Volume 7 Number 3 (2025)
September-December 2025
Page: 280-300

E-ISSN: 2656-4491
P-ISSN: 2656-4548
DOI: 10.37680/scaffolding.v7i3.7962

SCAFFOLDING
Jurnal Pendidikan Islam dan Multikulturalisme

SOCIAL LEARNING ENVIRONMENT AND GADGET USE AS DETERMINANTS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS' LEARNING MOTIVATION

Syarifah Salmah[1], Hayatul Amilia[2], Mualimin[3]
[12]Universitas Islam Negeri Antasari Banjarmasin; Indonesia
[3]Sakarya University; Turkey
Correspondence Email; syarifahsalmah@uin-antasari.ac.id

Submitted: 08/09/2025 Revised: 14/09/2025 Accepted: 10/10/2025 Published: 21/10/2025

Abstract

This study investigates the relationship between the learning environment and gadget use on students' learning motivation. The research employed a quantitative approach with a descriptive survey design, involving a population of 53 fifth-grade students at SDN Jelapat II-1, Mekarsari District, Barito Kuala Regency. A sample of 44 students was selected using simple random sampling based on the Isaac and Michael table, with a 5% margin of error. Data were collected through questionnaires and analyzed using correlation tests, after meeting the prerequisite assumptions of normality, linearity, multicollinearity, heteroscedasticity, and autocorrelation. The findings revealed a strong positive correlation between the learning environment and learning motivation (r = 0.732). In contrast, gadget use showed a moderate positive correlation with learning motivation (r = 0.429, P = 0.004). Multiple correlation analysis indicated a significant combined effect of the learning environment and gadget use on learning motivation (R = 0.561, Sig. F Change = 0.000), categorized as a moderate relationship. These results highlight the importance of both learning environment quality and responsible gadget use in enhancing students' motivation to learn.

Keywords

Learning Environment, Gadget Use, Learning Motivation, Elementary Students, Quantitative Study.

INTRODUCTION

Today's technological advances have also reached the field of education. The increased use of technology in education must be addressed responsibly (Maritsa et al., 2021). This is to prevent the digital divide from widening (Anita & Astuti, 2022). Education plays a crucial role in shaping the quality of human resources who are able to adapt to the times (Rahmad et al., 2025). In this context, learning motivation is a significant factor that determines a student's learning success (Annela & Safran, 2023). According to Law No. 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System, education aims to develop students' potential in various aspects, including intelligence, skills, and personality.

Learning motivation serves as a driving force that encourages students to strive for learning goals (Kurniawan et al., 2024). According to Deci and Ryan, motivation stems from basic human needs that drive individuals to engage in activities such as learning (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002). Based on the results of a pre-survey at SDN Jelapat II-1, the learning motivation of fifth-grade students varied. Some students showed high enthusiasm, while others tended to be less motivated, as evidenced by their less active participation in the learning process in class.

This phenomenon raises questions about what influences their learning motivation (Nurhaliza & Ritonga, 2023). The importance of learning motivation has become a concern for educators and researchers (Sinaga et al., 2023). Ideally, high learning motivation will help students focus more and face challenges in the learning process (Ainiyyah et al., 2023). Low motivation often causes students to struggle with achieving the expected competencies (Kholis et al., 2024). The learning environment is one of the factors that significantly influences student learning motivation (Lim, 2024).

Social learning theory emphasizes that individuals encounter environments by chance; these environments are often chosen and altered by individuals through their own behavior (Bandura, 1977). Albert Bandura's theory, as presented in his journal on the learning environment, emphasizes that interaction with the surrounding environment can strengthen student motivation (Kay & Sağlam, 2025). A conducive learning environment, both physically and non-physically, can increase students' enthusiasm and interest in learning (Shafwa & Hikmat, 2023). Conversely, an unsupportive or unproductive environment can reduce students' motivation to learn (Rachman et al., 2024). Therefore, creating an optimal and supportive learning environment for students is crucial to ensure maximum learning outcomes (Rahmawati, 2020). Additionally, in this digital age, the use of gadgets has become

highly relevant in discussions about learning motivation (Rahmad, 2024). Gadgets, which were originally designed to facilitate communication and access to information, are now more commonly used for entertainment, such as playing games or accessing social media. Excessive use of gadgets can reduce students' learning motivation, especially when their use is not properly supervised by parents or teachers (Shen et al., 2024) This is because uncontrolled use of gadgets can distract students from their academic tasks, thereby reducing their interest and focus in learningThis phenomenon is also reflected in data from the Central Statistics Agency, which shows a 66.48% increase in the Indonesian population accessing the internet in 2022, up from 62.10% in 2021.8 And data from APJII (Indonesian Internet Service Providers Association) shows an increase in 2024 to 79.5%, reaching 221 million people, from 78.19% in 2023, an increase of 1.4%. This includes elementary school-aged children. Therefore, it is crucial to regulate the use of gadgets wisely to avoid interfering with students' motivation and mental health. The research is also a reference in our study. They argue that the use of gadgets as tools or media in learning can increase interest and also improve student learning outcomes.

However, even though an ideal learning design has been attempted, the reality in the field shows a gap between the expected learning environment and uncontrolled gadget use. Many students are more interested in using gadgets for playing than for learning, while the learning environment at school and at home does not fully support their learning activities. This aligns with the study, which also faces the same issue. This study examines the negative impact of gadgets on the decline in interest in learning. This decline is due to students being more interested in using gadgets rather than as a learning medium.

Before conducting the treatment in this study, we distributed a questionnaire for students to complete. The learning motivation index in this study was 72.42%, which is in the "moderate" category. The average score of 72.42% indicates that students' learning motivation is quite good, but has not reached the optimal level. However, based on the interviews we conducted, it must be acknowledged that the school expects attention to be paid to improving existing facilities and human resources.

The principal of SDN has not yet issued a policy to improve learning motivation. The policies taken tend to be policies aimed at enforcing rules and regulations. However, the principal of SDN mentioned that the independent curriculum should open up more flexible learning spaces. However, conditions at SDN Jelapat II are still not fully supportive. Another obstacle is that not all

teachers have received training related to the implementation of the independent curriculum. This is clearly one of the obstacles in efforts to improve the quality of learning. The learning process implemented at SDN Jelapat II is still not optimal. This is due to the limited school and classroom facilities.

Bronfenbrenner (1979), which states that the environment influences the learning process. In Bronfenbrenner's view, the ecological environment takes us further and raises the hypothesis that a person's development is greatly influenced by events that occur in the environment, even when that person is not present.

We also chose the variable of gadget use in this study because it aligns with social constructivist theory. This theory explains how cultural tools, including technology, play a role in helping individuals construct their knowledge through social interaction. Learning occurs through interaction between individuals and their environment. One focus of this theory is the zone of proximal development (ZPD), which states that the distance formed can be minimized with help or tools. In this study, we defined these aids as gadgets. This clearly became the basis for determining the variables in this study. Additionally, regarding gadget ownership among students at SDN Jelapat II, it can be observed that all students in grade V already own a gadget.

Research by Wulandari et al. (2025) is another relevant study. The study's results conclude that the intensity of gadget use has a significant impact on the learning motivation of elementary school students. The higher the intensity of gadget use, especially for non-educational purposes such as playing games or accessing social media, the lower the learning motivation shown by students.

Next, research by Hasanah (2025) found that there was no significant positive effect between the intensity of gadget use and the learning achievements of fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade students at MI Miftahul Huda Mojosari Kepanjen. This certainly serves as a reference that can be used as a guideline. There was no significant effect on student learning achievements. This could be influenced by other factors, such as student interest and talent, psychological conditions, intelligence levels, and many more. This finding is similar to those of the study by Susanti et al., (2024), which, based on questionnaire results and report card scores, concluded that fifth-grade students at SDN 03 Salatiga appear to have no dependence on gadgets. In other words, gadgets are not the only dominant factor influencing learning achievement. Finally, research by Hariani (2025) suggests that the successful use of gadgets depends on their intended purpose.

Several studies above show that the use of gadgets is one of the efforts to improve the competence of students and teachers in the digitalization of research. The above studies show that the use of gadgets can improve learning outcomes or motivation. However, some studies state that there is no influence between the variables in their research. However, Hariani's (2025) study states that the improvement in achievement and motivation is determined by the purpose for which the gadget is used. The similarity between these studies is that they both look at the relationship between the use of gadgets and students' interest in learning. Another similarity is that the research was conducted at the elementary school level. The difference in our research is that we included another variable in this study, namely, environmental factors, and we did not examine student learning outcomes. Therefore, this study aims to analyze the relationship between the learning environment and learning motivation. The relationship between *gadget* use and learning motivation. As well as the combined relationship between the learning environment and gadget use on the learning motivation of fifth-grade students at SDN Jelapat II-1.

METHOD

This study is a survey study. A survey is a research method that aims to describe the characteristics, attitudes, or views of individuals in a population by collecting data from a sample of individuals. In the context of this study, surveys were used to identify the relationship between the learning environment and gadget use on student learning motivation.

The population studied consisted of fifth-grade students at SDN Jelapat II-1. The number of students or the population was 50. The sample was determined to be representative using Isaac and Michael's table, which has a 5% error rate (Amin et al., 2023). Based on this table, the sample size was set at 44 students selected at random.

This study used questionnaires for each variable. The variables were learning environment, gadget use, and learning motivation. The data analysis techniques used in this study included descriptive tests, classical assumption tests (normality test, linearity test, multicollinearity test, heteroscedasticity test, and autocorrelation test), and, of course, hypothesis testing. This study presents three hypotheses. The first hypothesis (Ho1): There is no relationship between the learning environment and the learning motivation of fifth-grade students at SDN Jelapat II-1. Ha1: There is a relationship between the learning environment and the learning motivation of fifth-grade students at SDN Jelapat II-1. The second hypothesis (Ho2): There is no relationship between gadget use and

the learning motivation of fifth-grade students at SDN Jelapat II-1. Ha2: There is a relationship between gadget use and the learning motivation of fifth-grade students at SDN Jelapat II-1. Ho3: There is no simultaneous relationship between the learning environment and gadget use on the learning motivation of fifth-grade students at SDN Jelapat II-1. The third hypothesis is Ha3: There is a simultaneous relationship between the learning environment and gadget use on the learning motivation of fifth-grade students at SDN Jelapat II-1. The instrument was tested on 29 students who were not included in the research population. The results of testing each item are presented below.

Table 1. Validation Test

Question	R table	Correlation	Decision
Question_1	0.3673	0.468	Valid
Question_2	0.3673	0.673	Valid
Question_3	0.3673	0.592	Valid
Question_4	0.3673	0.417	Valid
Question_5	0.3673	0.348	No
Question_6	0.3673	0.323	No
Question_7	0.3673	0.563	Valid
Question_8	0.3673	0.738	Valid
Question_9	0.3673	0.129	No
Question_10	0.3673	0.507	Valid
Question_11	0.3673	0.259	No
Question_12	0.3673	0.340	No
Question_13	0.3673	0.441	Valid
Question_14	0.3673	0.402	Valid
Question_15	0.3673	0.273	No
Question_16	0.3673	0.618	Valid
Question_17	0.3673	0.527	Valid
Question_18	0.3673	0.417	Valid
Question_19	0.3673	0.587	Valid
Question_20	0.3673	0.071	No
Question_21	0.3673	0.598	Valid
Question_22	0.3673	0.624	Valid
Question_23	0.3673	0.404	Valid
Question_24	0.3673	0.447	Valid
Question_25	0.3673	0.418	Valid
Question_26	0.3673	0.261	No
Question_27	0.3673	0.414	Valid
Question_28	0.3673	0.558	Valid
Question_29	0.3673	0.479	Valid
Question_30	0.3673	0.174	No
Question_31	0.3673	-0.030	No
Question_32	0.3673	0.556	Valid
Question_33	0.3673	-0.031	No
Question_34	0.3673	0.538	Valid
Question_35	0.3673	0.471	Valid

Question_36	0.3673	0.446	Valid
Question_37	0.3673	0.000	No
Question_38	0.3673	0.401	Valid
Question_39	0.3673	0.611	Valid
Question_40	0.3673	0.361	No

Next, a reliability test was conducted, and a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.749 was obtained, indicating that the interpretation of the questions falls into the very high category.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

The research instrument was a questionnaire that included indicators and sub-indicators for each variable. The learning environment variable included learning conditions, learning facilities, and social factors. The gadget usage variable consisted of usage intensity and usage impact. Meanwhile, the learning motivation variable consisted of two primary indicators: intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. This study also conducted prerequisite tests for analysis, including:

The normality test is used to determine whether the data have a normal distribution, ensuring it meets the requirements for parametric statistical analysis. The results of the normality test in this study are presented as follows.

Table 2. Normality Test

Tests of Normality						
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Learning Motivation	.124	44	.089	.950	44	.054
Learning Environment	.124	44	.086	.983	44	.768
Gadget usage	.115	44	.170	.965	44	.202

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Based on the results of the normality test using the Shapiro-Wilk method, it can be concluded that the three variables — Learning Motivation, Learning Environment, and Gadget Use — have significance values (p-values) above 0.05. For Learning Motivation, a p-value of 0.054 indicates that the data is not significantly different from a normal distribution. Meanwhile, the Learning Environment variable has a p-value of 0.768, indicating a normal distribution of data. The same

applies to the Gadget Use variable, with a p-value of 0.202, indicating that the data from these three variables meet the assumption of normality.

Thus, it can be concluded that the data in this study are normally distributed, so that parametric statistical methods, such as t-tests and ANOVA, can be used for further analysis. These results indicate that the assumption of a normal distribution has been met, allowing the data to be interpreted more optimally.

Linearity Test

The linearity test in this study was used to determine whether a linear relationship existed between two variables. The results of the linearity test in this study are presented in the following table.

Table 3. Linearity Test

ANOVA Table

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Motivation Learning Environment Learning	Between Groups	(Combined)	363,409	18	20,189	2,660	.012
		Linearity	296,441	1	296,441	39,057	.000
		Deviation from Linearity	66,968	17	3,939	.519	.917
	Within Groups		189,750	25	7,590		
	Total		553,159	43			

a. Linearity Test of Learning Motivation with Learning Environment

The first table, the results of the linearity test between Learning Motivation and Learning Environment, shows a significance value (Sig.) for Linearity of 0.000. This value is much smaller than the significance level of 0.05, so H_0 is rejected, and it can be concluded that the relationship between the two variables is linear. This linearity describes a significant linear relationship between Learning Motivation and Learning Environment, where changes in the learning environment variable are consistently related to changes in learning motivation.

Meanwhile, the results for Deviation from Linearity show a significance value of 0.917. Because this value is much greater than 0.05, there is no deviation from linearity, or in other words, the relationship pattern between Learning Motivation and Learning Environment is truly linear.

This means that the assumption of linearity is fulfilled, allowing further analysis that requires a linear relationship to proceed.

Table 4. Linearity Test

ANOVA Table							
			Sum of Squares	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
Motivation Learning Usage *Gadgets*	Between Groups	(Combined)	261,326	15	17,422	1,672	.117
		Linearity	101,758	1	101,758	9,763	.004
		Deviation from Linearity	159,568	14	11,398	1,094	.404
		Within Groups	291,833	28	10,423		
		Total	553,159	43			

b. Linearity Test of Learning Motivation with Gadget Use

The second table, the results of the linearity test between Learning Motivation and Gadget Use, shows a significance value for Linearity of 0.004, which is smaller than the significance level of 0.05. This indicates that the relationship between Learning Motivation and Gadget Use is linear. Thus, it can be concluded that these two variables exhibit a significant linear relationship, where learning motivation tends to change in line with changes in gadget use.

However, the significance value for Deviation from Linearity is 0.404, which is greater than 0.05. This indicates that there is no significant deviation from linearity, so that the relationship between these two variables as a whole follows a linear pattern. The assumption of linearity can thus be accepted, and statistical analysis requiring a linear relationship between the two variables can be performed.

c. Multicollinearity Test

The multicollinearity test was conducted to see whether there was a strong relationship between the independent variables in the regression model. If the independent variables are highly correlated, the regression results may be unstable and less accurate. The results of the multicollinearity test can be seen in the following table.

Table 5. Multicollinearity Test

Coefficients[a]							
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)	.398	2.926		.136	.892		
Learning Environment	.501	.085	.666	5,930	.000	.850	1,177
Gadget usage	.140	.092	.171	1,522	.136	.850	1,177
a. Dependent Variable: Learning Motivation							

Based on the *Collinearity Statistics* table, the results for the independent variables are as follows; 1) Learning Environment has a *Tolerance* value of 0.850 and a VIF value of 1.177; 2) *Gadget* Use has a *Tolerance* value of 0.850 and a VIF value of 1.177.

The criteria for declaring the absence of multicollinearity in the model are a *Tolerance* value greater than 0.10 and a VIF value less than 10. Since both variables meet these criteria, it can be concluded that there is no multicollinearity problem between the independent variables (Learning Environment and *Gadget* Use). The regression model does not have high correlations between independent variables that could interfere with the analysis results.

d. Heteroscedasticity Test

The heteroscedasticity test was conducted to determine whether the variance of the residuals was constant or not. If the residual variance was variable (not constant), then a problem of heteroscedasticity would arise, which could interfere with the validity of the regression model.

Table 6. Heteroscedasticity Test

Correlations					
			Learning Environment	*Gadget* Use	Unstandardized Residual
Spearman's rho	Learning Environment	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.406	-.052
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.006	.738
		N	44	44	44

Usage *Gadgets*	Correlation Coefficient	.406	1.000	-.046
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.006	.	.765
	N	44	44	44
Unstandardized Residual	Correlation Coefficient	-.052	-.046	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.738	.765	.
	N	44	44	44

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

Based on the results of the heteroscedasticity test, as shown in the Correlations table, where the Spearman correlation test was performed between the independent variables (Learning Environment and Gadget Use) and the unstandardized residuals. The results show that the correlation between Learning Environment and residuals is -0.052 with a significance value of 0.738. The correlation between Gadget Use and residuals is 0.046 with a significance value of 0.765.

The criterion for stating that there is no heteroscedasticity is that if the significance value is greater than 0.05, then there is no heteroscedasticity. Based on the above results, both independent variables have a significance value greater than 0.05. This indicates that there is no heteroscedasticity in the regression model. Thus, the variance of the residuals is distributed constantly.

e. Autocorrelation test

The autocorrelation test is used to determine whether the residuals in the regression model are correlated with each other. If the residuals are correlated, an autocorrelation problem arises that can affect the estimation of the regression coefficients.

Table 7. Autocorrelation Test

Model Summary[b]					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R-Square	Standard Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.749[a]	.561	.539	2,434	1,985

a. Predictors: (Constant), *Gadget* Use, Learning Environment
b. Dependent Variable: Learning Motivation

Based on the Model Summary table, the Durbin-Watson value obtained is 1.985. The interpretation of the Durbin-Watson value is that if the Durbin-Watson value is close to 2, there is no autocorrelation. If the Durbin-Watson value is far below one or above 3, there is an indication of autocorrelation. Since the Durbin-Watson value of 1.985 is close to 2, it can be concluded that there is no autocorrelation in the regression model. The residuals in the model are random and uncorrelated.

The results of the descriptive analysis calculations for each variable —namely, learning environment (X1), gadget use (X2), and learning motivation (Y) —can be seen in the output generated in the Descriptive Statistics menu. The details of these calculations are presented in the following table.

Table 8. Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	**Min**	**Maximum**	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**
Total_Y	44	13	26	20.70	3.587
Total_X1	44	22	43	33.20	4,762
Total_X2	44	15	33	26.18	4.390
Valid N (listwise)	44				

Learning Motivation is the dependent variable (Y). The average score for student learning motivation is 20.70, with a minimum score of 13 and a maximum score of 26. This shows that there is variation in the level of learning motivation among students, but most scores are close to the average (20.70). The standard deviation of 3.587 indicates that the distribution of student learning motivation data is relatively low, suggesting a homogeneous tendency.

The average learning environment score is 33.20, with a minimum score of 22 and a maximum score of 43. This shows that most students have a fairly good perception of their learning environment. The standard deviation of 4.762 indicates that the distribution of learning environment data varies considerably among respondents. The average score for *gadget* usage is 26.18, with a

minimum score of 15 and a maximum score of 33. This means that the level of *gadget* usage among students varies, with scores fairly close to the average. The standard deviation of 4.390 indicates variation in gadget usage among respondents. In conclusion, the average learning motivation of students tends to be high (20.70), but the distribution is relatively small. The learning environment has the highest average score (33.20), indicating that it is quite supportive. The average gadget usage is moderate (26.18), with fairly even data distribution.

Based on the index results of the three variables learning motivation, learning environment, and gadget usage —it can be concluded that the learning motivation variable has an average value of 72.42%, which falls within the moderate category. The learning environment variable has an average value of 47.3672%, which is in the low category. The gadget usage variable has an average value of 42.89%, which falls within the low category. The results of the simple correlation test are presented in the following table.

Table 9. Simple Correlation Test

Correlations				
		Learning Motivation	**Learning Environment**	**Usage *Gadgets***
Learning Motivation	Pearson Correlation	1	.732	.429
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.004
	N	44	44	44
Learning Environment	Pearson Correlation	.732	1	.388
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.009
	N	44	44	44
Usage *Gadgets*	Pearson Correlation	.429	.388	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	.009	
	N	44	44	44
. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				

Based on the Pearson correlation test results in Table 9, learning motivation and learning environment show a Correlation Coefficient (r) value of 0.732 and Significance (2-tailed) of 0.000. 0.000 < 0.05, so it can be concluded that H01 is rejected and Ha1 is accepted. This indicates a strong and statistically significant positive correlation between learning motivation and the learning environment at a 99% confidence level (α = 0.01). Meanwhile, learning motivation and gadget use show a Correlation Coefficient (r) of 0.429 and Significance (2-tailed) of 0.004. 0.004 < 0.05, so it can be concluded that H02 is rejected and Ha2 is accepted. This indicates a moderate positive correlation

that is statistically significant between learning motivation and gadget use at a 99% confidence level (α = 0.01).

Furthermore, multiple correlation is an analysis to determine the strength of the relationship between one dependent variable and several independent variables together. In SPSS, it can calculate the multiple correlation coefficient (R), which ranges from 0 to 1. The closer it is to 1, the stronger the relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variables together. This analysis examines the relationship between the independent variables (learning environment and gadget use) and the dependent variable (learning motivation). The decision is based on the Sig. F Change value, where if the value is < 0.05, the data is considered to have a correlation, while if it is > 0.05, the data is not correlated.

Table 10. Multiple Correlation Test

Model Summary[b]									
					Change Statistics				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.749[a]	.561	.539	2,434	.561	26,166	2	41	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), *Gadget* Use, Learning Environment
b. Dependent Variable: Learning Motivation

The results of the multiple correlation analysis shown in Table 10 indicate that the Sig. F Change value is 0.000. This indicates a correlation, because 0.000 < 0.05. * In addition, the R value of 0.561 indicates a multiple correlation level in the range of 0.40-0.599, classifying the relationship between the learning environment and gadget use in relation to student learning motivation as moderate. Thus, the null hypothesis ($H_0$3) stating that "there is no relationship between the learning environment and gadget use simultaneously on student learning motivation" is rejected. Conversely, the alternative hypothesis (H_a3), which states that "there is a relationship between the learning environment and the simultaneous use of gadgets on student learning motivation," is accepted.

Discussion

The development of high-quality and superior human resources through inclusive and high-quality education must be a priority (Aditama, 2024). The educational environment is one of the key factors in achieving success in implementing quality education (Suriyati et al., 2023). A conducive learning environment has a strong positive relationship with student learning motivation.

According to (Yilmaz Kurt et al., 2025), the better the learning environment, the higher the student's learning motivation.

The environment has a reciprocal influence on attitudes and behavior (Lindawati et al., 2023). Satisfaction is no less important than deprivation (Maslow, 1970) . A conducive environment fosters a sense of security, encompassing physiological needs, safety, and love (Rahmi et al., 2022). A safe and supportive learning environment fosters student growth and development (Yenuri et al., 2025). These findings align with Abraham Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory, which posits that a conducive environment can fulfill students' basic needs, such as safety and esteem, ultimately encouraging them to achieve self-actualization. A good learning environment includes adequate facilities, positive social interactions, and support from teachers and families, all of which contribute to increasing students' motivation to learn. In self-determination theory, a supportive learning environment fulfills students' basic psychological needs, namely competence, autonomy, and relatedness, which encourages their intrinsic motivation to learn.

Based on Table 9 of the Pearson correlation test results, it was found that the relationship between the learning motivation variable and the learning environment variable showed a correlation coefficient (r) of 0.732 and a significance (2-tailed) of 0.000. 0.000 < 0.05, so it can be concluded that H01 is rejected and Ha1 is accepted. This indicates a strong and statistically significant positive correlation between learning motivation and the learning environment at a 99% confidence level ($\alpha = 0.01$). The learning environment has a strong positive relationship with learning motivation ($r = 0.732$; $p < 0.05$). This can be interpreted as meaning that the more conducive the learning environment, the higher the students' motivation for learning. In line with this, Putri (2025) states that a positive school environment has a positive and strong impact on learning motivation. Research by Sari et al. (2021) also indicates a positive relationship between the school environment and student learning motivation, characterized by a moderate level of correlation. Our research findings regarding the importance of the school environment for student learning are also consistent with the findings. The study's findings indicate that students in the learning process, when supported by a good and conducive environment, will perform better. The results of the analysis suggest that a conducive learning environment has a strong positive relationship with student learning motivation. In other words, the better the learning environment, the higher the student's motivation for learning.

The next finding is the relationship between the learning motivation variable and the gadget usage variable. The correlation coefficient (r) is 0.429, and the significance (2-tailed) is 0.004. 0.004 < 0.05, so it can be concluded that H02 is rejected and Ha2 is accepted. This indicates a moderate positive correlation that is statistically significant between learning motivation and gadget usage at a 99% confidence level (α = 0.01). These research findings are similar to those reported by Devi & Dafit (2024), who found that gadgets affect students' learning motivation. There is a significant influence of gadgets on the learning outcomes of fourth-grade students at SD Negeri 005 Pulau Beralo, Kuantan Singingi District.

Our findings are also in line with those of (Magfirah & Iryani, 2025), which states in their research that students are motivated when gadgets are used in the learning process. Although it is mentioned that students with good time management skills will perform better, the positive correlation between gadget use and motivation must still be carefully considered. This is because excessive use of gadgets can actually have negative consequences. Excessive gadget use can potentially decrease student learning motivation.

The use of gadgets or media has a positive impact on motivation. This concept can be linked to the theory of use and gratification, as proposed by Katz, Blumler, and Gurevich, in the context of education. In the context of education, gadgets can be effective learning tools if used wisely, for example, to access digital learning materials and communicate with teachers or friends. However, if their use is excessive and uncontrolled, it can actually reduce students' focus and discipline in learning. This theory relates to a person's socio-psychological condition, which creates a need that, in turn, generates expectations, such as the use of media, which will ultimately result in fulfillment and other consequences.

Learning involves the addition of information. The role of the teacher is to present information, and the role of the learner is to receive and store it. This is known as the transmission model (Mayer, 2008). Richard Mayer, in his theory on multimedia learning, also explains that the use of technology in education must take into account cognitive principles to increase learning effectiveness (Rahayu et al., 2024). Therefore, the use of gadgets in learning should be directed to support student learning motivation, rather than becoming an inhibiting factor. However, the use of these gadgets must also be responsible and not excessive. According to Wang et al. (2025) and Salazar et al. (2024), although there is a positive correlation with gadget use, excessive gadget use

tends to have a negative impact on student learning motivation, where the higher the gadget use, the more likely student learning motivation is to decrease.

The results of the multiple correlation analysis shown in the table indicate that the Sig. F Change value is 0.000. This indicates a correlation, since 0.000 < 0.05. * In addition, the R value of 0.561 indicates a multiple correlation level in the range of 0.40-0.599, which classifies the relationship between the learning environment and gadget use in relation to student learning motivation as moderate. Thus, the null hypothesis ($H_0$3) stating that "there is no relationship between the learning environment and gadget use simultaneously on student learning motivation" is rejected. Conversely, the alternative hypothesis (H_a3), which states that "there is a relationship between the learning environment and gadget use simultaneously on student learning motivation," is accepted.

The results of the multiple correlation analysis, as shown in the table, indicate that the Sig. F Change value is 0.000. This indicates a correlation, because 0.000 < 0.05. In addition, the R value of 0.561 indicates a multiple correlation level in the range of 0.40-0.599, which classifies the relationship between the learning environment and the simultaneous use of gadgets on student learning motivation as moderate. Thus, the null hypothesis ($H_0$3) stating that "there is no relationship between the learning environment and the simultaneous use of gadgets on student learning motivation" is rejected. Conversely, the alternative hypothesis (H_a3), which states that "there is a relationship between the learning environment and the simultaneous use of gadgets on student learning motivation," is accepted.

The learning motivation perspective suggests that various forms of learning motivation stem from distinct factors. These factors can originate from within or outside a person (Diandaru, 2023). Student motivation can be increased by utilizing various strategies and media that align with learning objectives (Monica Gabriela Nainggolan et al., 2024). Motivation will clearly increase with a conducive environment and the use of gadgets in the learning process.

The learning motivation index in this study was 72.42%, which is in the "moderate" category according to the three-box method. The average score of 72.42% indicates that student learning motivation is quite good, but has not reached the optimal level. Upon closer inspection, the indicators that make up this variable have quite significant score variations. The indicators "appreciation in learning" and "interesting activities while learning" have values of 68.8% and 62%, respectively, both of which are still below the variable average. This suggests that there are several obstacles to motivating students, particularly in terms of the appreciation they feel during the

learning process and the availability of interesting and enjoyable activities. However, on the other hand, the indicator "desire and willingness to succeed" reached 78%, indicating that students' intrinsic drive to achieve success is already quite strong. This indicator can serve as the foundation for building more optimal learning motivation by focusing on improving aspects of appreciation and engaging activities. Overall, the learning motivation variable suggests that most students have sufficient motivation to learn, but require improvement in fulfilling more varied learning needs.

CONCLUSION

This study attempts to find the relationship between the environment and learning motivation. The relationship between gadget use and learning motivation, as well as the relationship between the environment and gadget use and student learning motivation at SDN Jelapat II-1. The hypothesis test was conducted through the results of the Pearson correlation test. For the learning motivation variable in relation to the learning environment, the correlation coefficient (r) value was 0.732, and the significance (2-tailed) was 0.000. 0.000 < 0.05, so it can be concluded that Ho1 is rejected and Ha1 is accepted. This shows that gadget use can have a positive impact on learning motivation if managed properly. Meanwhile, learning motivation and gadget use showed a correlation coefficient (r) of 0.429 and a significance (2-tailed) of 0.004. 0.004 < 0.05, so it can be concluded that Ho2 is rejected and Ha2 is accepted. Next, a multiple correlation test was conducted. The results of the multiple correlation analysis shown in the table indicate that the Sig. F Change value is 0.000. This indicates a correlation, because 0.000 < 0.05. In addition, the R value of 0.561 shows a multiple correlation level in the range of 0.40-0.599, so that the relationship between the learning environment and the use of gadgets together on student learning motivation is classified as a moderate relationship category. This suggests that the learning environment factor is more influential in shaping learning motivation than gadget use. Therefore, efforts to increase learning motivation should focus on providing a conducive learning environment, with proper management of gadget use, so that it continues to provide positive benefits for students.

REFERENCES

Aditama, A. Y. (2024). Implementation of Character Building Policy: A Case Study at Junior High Schools in Lebak Regency. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan*, *9*(2), 169–187. https://doi.org/10.24832/jpnk.v9i2.4558

Ainiyyah, S., Astuti, S., & Safitri, C. (2023). Pengaruh Media Audiovisual Terhadap Motivasi Belajar Siswa Pada Pembelajaran IPS Kelas V. *Kwangsan: Jurnal Teknologi Pendidikan*, *11*(1), 437–447.

https://doi.org/10.31800/jtp.kw.v11n1.p437--447

Amin, N. F., Garancang, S., & Abunawas, K. (2023). Konsep Umum Populasi dan Sampel dalam Penelitian. *Jurnal PILAR: Perspektif Ilmu-Ilmu Agama Islam Kontemporer*, *14*(1), 15–31.

Anita, A., & Astuti, S. I. (2022). Digitalisasi dan Ketimpangan Pendidikan: Studi Kasus terhadap Guru Sekolah Dasar Kecamatan Baraka. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan*, *7*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.24832/jpnk.v7i1.2509

Annela, A., & Safran, S. (2023). Analysis of Early Reading Difficulties for Elementary School Students. *Scaffolding: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam dan Multikulturalisme*, *5*(2), 466–484. https://doi.org/10.37680/scaffolding.v5i2.3121

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Prentice-Hall.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The Ecology of Human Development*. Harvard University Press.

Diandaru, B. H. (2023). Motivasi Belajar Peserta Didik pada Pembelajaran Matematika di MTs Negri 2 Kota Semarang. *Jurnal Pendidikan Widya Tama*, *20*(2), 185–196.

Hariani, E. R. (2025). Pengaruh Penggunaan Gadget terhadap Motivasi dan Hasil Belajar Siswa. *EduCompasion: Jurnal Integrasi Pendidikan dan Global*, *2*(2), 228-33. https://doi.org/10.63142/educompassion.v2i2.223

Hasanah, U. (2025). Pengaruh Penggunaan Media Nearpod Terhadap Pemahaman Materi IPA Gerak benda Pada SIswa Kelas 3 SDN Padelegan. *Pendas: Jurmal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar*, *10*(1), 231–245. https://doi.org/10.23969/jp.v10i01.23744

Kay, M. A., & Sağlam, M. (2025). As Predictives of Digital Game Addiction in Early Childhood: Digital Parenting, Family Relations, and Social Competence. *Annales Médico-Psychologiques, Revue Psychiatrique*, *183*(4), 429–438. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amp.2024.11.003

Kholis, N., Indriharta, L., Sholeh, M., & Cardoso, L. M. O. D. B. (2024). Understanding Adiwiyata School Artifacts in Cultivating Students' Characters at Madrasah Ibtidaiyah. *EdukasI: Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Agama dan Keagamaan*, *22*(1), 19–38. https://doi.org/10.32729/edukasi.v22i1.1694

Kollmuss, A., & Agyeman, J. (2002). Mind the Gap: Why do People Act Environmentally and What Are the Barriers to Pro-Environmental Behavior? *Environmental Education Research*, *8*(3), 239–260. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504620220145401

Kurniawan, D., Firdaus, S., Nafia, I., & Gumiandari, S. (2024). Strengthening Students' Islamic Character Education Through Ecopedagogic-Based Learning: A Case Study at Darul Huffadz Primary School. *Al Ibtida: Jurnal Pendidikan Guru MI*, *11*(1), 187. https://doi.org/10.24235/al.ibtida.snj.v11i1.18881

Lim, Y. (2024). When You Are Not Alone: School Composition by Family Structure and Students' Academic Achievements in South Korea. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, *35*(1), 26–47. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2024.2311930

Lindawati, Y. I., Siregar, H., & Indriyani, L. (2023). The Correlation between the Culture of Islamic Boarding Schools and Student Behavior. *Scaffolding: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam Dan Multikulturalisme*, *5*(3), 172–186. https://doi.org/10.37680/scaffolding.v5i3.2508

Magfirah, W., & Iryani, J. (2025). Pengaruh Penggunaan Gadget Terhadap Motivasi Berprestasi Pada Anak Usia Sekolah Dasar. *Jurnal IPSIKOM*, *13*(1), 92–96. https://doi.org/10.58217/ipsikom.v13i1.70

Maritsa, A., Hanifah Salsabila, U., Wafiq, M., Rahma Anindya, P., & Azhar Ma'shum, M. (2021). Pengaruh Teknologi dalam Dunia Pendidikan. *Al-Mutharahah: Jurnal Penelitian dan Kajian Sosial Keagamaan*, *18*(2), 91–100. https://doi.org/10.46781/al-mutharahah.v18i2.303

Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation And Personality* (2nd ed.). Harper and Row.

Mayer, R. E. (2008). *Applying The Science of Learning*. Pearson.

Monica Gabriela Nainggolan, Ratih Ayunda, Wahyuni Amanda Hasibuan, & Windy Antika. (2024). Meningkatkan Motivasi Belajar Siswa Melalui Media Pembelajaran. *Jurnal Yudistira : Publikasi Riset Ilmu Pendidikan dan Bahasa*, *2*(3), 237–244. https://doi.org/10.61132/yudistira.v2i3.904

Nurhaliza, L., & Ritonga, A. A. (2023). Elderly Community Education System. *Scaffolding: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam dan Multikulturalisme*, *5*(2), 614–652. https://doi.org/10.37680/scaffolding.v5i2.3225

Putri, A. N. K. (2025). Kondusifitas Lingkungan Sekolah dan Budaya Sekolah dalam Meningkatkan Motivasi Belajar Peserta Didik (Sebuah Kajian Konseptual Sebagai Panduan Bagi Peneliti). *JPKN: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Nusantara*, *3*(1), 10–20. https://doi.org/10.38035/jpkn.v3i1.2074

Rachman, A., Putro, H. Y. S., Rusandi, M. A., & Situmorang, D. D. B. (2024). The development and validation of the "Kuesioner Tema Proyek Penguatan Profil Pelajar Pancasila" (KT P5): A New Tool for Strengthening the Pancasila Student Profile in Indonesian Pioneer Schools. *Heliyon*, *10*(16), e35912. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e35912

Rahayu, I., Suwarna, I., Wahyudi, E., Asfahani, & Jamin, F. S. (2024). Pendidikan Lingkungan Hidup dengan membentuk Kesadaran Lingkungan dan Tanggung Jawab Sosial di Kalangan Pelajar. *Global Education Journal*, *2*(2), 101–103.

Rahmad. (2024). The Profile of State Islamic Primary School Teacher Education in Palangka Raya. *Al Adzka Jurnal Pendidikan Guru Madrasah Ibtidaiyah*, *11*(1), 49–57. https://doi.org/10.18592/aladzkapgmi.v11i1.4438

Rahmad, R., Oktaviany, M., & Syar, N. I. (2025). The Use of Nearpod Media in the Social Sciences Subject at an Islamic Elementary School. *Scaffolding: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam dan Multikulturalisme*, *7*(2), 585–601. https://doi.org/10.37680/scaffolding.v7i2.7531

Rahmawati. (2020). Analisis Adversity Quotient Mahasiswa PGMI dalam Mengatasi Masalah. *Al Adzka Jurnal Pendidikan Guru Madrasah Ibtidaiyah*, *9*(2), 99–106. https://doi.org/10.18592/aladzkapgmi.v9i2.3122

Rahmi, A. A., Hizriyani, R., & Sopiah, C. (2022). Analisis Teori Hierarki of Needs Abraham Maslow Terhadap Perkembangan Sosial Emosional Anak Usia Dini. *Aulad: Journal on Early Childhood*, *5*(3), 320–328. https://doi.org/10.31004/aulad.v5i3.385

Salazar, C., Jaime, M., Leiva, M., & González, N. (2024). Environmental Education and Children's Pro-Environmental Behavior on Plastic Waste. Evidence from the Green School Certification Program in Chile. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *109*, 103106. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2024.103106

Sari, S. E., Susiani, T. S., & Joharman. (2021). The Correlation Between School Environment and Learning Motivation For Fifth Grade Students of Public Elementary Schools in Butuh Subdistrict in Academic Year 2019/2020. *Kalam Cendikia: Jurnal Ilmiah Kependidikan*, *9*(2), 539–545. https://doi.org/10.20961/jkc.v9i2.48101

Shafwa, E., & Hikmat, A. (2023). The Effectiveness of Evaluation of Mathematics Learning Using Wordwall Media in Elementary School. *Scaffolding: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam dan Multikulturalisme*, *5*(3), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.37680/scaffolding.v5i2.3406

Shen, X., Zhou, X., Liao, H.-P., McDonnell, D., & Wang, J.-L. (2024). Uncovering the Symptom Relationship Between Anxiety, Depression, and Internet Addiction Among Left-Behind Children: A Large-Scale Purposive Sampling Network Analysis. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, *171*, 43–51. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2024.01.025

Sinaga, R., Perangi-angin, R. B. B., & Simaremare, A. (2023). The Influence of the Two Stay Two Stray Learning Model and Learning Motivation on Civics Learning Outcomes in Primary School Students. *Scaffolding: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam dan Multikulturalisme*, *5*(3), 553–572.

https://doi.org/10.37680/scaffolding.v5i3.3828

Suriyati, Hasmiati, Judrah, M., & Jamaluddin. (2023). Tujuan, Alat dan Lingkungan Pendidikan Sebagai Faktor Determinan dalam Pendidikan. *Jurnal At-Tarbiyah Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Islam*, *9*(2), 122–129.

Susanti, D., Suprapto, W., & Setyowati, R. (2024). Pengaruh Penggunaan Gadget terhadap Hasil Belajar Ranah Kognitif Siswa pada Mata Pelajaran IPS Kelas V SDN 27 Kartiasa. *Jurnal Papeda*, *6*(3), 292–299. https://doi.org/10.36232/jurnalpendidikandasar.v6i3.1853

Wang, S., Tan, Y., Yu, M., Wang, H., Wang, T., Feng, S., Liu, K., & Xiang, B. (2025). Association of Internet Addiction Disorder With Self-Injurious Behavior: A Meta-Analysis. *Addiction Research & Theory*, *33*(4), 340–349. https://doi.org/10.1080/16066359.2025.2463408

Wulandari, M. D., Rahmawati, L. E., & Widyasari, C. (2025). Pengaruh Intensitas Penggunaan Gadget terhadap Motivasi Belajar Siswa Sekolah Dasar. *Cetta: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, *8*(3), 512–522. https://doi.org/10.37329/cetta.v8i3.4578

Yenuri, A. A., Aminuddin, A., & Sm, M. M. (2025). The Child-Friendly School Policy Implementation. *Scaffolding: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam dan Multikulturalisme*, *7*(1), 612–625. https://doi.org/10.37680/scaffolding.v7i1.7197

Yilmaz Kurt, F., Öner, B., & Bulut, A. (2025). Digital Addiction: Are Children in Danger? Are parents Aware? *Journal of Pediatric Nursing*, *80*, 121–128. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pedn.2024.11.018