Scholars' Journal
ISSN: 2645-8381
Published by Scholars' Association of Nepal
A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed, Open Access Journal
DOI : https://doi.org/10.3126/scholars.v5i1.55801
https://www.nepjol.info/index.php/scholars

Perception towards Online and Face to Face Learning

Deb Bahadur Chhetri
Dhawalagiri Multiple Campus, Baglung
Email: devchhetri010@gmail.com

Article History: Received: 29 Sep, 2022; Revised: 20 Nov, 2022; Accepted: 22 Nov, 2022

Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic scenario suspended educational activities. The traditional face-to-face educational model was replaced by an online one. The online mode of instruction has been adopted by higher education institutions. The direct conversation was broken off. To understand the justification for continuing the online method in higher education in the context of Nepal, it is reasonable to examine how both students and teachers feel about face-to-face learning that is done online. For the present study mixed method study design was adopted aimed to identify the perception of faculties and students at the university level towards online learning. Only 119 students and 44 faculties of the Tribhuvan University of Nepal were surveyed based on accidental sampling through the questionnaire. Only 6 students and 6 faculties were included in the focus group discussion.The perception of students and faculties was identified through the Likert-type scale and focus group discussion. Faculties have experienced stressful, painful, transformative experiences toward online learning. However, students have experienced effective, enjoyable experiences except for connectivity problems and less interactive environments towards online learning.From the comparative perspective,the perception of faculty members includes the lack of students' participation in the learning process, inactivity and difficulty to expose on the screen for a long time.

***Keywords*:** Online learning; perception; face-to-face learning; distance education

Introduction

The face-to-face or physical learning style was facing unmatched difficulties during the global COVID-19 pandemic. To maintain social distance and avoid the gathering of

large groups, global health norms were announced.The majority of educational institutions were temporarily quarantined. Education institutions were directly affected by this scenario. But to contact teachers and students, universities all around the world, including Nepal, used social media and online communication technologies. Due to the lack of an online learning management system teachers have used technology-enabled mediums to host free webinars and started to instruct their students. Nearly all higher education institutions used the online teaching-learning model during the continuing COVID-19 worldwide pandemic.A relatively small number of institutions worldwide have been adopting online learning on a systematic basis outside of the pandemic crisis. It is a relatively new concept from a modern perspective. Different universities around the world have been using online learning, However, one of the first instances of online learning in the world can be traced back to 1960, at the University of Illinois, USA(Kentnor, 2015). Despite various challenges and advantages, online learning is still going on in the world and is spreading around the world.

There is no long history of distance education. However, Nepal has been practising distance education by using different modalities. Besides traditional distance education, colleges of distance education and online studies offer different degree programs in open and distance learning in Nepal since 2002(Pangeni, 2016). By following open and distance learning modalities Kathmandu university started online learning through the open and distance learning program in 2011(Pangeni, 2016). Nepal Open University has launched an online mode educational program systematically. Due to the ongoing pandemic of COVID-19, most educational institutionsin Nepal started the online mode of instructiondespite the lack of a formal online management system.

The online mode of instruction has been used by several universities in Nepal, including Nepal Open University, Tribhuvan University, and Kathmandu University, both before and after the pandemic emergency. They have been using the double mode, face-to-face and online in their program. In this context, different views can be found about the mode of learning.

Online and face-to-face are considered two major modes of instruction this mode of instruction are not only the single factors to determine the effectiveness of learning but other complex factorsinfluencing the teaching-teaching-learning process(Almahasees et al., 2021). In the online mode of teaching the rate of motivation is low, computer skill is high the working capacity is moderate, Thus conventional face-to-face teaching is important(Basar et al., 2021). Besidesthe lack of social connection online process of teaching is beneficial not only duringthe pandemic period but also at other times(Rawashdeh et al., 2021).

Online learning is showing great potential for addressing jobholder students' requirements. Beyond this positive component of online learning, significant concern about its efficacy and teacher-student satisfaction in making selections about further programs is emerging. The purpose of this research was to investigate the circumstances surrounding the Nepalese Tribhuvan University.

There are mixed types of experiences about efficacy and logic linking its advantages and disadvantages with how teachers and students feel about face-to-face and online learning, according to previous literature.In the international contexts found in developed countries, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic years, the previous research results demonstrated varied types of results in online learning and face-to-face learning. In the context of Nepal, sufficient studies can't be found to explain the faculty's and students' experience with face-to-face and online learning.

The main aim of this study was to identify the perception of faculties and students toward online learning and face-to-face learning. Based on these objectives research focused to answer the research questions: (1)what perceptions do the faculties and students have towards online learning in comparison to face to face to learning? (2) Do the students have the same perception of online learning and face-to-face learning? (3) Does the perception toward online learning differ across gender, ecological region and geographical region? (4) How do faculties and students experience online learning and face-to-face learning? For the statistical testing purpose, research hypotheses were made: H_1: The students' perception towards online learning and face-to-face learning differ significantly; H_2: The students' perception towards online learning and face to learning differs across gender, ecological regions and geographical regions.

Literature Review

On the perception of online and face-to-face learning, various research findings may be found. This section provides a summary of earlier researchers' work on the considered issue.

Online learning and Face to Face Learning

Comparatively, online learning is a new mode of instruction in comparison of face to face learning. Online learning has beneficial aspects. Lower costs, high accessibility and flexibility, rapid exchanges between teachers and students, opportunities for students to perform other activities while undertaking their studies and lower levels of stress are considered such advantages(Almahasees et al., 2021). The researchers pointed out the disadvantages of online learning; internet connection, broadband issues, low attention

level of the participants' loss of sense of belonging, isolation, loss of motivation, and poor communication (Zhang et al., 2006). The determinant factors to impact arethe effectiveness of online learning, and some of the design of e-learning platforms, and convenience of learning asynchronous and synchronous learning materials, instructors' characteristics(Curelaru et al., 2022).

The challenging aspect of online teaching-learning is to maintain the quality that is provided by face to the face education process. The main objective of online is to preserve the same quality of education as conventional face-to-face instruction while using online methods and platforms(Holden et al., 2021). This is very complex and challenging to achieve since online learning requires a completely different learning environment. From the perspective of social presence, social interaction and satisfaction about learning face-to-face learning are more beneficial rather than online learning but it is statistically insignificantly different in learning preferences(Bali & Liu, 2018).

Likewise,in the above-mentioned manner,numerous studies have been carried out in this field focusing on the advantages and disadvantages of e-learning vas face to face learning(Noorulhasan et al., 2017). Direct interaction, closed relationships, and a social environment is the advantages of face-to-face learning and the high cost, and unable to break geographical or other barriers are disadvantage of face-to-face learning. However, learning from own place and flexibility are advantages of online learning and detachment from a physical visit tothe college hasthe limitation of learning(Kokawa et al., 2012). According to the research conducted by Bhagat et al.(2021), the public hasa positive attitude towards online learning during the pandemic.

The aforementioned literature focused on face-to-face learning due to its advantages however, online learning becomes a beneficial alternative to learning. It is considered that these results are helpful to analyze the result and extracted themes that were made from the research.

Students and faculties' perceptions towards online and face-to-face learning

The similarity in the perception of faculties and students that flexibility of time, place, material and more organized documentation are the beneficial aspect of online learning(Firmansyah et al., 2021). Moreover, the learning allowed making thought about transformational aspects. It is a more remarkable advantage of online learning that both are required for faculties and students in the technological era(Yuhanna et al., 2020). Scholars claim that the teachers' role supportin online learning,increases the students' perception and their activeness in online learning(Kulal & Nayak, 2020). The struggle with focusing on the screen for a long period, and the lack of well-established connectivity is a major

common problems faced by the faculties and students(Almahasees et al., 2021;Firmansyah et al., 2021). Another study reports that poor connectivity, low participation, lack of enough interaction, and initiative context delivery were felt during online learning(Rijal, 2022). Besides the flexibility and more freedom for connectivity e-learning promotes being a self-regulated learner (Curelaru et al., 2022). Thus both modes of instruction have advantages and disadvantages.(Kokawa et al., 2012). According to the research conducted by Bhagat et al.(2021), the public hasa positive attitude towards online learning during the pandemic. Technological issues are the most important, followed by teachers' lack of mechanical skills and their teaching style improperly adapted to the online environment. However, the last place was assigned by students to the lack of interaction with teachers or poor communication with them(Coman et al., 2020).

The current trend is to promote the students as self-regulated learners and it provides resources such that they can study according to their desire. The concept of open and distance learning focuses on providing, quality education through the e-learning modality.

Theory of Connectionism

The theory of connectionism is a relatively new theory which advocates the integration of technology in teaching-learning. Technology is an important part of the learning process and our constant connectedness gives us opportunities to make choices about our learning(Banan et al., 2020). The learning and knowledge rest ona diversity of options. The technological advantages can be adopted to make learning meaningful with multiple alternatives(Keller & Utecht, 2019).This theory allowed online learning as a strong tool for collaboration and connection with the learning community. Learners can engage from one place through the internet for collaborative learning.This theory is considered to analyze the finding of the study.

This theory claims that people have the chance to join cooperative study groups, which may encourage them to choose online learning as a beneficial platform. Faculty members can also create expert groups for further professional work and select online learning as a new area of study. This theory directs the creation of the questionnaire by using its presumptions and examining the outcomes to see if they conflict with our surroundings.

Methods and Procedures

This study was guided by the pragmatist research paradigm. The mixed method research design was followed to conduct the study. Convenience sampling including 119 students and 44 faculties of Tribhuvan University, Nepal were used in this study.The online survey form was used to collect the data at first. Opinionnaire was attached to write about

their experience regarding online learning and face-to-face learning.The prepared Likert-type scale and legionnaire were sent from online mode via email. The link was shared in messenger and Facebook also.

The focus group discussion was used to gather qualitative data. Students and faculty members were both requested to voluntarily participate in the focus group discussion. After the request was granted and consent was obtained, a focus group was held. First, the group was given a wide question about the effectiveness of online learning, along with its benefits and drawbacks, and asked to discuss it based on personal experience. A mobile device was used to record the conversation.

The numerical data were analyzed by using descriptive statistics, especially percentages, mean was calculated. The t-testand ANOVA test were performed to find the answer to the second and third research. The procedures of thematic analysis include familiarizing oneself with data, creating codes, searching themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing reports(Braun & Clarke, 2006; Dakduk & Gonzalez, 2019).These procedures served as a guide for the transcription of the focus group conversation record into text. The opinion survey responses and the transcribed data were examined and classified separately. By looking for comparable patterns of views, these codes were aggregated and recorded. Recorded data were used to create themes, which were then given names for interpretation. The exact themes were returned to the participants for verification of their responsesat the time of the focus group discussion. A combination of thematic coding(Flick, 2002) and constant comparative methods havebeen used to analyze the qualitative information. The triangulation method was used to make the finding.

The Likert-type survey tool was used to collect the data from students. The Validity of the scale was established by expert judgment. The Cronbach's alpha of the perception scale was found to be more than 0.80, which ensures the reliability of the tools(Bonett & Wright, 2015). The validity of tools for the teacher also ensure by expert judgment.

To verify dependability and validity, the researcher uses the definition of "trustworthiness" set forth by(Guba & Lincoln, 1989). Credibility, transferability, dependability, and conformability were the four criteria that Guba and Lincoln used to assess the worth of a realistic study. They represent, in turn, the concepts of objectivity, reliability, external validity, and interior validity. To ensure trustworthiness the prepared text form of group discussion and theme were judged by the participants.

Results and Discussion

The result of the study was arranged into two parts.The first parts include the quantitative data and its result and the second part includes the qualitative information gathered from focus group discussion and opinionnaire.The overall analysis arranges into result and discussion sections.

Results

In this study, among the participants, more than two third were female and the rest were male. The respondents reported that they had education, management humanities and science and technology steam. The respondent's information was shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Demographic information of students(n=119)

Categories		n	Percentage
Gender			
	Male	41	34.5
	Female	78	65.5
Faculties			
	Education	62	52.2
	Management	53	44.5
	Humanities	2	1.7
	Science	2	1.7
Ecological region			
	Hilly	70	58.8
	Terai	49	41.2
Geographical Location			
	Rural	47	39.5
	City	35	29.4
	Bazaar	37	31.1

Advantages and Disadvantages of online learning

The participants have been allowed to vote on the given five options of advantages and disadvantages of online learning. They were allowed to vote on more than one option. The result is shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Advantages and disadvantages of online learning (n=119)

Items (Advantages of online learning)	N	Percentage
Learning from one place	83	69.7
Access the material in the online mode	37	31.1
Self-motivated learning	44	37
Interacting in the class	21	17.6
Ability to record the meeting	35	29.4
Disadvantages of online learning		
Technical problems in learning	105	88.2
Lack of interaction	36	30.3
Lack of motivation	27	22.7
Poor learning conditions at home	32	26.9
Lack of self-discipline	16	13.4
Isolated from college	22	18.5

As participants reported, learning from their place has more advantages. Interaction can be found on disadvantages but the vote on that option was less than one-third of the total respondents. Therefore, online interaction can be made more interactive than the traditional mode of learning. Among the purposed advantages of online learning, students have felt that connectivity was the main issue that discourage online learning. The general voice heard by the researcheris that "Online learning can't motivate learning" but in this option, comparatively the vote in motivation in the advantage section was more than in the disadvantages section. There the ground voice is not true as claimed in public speaking.

Students' perception of online learning from a different perspective

Increasing knowledge, increasing self-confidence and getting mastery of subject matter were considered the three perspectives to measure the students' perspective. The students' perception rate on that perspective was recorded as shown in table 3. The indicators 1= extremely ineffective, 2= ineffective, 3= somewhat effective, 4= very effective, and 5= extremely effective.

In the given statements extremely ineffective and ineffective were in the negative direction of each perspective and the rest were in the positive direction. Based on this the rate of view was categorized into two directions which were as shown in Table 4.

Table 3

Students' perception of effectiveness of online learning (n=119)

Indicators	Percentage distribution				
	1	2	3	4	5
Effectiveness of online learning in terms of increasing the knowledge	7.6	11.8	49.6	13.4	17.6
Effectiveness of online learning in terms of Increasing the self-confidence	8.4	13.4	39.5	24.4	14.3
Effectiveness of online learning for getting Mastery in subject matter	9.2	16	43.7	19.3	11.8

Table 4

The Direction of students' perception toward online learning

Indicators	Percentage distribution	
	Vote in a negative direction	Vote in a positive direction
Effectiveness of online learning in terms of increasing knowledge	19.4	80.6
Effectiveness of online learning in terms of increasing self-confidence	21.8	78.3
Effectiveness of online learning for getting mastery in subject matter	25.2	74.8

The majority of perception inclinations in perspective were found to be in a positive direction. More than two-thirdsof participants have perceptions in a positive direction. Hence the students' perception towards online learning is positive.

Comparison of Students' perception towards face-to-face and online learning

In general, it is assumed that students' perception of face-to-face learning is more than online learning. The five-point Likert-type scale was used to measure the perception. The average of the two modes of learning is shown in Table 5.

Table 5

The mean of indicator on both mode of learning

Online learning perception indicator	Mean	SD
Rate the effectiveness of e-learning in terms of increasing knowledge	3.2	1.1
rate the effectiveness of online learning in terms of increasing self-confidence in the subject matter	3.2	1.1
Rate the effectiveness of online learning in terms of increasing mastery of your subject matter	3.1	1.1
The total mean of online perception indicator	3.17	0.94
Face-to-face learning perception indicators		
Rate the effectiveness of traditional face-to-face learning in terms of increasing knowledge	3.4	1.2
Rate the effectiveness of traditional face-to-face learning in terms of increasing concept and understanding of the content of your subject	3.3	1.1
The total mean of face-to-face learning indicators	3.33	1.04

The averages of perception towards online learning and face-to-face learning are in scale. The assumption of normality was checked and found to be valid on both variables. After the fitting of the assumption for the parametric test the paired sample t-test was carried out to test the difference in perception in traditional and online learning. The result (in Table 6) showed that $t_{(118)} = -1.69$ with 95% confidence level with $p= 0.092 > 0.05$.

Table 6

Perception comparison

Categories	n	Mean	Mean difference	t	Sig
Perception of online	119	3.18	0.32	-1.698	0.092
Perception of face-to-face	119	3.33			

Thus, the difference was statistically insignificant. Thus the students' perception towards online learning and face-to-face learning is similar in terms of gaining knowledge and effectiveness of teaching-learning.

The ANOVA and independent t-test were carried out to check the significant difference towards online learning across the geographical region and ecological regions. The test result was as shown in Table 7.

Table 7

Multiple comparison of perception across demographic variables

Category		n	M	Statistics	Sig
	Male	41	3.36	t=0.28	
	Female	78	3.07		0.11
Ecological Region					
	Hill	70	3.25	t=0.19	
	Terai	49	3.06		0.26
Geographical Location					
	City	35	3.31		
	Bazzar	37	3.2	F= 1.5	0.227
	Rural	47	2.92		

An independent t-test was performed to test the gender deference and differences across ecological regions. ANOVA was carried out to test the possible difference across the geographical locations. The t-test result across gender showed that $t_{(117)} = 0.28$, at 95 % confidence level, with p= 0.11> 0.05, hence the difference was statistically insignificant. Similarly, independent t-test results over ecological region showed that that $t_{(117)} = 0.19$ at 95 % confidence level, with p= 0.26 > 0.05, hence the difference was statistically insignificant. The ANOVA test result over the geographical region showed that $F_{(2,116)} = 1.5$ at 95 % confidence level, with p= 0.22>0.05, hence the perception towards online learning across the geographical region was statistically insignificant.

Thus, the perception level towards online learning across gender, ecological region and the geographical region was found to be statistically insignificant.

Faculty's perception toward online learning

In the accidental sampling, only 44 university teachers/faculties were included in the sample. The socio-demographic information of the respondents was as shown the table 8.

Table 8

Socio-demographic characteristics of faculties

Categories		N	Percentage
Gender	Male	40	90
	Female	4	9
Designation			
	Professor	3	6.8
	Associate professor	1	2.2
	Lecturer	25	56.8
	Assistant lecturer	5	11.5
	Part-time faculties	10	22.7

Table 9

Faculty's perception toward online Learning

Dimensions	Classification	N	Percentage
Do you have experience with online teaching before COVID- 19	Yes	4	9
	No	40	91
Which apps do you use for online teaching			
	Teams	25	56.8
	Zoom	16	36.4
	Messenger	0	0
	Google Meet	3	4.6
	other	00	00
What is your major feeling about online teaching at the beginning of the pandemic			
	Stressful	25	56.8
	Enjoyable	4	9
	Satisfactory	15	34.2
What lacks do you feel in online teaching			
	Problem in connectivity	44(in 44)	100
	Students' inactive presence	20(in 44)	45.45
	Physical paining	25(in 44)	58.6
	other	00	00

What do you feel about online teaching in comparison of face to face learning	Passive learning	28	63.64
	No remarkable difference	3	6.82
	just for job	5	11.36
	Panic teaching	6	13.64
	joyful teaching	2	4.55

Table 8 shows that majority of the faculties were male from the gender perspective. From the designation perspective, the majority of the participants were lecturers, covering more than half of the total participants. The general information on the faculties' perception was as shown in table 9.

The result shows that almost faculties among 44 didn't have online teaching experiences before the pandemic. More than half of the faculties used Microsoft teams for online teaching. Zoom was found in the second position. A negligible number of faculties were found to be using Google meet. However other apps were not prescribed by the respondent. More than half of the faculties feel stress at the beginning of online teaching which leads to a negative perception towards online teaching. All the participant faculties felt the connectivity problem during online teaching. More than half of the faculties felt the physical pain from online teaching. The comparison indicators show that participants' perception on face to face learning is more than online teaching because more than 60 % felt online teaching was passive learning and joyful and no remarkable difference in options vote was found to be negligible.

The Qualitative inquiry Result

The focus group discussion was conductedwith the participants about their perception toward online learning. The major question was the same as in the survey but it was more open to the participants. The following theme was extracted from the interview.

Students' perception toward online learning

Six students participated in the focus group discussion. The extracted theme was made as below.

Theme 1: Online learning is effective; however, its effectiveness or failure depends on how teachers and students are held accountable.

The efficiency of online learning was the first topic of discussion. It was discovered that the participants' opinions on efficacy were not unqualified. They saw how teaching-learning effectiveness deepened in how students and teachers are accountable for their jobs and tasks that are significant. This version of the summary is similar to the research finding that intention of use, service quality, and method of instruction affect the perception of online learning(Perera & Abeysekera, 2022). Among the six participants, almost all of them agreed that online teaching is effective except for the exceptional case. Participant A said, "We need to prepare the required things for online then the class become effective, if don't prepare our device and book as well it may create irritation". This saying is supported by the slaying of Student C, "In the physical class also becomes disruptive when teacher and students don't manage the class, it is our responsibility" In this view other participants also agreed.

Theme 2: Online learning is effective as face-to-face learning.

Online learning is not only joyful during the time of pandemic but also at other times. It beautiful aspect is learning from one place by saving time for direct visiting and money for long travelling and contact. A says "In my feeling, the effectiveness of online learning is not different from traditional learning, it is our traditional thought, both have a strong and weak point." Student D said "Online learning is effective if we use systematic learning technology handled by well-trained teachers and provide training for students" The sense of this saying was connected with the previous research finding that, for students who lived in remote areas, online learning was a practical and effective method of meeting their educational demands.(Ijaz Hussain et al., 2020). According to these perspectives, there is no distinction between online and face-to-face learning.

Theme 3: Connectivity problems, promoting laziness and comparatively high cost for preparationare major weaknesses of online learning

The conversation in the focus group highlighted the advantages and disadvantages of both online and in-person learning. During focus group talks, issues with bandwidth, device management, and training for teachers and students were discovered to be the biggest challenges. **"**We feel easy and free in-room /home to preparation which promotes the lazy habit- C" in that time A said " role breakersin learning at university level break themselves, need to feel it" " a humorous situation was created. Student E said"high const device and arrangement learning device discourage the students of the low-income family" The above theme is supported by the student saying. The pointed problem is similar to the finding of ("Problems of Online Classes," 2020).

Faculty perception toward online learning

Six faculty members of the university teacher were included in the focus group discussion. The following themes were extracted from the discussion.

Theme 1: Online teaching is stressful at the beginning and becomes familiar gradually

The faculty members who did not have experience in online teaching they feel stressedat the beginning of online teaching. However, they followed their profession withdifficulty andstruggle with accessing efficient methods of continuing professional growth in addition to the enormous obligations currently placed on their work(Hertz et al., 2022). B said, "In the beginning stage online teaching was very panic and stressful; however, regular practice makesit easy to regulate the class". Similarly, A said "the initial stage makes me panic and stressful about online teaching and I felt it is not good it only drama of teaching, but after practice it was good" D said "it forces me to learn technology."These views indicate starting is a struggle, but can learn slowly and succeed for the faculties professional development to fulfil the new emergency demand.

Them2: Online instruction is passive and encourages psychological isolation.

Most of the faculties didn't have experience with online teaching. They believe that online learning is an alternative but better is face to face learning. The interaction between students and teachers is important for productive learning but interaction in cyberspace may poor. This view was similar to the view that Online learning can lead to feelings of dissatisfaction and loneliness, which must be addressed if it is to be productive(Gouseti, 2011). In the discussion, B said "better is face-to-face learning because, it is required to control and convince first-year university students, online teaching makes them passive" Participant D said, " regular online teaching makes my body pain. " This view was focused on the drawback of online learning which may be the voice struggle for families with onlinelearning. In this sense,the teacher felt a struggle situation in online teaching.

Discussion

From the result of qualitative and quantitative studies, students have positive perceptions toward online learning. The main advantage of online learning was found to be learning from home. This finding is also supported by the theme of previous the study(Firmansyah et al., 2021). The students and faculties agreed with the case that online teaching learning made them IT-friendly, this finding was supported by both the data. This finding is similar to the claim of Online learning allowed one to make thoughts on transformational aspects is a more remarkable advantage of online learning that both are required for faculties and students in the technological era(Yuhanna et al., 2020, Bhagat

et al., 2021). Teaching learning was not only the factor for making learning effective and ineffective, it is based on the teacher and student role. This theme is similar to the theme found by Kulal & Nayak (2020). The teacher experienced that panic and struggle situation in online teaching. The finding of the quantitative result was also supported by the qualitative discussion. This finding is similar to the theme that struggles with focusing on the screen for a long period, the lack of well-established connectivity is a major common problem faced by the faculties and students(Almahasees et al., 2021; Firmansyah et al., 2021). Both students and teachers felt that the connective problem is a major problem in online teaching-learning. This finding is similar to the finding of the previous finding (Bhagat et al., 2021; Coman et al., 2020, Rijal, 2022).

In this study, Students were found to be more inclined toward the theory of connectionism claiming that technology is an important part of the learning process and that our constant connectedness gives us opportunities to make choices about our learning(Banan et al., 2020). Faculties were found to be supportive of the fact but had a poor inclination to adopt the practical application given by this theory but the findings of quantitative data have deviated in group discussion. In quantitative data faculties, inclinations toward online were poor but in qualitative, they reported that besides some disadvantages it not neglecting the mode of teaching. The perception of online learning across gender, ecological region, and the geographical region was statistically insignificant.

Conclusion

The university students felt that online learning is a new innovative mode of learning. However, faculties were more interested in face-to-face teaching rather than online teaching. It provides the facility of learning from home. The effectiveness of online learning is based on the activities and rules adopted and accepted by the tutors and students. The mode of learning does not impact the effectiveness of teaching-learning because university students are aware of their learning which is major for determining the effectiveness.
The teachers' presentations and arrangement of subject matter determine the activeness and passiveness of learning. Both teachers and students have a remarkable role. Gender, ecological region and geographical locations have no significant role to shape the perception towards online learning.This study covers only a small sample and a small area of online learning. Despite this limitation, the result of the study may be useful to those persons who are trying to conduct online learning. This study suggestsconductinga study on how to make online learning effective from the perspective of teachers and students.

References

Almahasees, Z., Mohsen, K., & Amin, M. O. (2021). Faculty's and Students' Perceptions of Online Learning During COVID-19. *Frontiers in education*, *6*(May), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.638470

Bali, S., & Liu, M. C. (2018). Students' perceptions toward online learning and face-to-face learning courses. *Journal of physics: Conference series*, *1108*(1). https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1108/1/012094

Banan, S., Ridwan, M., & Adisaputera, A. (2020). A study of connectionism theory. *Budapest international research and critics institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and social sciences*, *3*(3), 2335–2342. https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v3i3.1181

Basar, Z. M., Mansor, A. N., Jamaludin, K. A., & Alias, B. S. (2021). The effectiveness and challenges of online learning for secondary school students - A case study. *Asian journal of university education*, *17*(3), 119–129. https://doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v17i3.14514

Bhagat, K. K., Mishra, S., Dixit, A., & Chang, C. Y. (2021). Public opinions about online learning during covid-19: A sentiment analysis approach. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *13*(6), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13063346

Bonett, D. G., & Wright, T. A. (2015). Cronbach's alpha reliability: Interval estimation, hypothesis testing, and sample size planning. *Journal of organizational behaviour*, *36*(1), 3–15. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1960

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology; in qualitative research in psychology. *Uwe Bristol*, *3*(2), 77–101. http://eprints.uwe.ac.uk/11735

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 (Switzerland)*, *12*(24), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.3390/su122410367

Curelaru, M., Curelaru, V., & Cristea, M. (2022). Students' Perceptions of Online Learning during COVID-19 Pandemic: A Qualitative Approach. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *14*(13), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14138138

Dakduk, S., & González, Á. (2019, March 27). *Analyzing focus groups data: The consumption of media in the digital era*. Analyzing focus groups data: The consumption of media in the digital era; SAGE Publications, Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526494726

Firmansyah, R., Putri, D. M., Wicaksono, M. G. S., Putri, S. F.,& Widianto, A. A. (2021). The university students' perspectives on the advantages and disadvantages of online learning due to COVID-19. *Proceedings of 2nd annual management, business and economic conference (AMBEC 2020)*, *183*(Ambec 2020), 120–124. https://doi.org/10.2991/aebmr.k.210717.025

Flick, U. (2002). *An introduction to qualitative research*. SAGE.

Gouseti, A. (2011). Online communication and collaboration: A reader. *Evaluation and research in education*, *24*(2), 159–160. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500790.2010.547016

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth-generation evaluation*. Sage Publications.

Hertz, B., Grainger Clemson, H., Tasic Hansen, D., Laurillard, D., Murray, M., Fernandes, L., Gilleran, A., Rojas Ruiz, D., & Rutkauskiene, D. (2022). A pedagogical model for effective online teacher professional development—findings from the teacher academy initiative of the European commission. *European journal of education*, *57*(1), 142–159. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12486

Holden, O. L., Norris, M. E., & Kuhlmeier, V. A. (2021). Academic integrity in online assessment: A research review. *Frontiers in education*, *6*(July), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.639814

Ijaz Hussain, I. H., Saeed, R. M. B., & Syed, A. F. (2020). A Study on effectiveness of online learning system during COVID-19 in Sargodha. *International journal of language and literary Studies*, *2*(4), 122–137. https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v2i4.404

Keller, D.,& Utecht, J. (2019). Becoming relevant again: Applying connectivism learning theory to today's classrooms. *Critical questions in education*, *10*(2), 107–119. https://www.edx.org/,

Kentnor, H. (2015). *Curriculum and teaching dialogue*. *17*(1), 22–34. https://digitalcommons.du.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1026&context=law_facpub

Kokawa, T., Nomura, S., Fukuroi, T., & Yasunaga, K. (2012). Students' perceptions on incorporating e-learning into teaching and learning at the university of Ghana. *International journal of educational and development using information and communication technology (IJEDICT)*, *8*(1), 91–103. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1423-0410.1993.tb05162.x

Kulal, A., & Nayak, A. (2020). A study on the perception of teachers and students toward online classes in Dakshina Kannada and Udupi district. *Asian association of open universities journal*, *15*(3), 285–296. https://doi.org/10.1108/AAOUJ-07-2020-0047

Noorulhasan, Q., Muhammad, A., Sanober, S., Rafik, M., & Shah, A. (2017). A mixed method study for investigating critical success factors (CSFs) of e-learning in Saudi Arabian universities. *International journal of advanced computer science and applications,8*(5), 171-178. https://doi.org/10.14569/ijacsa.2017.080522

Pangeni, S. K. (2016). Open and distance learning: Cultural practices in Nepal. *European journal of open, distance and e-Learning*, *19*(2), 32–45. https://doi.org/10.1515/eurodl-2016-0006

Perera, R. H. A. T., & Abeysekera, N. (2022). Factors affecting learners' perception of e-learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Asian association of open universities journal*, *17*(1), 84–100. https://doi.org/10.1108/AAOUJ-10-2021-0124

Venkataraman,S.(2020). Problem of online classes.*International journal of academic research reflector*, *9* (6), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.13573550

Rawashdeh, A. Z. Al, Mohammed, E. Y., Arab, A. R. Al, Alara, M., & Al-Rawashdeh, B. (2021). Advantages and disadvantages of using E-learning in university education: Analyzing students' perspectives. *Electronic Journal of E-Learning*, *19*(2), 107–117. https://doi.org/10.34190/ejel.19.3.2168

Rijal, D. (2022). Students' perception on the effectiveness of online classes during pandemic. *The EFFORTS, journal of education and research*, *4*(1), 81–101. https://doi.org/10.3126/ejer.v4i1.44173

Yuhanna, I., Alexander, A., & Kachik, A. (2020). Advantages and disadvantages of online learning. *Journal educational verkenning*, *1*(2), 13–19. https://doi.org/10.48173/jev.v1i2.54

Zhang, D., Zhou, L., Briggs, R. O., & Nunamaker, J. F. (2006). Instructional video in e-learning: Assessing the impact of interactive video on learning effectiveness. *Information and management*, *43*(1), 15–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2005.01.004