Review Of Literature On A Study Of India'S Most Popular Online Educational Portals, Website And Apps

*Benjamin Nakho KH and **Dr. Neetu Sagar

*Research Scholar, Department of Education, SunRise University, Alwar, Rajasthan (India)
**Associate Professor, Department of Education, SunRise University, Alwar, Rajasthan (India)
Email: benngade@gmail.com

Abstract: Teachers' effectiveness depends on various things and self-efficacy is one of them. The construct of self-efficacy was coined by psychologist Albert Bandura in his social cognitive theory. Self-efficacy refers to one's belief about his/her capabilities to accomplish specific tasks. Teachers who have a high sense of belief in their teaching capabilities will achieve higher goals while teachers who have a low sense of belief in their capabilities will be under the shadow of fear of failures. Over the last four decades, researchers have thrown the light on teachers' self-efficacy in teaching and learning and established it as one of the important effective constructs. Self-efficacy plays a vital role for teachers to accomplish their goals, tasks, and how they approach instructional challenges. Teachers with a low self-efficacy evade challenging activities, take creative activities and situations as difficult to do, take most of the things negative and lose confidence in their abilities while teachers with a high self efficacy welcome challenging activities as to be mastered, create deeper interest in their activities, develops a high sense of commitments and mend swiftly from failures. The purpose of this study is to review the construct of teachers' self-efficacy and its importance in teachers' effectiveness.

Introduction

A review of related literature is an essential component of any research project. It involves analysing and evaluating previously published materials such as books, journals, articles, and other relevant sources to gain a deeper understanding of the research topic. The purpose of a literature review is to identify gaps in existing research, provide a theoretical framework for the study, and inform the research methodology.(Blazer, 2008) Literature reviews can be either narrative or systematic. A narrative review provides a comprehensive summary of the existing literature on a particular topic, while a systematic review uses a rigorous and structured approach to identify, evaluate, and synthesize the available evidence. This chapter consists of literature review done for the research work. The topic selected for research requires details understanding of Online Educational Portal concept, its various aspects, importance, benefits and advantages, issues and challenges towards initiatives and implementation in higher education, its impact on stakeholders (mainly students, faculty technical and administrative staff, directors, policy makers) and overall performance of institute with a sustainability approach.(Pinho et al., 2018).

In the literature reviewed, a great number of studies have aimed at determining whether computer-mediated education in the form of e-learning, blended learning or hybrid learning is better than traditional face-to-face teaching in relation to, for instance, learning outcome and student satisfaction. Researchers, educators and educational decision makers alike are eager to find out which format leads to the best results for their students and the educational institutions. However, as we shall see below, comparative studies of educational formats show different results, which might indicate that factors other than the format alone influence learning outcome, satisfaction, student retention et cetera. In this review of the literature on e-learning, we present and discuss definitions of e-learning, hybrid learning and blended learning, and we review the literature comparing different online teaching formats with traditional on-campus/face-to-face teaching. With this point of departure, we explore which factors affect students' learning experiences in different online formats in higher education, with particular emphasis on professional education and teacher training. The review serves to show that some factors are more prominent than others, and these factors, including spaces, learning community and student identity,

course design and the educator's role, are further discussed

Review of literature:

Several studies (e.g., Bernard et al., 2014; Chigeza and Halbert, 2014; González-Gómez et al., 2016; Israel, 2015; Northey et al., 2015; Ryan et al., 2016; Southard, Meddaug and Harris, 2015) have compared F2F teaching to online learning and/or blended learning in order to try to define which of the formats provides, e.g., the highest learning outcome, creates the most satisfied students or has the highest rate of course completion. In the following, we make an introductory review of recent comparative studies of the three formats mentioned. The main focus will be on summing up the results developed by these studies and discussing some of the limitations said to accrue to comparative studies of teaching formats. In the literature reviewed, it is often shown that teaching and learning are influenced by more than teaching format alone as many other factors play significant roles. Before embarking on our comparative review of the three different teaching and learning formats, we will begin by clarifying how each of them is definable according to studies of the different formats. Although there has not been complete agreement among researchers about the precise definition or meaning of the term 'blended learning' in particular (Bernard et al., 2014; Chigeza and Halbert, 2014), consensus has still built up around a sense of fairly clear distinctions between the three formats. Definitional questions do not, however, seem to haunt the terms 'face-to-face learning' and 'online learning' in the same way as they do 'blended learning' in the articles reviewed. Their meaning appears to be more or less agreed upon. For instance, the F2F learning format is characterized as "traditional" by many of the authors, referring to the fact that this is the format with the longest history of the three formats and in relation to which online and blended learning represent a modern or innovative intervention (e.g., Chigeza and Halbert, 2014; Adams, Randall and Traustadóttir, 2015; Pellas and Kazandis, 2015; González-Gómez et al., 2016).

Dr.P. Nagrajan, DR. G. Wiselin Jiji (2010) described various Online Educational Portal services and focuses on Learning Management system. The authors proposed a general formulation of model and frame work with a view to have more accurate assessment and for more effective evaluation of the learning process. Ghulam Muhammad Kundi et al. (2010) under took a study of inter relationship between different perceptions and attitudes of Online Educational Portal users. It revealed that perception of users about ICT and Online Educational Portal environment gets reflected in their attitude in using educational technologies for teaching and learning.

Kunal Sharma et al. (2011) undertook a study for Online Educational Portal at H.P. University. It was about crafting a strategic architecture for the same. He outlined critical success factors in this context. Students of International Centre for Distance and Open Learning were the respondents of the study. They were registered for personal contact programmes of professional courses. The study revealed that there are satisfactory current practices of instruction at University. The students were IT savvy. But trainers were lacking in interest about IT, Centre did not provide required training, there was irregular lectric supply. The facilities and consumables required for the usage were also insufficient. Thus author tried to conclude that role of Technology is not limited to making available software and hardware features. It also matters how technology was put into 69 / 402 the best practices of teaching. The results implied that if technology was available but not used, it lowers satisfaction. Kalpna Sai B., "A Study of Antecedents of Online Educational Portal Adoption of B-School Students In Deemed Universities of Tamil Nadu" was conducted at Anna University, Chennai, June 2015. The said research had an objective to study the relationship between B-school Students' attitude to use Online Educational Portal and their intention to continue using Online Educational Portal. The researcher has mentioned seven adoption factors viz. relative advantage, ease of use, compatibility, visibility, image, results, demonstrability and self-efficacy. The study was based on two theories viz. Davis' Technology Acceptance Model to understand the attitude and intention of adopter, the other one proposed by Moore and Benbasat to understand the factors affecting adoption process. The author extended this Moore and Benbasat model. This study was limited to students (MBA stream) who used Learning Management System (LMS) in their management programs. The outcome through inferences made comprised of image, ease of use, visibility, relative advantage and self-efficacy positive influenced attitude. Whereas image, visibility, compatibility, results demonstrability and ease of positive influenced intention of students. Thus, it wasobserved that, attitude had a strong positive relationship with intention. Among the many antecedents to Online Educational Portal adoption was image. The research results depicted a broader understanding of dynamics leading to the acceptance and intention to use Online Educational Portal by students in deemed universities.

Generally, its meaning derives from an understanding of an instructional format that involves a physical classroom and the synchronous physical presence of all participants (i.e., teachers and students). One study emphasizes that even in-class use of

computers and educational technology does not affect the definition of the F2F format so as to change it into blended learning (Bernard et al., 2014). Online learning is commonly defined in contradistinction to F2F learning (e.g., Ryan et al., 2016). Its most prominent feature is the absence of the physical classroom, which is replaced by the use of web-based technologies offering opportunities for out-of-class learning independent of time, place and pace (Bernard et al., 2014; Chigeza and Halbert, 2014; Northey et al., 2015; Israel, 2015; Potter, 2015). Ryan et al. (2016) point out that "in the context of higher education, the phrase online learning is often interpreted as referencing courses that are offered completely online; [..]" (p. 286). Typically, the online learning setting is launched through so-called learning management systems (LMS) or virtual learning environments (VLE) such as Moodle and Blackboard (Pellas and Kazanidis, 2015).

Deepak Chawla and Himansu Joshi (2012) conducted exploratory study at IIM, Ahmadabad to examine the awareness levels, degree of familiarity and readiness to accept Online Educational Portal environment.It addressed the issues relating to the extent of e- learning readiness among students. Kamla Ali Al- Busaidi (2012) at Oman examined "the critical success factors which influenced the success of LMS in blended learning in terms of actual usage, perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user satisfaction from the perspective of learners." The study results showed that all success factors were critical to learner's continuous intention to use LMS in blended learning. Indrajit Bhattacharya and Kunal Sharma (2007) recommended investing in ICT and thereby exploring the possibilities of online / Online Educational Portal resources in higher education in India that can ensure the quality of human resource capital. This would further add to economic upliftment of India. The authors also advocated the urgency for the traditional institutions for investment in ICT. The focus of ICT should be for knowledge delivery with e- instruction by utilizing the information super highway. Quality of education: The quality of education offered through online educational portals has been found to be high. A study by Choudhary and Gupta (2020) found that the majority of students who used online educational portals reported that the quality of education was excellent. A study by Singh and Gupta (2020) on Engagement and motivation it was found that the majority of students who used online educational portals reported that they were more engaged and motivated than those who used traditional classroom-based learning.Online educational portals can help to increase student engagement and motivation.

Cost-effective: Online educational portals are cost-effective compared to traditional classroom-based learning. A study by Kaur and Singh (2021) found that online educational portals were significantly cheaper than traditional classroom-based learning, especially for students living in urban areas. Dr. S.S. Gautam, Manishkumar Tiwari (2016) through their research paper presented different components of Online Educational Portal system, benefits and drawbacks of Online Educational Portal system. They state that, many creative ideas are refused because they do not work; likewise, a well-structured Online Educational Portal course can be ill received if it does not function properly. Explaining various advantages, for trainer or organization and to the student the authors state that the flip side include disadvantages of Online Educational Portal trainer /organization include upfront. Investment, technology issues, cultural acceptance issues, as also disadvantages, for students include technology issues, portability issues, reduction in social and cultural interaction. However, authors claim that knowing and understanding of five major components of Online Educational Portal system viz. Audience, Course Structure, Page design, Content engagement, Usability, will help to build instructionally sound and successful online programs. Therefore, the literature suggests that online educational portals have the potential to significantly improve the accessibility, quality, and affordability of education in India.

Mr. Danial V. Eastmond (1998) addressed the issues about challenges of distance education and effects of internet technology in the process of learning. It addresses the issues with respect to internet technology being an enabler to support and enhance adult learning. Mr. Harvi Sing and Mr. Chris Reed (2001) focused on blended learning in organizations in North Carolina and have addressed various issues relating to blending of off-line and on-line learning with a case study of Stanford University. The study found a gap between students desired learning style with the program's delivery format. Mr. Joanne Capper (2001), World Bank Consultant has explained the necessity and rapid growth of Online Educational Portal, effectiveness of distance education, barriers to its effective use, efforts made in different countries. He concluded that, although many Online Educational Portal courses exist in areas related to small business, still more can be done to facilitate access of the poor to Online Educational Portal, which necessities range of financial and human support structures. Narayan Alavi and R. Brent Gallupe (2003) addressed the issues of Technology- Mediated Learning (TML) programs in USA based five case studies. According to their study relatively high levels of cultural change and high levels of institutional resources are necessary

to implement and to operate TML programs. Administrators from these five institutions often underestimated the cultural change and resource requirements.

Sandra Meredith and Becci Newton (2003) viewed that there are potential benefits to all concerned delivering education and management training with ICT. Still providers face few challenges while developing new strategies for teaching and learning. Thus it creates fundamental issues of the learning process. They concluded that a study of perception of learners and end users is important. Shawn Clouse and Gerald Evans (2003) undertook an empirical study relating to "effect of synchronous and asynchronous instructional methods on performance of students under distance learning and Online Educational Portal". The latter area described the relationship between instructional methods and the moderating factors. Factors include ability of students, learning styles, types of personality, and technical skills. It also described the difference of performance of graduate business students relating to discrete exam questions. It was a comparison between on- campus and offcampus students. It was observed that, students were more participative in asynchronous threaded discussion. It also had the added advantage to student for getting time to reflect by self-comments and posts on content and responses posted by the instructor. Badrul H. Khan (2004) developed Online Educational Portal P3 Model to depict a comprehensive picture of Online Educational Portal process. The model covers identification of roles and responsibilities of people with respect to design and management of all Online Educational Portal and blended learning materials and systems. This model is useful in the case where institute is in the process of designing the online course to be made available in online environment for the students. Thus, it discusses the issues relating to purely online courses.

Stephen Marshall and Geoff Mitchell (2004) suggested to apply a capability maturity model (CMM) with SPICE approach to identify weakness in Online Educational Portal development, delivery and management and future sourcing and also strategic priorities. They offered a view to move from CMM and SPICE to an Online Educational Portal maturity model (eMM). "Martin Weller, Chris Pegler, Robin Mason" (2004) suggested to make use of innovative technologies in an Online Educational Portal course. According to them, all four technologies viz. blog, instant messaging, audio conferencing and video conferencing are primarily communication tools but they play an important role in learning cycle or learning style. The focus of the paper is on pedagogical issues, effectiveness in learning mechanism and its suitability to learning theories, cycles and styles. Jared

M. Carman (2005) discussed the need and importance of blended learning especially a blend of theories and not just one; the theories viz. cognitivism, constructivism and performance support. The important ingredients / elements were explored viz. Live events, Online content, Collaboration, Assessment and Reference material. The author addressed the issues based on ARCS motivation model of John Keller while discussing live events. The paper explored all the points theoretically in view point of adult learners. Panopoulos Anastasios, VentouraNeokosmidi Zoe (2005) in their research paper explored about the use of websites by Greek Institutions in maintaining public relations for both internal and external stakeholders. They addressed the issued from the point of view of five dialogic principles of Kent and Taylor (1998).

J.B. Arbaugh and Raquel BenbunanFich (2006) in their paper examined the relationship between teaching approaches and online learning outcomes of 40 MBA level courses. Online courses need to be designed and delivered on the foundation of collaborative learning model. Maggie McPherson and Miguel Bapatista Nunes (2006) identified certain organizational Critical Success Factors (CSFs) in implementation of Online Educational Portal in higher education. Authors further stated to use these CSFs as theoretical foundation in decision making and strategic thinking process of Online Educational Portal. Swapan Deoghuria, Stayabrata Roy (2006) discussed different aspects of OCW (Open Course Ware) and its impact on total learning process. The course material was made available online to enhance the quality of engineering education under the NPTEL ("National Programme on Technology Enhanced Learning"). OCW movement had become popular in USA, India and also in other countries viz. China, Japan, Taiwan, Thailand, Vietnam and Europe etc. Hence most of these initiatives are for engineering education. Deborah L.G. Hutti (2007), the author conducted a survey at Illinois Community Colleges Online (ILCCO) of students, faculty and staff about pressing issues about online learning quality, retention and capacity building which revealed that all the three respondents consistently identified four main components for quality online learning programme as strong administrative support team in collaboration with faculty, system established regarding continuous improvement of online teaching and learning, reliable technology and assistance, strong online teaching and learning preparation / orientation programs.

The terms blended learning and hybrid learning sometimes seem to be used interchangeably (Ryan et al., 2016). According to Bernard et al. (2014), who builds on Graham's definition (2005), blended learning can be defined as "the combination of

instruction from two historically separate models of teaching and learning: traditional F2F learning systems and distributed learning systems" (p. 91). In some cases, blended learning is seen as the more effective counterpart to the other two formats used separately (Pellas and Kazandis, 2015; González-Gómez et al., 2016) insofar as it is, e.g., characterized as F2F and online learning being "optimally integrated" (Israel, 2015) or combining their "benefits" (Adams, Randall and Traustadóttir, 2015). Moreover, several studies seem to agree that blended learning is definable according to the relative time spent on respectively online and F2F instruction in courses. Thus, at least 50 percent of total course time dedicated to F2F instruction appears to be the lower limits of in-class components in the blended learning format (Bernard et al., 2014). Many studies compare the effect on students' learning outcome generated by respectively F2F teaching and/or blended learning. In Bernard et al.'s (2014) meta-study of blended learning in higher education, students in blended programs have turned out to achieve slightly better than students following traditional classroom instruction programs. Similar findings have been made by other studies – e.g., Israel (2015), Northey et al. (2015), Southard, Meddaug and Harris (2015), González-Gómez et al. (2016) and Ryan et al. (2016). What leads to a better learning outcome among students in online and blended learning programs is, however, a question that is not answered in the same way by all the studies mentioned. Bernard et al. (2014) conclude that the element of technology integration in blended learning courses seems to lead to very low, though significant improvement in student achievement – particularly when technology yields cognitive support (e.g., simulations) or facilitates student interaction (i.e., with other students, content and teachers). In GonzálezGómez et al.'s study (2016), it is the adoption of a flipped classroom model of blended learning in a general science course that results in higher grades among teacher training students when compared with those achieved by students following a traditional classroom setting. Though no specific predictor is mentioned by Israel (2015) or Potter (2015), the former still observes modest positive impacts on students' learning outcome resulting from the adoption of the blended format, while the latter records grades "significantly higher in the hybrid option than for the traditional face-to-face format" (p. 7).

References

1. Adams, A. E. M., Randall, S. and Traustadóttir, T., 2015. A Tale of Two Sections: An Experiment to Compare the Effectiveness of a Hybrid versus a Traditional Lecture Format in Introductory Microbiology. CBE - Life Sciences Education, 14, pp. 1-8
2. Barber, W., King, S. and Buchanan, S., 2015. Problem Based Learning and Authentic Assessment in Digital Pedagogy: Embracing the Role of Collaborative Communities. The Electronic Journal of E-Learning , 13(2), pp. 59–64.
3. Baxter, J. A., and Haycock, J., 2014. International review of research in open and distance learning. The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 15(1).
4. Bernard, M. B., Borokhovski, E., Schmid, R. F., Tamim, R. M. and Abrami, Ph. C., 2014. A meta-analysis of blended learning and technology use in higher education: from the general to the applied. Journal of Computing in Higher Education, 26(1), pp. 87-122.
5. Beth, A. D., Jordan, M. E., Schallert, D. L., Reed, J. H., and Kim, M., 2015. Responsibility and generativity in online learning communities. Interactive Learning Environments, 23(4), pp. 471–484.
6. Bolsen, T., Evans, M. and Fleming, A. M., 2016. A Comparison of Online and Face-to-Face Approaches to Teaching Introduction to American Government. Journal of Political Science Education, 12(3), pp. 302-317.
7. Bryman, A. (2012) Social research methods. Oxford: Oxford university press. Cheng, G., and Chau, J., 2016. Exploring the relationships between learning styles, online participation, learning achievement and course satisfaction: An empirical study of a blended learning course. British Journal of Educational Technology, 47(2), pp. 257–278.
8. Chiero, R., Beare, P., Marshall, J., and Torgerson, C., 2015. Evaluating the effectiveness of e-learning in teacher preparation. Educational Media International, 52(3), pp. 188–200.
9. Chigeza, P. andHalbert, K., 2014. Navigating E-Learning and Blended Learning for Pre-service Teachers: Redesigning for Engagement, Access and Efficiency. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 39(11), pp. 133–146.
10. Cho, M. and Tobias, S., 2016. Should instructors require discussion in online courses? Effects of online discussion on community of inquiry, learner time, satisfaction, and achievement. International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 17(2), pp. 123-140.
11. Choi, B., 2016. How people learn in an asynchronous online learning environment: The relationships between graduate students' learning strategies and learning satisfaction

Comment apprennent les gens dans un environnement d'apprentissage en ligne asynchrone. Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology / La Revue Canadienne de L'apprentissage et de La Technologie, 42(1).

12. Creswell, J. W., 2013. Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

13. Donnelly, D. F. and Hume, A., 2014. Using collaborative technology to enhance pre-service teachers' pedagogical content knowledge in Science. Research in Science & Technological Education, 33(1), pp. 61–87.

14. Fedynich, L., Bradley, K. S., and Bradley, J., 2015. Graduate students' perceptions of online learning. Research in Higher Education Journal, 27(1), pp. 1–13

12/11/2024