# IMPLEMENTING E- LEARNING PRACTICES AND INTEGRATION OF TECHNOLOGY AT HIGHER EDUCATION LEVEL IN PAKISTAN: PROBLEMS AND POTENTIALS

By

<sup>1</sup>Romena Ali, <sup>2</sup> Prof. Dr. Khalid Khurshid, <sup>3</sup>Vagiha Naz

### Abstract

E-learning is a developed and modern form of classroom instructions based educations in which students and teachers interact with one another through the most advance technology based visual instruments. In this context, e-learning is quite different from traditional way of learning and partially from online or distance learning. The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of students and find out the problems and potentials regarding Implementation of E-Learning Practices and Integration of Communication and Technology at Higher Education level in Pakistan. Most relevant and latest theory of connectivism was applied in this study. The researcher adopted mixed methodology and qualitative and quantitative data was collected through multi stage sampling technique. Total population of the selected public and private universities from five divisions of Punjab-Pakistan were fifty nine thousand one hundred and five (59105) students. In order to get the exact sample size for this study, three hundred and ninety seven (397) students were selected through stratified sampling technique. After data collection, the Quantitative and Qualitative Data Analysis were done through SPSS v.20 and Nvivo v.10 respectively. Findings of this study show that the private universities' students are comparatively at better level of perception regarding e-learning practices and its potentials than public universities. Findings of the qualitative analysis revealed that the students of both public and private universities consider the lack of resources, communication gap and technical skills as major issues towards implementing elearning practices. Further, the findings of this research also highlights a great potential of e-learning practices, if adopted, at higher education level for enhancing critical thinking, positive perception, technical skills, less time consuming, cost reducing, result-orienting and innovative learning to compete the international universities in quality education. The researcher recommends for providing e-learning resources, technical training as well as better communication skills among students and teachers through technology integration in classrooms to remove perceptional, conceptual and practical flaws towards e-learning practices at higher education level in Pakistan.

**Keywords:** Integration of Technology, E-learning, Classroom Instructions, Practices, Technology Education

# Introduction

As technology grows, there are many ways that it can be applied to different things. Education is no different. There are many technological advances that have changed the



world of education in the 21st century. Knowing about these advancements and the impact they have on education around the world will show just how essential technology is for education. These different technology uses in the class room have a vast impact on the overall education of students around the world. Bicak (2019) stated that in this globalized world, information technology has positive impact on the development of society by the production of new technologies. Today, the emerging societies are just based on science and technology. Due to the development in recent years, there have been seen reforms in education and instructional technology became the part of modern education.

Additionally, with the continued development of societal demand and the continued improvement of educational technology, educational institutions need to succeed their students and find solutions to the problems they face (Schols & Bottema, 2014). There are many types of technologies from simple to complex and are used for different purposes in our learning environment. Over time, science and technology have evolved, such as projectors, visual equipment, smart devices, computers, as well as the latest technical devices, especially smart boards, to make the learning process more efficient (Raby & Meunier, 2011).

For this reason, students at higher education level promote their knowledge through self-learning. The students of today are blessed with the facilities that are provided to them by technology. Technology opens new prospects for traditional education. It also expands learning experiences outside the classroom (Nasir, 2017). Another concept generated among learners since last 2-dcades which is well known as "e-learning" (Laurillard, 2013). Students usually use various kinds of technologies in their learning process through e- learning approach. E-learning has played a key role and introduced new ideas in learning and teaching process (Altameem, 2013).

Essentially, the latest trend in higher education is a new e-learning platform which enabled students to access various learning content through the electronic ways. The main drivers of this trend are changing teaching conditions, the demographic development of the students and technological innovations (Shivetts, 2011). Education structure around the world is integrating information and communication technologies to improve the student's learning experience. It was important to explore the positive contribution of e-learning in education. Indeed, e-learning is the learning that a person gets through the use of electronic media with the use of internet. In E-learning learner learns on his own pace according to his interest



(Susanti & Ayuni, 2018). Hence, Surry and Stanfield (2017) found that the technology based instructional education may have many barriers, for example, students' competence, infrastructure of technology, satisfaction and motivation of instructors. As an effective as the technology is, it makes little sense if it is not used properly. Many universities are failed due to high costs, poor strategies, intense competition, poor academic performance, and resistance to change.

In general, Pakistan is facing the challenge of e-learning integration because of the low literacy rate and little investment on education by government. So, Tusubira et al., (2013) explained that investment in infrastructure, content development and training of IT staff members are up to the mark to implement successfully of e-learning. Student frustration with using e-learning is often because of late feedback. More investigation is required to examine the students' opinions and preferences regarding e-learning. In order to be able to use e-learning based education, reasonable facilities must be available in the organization. Gulati (2013) described that the insufficient resources are major issues with using e-learning. Compared to developed countries, developing countries spend more on higher education. Despite of this, developing countries spend fewer resources on per student as compared to developed countries. Furthermore, Farid et al., (2018) concluded that universities around all over the world integrating ICT in education to enhance learning experience of students (Joshi & Vaidya, 2013). Higher education facilities are increasing for uplifting the socio-economic condition of the people. The Government of Pakistan is establishing IT infrastructure for the enhancement of digital learning in the country. Moreover, the HEC administers are enhancing and encouraging not only research activities but also higher education in the country as well.

Therefore, the aim of this study was to determine the effective use of e-learning based education in higher education institutions and find out potentials of technology integration as well as problems in e-learning during the classroom instructions. The useful practices of these technologies in teaching and learning process are very necessary. It develops interest and motivates students to learn. Through e-learning with the help of several instructional methods such as lecture notes, supporting materials, classroom activities, recorded videos, written reports, exercises, formative assessments, and quizzes enhance effective learning. Today effective learning is possible due to the use of advance technologies. Pakistan is far away in e-teaching and e-learning in classrooms than other developed countries. A very few



researches was found on this study in the current literature. Therefore, the researcher decided to conduct research on the use of e-learning based education in higher education to create technological enhanced learning environment in public and private universities in Pakistan. This research is able to recommended strategies for supporting educational institutions to resolve the identified problems in order to save time, skills and resources in the future because e-learning can have a positive impact on education.

### **Statement of the Problem**

The researcher has reviewed the previous studies (Rusman 2016;Santos and Miguel 2019) which show a great debate among the researchers regarding traditional vs e-learning methods in education through which it was found that technology based learning has a great potential than traditional education. Although a few researchers (Hussain, 2012; Jawaid, et al., 2013; Shah & Salman, 2016) tried to analyze distance/online learning in Pakistan at higher level education, but especially in Punjab, a high-populated area of Pakistan, there's still no investigation has been done to address e-learning based education in classroom perspective along-with its problems and potentials. Therefore, the researcher decided to select this topic to examine the students' perceptions regarding the practices of e-learning that are perceived by Pakistani public and private universities to establish e-learning based education as a useful tool for improving academic performance.

### **Objectives of the Study**

In the light of above research background, the following objectives of the study are set out;-

- To identify the students' perceptions regarding the e-learning practices of public and private universities.
- 2. To identify the problems faced by the students regarding the use of e- learning practices in public and private universities.
- 3. To identify the difference in public and private universities perceptions about the use of e-learning at higher education level.
- 4. To suggest the potentials of e-learning based education for students in public and private universities.

### Significance of the Study

This study is based on e-learning which is proved more preferable, useful, and most up-todate and result oriented method than traditional way of learning and teaching in education especially at higher education level in the world. Hence this study will be very significant for



the under-development countries like Pakistan which is left behind in quality education and innovations. This study addresses the perceptions, issues and potentials of students regarding e-learning based education at higher education level in Pakistan. Therefore, this study will be very useful for policy makers to address real and actual features of e-learning at higher education level. The present study might be valuable to other higher education institutions that face issues in their effort to support teaching and learning with technology in the classroom. This research will also be helpful for the Government to implement this concept in nearer future throughout the Pakistan.

# **Research Methodology**

In this research study, quantitative and qualitative mix method research was used. For quantitative and qualitative data collection, close-ended and open-ended statements were used through survey method for seeking the existing perception among students about use of e-learning based education in higher education institutions and about the issues and future potentials in public and private sector universities in Pakistan. Total population of this study was calculated as fifty nine thousand one hundred and five (59105) students of public and private universities of Punjab, Pakistan. In quantitative research, Proportional allocation is recommended to evaluate sample size in case of large population through stratified sampling technique. The overall proportional allocation sampling size was calculated three hundred and ninety seven (397) students.

# Date Analysis Quantitative Data Analysis

Table 1: Responses to Technology Accessibility

| Item | Statement                  | - <b>G</b> , | SA    | Ā     | UN    | D     | SD    | Total  | Mean | SD    |
|------|----------------------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|------|-------|
| 1    | My University Public       | Count        | 47    | 56    | 35    | 47    | 75    | 260    | 2.51 | 1.491 |
|      | provides me                | %            | 11.8% | 14.1% | 8.8%  | 11.8% | 18.9% | 65.5%  |      |       |
|      | access to e Private        | Count        | 53    | 22    | 21    | 21    | 20    | 137    | 2.75 | 1.500 |
|      | books via                  | %            | 13.4% | 5.5%  | 5.3%  | 5.3%  | 5.0%  | 34.5%  |      |       |
|      | website rather Total       | Count        | 100   | 78    | 56    | 68    | 95    | 397    | 2.95 | 1.528 |
|      | than in the<br>library     | %            | 25.2% | 19.6% | 14.1% | 17.1% | 23.9% | 100.0% |      |       |
| 2    | E-learning <b>Public</b>   | Count        | 49    | 55    | 36    | 57    | 63    | 260    | 2.26 | 1.350 |
|      | resources are              | %            | 12.3% | 13.9% | 9.1%  | 14.4% | 15.9% | 65.5%  |      |       |
|      | placed in <b>Private</b>   | Count        | 19    | 49    | 35    | 16    | 18    | 137    | 2.77 | 1.516 |
|      | classrooms as              | %            | 4.8%  | 12.3% | 8.8%  | 4.0%  | 4.5%  | 34.5%  |      |       |
|      | well as in the Total       | Count        | 68    | 104   | 71    | 73    | 81    | 397    | 2.43 | 1.428 |
|      | labs/Library of university | %            | 17.1% | 26.2% | 17.9% | 18.4% | 20.4% | 100.0% |      |       |



| 3 | My classroom learning | Public         | Count % |       | 58<br>14.6% | 32<br>8.1% | 70<br>17.6% | 56<br>14.1% | 260<br>65.5% | 2.49 | 1.318 |
|---|-----------------------|----------------|---------|-------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|------|-------|
|   | environment is        | Private        | Count   |       | 51          | 21         | 13          | 18          | 137          | 2.65 | 1.421 |
|   | connected to          |                | %       | 8.6%  | 12.8%       | 5.3%       | 3.3%        | 4.5%        | 34.5%        |      |       |
|   | internet              | Total          | Count   | 78    | 109         | 53         | 83          | 74          | 397          | 2.91 | 1.419 |
|   |                       |                | %       | 19.6% | 27.5%       | 13.4%      | 20.9%       | 18.6%       | 100.0%       |      |       |
| 4 | Different uses        | <b>Public</b>  | Count   | 43    | 54          | 44         | 61          | 58          | 260          | 2.66 | 1.396 |
|   | of technology         |                | %       | 10.8% | 13.6%       | 11.1%      | 15.4%       | 14.6%       | 65.5%        |      |       |
|   | helped me             | <b>Private</b> | Count   | 36    | 36          | 24         | 21          | 20          | 137          | 2.77 | 1.408 |
|   | during the            |                | %       | 9.1%  | 9.1%        | 6.0%       | 5.3%        | 5.0%        | 34.5%        |      |       |
|   | classroom             | Total          | Count   | 79    | 90          | 68         | 82          | 78          | 397          | 2.97 | 1.421 |
|   | instructions          |                | %       | 19.9% | 22.7%       | 17.1%      | 20.7%       | 19.6%       | 100.0%       |      |       |
| 5 | Digital Library       | <b>Public</b>  | Count   | 37    | 23          | 29         | 105         | 66          | 260          | 2.74 | 1.225 |
|   | helps me a lot        |                | %       | 9.3%  | 5.8%        | 7.3%       | 26.4%       | 16.6%       | 65.5%        |      |       |
|   | in my                 | <b>Private</b> | Count   | 38    | 35          | 12         | 25          | 27          | 137          | 3.01 | 1.421 |
|   | Learning              |                | %       | 9.6%  | 8.8%        | 3.0%       | 6.3%        | 6.8%        | 34.5%        |      |       |
|   |                       | Total          | Count   | 143   | 101         | 41         | 62          | 50          | 397          | 2.99 | 1.428 |
|   |                       |                | %       | 36.0% | 25.4%       | 10.3%      | 15.6%       | 12.6%       | 100.0%       |      |       |

Table 1 reveals that the students of private universities have better technology accessibility in their classroom as compare to the students of public universities. Further, the highest total mean value 2.99 shows the strongest factor of digital library is the major source of information which is mostly used by the students for e-learning regarding technology accessibility while the lowest total mean value 2.43 reveals the weakest factor of less availability of E-learning resources in classrooms.

**Table 2: Responses towards Perceived Usefulness** 

| Item | Statement       |                |       | SA    | A     | UN    | D     | SD    | Total  | Mean | SD    |
|------|-----------------|----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|------|-------|
| 1    | E-learning      | Public         | Count | 53    | 44    | 40    | 66    | 57    | 260    | 2.74 | 1.520 |
|      | promotes an     |                | %     | 13.4% | 11.1% | 10.1% | 16.6% | 14.4% | 65.5%  |      |       |
|      | active learning | <b>Private</b> | Count | 41    | 29    | 18    | 22    | 27    | 137    | 3.12 | 1.453 |
|      | experience for  |                | %     | 10.3% | 7.3%  | 4.5%  | 5.5%  | 6.8%  | 34.5%  |      |       |
|      | the students    | Total          | Count | 94    | 73    | 58    | 88    | 84    | 397    | 2.99 | 1.485 |
|      |                 |                | %     | 23.7% | 18.4% | 14.6% | 22.2% | 21.2% | 100.0% |      |       |
| 2    | I am interested | Public         | Count | 55    | 44    | 41    | 66    | 54    | 260    | 2.63 | 1.435 |
|      | in learning my  |                | %     | 13.9% | 11.1% | 10.3% | 16.6% | 13.6% | 65.5%  |      |       |
|      | course with the | <b>Private</b> | Count | 41    | 31    | 24    | 20    | 21    | 137    | 3.08 | 1.450 |
|      | help of E-      |                | %     | 10.3% | 7.8%  | 6.0%  | 5.0%  | 5.3%  | 34.5%  |      |       |
|      | learning "      | Total          | Count | 96    | 75    | 65    | 86    | 75    | 397    | 2.92 | 1.459 |
|      |                 |                | %     | 24.2% | 18.9% | 16.4% | 21.7% | 18.9% | 100.0% |      |       |
| 3    | The students    | Public         | Count | 60    | 46    | 29    | 61    | 64    | 260    | 2.68 | 1.485 |
|      | who use         |                | %     | 15.1% | 11.6% | 7.3%  | 15.4% | 16.1% | 65.5%  |      |       |
|      | electronic-     | <b>Private</b> | Count | 41    | 33    | 15    | 25    | 23    | 137    | 2.75 | 1.523 |
|      | library and     |                | %     | 10.3% | 8.3%  | 3.8%  | 6.3%  | 5.8%  | 34.5%  |      |       |
|      | electronic-     | Total          | Count | 101   | 79    | 44    | 86    | 87    | 397    | 2.95 | 1.521 |



|   | learning resources are getting better education than those who do not |                | %     | 25.4% | 19.9% | 11.1% | 21.7% | 21.9% | 100.0% |      |       |
|---|---|----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|------|-------|
| 4 | E-learning  | Public         | Count | 52    | 45    | 29    | 68    | 66    | 260    | 2.66 | 1.467 |
|   | provide quality   |                | %     | 13.1% | 11.3% | 7.3%  | 17.1% | 16.6% | 65.5%  |      |       |
|   | of learning   | <b>Private</b> | Count | 40    | 34    | 20    | 19    | 24    | 137    | 2.83 | 1.490 |
|   | more than   |                | %     | 10.1% | 8.6%  | 5.0%  | 4.8%  | 6.0%  | 34.5%  |      |       |
|   | traditional   | Total          | Count | 92    | 79    | 49    | 87    | 90    | 397    | 3.01 | 1.502 |
|   | classroom<br>learning   |                | %     | 23.2% | 19.9% | 12.3% | 21.9% | 22.7% | 100.0% |      |       |
| 5 | I am self-  | <b>Public</b>  | Count | 25    | 76    | 33    | 75    | 51    | 260    | 2.72 | 1.194 |
|   | motivated to  |                | %     | 6.3%  | 19.1% | 8.3%  | 18.9% | 12.8% | 65.5%  |      |       |
|   | use e-learning  | <b>Private</b> | Count | 13    | 69    | 13    | 28    | 14    | 137    | 2.91 | 1.311 |
|   |   |                | %     | 3.3%  | 17.4% | 3.3%  | 7.1%  | 3.5%  | 34.5%  |      |       |
|   |   | Total          | Count | 38    | 145   | 46    | 103   | 65    | 397    | 3.03 | 1.291 |
|   |   |                | %     | 9.6%  | 36.5% | 11.6% | 25.9% | 16.4% | 100.0% |      |       |

Table 2 reveals that the students of private universities have better perception of technology usefulness in their classroom as compare to the students of public universities. Further, the highest total mean value 3.03 shows the strongest factor of self-motivation of students to use e-learning which depends on their perceived usefulness while the lowest total mean value 2.92 reveals the weakest factor of less interest of students to use E-learning resources in classrooms.

**Table 3 Responses to Problems** 

| <b>ItemStatement</b> |                   |                     | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | Total  | Mean | SD    |
|----------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|--------|------|-------|
| 1                    | I face Pu         | ıblic Count         | 46     | 53    | 15        | 122    | 23    | 260    | 2.89 | 3.126 |
|                      | electricity       | %                   | 11.6%  | 13.4% | 3.8%      | 30.7%  | 5.8%  | 65.5%  |      |       |
|                      | issues in the Pr  | <b>rivate</b> Count | 30     | 13    | 5         | 16     | 72    | 137    | 2.37 | 1.170 |
|                      | use of e-         | %                   | 7.6%   | 3.3%  | 1.3%      | 4.0%   | 18.1% | 34.5%  |      |       |
|                      | learning To       | tal Count           | 76     | 125   | 20        | 138    | 36    | 397    | 2.55 | 2.637 |
|                      |                   | %                   | 19.1%  | 31.5% | 5.0%      | 34.8%  | 9.1%  | 100.0% |      |       |
| 2                    | I have lack of Pu | iblic Count         | 17     | 74    | 103       | 39     | 26    | 260    | 3.01 | 2.073 |
|                      | competency        | %                   | 4.3%   | 18.6% | 25.9%     | 9.8%   | 6.5%  | 65.5%  |      |       |
|                      | in the use of Pr  | <b>rivate</b> Count | 10     | 32    | 47        | 30     | 16    | 137    | 2.11 | 2.858 |
|                      | e-learning        | %                   | 2.5%   | 8.1%  | 11.8%     | 7.6%   | 4.0%  | 34.5%  |      |       |
|                      | To                | tal Count           | 27     | 106   | 150       | 69     | 42    | 397    | 2.98 | 2.813 |
|                      |                   | %                   | 6.8%   | 26.7% | 37.8%     | 17.4%  | 10.6% | 100.0% |      |       |
| 3                    | There is lack Pu  | ıblic Count         | 157    | 54    | 10        | 9      | 25    | 260    | 3.19 | 4.946 |
|                      | of                | %                   | 39.5%  | 13.6% | 2.5%      | 2.3%   | 6.3%  | 65.5%  |      |       |
|                      | Infrastructure Pr | <b>rivate</b> Count | 14     | 30    | 4         | 8      | 78    | 137    | 3.02 | 0.993 |
|                      | in the            | %                   | 3.5%   | 7.6%  | 1.0%      | 2.0%   | 19.6% | 34.5%  |      |       |
|                      |                   |                     |        |       |           |        |       |        |      |       |



|   | institution to            | Total          | Count | 235   | 84    | 14    | 17    | 39    | 397    | 3.08 | 3.020 |
|---|---------------------------|----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|------|-------|
|   | use e-learning            |                | %     | 59.2% | 21.2% | 3.5%  | 4.3%  | 9.8%  | 100.0% |      |       |
| 4 | Unavailability            | <b>Public</b>  | Count | 46    | 148   | 13    | 29    | 24    | 260    | 3.05 | 2.138 |
|   | of internet               |                | %     | 11.6% | 37.3% | 3.3%  | 7.3%  | 6.0%  | 65.5%  |      |       |
|   | facilities                | <b>Private</b> | Count | 26    | 68    | 6     | 20    | 14    | 137    | 2.51 | 3.767 |
|   | creates                   |                | %     | 6.5%  | 17.1% | 1.5%  | 5.0%  | 3.5%  | 34.5%  |      |       |
|   | difficulty in             | Total          | Count | 72    | 216   | 19    | 49    | 38    | 397    | 3.01 | 2.077 |
|   | the use of e-<br>learning |                | %     | 18.1% | 54.4% | 4.8%  | 12.3% | 9.6%  | 0.3%   |      |       |
| 5 | Ineffective               | <b>Public</b>  | Count | 134   | 39    | 43    | 7     | 37    | 260    | 3.27 | 3.700 |
|   | training                  |                | %     | 33.8% | 9.8%  | 10.8% | 1.8%  | 9.3%  | 65.5%  |      |       |
|   | becomes                   | <b>Private</b> | Count | 75    | 14    | 27    | 3     | 16    | 137    | 2.44 | 2.690 |
|   | problem for               |                | %     | 18.9% | 3.5%  | 6.8%  | 0.8%  | 4.0%  | 34.5%  |      |       |
|   | me in the use             | Total          | Count | 10    | 53    | 70    | 209   | 53    | 397    | 2.87 | 3.020 |
|   | of e-learning             |                | %     | 2.5%  | 13.4% | 17.6% | 52.6% | 13.4% | 100.0% |      |       |
| 6 | I find it                 | <b>Public</b>  | 4     | 136   | 32    | 24    | 61    | 3     | 260    | 2.08 | 1.883 |
|   | difficult to              |                | 1.0%  | 34.3% | 8.1%  | 6.0%  | 15.4% | 0.8%  | 65.5%  |      |       |
|   | learn in the              | <b>Private</b> | 12    | 34    | 12    | 1     | 75    | 3     | 137    | 1.97 | 1.793 |
|   | class with the            |                | 3.0%  | 8.6%  | 3.0%  | 0.3%  | 18.9% | 0.8%  | 34.5%  |      |       |
|   | help of E-                | Total          | 36    | 95    | 44    | 5     | 211   | 6     | 397    | 2.01 | 3.453 |
|   | learning                  |                | 9.1%  | 23.9% | 11.1% | 1.3%  | 53.1% | 1.5%  | 100.0% |      |       |

Table 3 reveals that the students of private and public universities face same problems for e-learning in their classroom. Further, the highest mean value 3.08 shows the major problem of lack of Infrastructure to use e-learning in classroom instructions. The second problem, which shows mean value 3.01, is unavailability of internet facilities during classroom instruction that creates difficulty in the use of e-learning in both private and public universities. The third problem has mean score 2.98 which reveals that the lack of competency towards use of technology among the students of both private and public universities may cause their less use of e-learning during classroom instructions. The fourth problem which got mean scores 2.87 shows ineffective training that creates technical hurdles for the students in the use of e-learning. The fifth problem which got mean scores 2.55 shows lack of electricity and the sixth problem which got mean scores 2.01 shows that the students of both private and public universities found it difficult to learn in the class with the help of E-learning.

**Table 4 Responses to Potentials** 

| Iter | nStatemer | nt        |       | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never | Total | Mean | SD    |
|------|-----------|-----------|-------|--------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|------|-------|
| 1    | Using     | e- Public | Count | 14     | 72    | 70        | 81     | 23    | 260   | 1.91 | 1.200 |
|      | learning  |           | %     | 3.5%   | 18.1% | 17.6%     | 20.4%  | 5.8%  | 65.5% |      |       |



|   | technology Private       | Count | 31    | 35    | 35        | 22     | 14    | 137     | 2.80 | 1.294 |
|---|--------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|---------|------|-------|
|   | is a good                | %     | 7.8%  | 8.8%  | 8.8%      | 5.5%   | 3.5%  | 34.5%   |      | 1,2,  |
|   | idea during <b>Total</b> | Count |       | 107   | 105       | 103    | 37    | 397     | 2.49 | 1.164 |
|   | classroom                |       |       |       | 26.40/    | 25.00/ | 0.20/ | 100.00/ |      |       |
|   | learning                 | %     | 11.3% | 27.0% | 26.4%     | 25.9%  | 9.3%  | 100.0%  |      |       |
| 2 | I think <b>Public</b>    | Count | 5     | 33    | 27        | 171    | 24    | 260     | 2.55 | 1.036 |
|   | using e-                 | %     | 1.3%  | 8.3%  | 6.8%      | 13.1%  | 6.0%  | 65.5%   |      |       |
|   | learning is Private      | Count | 3     | 95    | 14        | 11     | 14    | 137     | 2.62 | 1.043 |
|   | a trend                  | %     | 0.8%  | 23.9% | 3.5%      | 2.8%   | 3.5%  | 34.5%   |      |       |
|   | during <b>Total</b>      | Count | 8     | 266   | 41        | 44     | 38    | 397     | 2.59 | 1.039 |
|   | learning                 | %     | 2.0%  | 67.0% | 10.3%     | 11.1%  | 9.6%  | 100.0%  |      |       |
| 3 | The e- <b>Public</b>     | Count | 89    | 19    | 23        | 50     | 79    | 260     | 2.66 | 1.274 |
|   | learning                 | %     | 22.4% | 4.8%  | 5.8%      | 12.6%  | 19.9% | 65.5%   |      |       |
|   | technology Private       | Count | 67    | 44    | 8         | 8      | 10    | 137     | 3.10 | 1.073 |
|   | will be                  | %     | 16.9% |       | 2.0%      | 2.0%   | 2.5%  | 34.5%   |      |       |
|   | compatible Total         | Count | 117   | 123   | 31        | 97     | 29    | 397     | 2.95 | 1.331 |
|   | with the                 | %     | 29.5% | 31.0% | 7.8%      | 24.4%  | 7.3%  | 100.0%  |      |       |
|   | smart                    |       |       |       |           |        |       |         |      |       |
|   | devices I                |       |       |       |           |        |       |         |      |       |
|   | use during               |       |       |       |           |        |       |         |      |       |
|   | learning                 |       |       |       |           |        |       |         |      |       |
| 4 | I plan to <b>Public</b>  |       |       | 23    | 27        | 5      | 172   | 260     | 2.53 | 1.015 |
|   | use for e-               | %     | 8.3%  | 5.8%  | 6.8%      | 1.3%   | 43.3% |         |      |       |
|   | learning <b>Private</b>  |       |       | 96    | 14        | 11     | 13    | 137     | 2.60 | 1.033 |
|   | technology               | %     | 0.8%  | 24.2% |           | 2.8%   | 3.3%  | 34.5%   |      |       |
|   | during <b>Total</b>      | Count |       | 268   | 41        | 44     | 36    | 397     | 2.58 | 1.026 |
|   | learning                 | %     | 2.0%  | 67.5% |           | 11.1%  | 9.1%  | 100.0%  |      |       |
| 5 | I would <b>Public</b>    | Count |       | 72    | 18        | 101    | 23    | 260     | 1.99 | 1.328 |
|   | recommend                | %     | 11.3% | 18.1% |           | 25.4%  | 5.8%  | 60.7%   |      |       |
|   | using e- Private         |       |       | 43    | 5         | 6      | 16    | 137     | 2.10 | 2.863 |
|   | learning                 | %     | 16.9% | 10.8% |           | 1.5%   | 4.0%  | 39.3%   |      |       |
|   | technology Total         | Count | 112   | 115   | 23        | 107    | 39    | 397     | 2.72 | 2.500 |
|   | during                   | %     | 28.2% | 29.0% | 5.8%      | 27.0%  | 9.8%  | 100.0%  |      |       |
|   | learning                 |       | , .   |       | _ , _ , _ |        |       |         |      |       |

Table 4 reveals that the students of private universities consider e-learning has a better level regarding potentials as compare to the students of public universities. Further, the highest mean value 2.95 shows the strongest factor in which students of private and public universities are more likely to use e-learning technology if it compatible with the smart devices which are easily accessible during learning while the lowest mean value 2.49 reveals the weakest factor in which students don't think that using e-learning technology is a good idea during classroom learning.

**Qualitative Data Analysis** 

**Table 5: Three Main Issues Regarding E-Learning Practices** 



|         | Issues   | Code  | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------|--|-------|-----------|------------|
| Public  | Lack of Resources (Devices, Electricity, Internet) | LR    | 33        | 28.70%     |
|         | Lack of Interest and Motivation                    | LI    | 16        | 13.91%     |
|         | Online Management System                           | OMS   | 8         | 6.96%      |
| Private | Communication Gap                                  | CG    | 28        | 24.35%     |
|         | Technical Skill                                    | TS    | 14        | 12.17%     |
|         | Time   | T     | 12        | 10.43%     |
|         | Cost   | C     | 4         | 3.48%      |
|         |  | Total | 115       | 100%       |

The above table is showing the highest frequency (33, 28.70%) regarding the Lack of Resources (compatible/updated Devices, Electricity short fall and non-availability of Internet etc.) Which means lack of resources is the major issue for students not to adopt e-learning practices in the public universities. While, according to the students of private universities, communication gap by scoring (28, 24.35%) which means communication gap among students and teachers creates hurdle for e-learning during classroom instructions which are main issues for students to adopt e-learning practices.

**Table 6: Three Main Suggestions Regarding E-Learning Practices** 

|         | Suggestions   | Code  | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------|---|-------|-----------|------------|
| Public  | Provision of Resources (Devices, Electricity, Internet) | PR    | 7         | 33.33      |
|         | Increase Technical Skill                                | ITS   | 3         | 17.29      |
|         | Free of Cost Facilities                                 | FCF   | 2         | 9.52       |
|         | Online Management System                                | OMS   | 1         | 4.76       |
| Private | Increase Interest and Motivation                        | IIM   | 4         | 19.05      |
|         | Time Management   | TM    | 3         | 11.29      |
|         | Fill Communication Gap                                  | FCG   | 1         | 4.76       |
|         |   | Total | 21        | 100.00     |

The above table is showing the highest frequency (7, 33.33%) regarding the provision of resources (compatible/updated Devices, Electricity short fall and non-availability of Internet etc.) which means the provision of resources related to e-learning are suggested. While Increase Interest and Motivation (4, 19.05%) was mainly suggested by the students of private universities to adopt e-learning practices.

Table 7: Three Main Differences between E-Learning and Traditional Learning

|        | Suggestions                    | Code | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------|--------------------------------|------|-----------|------------|
| Public | Traditional learning is better | TL   | 61        | 52.14      |



|         | Technical skills are required for e-learning | TS    | 16  | 13.7   |
|---------|--|-------|-----|--------|
|         | e-learning is better                         | EB    | 4   | 4.71   |
| Private | e-learning is same as distance learning      | DL    | 28  | 22.64  |
|         | e-learning is based on technology            | ET    | 6   | 5.1    |
|         | e-learning is cheaper than traditional       | EC    | 2   | 1.71   |
|         |  | Total | 117 | 100.00 |

The above table is showing the highest frequency (61, 52.14%) regarding the traditional learning which means the traditional learning is considered better than e-learning. While, according to the students of private universities, e-learning is same as distance learning by scoring (28, 22.64%) which means they considered the both as same, therefore, their views and perception regarding e-learning is not clear.

**Table 8: T-Test** 

|                          |         |        |     |          |            | 95% Confidence |         |
|--------------------------|---------|--------|-----|----------|------------|----------------|---------|
|                          |         |        |     |          |            | Interval       | of the  |
|                          |         |        |     | Sig. (2- | Mean       | Difference     |         |
|                          |         | T      | Df  | tailed)  | Difference | Lower          | Upper   |
| Technology Accessibility | Public  | 78.585 | 396 | .000     | 14.12481   | 13.4848        | 14.1481 |
|                          | Private | 78.832 | 396 | .000     | 14.25945   | 13.9065        | 14.6124 |
| Perceived Usefulness     | Public  | 80.132 | 396 | .000     | 14.12483   | 14.2321        | 15.1213 |
|                          | Private | 80.268 | 396 | .000     | 14.89673   | 14.5319        | 15.2616 |
| Potentials               | Public  | 56.136 | 396 | .000     | 13.10213   | 12.2018        | 13.2123 |
|                          | Private | 56.336 | 396 | .000     | 13.32494   | 12.8599        | 13.7899 |
| Problems                 | Public  | 45.124 | 396 | .000     | 14.13248   | 13.1141        | 15.0124 |
|                          | Private | 45.365 | 396 | .000     | 14.56423   | 13.9331        | 15.1954 |

In order to find the significant differences among variables, one sample t-test was used at 95% confidence interval and 5% significance level in this study. Table shows the 2-tail significance on scales of E-learning, Problems, and Potentials, Perceived Usefulness and Technology Accessibility of students in both private and public universities. Significant values reveal that there is a significant relationship (p=.000<.05) among all variables while the Mean Difference Values show that all variables have different relationship with each other. The t-statistic value 80.26 and mean value 14.89 show that the students' Perception regarding the usefulness of E-learning has stronger effect on their e-learning practices than other variables.



# **Findings**

In this present study public universities, students' data analysis show the mean values 2.51, 2.26, 2.49, 2.66, 2.74 against five -items under Technology Accessibility in which all five values are negative (below than 3.00), therefore, the students of public universities have no access to the technology in their classrooms. In private universities, students' data analysis show the mean values 2.75, 2.77, 2.65, 2.77, 3.01 scored by the students of private universities in which four values are negative (below than 3.00) while only one value is positive (above than 3.00), therefore, the students of private universities have also less access to the technology in their classrooms.

This study indicate that in public universities, students' data analysis the mean values 2.74, 2.63, 2.68, 2.66, 2.72 scored by the students of public universities against five items under technology usefulness in which all values are negative (below than 3.00), therefore, the students of public universities have negative perception towards the usefulness of e-learning. In private universities, students' data analysis show the mean values 3.12, 3.08, 2.75, 2.83, 2.91 scored by the students of private universities in which two values are positive (above than 3.00) and three values are negative (below than 3.00), therefore, the students of private universities have also negative perception towards the usefulness of e-learning.

In this study public universities, students' data analysis show the mean values 2.89, 3.01, 3.19, 3.05, 3.27, 2.08 scored by the students of public universities in which four values are positive (above than 3.00) and two values are negative (below than 3.00), therefore, the students of public universities have a high level of problems in using e-learning. In private universities, students' data analysis show the mean values 2.37, 2.11, 3.02, 2.51, 2.44, 1.97 scored by the students of private universities in which five values are negative (below than 3.00) and one value is positive (above than 3.00), therefore, the students of private universities have an average level of problems in using e-learning.

In public universities, students' data analysis show the mean values 1.91, 2.55, 2.66, 2.53, 1.99 scored by the students of public universities in which all values are negative (below than 3.00), therefore, the students of public universities considered there is no potential of elearning in future. In private universities, students' data analysis show the mean values 2.80, 2.62, 3.10, 2.60, 2.10 scored by the students of private universities in which four values are negative (less than 3.00) and one value is positive (above than 3.00), therefore, the students of private universities also didn't consider enough potential of e-learning in future.



Furthermore, qualitative data analysis of students also shows their perceptions regarding e-learning practices. Majority of public and private universities' students considered traditional learning is better (52.14%) e-learning is similar as distance learning (23.93%) and higher technical skills are required for e-learning (13.7%). Further, students of public and private universities' perception regarding perceived ease of use show a negative perception towards e-portal, satisfaction with e-learning, e-learning need, e-learning facilities and brighter prospects with e-learning in classrooms. Qualitative data analysis also shows the opinion of public and private universities' students regarding e-learning practices. Their responses show a negative perception of e-learning practices regarding online lectures, less satisfaction, e-learning portal and less use of group presentations.

### **Discussion**

The results of this study show the students' perception regarding e-learning reveals that the students of public universities have lower and negative perception regarding e-learning while the students of private universities have comparatively better perception. These findings are in-line with the studies' results of (Zuvic-Butorac et al., 2011) in which they found that students' expectations for e-learning became stronger as features such as usability, functionality, management, interactive content and e-learning assistance are completely incorporated into the learning environment. This study results show the problems in adopting e-learning practices such as lack of resources, communication gap, less technical skills, lack of funds, insufficient technology based infrastructure and missing specific e-learning policy create hurdle to adopt e-learning during classroom instructions. These findings are in line with the findings of (Nasir, 2017; Paul & Jefferson, 2019) performed a research which have shown that IT implementation of education by e-learning poses a range of challenges linked to quality. There is also another motivating finding regarding the appropriate suggestions about e-learning practices for future adaptation by students at higher education level in Pakistan. In qualitative analysis, the highest frequency regarding the provision of resources which means the provision of resources related to e-learning is suggested on priority bases by the students. These findings are in line with the findings of (Cruthers, 2008; Hossain & Quinn, 2012) found that E-learning specific policy must be made by university management and implemented in the universities. Most important thing also describe in these studies that financial support for e-learning classroom instructional environment must be given by the



govt. Training for both (students and teachers) must be provided regarding e-learning adaptation.

### Conclusion

The researcher investigated the perceptions of students regarding practices of e- learning based education at Higher Education level in Pakistan. The researcher successfully identified the students' perceptions problems and potentials regarding e-learning based education and Integration of Technology at higher education level in Pakistan. Under the theory of connectivism, three dimensions related to the e-learning based education were analyzed in context of higher education of Pakistan in 9-universities of Punjab. The research tried to get answers of the research questions of this study which were regarding the perception of students about e-learning while the differences among public and private universities of Punjab-Pakistan were also identified. Potentials of e-learning based education were also examined through this research. Suggestions for adopting e-learning based education and its implementation during classroom instructions at higher education level were also analyzed in the light of students opinions. The findings of this research will be helpful for further investigations in future as well as to address the real issues which are provoking e-learning implementation and adaptation in public and private universities in Pakistan.

### **Recommendations for Future Researches**

This study shows the appropriate potentials of e-learning practices at higher education level of Pakistan and for future researches which are as under;-

- 1. It must be understood that using e-learning during learning and teaching is not considered only a trend but also a need for quality education.
- 2. E-learning technology is compatible with the smart devices for use during learning and teaching, therefore, no hesitation among both teachers and students must be felt.
- 3. Moral, technical and financial support of Universities must be available for students and teachers because it is a major factor to increase potential of e-learning practices during classroom instructions.
- 4. Further Training and courses about importance of perception of technology usefulness, potentials, behaviour, skills, infrastructure and challenges towards elearning should be provided to the HEIs.



# References

- Altameem, A. A. (2013). E-Learning Implementation: Benefits And Challenges In The Developing Countries. *Information Technology And Development Of Education Itro* 2013, 90.
- Bicak, F. (2019). Investigation of the views of teachers toward the use of smart boards in the teaching and learning process. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, *3*(1), 15-23.
- Cruthers, M. (2008). Education technology gives teachers a wider reach. *English Teachers Network*, 5.
- Farid, S., Qadir, M., Ahmed, M. U., & Khattak, M. D. (2018). Critical Success Factors of E-Learning Systems: A Quality Perspective. *Pakistan Journal of Distance and Online Learning*, 4(1), 1-20.
- Gulati, N. (2013, December). Framework for cognitive agent based expert system for metacognitive and collaborative E-Learning. In 2013 IEEE International Conference in MOOC, Innovation and Technology in Education (MITE) (pp. 421-426). IEEE.
- Hossain, M. M., & Quinn, R. J. (2012, March). Prospective Use of Web 2.0 Technologies in Promoting Mathematics Education in the United States. In *Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference* (pp. 3637-3642). Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE).
- Hussain, I. (2012). Study on Instructional Paradigms of Virtual Education in Pakistan: A Learners' Perspective. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, 11(2), 178-186.
- Jawaid, M., Raheel, S., Ahmed, F., & Aijaz, H. (2013). Students' perception of educational environment at Public Sector Medical University of Pakistan. *Journal of research in* medical sciences: the official journal of Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, 18(5), 417.



- Joshi, M., & Vaidya, R. (2013, August). A review of paradigm shift from conventional to personalized e-learning. In 2013 International Conference on Advances in Computing, Communications and Informatics (ICACCI) (pp. 1263-1269). IEEE.
- Laurillard, D. (2013). Teaching as a design science: Building pedagogical patterns for learning and technology. Routledge.
- Nasir, M. (2017). E-Learning as a Means of Knowledge and Learning at Higher Education Level. *Pakistan Journal of Distance and Online Learning*, *3*(2), 41-52.
- Paul, J., & Jefferson, F. (2019). A comparative analysis of student performance in an online vs. face-to-face environmental science course from 2009 to 2016. *Frontiers in Computer Science*, 1, 7.
- Raby, C., & Meunier, H. (2011, March). Factors influencing ICT integration according to the teacher's level of pedagogical integration. In *Society for information technology & teacher education international conference* (pp. 2667-2673). Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE).
- Rusman, M. P. (2016). The development of an e-learning-based learning service for MKDP curriculum and learning at the Indonesia University of Education. *Development*, 7(31).
- Santos, D., & Miguel, L. (2019). The Relationship between Teachers' Beliefs, Teachers' Behaviors, and Teachers' Professional Development: A Literature Review. *International Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(1), 10-18.
- Schols, M., & Bottema, J. (2014, March). A national ICT competency framework for student teachers. In *Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference* (pp. 2637-2645). Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE).
- Shah, N. A., Meenakshi, K., Agarwal, A., & Sivasubramanian, S. (2021, January).

  Assessment of Student Attentiveness to E-Learning by Monitoring Behavioural



Elements. In 2021 International Conference on Computer Communication and Informatics (ICCCI) (pp. 1-7). IEEE.

- Surry, D. W., & Stanfield, A. K. (2017). Performance technology. *Foundations of Learning and Instructional Design Technology*.
- Susanti, N. I., & Ayuni, M. (2018). The Students' Perception towards the Use of Padlet in L2 Writing.
- Tusubira, P. I., Mayoka Kituyi, G., & Nyeko, S. (2013). How can e-learning integration be realized? An exploratory study in Higher Education Institutions..
- Zuvic-Butorac, M., Roncevic, N., Nemcanin, D., & Nebic, Z. (2011). Blended e-learning in higher education: Research on students' perspective. *Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology*, 8, 409-429.