. However, as long as the decision has a reason, the behavior is certainly motivated by certain motives (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Some literature agrees that the decision is motivated by internal motives. Internal motives are most often defined as' 'doing things for their own sake,' like when a child plays football that has no other reason than to do so. Therefore, internal motives cannot be intervened. While external motives refer to instrumental goals, such as when a child plays football to win the championship. Therefore, external motives can be intervened (Reiss, 2012).

This study aims to explain the relationship between internal motivation towards student attendance in lectures. This study develops a deeper empirical understanding of the factors that influence the student's present decision to attend lectures. This knowledge is important related to the strategies that can be carried out by economic education study programs to increase attendance in efforts to achieve certain academic goals. Furthermore, the strategy to increase attendance can be a preventive measure to anticipate or reduce the occurrence of student deviant behavior.

Human motives for doing things are very universal (Eisenberger et al., 1999). The theory of motivation distinguishes these motives into two, namely internal motivation and external motivation. However, internal motivation and internal motivation are still the background for someone doing something. One theory that explains these conditions is the theory of self-determination or self-determination theory (Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, & Ryan, 1991). Unlike most other theories, the theory of self-determination makes important additional differences that are included in intentional or motivated classes of behavior. This theory distinguishes between controlled behavior and intentional or motivated behavior. Motivated behavior is determined by oneself where the subject is fully involved with will and is supported by self-feelings, whereas controlled behavior arises because of coercion by some interpersonal pressure. Therefore,

when a behavior is determined by itself, the regulatory process is chosen but when the behavior is controlled (controlled), the regulatory process is compliance.

Some studies show that a person's decision to choose a particular behavior is influenced by (1) the level of enjoyment that is generated, (2) the existence of challenges and (3) self-awareness. When intrinsically motivated, a person's behavior leads to enjoyment or challenges arising from due to external influences such as pressure or appreciation (Ryan & Deci, 2000). The tendency to be interested in new things makes a person actively assimilate, and apply skills creatively. Although some researchers consider this process limited to childhood, but in fact this rustic rust is a significant feature of human nature that affects performance, perseverance, and well-being.

Internal motivation or also called intrinsic motivation can be defined as the motive for carrying out an activity for inherent satisfaction rather than for several consequences that can be separated. When intrinsically motivated a person acts for enjoyment or challenges that arise rather than because of outside influence, pressure, or appreciation (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Internal motivation is also often defined as' 'doing something for its own sake,' like when a child plays baseball which has no other reason than to do so (Reiss, 2012).

One theory that can be used to define what activities students like in learning is the Pyramid of Learning (learning pyramid) (Kybartaite et al. 2007).. The learning pyramid classifies learning activities based on student retention. These activities are grouped into 7 starting from activities that have the highest retention rate towards activities that have the lowest retention rate. The activity of teaching each other in the learning process has the highest retention rate of 90%. While the activity that has the lowest retention rate is listening to lectures which are only 5%. Other activities were practicing with 75% practice, 50% group discussion, 33% demonstration, seeing and listening (audio visual) 10% and reading 10% (Kybartaite et al. 2007).

Student's internal motives in interacting well with lecturers, with students and the learning environment lead to learning activities. Table 1.3 shows that there are at least 7 activities that might occur in the interaction process. Therefore, internal motives lead to enjoyment, the existence of challenges and awareness in carrying out these various activities. The hypothesis in this study is formulated as follows.

1. The presence of students in learning planning courses is not influenced by the enjoyment of following the learning process ($H_{0.1}$) or the presence of students in learning planning courses is influenced by the enjoyment of following the learning process ($H_{a.1}$)
2. The presence of students in learning planning courses is not influenced by the challenges of following the learning process ($H_{0.2}$) or the presence of students in learning planning courses is influenced by the challenges of following the learning process ($H_{a.2}$).
3. The presence of students in learning planning courses is not influenced by awareness of following the learning process ($H_{0.3}$) or the presence of students in learning planning courses influenced by awareness following the learning process ($H_{a.4}$).
4. The presence of students in learning planning courses is not influenced by enjoyment, challenges and awareness of following the learning process ($H_{0.5}$) or the presence of students in learning planning courses is influenced by fun, challenges and awareness following the learning process ($H_{a.5}$).

Proof of hypothesis will be done through multiple regression analysis. The description of the relationship between variables in this study is formulated in the form of linear equations as follows.

$$Y = a + B_1X_1 + B_2X_2 + B_3X_3 + \varepsilon$$

Where,
Y = student attendance in instructional design courses
a = constant
B_1, B_2, B_3 = coefficient of determination
X_1 = enjoyment
X_2 = challenge
X_3 = awareness
ε = error

Method

The study was conducted on all students of semester 3 of the 2018/2019 academic year study program at the university's PGRI Semarang university who took a course in learning planning. The total number of participants was 92 students for three classes namely class A = 30 students, B = 30 students and C = 32 students. Sampling was done randomly at 60% of each class so that 18 were obtained for class A, 18 classes B and 18 classes C. So that the total respondents who filled out the questionnaire were 54 people (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2009). Based on observations it is known that 85.09% are female and the remaining 14.9% are male.

This study is a correlational study using a deductive approach. The instrument used to collect data is a questionnaire developed in the form of Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) (Lin, McKeachie, & Kim, 2003). The questionnaire contains a set of statements that require a response between "completely untrue" to "very true" on a scale of 1 to 5. The questionnaire is used to collect data on internal motivation indicators, namely (1) enjoyment, (2) challenges and (3) student awareness is present in the lecture. In addition, the questionnaire was used to collect data on external motivation indicators, namely (1) the desire to be the best, and (2) the response to regulation.

The student attendance observation method was developed based on the previous method where attendance was observed through direct observation of the total number of student attendance (Kottasz, 2005) in the learning planning lecture starting from meeting 1 to the 11th meeting. In addition to physical presence documents, the method used for making observations is validated by the lecturer through calling one by one. The data was collected through attendance validation methods carried out by students through hand bunches and lecturer validation which was carried out by calling on students' names in the presence provided by the institution. This method is done to avoid academic fraud in the form of signature forgery.

Table 2. Criteria for student attendance in learning evaluation lectures

Percentage of attendance	Predicate
>75%	High
=75%	Middle
<75%	Low

Data collection was conducted in November 2018 to coincide with the meeting of the eleven learning planning courses. Data collection is done using a questionnaire that is all filled out by students. The questionnaire was used to make observations on internal motivation which was

the reason they were present in the learning planning lecture. Data analysis was performed on the average score of all the statement items used to construct internal motivation.

Filling out questionnaires is done by sharing URL links to students through whats app class groups so students can respond independently using their smartphone. The time given to students to give a response to the questionnaire is 10 minutes. There are 27 statements that are measured using a scale of 1 to 5 starting from completely untrue to very true. Of all the statements there were 20 statements to collect internal motivation data, as well as 7 statements to collect internal motivation data. While student attendance data is measured using a scale of 1 to 5 and asked directly to students through questionnaires.

Table 3. Validity and reliability of the instrument.

	Cronbach's Alpha	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Pleasure (P)	0.741		
P_Personal		0.592	0.669
P_Completing the task		0.504	0.696
P_Showing work results		0.432	0.716
P_Information		0.503	0.702
P_Against reference		0.642	0.652
P_Listening to a lecture		0.242	0.773
Challenge (C)	0.837		
C_Teaching each other		0.719	0.793
C_In practice		0.583	0.817
C_In discussion		0.485	0.83
C_In showing work results		0.779	0.784
C_In seeing and hearing information from lecturers		0.71	0.797
C_In reading literature		0.419	0.839
C_In lectures		0.44	0.836
Awareness (Aw)	0.83		
Aw_For the opportunity to teach each other		0.449	0.828
Aw_For of practice		0.486	0.823
Aw_ For of the opportunity to discuss		0.581	0.807
Aw_ For of showing work results		0.675	0.791
Aw_ For of the opportunity to hear and see information		0.849	0.759
Aw_ For of the opportunity to read references		0.631	0.799
Aw_ For of the opportunity to hear lecturer lectures		0.392	0.835

The quality of the instrument was analyzed through the calculation of validity and reliability using IBM SPSS Statistics 20. Analysis of validity and reliability was done by distributing

questionnaires to 34 students who were not included in the sample. This method aims to make no student respond more than once. Furthermore, the validity test is done through the correlation test score statement item with a total score. While the reliability test (consistency) of the instrument was done using Cronbach's Alpha. The purpose of reliability is done both by the instrument and overall.

Overall it can be concluded that the instruments used to collect data have good consistency. It can be seen from the value of Cronbach's Alpha greater than 0.13 (r_table). Results of the reliability test per item statement show the value of Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted greater than 0.13. The results of testing the validity of table 1.1 indicate that no single item has a very weak relationship with the total item (Corrected Item-Total Correlation> 0.2). So that it can be concluded that the item statement used to construct the variables of pleasure, challenge and awareness has good validity or r_count > r_table except item number 6 on the fitness variable. Next is done by not including the items "pleasure listening to lectures" (listening to lectures).

Result and Discussion

Table 4. shows that the presence of students in learning planning courses is in the high category (97.31%). In addition, the lecture process is also able to make students feel happy, challenged and have a high enough awareness to attend lectures. This is evident from the perception of the average approaching number 4 and the standard deviation which is far from the average.

Table 4. Description of variables

Description of Variables	Average	Std. Deviation
Attendance	106.852	0.50746
Enjoyment	38.778	0.5689
Challenge	36.905	0.58195
Awareness	37.619	0.52066

Table 5. shows that the regression equation can be written as follows.

$$Y = 11.159 + 0.291X_1 + 0.162X_2 + 0{,}333X_3$$

Based on these equations it can be concluded that the addition of each independent variable by 1 will have an impact on the increase in attendance of 0.786 or 7.043%. However, this effect seems (t [50] =2.01, p > 0.05) so that $H_{a.1}$, $H_{a.2}$, $H_{a.3}$ rejected and $H_{0.1}$, $H_{0.2}$, $H_{0.3}$ is accepted or in other words, each independent variable (pleasure, challenge and awareness) does not partially influence student attendance in learning planning courses.

Table 5. Partial Effect

	B	Std. Error	β	t	Sig
(Constant)	11.159	0.543	0	20.568	0
Enjoyment	0.291	0.178	0.326	1.639	0.107
Challenge	0.162	0.274	0.186	0.592	0.556

Awareness	0.333	0.274	0.342	1.217	0.229
t_table	2.009				

The simultaneous correlation test is shown in table 6. From the table it can be seen that the proposed regression model is only able to give a very small and not significant effect (F [50] 2.79, p> 0.05) which is 9%. So that it can be concluded that partially, the independent variable is not able to explain the presence of students in instructional design lectures.

Table 6. Simultaneous effects

	R Square	**F**	**Sig**
Model	0.090	1.654	.189b

The results of data processing in table 7. also show that the independent variables proposed in the model are pleasure, challenge and awareness only able to provide an explanation of 9% of attendance and not significant. This shows that H_ (a.4) is rejected and H_0.4 is accepted or in other words, the presence of students in learning planning courses is not influenced by pleasure, challenges and awareness following the learning process.

Table 7. Relations between variables

		1	**2**	**3**	**4**
1	**Enjoyment**	-	.735**	.652**	-0.24
2	**Challenge**		-	.877**	-0.126
3	**Awareness**			-	-0.034
4	**Attendance**				-

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Rejection of $H_{a.1}$, $H_{a.2}$, $H_{a.3}$ and $H_{a.4}$ in this research is possible because there is a strong and significant relationship between the independent variables described in table 1.6. this condition illustrates the existence of multicollinearity between independent variables so that they cannot be used as predictors.

As previously known, attendance is an important variable that is considered to be closely related to student performance and academic achievement. therefore, an explanation of attendance is an interesting topic to study. However, the results of this study seem to find some things that are contrary to the motivation theory where pleasure, challenge and awareness cannot be used as independent variables which are expected to be able for used as explaner and predictors for the presence of students in lectures (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Therefore, subsequent research can use other methods to explain the motives for attendance. one of the ways is through (1) experiments and (2) self-reports regarding interesting activities and enjoying the activities themselves (Ryan, 1982). This is certainly an effort to make interventions to increase participation through student attendance effective and efficient for both institutions and lecturers.

The results of the study also show that through simultaneous testing the multiple regression analysis of the presence variables cannot be explained properly. Through these findings it can be analyzed that there is an error that is too high or in other words, the chance of another variable that can be used to explain the presence is very large. In addition, the limited scope of

the study also becomes an indication of the gap between findings and existing theories. Therefore, further research can propose other variables to study and expand the scope of research by adding differences in student characteristics and number of samples.

Conclusion

The results showed that the proposed independent variables, namely, (1) enjoyment, (2) challenges and (3) awareness did not affect the presence of students in instructional design courses either partially or simultaneously so that in this study, these variables were not well used as predictor of attendance. Therefore, the next study can propose variables, differences in student characteristics and other methods to explain the motive for attendance.

Funding

The authors have no funding to report.

Acknowledgments

The authors have no support to report.

References

Bippus, A. M., & Young, S. L. (2000). What behaviors reflect involvement in a course?: Students' perceptions and differences between high and low communication apprehensives. *Communication Research Reports*, *17*(3), 310–319. https://doi.org/10.1080/08824090009388778

Credé, M., Roch, S. G., & Kieszczynka, U. M. (2010). Class Attendance in College. *Review of Educational Research*, *80*(2), 272–295. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654310362998

Dancer, D., & Kamvounias, P. (2005). Student involvement in assessment: a project designed to assess class participation fairly and reliably. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *30*(4), 445–454. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930500099235

Deci, E., Vallerand, R., Pelletier, L., & Ryan, R. (1991). Motivation and Education: The Self-Determination Perspective. *Educational Psychologist*, *26*(3), 325–346. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2603&4_6

Eisenberger, R., Rhoades, L., & Cameron, J. (1999). Does pay for performance increase or decrease perceived self-determination and intrinsic motivation?

Fleming, N. (1992). Why don't they attend. *Occasional Paper*.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2009). *How to design and evaluate research in social science*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Friedman, P., Rodriguez, F., & McComb, J. (2001). Why Students Do and Do Not Attend Classes. *College Teaching*, *49*(4), 124–133. https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2001.10844593

Gottfried, M. A. (2010). Evaluating the Relationship Between Student Attendance and Achievement in Urban Elementary and Middle Schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, *47*(2), 434–465. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831209350494

Kane, J. (2006). School exclusions and masculine, working-class identities. *Gender and Education*, *18*(6), 673–685. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540250600980568

Kybartaite, A., Nousiainen, J., Marozas, V., & Jegelavicius, D. (2007). Review of e-teaching/e-learning Practices and Technologies. *Biomedical Engineering Institute, Kaunas University of Technology (KUT), Ragnar Granit Institute (RGI)*, 1-25.

Kottasz, R. (2005). Reasons for student non-attendance at lectures and tutorials: an analysis. *Investigations in University Teaching and Learning*, *2*(2), 5–16.

Lin, Y.-G., McKeachie, W. J., & Kim, Y. C. (2003). College student intrinsic and/or extrinsic motivation and learning. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *13*(3), 251–258. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1041-6080(02)00092-4

Marburger, D. R. (2001). Absenteeism and Undergraduate Exam Performance. *The Journal of Economic Education*, *32*(2), 99. https://doi.org/10.2307/1183486

Moore, R. (2003). Attendance and performance. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, *32*(6), 367.

Reiss, S. (2012). Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation. *Teaching of Psychology*, *39*(2), 152–156. https://doi.org/10.1177/0098628312437704

Romer, D. (1993). Do Students Go to Class? Should They? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *7*(3), 167–174. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.7.3.167

Ryan, R. M. (1982). Control and information in the intrapersonal sphere: An extension of cognitive evaluation theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *43*(3), 450–461. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.43.3.450

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *25*(1), 54–67. https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1020

Xia Wang, Thomas G. Blomberg. (2005). Comparison of the Educational Deficiencies of Delinquent and Nondelinquent Students. *Sage Journal*, Vol 9, Issue 4, https://doi.org/10.1177/0193841X05275389