
Interrelation Between Online Instruction and E-Resources in Higher Education

Yogendra Thapa

Central Department of Education, Tribhuvan University

thapayog@gmail.com

<https://doi.org/10.3126/oas.v2i1.65611>

Abstract

To measure the interrelationships between online instruction and e-resources in higher education is the objective of this study. Four hundred students who are studying for a master degree in Kathmandu Valley are randomly assigned. A correlational research design is applied within the nonexperimental study with a positivist philosophical background. Data are collected once through a semi-structured questionnaire. Relationships were identified using chi-square and logistic regression through Stata 14. The results show that the majority of students have limited access to e-resources. Less than one-third of students have utilized online resources. Students' satisfaction and perception of effective online instruction were more likely to utilize e-resources. The study concludes that online modes of instruction have limited success in utilizing online resources. The majority of students have limited access to e-resources and mainly depend on printed materials. The study suggests that practical-based training for utilizing online resources should be provided to enhance proficiency in technology and awareness of e-resources.

Keywords: online instruction, e-resources, accessibility, social media, e-library, higher education

Introduction

The successful interrelation between online instruction and learning facilities in higher education. It requires a holistic approach that considers technological, pedagogical, and infrastructural aspects to create a seamless and effective learning environment. Students' active engagement is necessary for education to be effective. For this, students' access, attitude, and learning resources also play a significant role in effective class instruction. When it comes to online education, students' perceptions, the availability of infrastructure, and their technology support all play a big part (Gautam & Gautam, 2021) in collecting information from different resources. Lack of resource mobilization is responsible for poor academic performance online.

Institutions of higher learning are putting in place strict policies to use ICTs for efficient online instruction and learning, developing cognitive abilities for socioeconomic contributions in the information age (Eze et al., 2018). Skilful manpower or those more familiar with technology feel more at ease utilizing the e-learning resources than they do at other public tertiary institutions, but their use has not been optimized (Eze et al., 2018). As a result, the impact of online education on academic accomplishment is medium-sized, according to recent meta-analysis research published in Springer. The study found that the effect magnitude is invariant to the nation, class level, online learning platforms, and lecture moderators (Ulum, 2022). On the other hand, another ERIC meta-analysis showed that ICT had a statistically significant and positive effect on academic performance (Mothibi, 2015). Other studies found that students who complete their schoolwork online typically perform worse than those who complete it in person. These contradictory results call for more studies to clarify this inconsistency. In higher education, the relationship between virtual instruction and learning resources is a complicated one that can have both advantages and disadvantages. To completely comprehend the effect of online learning on student outcomes, more study is required.

Online instruction allows for greater accessibility to educational resources, enabling students to access learning materials and participate in classes from anywhere with an internet connection. Similarly, learning facilities, such as digital libraries and online databases, complement online instruction by providing a wide range of resources that students can utilize for research and study. However, to develop proficiency in technology and access to information resources, user training plays a major role in the effective adoption of new technologies (Eze et al., 2018). The use of information resources and effective application of technology has not been optimized (Eze et al., 2018) due to a lack of skilled manpower and access to technology (Hodges et al., 2020), low-quality phones or technology, instability of networks (Skopec, 2020, p. 19), a lack of information resources, and inappropriate skills in technology (Coman et al., 2020; Khanal, 2020). However, our online class instructions are running by adapting the minimum requirements. Students' study habits are limitedly modified. As a result, online learning or instruction has substantial drawbacks, particularly for students pursuing bachelor's degrees and those who are less intellectually prepared (Jensen et al., 2022). The majority of the research focused on online academic performance, teacher competency, and pedagogy. These studies not only focused on the impact of online instruction but also raised many learning difficulties from the perspective of teachers and administrators. However, limited studies are not sufficient to determine the accessibility of students toward the mobilization of online resources, especially in the Nepalese context. So, this study is one step towards fulfilling the discrepancy.

Social media such as Facebook, Youtube, Instagram, websites, and e-journals play a significant role as learning resources. After supporting teachers and students to manage learning facilities and competency in resource mobilization, effective instruction would be maintained by enhancing accessibility within different sources of information and personalized learning. The goal of this study is to assess the accessibility and impact of electronic resources on online modes of instruction in higher education at Tribhuvan University. This study contributes to the current condition of e-resource mobilization and to the development of insight, strategy, or policy to mobilize e-resources to enhance effective instruction.

Method

Correlational research design is adapted, which is a non-experimental research method that observes and measures two or more variables without manipulating them (Creswell, 2014). It is the most popular and quite flexible research design. By designing research, specific dependent variables were specified, such as class participation phenomena, which were converted into quantitative data (Bryman, 2012; Creswell, 2012).

The target demographic of the study was Tribhuvan University master's degree holders who were enrolled in online courses during the COVID-19 epidemic. According to the Planning Division (2020), there are 5948 students enrolled in master's programs in education who also took part in online learning. Furthermore, the Kathmandu Valley was chosen to provide comfortable and thorough research. One of Nepal's most important and well-liked locations for higher education is the Kathmandu Valley. Thus, three campuses in the Kathmandu Valley were chosen.

To calculate the sample size, Slovin's formula was utilized. 374.8 samples were computed using the population size, the margin of error (0.05), and the confidence level (95%). Then, six and nineteen samples were added, respectively, because of the nonresponse and design impact. With the use of random selection, 400 pupils were chosen as a sample in the end.

To investigate how online teaching is accessed through information resources, mini-correlational research was carried out during the COVID-19 pandemic. The primary instrument is the semi-structured questionnaire that was used for four hundred students as a "large sample" (Kothari & Garg, 2015). Survey research is assisted by quantitative measures of engagement and classroom experience. If the instruments prove effective in measuring goals after testing, they will continue to exist in their ultimate form as surveys. This procedure made it easier to build and validate trustworthy tools.

This study's primary methodology, a non-standardized questionnaire, was administered once. The fundamental goal of this study, which was to preserve the scarcity of students' experiences and perspectives, was first justified with the aid of the subject instructor on campus. After that, questionnaires were given out, and respondents were asked to complete them honestly and collect them.

Functional relationships among categorical variables were analyzed by logistic regression through Stata 14. Logistic regression assists in understanding the contribution of each predictor (Jacob, 2017). According to Hogland et al. (2013), logistic regression is simple and the best way to analyze categorical data. So logistic regression is used to study multivariate analysis among dependent and independent variables. Most of the variables are categorized as binary forms with categorical scales. As Lamichhane (2012) states, it does not assume linearity in the relationship between each independent and dependent variable. Similarly, it does not require normally distributed variables.

The logistic regression equation is:

$$\text{logit} [\theta(x)] = \log [\theta(x) / 1 - \theta(x)] = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 + \dots + \beta_n X_n$$

Where $\text{logit} [\theta(x)] = \text{logit}$ of dependent variable

β = coefficient of the predictor (independent) variable

α = consent to the equation

$X_1, X_2,$ and X_n are independent (predictor) variables.

Logistic regression analysis presented the result in terms of the odds ratios (ORs). These are much easier parameters to interpret from the results (Lamichhane, 2012). To analyze logistic regression, the dependent variable was measured in a binary form such as yes or no with values 1 and 0, respectively, and the independent variables remained in categorical form, where the best method is logistic analysis (Jacob, 2017).

To analyze the utilization of e-resources, three models were used. The first model helps to find the direct impact of online class instruction on class participation, such as learning uses of information resources (dependent). Based on the effect of these variables, the study analyzes the effect on other socio-demographic variables such as gender, living with, learning technology, and so on. The third model included teaching and learning variables and socio-demographic variables, which remain control variables. It is useful to identify the net effect of online instruction.

This study is based on quantitative methods within a positivist philosophical framework. Data are archival data and data from causal-comparative research (Fraenkel, 2015). After coding, decoding, and entering them in the Stata program, and then analyzing the data with the help of software, To identify the relationship or effectiveness of online instruction, chi-square (χ^2) and logistic regression were used, respectively.

Results

Relationship Between Online Instruction and Information Resources

An information resource is measured based on access to the e-library with values of “yes” and “no.”. Online instruction, information resources, and socio-demographics are based on measurement.

Relationship Between Socio-Demographic and Information Resources

Table 1 shows that 24.07% of room holders and 26.67% of flat holder students have access to the e-library, while only 21.43% of their own household students have access to the e-library. Two-thirds of students have no access to online materials. Slightly higher percentages of flat holders have better opportunities for e-materials. Surprisingly, household students have limited access to online resources during the online mode of instruction. Similarly, students who live with friends have better opportunities (28.78%) to access the e-library for the collection of online materials, while 17.67% and 26.85% of parents and single-living students, respectively, have access to the e-library. By sharing friends’ experiences, students who live with friends have better opportunities for online resources. Unexpectedly, students who lived with parents have applied the limited e-resources. It might be that their parents have limited access to technology and proficiency in using online resources. Relationships between living with and accessing the e-library have significant associations.

Table 1 displays that students with participated in training to develop the online skills have better access (29.07%) to the online learning materials whereas students who did not participate have fewer (17.65%) opportunities. Participation in training programs was slightly more beneficial than using the e-library. Access to online resources has been slightly increased by training programs. Similarly, students who have better skills have utilized more (27.81%) opportunities for online information while students who have poor skills have cashed limited (12.28%) opportunities for online information. It indicates that good skills were facilitated to search for and manage online resources.

Table 1 *Distribution of Respondents by Socio-Demographics and Information Resources*

		Access to the E-library			χ^2
		No	Yes	Total	
Students living status	Rant Room	75.93	24.07	100	1.2253
	Flat	73.33	26.67	100.	
	Own house	78.57	21.43	100	
Living with	Friends	71.22	28.78	100	5.6060*
	Parents	82.35	17.65	100	
	Single	73.15	26.85	100	
Participation on training	No	77.39	22.61	100	1.5438
	Yes	70.93	29.07	100.	
Skill at technology	Poor	87.72	12.28	100	5.6392
	Normal	75.86	24.14	100	
	Good	72.19	27.81	100.	
Gender	Boys	72.80	27.20	100.	1.0207
	Girls	77.45	22.55	100	

Note *= $p < 0.05$, **= $p < 0.01$, ***= $p < 0.001$

On the other hand, only 22.55% of female and 27.2% of male students have access to the e-library. The rest of them (72% male and 77.45% female students) have no access to online materials. Gender has no direct effect on e-resources. It mainly depends on online learning skills and access to an e-library to facilitate learning. However, there are slightly higher opportunities for online resources utilized by boys.

Relationship between Information Resources and Online Instruction

Table 2 shows that one-fourth of students who used printed materials as instructional materials have accessed the e-library, whereas 30% and 18% of students who depended on websites, journals, and social networks, respectively, have access to the e-library. Comparatively, a higher proportion of website and journal users have access to the e-library. Surprisingly, social media user students are not more interested in collecting instructional information from the e-library.

About three-thirds of students who use software and human resources to translate information into their written language have no access to the e-library. It is a surprising issue in the online mode of instruction. Similarly, a slightly higher proportion (25.97%) of human resource user students have access to the e-library to collect the necessary information, while 25.23% of software user students have access to the e-library.

Table 2 denotes that mobile-user students have few opportunities (23.13%) to gather necessary information from the E-library while computer-user students have more opportunities (26.88%) to amass information. The rest of them have no access to the e-library. Nepalese students with master's degrees have limited access to the e-library. It is a critical condition for Tribhuvan University and its students in the context of the twenty-first century.

Table 2 Distribution of Respondents by Online Instruction and Information Resources

		Access to the E-library			χ^2
		No(%)	Yes(%)	Total	
Source of information	Printed	74.65	25.35	100	2.219
	Website and Journal	70.00	30.00	100	
	Social network	81.52	18.48	100	
Language Translation	By software	77.63	22.37	100	0.701
	Human	74.03	25.97	100	
Learning Instrument	Mobile	76.87	23.13	100	0.551
	Computer	73.12	26.88	100	
Selection criteria	Referenced by teacher	71.23	28.77	100	2.475
	E-materials	75.22	24.78	100	
	curriculum reference	81.19	18.81	100	

Note *= $p < 0.05$, **= $p < 0.01$, ***= $p < 0.001$

Table 2 illustrates that students who independently researched different types of information for websites and journals have a slightly higher proportion (24.78%) of access to the e-library than curriculum reference material users (18.81%). On the other hand, students who used teacher-referred materials utilized more (28.77%) opportunities for the e-library. Printed instructional materials for users Nepalese students pursuing master's degrees have limited access to the e-library.

It indicates that the majority of Nepalese students at Tribhuvan University have limited access to the e-library. They are more familiar with printed materials, which teachers refer to.

It might be limited awareness of e-resources, proficiency in technology, and access to online materials. However, some habits are being changed during the pandemic period.

Relationship between Online Instruction and Information Resources

Table 3 shows that most (80.05%) of unsatisfied holder students have no access to E-library to collect necessary information whereas only 15% of unsatisfied students have access. Similarly, three-fourths of students who were neutral toward the online mode of instruction during the pandemic period had no access to the e-library. About one-fourth of students have access. Thirty-two percent of satisfied students have access, while two-thirds have no access. It indicates that students who were satisfied with the online mode of instruction have more access than others. Relationships between the satisfaction of online instruction and access to the e-library have a strong and significant association. Satisfied students have huge access to information resources.

Table 3 shows that students with curriculum reference materials had the least opportunities (18%) for e-library, while the highest (28.77%) opportunities were gained by students with printed material. Similarly, one-third of e-materials users have access to the e-library. Based on selection criteria, two-thirds of students have no access to the e-library. So the concept of an e-library was not effectively implemented. Similarly, students who were not supported enough had the least opportunity (about 22%) for e-library, whereas 25% of students who were less supported by teachers had slightly more opportunity for e-materials. More than two-thirds of students were out of E-source. E-library has not been influenced by teachers' support.

Table 3 *Distribution of Respondents by Online Instruction and Information Resources*

		Access to the E-library			χ^2
		No	Yes	Total	
Satisfaction of online education	Unsatisfied	85.07	14.93	100	10.2053**
	Neutral	73.62	26.38	100	
	Satisfied	67.96	32.04	100	
Selection of materials	Printed	71.23	28.77	100	2.4751
	E-materials	75.22	24.78	100	
	Curriculum reference	81.19	18.81	100	
Support by teacher	No Support	77.27	22.73	100	0.4055
	Little support	74.90	25.10	100	
	Enough support	77.89	22.11	100	
Nature of support	Insufficient	78.84	21.16	100.	1.5799
	Sufficient	73.46	26.54	100	
	Not clear	72.84	27.16	100.	
Direction	Insufficient	76.43	23.57	100	4.5297
	Sufficient	77.16	22.84	100.	
	No feedback	83.65	16.35	100	
Feedback System	Individual	73.81	26.19	100	3.8499
	Group	73.11	26.89	100.	
	Poor	76.70	23.30	100	
Effectiveness of instruction	Neutral	72.36	27.64	100	
	Good	82.65	17.35	100	

Note *= $p < 0.05$, **= $p < 0.01$, ***= $p < 0.001$

Table 3 shows that 21% of students who were supported insufficiently have the fewest opportunities to collect information from the e-library, whereas 26.52% of students who were supported sufficiently have access to the e-library in slightly greater proportion. It indicates that learning support did not succeed in increasing access to e-resources. On the other hand, a slightly small proportion (4%) of the difference was seen between the not-clear direction and the insufficient and sufficient direction. Not-clear-direction holders were more benefited than others. About 23% of students who have sufficient and insufficient direction have fewer opportunities in the e-library, whereas 27% of students who have no clear direction have slightly better access. Online work clarity has no direct effect on e-resources.

Most students (83.65%) who did not receive feedback had no access to the E-library whereas 73% of students who received feedback individually or within groups had access to e-materials. More than one-fourth of students who received feedback individually or within groups have more access than those who did not receive it. Compared to those students with no feedback, feedback holders have more access to online resources. Similarly, two-thirds of students who were satisfied or not have no access to the e-library. On the other hand, the lowest proportion (17%) of students thought that online instruction was good to have access to the e-library, whereas 23% and 27.64% of poor and neutral perceptions, respectively, held that students have better access. Slightly more access was gained by neutral perception-holder students who did not have a good perception. Good perception is not a significant indicator of accessing online resources.

Relationship between Online Instruction and Information Resources

To measure the relationship between information resources and online instruction, three models were fitted in logistic regression. The first model is based on information resources; the second is information resources and online instruction, and the third is information resources, online instruction, and socio-demographic variables. Sources of information, language translation, learning instruments, and selection criteria remain information resources. Similarly, satisfaction with online education, selection of materials, support by teachers, nature of support, direction, feedback system, and effectiveness of instruction remain online instructional variables. Students' living status, living with, participation in training, skill at learning technology, and gender remain socio-demographic variables.

Table 4 displays that students who had followed the sources of the website and journal were 1.12 times more likely to be involved in the in the source of E-library compared to those whose learning sources were not E-library. Similarly, students who collected materials from social networks were 32% less likely (OR = 68) to be dependent on the e-library. In the comparison of software, students who used human resources to translate languages were 1.21 times more likely to be collected from the source e-library. Computer-user students were 1.23 times more likely to have participated in the source of an e-library in comparison to mobile-holder students. Furthermore, students who were dependent on the nature of the content to collect information were about 30 percent less likely to be involved with the with the source of an e-library in the first model.

Online instructional variables were included in Model II. All odds ratios were increased except for selection criteria for online materials, whereas online instructional variables remained control variables. Website and e-journal as an online resource of materials user students were 1.35 times more likely to be involved in the online resource of an e-library in Model II. It was slightly decreased in Model III, whereas it was 1.34 times more likely to be involved in the source of the e-library. Students who used human resources to translate information into their languages were 1.25 times more likely to have participated in the e-library. When online instruction and socio-demographic variables were included as a control

variable in Model III, it was slightly decreased. Only 1.15 times more likely to be involved in the e-library.

Unexpectedly, laptop-user students were five percent less likely to be involved in e-library in the model, which was fewer than in Model I. Similarly, it was decreased in Model III, where participants were about 30% less likely to have participated.

In Model II, a slightly smaller percent decreased in comparison to Model I. In the comparison of printed materials, students who followed the selection criteria of the nature of the content were 34% less likely to participate in the e-library. Unexpectedly, it decreased in Model III. Students who adopted the selection criteria of curriculum reference have less than fifty processes involved in the e-library. The condition of e-library users in Model II and Model III was poor.

Table 4 Adjust Odd Ratio (an OR) and 95% CI for Information Resources

Source of information		Model I			Model II			Model III		
		Odds	95% CI		Odds	95% CI		Odds	95% CI	
	Printed	1			1			1		
Source of selection information	Website and Journal	1.12	0.61	2.06	1.35	0.69	2.63	1.34	0.67	2.68
	Social network	0.68	0.38	1.23	0.78	0.41	1.47	0.84	0.43	1.66
Language translation	By software	1			1			1		
	Human	1.21	0.76	1.93	1.25	0.76	2.06	1.15	0.67	1.95
Instrument	Mobile				1			1		
	Computer	1.23	0.73	2.09	0.95	0.53	1.69	0.76	0.4	1.44
Selection Criteria	Referred by teacher			1			1			
	Nature of content	0.69	0.33	1.44	0.66	0.3	1.46	0.51	0.22	1.18
	Recommended by curriculum	0.81	0.4	1.61	0.68	0.33	1.42	0.51	0.24	1.12
Satisfaction of online education	Unsatisfied				1			1		
	Neutral				2.62*	1.38	4.98	3.11***	1.57	6.14
	Satisfied				3.47***	1.67	7.2	4.97***	2.24	11.1
Selection of materials	Printed				1			1		
	E-materials				0.82	0.43	1.58	0.76	0.38	1.52
Support by teacher	curriculum reference				0.55	0.25	1.19	0.51	0.23	1.15
	No Support				1			1		
	Little support				1.4	0.68	2.88	1.18	0.56	2.5
Nature of support	Enough support				1.13	0.47	2.71	0.99	0.41	2.41
	Insufficient				1			1		
	Sufficient				1.21	0.69	2.13	1.33	0.73	2.43
Direction of	No				1			1		

Source of information		Model I		Model II			Model III		
		Odds	95% CI	Odds	95% CI		Odds	95% CI	
assignment	Insufficient			0.76	0.39	1.48	0.86	0.43	1.73
	Sufficient			0.59	0.29	1.19	0.56	0.27	1.17
	No			1			1		
Nature of feedback	Individual			1.86	0.85	4.08	2.49*	1.08	5.75
	Group			1.67	0.87	3.21	1.98	0.99	3.94
Effectiveness of instruction	Poor						1		
	Neutral			1.12	0.61	2.07	1.01*	0.54	1.91
	Good			0.38	0.17	0.84	0.32	0.14	0.74
Students living status	Rant Room						1		
	Flate						2.05	0.86	4.84
Living with Participation on training	Own house						1.64	0.5	5.31
	Friends						1		
	Parents						0.32*	0.15	0.66
Skill at technology	Single						0.73	0.37	1.44
	No						1		
Gender	Yes						1.57	0.87	2.87
	Poor						1		
	Normal						3.46***	1.33	9.05
Gender	Good						3.85**	1.47	10.1
	Female						1		
_cons	Male						1.42	0.79	2.55
		0.38*	.19- .75	0.19*	0.05	0.74	0.08*	0.02	0.41

Note *= $p < 0.05$, **= $p < 0.01$, ***= $p < 0.001$, ref. = reference category

Discussion

The COVID-19 pandemic has had a profound impact on education, leading to a rapid shift from traditional face-to-face instruction to online learning. This paradigm shift has brought about numerous challenges and opportunities for students, educators, and educational institutions. While there are obstacles to overcome, online learning has the potential to transform education by making it more accessible, flexible, and personalized. However, limited access to online resources is the main challenge. Similarly, not all students have equal access to digital devices and competency in modern technology.

Believe that online learning provides access to a vast array of educational resources and materials that may not be available in traditional classrooms. Modern education accepts the claim of Ghavifekr and Rosdy (2015), who explained that one of the key elements in the effectiveness of technology-based teaching and learning is instructors who are well-prepared with ICT tools and resources. However, the majority of Nepalese students in higher education during the pandemic period had no access to online resources. About less than one-third of students have utilized online resources like the e-library. The majority of the students depend on printed materials, which are preferred by class teachers and more familiar to them. It might be done due to a lack of accessibility and nuance in the digital world.

Students who have more access to online resources, such as the e-library, websites, interactive learning modules, and multimedia content, tend to be more engaged and satisfied with their learning experience. These resources can provide students with more flexibility, personalized learning, and opportunities for collaboration. However, diversified problems of the online mode of instruction, such as lack of social interaction, low level of proficiency in technology, instability of the network, and low level of access to online resources (Coman et al., 2020; Khanal, 2020), have a crucial role in poor performance. Among them, online resources are one of the significant issues for better performance, which is far from Nepalese students.

By providing constructive suggestions, feedback might help them identify the areas where they need to improve. This information can then be used to guide users to the online resources that are most likely to be helpful. As a result, they have acquired more opportunities for online resources for career development. Fruitful feedback has unfolded more opportunities for better searching and studying information from different fields of information. Consistency results were found by Gopal et al. (2021, p. 19) that the expectations of students, timely feedback, course design, and the support of teachers all have a beneficial impact on how satisfied students are with their online education.

Online resources encompass a wide range of digital tools and materials available on the internet. These resources can include educational websites, interactive simulations, videos, online courses, and virtual learning platforms. Effective learning has created better opportunities for online resources because of the potential of digital tools to enhance teaching methods, provide access to information, facilitate interactive learning, enable collaboration, support personalized learning, and offer flexibility. As Li et al. (2022) clarified, through the use of instructional interactions, students may adjust their learning to fit their cognitive structure by exchanging information with teachers, peers, and learning resources. By integrating online resources with effective instruction, students may create more engaging and effective learning experiences in online environments. It helps students enhance their perspectives. Effective instruction is understood by utilizing different sources of information and improving engagement in academic development.

Journals and websites are reliable sources of information for better knowledge enhancement. The majority of students conducted studies with the support of these resources. It is followed by many students who participate in online modes of instruction. It also supports students in utilizing different e-resource materials. However, social media has not succeeded in increasing insights into e-resources. Students who are involved in social media like Facebook, Instagram, and WhatsApp are less likely to acquire information from online resources. The use of social media in academic learning has not increased due to a lack of awareness and academic practice. As mentioned by Marone et al. (2018), if "distractive multitasking" on social media platforms is unrelated to academic work, it can result in lower grade-point averages and worse overall academic performance.

On the other hand, learning an instrument like the computer, teachers' support, guidance, and participants in training have not provided significant opportunities for utilizing e-resources. Learning technology and proficiency have created slightly more opportunities. However, it does not play a significant role in increasing accessibility to e-resources. Unexpectedly, teachers' support, work direction, and guidance in online work were not fruitful in developing habits or insight into searching different materials for online resources. Roddy et al. (2017) claims are not matched within this study. They asserted that monitoring student progress, responding to questions, and building rapport are all parts of online teacher assistance, which improves both the quality of the online learning environment and the efficacy

of the instructors (Roddy et al., 2017). In the Nepalese context, non-significant teachers' roles were found in terms of online resource utilization. Why has this situation occurred? It is a critical issue for further study and investigation.

Conclusion

During the pandemic period, survival is a main focus due to mental stress, illness, and health security. On the other hand, educational systems are shifting from face-to-face to online without any preparation. In this context, the study found that the majority of students have limited access to online resources for information. Social media and online resources are not becoming fruitful online modes of instruction. Among them, significantly higher proportions of satisfaction and positive perceptions of students with online instruction are applied to e-resources effectively. Unexpectedly, feedback systems, teachers' guidance, and support systems in online instruction are not effective in utilizing information resources.

References

- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods, International edition*. Oxford University Press.
- Coman, C., Țiru, L. G., Meseșan-Schmitz, L., Stanciu, C., & Bularca, M. C. (2020). Online teaching and learning in higher education during the coronavirus pandemic: Students' perspective. *Sustainability*, 12(24), Article 24. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su122410367>
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conduction and evaluating, quantitative and qualitative research* (4th Ed.). SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design, qualitative, quantitative and mixed method approaches*. Sage publication.
- Eze, S. C., Chinedu-Eze, V. C., & Bello, A. O. (2018). The utilisation of e-learning facilities in the educational delivery system of Nigeria: A study of M-University. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 15(1), 34. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-018-0116-z>
- Fraenkel, J. R. (2015). *How to design and evaluate research in education (9th Ed.)*. NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Ghavifekr, S., & Rosdy, W. A. W. (2015). Teaching and learning with technology: Effectiveness of ICT integration in schools. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, 2(1), 2015175–2015191.
- Gopal, R., Singh, V., & Aggarwal, A. (2021). Impact of online classes on the satisfaction and performance of students during the pandemic period of COVID-19. *Education and Information Technologies*, 26(6), 6923–6947. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10523-1>
- Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., & Aaron Bond, A. (2020, March 27). *The difference between emergency remote teaching and online learning*. <https://er.educause.edu/articles/2020/3/the-difference-between-emergency-remote-teaching-and-online-learning>
- Hogland, J., Billor, N., & Anderson, N. (2013). Comparison of standard maximum likelihood classification and polytomous logistic regression used in remote sensing. *European Journal of Remote Sensing*, 46(1), 623–640. <https://doi.org/10.5721/EuJRS20134637>
- Jacob, A. (2017). Modelling speech emotion recognition using logistic regression and decision trees. *International Journal of Speech Technology*, 20(4), 897–905. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10772-017-9457-6>

- Jensen, J., Smith, C. M., Bowers, R., Kaloi, M., Ogden, T. H., Parry, K. A., Payne, J. S., Fife, P., & Holt, E. (2022). Asynchronous Online Instruction Leads to Learning Gaps When Compared to a Flipped Classroom. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 31(6), 718–729. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-022-09988-7>
- Khanal, P. (2020). Lived experience of online teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic: Implications for curriculum and teaching. *Interdisciplinary Research in Education*, 5(1–2), Article 1–2. <https://doi.org/10.3126/ire.v5i1-2.34738>
- Lamichane, K. D. (2012). *Women's autonomy and utilization of mental health care services in Nepal* [Unpublished Thesis of Master of Philosophy]. Tribhuvan University.
- Li, X., Lin, X., Zhang, F., & Tian, Y. (2022). What matters in online education: Exploring the impacts of instructional interactions on learning outcomes. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.792464>
- Marone, J. R., Thakkar, S. C., Suliman, N., O'Neill, S. I., & Doubleday, A. F. (2018). Social media interruption affects the acquisition of visually, not aurally, acquired information during a pathophysiology lecture. *Advances in Physiology Education*, 42(2), 175–181. <https://doi.org/10.1152/advan.00097.2017>
- Mothibi, G. (2015). A meta-analysis of the relationship between e-learning and students' academic achievement in higher education. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(9), 6–10.
- Skopec, C. (2020, May 21). *The 7 biggest higher ed technology challenges schools are facing amidst COVID-19*. Collegis Education — Tech-Enabled Higher Ed Solutions. <https://collegiseducation.com/news/technology/higher-ed-technology-challenges-covid-19/>
- Ulum, H. (2022). The effects of online education on academic success: A meta-analysis study. *Education and Information Technologies*, 27(1), 429–450. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10740-8>