Cover Page

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
ISSN:2277-7881; IMPACT FACTOR :7.816(2021); IC VALUE:5.16; ISI VALUE:2.286
Peer Reviewed and Refereed Journal: VOLUME:10, ISSUE:5(1), May:2021
Online Copy of Article Publication Available: www.ijmer.in
Digital certificate of publication:http://ijmer.in/pdf/e-Certificate%20of%20Publication-IJMER.pdf
DOI: http://ijmer.in.doi./2021/10.05.70
Scopus Review ID: A2B96D3ACF3FEA2A
Article Received: 10th May- Publication Date:30th May 2021

LEARNERS APPROACH TOWARDS ENGAGEMENT IN TRADITIONAL CLASSROOM AND E-LEARNING

Premagowri Balakrishan
Assistant Professor
Clinical Nutrition and Dietetics, PSG CAS
Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India

Abstract

Computer screens and mobile screens are replacing the blackboards and keypads are replacing chalk. The advance of science and technology has brought about significant diversity in education and also in learning - teaching methodology. The present study was intended to understand learner attitudes or intentions toward engagement in traditional classroom and e-learning. Around 66 post graduate students of Clinical Nutrition and Dietetics, Botany, Zoology and Biotechnology were the participants. The Questionnaire was used to collect information on the attitude or intention toward some questions about behavioral engagement in classroom, including to listen to what professors say, to write down something important, to work with other students on task during class, to think or respond to questions without fixed answer in classroom, to make a class presentation, to ask question in the class or contribute to class discussion, to challenge professor's opinion. And the questions were answered using a 4-point Likert scale. It was found that for all the criteria the mean of the traditional classroom learning was more than that of e-learning and there exist significant differences in mean (significant at $p < 0.05$). ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship between traditional and human e-learning. The results show that the p-value is less than 0.05, which allowed rejecting the null hypothesis and supporting the conclusion that there was a statistically significant difference between traditional learning and e-learning.

Keywords: Education, Students, Traditional Learning, E-Learning, Classroom.

Introduction

In current situation, there is anargument that traditional learning is the best way to maintain a learning process. Other learning processes are always considered to be substandard or less efficient. To establish a defined communication between teachers and learners aiming generally to realize the promotion of knowledge, increase of information, acquisition of skill, and to make a change in learner's capabilities is education. Education could be divided into traditional classroom and e-learning (Maryam et al., 2011).Presentation of ideas by the students, group discussions, arguments and many other forms of conveying information and accumulating knowledge which are familiar from traditional learning are the components of E-learning. The curriculum course contents might be structured according to subjects and in a successive manner.

Extension to the Massive Open Online Courses (MOOC) is a recent development in online teaching. Concerns haverisen by free MOOCs about the survival of higher education, a system centered on the traditional classroom delivery of knowledge. Currently, 2.6% of higher education institutions have a MOOC while 9.4% report that they are in the planning stages (Allen & Seaman, 2013). Habitually the free MOOCS are thought to be a means for ultimately recruiting tuition paying students. Though, there are reported difficulties in getting MOOC students to enroll on campus, and attracting students who will pay a fee to take a MOOC for actual college credit (Kolowich, 2013).

Traditional learning can be described as face-to-face coursesand is considered to be the most effective if there are no any other alternative processes like online learning or combined educational modes. Traditional classrooms in the institutions provide traditional learning. The traditional teaching-learning approach focuses on face-to-face meetings and total organizational control over the process. This approach focuses on teaching, unlike the e-learning approach, which is learner-based. Emerging technologies have made education more productive and more individual, have given instruction a more scientific basis and have made it more powerful. They can serve learners at their ease in terms of time and place (Khan and Jumani, 2012).

Traditional classes are more comfortable and appropriate for young children, teenagers, and young adolescents who are yet to join the workforce. Interact and intermingle with other individuals of their own age, be better disciplined, follow a regular schedule, and improve their physical fitness and mental alertnessare developed by the regular attendance in classes. Classroom learning makes students and teachers to know each other in a better way. Traditional classroom learningletsthe teachers to know the students and assess their strengths and weaknesses better, act as mentors, and guides students in their career opportunities. Though they use generalized online notes and more suggestions are available on the internet, students find it more helpful in classroom learning to learn and understandby question-and-answer pattern, with suggestions provided by experienced teachers. (https://elearningindustry.com/traditional-learning-vs-online-learning).

Cover Page

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
ISSN:2277-7881; IMPACT FACTOR :7.816(2021); IC VALUE:5.16; ISI VALUE:2.286
Peer Reviewed and Refereed Journal: VOLUME:10, ISSUE:5(1), May:2021
Online Copy of Article Publication Available: www.ijmer.in
Digital certificate of publication:http://ijmer.in/pdf/e-Certificate%20of%20Publication-IJMER.pdf
DOI: http://ijmer.in.doi./2021/10.05.70
Scopus Review ID: A2B96D3ACF3FEA2A
Article Received: 10th May- Publication Date:30th May 2021

Shachar& Neumann (2003) in their meta-analysis of 86 studies determined that students in online sections of a course generally score higher on standardized final exams than students enrolled in traditional classes. Means et al., (2010) reported that the difference was large, amounting to a half of a standard deviation in comparing online learning and classroom learning. It was also confirmed that academic performance was higher in online vs. traditional classes by a meta-analysis limited to 50 findings from the relevant research.

Delvecchio&Lougney (2007) stated some disadvantages of e-learning include E-learning requires more time for attending class and completing assignments than any traditional classroom course. Students feel isolated from the instructor. Instructions are not always available to help the learner, so learners need self-discipline to work independently without the instructor's assistance. E-learning also needs to have good writing and communication skills because when instructors and other learners do not meet face to face, it is possible to misinterpret what was meant. There are always two sides of a coin. For some individuals, e-learning is more appropriate, while for others classroom learning is the preferred delivery method. Hence the present study was conducted to understand learner attitudes or intentions toward engagement in traditional classroom and e-learning

Methodology

Post graduate students around 66from the following four departments Clinical Nutrition and Dietetics, Botany, Zoology and Biotechnology were participants who behaved similar at normal classroom. These participants were who participated in traditional classroom and also participated in e-learning, as intervention group. After respectively attending classes, a survey was conducted to understand learner attitudes or intentions toward engagement in traditional classroom and e-learning. To test the differences the comparison study was designed. Survey method was used to gather the data for the study. National Survey of Students Engagement (NSSE) questionnaire and NSSE-CHINA questionnaire was modified and a simple survey tool was developed. The attitude or intention toward some questions about behavioral engagement in classroom, including to listen to what professors say, to write down something important, to work with other students on task during class, to think or respond to questions without fixed answer in classroom, to make a class presentation, to ask question in class or contribute to class discussion, to challenge professor's opinion were the questions included in the questionnaire. The 4-point Likert scales, ranging from 1 which means strongly disagree to 4 which means strongly agree were used to answer the questions. For statistical analysis SPSS19.0 statistical software package was used. Data were summarized as the mean and standard deviation for continuous variables of different group, and t-test was used to distinguish differences for those. ANOVA was used to analyze the differences, p -values < 0.05 were regarded as the significance level. Two hypotheses established are H0: There is no significant difference between the learners' attitude towards traditional learning and e-learning. H1: There is a significant difference between the learners' attitude towards traditional learning and e-learning. The results of the ANOVA are then discussed with reference to the p-values obtained. H0 is rejected if the p-value is lower than 0.05 andin contrast;H1 is rejected if the p-value is above 0.05.

Results

Table I summarizes the mean and standard deviation of the criteria regarding the attitude towards traditional learning and e-learning. For all the criteria the mean of the traditional classroom learning was more than that of e-learning and there exist significant differences in mean (significant at p <0.05).

Table -1
Descriptive statistics of traditional classroom and e-learning

Criteria	Traditional Learning			E-Learning			t-test
	Mean	SD	S.E. Mean	Mean	SD	S.E. Mean	
To listen to what professors say	3.58	0.50	0.06	2.71	0.65	0.08	8.55
To write down something important	3.62	0.49	0.06	2.61	0.76	0.09	10.14
To work with other students on task during class	3.55	0.56	0.07	2.32	0.86	0.11	8.79
To think or respond to questions without fixed answer in classroom	3.32	0.61	0.08	2.64	0.72	0.09	5.57
To make a class presentation	3.24	0.63	0.08	2.74	0.79	0.10	3.79
To ask question in class or contribute to class discussion	3.33.	0.62	0.08	2.48	0.77	0.09	6.19
To challenge professors opinion	3.11	0.64	0.08	2.38	0.65	0.08	6.66

Cover Page

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
ISSN:2277-7881; IMPACT FACTOR :7.816(2021); IC VALUE:5.16; ISI VALUE:2.286
Peer Reviewed and Refereed Journal: VOLUME:10, ISSUE:5(1), May:2021
Online Copy of Article Publication Available: www.ijmer.in
Digital certificate of publication:http://ijmer.in/pdf/e-Certificate%20of%20Publication-IJMER.pdf
DOI: http://ijmer.in.doi./2021/10.05.70
Scopus Review ID: A2B96D3ACF3FEA2A
Article Received: 10th May- Publication Date:30th May 2021

The result is significant at p <0.05

These days online courses/training have become extremely popular, as more and more institutes and companies are offering courses online. Despite the popularity of online education, vast groups of people consciously stay away from such methods, mostly due to misconception. Traditional learning is more helpful due to a continuous interaction between students and teachers, as it helps students to get rid of their fears regarding examinations, which can rarely happen with and e-learning and online guidance (https://elearningindustry.com/traditional-learning-vs-online-learning).

One-way ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship between traditional and human e-learning. Table II presents the results of the one-way ANOVA for the collected data.

Table II
Significant differences between variables of Traditional classroom and e-learning

Criteria	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		ANOVA						
	Levene Stat	Sig.	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig.	95% CI for Mean	
								Lower	Upper
To listen to what professors say	158.96	0.00	65	16.12	0.76	2.24	0.92	3.45	3.70
To write down something important	6.36	0.001	65	15.53	0.50	1.07	0.367	3.50	3.74
To work with other students on task during class	6.19	0.001	65	20.36	0.83	1.75	0.167	3.41	3.68
To think or respond to questions without fixed answer in classroom	2.18	0.099	65	24.32	0.63	0.66	0.579	3.17	3.47
To make a class presentation	0.79	0.506	65	26.12	0.70	0.70	0.556	3.09	3.40
To ask question in class or contribute to class discussion	3.00	0.37	65	24.67	1.52	3.46	0.22	3.18	3.48
To challenge professor's opinion	1.56	0.208	65	26.26	0.98	1.45	0.236	2.95	3.26

The results show that the p-value of the relationship is less than 0.05, signifying that the likelihood of a significant difference existing between traditional learning and e-learning. Hence, the null hypothesis (H0) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H1) is accepted. The results of the ANOVA allowed rejecting the null hypothesis H0 and supporting the conclusion that there is a statistically significant difference between traditional learning and e-learning.

Conclusion

In today's online era, the concept of a classroom extends beyond a walled room with desks and chairs and into the realm of cyber space. Online screens are replacing the blackboard and keypads are replacing chalk. The advance of science and technology has brought about significant diversity in education as well as in teaching methodology. The penetration of technology into the teaching and learning process as a vehicle by which instruction is shaped, stored and delivered to learners according to their learning styles has proved its worth. When comparing learning course in a traditional framework to a computer mediated learning framework, students have expressed higher satisfaction from the computer mediated learning, and rated the learning as effective as the traditional framework.

Cover Page

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
ISSN:2277-7881; IMPACT FACTOR :7.816(2021); IC VALUE:5.16; ISI VALUE:2.286
Peer Reviewed and Refereed Journal: VOLUME:10, ISSUE:5(1), May:2021
Online Copy of Article Publication Available: www.ijmer.in
Digital certificate of publication:http://ijmer.in/pdf/e-Certificate%20of%20Publication-IJMER.pdf
DOI: http://ijmer.in.doi./2021/10.05.70
Scopus Review ID: A2B96D3ACF3FEA2A
Article Received: 10th May- Publication Date:30th May 2021

References

1. Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2013). Changing course: Ten years of tracking online education in the United States. Babson Survey Research Group. Pearson Publishers and Sloan Foundation.
2. Doskocil, Angela R. Instructor Perception of Student Education: Traditional Vs. Online Learning Methods. ProQuest, 2008
3. Kolowich, S. (2013). A university's offer of credit for a MOOC gets no takers. Chronicle of Higher Education, July 8.
4. Maryam Fooladvand, Mohammad HosseinYarmohammadian. A comparative study between virtual and traditional approaches in higher education in Iran. Social and Behavioral Sciences. 2011,28, pp. 646-650
5. Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., Bakia, M., & Jones, K. (2010). Evaluation of evidence-based practices in online learning: A Meta-analysis and review of online learning studies. Washington: U.S. Department of Education.
6. Shachar, M., & Neumann, Y. (2003). Differences between traditional and distance education academic performances: A Meta-analysis approach. International Review of Research in Open and Distance Education, 4 (2), accessed online on October 12, 2012, (http://www.irrodl.org/content/v4.2/shacharneumann.html)
7. https://elearningindustry.com/traditional-learning-vs-online-learning
8. http://www.click4it.org/images/f/f5/Traditional_Learning_vs_eLearning.pdf

Filename:	10
Directory:	C:\Users\DELL\Documents
Template:	C:\Users\DELL\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Templates\Normal.dotm
Title:	
Subject:	
Author:	Windows User
Keywords:	
Comments:	
Creation Date:	5/15/2021 12:19:00 PM
Change Number:	5
Last Saved On:	5/25/2021 10:53:00 PM
Last Saved By:	Murali Korada
Total Editing Time:	13 Minutes
Last Printed On:	6/2/2021 12:12:00 PM
As of Last Complete Printing	
Number of Pages:	4
Number of Words:	2,075 (approx.)
Number of Characters:	11,834 (approx.)