

**Citation:** Ullah, H., Muhammad, & Bakhsh, H. P. (2020). Online Oriented Classes: Merits and Demerits of the Point of View of Ghazians at Ghazi University Dera Ghazi Khan. *Global Educational Studies Review*, V(III), 175-190.

[https://doi.org/10.31703/gesr.2020\(V-III\).18](https://doi.org/10.31703/gesr.2020(V-III).18)



## Online Oriented Classes: Merits and Demerits of the Point of View of Ghazians at Ghazi University Dera Ghazi Khan

Hafeez Ullah\*

Muhammad†

Hashim Pear Bakhsh‡

Vol. V, No. III (Summer 2020)

Pages: 175 – 190

DOI: 10.31703/gesr.2020(V-III).18

**Abstract:** *The purpose of this paper is to point out the Merits and Demerits of Ghazians at Ghazi University Dera Ghazi Khan. Over the past two years, online oriented classes have become an inseparable part of educations. Providing online learning opportunities at the university level is the compulsion of the day. The quality education of online-oriented classes at the University Level is one of the inordinate challenges faced by the students of Ghazi University. Online oriented classes change all mechanisms of teaching and learning at a Higher Level in the educational system. Regular assessing of the online programs is important to enhance the quality of education at University Level. The simple random sampling technique was used to collect data. A total of 362 students from different departments of Ghazi University were involved. As a research device for data collection, the five-point rating scale sample was used. The collected data was analyzed by means of the SPSS.*

**Key Words:** Online Classes, Quality Education, Quality Development

### Introduction

In the present situation, online oriented classes are increasingly accessible in current educational situations. Nowadays, online classes for different levels, vocational training or modern science, educational campaigns, and formal education at every level and in every area of the education system covering different subjects and obviously client base. The point of the study is to classify both students' views, the organization as a teaching methodology and the online classes merits and merits. One of the most important developments in higher education systems over the past few decades is the introduction of quality assurance systems through online oriented classes at Universities Level. Higher education institutions have gradually adopted online education, and the number of students participating in learning programs is growing exponentially in universities and colleges across the globe. At higher institutions, the quality of education is the source establishment of national quality assurance systems. Higher education institutions developed to address the highest possible requirement from students, a wide variety of listeners and students seeking flexibility, and the specificity of conventional methods, consider the possibility of qualifications. These would be the considerations expressed in this study, and the article is only planned to provide both organizations and the community with the merits and demerits of online education.

The quality assurance of educational courses is a great challenge for the higher education system through online assessment at the universities level. Regular assessment of such courses is essential in

\* PhD Scholar, Department of Educational Training, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan.

Email: [ahmadbinhafeez@gmail.com](mailto:ahmadbinhafeez@gmail.com)

† MPhil Scholar, Department of Education, University of Education Lahore, D.G Khan Campus, Punjab, Pakistan.

‡ MPhil Scholar, Department of Education, University of Education Lahore, D.G Khan Campus, Punjab, Pakistan.

order to take steps to improve their quality. In the field of education, a variety of public universities, organizations, and other institutions have online learning courses. Professional training, scientific and healthcare technology, infrastructure development planning and technical education were included in the curriculum. In order to take steps to enhance their efficiency, a regular review of these services is necessary. In doing so, it is expected that it will promote an intense discussion on effective ways that can boost the performance of universities and faculty in the transition to online programs and course. Numerous experiential researches have been directed to observe the merits and demerits of online oriented classes. The prior studies provided an overview of the merits and demerits of online oriented classes.

## Theoretical Framework

Time is the main aspect that splits online oriented and faces to-face learning and teaching methods (Wang, Woo 2007, Meyer 2003, Mahoney 2009). Because of the time flexibility, learners with limited time those who in work favored online oriented classes than face to face learning. The implication is that Due to their busy lifestyles and epidemic covid-19, numerous learners select online oriented classes than face to face education, not due to its professed benefits. Efficiency and fulfilment should be measured in this framework. Similarly, Stephenson, Brown, and Griffin (2008) demonstrated that when asked to give a selection, students participating in a test on face-to-face oriented classes and online oriented classes. Generally, learners preferred conventional face-to-face teaching instead of the online learning system. Online oriented classes are a record that covers activities intended to accomplish the instructive destinations for a decided timeframe. It is directed completely utilizing correspondence and data innovation with the technical help of online oriented classes and the assistance of online instructors who help the learner's educational improvement through various intuitive media transmission frameworks (Marciniak, 2016). There seems to be no point in distinguishing the evaluation of the elements of curriculum from the assessment process of the curriculum, the conventional aim of education.

## Assessment of the Quality of Online Oriented Classes

Constant feedback on its development of online education should be given for the assessment of the online course and degree versions. This capability enables for the development degree value by responses. Consequently, the quality evaluation of online oriented classes depends on the elements of the course and the ongoing assessment, except for evaluative testing and other reasons, maybe combine in an entirely good way. Technologies empowered online learning through the combination of software, broadcasting delivery system, hardware and communication systems, including networking.

## The Online Oriented Classes Experiences

The online oriented classes considered by numerous terms. Kearsley and Moore (2012) stated online oriented classes suggests a distant and reciprocal relationship between students and teachers. Online oriented classes and e-learning are used in relation to distance education. Both relations characterize a mutual relationship between students and teachers, which holds the deliberate goal line of serving the learners to learn through the usage of the Net. The online oriented classes experience consist of learners, teachers, and the curriculum, of course, need the usage of technical tools for accessing the online classes and environment (Ally, 2008). In higher education, the expansion of online classes does not change quickly. The 2008 study by the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) concluded that the best factors affecting the growth of higher education institutions' online classes included satisfying student demands for schedule flexibility (68 percent), making further classes accessible (46 percent), offering university access for students who would not have access (67 percent). (Parsad, Lewis, & Tice, 2008).

## Demand of Online Oriented Classes at Higher Level

As the quality of public education develops, there is an increasing demand for online classes for international universities, in which students, staff, courses and educational institutions are increasingly

mobilized in global networks (Hou, 2012; Varonism, 2014). Online oriented classes should be focused at universities to overcome challenges faced by learners at a higher level. The majority belief is that the quality assessment of these two forms of education, online and formal, is practically the same and varies only in view of the effectiveness granted to the standards used for measuring (Marúm-Espinosa, 2011 [Padilla, 2005](#)). The general aim of the study was to establish an integrated framework for the analysis of online oriented classes in higher education for assessing the quality of online oriented classes and the ongoing evaluation of education. This paper introduces the method of developing and validating online oriented classes which are intended to become a valuable tool for assessing and enhancing all components of the online oriented class. Whether online oriented classes learners can produce good graduates of interpersonal qualification compare to face-to-face learning can be challenged ([Wagner, Hassanein & Head, 2008](#)).

Merits of Online Oriented Classes	Demerits of Online Oriented classes
<p>When problems of time and place are considered, it is versatile. Every student has the luxury of choosing the appropriate time and place.</p>	<p>The method of education for online-oriented classes allows students experience reflection, exclusion, as well as lack of connection or relationship. Therefore, in order to minimize such impact, it needs very strong motivation as well as skills with time management</p>
<p>The emphasis of online-oriented classes is on the ease and flexibility of learning, transcribed into the business sector, this makes it the possible aim of providing 'merely' learning whenever necessary, and that can mean wider access in the educational system for non-traditional students) (<a href="#">Childs et al., 2005</a>; <a href="#">Winterbottom, 2007</a>; <a href="#">Meyer, 2003</a>; <a href="#">Wang &amp; Woo, 2003</a>).</p>	<p>The method of education for online-oriented classes allows students experience reflection, exclusion, as well as lack of connection or relationship. Therefore, in order to minimize such impact, it needs very strong motivation as well as skills with time management</p>
<p>Online oriented classes increase the effectiveness of data and qualifications via the luxury of access to a massive bulk of information.</p>	<p>Whenever it comes to improving students' communication skills, online oriented classes have a negative impact as a tool. The students. Although they may have impressive educational skills, they may not have the skills required to execute their skills acquired.</p>
<p>There seem to be obvious cost savings for learners' commuters who are willing to work from home and advance their studies.</p>	<p>Since assessments for online oriented classes evaluations can be conducted through proxy use, it would be hard, but not impossible, to overcome bad activities such as cheating.</p>
<p>Online education could save several million pounds per year. (<a href="#">Childs et al., 2005</a>).</p>	<p>Plagiarism and piracy predisposed by poor selection abilities, as well as the ease of copying and pasting, can also be tricked into online oriented classes.</p>
<p>Online Oriented classes make accessible additional events for interactivity between teachers and learners through content transfer. (<a href="#">Wagner et al. 2008</a>)</p>	<p>Online-oriented can also disintegrate the role of socialization role of organizational culture as well as the role of teachers as managers of the learning process.</p>
<p>Online oriented class is cost operative in the intelligence that there is no more necessity for the students. This way also is cost-effective in which no more buildings require with increasing the numbers of learners.</p>	<p>Online oriented classes approach of education can also not be used for all sectors or disciplines.</p>

---

<p>improving online education, knowledge of learners and skills.</p> <p>Educational training at multiple places at once saves time and reduces fixed expenses (Scarafiotti, 2004, <a href="#">Childs et al., 2005</a>).</p> <p>Online learning needs to be compensated for educational personnel shortages, including instructors, coordinators, laboratory technicians, etc.</p> <p>Self-pacing enables the use of online oriented classes. The interactive way, for example, enables students to research at his and their own pace and tempo, either slow or fast. Satisfaction is then improved, and stress is minimized (<a href="#">Codone, 2001</a>; <a href="#">Amer, 2007</a>)</p> <p>Online Oriented classes encourage students to communicate with others and to exchange and appreciate various points of view. Education makes communication simpler and strengthens the connections that support learning.</p> <p>According to Raba (2005), goals can be achieved with the least amount of effort in the shortest time by online oriented Classes.</p>	<p>For example, online education does not adequately study the strictly scientific areas that involve functional fields.</p> <p>Online Oriented classes result in certain websites being congested or highly used. In terms of time and money demerits, this may result in unexpected costs (<a href="#">Hameed et al. 1999 by Scott et al.; 2002 by Marc</a>)</p> <p>The total lack of important personal relations not only between students and teachers but also between fellow learners is the most apparent criticism of online-oriented classroom learning (Young, 1997; <a href="#">Burdman, 1998</a>).</p> <p>Online oriented classes need high-speed internet and supported communicative devices.</p> <p>Online oriented classes, learners need specific expertise in learning.</p>
--	--

---

A comparison of merits and demerits given in the above table indicate that online oriented classes and face-to-face oriented classes show that face-to-face oriented classes have less stressful and less humiliating to dynamically involve with. Even so, in comparison to traditional face-to-face practices. The quality of fully online oriented learning and teaching remains a difficult question, specifically with respect to the efficacy of online oriented classes. Finally, almost to the point of becoming a cliché, whether it is completely online oriented or traditional face-to-face, it is the consistency of the total experience of the student's community that seems to be of utmost concern to the new learners.

## Materials and Methods

This study was descriptive in nature, and the researcher developed the questionnaire after the literature review. The study was enclosed to Ghazi University Dera Ghazi Khan. The study sample consisted of 362 students from Ghazi University Dera Ghazi Khan Pakistan. A simple random sampling technique was used in this study. The sample of different departments students were selected randomly according to the advisory table (Gay, 2003) of sample selection. To keep the theory and objectives of the research, the researchers compiled a list of questions after the literature review. The questionnaire is compiled on a five-point scale (Likert) to measure respondents' perceptions. The answers in this questionnaire were rated from negative (SDA) to very high (SA). The first draft of the tool was discussed among researchers, and some amendments were made according to the research objectives. Before data collection, the researcher had a meeting with the participants. The researchers informed the respondents about the nature and objectives of the research study. They were guaranteed the confidentiality of their provided information. In this way, the researchers got the consent of the respondents. The researcher perceived ethics of research in social sciences.

## Results and Discussions

Data were analyzed via SPSS v.22. Quantitative data collected by questionnaire was entered into the SPSS and calculated percentage and description of each item.

**Table 1**

S.No	Item	Options	SDA	DA	UD	A	SA	Mean
1	Online mode of education is a compulsion in the current situation.	Frequency	40	42	129	110	41	3.47
		Percentage	11.04	11.60	35.63	30.38	11.32	
2	Online oriented classes need more efforts than face to face orient base classes	Frequency	40	15	120	76	111	3.48
		Percentage	11.04	4.14	33.14	20.99	30.66	
3	Students were successful at face-to-face oriented classes than online oriented classes.	Frequency	22	66	101	110	63	3.49
		Percentage	6.07	18.23	27.91	30.38	17.40	

In table no.1, a total number of 362 students gave their (100%) responses in favor of the first statement as 41 (11.32%) were strongly agree, 110 (30.38%) agreed, 42 (11.60%) disagreed, 40 (11.04%) strongly disagreed and 129 (35.63%) were undecided. The mean score was 3.47. So, the majority of the respondents agreed that the Online mode of education is a compulsion in the current situation. From the second statement, 111 (30.66%) strongly agreed, 76 (20.99%) agreed, 15 (4.14%) disagreed, 40 (11.04%) strongly disagreed, and 120 (33.14%) were undecided; meanwhile, the mean score was 3.48. So, the majority of the respondents agreed that Online oriented classes need more efforts than face to face orient base classes. On the other hand, the third statement, as 63 (17.40%) strongly agreed, 110 (30.38%) agreed, 66 (18.23%) disagreed, 22 (6.07%) were strongly disagree, and 101 (27.91%) were undecided meanwhile the mean score was 3.49. Therefore, the majority of the respondents agreed that Students was successful at face-to-face oriented classes than online oriented classes.

**Table 2**

S.No	Item	Options	SDA	DA	UD	A	SA	Mean
4	Online oriented classes material does not meet the learner's requirements than face to face oriented classes.	Frequency	24	16	77	135	110	3.88
		Percentage	6.62	4.41	21.27	37.29	30.38	
5	The students face difficulties through an online class.	Frequency	22	45	72	116	107	3.78
		Percentage	6.07	12.43	19.88	32.04	29.55	
6	Group discussions in online orientation classes are necessary.	Frequency	12	40	121	90	99	3.80
		Percentage	3.31	11.04	33.42	24.86	27.34	

In the light of table no.2, a total number of 362 students gave their (100%) responses in favor of the fourth statement as 110 (30.38%) were strongly agree, 135 (37.29%) agreed, 16 (4.41%) disagreed, 24 (6.62%) strongly disagreed and 77 (21.27%) were undecided meanwhile the mean score was 3.88. So, the majority of the respondents agreed that Online oriented classes material does not meet the learner's requirements than face to face oriented classes. From the fifth statement, 107 (29.55%) strongly agreed, 116 (32.04 %) agreed, 45 (12.43%) disagreed, 22 (6.07%) strongly disagreed, and 72 (19.88%) were undecided; meanwhile, the mean score was 3.78. Therefore, the majority of the respondents agreed that

the students face difficulties through an online class. On the other hand, the sixth statement showed 99 (27.34%) strongly agreed, 90 (24.86%) agreed, 40(11.04%) disagreed, 12 (3.31%) strongly disagreed, and 121 (33.42%) were undecided; meanwhile, the mean score was 3.80. So, the majority of the respondents agreed that Group discussions in online orientation classes are necessary.

**Table 3**

S. No	Item	Options	SDA	DA	UD	A	SA	Mean
7	Online oriented classes lack the learning interactivity of face to face oriented class.	Frequency	21	73	87	122	59	3.39
		Percentage	5.80	20.16	24.03	33.07	16.29	
8	Online oriented classes increased usage of the computer and the internet.	Frequency	20	62	72	142	66	3.49
		Percentage	5.52	17.12	19.88	39.22	18.23	
9	There was so much workload in online classes.	Frequency	18	58	72	69	145	3.74
		Percentage	4.97	16.02	19.88	19.06	40.05	

In the light of table no.3, a total number of 362 students gave their (100%) responses in favor of the seventh statement as 59 (16.29%) were strongly agree, 122 (33.07%) agreed, 73 (20.16%) disagreed, 21 (5.80%) strongly disagreed and 87 (24.03%) were undecided meanwhile the mean score was 3.39. So, the majority of the respondents agreed that online oriented classes lack the learning interactivity than face to face oriented class. From the eighth statement, 66 (18.23%) strongly agreed, 142 (39.22%) agreed, 62 (17.12%) disagreed, 20 (5.52%) were strongly disagree, and 70 (19.55%) were undecided. The mean score was 3.49. So the majority of the respondents agreed that online oriented classes increased usage of the computer and the internet. On the other hand, the ninth statement showed that 145 (40.05%) strongly agreed, 69 (19.06%) agreed, 58 (16.02%) disagreed, 18 (4.97%) strongly disagreed, and 72 (19.88%) were undecided; meanwhile, the mean score was 3.74. So, the majority of the respondents agreed that there was so much workload in online classes.

**Table 4**

S. No	Item	Options	SDA	DA	UD	A	SA	Mean
10	Learners obtained ample information from the Online oriented classes about studies.	Frequency	8	49	178	74	53	3.77
		Percentage	2.20	13.53	49.17	20.44	14.64	
11	Learners got appropriate guidance through questions about the study course through online oriented classes.	Frequency	18	60	34	101	149	3.39
		Percentage	4.97	16.57	9.39	27.90	41.16	
12	To assist curriculum in online oriented classes, there was a lack of extensive empirical resources.	Frequency	22	14	69	112	145	3.27
		Percentage	6.07	3.86	19.06	30.93	40.05	

In the light of table no.4, a total number of 358 students gave their (100%) responses in favor of the tenth statement as 53 (14.64%) were strongly agree, 74 (20.44%) agreed, 49 (13.53%) disagreed, 8 (2.20%) strongly disagreed, and 178 (49.17%) were undecided meanwhile the mean score was 3.36. So, the majority of the respondents that learners obtained ample information from the Online oriented classes about studies. From eleventh statement, 149 (41.62%) were strongly agree, 101 (27.90%) were agree, 60 (16.57%) were disagree, 18 (4.97%) were strongly disagree and 34 (9.39%) were undecided. The mean score was 3.37. So, the majority of the respondents agreed that Learners got appropriate guidance through questions about the study course through online oriented classes. On the other hand, the twelfth statement showed that 145 (40.05%) strongly agreed, 112 (30.93%) agreed, 14 (3.86%) disagreed, 22 (6.07%) strongly disagreed, and 69 (19.06%) were undecided; meanwhile, the mean score was 3.26. So, the majority of the respondents agreed that To assist curriculum in online oriented classes, there was a lack of extensive empirical resources.

**Table 5**

No	Item	Options	SDA	DA	UD	A	SA	Mean
13	In online-based courses, facilitation sessions are organized.	Frequency Percentage	10 2.76	50 13.81	72 19.88	123 33.97	107 29.55	3.58
14	The proper assessment of learners is impossible through online examination.	Frequency Percentage	18 4.97	65 17.95	89 24.58	126 34.31	60 16.57	3.30
15	Proper training should session should be conducted to guide the students and teachers.	Frequency Percentage	30 8.28	66 18.23	38 10.49	101 27.09	125 34.53	3.23

In table no.5, an overall number of 362 students gave their (100%) responses in favor of thirteen statements as were 107 (29.55%) strongly agree, 123 (33.97%) agreed, 50 (13.96%) disagreed, 10 (2.76%) were strongly disagree, and 72 (19.88%) were undecided meanwhile the mean score was 3.56. So, the majority of the respondents agreed that in online-based courses, facilitation sessions are organized. From fourteen statement, 60 (16.57%) strongly agreed, 126 (34.31%) agreed, 65 (17.95%) disagreed, 18 (4.97%) were strongly disagree, and 89 (24.58%) were undecided. The mean score was 3.28. So, the proper assessment of learners is impossible through online examination. On the other hand, fifteen statements showed that 125 (34.53%) strongly agreed, 101 (27.09%) agreed, 66 (18.23%) disagreed, 30 (8.28%) strongly disagreed, and 66 (10.49%) were undecided; meanwhile, the mean score was 3.22. So, the majority of the respondents agree that Proper training should session should be conducted to guide the students and teachers.

### Conclusion and Recommendation

Butcher & Hoosen, 2014) noted that in order to have a critical view of these courses, as well as of the aspects related to maintaining a high standard of programmed online education, the evaluation of online classes should be an ongoing practice. Two forms of evaluation are incorporated into the model provided in this paper and include dimensions that help to assess all the components of online educational programs. This study presented to address the persons in charge of implementing online programs. Online learning must employ a sector-leading way of engaging learners in educational design. As demonstrated above, cooperation and interaction are essential components. Institutions should have specific statements in their portfolios about the position of online education.

- Institutions should understand that the reasons students choose online classes over face to face on campus.

- In teaching design, it is necessary to highlight that this will involve different strategies.
- Similarly, indicators should be mindful of the value variables that distinguish between wholly online oriented classes learning and face to face oriented classes campus-based to evaluating students satisfactions.
- There would be aware at all levels that online education poses very different classroom-based education challenges. For instance, this involves the 'instant reply' requirement in the online space.
- In supporting educators involved in online learning, course-specific administrative support is important.
- As part of the integration strategy, online education and learning grants organizations with opportunities to expand and assess the delivery of their institutions in different ways.

## References

- Abbad, M. M., Morris, D., & de Nahlik, C. (2009). Looking under the Bonnet: Factors Affecting Student Adoption of E-Learning Systems in Jordan.
- Abbit, J. T., & Klett, M. D. (2007). Identifying influences on attitudes and self-efficacy beliefs towards technology integration among pre-service educators: *Electronic Journal for the integration of technology in education*, 6, 28-42.
- Adams, D. A; Nelson, R. R.; Todd, P. A. (1992), "Perceived u, ease of use, and usage of information technology: A replication", *MIS Quarterly* 16: 227-247.
- Ajzen, I. (1985). From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behavior. In J. Kuhl, & J. Beckmann (Eds.), *Springer series in social psychology* (pp. 11-39). Berlin: Springer.
- Akkoyuklu, B. & Soyulu, M. Y. (2006). A study on students' views on blended learning environment. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 7(3), ISSN 1302-6488.
- Al-adwan, A., & Smedly, J. (2012). Implementing E-Learning in the Jordanian Higher Education System: Factors Affecting Impact. *International Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication Technology (IJEDICT)*, 2012, Vol. 8, Issue 1, 121-135.
- Alarifi, Y. (2003). E-learning Technology: Promising Method, E-learning International Conference, Saudi Arabia 23-25/3/2003, Riyadh: King Faisal School.
- Algahtani, A.F. (2011). Evaluating the Effectiveness of the E-learning Experience in Some Universities in Saudi Arabia from Male Students' Perceptions, Durham theses, Durham University.
- Alias, N. A., & Zainuddin, A. M. (2005). Innovation for Better Teaching and Learning: Adopting the Learning Management System. *Malaysian Online Journal of Instructional Technology*, 2(2), 27-40.
- Alkhateeb F., AlMaghayreh E. Aljawarneh S., Muhsin Z., Nsour A. E-learning Tools & Technologies in Education: A Perspective.
- Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2013). Changing course: Ten years of tracking online education in the United States. Babson Survey Research Group and Quahog Research Group, LLC. Retrieved 20 March 2015 from
- Almosa, A. & Almubarak, A. (2005). E-learning Foundations and Applications, Saudi Arabia: Riyadh.
- Almosa, A. (2002). Use of Computer in Education, (2nd ed), Riyadh: Future Education Library.
- Alsalem, A. (2004). Educational Technology and E-learning, Riyadh: Alroshd publication.
- Amer, T. (2007). E-learning and Education, Cairo: Dar Alshehab publication.
- Anderson, P. (2007). "What is Web 2.0? Ideas, technologies and implications for education. JISC Technology and Standards Watch". <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/media/documents/techwatch/tsw0701b.pdf> accessed 11 December, 2006.
- Anderson, S., & Maninger, R. (2007). Preservice teachers' abilities, beliefs, and intentions regarding technology integration. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 37 (2), 151-172
- Andersson, A., (2008). Seven Major Challenges for e-learning in Developing Countries: Case Study eBIT, Sri Lanka, *International Journal of Education and Development using ICT*, Vol 4, Issue
- Arabasz, P., Pirani, J., & Fawcett, D. (2003). Supporting e-learning in higher education.[Online]. Available at <http://net.educause.edu>
- Ash, C., & Bacsich P. (2002). The costs of networked learning. In C. Steeples & C. Jones (Eds.), *Networking learning: Perspectives and issues computer supported cooperative work*. London:
- Awidi, I.T, (2008). Developing an e-learning Strategy for Public Universities in Ghana,
- Barber, M., Donnelly, K., & Rizvi, S. (2013). An avalanche is coming - higher education and the revolution ahead. London: IPPR.
- Barnard, I., Paton, V. O., & Rose, K. (2007). Perceptions of online course communications and collaboration. *Online journal of distance learning administration*,. 10(4), 1-9.
- Barron, A. E., (2003). Course management systems and online teaching. *Journal of computing in higher education*.
- Bennion, A., Scesa, A., & Williams, R. (2011). The benefits of part-time undergraduate study and UK higher education policy: A literature review. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 65(2), 145-163.

- Biggs, J. (1999). *Teaching for quality learning at university* (pp. 165-203). Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.
- Birch, D., & Burnett, B. (2009). Bringing academics on board: Encouraging institutionwide diffusion of e-learning environments. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 25(1), 117-134.
- Bishop, M. J., Hyclak, T., & Yerk-Zwickl, S. (2007). The clipper project: Lessons learned teaching an online economics course. *Journal of computing in higher education*, 18(2), 99-120.
- Blackmore, C., Tantam, D., & Deurzen, E. V. (2008). Evaluation of e-learning outcomes: Experience from an online psychotherapy education programme. *Open learning*, 23(3), 185-201.
- Borstorff, P. C., & Lowe, S. L. (2007). Student perceptions and opinions toward e-learning in the college environment. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 11(2), 13-30.
- Boud, D., & Middleton, H., (2003). 'Learning from others at work: communities of practice and informal learning', *Journal of workplace learning*, vol. 15, no.5, pp. 194-202.
- Brown, C., Thomas, H., Merwe, A. & Dyk, L. (2008). The impact of South Africa's ICT Infrastructure on higher education. [online]. Available at <http://suno25.sun.ac.za>. Accessed on 27/02/2014
- Brown, D., Cromby, J., & Standen, P. (2001). The effective use of virtual environments in the education and rehabilitation of students with intellectual disabilities. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 32(3), p. 289-299.
- Brown, R. E. (2001). The process of community-building in distance learning classes. *Journal of asynchronous learning networks*, 5(2), 18-35.
- Burdman, P. (1998). *Cyber U*. Anaheim (California) Orange County Register, September 13, sec. 1, p. 9.
- Burn, J., & Thongprasert, N., (2005). "A Culture-based model for strategic implementation of virtual education delivery", *International Journal of Education and Development using ICT*, Vol. 1, No. 1.
- Carswell, A. D. & Venkatesh, V. (2002). 'Learner Outcomes in an Asynchronous Distance Educational Environment.' *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* 56, (5) 475-494.
- Childs, S., Blenkinsop, E., Hall, A., & Walton, G. (2005). Effective e-learning for health professionals and students - barriers and their solutions. A systematic review of the literature - findings from the hexl project. *Health information and libraries journal*, 22(0), 20-32.
- Clara, M., & Barbera, E. (2013). Learning online: Massive open online courses (MOOCs). *Connectivism and cultural psychology*, 34(1), 129-136.
- Clark, R. C., & Mayer, R. E. (2003). *e-learning and the science of instruction*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bas
- Clarke, T. (2013). The advance of MOOCs (massive open online courses) - The impending globalization of business education? *Education + training*, 55(4/5), 403-413.
- Codone, S. (2001) *An E-Learning Primer*, Raytheon Interactive. Available from: <http://faculty.mercer.edu>
- Collins, J., Hammond, M. & Wellington, J. (1997). *Teaching and Learning with Multimedia*, London: Routledge.
- Committee of Inquiry into the Changing Learner Experience (CICLE). (2009). *Higher education in a web 2.0 world*, 570. London: Higher Education Academy and JISC.
- Concannon, F., Flynn, A., & Campbell, M. (2005). What campus-based students think about the quality and benefits of e-learning. *British journal of educational technology*, 36(3), 501-512.
- Conference on Information & Communication Technologies: from Theory to Applications, Damascus, 2008, 1-5
- Cowan, T., & Duggleby, J. (2005). Pedagogy and quality assurance in the development of online learning for online instructors. *Journal of asynchronous learning networks*, 9(4), 1-10.
- Creswell, J. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Method Approaches*. 2nd edition. Thousand oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dahl, B. (2005). 10 ways to improve online learning. *Distance education report*, 9(20), 7-8.
- Davis, F. D. (1989). 'Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology.' *MIS Quarterly* 13, (3) 319-340.
- Deka, T. S., & McMurphy, P. (2006). Student success in face-to-face and distance teleclass environments: A matter of contact? *International review of research in open and distance learning*, 7(1).

- Department for Business, Innovation and Skills. (2013). BIS research paper number 130 – The maturing of the MOOC. London: Department for Business, Innovation and Skills.
- Department for Education and Skill (2004) "Use of interactive whiteboards in history". [http://publications.teachernet.gov.uk/eOrderingDownload/DfES-0812-2004\\_History.pdf](http://publications.teachernet.gov.uk/eOrderingDownload/DfES-0812-2004_History.pdf). accessed 11 February, 2007.
- Díaz, L., & Entonado, F. (2009). Are the functions of teachers in e-learning and face-to-face learning environments really different? *Journal of educational technology & society*, 12(4), 331-343.
- Dowling, C., Godfrey, J. M. & Gyles N. (2003). "Do Hybrid Flexible Delivery Teaching Methods Improve Accounting Students' Learning Outcomes," *Accounting Education: An International Journal*, 12 (4), 373-391.
- Dublin, L. (2003). If you only look under the street lamps.....Or nine e-Learning Myths. *The eLearning developers journal*. <http://www.eLearningguild.com>.
- Dutton, J., Dutton, M., & Perry, J. (2002). How do online students differ from lecture students? *Journal of asynchronous learning networks*, 6(1), 1– 20.
- Dutton, W. H., Cheong, P. H., & Park, N. (2003). The social shaping of a virtual learning environment: The case of a university-wide course management system. *The Electronic Journal of e-Learning*, 2(1). Available: <http://www.ejel.org/volume-2/vol2-issue1/issue1-art3dutton-cheong-park.pdf>
- EDUCAUSE Quarterly, Vol. 31 No. 2, EDUCASE, 66-69. Implementation of e-Learning in Ghanaian Tertiary Institutions (A Case Study of KNUST)
- Eke, H. N. (2009). *The Perspective of E-Learning and Libraries: challenges and opportunities*. Unpublished article, completion.
- Engel Brecht, E. (2005). Adapting to changing expectations: postgraduate students' experience of an e-learning Tax Program, *Computers and Education*, 45, 2, 217-229.
- European Commission. (2001). *The eLearning Action Plan: Designing tomorrow's education*. <http://www.elearningeuropa.info>.
- Falvo, D., & Johnson, B. (2007). The Use of Learning Management Systems in the United States. *TechTrends*, 51(2), 40-45. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11528-007-0025-9>
- Fares, A. (2007). *ICT Infrastructure, Applications, Society, and Education*. Nairobi, (2007). Nairobi: Strathmore University.
- Fillion, G., Limayem, M., Laferrière, T., & Mantha, R. (2009). Integrating information and communication technologies into higher education: Investigating onsite and online students' points of view. *Open learning: The journal of open and distance learning*, 24(3), 223-240.
- Fishbein, M. & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- France, D., & Fletcher, S. (2007). E-learning in the UK: Perspectives from GEES practitioners. *Planet – learning and teaching in geography, earth and environmental sciences*, 18, 3-5.
- Fry, K. (2001). E-learning markets and providers: some issues and prospects. *Education Training*, 233-239.
- Garrison, D. R. (2006). Online collaboration principles. *Journal of asynchronous learning networks*, 10(1), 1-7.
- Gefen, D. (2003). "TAM or Just Plain Habit: A Look at Experienced Online Shoppers." *Journal of End User Computing* 15, (3) 1-13.
- Ghana Ministry of Education. (2008). *ICT in Education*. November, Accra: Ghana.
- Gotschall, M. (2000). E-learning strategies for executive education and corporate training. *Fortune* 141(10). 5-59.
- Guiller, J., Durndell, A., & Ross, A. (2008). Peer interaction and critical thinking: Face-to-face or online discussion. *Learning and instruction*, 18(2), 187-200.
- Gulbahar, Y. (2007). Technology planning: A Roadmap to successful technology integration in schools. *Computers and Education*, 49 (4), 943-956.
- Guri-Rosenblit, S. (2005). Eight paradoxes in the implementation process of e-learning in higher education. *Higher education policy*, 18(1), 5-29.

- Hameed, S. Badii, A. & Cullen, A. J. (2008). Effective e-learning integration with traditional learning in a blended learning environment. European and Mediterranean conference on information system, (25-26).
- Hanson, P., & Robson, R. (2004). Evaluating course management technology: A pilot study. Boulder, CO: Educause Center for Applied Research, Research Bulletin, Issue 24. Available: <http://www.educause.edu/library/ERBo424>
- Hawkins, B. L., & Rudy, J. A. (2008). Educause core data service: Fiscal year 2007 summary report. Boulder, CO: Educause. Available: <http://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/PUB8005.pdf>
- HCESC – House of Commons Education and Skills Committee. (2005). UK e-University. Third Report of Session 2004–05, Report, together with formal minutes, oral and written evidence ordered by House of Commons, 1–153. Retrieved 20 March 2015 from
- Hedberg, J. G. (1989). CD-ROM: Expanding and shrinking resource based learning *Journal of Educational Technology*, 5(1), 56-75 *The Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia*, 6th ed. Copyright © 2012, Columbia University: digital versatile disc|Infoplease.com <http://www.infoplease.com/encyclopedia/science/digital-versatile-disc.html#ixzz2uXHQNdHH>
- Hemsley, C. (2002). Jones International University's focus on quality eLearning opens doors for students worldwide. *Business Media*, 39(9), pp. 26-29.
- Holmes, B. & Gardner, J. (2006). *E-Learning: Concepts and Practice*, London: SAGE Publications.
- Holsale, C. W., & Lee-Post, A. (2006). Defining, assessing and promoting e-learning success: An information systems perspective. *Decision sciences journal of innovative education*, 4(1), 67–85.
- Hunsinger, J. (2005). "How to determine your readiness for mobile e-learning. Information policy". [http://i-policy.typepad.com/informationpolicy/2005/04/how\\_to\\_determin.html](http://i-policy.typepad.com/informationpolicy/2005/04/how_to_determin.html) accessed 26, March, 2007
- Internet banking: An empirical study. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 14, 501–519.
- Ishtaiwa, F. (2006). Factors influencing faculty Participation in E-learning: The Case of Jordan. Unpublished dissertation. (USA: Washington University).
- Iverson, K. M., Colky, D. L., & Cyboran, V. L. (2005). E-learning takes the lead: An empirical investigation of learner differences in online and classroom delivery. *Performance improvement quarterly*, 18(4), 5–18.
- Jennex, M. E. (2005). *Case Studies in Knowledge Management*. Idea Group Publishing: Hershey.
- Johnson, L. et al. (2010). 2010 Horizon Report: K-12 Edition. The New Media Consortium. Austin, Texas.
- Juhadii, N., Samah, A & Sarah, H. (2007). Use of Technology, Job Characteristics and work outcomes: A case of Unitary Instructors. *International Review of business Research papers*, 3 (2)184-203.
- Karatas, S., & Simsek, N. (2009). Comparisons of internet-based and face-to-face learning systems based on "equivalency of experiences" according to students' academic achievements and satisfactions. *Quarterly review of distance education*, 10(1), 65–74.
- Karim, M. R. A., & Hashim, Y. (2004), "The Experience of e-learning Implementation at the Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris, Malaysia", *Malasian Online Journal of Instructional Technology*, Vol 1, No. 1, pp 50-59
- Kartha, C. P. (2006). Learning business statistics vs. traditional. *Business Review*, 5, 27–33.
- Keegan, D., Lossenko, J., Mazar, I., Michels, P. F., Paulsen, M. F., Rekkedal, T., & Zarka D. (2007). E-learning initiatives that did not reach targeted goals. *Megatrends Project 2007*. Retrieved 28 January 2015
- Keller, C. & Cernerud, L. (2002). Students' perception of e-learning in university education. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 27(1), 55-67.
- Kelly, H. F., Ponton, M. K., & Rovai, A. P. (2007). A comparison of student evaluations of teaching between online and face-to-face courses. *The internet and higher education*, 10(2), 89–101.
- Khan, B. H. (2005). *Managing E-learning: Design, Delivery, Implementation and Evaluation*, Hershey, PA: Information Science Publishing.
- Khan, BH. (2001). *A Framework for Web-based Learning*. Educational Technology Publications: Englewood Cliffs.

- Klein, D. & Ware, M. (2003). E-learning: new opportunities in continuing professional development. *Learned publishing*, 16 (1) 34-46.
- Kocur, D., & Kosc, P., (2009) "E-learning Implementation in Higher Education", *Acta\_ElectrotechnicaetInformatica*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp20-26
- Koohang, A. Riley, L. Smith, T. (2009) E-Learning and Constructivism: From Theory to Application. *Interdisciplinary Journal of E-Learning and Learning Objects: Volume 5*
- Kwofie, B., & Henten, A. (2011). The Advantages and Challenges of E-Learning Implementation: The Story of a Developing Nation. Paper presented on 3rd World Conference on Educational Sciences Bahcesehir University, Conference Centre Istanbul – Turkey.
- LaRose, R., Gregg, J., & Eastin, M. (1998). Audio graphic tele-courses for the Web: An experiment. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communications*, 4(2).
- Laurillard, D. (2014). Five myths about Moocs. *Times Higher Education*. Retrieved 20 March 2015, from Lee, B., Yoon, J., & Lee, I. (2009). Learners' acceptance of e-learning in South Korea: Theories and results. *Computers & Education*, 53(4), 1320– 1329.
- Levine, A. & Sun, J. (2002). Barriers to Distance Education. [Online]. Available at <http://www.acenet.edu>. Accessed on 25/02/2014.
- Levy, P., Ford, N., Foster, J., Madden, A., Miller, D., Nunes, M. B., Mcpherson, M., & Webber, S. (2003). Educational informatics: An emerging research agenda. *Journal of information science*, 29(4), 298–310.
- Lewis, N. J. (2000). The Five Attributes of Innovative E-Learning, Training and Development, Vol. 54, No. 6, 47 51.
- Liaw, S. S., Huang, H. M. (2003). Exploring the World Wide Web for online learning: a perspective from Taiwan. *Educational Technology* 40(3): 27–32.
- Liu, Y., & Wang, H. (2009). A comparative study on e-learning technologies and products: from the East to the West. *Systems Research & Behavioral Science*, 26(2), 191–209.
- Love, N. & Fry, N. (2006). "Accounting Students' Perceptions of a Virtual Learning Environment: Springboard or Safety Net?," *Accounting Education: An International Journal*, 15 (2), 151-166.
- Macharia, J., & Nyakwende, E. (2009). Factors affecting the adoption and diffusion of internet in Higher educational institutions in Kenya. *Journal of Language, Technology and Entrepreneurship in Africa*, 1, 2, 6-23.
- Macharia, J., & Nyakwende, E. (2010). Influence of university factors on the students' acceptance of internet based learning tools in higher education. *Journal of Communication and Computer*, 7, 10, 72-82.
- Mahoney, S. (2009). Mindset change: influences on student buy-in to online classes. *Quarterly review of distance education*, 10(1), 75–83.
- Maltz, L., Deblois, P. & The EDUCAUSE Current Issues Committee. (2005). Top Ten IT Issues. *EDUCAUSE Review*, 40 (1), 15-28.
- Marc, J. R. (2002). Book review: e-learning strategies for delivering knowledge in the digital age. *Internet and Higher Education*, 5, 185-188.
- Mcdonald, J. (2002). Is "as good as face-to-face" as good as it gets? *Journal of asynchronous learning networks*, 6(2), 10–23.
- Meyer, K. A. (2003). Face-to-face versus threaded discussions: The role of time and higher-order thinking. *Journal of asynchronous learning networks*, 7(3), 55–65.
- Michel, D. (1996). Two-year College and the Internet: An Integration Practices and Beliefs of Faculty Users, PhD Thesis, U.S.A: University of Minnesota.
- Moller, L., Foshay, W. R. and Huett, J. (2008). The evolution of distance education: Implications for instructional design on the potential of the web. *Techtrends: linking research & practice to improve learning*, 52(3), 70–75.
- Motteram, G., & Forrester, G. (2005). Becoming an online distance learner: What can be learned from students' experiences of induction to distance programmes? *Distance education*, 26, 281–298.
- Muhsin, H., (...) "The Using of E-Learning Techniques to Improve the Medical Education", 3rd International Conference.

- Muirhead, R. J. (2007). E-learning: Is this teaching at students or teaching with students? *Nursing forum*, 42(4), 178–184.
- Nagel, L., & Kotzé, T. G. (2010). Supersizing e-learning: What a CoI survey reveals about teaching presence in a large online class. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 13(1–2), 45–51
- Nichols, M. (2003). A Theory for E-Learning, *Educational Technology and Society*, Vol. 6, No.2, 1–10.
- Njenga, J. K., & Fourie, L. C. H. (2010). The myths about e-learning in higher education. *British journal of educational technology*, 41(2), 199–212.
- Nor, A. & Ahmed, M. (2005). Innovation for better teaching and learning: Adopting the Learning Management System. *Malaysian online journal of instructional technology*. Vol 2, No.2, 2740.
- Oblinger, D. G., & Hawkins, B. L. (2005). The myth about E-learning. *Educause review*.
- OECD. (2005). E-learning in tertiary education [Online]. Available at <http://www.cumex.org>. (Accessed 27 /02/ 2014).
- Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD). (2005) “E-learning in Tertiary Education”. *Policy Briefs*. <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/27/35/35991871.pdf> accessed 8 January 2006.
- Padilla Vargas, I. (2005). Educación a distancia: Ofrecimientos con calidad y eficacia
- Pagram, P., & Pagram, J., (2006). “Issues in e-learning: A Thai Case Study”, *The Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries*, Vol. 26, No. 6, 1–8
- Papastergiou, M. (2006). Course management systems as tools for the creation of online learning environments: Evaluation from a social constructivist perspective and implications for their design. *International Journal on E-Learning*, 5(4), 593–622. Available: <http://www.editlib.org/p/6084>
- Parr, C. (2013). Mooc completion rates ‘below 7%’. *Times Higher Education*. Retrieved 20 March 2015 from
- Pelz, B. (2004). Three principles of effective online pedagogy. *Journal of asynchronous learning networks*, 8(3), 103–116.
- Pérez Juste, R. (1986). *Pedagogía experimental. La medida en educación*.
- Perraton, H. (2002). *Open and Distance Learning in the Developing World*, London: Routledge.
- Piskurich, G. M. (2006). Online learning: E-learning. Fast, cheap, and good. *Performance Improvement*, 45(1), 18–24.
- Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants part 2: Do they really think differently? *On the horizon*, 9(6), 1–6.
- Prensky, M. (2009). ‘H. Sapiens Digital: From Digital Immigrants and Digital Natives to Digital
- Price, L., Richardson, J. T. E., & Jelfs, A. (2007). Face-to-face versus online tutoring support in distance education. *Studies in higher education*, 32(1), 1–20.
- Re.ViCa. (2009). *Reviewing (Traces of) European Virtual Campuses: Scottish Knowledge*. Retrieved 20 March 2015 from
- Richard, H., & Haya, A. (2009). Examining student decision to adopt web 2.0 technologies: theory and empirical tests. *Journal of computing in higher education*, 21(3), 183–198.
- Richardson, J. T. E. (2009). Face-to-face versus online tutoring support in humanities courses in distance education. *Arts and humanities in higher education*, 8(1), 69–85.
- Rodgers (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of distance learning*, (1994–1999). New York: IGI.
- Rosenberg J. M. (2001). *E-learning: Strategies for Delivering Knowledge in the Digital Age*. McGraw-Hill: New York.
- Rossi, P. G. (2009). Learning environment with artificial intelligence elements. *Journal of e-learning and knowledge society*, 5(1), 67–75.
- Rumble, G. (2001). The costs and costing of networked learning. *Journal of asynchronous learning networks*, 5(2), 75–96.
- Sadler-Smith, E. (2000). "Modern" learning methods: rhetoric and reality. *Personnel Review*, 29(4), 474–490.
- Salmon, G. (2004). *E-moderating: the key teaching and learning online*. (2nd Ed.) UK: Routledge.
- Scarafiotti, C. (2004). Five important lessons about the cost of e-learning. *New directions for community colleges*, (128), 39–46.

- Schank, R. C. (2000). A Vision of Education for the 21st Century , T.H.E. Journal. Vol. 27, No. 6, 43-45.
- Scott B., Ken C. H. & Edwin M. G. (1999). The Effects of Internet-Based Instruction on Student Learning , Journal of Asynchronous Learning Network, Vol. 3, No. 2.,98-106.
- Seidel, G., (2009). Facebook friends/fiends. Teacher, (204), 60-63
- Selim, H. M. (2003). 'An Empirical Investigation of Student Acceptance of a Course Websites.' Computers and Education 40, (4) 343- 360.
- Senge, P. M. (2000). The Fifth Discipline: the Art and Practice of the Learning Organization. Double Day Currency: New York.
- Serwatka, J. (2002). Improving student performance in distance learning courses. The Journal of Technological Horizons In Education, 29(9), 46-52.
- Shattuck, K. (2014). Assuring quality in online education: Practices and processes at the teaching, resource, and program levels. Sterling: Stylus Publishing.
- Sife, A. S. Lwoga E. T. & Sanga, C. New technologies for teaching and learning: Challenges for higher learning institutions in developing countries.
- Singh, H. (2001) Building effective blended learning programs. Educational Technology 43(6): 51-4.
- Smedley, J. K. (2010). Modelling the impact of knowledge management using technology. OR Insight (2010) 23, 233-250.
- Smith, G. & Taveras, M. (2005). The Missing Instructor: Does E-Learning Promotes Absenteeism. E-learn Magazine, 5 (1), 1-18.
- Smith, M. (2011). The quality factors which influence online learning. PhD Research Dissertation. Sokoine University of Agriculture, Tanzania IJEDICT), 2007, Vol. 3, Issue 2, 57-67.
- Solimeno, A., Mebane, M. E., Tomai, M., & Francescato, D. (2008). The influence of students and teachers characteristics on the efficacy of face-toface and computer supported collaborative learning. Computers & education, 51(1), 109-128.
- Soloway, E., Guzdial, M., & Hay, K. E. (1994). Learner-centered design: The challenge for HCI in the 21st century. Interactions, 1(2), 36-48. doi:10.1145/174809.174813
- Spanish Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports. (2016). Datos y cifras del sistema universitario español. Curso 2015-2016
- Spiceland, J. D., & Hawkins, P. C. (2002). The impact on learning of an asynchronous active learning course format. Journal of asynchronous learning networks, 6(1), 68-75.
- Stephenson, J. E., Brown, C., & Griffin, D. K. (2008). Electronic delivery of lectures in the university environment: An empirical comparison of three delivery styles. Computers & education, 50(3), 640-651.
- Steven, D. L. (2009). PhD dissertation .student use of a learning management system for group projects: a case study investigating interaction, collaboration, and knowledge construction.
- Stoel, L., & Lee, K. H. (2003). 'Modeling the Effect of Experience on the Student Acceptance of Web-Based Courseware.' Internet research: Electronic Network Applications and Policy 13, (5) 364-374.
- Surry, D. W., & Ensminger, D. C. (2009). Supporting the implementation of online learning. In P. L.
- Szajna, B. (1996). Empirical Evaluation of the Revised Technology Acceptance Model. Management Science 42 (1):85-92.
- Tagoe, M. (2012). Students' perceptions on incorporating e-learning into teaching and learning at the University of Ghana international Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication Technology (IJEDICT), Vol. 8, Issue 1, 91-103.
- Tao, Y. H., Yeh, C. R., & Sun, S. I. (2006). Improving training needs assessment processes via the internet: system design and qualitative study. Internet Research, 16 (4), 427-49.
- Twigg, C. (2002). Quality, cost and access: the case for redesign. In The Wired Tower. Pittinsky MS (ed.). Prentice-Hall: New Jersey. p. 111-143.
- UHI (University of the Highlands and Islands). (2014). Facts and figures 2014. 29 January 2015
- UNESCO (2006). Teachers and Educational Quality: Monitoring Global Needs for 2015
- Universities UK. (2013). The power of part-time: Review of part-time and mature higher education. London: Universities UK.

- Ur, T. A., & Weggen C. C. (2000). *Corporate E-Learning: Exploring a New Frontier*, San Francisco, CA: WR Hambrecht and Co. Available from:<http://www.spectrainteractive.com>
- Vencatachellum, I. & Munusami, V. (2006). Barriers to effective corporate e-learning in Mauritius. [Online]. Available at [<http://uom.academia.edu>]. Accessed on 27/02/2014.
- Venkatesh, V. & Davis, F. (2000). 'A Theoretical Extension of the Technology Acceptance Model: Four Longitudinal Field Studies.' *Management Science* 46, (2) 186-204.
- Wagner, N., Hassanein, K. & Head, M. (2008). Who is responsible for E-learning in Higher Education? A Stakeholders' Analysis. *Educational Technology & Society*, 11 (3), 26-36.
- Wagner, N., Hassanein, K., & Head, M. (2008). Who is responsible for e-learning success in higher education? A stakeholders' analysis. *Journal of educational technology & society*, 11(3), 26-36.
- Wang, Q., & Woo, H. L. (2007). Comparing asynchronous online discussions and face-to-face discussions in a classroom setting. *British journal of educational technology*, 38(2), 272-286.
- Wang, Y. S., Wang, Y. M., Lin, H. H., & Tang, T. I. (2003). Determinants of user acceptance of Welsh ET, Wanberg CR, Brown EG, Simmering M.J. (2003). E-learning: emerging uses, empirical results and future directions. *International Journal of Training and Development* 2003(7): 245-258
- Wentling T. L., Waight C, Gallagher J, La Fleur J, Wang C, Kanfer A. (2000). E-learning - a review of literature. *Knowledge and Learning Systems Group NCSA* 9.1-73.
- Winterbottom, S. (2007). Virtual lecturing: Delivering lectures using screencasting and podcasting technology. *Planet*, 18, 6-8.
- Wisdom', *Innovate: Journal of Online Education*, Vol. 5, issue 3, 1-9 Rabah, M. (2005) *E-learning*, Jordan: Dar Almnahej Publisher.
- Wood, R., & Ashfield, J. (2008). The use of the interactive whiteboard for creative teaching and learning in literacy and mathematics: a case study. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 39 (1), 84-96.
- Zhu, C. (2012). Student Satisfaction, Performance and Knowledge Construction in Online Collaborative Learning. *Educational Technology & Society*, 15(1), 127-136.