Quest Journals
Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Science
Volume 12 ~ Issue 11 (2024) pp: 46-54
ISSN(Online):2321-9467
www.questjournals.org

Research Paper

A Comparison between Conventional and Digital Education

S. Kiruba Joshuakumar
Master of Technology in Embedded Systems, School of Electronics Engineering
Vellore Institute of Technology, Vellore-632 014, Tamil Nadu, India

Prof. G. Anburaj
Assistant Professor of English, School of Social Sciences and Languages
Vellore Institute of Technology, Vellore-632 014, Tamil Nadu, India

Abstract
The rapid advancement of technology has transformed traditional education, giving rise to digital education systems that leverage digital resources and platforms. This research paper presents a comparative analysis between conventional and digital education, focusing on the accessibility and impact of digital resources. This paper addresses the key problem of imbalance in digital resource availability, which affects the efficiency and inclusivity of digital education, particularly in underprivileged regions. While digital education offers flexibility and a vast array of learning materials, limitations such as inadequate infrastructure, internet access, and technological literacy create significant challenges. This paper explores these issues and evaluates the effectiveness of both educational models in delivering quality education across diverse socioeconomic backgrounds.

Keywords: *Digital divide, Hybrid learning, Digital literacy, Educational inclusivity, Socioeconomic disparities*

***R**eceived 01 Nov., 2024; **R**evised 09 Nov., 2024; **A**ccepted 11 Nov., 2024 © The author(s) 2024.*
P**ublished with open access at **www.questjournas.org

I. Introduction

Digital technologies are profoundly changing the education landscape. Digital education has offered new opportunities for flexible and personalized learning with access to a wide array of digital resources and interactive platforms. However, this transition from conventional to digital education is not without its own set of challenges. One of the major challenges is the issue of equality in access to digital resources. This poses challenges for students in regions with limited technological infrastructure. Traditional education necessitates the use of face-to-face relationships, physical materials, and established infrastructure. However, digital education requires having a reliable internet connection along with digital devices and educational software resources, which is not something accessible to everyone. This access gap determines the inclusiveness and effectiveness of digital education while raising concerns about the issue of equity in learning. More importantly, because more institutions adopt online or blended learning models, gaps between students who can readily use digital tools and those who cannot come more sharply into focus. Other determinants include technological literacy, economic disparities, and the state of readiness by institutions, among others. This paper will analyse critical differences in conventional and digital education with an emphasis on the problem of the availability of digital resources. A major challenge is the lack of resources, which can leave students left behind. This report analyses how these inequalities affect education quality and recommends possible interventions to mitigate such inequalities so that digital education can complement or even surpass traditional methods in terms of access and effectiveness.

Problem Statement

The availability of digital resources is one of the major challenges in the comparison between traditional and digital education, which is currently transforming. Because unequal access to essential technology excludes many from flexible, personalized learning and access to an enormous range of digital resources, digital education still lags. Where the provision of the Internet is small, with no adequate and

accessible means like computers and tablets, in a world where people make learning fun, most barriers occur toward digital learning from regions that are in poorer settings compared to more progressive countries and areas. Traditionally speaking, it differs in relying on mostly inaccessible, at any rate, less available technological basis, with something more related to buildings which would call for actual schools and hard copies to obtain teaching while in a room as someone teaches another within. However, the geographical and scheduling issues point to limitations in the traditional mode of learning, which points toward the need for alternatives within the digital environment. The question of the availability of digital resources must be sorted to ensure that digital education can be implemented in ways that are inclusive enough for it to complement or not aggravate the problems under the traditional models of learning.

Research Gap

Although many studies are comparing traditional learning with digital learning, the literature on how differences in digital resources really affect these two modes of learning remains grossly underrepresented. This article focuses on highlighting flexibility, as well as a wider range of resources available online, while few studies examine how unequal access affects student performance and engagement in resource-limited areas. Most of the research work conducted to date has utilised a benchmark level of infrastructure for accessing digital information resources, yet it remains blind to the strong differences in accessing the Internet, using a machine, or having access to technical support in the development and social context of places. Indeed, whereas traditional forms of education are often perceived to be a sure-fire antidote to resource-constrained settings, very little has been written on how resource-constrained contexts might effectively swing toward the use of technology or, for that matter, how a halfway digital/halfway traditional amalgamation might make up for its shortcomings in terms of resource provision. Addressing such research gaps can also be crucial while forming educational policies that may promote equitable learning, at least when digital education seems capable enough to serve all children in place of these older strategies, even while using abundant or scarce resources.

II. Literature Review

A new face was given to education lately where the trend is more digitally oriented rather than a classroom-based teaching and learning mechanism. Conventionally, these are taught in classes among students and teachers interacting person-to-person. A student learns most from instructors inside a traditional classroom that incorporates textbooks, printed handouts, direct lectures in actual classrooms and visits physical libraries for the search into a discussion with classmates and tutors. The social aspect of the older style of education supports basics such as teamwork, communication, and emotional intelligence through group discussions, group projects, and extracurricular activities. In contrast, digital education has received extensive momentum in the last decade, primarily owing to how technology has rapidly advanced and amplified the penetration rates of the internet. It differs significantly from traditional education in that it allows students the freedom to study at their own pace and convenience. Through digital resources like e-books, video lectures, interactive software, and online databases, access can be had with just a few clicks. This is how knowledge dissemination has revolutionized into a dynamic and personalized experience. From where they are, online and learning management systems allow for virtual classroom attendance, interaction in online discussions, and completion of assignments. Its mode of education has benefited working professionals, non-traditional learners, as well as those with some geographical or time constraints immensely.

The availability of digital resources is the largest advantage of digital education. However, the availability of digital resources is the critical challenge to realizing digital education. Theoretically, digital resources are ample, but their accessibility is never uniform in practice. Access to resources is a real headache problem in digital education, depending on several critical factors, such as internet connectivity, accessible devices, and digital literacy. Digital literacy: this enables students to effectively navigate, evaluate, and use available digital platforms. Even if younger generations could more naturally master the use of digital devices, many older students or educators may find themselves struggling with the technical demands of using digital learning platforms. The lack of digital literacy prevents some demographics from appropriately accessing the resources available to them, which will hinder the adoption of digital education. Moreover, the quality of the resources available digitally can be highly variable. Not all online materials are equal, and students need to know how to evaluate the credibility and quality of the content in which they are finding it difficult to distinguish good-quality sources from bad ones. These have made comparisons between traditional and e-learning, therefore quite complex and instead showed the different advantages and drawbacks of each of them.

Traditional education values the stable environment with clear structures and direct human contact between the learner and the teacher for long. A teacher's physical presence can provide immediate feedback and guidance, which develops a close student-teacher relationship or community. This environment also encourages social learning, peer collaboration, and interpersonal skills, important for both individual and professional life. Conventional education always depended on real materials, books, and classroom lectures with the aspect of

predictability and a routine, giving the chance for pupils to accumulate disciplinary and time-management skills. Digital education creates a chance that could never be satisfied with a more traditional solution. Digital education allows for flexible learning and adaptation to individual needs. It would give every student a better chance at their rhythm and be exposed to an incredibly much wider source than any establishment can offer. Online platforms and digital tools can also be used for different learning styles, using multimedia content, interactive software, and simulations to enhance interest, and understanding. Digital education removes geographical barriers in that students can access courses and teachers from anywhere in the world. This unprecedented access democratizes education by allowing the student in a remote or underserved area to access a wealth of knowledge hitherto out of his reach. A great majority still have the promise of educational access unattainable, merely as an idea, while the critical issue of resource accessibility is left untouched. The gulf divide in digital access reflects disparities in access to high-speed internet, affordable devices, and digital literacy, leaving millions of students who cannot take full advantage of an online learning option. People in rural or impoverished areas have minimal or no infrastructure to support perpetual, efficient digital learning. A student cannot access live lecture sessions, course texts, or interact with content without a stable internet connection. Furthermore, in some areas of the world where internet connectivity is available, high-end computing devices such as laptops and tablets are also prohibitively expensive for most households. As a result, digitally enabled education in these regions is disproportionately denied to students, and the outlook for inequality in education worsens.

III. Result Analysis

1. Impact of Digital Tools on Learning Access

An analysis of the differential impact of the use of digital media to access learning presents one significant difference between the classical mode and the use of digital for education delivery, specifically when accessed in the form of available digital content. Digital support in digitally advanced regions translated to plenty of choices and included online e-books, online lecture presentations, a learning management system, and interactive content. These tools have been very important in offering personalized and flexible learning experiences, which allow the accessing of learning materials anywhere at any time and virtually anywhere. This flexibility allows self-paced learning, a means to tailor educational experiences and access a wider content portfolio than that traditionally available in traditional systems of education. Digital tools have facilitated interactive learning via virtual simulations, real-time collaboration, and global databases of knowledge, which ensured a better understanding of subjects and good academic performance. The analysis also points to considerable challenges in areas of low availability of digital resources. Poor digital infrastructure in some regions is a major setback for students to access digital tools because of low internet connectivity, insufficient laptops and tablets, and technical support. Such circumstances have led to significant disparities between students who can fully benefit from digital education and those who cannot from digital education solely due to a lack of resources. The results thus depict the challenge posed by these students to online learning often resulting in poor engagement with academics and significant dependence on traditional methods of education. The findings reveal the critical determinant of digital education success based on the provision of digital infrastructures. With insufficient basic resources, digital tools therefore fail to actualize much of their full potential to change how access to learning takes place. Urgent investments to bridge this gap must be targeted on the underserved and rural regions. Otherwise, all the students will not enjoy these advantages of digital education because of their deprived backgrounds. Technology can enhance learning access for everyone when there is an investment in digital tools and infrastructure inside educational systems.

2. Influence of Digital Resource Availability on Educational Outcomes

The availability of digital resources shows the highest degree of impact on comparative effectiveness, depending upon the availability of a conventional and digital education infrastructure. As compared to those regions where a strong digital infrastructure was found available, some students took the benefit of digital education wherein more flexibility in learning with greater access to various digital resources that students' personalized learning and progress according to their own pace. The availability of such resources enabled learners to create their own study schedules and pursue other materials outside the curriculum, thus making learning more enhanced. Such access to various digital tools allows for more individualized learning pathways that cater to different learning styles and paces, which ultimately increases overall student engagement and academic success. However, in areas with few digital resources, the environment is characterized by less availability of dependable internet access, fewer digital tools, and limited technical services; this hampers the students. Thus, it limits the engagement of the student in the online course, and as a result, it is less engaging compared to students in a regular classroom setting. The lack of access to the most basic digital tools made students rely on the least adequate or outdated material, which restricted their capacity to fully engage with a digital learning platform. As a result, many of these students fell behind compared to their peers, proving that

there is still a significant digital divide in education. Traditional education, though it suffers from geographical and temporal bounds, has been a much stronger and more reliable way of accessing educational resources especially when digital access is hard. In traditional settings, a student had solidly stable support in physical classes, teachers, and books that were there compared with the instability in most instances of digital education that can easily break down if the infrastructural setup is poor. Although conventional education lacked flexibility and customization, it had the reliability needed to ensure accessibility in regions with less access to digital infrastructure. Availability of resources was a prime determinant of the total success of digital education and thus a critical call for urgent investment in digital infrastructure to promote equitable access to quality education. Students in less developed areas can hardly take advantage of the flexibility and breadth of learning that digital education offers without equal access to digital tools and resources. The results, therefore, underscore the importance of addressing digital inequalities to make digital education a more viable and inclusive alternative to conventional models. Closing the gap will be important to make sure that every child, regardless of location or background, has the chance to succeed in an increasingly digitizing educational environment.

3. Digital Resource Accessibility

Accessing digital resources is very challenging and affects both traditional and digital education, especially the availability of resources. In most traditional settings, schools cannot absorb digital tools into their curriculum because of infrastructural deficiencies, funding, and poor access to technology. Most learning institutions, especially in unprivileged areas, still employ outdated textbooks, printed media, and traditional teaching processes. These limitations mean that access to modern, interactive learning platforms and current digital resources that can enrich their knowledge experience is denied to the student. Keeping abreast with the rapid changes in a fast-moving knowledge economy demands one to have access to upgraded digital resources. Such resources missing in traditional environments may suppress innovation and restrict students' ability to engage with newer types of content, hence creating space for critical thinking, creativity, and problem-solving skills. But for digital education, despite its flexibility and emphasis on personal learning, many drawbacks point to resource availability issues. The most common and significant barrier to fully capitalizing on this kind of environment, however, is the digital divide. In many cases, in an underserved or low-income community, students will have little to no internet capabilities, and old devices, making it extremely difficult to interact adequately with any digital learning environments. Such a situation has become far starker when looking at rural or economically disadvantaged sites, as minimal internet bandwidth or very costly digital equipment does not assist the students. Without these inequalities, many students are left out of the benefits of available online educational materials, video lectures, interactive tools, and other digital resources that can be accessed by their more privileged peers. In addition, disparities in technological literacy complicate this issue further. Even when students have access to digital tools and the internet, the ability to navigate and effectively use these resources varies widely. They adapt quickly to new technology; it is the students coming from less tech-friendly backgrounds or those who had little or no experience with digital learning since a young age, that would face difficulty. Digital non-fluency could also mean limited interaction with online materials, fewer opportunities to actively engage in virtual classrooms, and therefore, reduced achievements. Teachers and instructors in the traditional setting also fail to adapt to digital platforms. This creates gaps in the quality of instruction and support given to students. It is through this that the challenge in both conventional and digital education systems can be addressed to ensure equitable access to digital resources. Such a challenge would require investment in the digital infrastructure, to be deployed particularly in less developed areas, besides efforts that must reduce the costs of technology so that access becomes easy for every learner, and huge programs must be conducted for the spread of digital literacy. That will benefit not only the students but the educators also. In the process, educational institutions will create a learning environment where each student can benefit the most from the great richness of digital tools and resources that are revolutionizing education in the future. The moment access to digital resources becomes the focus, conventional education will begin to look more manageable and accessible while becoming reachable with digital education. The goal should ultimately be a more holistic educational system in which technology and digital resources are not accessible only to a few but rather a necessity that can reach learners of all backgrounds and geographical areas.

4. Enhancement of Digital Resources

The availability of digital resources is what can free the full learning potential of digital education and make the educational environment more equitable. Recently, reliance on digital education has encouraged more strategic and comprehensive solutions for access to crucial technologies. The basics of digital learning platforms include high-speed internet, affordable digital devices, and relevant educational software. However, access to these tools is still unequal between regions and socio-economic groups, thus increasing educational inequality. Digital resources can be effectively improved only by concerted efforts from governments, institutions of education, and private organizations. Only through such cooperation can major investments in the development

of infrastructure, especially in less privileged and rural areas with limited or intermittent internet access and technological infrastructure, be ensured. One of the major challenges in accessing digital resources is the absence of consistent broadband internet in most countries, especially in developing regions. Even in developed nations, underprivileged communities often lack good connectivity, and thus, they have limited access to online learning and other digital resources. In short, governments should embrace broadband infrastructure development to ensure the internet is stable and fast for all students regardless of their geographical location. Internet can be made more affordable and accessible in a larger way through public-private collaboration. More importantly, cost-friendly digital products, such as laptops, tablets, and smartphones, need to be made available to students from all walks of the economy. The gap can be filled with the subsidization of these programs, and in affordable payment plans, including the donation of devices, and getting modern learning tools to students. More important than getting devices and an internet connection is the improvement of quality and relevance to the content of the digital resource. Inclusiveness, cultural relevance, and alignment with educational standards should be characteristic of digital learning materials to meet the diverse needs of learners. Policies in support of promoting digital literacy among students and educators are most important for maximising effectiveness. While the younger generation may be more effective in using digital tools, many still lack the critical skills needed to navigate online platforms, assess the quality of information, and engage meaningfully with digital content. Another important aspect of enhancing digital resources is that the content available online is not only accessible but also engaging and interactive. Scanned textbook pages and other static content usually cannot grab the attention of students or encourage deep learning. Interactive software, virtual simulations, and multimedia-based educational materials have proven far more effective in maintaining student engagement and promoting comprehension of complex topics. Improvement of digital resources will ensure more inclusive access to quality education. This only serves to bridge the digital divide between conventional and e-learning but also ensures online learning is accessible as an achievable and practicable substitute in models of education. It is in this manner that educational institutions can offset disparities occasioned by the divide as all learners from varying economic contexts will find themselves capable of enjoying learning experiences that impact society. Proper infrastructure, inclusive content, and digital literacy will increase the quality of digital resources, so the opportunity to turn education into something more accessible and fairer for every learner, from whatever perspective, is possible. In this way, education can be the perfect tool to base empowerment and social mobility in the digital age.

5. Multilingual Support for Diverse Learners

One of the key differences between digital education and conventional education is the ability of the former to accommodate multilingual support, allowing students of diverse backgrounds better access to learning. Nowadays, most students come from a myriad of linguistic and cultural backgrounds, and such educational resources as multilingual access become a very great asset. Digital learning tools will, among other benefits, provide real-time translation services, multilingual libraries, and language-specific tutorial programs that can enhance students' learning if they do not speak the dominant language used in instruction. In most multilingual societies, a student may face problems understanding courses taught in their language of instruction. Under a traditional education system, there has often been one language of teaching by a teacher that may not always facilitate learning and understanding for the student. Texts and classroom discussions in such a system are mostly published in only one language that cannot be understood by anyone who is not a native speaker. In contrast, digital education provides learning content in a preferred or native language for students, with resulting comprehension as well as confidence building. However, the multilingual support system of digital education relies heavily on digital resources for proper functioning. In regions with good development of digital infrastructure and internet penetration, students can access a more diversified set of multilingual resources. For example, educational platforms could provide the functionality of real-time translation and offer students various languages or even specific instructors fluent in a given language, which will accompany them on their way through the intricacy of topics. It helps break the language barrier and create an inclusive educational environment, where students coming from different linguistic backgrounds could take part equally and fully in the learning process. Students are at a disadvantage wherever digital resource availability is less. Although digital education promises to support multiple languages, students cannot access the promised features if they lack the infrastructure such as high-speed internet, up-to-date software, and devices needed to access the tools. For instance, in rural or underserved areas, students may not be able to access digital resources in their preferred language, which leaves them to navigate through content in a language they may not fully understand. This can result in lower engagement, reduced understanding, and worse learning results overall for non-native speakers or others with less proficiency in the target language. Closing in on such resource gaps can make digital education reach several learners that conventional education cannot. While traditional systems are confined by the limitations of physical materials and monolingual instruction, digital platforms can flexibly provide customized content by individual linguistic and cultural needs. This is what distinguishes digital

education and makes it a potential game-changer for education systems around the world in making learning more inclusive, equitable, and accessible to all students regardless of language or location.

IV. Discussion on the Results

Comparison results of traditional and digital education have revealed a significant difference in the outcomes of education, and these differences are mostly attributed to the availability of digital resources. In better-resourced environments, digital education has proven capable of enhancing flexibility, providing diverse interactive learning tools, and encouraging self-directed learning. Such students can take advantage of customized learning experiences because, for instance, they are allowed to progress at their own pace, and materials will be accessed to assist in helping them, depending on the various learning styles. This has been amazingly helpful to those students who require more support and for others who have specific strengths. However, those findings also point to a significant challenge: without adequate digital infrastructure, such as reliable internet access, affordable devices, and appropriate digital tools, students in poorer areas cannot benefit from those advantages. In many poor communities, barriers to accessing digital are barriers to educational progress; students rely on traditional ways of learning, which often lack the flexibility and innovation available through digital platforms. All this contributes to a gap, which widens ever wider, between the student communities and the digitally advanced parts of society, as they remain behind in both the academia and digital literacy spheres. The discussion thus comes forth with the need for hybrids of both digital and more conventionally-based educational approaches. Such models would allow teachers to take advantage of digital resources where they are available while maintaining the structured, teacher-led framework of traditional classrooms to support students who do not have consistent digital access. The underlying issue of the availability of digital resources also needs to be addressed. Targeted investments and policies to reduce the digital divide could help reduce these disparities. This may involve government and community-led efforts to make affordable internet available, distribute devices, and offer digital literacy programs for students and their families.

Unexpected Findings

In the comparison between traditional and digital learning, one of the surprising findings related to the availability of digital resources was that hybrid models of learning appeared as a bridge between both systems. Attention was first paid to the constraints of digital learning in developing regions, where the unavailability of reliable internet, devices, and digital infrastructure presented major challenges. However, during the time of the research, many educational institutions were found to have well taken up the proactive manner of embracing the blended learning model as it handles the constraints in both the technological and instructional approaches. They put together face-to-face teaching with digital tools to achieve a flexible, resource-saving model that was meant to fill in those gaps. In areas where internet accessibility and digital devices were not regular, the schools came up with novel ways to make the learning experience better for students. For instance, they used low-tech or offline digital resources such as pre-loaded educational content on a tablet or a laptop. This implies that students have access to necessary material and do not require a real-time internet connection. They also established local digital libraries where some preselected material has been prepared and distributed access to the students on a common device. These measures ensured that, even in those places where the digital infrastructure is not robust, students will reap the benefits of digital education in a manner that supplements the conventional teaching methods. This study reveals that rather than being positioned as total substitute for traditional education, digital education functions best if applied to the existing systems thoughtfully. Through the adoption of this hybrid model, institutions can achieve diversity in their approaches toward accommodating the various needs for learning, closing the digital gap, and delivering a more balanced approach that involves some structured guidance combined with autonomous digital learning. It supports greater flexibility but at the same time provides more equitable access to contemporary education sources for all students across every background. Hybrid approaches have shown success, with the scope and capacity of schools, policymakers, and communities to innovate collaborative efforts that bridge gaps with digital tools, provide ample resources, and strengthen overall educational experiences for learners at all levels.

Scope for Further Research

It leaves immense scope for further research, especially regarding the availability of digital resources to compare conventional and digital education. Studies have already explored many benefits and limitations of learning in a digital environment; however, how such specific digital resource constraints will affect educational outcomes across different socio-economic settings requires much deeper exploration. This will include studies on the impact of limited internet connectivity, lack of access to digital devices, and inadequate infrastructure on student engagement, academic performance, and overall satisfaction levels in primary and higher education. It may further be able to determine regional imbalances in the availability of digital resources and the impact on

long-term educational equity in terms of rural-urban settings and income brackets. There are promising areas for future studies. Some of these entail the study and evaluation of new hybrid models of learning combined with the old modes that involve conventional means of learning and digital versions, in environments where resources remain scarce. By studying, for example, the effectiveness of blended learning in different context settings, researchers could go on to identify the digital and the conventional elements or components whose combination would allow for robust educational outcomes in a study. Another avenue for research is the exploration of alternative, low-tech digital solutions, like preloaded educational devices or community-based digital libraries, as alternatives to the internet, particularly in areas where it is unstable. Such studies would provide much-needed insight into how best to implement digital resources in diverse educational environments to maximize inclusivity and effectiveness. Finally, because technology continues to advance, further studies might analyse the part that emerging technologies, like artificial intelligence, virtual reality, and machine learning, play in reducing resource disparities in education. Research into the possibility of using these technologies with minimal or no connectivity or even completely offline may offer new approaches to extending digital educational benefits to under-resourced communities. The second avenue of research could investigate the models of policy and funding that have worked well in supporting digital infrastructure in low-resource regions. These models can then serve as templates for other regions to use. Ultimately, the solutions to these gaps in the knowledge base will not only open our eyes to the dynamic relationship between digital and conventional education but also give us action plans for building more just, resilient, and adaptive education systems.

V. Conclusion

In conclusion, the comparison of traditional and digital education reveals that each model has its unique advantages, but the availability of resources, especially in the digital domain, will determine their effectiveness. Flexibility and scalability in digital education can offer more opportunities for personalization and access to learning experiences, depending on adequate digital infrastructure. The availability of digital resources, especially in underserved regions, has been a significant issue against the widespread adoption and success of digital education. Therefore, bridging the educational divide must be addressed through investment in technology infrastructure, affordability in access to digital devices, and digital literacy programs. Enhancing availability can improve educational systems, including the advantages of conventional and digital learning, such that all students can receive quality learning regardless of origin and socioeconomic status.Closing the educational divide will require partnership and cooperation among governments, educational organizations, and private stakeholders in improving access to digital resources to increase the effectiveness of knowledge delivery. This will pave the way for education to adopt the best of traditional and digital education - a hybrid approach that serves to ensure access to effective learning by every student regardless of his or her geographical or socio-economic background. The bottom line will always be the digital infrastructure, along with promoting a culture of inclusivity; and this will surely bring us closer to achieving a future wherein every student has the necessary and required resources and support.

Reference

[1]. Anderson, T. 2008. The theory and practice of online learning. Canada: Athabasca University Press.
[2]. Babu, N. S. C. 2005. Quality Assurance Framework for eLearning. India: ELEL Tech.
[3]. Chawinga, W. D., & Zozie, P. A. 2016. Increasing Access to Higher Education Through Open and Distance Learning: Empirical Findings From Mzuzu University, Malawi. The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 17(4). doi:10.19173/irrodl.v17i4.2409
[4]. Denić, N., Živić, N., & Spasić, B. 2014. Application Of Information And Communication Techologies In School Education. Annals Of The Oradea University. Fascicle Of Management And Technological Engineering., XXIII (XIII)(3). doi:10.15660/auofmte.2014-3.3062
[5]. Denić, N., Nešić, Z., Radojičić, M., Petković, D., & Stevanović, M. 2017a. Contribution to the research of children protection in use of internet. Tehnički vjesnik, 24, pp. 525-533.
[6]. Denić, N., Gavrilović, S., & Kontrec, N. 2017b. Information and communications technologies in function of teaching process. The University Thought - Publication in Natural Sciences, 7(2), pp. 58-63. doi:10.5937/univtho7-15472
[7]. Denić, N., & Petković, D. 2018. Obrazovni softver. Kosovska Mitrovica: Prirodno matematički fakultet. ISBN 978-86- 80795-36-2.
[8]. Gavrilović, S., Denić, N., Petković, D., Živić, N. V., & Vujičić, S. 2018. Statistical evaluation of mathematics lecture performances by soft computing approach. Computer Applications in Engineering Education, 26(4), pp. 902-905. doi:10.1002/cae.21931
[9]. Hassanzadeh, A., Kanaani, F., & Elahi, S. 2012. A model for measuring e-learning systems success in universities. Expert Systems with Applications, 39(12), pp. 10959-10966. doi:10.1016/j.eswa.2012.03.028
[10]. Keegan, D. 1996. Foundations of distance education. London: Croom Helm.
[11]. Keegan, D., (Eds). 2005. Theoretical Principles of Distance Education.Informa UK Limited. doi:10.4324/9780203983065
[12]. Lee, J., & Lee, W. 2008. The relationship of e-Learner's selfregulatory efficacy and perception of e-Learning environmental quality. Computers in Human Behavior, 24(1), pp. 32-47. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2006.12.001
[13]. Moore, M., & Kearsley, G. 2011. Distance Education: A Systems View of Online Cengage Learning.
[14]. Moore, J. L., Dickson-Deane, C., & Galyen, K. 2011. eLearning, online learning, and distance learning environments: Are they the same. The Internet and Higher Education, 14(2), pp. 129-135. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2010.10.001
[15]. Moore, M. G., & Kearsley, G. 2005. Distance education: A systems view. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

[16]. Simonson, M. 2001. Distance education and online instruction: Profession or Field. The Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 2(4); 301-302

[17]. Simonson, M., & Schlosser, C. 2004. We Need A Plan, An Instructional Design Approach for Distance Education Courses. Fischler College of Education: Faculty Articles

[18]. Wilen-Daugenti, T. 2009. Edu: Technology and Learning Environments in Higher Education. Peter Lang, International Academic Publishers. doi:10.3726/b11473

[19]. Atiyah, J. M., El Sherbiny, M. M., & Guirguis, S. K. (2015). Evaluation of Online learningProgram versus Traditional Education Instruction for Undergraduate. International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Engineering and Technology, 2(7), 776-786.

[20]. Banihashem, Seyyed Kazem, et al. ―The effect of Online learningon students creativity.‖ Scientific Information Database, Vol. 5, No. 4, 2015, pp. 53-61

[21]. Ellis, Robert A., Paul Ginns, and Leanne Piggott. ―Online learningin higher education: Some key aspects and their relationship to approaches to study.‖ Higher Education Research and Development, Vol. 28, No. 3, 2009, pp. 303-18

[22]. Liaw, Shu-Sheng. ―Investigating students‘ perceived satisfaction, behavioral intention, and effectiveness of elearning: A case study of the blackboard system. Computers and Education, Vol. 51, No. 2, 2008, pp. 864-73

[23]. Mason, Robin, and Martin Weller. ―Factors affecting students‘ satisfaction on a web course.‖ Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, Vol. 16, No. 2, 2000, pp. 173- 200

[24]. Oye, N. D., Mazleena Salleh, and N. A. Iahad. ―Holistic Online learningin Nigerian higher education institutions.‖ Journal of Computing, Vol. 2, No. 11, 2010, pp. 20-26

[25]. Paul, S. (2006, November). Comparative Assessment of the Effectiveness of Online Vs Paper Based. In 2006 International Conference on Computational Inteligence for Modelling Control and Automation and International Conference on Intelligent Agents Web Technologies and International Commerce (CIMCA'06) (pp. 271-271). IEEE

[26]. Sangra, Albert, Dimitrios Vlachopoulos, and Nati Cabrera. ―Building an inclusive definition of e-learning: An approach to the conceptual framework.‖ The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, Vol. 13, No. 2, 2012, pp. 145-59

[27]. Wang, Yi-Shun. ―Assessment of learner satisfaction with asynchronous electronic learning systems.‖ Information and Management, Vol. 41, No. 1, 2003, pp. 75-86

[28]. Mitra, S., & Beenen, G. (2019). A Comparative Study of Learning Styles and Motivational Factors in Traditional and Online Sections of a Business Course. INFORMS Transactions on Education, 20(1), 1-15

[29]. Bir, D. D. (2019). Comparison of Academic Performance of Students in Online vs Traditional Engineering Course. European Journal of Open, Distance and Elearning, 22(1), 1-13

[30]. Wei, Y., Shi, Y., Yang, H. H., & Liu, J. (2017, June). Blended learning versus traditional learning: a study on students‘ learning achievements and academic press. In 2017 International Symposium on Educational Technology (ISET) (pp. 219-223). IEEE

[31]. Khan, S. B., & Jumani, N. B. (2012). Online learningversus traditional learning in Pakistan. Asian Journal of Distance Education, 10(1), 28-34

[32]. Anitha, M. S. (2012). A comparative study between online learningand traditional learning in management education. EXCEL International Journal of Multidisciplinary Management Studies, 2(7), 230-243

[33]. Agasisti, T., and Johnes, G. (2015). Efficiency, costs, rankings and heterogeneity: the case of US higher education. Stud. High. Educ. 40, 60–82. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2013.818644

[34]. Ary, E. J., and Brune, C. W. (2011). A comparison of student learning outcomes in traditional and online personal finance courses. MERLOT J. Online Learn. Teach. 7, 465–474

[35]. Atchley, W., Wingenbach, G., and Akers, C. (2013). Comparison of course completion and student performance through online and traditional courses. Int. Rev. Res. Open Dist. Learn. 14, 104–116. doi: 10.19173/irrodl.v14i4.1461

[36]. Bartley, S. J., and Golek, J. H. (2004). Evaluating the cost effectiveness of online and face-to-face instruction. Educ. Technol. Soc. 7, 167–175

[37]. Beale, E. G., Tarwater, P. M., and Lee, V. H. (2014). A retrospective look at replacing face-to-face embryology instruction with online lectures in a human anatomy course. Am. Assoc. Anat. 7, 234–241. doi: 10.1002/ase.1396

[38]. Beale, E. G., Tarwater, P. M., and Lee, V. H. (2014). A retrospective look at replacing face-to-face embryology instruction with online lectures in a human anatomy course. Am. Assoc. Anat. 7, 234–241. doi: 10.1002/ase.1396

[39]. Bernard, R. M., Abrami, P. C., Borokhovski, E., Wade, C. A., Tamim, R. M., Surkesh, M. A., et al. (2009). A meta-analysis of three types of interaction treatments in distance education. Rev. Educ. Res. 79, 1243–1289. doi: 10.3102/0034654309333844

[40]. Biel, R., and Brame, C. J. (2016). Traditional versus online biology courses: connecting course design and student learning in an online setting. J. Microbiol. Biol. Educ. 17, 417–422. doi: 10.1128/jmbe.v17i3.1157

[41]. Bigelow, C. A. (2009). Comparing student performance in an online versus a face to face introductory turfgrass science course-a case study. NACTA J. 53, 1–7

[42]. Columbaro, N. L., and Monaghan, C. H. (2009). Employer perceptions of online degrees: a literature review. Online J. Dist. Learn. Administr. 12

[43]. Craig, R. (2015). A Brief History (and Future) of Online Degrees. Forbes/Education

[44]. Daymont, T., and Blau, G. (2008). Student performance in online and traditional sections of an undergraduate management course. J. Behav. Appl. Manag. 9, 275–294

[45]. Dell, C. A., Low, C., and Wilker, J. F. (2010). Comparing student achievement in online and face-to-face class formats. J. Online Learn. Teach. Long Beach 6, 30–42

[46]. Driscoll, A., Jicha, K., Hunt, A. N., Tichavsky, L., and Thompson, G. (2012). Can online courses deliver in-class results? A comparison of student performance and satisfaction in an online versus a face-to-face introductory sociology course. Am. Sociol. Assoc. 40, 312–313. doi: 10.1177/0092055X124 46624

[47]. Friday, E., Shawnta, S., Green, A. L., and Hill, A. Y. (2006). A multisemester comparison of student performance between multiple traditional and online sections of two management courses. J. Behav. Appl. Manag. 8, 66–81

[48]. Girard, J. P., Yerby, J., and Floyd, K. (2016). Knowledge retention in capstone experiences: an analysis of online and face-to-face courses. Knowl. Manag. ELearn. 8, 528–539. doi: 10.34105/j.kmel.2016.08.033

[49]. Helms, J. L. (2014). Comparing student performance in online and face-to-face delivery modalities. J. Asynchr. Learn. Netw. 18, 1–14. doi: 10.24059/olj.v18i1.348

[50]. Herman, T., and Banister, S. (2007). Face-to-face versus online coursework: a comparison of costs and learning outcomes. Contemp. Issues Technol. Teach. Educ. 7, 318–326.

[51]. Kemp, N., and Grieve, R. (2014). Face-to-Face or face-to-screen? Undergraduates' opinions and test performance in classroom vs. online learning. Front. Psychol. 5:1278. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.01278

[52]. Keramidas, C. G. (2012). Are undergraduate students ready for online learning? A comparison of online and face-to-face sections of a course. Rural Special Educ. Q. 31, 25–39. doi: 10.1177/875687051203100405

[53]. Larson, D.K., and Sung, C. (2009). Comparing student performance: online versus blended versus face-to-face. J. Asynchr. Learn. Netw. 13, 31–42. doi: 10.24059/olj.v13i1.1675

[54]. Li, F., and Chen, X. (2012). Economies of scope in distance education: the case of Chinese Research Universities. Int. Rev. Res. Open Distrib. Learn. 13, 117–131

[55]. Liu, Y. (2005). Effects of online instruction vs. traditional instruction on student's learning. Int. J. Instruct. Technol. Dist. Learn. 2, 57–64

[56]. Lorenzo-Alvarez, R., Rudolphi-Solero, T., Ruiz-Gomez, M. J., and Sendra-Portero, F. (2019). Medical student education for abdominal radiographs in a 3D virtual classroom versus traditional classroom: a randomized controlled trial. Am. J. Roentgenol. 213, 644–650. doi: 10.2214/AJR.19.21131

[57]. Lundberg, J., Castillo-Merino, D., and Dahmani, M. (2008). Do online students perform better than face-to-face students? Reflections and a short review of some Empirical Findings. Rev. Univ. Soc. Conocim. 5, 35–44. doi: 10.7238/rusc.v5i1.326

[58]. Maloney, S., Nicklen, P., Rivers, G., Foo, J., Ooi, Y. Y., Reeves, S., et al. (2015). Cost-effectiveness analysis of blended versus face-to-face delivery of evidence-based medicine to medical students. J. Med. Internet Res. 17:e182. doi: 10.2196/jmir.4346

[59]. Mann, J. T., and Henneberry, S. R. (2014). Online versus face-to-face: students' preferences for college course attributes. J. Agric. Appl. Econ. 46, 1–19. doi: 10.1017/S1074070800000602

[60]. Mozes-Carmel, A., and Gold, S. S. (2009). A comparison of online vs proctored final exams in online classes. Imanagers J. Educ. Technol. 6, 76–81. doi: 10.26634/jet.6.1.212

[61]. Richardson, J. C., and Swan, K. (2003). Examining social presence in online courses in relation to student's perceived learning and satisfaction. J. Asynchr. Learn. 7, 68–88

[62]. Roval, A. P., and Jordan, H. M. (2004). Blended learning and sense of community: a comparative analysis with traditional and fully online graduate courses. Int. Rev. Res. Open Dist. Learn. 5. doi: 10.19173/irrodl.v5i2.192

[63]. Salcedo, C. S. (2010). Comparative analysis of learning outcomes in face-to-face foreign language classes vs. language lab and online. J. Coll. Teach. Learn. 7, 43–54. doi: 10.19030/tlc.v7i2.88

[64]. Stern, B. S. (2004). A comparison of online and face-to-face instruction in an undergraduate foundation of american education course. Contemp. Issues Technol. Teach. Educ. J. 4, 196–213

[65]. Summers, J. J., Waigandt, A., and Whittaker, T. A. (2005). A comparison of student achievement and satisfaction in an online versus a traditional face-toface statistics class. Innov. High. Educ. 29, 233–250. doi: 10.1007/s10755-005- 1938-x

[66]. Tanyel, F., and Griffin, J. (2014). A Ten-Year Comparison of Outcomes and Persistence Rates in Online versus Face-to-Face Courses

[67]. Werhner, M. J. (2010). A comparison of the performance of online versus traditional on-campus earth science students on identical exams. J. Geosci. Educ. 58, 310–312. doi: 10.5408/1.3559697

[68]. Westhuis, D., Ouellette, P. M., and Pfahler, C. L. (2006). A comparative analysis of on-line and classroom-based instructional formats for teaching social work research. Adv. Soc. Work 7, 74–88. doi: 10.18060/184

[69]. Wladis, C., Conway, K. M., and Hachey, A. C. (2015). The online STEM classroom who succeeds? An exploration of the impact of ethnicity, gender, and nontraditional student characteristics in the community college context. Commun. Coll. Rev. 43, 142–164. doi: 10.1177/0091552115571729

[70]. Xu, D., and Jaggars, S. S. (2016). Performance gaps between online and face-toface courses: differences across types of students and academic subject areas. J. Higher Educ. 85, 633–659. doi: 10.1353/jhe.2014.0028