Contrasting the Level of Student Participation in in-person and online Health and Physical Education Classes

Mohammad Iqabl Shah

Ms Research Sarhad University Peshawar Campus

Abstract

By comparing the levels of involvement among students majoring in health and physical education in traditional lecture settings and online learning environments, the purpose of this research effort was to determine which setting was more effective. People who are by themselves Regarding the In the course of the research, twenty-two first-year college students who were working toward a degree in health and physical education participated as participants. These students from the college decided to enroll in a summer session class that lasted for a total of three hours. There are two distinct components that make up the course, and students are allowed to select the one that they wish to focus on. In contrast to the second class, which viewed a video presentation on the same topic that was being presented online, the first class went to a traditional lecture that was held in person. The fact that the in-person and online versions of the course contained the same activities and content meant that there was no visible difference between the two learning environments. The course may be taken either in-person or online, two different options were available to students. In order to determine the extent to which the students were interested in the subject matter, a set of 34 questions based on the Likert scale was presented to them. The Mann-Whitney Test was utilized in order to conduct an analysis and evaluation of the responses that were gathered from the two distinct research groups. The significance level for this experiment was set at 0.05, and it was carried out. According to the statistics, none of the 34

1

methods that were utilized to assess an individual's level of participation shown any statistically significant changes.

Keywords: engagement, undergraduate, physical education

INTRODUCTION

Universities are working hard to accommodate the rising demand for these kinds of educational programs as more and more students choose to enroll in online courses. Online student attendance significantly increased, rising by 17% over the previous year, while traditional student enrollment increased by 1.2%, according to Allen and Seaman (2010). By giving priority to the different factors that affect students' overall achievement and satisfaction in the online learning environment, universities might potentially meet the growing demand for online education. There is a good amount of research on students' general satisfaction with online learning. Numerous studies conducted recently have looked at different facets of online learning and how it affects student happiness. A variety of factors, including student characteristics, technology use, course design and instruction, student assessment techniques, and student involvement, have been examined in these research. Nevertheless, the mode of delivery of online learning has not been the explicit focus of these investigations. The next paragraphs provide a brief summary of the body of research on each of the previously stated topics.

Student Characteristics

assessment technique for online learners incorporates a variety of attributes. Extensive academic research spanning several decades has focused on assessing demographics. However, the particular demographic characteristics considered in each study tend to vary to some extent. Pontes, Hasit, Pontes, Lewis, and Siefring (2010) conducted a recent study that found that individuals who chose to enroll in online courses often had additional responsibilities, such as living with dependents, being married or having concurrent

employment obligations, or facing physical limitations that restricted their mobility. Moreover, a higher proportion of senior adults were found to choose to participate in online courses. Several The academic sources (Beqiri, Chase, & Bishka, 2010; Muilenberg & Zane, 2005; Pontes et al.) have discovered through recent research that living further away from the university campus and being a graduate student are additional factors that can accurately predict higher rates of enrollment in online courses. The findings were published in the Journal of Educational Computing Research. Age, family structure, employment position, personal schedules, and the studies conducted by Bickle and Carroll (2003), Clayton, Blumberg, and Auld (2010), and Muilenberg and Zane (2005) have all shown that these factors have a major influence on individuals' decisions to enroll in online courses.

How Students Interact

Creating a sense of community is crucial in the field of online education since it has a direct impact on student involvement. Lao and Gonzales (2005) argue that creating a learning community is an essential aspect of online education. Research indicates that students in distance education encounter difficulties in developing a feeling of community and rapport (Song, Singleton, Hill, & Koh, 2004; Ritter, Polnick, Fink, & Oescher, 2010). Lapointe and Reisetter (2008) found conflicting data on the advantages of learning groups. On the one hand, some students found the online community to be beneficial for their academic endeavors, while on the other hand, others found it to be harmful.

Planning and teaching the course

Multiple research studies have extensively examined the parallels and distinctions in students' preferences for conventional in-person education versus remote learning. Based on the research conducted by Song et al. (2004), students frequently stated that the combination of academic challenge and practicality in the course design was the key

factor in their success in the online learning environment. Anderson (2006) found that students developed a negative perception of online learning due to the lack of organization among their lecturers. Hoban, Neu, and Castel (2002) found that students expressed greater satisfaction with online learning compared to in-person learning, particularly when considering criteria such as curriculum rigor, instructor quality, and personalized attention.

Evaluation of Students

The happiness of students with both in-person and online training delivery methods has significantly improved due to the impact of student evaluation and current knowledge. Banks and Faul (2007) conducted a study to compare the effectiveness of different instructional methods in conveying educational material. The research findings suggested that the use of various teaching methods did not result in significant enhancements in the students' ability to acquire information. In contrast, prior studies suggest that students express a significant degree of satisfaction with their academic accomplishments when they answer to evaluations linked to remote education (Sampson, Leonard, & Coleman, 2010; Sherman, Crum, & Beaty, 2010). The aforementioned queries were conducted by Sampson, Leonard, and Coleman (2010) and Sherman, Crum, and Beaty (2010). Pribesh, Dickinson, and Bucher's (2006) research found no statistically significant disparity in the overall academic performance of students between in-person and remote learning settings. The research findings suggested that students' overall academic performance decreased when they participated in face-to-face classes, especially when project-based learning was used. Ferguson and Tryjankowski (2009) found that students who choose traditional classroom settings performed better on exams compared to those who preferred online programs. Our finding highlights the existence of uncertainty in this area of research, thereby contributing a vital addition to the current body of

knowledge. Tucker (2001) found that students who participated in remote learning achieved better results than those who attended traditional classroom settings in terms of academic performance. The participants' performance on the post-test and final exam significantly bolstered the conclusions made in the study. Sussman and Dutter (2010) further support the idea that the academic performance of students who attend classes in person and those who study online is similar.

Distance learning and getting students involved

In recent years, there have been several scholarly investigations conducted to explore different elements of online learning. These include areas such as course development, instructional approaches, assessment strategies, student involvement, satisfaction, and student characteristics. There is a growing focus on a new element of online education called student involvement. Engagement, as defined by Axelson and Flick (2011), refers to the degree to which students display interest and active involvement in their academic endeavors, as well as their level of connection with peers, educational institutions, and learning settings. Axelson and Flick (year) suggest that future research should focus on creating improved ways to assess student participation in higher education. Furthermore, they highlight the crucial importance of understanding the complex relationship that occurs between student participation and the educational process. Chen, Gonyea, and Kuh (2008) discovered that the degree of student involvement in remote learning is similar to that of students who participate in typical campus-based learning settings. Dixson (2010) developed a quantitative method to evaluate student involvement in online courses. The metric aims to analyze the particular behaviors and interactions that lead to higher levels of engagement. Six colleges situated in the Midwest region took part in the investigation. A study was done to investigate the correlation between the presence of

5

instructors and students and the level of student involvement. Dixson's study has established a clear link between increased student engagement in online learning environments and enhanced interaction between students and teachers. The research utilized several strategies, including offering a wide range of communication formats, in order to enhance student involvement. However, additional examination is necessary to validate this theoretical claim. The aim of this research is to determine if further investigations into online student engagement require a broader scope. Dickson (2010) proposed a hypothesis in order to perform a thorough investigation of the factors related to engagement in online training. This study examined two distinct strategies aimed at engaging undergraduate students in health and physical education courses at a public regional institution in the southern region. One strategy followed a conventional lecture structure, while the other fostered interaction between teachers and learners in a virtual environment. The purpose of this study was to see if there were any notable differences in the levels of participation between traditional lecture formats and online instruction among undergraduate students studying physical education and health.

METHOD

2.1 Individuals taking part The research cohort consisted of twenty-two undergraduate students who were studying health and physical education. These students enrolled in a three-hour course during the summer semester. The course was titled "Technology Integration in Physical Education and Health." Students are given two options about the course components. One portion of the course was taught through a traditional in-person lecture, while the other portion had the lecture available online as a supplement. The academic requirements and regulations were the same for both in-person and virtual seminars. All students met the requirement of attaining a 2.50 cumulative grade

point average before the start of the summer term. The university has received accreditation for issuing doctoral degrees from both the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). 2.2 Modification A total of eleven students engaged in a four-week online course that consisted of four distinct learning modules. The academic term began with an in-person meeting, which was followed by a subsequent meeting in the third week. Students can choose to either use the computer facilities on campus or complete all course prerequisites remotely using online platforms. Every student who is registered for this online course must finish one module per week. The instructor employed a learning management system to disseminate written, audio, and video notifications, so ensuring uniformity in communication. The instructor assessed the assignments submitted by the students using a learning management system and a wiki. Students may have sought the lecturer's aid through other means such as phone calls, text messages, or emails. The average duration of the eleven days of in-person teaching (n = 11) was around three hours. Following the instructor's instructions, the students assembled at the university's computer center and diligently finished their assignment. Within certain educational environments, students acquired knowledge not solely through the instructor's direct teaching, but also through facilitated discovery, student-initiated discourse, and comparable approaches. The lecturer furnished both oral and written instructions for every assignment that the pupils were obligated to finish. All assignments were submitted and critiqued through class discussions utilizing the course wiki platform. Students have the option to communicate with their instructor through several means, such as email, text messaging, phone conversations, and in-person sessions. To determine if there was a substantial difference in involvement levels between in-person and online physical education training, we used

Dixson's (2010) indicator of Student Online participation. A total of thirty-four Likert-scale items were employed to assess the degree of student participation in the course. The dependability coefficient of the instrument, as documented by Dixson, was 0.95. A SurveyMonkey questionnaire was delivered to every pupil on the final day of teaching in order to collect data. The data was examined using the Mann-Whitney U test. Due to the ordinal nature of the acquired data, this non-parametric test was chosen. Due to the limited sample size, it was challenging to determine a significant p-value for any of the 34 elements being analyzed. Evidentiary number four serves as a supplementary piece of evidence that supports the claim. The study utilized the Dixson (2010) metric of Student Online Participation to evaluate the extent of student involvement in physical education teacher preparation programs. This was done by comparing students' perceptions of their participation in face-to-face instruction versus online training. No significant changes were found in any of the 34 variables used to measure engagement, according to the statistical study. The researchers did a statistical study to examine the disparities in replies between the two research groups. This refers to the Mann-Whitney test. A test was performed in this case, using a significance level of $p = 0.05$. Based on the information presented in Table 1, the online course offered a significantly more accurate representation of engagement in relation to a specific attribute. The investigation focused on the degree to which students perceived their lecturer's knowledge. There were no notable differences detected in relation to the other characteristics associated with student engagement. There are two possible disadvantages linked with this investigation. Each cohort initially consisted of eleven individuals. This undermines the credibility of the exam and complicates the process of determining its importance. Furthermore, the investigation was restricted in its focus to the instruction of physical education

instructors. The possibility of reaching similar results through different teacher preparation programs is uncertain. Ensuring the worth of online courses that cover topics like laboratory work and industrial training is a challenging undertaking.

DISCUSSION

Both public and private universities prioritize offering online courses. The current trend indicates that there are numerous advantages to having access to online courses. It is recommended that educational establishments continue to offer online courses to students and investigate new strategies in order to protect their learning, participation, and other important outcomes from any possible harm. In light of the study's findings, it is essential to carefully consider a few crucial ideas. It is decided that using online learning environments to teach every course in a traditional teacher preparation program is both foolish and impractical. Similar claims can be made about other programs that follow more conventional approaches and are meant to improve teacher competency, including music education. Therefore, it is imperative that program instructors first determine which courses are most appropriate for distribution via the internet. Even though there was just one question that showed statistical significance—"how well do you feel you know your instructor"—more research shows that this single question does in fact carry statistical relevance. Students registered in the totally online course gave a rating of "5", while those enrolled in the traditional in-person course gave a rating of "4". The ratings are based on a 5-point rating system, where 5 is the highest rating. It is clear from the statistical data provided that both categories performed quite well. Both transmission modes have the ability to improve students' familiarity with the instructor, according to the study's findings. Even though most people agree that online learning represents a student-centered approach to education rather than the traditional teacher-centered method of in-person instruction, there's a

chance that students taking fully online courses could think of their instructor as a virtual person with no real-world presence. Future studies could compare the roles that teachers play in virtual learning environments against traditional face-to-face classroom settings. It might also investigate instructors' satisfaction and readiness to use online learning environments. In addition, it would be beneficial to investigate how much time and energy instructors should spend with each individual student while teaching online as opposed to in a typical classroom setting. The final, and perhaps most insightful, finding of the study was that there were no appreciable differences between undergraduate physical education students' perspectives on their participation in in-person and online teacher preparation programs. Several studies have produced interesting results (Ware, 2005). Therefore, it is evident that undergraduate courses intended for teacher preparation possess the ability to incorporate students into the course material, regardless of whether the instruction is provided fully online or in conventional classroom environments. The researchers admit that there isn't a single, globally applicable strategy for putting online learning into practice. Careful planning and implementation can improve the effectiveness of undergraduate online learning. This method may help kids who are more likely to learn independently and self-directedly by giving them more flexibility in their academic pursuits.

REFRENCES

Axelson, R. D., & Flick, A. (2011). Defining student engagement. Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 43(1), 38-43. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2011.533096 Artino, A. R. (2010). Online or face-to-face learning? Exploring the personal factors that predict students' choice of instructional format. Internet and Higher Education, 13(4), 272-276. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2010.07.005 Allen, I. E., & Seaman,

J. (2010). Learning on Demand, Online Education in the United States. Needham MA: The Sloan Consortium. Banks, A. C., & Faul, A. C. (2007). Reduction of face-to-face contact hours in foundation research courses: Impact on students' knowledge gained and course satisfaction. Social Work Education, 26(8), 780-793. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02615470601140500 Beqiri, M. S., Chase, N. M., & Bishka, A. (2010). Online course delivery: An empirical investigation of factors affecting student satisfaction. Journal of Education for Business, 85(2), 95-100. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08832320903258527 Bickle, M. C., & Carroll, J. C. (2003). Checklist for quality online instruction: Outcomes for learners, the professor, and the institution. College Student Journal, 37(2), 208-216. Chen, P. S. D., Gonyea, R., & Kuh, G. (2008). Learning at a distance. Journal of Online Education, 4(3). Clayton, K., Blumberg, F., & Auld, D. P. (2010). The relationship between motivation, learning strategies, and choice of environment whether traditional or including an online component. British Journal of Educational Technology, 41(3), 349-364. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2009.00993.x Dixson, M. D. (2010). Creating effective student engagement in online courses: What do students find engaging? Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 10(2), 1-13. Ferguson, J., & Tryjankowski, A. M. (2009). Online versus face-to-face learning: Looking at modes of instruction in master's-level courses. Journal of Further and Higher Education, 33(3), 219-228. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03098770903026149 Hoban, G., Neu, B., & Castel, S. (2002). Assessment of student learning in an educational administration online program. Lao, T., & Gonzales, C. (2005). Understand online learning through a qualitative description of professors and student's experiences. Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, 13(3), 459-474. Lapointe, L., & Reisetter, M. (2008). Belonging online: Students' perceptions of the value and efficacy of an

online learning community. International Journal of ELearning, 7(4), 641-665. Muilenburg, L. Y., & Berge, Z. L. (2005). Student barriers to online learning: A factor analytic study. Distance Education, 26(1), 49-48. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01587910500081269 Pontes, M. C. F., Hasit, C., Pontes, N. M. H., Lewis, P. A., & Siefring, K. T. (2010). Variables related to undergraduate students preference for distance education classes. Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 8(2). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/summer132/pontes_pontes132.html Pribesh, S., Dickinson, G. K., Bucher, K. T. (2006). A comparison of online and face-to-face cohorts in a school library media specialist graduate program: A preliminary study. Journal of Education for Library and Information Science, 47(4), 303-323. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/40323823 Ritter, C., Polnick, B., Fink, R., & Oescher, J. (2010). Classroom learning communities in educational leadership: A comparison study of three delivery options. Internet and Higher Education, 13(1-2), 96-100. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2009.11.005 Rovai, A. P., & Jordon, H. M. (2004). Blended learning and sense of community: A comparative analysis with traditional and fully online graduate courses. International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 5(2). Sahin, I., & Shelley, M. (2008). Considering students' perceptions: The distance education student satisfaction model. Educational Technology & Society, 11(3), 216-223. Sampson, P. M., Leonard, J., Ballenger, J. W., & Coleman, J. C. (2010). Student satisfaction of online courses for educational leadership. Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 8(3). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/Fall133/sampson_ballenger133.html Sherman, W., & Beaty, D. M. (2007). The use of distance technology in educational leadership preparation programs. Journal of Educational Administration, 45(5), 605-620. Sherman, W. H., Crum, K.

S., & Beaty, D. M. (2010). Perspectives on distance technology in leadership education: Transfer, meaning, and change. Journal of Research on Leadership Education, 5(13). Song, L., Singleton, E. S., Hill, J. R., & Koh, M. H. (2004). Improving online learning: Student perceptions of useful and challenging characteristics. Internet and Higher Education, 7(1), 59-70. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2003.11.003 Sussman, S., & Dutter, L. (2010). Comparing student learning outcomes in face-to-face and online course delivery. Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 8(4). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/winter134/sussman_dutter134.html Tucker, S. (2001). Distance education: Better, worse, or as good as traditional education? Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 4(4). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/winter44/tucker44.html Walker, C. E., & Kelly, E. (2007). Online instruction: Student satisfaction, kudos, and pet peeves. The Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 8(4), 309-319. Ware, D. M. (2005). Social competence of students enrolled in online high school physical education courses. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida, Orlando.