

Effectiveness of Educational Delivery Modes: A Study in Computer Information Systems

Alan Peslak
arp14@psu.edu
Information Sciences and Technology
Penn State University
Dunmore, PA 18512 USA

Lisa Kovalchick
kovalchick@calu.edu
Computer Science, Information Systems, and Engineering Technology
California University of Pennsylvania
California, PA 15419 USA

Paul Kovacs
kovacs@rmu.edu

Wenli Wang
wangw@rmu.edu

Computer and Information Systems
Robert Morris University
Moon Township, PA 15108 USA

Abstract

Starting with the advent of the Internet the concept of online distance education became a more vibrant and viable alternative and has grown rapidly. With the arrival of the COVID-19 pandemic and low-cost Internet-based videoconferencing more hybrid options have become the standard in the current pandemic global environment. This study explores the evolution of student perceived effectiveness of online, hybrid, and on-ground course delivery methods so that when the pandemic abates, we can make better decisions on the viability of online and blended learning options. Survey results of over 400 students studying Computer Information Systems at three universities in 2017-2020 show that students have consistently perceived courses offered on-ground with an online supplement as being the most effective and such perception does not vary significantly based on age or gender. Students have the lowest perception of effectiveness for completely online courses. Moreover, the subject matter being taught does not change students' perceived effectiveness of the instructional delivery methods.

Keywords: Online Education, Face-to-Face Learning, Hybrid Learning, Remote Learning, CIS Curricula

1. INTRODUCTON

From Socrates to Aristotle to Harvard the traditional form of education for millennia was the concept of a live lecture or demonstration by a learned professor to a student audience. With the advent of the printing press, books were added as resources for students but the primary form of educational delivery remained, live lecture to students present in a classroom or auditorium setting. However, the emergence of forms of rapid mass communication are now providing an alternative for delivery of educational content. For instance, historically, the development of a relatively fast and reliable US mail system resulted in the development of correspondence education. The largest, most successful example of this, which is still operating today, is the International Correspondence Schools (ICS), now Penn Foster. Started in 1891, T.J. Foster developed a mining safety course that students could complete via the mail service, reading and returning assignments for grading and obtaining certificates. This grew exponentially and by 1899, the school had 190,000 students enrolled in over forty engineering trades. By 1925 ICS had 2.5 million students, a staggering number 100 years ago. However, the number of students did not necessarily translate to graduates; for example, long engineering has a completion rate of only about 5%. The educational delivery method, thus, had limited success and eventually greatly reduced its educational footprint. The dropout rate, the rise of community colleges, and the GI Bill, which allowed veterans from World War II to receive stipends to cover tuition and related expenses for veterans who attended college or a trade school, eventually relegated mail correspondence education to a very small slice of the educational delivery pie (Watkinson, 1996).

The development of the Internet in 1969 preceded the concept of instantaneous online delivery of educational courses. No longer would students need to endure mail delays and lack of timely teacher student interactions. In the mid-1970's the first college courses using the Internet via computer conferencing and email were offered. The first fully online course was offered in 1981 by Western Behavioral Sciences Institute. The first online undergraduate course was offered by New Jersey Institute of Technology. In 1985, Nova Southeastern University in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, offered the first college graduate courses. Online degrees started shortly thereafter in 1986. Since that time online course enrollment has exploded (Harasim, 2000).

The Babson Survey Research Group has been tracking online education for more than a decade with data collected from more than 2,800 colleges and universities (Allen & Seaman, 2015). This research group has found that institutions are incorporating online classes in their long-term strategies significantly more today than they did when the first survey began in 2002. The number of students enrolled in online courses has increased from about 1.6 million in 2002 to 5.8 million in 2014 (Allen & Seaman, 2015). For the institution, online education can be cost-effective and provide growth opportunities (Bristow, Shepherd, Humpreys, & Ziebell, 2011). Administration in higher education view online courses as more cost-effective than face-to-face courses, because they are not required to provide physical space for the courses.

The National Center for Education Statistics estimates 6.7 million college students participated in online education in 2017 (U.S. Department of Education , 2018).

With the current Coronavirus pandemic most universities have converted to online or remote live learning through live virtual classrooms. Though we have not been able to study this nascent educational delivery method, yet, we believe it is a variation of blended (hybrid) learning that we study.

This study examines evolving student perceptions of online, blended (hybrid), and generally resident instruction with online supplements in relation to Computer Information Systems (CIS) courses. The authors believe this research will provide educators, researchers, and administrators with valuable information when we emerge from the near total lockdown of in-person delivered classes.

Specifically, the study was conducted to answer the following research questions:

1. Has there been a significant change in the perceived overall effectiveness of courses, based on delivery methods, from 2017 to 2020?
2. Does the amount of course delivery provided online affect the perceived overall effectiveness rating of courses?
3. Is there a variation in the perceived overall effectiveness of course delivery methods based on age or gender?
4. Is there a variation in perceptions of the instructional method that provides the best learning, based on course content?

2. DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of this study, an online course is defined as a course that is conducted entirely through the Internet without any face-to-face contact among instructor(s) and students. In contrast, a face-to-face course (FTF) is a course that is conducted totally in a physical classroom without using any Internet technology for instructional purpose. Although there are many definitions for hybrid learning, for the purpose of this study, the researchers adopted enhancing blends as the definition of hybrid courses. A hybrid course, then, is defined as one that blends both web and face-to-face components in the same course. A hybrid course must include both face-to-face contact among instructor(s) and students and the use of web technology for instruction and course management. If the only utilization of a web technology (such as email) in a face-to-face course is for non-instructive use or routine communication, the course is considered a face-to-face course rather than a hybrid course.

A number of courses that incorporate web-based supplements such as web-based assignments, electronic bulletin boards, and threaded discussions are frequently considered to be online or hybrid courses. For this study, such courses are not considered online or hybrid delivery methods, but are regarded as face-to-face courses with online components or supplements.

3. RELATED STUDIES

Dobbs, Waid and del Carmen (2009) measured students' perceptions of online and on-ground course experiences and found that more students regarded on-ground courses to be easier than online courses. Student views about online education varied greatly between those who had completed an online course and those who had never taken such a course. The study found that the acceptance of online education increased as the number of online courses taken increased.

Ilgaz and Gülbahar (2015) developed an "e-Readiness" and "e-Satisfaction" research model to comprehensively measure a student's readiness *before* taking online courses, and the resulting satisfaction of students *after* taking online courses. The authors found that students begin online classes with specific expectations; therefore, meeting or not meeting these expectations directly impacts students' satisfaction levels. Students expect to have an effective learning experience that emulates the physical classroom by "...interacting with the instructors and other participants" (p. 183). The

authors also found that students are most satisfied with online classes if their expectations regarding "instructional content, communication and usability, and teaching process" were met by their online learning experiences (p. 183).

Vidanagama (2016) used the *Technology Acceptance Model* (TAM) to determine if technology has an impact on several factors associated with online learning by surveying 209 undergraduate students enrolled in computer-related degrees. The finding revealed that students enrolled in computing degrees are more satisfied with online learning when the technological environment (Learning Management System (LMS), software used in courses, etc.) performs adequately and is easy to use. It can be inferred from this study that students in computing fields are *more critical* about online learning than students in other degree fields.

Cole, Shelley, and Swartz (2014) conducted a three-year study to determine how satisfied students were with both online and partially online courses, as well as to determine the factors that contribute to student satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the online course delivery methods. Their results indicated that, overall, students were moderately satisfied with fully-online courses. The study also revealed that the participants were slightly more satisfied with hybrid/partially-online courses. Convenience was the factor that contributed most to *satisfaction* and lack of interaction (with both the instructor and other students) was cited as the main factor that contributed the most to *dissatisfaction* with online courses (p. 122).

In 2009, the U.S. Department of Education commissioned a meta-analysis of research comparing online to traditional learning by examining twelve years of experimental and quasi-experimental studies (Means, Toyama, Murphy, Bakia & Jones, 2010). The results found that despite what appears to be strong support for online learning, the studies in this meta-analysis do not demonstrate that online learning is superior as a delivery method. In many of the studies that involved a preference for online learning, the online and classroom conditions differed in terms of time spent, curriculum, and pedagogy. This meta-research also indicated that a blend of online and face-to-face instruction has been more effective, which provides a rationale for more effort to design and implement blended approaches.

4. METHODOLOGY

For this research, the author(s) used a web-based survey created in QuestionPro that consisted of 34 closed-ended questions. In addition to questions concerning student demographics, learning styles, and CIS-related course categories, subsequent questions asked students to identify motivations for either taking or not taking online courses. The survey was administered over a three-year period from the fall semester of 2017 through the spring semester of 2020.

Only students enrolled in CIS courses participated in the survey, regardless of their academic majors. While, five hundred and fifty three (N=553) students answered all questions, the actual number of responses to each question varied by question.

The three universities involved in this survey consisted of a private university, a state-owned public university, and a state-related university. The students surveyed at the private university included those seeking a bachelor's, Master's, or doctoral degree. The students surveyed at the state-owned and the state-related universities only included those seeking a bachelor's degree. The authors wanted to survey respondents from different types of universities because these universities provide a diverse, socio-economic mixture of participants and potentially different demographics.

According to Norvilitis, Merwin, Osberg, Roehling, Young, and Kamas (2006), many demographic differences exist between state and private university students, including debt to income ratio and a significant disparity in race. This research strategy of surveying students in different universities is consistent with the survey and data analysis strategy of categorizing research results based on different groups of universities used in the 2017 Noel-Levitz National Student Satisfaction and Priorities Report. Similarly, to the 2017 report, where 62% of surveyed online learners were undergraduate students and 34% were graduate students, in this research, more undergraduate students were surveyed than graduate students, by design.

5. RESULTS

Demographics

The statistical analysis of the results begins with the general demographics of the survey participants. Undergraduate students made up the majority of the survey respondents at 88%.

The ratio of male to female students was 76% male, 23% female, and 1% identified as other.

As noted, the survey responses were received from three U.S. universities. Twenty-two percent (22%) of the responses were from the state-owned university, 31% from the state-related university and 47% from the private university. These universities provide a diverse, socio-economic mix of participants.

The survey respondent age group was skewed with the general population but reflective of the specific population for receiving college education. Fifty-one percent (51%) of the survey respondents were in the 18-21 age group, 32% were in the 22-30 age group, and 17% were in the over 30 age group. In addition, 90% of the students were enrolled full-time.

Research Question 1: Has there been a significant change in perceived overall effectiveness of courses, based on delivery methods, from 2017 to 2020?

Perceived effectiveness of courses offered		N	Mean
COMPLETELY online	2017	239	2.79
	2018	90	2.39
	2020	89	2.74
	Total	418	2.7
HYBRID (i.e., partially online and partially on-ground)	2017	237	2.57
	2018	89	2.44
	2020	89	2.37
	Total	415	2.5
ON-GROUND with an ONLINE SUPPLEMENT (i.e., materials on LMS or an instructor's website)	2017	238	2.05
	2018	89	1.89
	2020	89	1.99
	Total	416	2

Table 1: Average perception of overall effectiveness of courses (1=Very Effective, 6=Very Ineffective), based on delivery method, from 2017 through 2020

Survey respondents were asked to rate their perceived overall effectiveness of courses that are offered completely online, partially online and partially on-ground (i.e., hybrid), and on-ground with an online supplement, on a scale of 1 to 6, with 1 being "Very Effective" and 6 being "Very Ineffective". Table 1 shows the average response rating provided for each delivery method during the years of 2017

through 2020. As shown in the table, regardless of year, the students perceived courses offered on-ground with an online supplement as the most effective, hybrid as the second most effective, and completely online as the least effective. All methods of delivery have shown improvement over the years, except for the completely online course delivery method.

Table 2 depicts the results of an ANOVA test to determine the significance of the perceived overall effectiveness of courses, based on delivery method. As shown in the table, over the years, only the change in perceived overall effectiveness of courses taught using a completely online delivery method was statistically significant at $p < 0.05$.

Perceived effectiveness of courses offered		Sig.
COMPLETELY online	Between Groups	0.018*
	Within Groups	
	Total	
HYBRID (i.e.,g partially online and partially on-ground)	Between Groups	0.258
	Within Groups	
	Total	
ON-GROUND with an ONLINE SUPPLEMENT (i.e., materials on LMS or an instructor's website)	Between Groups	0.389
	Within Groups	
	Total	

Table 2: Significance of perception of overall effectiveness of courses, based on delivery method, from 2017 to 2020

Table 3 depicts the results of a Bonferroni test used to determine the significance of the perception of overall effectiveness of courses, based on delivery method, from one year to another. As shown in the table, the mean difference is significant, at $p < 0.05$, only for courses offered using a completely online delivery method.

Perceived effectiveness of courses offered	(I) YR	(J) YR	Sig.
	2017	2018	0.015*

COMPLETELY online	2018	2020	1
		2017	0.015*
	2020	2017	1
		2018	0.132
HYBRID (i.e., partially online and partially on-ground)	2017	2018	0.938
		2020	0.381
	2018	2017	0.938
		2020	1
	2020	2017	0.381
		2018	1
ON-GROUND with an ONLINE SUPPLEMENT (i.e., materials on LMS or an instructor's website)	2017	2018	0.517
		2020	1
	2018	2017	0.517
		2020	1
2020	2017	1	
	2018	1	

Table 3: Bonferroni test results of significance of perceived overall effectiveness of courses, based on delivery method, from 2017 to 2020

Research Question 2: Does the amount of course delivery provided online affect the perceived overall effectiveness rating of courses?

Based on responses to the survey question asking respondents to rate their perceived overall effectiveness of courses that are offered completely online, hybrid (i.e., partially online and partially on-ground), and on-ground with an online supplement on a scale of 1 to 6, with 1 being "Very Effective" and 6 being "Very Ineffective", a series of paired samples t-tests were performed. Table 4 shows some summary results.

Paired sample t-tests confirm that, for our overall dataset from 2017 through 2020, there is significant difference between each of these means. Test results are omitted in the table format due to the size of the table. On-ground with an online supplement is seen as significantly more effective than hybrid at $p < .001$. Likewise, hybrid is seen as significantly more effective than completely online at $p < .001$. Finally, on-ground with an online supplement is seen as significantly more effective than completely online at $p < .001$.

Perceived effectiveness of courses offered	N		Mean
	Valid	Missing	
COMPLETELY online	418	278	2.7

HYBRID (i.e., partially online and partially on-ground)	415	281	2.5
ON-GROUND with an ONLINE SUPPLEMENT (i.e., materials on LMS or an instructor's website)	416	280	2.0

Table 4: Results of a series of paired sample t-tests performed on the dataset from 2017 through 2020

Research Question 3: Is there a variation in the perceived overall effectiveness of course delivery methods based on age or gender?

Survey respondents were asked to indicate their age range. Possible age ranges were: 18-21, 22-30, 31-40, 41-50, 51-60, and 61 or older.

Table A-1, in the Appendix, details our findings of the perceived effectiveness of courses, based on delivery method, by age group. Ratings are based on a scale of 1 to 6, with 1 being "Very Effective" and 6 being "Very Ineffective". While the average rating varies slightly for each age group, there is no significant difference in the perceived effectiveness of courses, based on delivery method by age group.

Survey respondents were asked to indicate their gender. Possible options were: male, female, and other.

Table A-2, in the Appendix, details our findings of the perceived effectiveness of courses, based on delivery method, by gender. Ratings are based on a scale of 1 to 6, with 1 being "Very Effective" and 6 being "Very Ineffective". While the average rating varies slightly, by gender, there is no significant difference in the perception of overall effectiveness of courses, based on delivery method, by gender, as shown in Table A-3, in the Appendix.

Research Question 4: Is there a variation in perceptions of the instructional method that provides the best learning, based on course content?

Survey respondents were asked to select the instructional method (on-ground, completely online, hybrid, on-ground with an online supplement) that they feel provides the best learning for different groupings of CIS course topics.

	On-ground	Online	Hybrid	Supp
SD	37%	17%	21%	25%
NA	39%	18%	19%	23%
WD	33%	21%	25%	21%
M/G	32%	21%	23%	23%
OP	31%	30%	22%	17%
PM	38%	20%	21%	20%
SA	37%	22%	20%	21%
CT	36%	23%	21%	20%
OS	36%	23%	22%	20%
DB	38%	19%	22%	21%
DA	38%	21%	21%	21%

SD	Software Development/Programming
NA	Network Administration/Security
WD	Web Development
M/G	Multimedia/Graphics
OP	Office Productivity Software
PM	IT Project Management
SA	Systems Analysis & Design Certification Courses (e.g., A+, N+)
CT	Operating Systems
OS	Database
DB	Data Analytics

Table 5: Perceptions of best learning instructional methods, based on CIS course content

Table 5 depicts the percentage of survey respondents that chose each instructional method that they felt provided the best learning, for each grouping of CIS course topics. As shown in the table, there was very little variation in perceptions of best learning instructional methods, based on course content. For each grouping of CIS course topics, the respondents indicated that they felt that the on-ground instructional method provided the best learning.

6. CONCLUSIONS

Although many universities are offering larger numbers of online courses, this study indicates that students perceive courses offered on-ground with an online supplement, as being the overall most effective. This perception has remained consistent over the years and does not vary significantly based on age or gender.

Furthermore, survey respondents reported a lower perception of overall effectiveness of courses, when more course content was delivered online.

In addition, the CIS subject matter being taught does not change the students' feeling regarding the instructional method that has the most effectiveness. Regardless of CIS topic, students feel that the on-ground instructional method with online supplements is the most effective.

This study was limited to only student perceptions of online, blended (hybrid), and generally resident instruction with online supplements in relation to Computer Information Systems (CIS) courses, regardless of the academic major of the student. The authors plan further research regarding the abrupt move to online and hybrid course delivery during the COVID-19 pandemic. This research will include CIS faculty perceptions of the various learning delivery methods by focusing on faculty workload, research disruptions, family-work conflict, and stress levels of faculty.

7. REFERENCES

- Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2016). 2015 Online Report Card Tracking Online Education in the United States. Babson Survey Research Group and Quahog Research Group. Retrieved May 23, 2017 from https://onlinelearningconsortium.org/survey_report/2015-online-report-card-tracking-online-education-united-states/
- Bristow, D., Shepherd, D. C., Humphreys, M. & Ziebell, M. (2011). To be or not to be: That isn't the question! An empirical look at online versus traditional brick-and-mortar courses at the university level. *Marketing Education Review*, 21(3), 241-250.
- Cole, M. T., Shelley, D. J., & Swartz, L. B. (2014). Online instruction, e-learning, and student satisfaction: A three year study. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 15(6).
- Dobbs, R. R., Waid, C. A., & del Carmen, A. (2009). Students' perceptions of online courses the effect of online course experience. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 10(1), 9-26.
- Harasim, L. (2000). Shift happens: Online education as a new paradigm in learning. *The Internet and higher education*, 3(1-2), 41-61.
- Ilgaz, H., & Gülbahar, Y. (2015). A Snapshot of online learners: E-readiness, e-satisfaction and expectations. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 16(2).
- 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. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/44840198_Evaluation_of_Evidence-Based_Practices_in_Online_Learning_A_Meta-Analysis_and_Review_of_Online_Learning_Studies
- Norvilitis, J. M., Merwin, M. M., Osberg, T. M., Roehling, P. V., Young, P., & Kamas, M. M. (2006). Personality factors, money attitudes, financial knowledge, and credit-card debt in college students. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36(6), 1395-1413.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Digest of Education Statistics 2018 Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=80>
- Vidanagama, D. U. (2016). Acceptance of E-learning among undergraduates of computing degrees in Sri Lanka. *International Journal of Modern Education and Computer Science*, 8(4), 25-32.
- Watkinson, J. D. (1996). "Education for Success": The International Correspondence Schools of Scranton, Pennsylvania. *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 120(4), 343-369.

Appendix A – TEST RESULTS

Perceived effectiveness of courses offered	Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Mini	Max
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
COMPLETELY online	18-21	183	2.93	1.082	.080	2.78	3.09	1	6
	22-30	142	2.61	1.203	.101	2.41	2.81	1	6
	31-40	54	2.39	1.220	.166	2.06	2.72	1	6
	41-50	17	1.82	1.015	.246	1.30	2.35	1	5
	51-60	6	2.83	.753	.307	2.04	3.62	2	4
	61+	4	2.00	.816	.408	.70	3.30	1	3
	Total	406	2.69	1.164	.058	2.58	2.80	1	6
HYBRID (i.e., partially online and partially on-ground)	18-21	183	2.46	1.026	.076	2.31	2.61	1	6
	22-30	142	2.62	1.083	.091	2.44	2.80	1	6
	31-40	52	2.40	1.071	.149	2.11	2.70	1	6
	41-50	16	2.25	.931	.233	1.75	2.75	1	4
	51-60	7	2.29	1.113	.421	1.26	3.31	1	4
	61+	3	2.33	.577	.333	.90	3.77	2	3
	Total	403	2.50	1.047	.052	2.40	2.60	1	6
ONGROUND with an ONLINE SUPPLEMENT (i.e., materials provided on LMS or an instructor's website)	18-21	183	1.86	.894	.066	1.73	1.99	1	6
	22-30	142	2.10	.845	.071	1.96	2.24	1	5
	31-40	52	2.17	1.216	.169	1.83	2.51	1	6
	41-50	16	1.94	1.289	.322	1.25	2.62	1	5
	51-60	7	1.57	.535	.202	1.08	2.07	1	2
	61+	3	2.33	.577	.333	.90	3.77	2	3
	Total	403	1.99	.942	.047	1.90	2.08	1	6

Table A-1: Perceived effectiveness of courses, based on delivery method, by age group

Perceived effectiveness of courses offered	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
COMPLETELY online	Male	304	2.70	1.148	.066	2.57	2.83	1	6
	Female	100	2.68	1.222	.122	2.44	2.92	1	6
	Other	1	1.00	1	1
	Total	405	2.69	1.167	.058	2.58	2.81	1	6
HYBRID (i.e., partially online and partially on-ground)	Male	302	2.52	1.052	.061	2.40	2.64	1	6
	Female	100	2.44	1.038	.104	2.23	2.65	1	6
	Other	1	2.00	2	2
	Total	403	2.50	1.047	.052	2.40	2.60	1	6
ONGROUND with an ONLINE SUPPLEMENT (i.e., materials provided on LMS or an instructor's website)	Male	302	2.01	.943	.054	1.91	2.12	1	6
	Female	101	1.91	.960	.096	1.72	2.10	1	6
	Other	1	3.00	3	3
	Total	404	1.99	.948	.047	1.90	2.08	1	6

Table A-2: Perceived effectiveness of courses, based on delivery method, by gender

Perceived effectiveness of courses offered		Sum of	df	Mean	F	Sig.
		Squares		Square		
COMPLETELY online	Between Groups	2.919	2	1.460	1.072	.343
	Within Groups	547.115	402	1.361		
	Total	550.035	404			
HYBRID (i.e., partially online and partially on-ground)	Between Groups	.729	2	.364	.331	.718
	Within Groups	440.021	400	1.100		
	Total	440.749	402			
ONGROUND with an ONLINE SUPPLEMENT (i.e., materials provided on LMS or an instructor's website)	Between Groups	1.815	2	.908	1.011	.365
	Within Groups	360.145	401	.898		
	Total	361.960	403			

Table A-3: Significance of perceived effectiveness of courses, based on delivery method, by gender