

Online Education in India: Enhancing the overall knowledge of students

Dr.(Mrs.) Urvesh Chaudhery
Associate Professor
Lingayas University, Faridabad

Dr. Satish Gill
Associate Professor
Shiv College of Education, Tigaon, Faridabad

Abstract

India presents one of the largest education systems in the world showing an extensive network of more than 1 million schools and higher education organizations. As per some surveys, more than half of the country's population falls in the target market for education and allied services. There are many institutions competing with each other to provide e-learning technologies in India. They have roped in many technological developments to felicitate their distance education branch. Many new entrants have been noticed in the market providing students with an opportunity to widen their horizons of knowledge and offer a wide array of Distance Learning Courses in India. Thus in this paper we have tried to come with the comparison of online education system & compared to traditional classroom learning and in relation to individual student needs, perceptions, and learning outcomes in Indian environment.

Keywords: *Online , education, students , schools , higher education*

I. Introduction

Now days there are many institutions competing with each other to provide e-learning technologies in India. They have entered in online education with the vision of providing good knowledge and to have a track of continuous evaluation overall development of the students. The system roped in many technological developments to felicitate their education. Many new entrants have been noticed in the market providing students with an opportunity to widen their horizons of knowledge and offer a wide array of Learning Courses in India like Merit Nation ,Gyan ganga , etc.

**International Journal Of Core Engineering & Management (IJCEM)
Volume 2, Issue 4, July 2015**

Infrastructure and regulation issues might seem to be slowing down the otherwise expanding education space in the country but this sector is already showing promise of an immense growth. The market is expected to grow leaps and bounds in upcoming years widening the areas of opportunities. It is predicted to grow \$40 billion by 2017.

There are many factors affecting its leverage. The online education providers should emphasize more on the education angle than the technology angle. This is the time where students may be tech savvy but they need relevant, precise and to the point high quality content that can be consumed online in a convenient manner. It is all about providing high quality content to the right person in the right manner.

The impact of learning environments in relation to learning outcomes has constantly been explored by researchers of education. For example, Ramsden and Entwistle (1981) empirically identified a relationship between approaches to learning and perceived characteristics of the academic environment. Haertela, Walberg, and Haertela (1981) found correlations between student perceptions of social psychological environments of their classes and learning outcomes. Web-based technology has noticeably transformed the learning and teaching environment.

Proponents of online learning have seen that it can be effective in potentially eliminating barriers while providing increased convenience, flexibility, currency of material, customized learning, and feedback over a traditional face-to-face experience (Hackbarth, 1996; Harasim, 1990; Kiser, 1999; Matthews, 1999; Swan et al., 2000). Opponents, however, are concerned that students in an online environment may feel isolated (Brown, 1996), confused, and frustrated (Hara & Kling, 2000) and that student's interest in the subject and learning effectiveness may be reduced (R. Maki, W. Maki, Patterson, & Whittaker, 2000).

The development of these new trends emerging in the contemporary education system raises a question about the effectiveness of online courses, particularly as compared to traditional classroom learning and in relation to individual student needs, perceptions, and learning outcomes.

Thus in this paper we have tried to come with the comparison of online education system & compared to traditional classroom learning and in relation to individual student needs, perceptions, and learning outcomes in Indian environment.

II. Research Method

The purpose of this study is to compare student performance in online and face-to-face classes in terms of interaction and efficacy in a public administration class. The study compares learning effectiveness in six (three online and three face-to-face) research methods classes taught by the same instructor to B.Tech students.

The study compares learning effectiveness of six factors out of which three are for online teaching and other three for face-to-face teaching. The study is done on the students of B.Tech (CSE, IT, ECE, CE) for teaching one theory subject and one practical subject through both online and face-to-face method and then at the end of semester and the feedback form was distributed to them to get the required data.

This research discovered two hypotheses:

H0: There is no significant difference in learning effectiveness between online and face-to-face classes.

H1: Online class differs from face-to-face class in learning effectiveness.

Table 1 : Data Statistics

Grade	Value	Online			Classroom		
		odd semester (N=28)	odd semester (N=30)	odd semester (N=29)	even semester (N=28)	even semester (N=30)	even semester (N=29)
A+	10	6	5	6	4	4	5
A	9	8	8	9	6	7	9
B+	8	6	7	7	6	6	5
B	7	2	4	2	2	4	2
C+	6	4	4	4	4	4	4
C	5	1	1	1	1	1	1
D	4	1	1	0	1	1	1
E	2	0	0	0	1	1	0
F	0	1	0	0	3	2	2

International Journal Of Core Engineering & Management (IJCEM) Volume 2, Issue 4, July 2015

Paired T-Test

Paired Samples Statistics

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	online study gp1	9	2.863	.954
	face to face study1	9	1.833	.611
Pair 2	online study gp2	9	3.000	1.000
	face to face study2	9	2.351	.784
Pair 3	online study gp3	9	3.420	1.140
	face to face study 3	9	2.333	.778

Paired Samples Correlations

	N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	online study gp1 & face to face study1	.924	.000
Pair 2	online study gp2 & face to face study2	.945	.000
Pair 3	online study gp3 & face to face study 3	.949	.000

Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	online study gp1 - face to face study1	.111	1.364	.455	-.938	1.160	.244	8	.813
Pair 2	online study gp2 - face to face study2	-.222	1.093	.364	-1.062	.618	-.610	8	.559
Pair 3	online study gp3 - face to face study 3	.000	1.414	.471	-1.087	1.087	.000	8	1.000

Inference :

The correlation between three of the pairs is very high i.e .924 , .945 and .949 which is of very high order.

To be significant at 0.05 level the value of T for df =8 must be 2.31 and the obtained value for 3 of the pairs is .244 , -.610 & 0 which are very less than the tabulated value thus Null Hypothesis is not accepted.

III. Conclusion

As the T-value obtained is very less as compared to the tabulated value we reject the Null hypothesis. We can now say that Online class differs from face-to-face class in learning effectiveness.

**International Journal Of Core Engineering & Management (IJCEM)
Volume 2, Issue 4, July 2015**

References

- Anna Ya Ni(). Comparing the Effectiveness of Classroom and Online Learning: Teaching Research Methods, *Journal of Public Affairs Education, JPAE 19(2)*, 199–215
- Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2007). Online nation: Five years of growth in online learning. Needham,MA: Sloan Consortium. Retrieved from http://sloanconsortium.org/publications/survey/pdf/online_nation.pdf
- Brown, G., & Wack, M. (1999). The difference frenzy and matching buckshot with buckshot. *TheTechnology Source*. Retrieved from <http://technologysource.org/?view=article&id=320>
- Brown, K. M. (1996). The role of internal and external factors in the discontinuation of off-campus students. *Distance Education, 17*, 14–71.
- Carr, S. (2000). As distance education comes of age, the challenge is keeping the students. *Chronicle of Higher Education, Information Technology Section*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/free/v46/i23/23a00101.htm>
- Citera, M. (1988). Distributed teamwork: The impact of communication media on influence and decision quality. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science, 49(9)*, 792–800.
- Davies, J., & Graff, M. (2005). Performance in e-learning: Online participation and student grades. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 36(4)*, 657–663. *Comparing the Effectiveness of Classroom and Online Learning*
- Frankola, K. (2001). Why online learners drop out. *Workforce, 80(10)*, 52–60.
- Fulford, C. P., & Zhang, S. (1993). Perceptions of interaction: The critical predictor in distance education. *American Journal of Distance Education, 7(3)*, 8–21.
- Ginn, M. H., & Hammond, A. (2012). Online education in public affairs: Current state and emerging issues. *Journal of Public Affairs Education, 18(2)*, 247–270.
- Hackbarth, S. (1996). *The educational technology handbook: A comprehensive guide*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.
- Haertela, G. D., Walberg, H. J., & Haertela, E. H. (1981). Socio-psychological environments and learning: A quantitative synthesis. *British Educational Research Journal, 7(1)*, 27–36.
- Hara, N., & Kling, R. (2000). Students' distress with a web-based distance education course: An ethnographic study of participants' experiences. *Information, Communication, and Society, 3*, 557–579.
- Harasim, L. M. (1990). *Online education: Perspectives on a new environment*. New York: Praeger.

International Journal Of Core Engineering & Management (IJCEM)
Volume 2, Issue 4, July 2015

- Harrington, D. (1999). Teaching statistics: A comparison of traditional classroom and programmed instruction/distance learning approaches. *Journal of Social Work Education, 35*(3), 343.
- Haythornthwaite, C., Kazmer, M., Robins, J., & Shoemaker, S. (2000). Community development among distance learners: Temporal and technological dimensions. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication, 6*(1). Retrieved from: <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol6/issue1/haythornthwaite.html>.
- Karayan, S., & Crowe, J. (1997). Student perspectives of electronic discussion groups. *THE Journal: Technological Horizons in Education, 24*(9), 69–71.
- Kiser, K. (1999). 10 things we know so far about online training. *Training, 36*, 66–74.
- Kumari, D. S. (2001). Connecting graduate students to virtual guests through asynchronous discussions: Analysis of an experience. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 5*(2), 53–63.
- Maki, R. H., Maki W. S., Patterson, M., & Whittaker, P. D. (2000). Evaluation of a web-based introductory psychology course: I. Learning and satisfaction in on-line versus lecture courses. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments and Computers, 32*, 230–239.
- McConnell, D. (2000). *Implementing computer supported cooperative learning*. London: Kogan Page Limited.
- McLaren, C. H. (2004). A comparison of student persistence and performance in online and classroom business statistics experiences. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education, 2*(1), 1–10.
- Smith, L. (2001). Content and delivery: A comparison and contrast of electronic and traditional MBA marketing planning courses. *Journal of Marketing Education, 21*(1), 35–44.
- Suskie, L. (2004). *Assessing student learning: A common sense guide*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Swan, K., Shea, P., Frederickson, E., Pickett, A. Pelz, W., & Maher, G. (2000). Building knowledgebuilding communities: Consistency, contact, and communication in the virtual classroom. *Journal of Educational Computing Research, 23*(4), 389–413.
- Thirunarayanan, M., & Perez-Prad, A. (2001). Comparing web-based and classroom-based learning: A quantitative study. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education, 34*(2), 131–137.



ISSN: 2348 9510

**International Journal Of Core Engineering & Management (IJCEM)
Volume 2, Issue 4, July 2015**

- Warschauer, M. (1997). Computer-mediated collaborative learning: theory and practice. *Modern*
- *Language Journal*, 8(4), 470–481.