
COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' SATISFACTION REGARDING BLENDED LEARNING AND CLASSROOM LEARNING

Muhammad Athar Hussain

Associate Professor,
Department of Education, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur,
Punjab, Pakistan.
Email: athar.hussain@iub.edu.pk

Muhammad Gohar Iqbal

M.Phil. Scholar,
Department of Education, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Rahim Yar Khan Campus,
Punjab, Pakistan.
Email: gohariqbal9@gmail.com

Sehrish Hussain

Visiting Lecturer,
Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Khwaja Fareed UEIT, Rahim Yar Khan,
Punjab, Pakistan.
Email: sehrish.hussain227@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to find out a comparison of students' satisfaction regarding blended learning and classroom learning. The objectives of the study were: to assess the level of student satisfaction and comparison of students' satisfaction regarding blended learning and classroom learning and to ascertain the differences between students' satisfaction regarding both on the basis of demographics i.e. gender, locality, and mode of learning. To achieve these objectives, this study used a descriptive survey design. 1545 (801 males and 744 females) from the departments of Education and English in IUB, IUB (RYK Campus), and KFUEIT RYK constituted the population of the study. A 40-item questionnaire for students was used to investigate the students' satisfaction regarding blended learning and classroom learning. The researcher used a stratified random sampling technique and 539 students (299 males and 240 females) were selected finally and the response rate was 98.1%. The researcher used both descriptive statistics and inferential statistical techniques to analyze the collected data of the participants by using SPSS. The results revealed that the majority of participants are of the point of view that blended learning is comparatively more effective and convenient than

classroom learning at the university level.

KEYWORDS

Students' Satisfaction, Blended Learning, Classroom Learning, Graduate Students, University Level

INTRODUCTION

Higher education has been trying to improve teaching methods to suit different learning styles and motivate students. Higher education has prioritized computer-enhanced teaching and learning as IT has grown in popularity and sophistication. Blended learning and online delivery have become commonplace in many universities to meet the emerging demands of graduate-level study (Zeqiri et al., 2020). A blend of online and face-to-face instruction is referred to as "*blended learning*". Blended learning integrates online and classroom-based learning courses delivered via computers and other mobile devices incorporating a blend of in-person tutoring, computer technology, and other forms of media. Another word for a blended learning setting is "*hybrid teaching*" (Boelens et al., 2015). E-learning, often called "*remote learning*" is facilitated by widespread computing and networking gear and software (Kulkarni et al., 2013). Blended learning, also known as hybrid learning has entered higher education to give students the best of both in-person and online learning (Asarta & Schmidt, 2013). Blended learning has been defined by researchers as a novel learning technique that combines traditional learning with e-learning in a variety of models to boost students' motivation and learning outcomes (Kavitha & Jaisingh, 2018). Blended learning, which blends classroom instruction with online activities, gives students more scheduling flexibility (Diep et al., 2017).

Blended learning is a combination of traditional classroom instruction with virtual instruction. Instructors can integrate online and face-to-face components of the course, and students can access resources whenever it's convenient for them, thanks to blended learning. On top of all that, it helps with grade organization because it allows for the data collection on a single platform, which aids in the management of the entire learning practice (Rahman et al., 2015).

The concept of "*blended learning*" existed prior to the turn of the century, but the phrase wasn't coined until then. "Blended learning" refers to a variety of instructional strategies that combine in-person training with online resources (Graham, 2013). It combines online and classroom instruction. Sessions may consist of synchronous online conferences and training (SOC), synchronous self-paced learning, and asynchronous self-paced learning (Graham, 2013). E-learning platforms that combine traditional classroom instruction with online education can be made far more effective with the assistance of a learning management system, also known as an LMS. Learning

Management Systems (LMS) are implemented in educational institutions with the intention of providing students to assist them in excelling in their academic pursuits. These resources may include chat rooms, discussion boards, file sharing, online grade uploading, online reviews, and task management (Cole et al., 2019). According to the findings of Goyal and Tambe (2015), student's performance in the course materials improved when they demonstrated comprehension of the online learning platform they were enrolled in. According to student feedback, adopting an online learning management system had a beneficial effect on their capacity to remember and utilize the information they had previously acquired.

According to a previous study (Anaraki, 2018), blended learning has been shown to have a beneficial impact on students' satisfaction as well as a favourable impact on students' understanding and academic performance. Teachers must provide greater help to students and employ for blended learning to be effective, there must be a unified, user-friendly online platform maintained (Botha, 2019). The quest for concrete evidence of learning's effects on students' lives was prompted by concerns about and satisfaction with flipped and blended learning environments. According to the path model study, both learning settings could have a positive effect on students' feelings of contentment, commitment, and achievement. In addition, the study found that students who participated in a flipped learning program were more satisfied with their work, regardless of how they felt about their performance (Fisher et al., 2018). Some studies, however, have lately found that preparation is a significant component when it comes to student happiness, despite the fact that they have identified aspects that could directly influence it. The findings had a significant impact on our knowledge of students' satisfaction. For example, a sense of control over one's own learning process and one's ability to effectively communicate in virtual settings were found to be critical factors in affecting learner satisfaction in the regression model analysis (Umi et al., 2018).

Ke and Kwak (2013) found that student satisfaction is affected by five factors: learner relevance, active learning, real learning, learner autonomy, and technology competency. Kuo et al. (2013) found that good student grades are linked to communication between the learner and the instructor, engagement with the content by the learner, and effective use of technology. Course success depends on the professor-student relationship. Blended learning is better than lectures, and there are signs that instructors' traditional ideas about how to teach undergraduates in general health courses need to be changed. Today's technology-driven education favors integrated learning. Yet, blended learning has only recently been embraced by higher education institutions worldwide to improve students' educational opportunities (Arbaugh, 2014). Blended learning is advertised as more effective and adaptable.

“Blended learning” is combining classroom time with online learning. Participant satisfaction can be a gauge of blended learning effectiveness (Arbaugh, 2014). Wu and Liu (2013) found many studies that use student satisfaction to evaluate schooling. Owston et al. (2013) looked at how blended learning uses a mix of in-person and online learning to find out what makes students happy and how it affects them. Results show that students perform better with more time and location flexibility and simpler access to learning materials. When students talk to each other face-to-face in class, it leads to deeper relationships (like friendships) outside of school. Blended learning lets students study on their own by combining online and in-person classes (Poon, 2013). If used well, it can help students do better in school, be happier, and remember more than traditional and online learning. Graham (2013) believes blended learning combines the best of classroom education and digital resources. Umoh and Akpan (2014) found that Nigerian universities lack blended learning tools for teaching and learning, which hinders its implementation. Previous studies are conducted in different regions of the world but there is no study in the Islamia University Bahawalpur and KFUEIT Rahim Yar Khan.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

1. To assess the level of student satisfaction regarding blended learning.
2. To assess the level of student satisfaction regarding classroom learning.
3. To compare students' satisfaction regarding blended learning and classroom learning.
4. To ascertain the differences between students' satisfaction regarding blended learning and classroom learning based on demographics i.e. gender, locality, and mode of learning.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What is the level of students' satisfaction regarding blended learning?
2. What is the level of students' satisfaction regarding classroom learning?
3. Does there any significant difference in students' satisfaction regarding blended learning and classroom learning?
4. Do there any significant differences between students' satisfaction regarding blended learning and classroom learning on the base of demographics i.e. gender, locality, and mode of learning?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A quantitative survey design was employed to conduct the study. A questionnaire was constructed on four-point Likert scale by researcher himself and validated by expert's opinion and pilot study. This study aimed to discover the comparison of students' satisfaction regarding blended learning and classroom learning.

Sample of Study**Table 1: Gender wise and University wise detail of sample**

University	Level	Students		
		Male	Female	Total
IUB Bahawalpur	M. Phil	69	85	154
IUB RYK Campus		129	74	203
KFUIT RYK		101	81	182
Total		299	240	539

Table 1 demonstrates that the sample was selected using a stratified random sampling procedure. As a result, a representative sample included 539 (299 males and 240 females) students at the university level from the departments of Education and English of IUB Bahawalpur, IUB RYK Campus, and KFUEIT RYK.

DATA ANALYSIS

Software application (SPSS 20.0) was used to analyze the data. The percentages and frequencies of solutions have been computed. The findings had been expressed as a proportion of entire replies. Conclusions had been reached, and guidelines have been given as a result.

Statement wise analysis of Students

This section presents the descriptive analysis of students.

Teaching Methodology/ Practices**Table 2: Frequency Distribution for Teaching Methodology/ Practices**

Sr.	Statements of Questions	Blended Learning f (%)	Classroom Learning f (%)	M	SD
1	The lecture was well prepared for class.	416 (77.2)	123 (22.8)	1.22	.42
2	The teacher clearly explained course goals/objectives.	359 (66.6)	180 (33.4)	1.33	.47
3	The teacher communicated in more understandable way.	370 (68.6)	169 (31.4)	1.31	.46
4	The teacher organized the lecture well.	425 (78.8)	114 (21.2)	1.21	.40

	The teacher explained	425	114	1.21	.40
5	well the course concepts.	(78.8)	(21.2)		

Table 2 explains the results of section-A (Teaching Methodology/Practices) of the questionnaire. The majority of the respondents (77.2%) agreed that the lecture was well prepared for class in blended learning having $M=1.22$ and $SD=.42$. Majority of the respondents (66.6%) agreed that the teacher clearly explained course goals/objectives in blended learning with $M=1.33$ and $SD=.47$. This table elaborates that 68.6% respondents agreed that the teacher communicated more understandably in blended learning having $M(1.31)$ & $SD(.46)$. Mostly the respondents (78.8%) are agreed that the teacher organized the lecture well in blended learning ($M=1.21$ & $SD=.40$). 78.8% of respondents are of the point of view that the teacher explained very well the course concepts in blended learning with $M=1.21$ and $SD=.40$. Therefore, it is clear from the findings that the majority of participants are in the point of view that blended learning is comparatively more effective than classroom learning.

Content/Course Material

Table 3: Frequency Distribution for Content/Course Material

Sr.	Statements of Questions	Blended Learning f (%)	Classroom Learning f (%)	M	SD
1	Course contents were according to prescribed syllabus.	423 (78.5)	116 (21.5)	1.21	.41
2	The course material was well organized.	362 (67.2)	177 (32.8)	1.32	.47
3	The instructional materials advanced knowledge in subject matter well.	370 (68.6)	169 (31.4)	1.31	.46
4	The course material developed critical thinking.	424 (78.7)	115 (21.3)	1.21	.41
5	The assignments helped to understand the course material well.	424 (78.7)	115 (21.3)	1.21	.41

Table 3 explains the results of section B (content/course material) of the questionnaire. 78.5% of respondents agreed that course contents were according to the prescribed syllabus in blended learning having $M(1.21)$ & $SD(.41)$. Respondents (67.2%) agreed that the course material was well organized in blended learning having $M=1.32$ & $SD=.47$. This table also elaborates that the instructional materials advanced knowledge in the subject matter well in blended learning such as 68.6% respondents agreed ($M=1.31$ & $SD=.46$). Majority of the respondents (78.7%) agreed that the course material developed critical thinking in blended learning having $M(1.21)$

& SD (.41). Mostly respondents (78.7%) agreed that the assignments helped to understand the course material well in blended learning (having $M=1.21$ & $SD=.41$). Therefore, it is clear from the findings that majority participants are in the point of view that blended learning is comparatively more effective than classroom learning.

Student Engagements

Table 4: Frequency Distribution for Student Engagements

Sr.	Statements of Questions	Blended Learning f (%)	Classroom Learning f (%)	M	SD
1	Students were more regular.	387 (71.8)	152 (28.2)	1.28	.45
2	Students' participation was well in class discussion.	404 (75.0)	135 (25.0)	1.25	.43
3	Collaboration among students was better.	344 (63.8)	195 (36.2)	1.36	.48
4	Student-teacher interaction was better.	313 (58.1)	226 (41.9)	1.41	.49
5	Used an electronic medium to complete assignments.	376 (69.8)	163 (30.2)	1.21	.41
6	Students' career plans were discussed in a better way.	385 (71.4)	154 (28.6)	1.28	.45
7	Creative ideas and solutions were discussed in better way.	320 (59.4)	219 (40.6)	1.40	.49

Table 4 explains the results of section C (Student Engagements) of the questionnaire. Respondents (71.8%) agreed that students were more regular in blended learning having M (1.28) & SD (.45). 75% respondents agreed that students' participation was well in class discussion in blended learning having $M=1.25$ & $SD=.43$. This table also elaborates that collaboration among students was better in blended learning, 63.8% respondents agreed (having $M=1.36$ & $SD=.48$). Mostly respondents (58.1%) agreed that student-teacher interaction was better in blended learning ($M=1.41$ & $SD=.49$). Large number of respondents (69.8%) agreed that they used an electronic medium to complete assignments in blended learning having M (1.21) & SD (.41). Mostly respondents (71.4%) agreed that students' career plans were discussed in a better way in blended learning having $M=1.28$ & $SD=.45$. This table also elaborates that creative ideas and solutions were discussed in better way in blended learning such as 59.4% respondents agreed (having $M=1.40$ and $SD=.49$). Therefore, it is clear from the findings that majority of the participants are in the point of view that blended learning is comparatively more effective than classroom.

Assessment**Table 5: Frequency Distribution for Assessment**

Sr.	Statements of Questions	Blended Learning f (%)	Classroom Learning f (%)	M	SD
1	Conduction of exams was easy.	338 (62.7)	201 (37.3)	1.37	.48
2	Better grades were achieved.	323 (59.9)	216 (40.1)	1.40	.49
3	Assessment criteria were clearly mentioned.	404 (75.0)	135 (25.0)	1.25	.43
4	Appropriate assessment results were provided to students.	345 (64.0)	194 (36.0)	1.35	.48
5	Quality of education was better.	368 (68.3)	171 (31.7)	1.31	.46

Table 5 explains the results of section B (Assessment) of the questionnaire. Respondents (62.7%) agreed that conduction of exams was easy in blended learning having M (1.37) & SD (.48). Most respondents (59.9%) agreed that better grades were achieved in blended learning having $M=1.40$ and $SD=.4$. This table also elaborates that assessment criteria were clearly mentioned in blended learning such as 75% respondents agreed having M (1.25) & SD (.43). Mostly respondents (64.0%) agreed that appropriate assessment results were provided to students in blended learning having M (1.35) & SD (.48). Respondents (68.3%) agreed that quality of education was better in blended learning having M (1.31) & SD (.46). Therefore, it is clear from the findings that majority participants are in the point of view that blended learning is comparatively more effective than classroom learning.

Convenience/Comfort-ability**Table 6: Frequency Distribution for Convenience/Comfort-ability**

Sr.	Statements of Questions	Blended Learning f (%)	Classroom Learning f (%)	M	SD
1	Learning environment was comfortable.	379 (70.3)	160 (29.7)	1.31	.64
2	Easy access to learning materials.	383 (71.1)	156 (28.6)	1.28	.45

3	Education was cost effective.	399 (74.0)	140 (26.0)	1.25	.43
4	Faced technical problems/connectivity issues during class.	367 (68.1)	172 (31.9)	1.31	.46
5	Level of motivation in students was high.	402 (74.0)	137 (25.4)	1.25	.43

Table 6 explains the results of section B (convenience/comfort-ability) of the questionnaire. Respondents (70.3%) agreed that the learning environment was comfortable in blended learning having M (1.31) & SD (.64). Respondents agreed (71.1%) that easy access to learning materials in blended learning having M (1.28) & SD (.45). This table also elaborates that education was cost-effective in blended learning such as 74% respondents agreed having M (1.25) & SD (.43). Mostly respondents (68.1%) agreed that they faced technical problems/connectivity issues in blended learning (having $M=1.31$ & $SD=.46$). 74% of respondents agreed that the level of motivation in students was high in blended learning having M (1.25) & SD (.43). Therefore, it is clear from the findings that the majority of participants are in the point of view that blended learning is comparatively more effective than classroom learning.

Communication Skills

Table 7: Frequency Distribution for Communication Skills

Sr.	Statements of Questions	Blended Learning f (%)	Classroom Learning f (%)	M	SD
1	IT skills were groomed.	381 (70.7)	158 (29.3)	1.29	.45
2	Reading skills were improved.	385 (71.4)	154 (28.6)	1.28	.45
3	Writing skills were improved.	326 (60.5)	213 (39.5)	1.39	.48
4	Listening skills were improved.	378 (70.1)	161 (29.9)	1.29	.45
5	Speaking skills were improved.	364 (67.5)	175 (32.5)	1.32	.46
6	Students were encouraged to raise questions.	351 (65.1)	188 (34.9)	1.34	.47

Table 7 explains the results of section B (communication skills) of the questionnaire. Respondents (70.7%) agreed that IT skills were groomed in blended learning having M (1.29) & SD (.45). Respondents (71.4%) agreed that Reading skills were improved in blended learning having $M=1.28$ and $SD=.45$. This table also elaborates that Writing skills were improved in blended learning such as respondents (60.5%) agreed having M (1.39) & SD (.48). Respondents (70.1%) agreed that listening skills were improved in blended learning having M (1.39) & SD (.48). Respondents (67.5%) agreed that speaking skills were improved in blended learning having M (1.29) & SD (.46). Respondents (65.1%) agreed that students were encouraged to raise questions in blended learning (having $M=1.34$ & $SD=.47$). Therefore, it is clear from the findings that majority participants are in the point of view that blended learning is comparatively more effective than classroom learning.

Class Environment

Table 8: Frequency Distribution for Class Environment

Sr.	Statements of Questions	Blended Learning f (%)	Classroom Learning f (%)	M	SD
1	Strength of class was suitable.	401 (74.4)	138 (25.6)	1.25	0.43
2	Class room activities were interesting.	353 (65.5)	186 (34.5)	1.34	0.47
3	I enjoyed the class.	364 (67.5)	175 (32.5)	1.32	0.46
4	I bored in class.	413 (76.6)	126 (23.4)	1.23	0.42
5	I expressed my views well in class.	408 (75.7)	131 (24.3)	1.24	0.42
6	I learned more from peers.	361 (67.0)	178 (33.0)	1.33	0.47
7	Teacher encouraged classroom discussion.	348 (64.4)	191 (35.4)	1.35	0.47

Table 8 explains the results of section C (Class Environment) of the questionnaire. 74.4% of respondents agreed that the strength of the class was suitable in blended learning having M (1.25) & SD (.43). Respondents (65.5%) agreed that classroom activities were interesting in blended learning having $M = 1.34$ & $SD = .47$. This table also elaborates that I enjoyed the class in blended learning, 67.5% of respondents agreed (having $M=1.32$ & $SD=.46$). Mostly respondents (76.6%) agreed that I bored in class was better in blended learning having M (1.23) & SD (.42). The Large number of respondents (75.7%) agreed that I expressed my views well in class in blended

learning having M (1.24) & SD (.42). Mostly respondents (67.0%) agreed that I learned more from peers in blended learning having M (1.33) & SD (.47). This table also elaborates that teacher encouraged classroom discussion in blended learning such as 64.4% respondents agreed (having $M = 1.35$ & $SD = .47$). Therefore, it is clear from the findings that majority participants are in the point of view that blended learning is comparatively more effective than classroom learning.

Analysis of difference between students' opinion regarding Blended Learning and Classroom Learning on the base of Demographics i.e. Locality, Gender, Age, Program of Study, Faculty

This section reveals the analysis of data to find the difference between participants' opinions regarding students' satisfaction with blended learning and classroom learning on the base of demographics i.e. locality, gender, age, program of study, and faculty. One-way ANOVA and independent sample t-test were used to analyze the data.

Table 9: Analysis of Difference between Participants Regarding Comparison of Students' Satisfaction regarding Blended Learning and Classroom Learning by Locality

Variables	Category	N	Mean	SD	Df	T	Sig.
Locality	Urban	306	97.49	13.76	537	.62	.53
	Rural	233	98.27	15.11			

Table 9 indicates the difference between participants' opinions regarding students' satisfaction with blended learning and classroom learning by locality. The calculated p-value is .53, which is greater than 0.05. The p-value shows that there is statistically no significant difference between participants' opinions on the base of locality i.e. urban and rural.

Table 10: Analysis of Difference between Participants' Perceptions Regarding Comparison of Students' Satisfaction regarding Blended Learning and Classroom Learning by Gender

Variables	Category	N	Mean	SD	Df	t	Sig.
Gender	Male	299	98.17	14.33	537	.62	.53
	Female	240	97.39	14.40			

Table 10 shows the difference between participants' opinions regarding students' satisfaction with blended learning and classroom learning by gender. The calculated p-value (.53) is greater than 0.05, which indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between participants' responses.

Table 11: Analysis of Difference between Participants' Perception regarding Comparison of Students' Satisfaction regarding Blended Learning and Classroom

Learning by Faculty

Variables	Category	N	Mean	SD	Df	T	Sig.
Faculty	Social Sciences	386	98.39	14.89	537	1.46	.14
	Applied Sciences	153	96.39	12.84			

Table 11 demonstrates the difference between participants' perceptions regarding the comparison of students' satisfaction regarding blended learning and classroom learning by faculty. The calculated significant value is .14, which was greater than 0.05 which displays the statistically no significant difference between the opinions of different participants having different faculty. F value (1.46) also supports the claim.

Table 12: Analysis of Difference between Participants regarding Comparison of Students' Satisfaction regarding Blended Learning and Classroom Learning by Age

Variables	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1056.95	3	352.32	1.71	.16
Within Groups	109865.99	535	205.35		
Total	110922.954	538			

Table 12 shows the difference between participants' perceptions regarding the comparison of students' satisfaction regarding blended learning and classroom learning by age. The calculated significance value is .163, which was greater than 0.05 and displays statistically no significant difference between the opinions of different students having different ages. F value (1.71) also supports the claim.

Table 13: Analysis of Difference between Participants Regarding Comparison of Students' Satisfaction regarding Blended Learning and Classroom Learning on the Base of Program of Study

Variables	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	607.06	3	202.35	.98	.40
Within Groups	110315.89	535	206.19		
Total	110922.95	538			

Table 13 shows the difference between participants' perceptions regarding the comparison of students' satisfaction regarding blended learning and classroom learning by program of study. The calculated significant value is .40, which was greater than 0.05 which displays the statistically no significant difference between the opinions of different students having different programs of study. F value (.98) also supports the claim.

DISCUSSION

The study was conducted to explore the comparison of students' satisfaction regarding blended learning and classroom learning. Blended learning improves university students' learning more than classroom learning. Blended learning improves students' academic performance and learning enjoyment (Anaraki, 2018). According to the Botha (2019) paradigm, blended learning is viable when teachers support students and use a standard, user-friendly digital platform. Naaj et al. (2012) stressed that student satisfaction in cooperative learning contexts is vital to any implementation method. Student happiness is linked to instructor efficacy, notably accessibility and reaction time. Students need reliable technology (Bower & Kamata, 2008). Bath and Bourke (2010) described three blended learning components. Course materials are flexible. Blended learning plans and prepares in a networked setting. It also promotes multiple educational methods. Pupils vary in learning techniques, talents, and pedagogical skills. Blended learning facilitates self-directed learning. Finally, we wish to teach students e-learning. Blended learning helps teachers to improve teaching strategies.

Blended learning emphasizes effective learning and two-way communication between teachers and students. Blended learning lets students and teachers balance constant guidance with unrestricted online access (Naaj et al., 2012). Instructors were advised to consider students' characteristics while choosing courses in blended and online college courses to boost satisfaction (Bolliger & Erichsen, 2013). Blended learning boosts teacher satisfaction by enabling more student-teacher interactions, according to several studies. Group learning improves (Romero-Fras et al., 2013). Flipped and blended classrooms have pros and cons; therefore, researchers want to know if they improve student outcomes, performance, and satisfaction. The route model study suggests that both sorts of educational environments can improve students' satisfaction, dedication, and success. The study found that flipped-learning students were happier with their work regardless of their ability.

The first objective of the study was to assess the level of students' satisfaction regarding blended learning. Most of the students were pleased with their blended learning experience. They thrive in the relaxed yet stimulating atmosphere of blended learning. Blended learning is an effective form of instruction and pedagogy. Blended learning improves students' knowledge and understanding of course material, as well

as their participation in class, as well as their ability to self-evaluate and collaborate with others.

The second objective of the study was to assess the level of student satisfaction regarding classroom learning. There is mounting evidence that shows students are less content in classroom learning than they are in blended learning. As a result of this research, we know that most students have not satisfied with blended learning. The third objective of the study was to compare students' satisfaction regarding blended learning and classroom learning. Many students have voiced their preference for blended learning over classroom learning. Blended learning is superior to classroom learning in terms of student engagement, course content, learning environment, assessment, and interpersonal and communicative skills. The fourth objective of the study was to ascertain the differences between students' satisfaction regarding blended learning and classroom learning on the base of demographics i.e. locality, gender, faculty, age, and program of study. The result revealed that there is statistically no significant difference between participants' opinions on the base of locality, gender, faculty, age, and program of study.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the majority of respondents are of the view that students learn more effectively in blended learning as compared to classroom learning. It is highly recommended that teachers should be taught students to learn in blended learning by using advanced pedagogical techniques.

The instructional materials should be according to advanced knowledge in the subject matter recommended by the respondents.

Most of the respondents argued that used an electronic medium to complete assignments.

Most of the respondents argued that they faced technical problems/connectivity issues during class. It is recommended that there should not be technical or connectivity issues during class.

REFERENCES

- Anaraki, F. (2018). The effectiveness of blended learning: a case study. *ABAC Journal*, 38(2), 82-93.
- Arbaugh, J. B. (2014). What might online delivery teach us about blended management education? prior perspectives and future directions. *Journal of Management Education*, 38(6), 784-817.
- Asarta, C. J. & Schmidt, J. R. (2013). Access Patterns of Online Materials in a Blended Course. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*, 11(1), 107-123.
- Bath, D. & Bourke, J. (2010). Getting started with blended learning. Griffith Institute

-
- for Higher Education. Australia:
- Boelens, R., Van Laer, S., De Wever, B., Elen, J. (2015), "Blended learning in adult education: towards a definition of blended learning", available at <https://biblio.ugent.be/publication/6905076/file/6905079> (2 June, 2022)
- Bolliger, D. U., & Erichsen, E. A. (2013). Student satisfaction with blended and online courses based on personality type. *Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology*, 39(1), 1–23.
- Botha, J. (2019). Student satisfaction with a blended learning approach: implementation evaluation of three Honours programmes in Education. Master theses. Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University
- Bower, B L., and Kamata, A. (2008) 'Factors influencing student satisfaction with online courses'. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, vol.4, no.3, pp. 52-56.
- Cole, A. W., Lennon, L., & Weber, N. L. (2019). Student perceptions of online active learning practices and online learning climate predict online course engagement. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 27 (8), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2019.1619593>
- Diep, A. N., Zhu, C., Struyven, K., Blicck, Y. (2017), "Who or what contributes to student satisfaction in different blended learning modalities?" *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 48(2), 473-489.
- Fisher, R., Perényi, Á., Birdthistle, N. (2018), "The positive relationship between flipped and blended learning and student engagement, performance and satisfaction", *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 18 (1), 11-24.
- Graham, C. R. (2013), "Emerging practice and research in blended learning", in Moore, M. G. (Ed.), *Handbook of Distance Education*, 3rd ed., Routledge, New York, pp. 333-350.
- Goyal, E., & Tambe, S. (2015). Effectiveness of Moodle-enabled blended learning in private Indian Business School teaching NICHE programs. *The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education*, 5(2), 14-22.
- Kavitha, R., Jaisingh, W., (2018). A study on the student experiences in blended learning environments. *Int. J. Recent Technol. Eng.* 7 (4S), 2277–3878.
- Ke, F., & Kwak, D. (2013). Constructs of student-centered online learning on learning satisfaction of a diverse online student body: A structural equation modeling approach. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 48(1), 97-122. doi: 10.2190/EC.48.1.e
- Kulkarni, C., Wei, K. P., Le, H., Chia, D., Papadopoulos, K., Cheng, J., Koller, D., & Klemmer, S. R. (2013). Peer and Self Assessment in Massive Online Classes. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction (TOCHI)*, 20(6), 1-31.
- Kuo, Y. C., Walker, A. E., Belland, B. R., & Schroder, K. E. (2013). A predictive study of student satisfaction in online education programs. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 14(1), 16-39.
- Naaj, M. A., Nachouki, M., & Ankit, A. (2012). Evaluating student satisfaction with blended learning in a gender-segregated environment. *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research*, 11, 185-200.
- Owston, Ron, York, Dennis, & Murtha, Susan. (2013). Student perceptions and achievement in a university blended learning strategic initiative. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 18, 38-46. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2012.12.003>
-

- Poon, J. (2013). Blended learning: An institutional approach for enhancing students' learning experiences. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 9(2) Available http://jolt.merlot.org/vol9no2/poon_0613.htm
- Rahman, N. A. A., Hussein, N., Aluwi, A. H. (2015), "Satisfaction on blended learning in a public higher education institution: what factors matter?", *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 211, pp. 768-775.
- Romero-Frías, E., Arquero, J. L. (2013), "A view on personal learning environments through approaches to learning", Vol. 1 No.1, pp. 29-36.
- Umi, K.M., Nik, N. & Nor Hazlin, .A. (2018). The underlying factors of learner readiness and satisfaction in blended learning environment. Proceedings of the IEEE 6th International Conference on MOOCs, Innovation and Technology in Education (MITE) 2018, 69-73.
- Umoh, J. B., & Akpan, E. T. (2014). Challenges of blended e-learning tools in mathematics: Students' perspectives University of Uyo. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 3(4), 60-70.
- Wu, J., & Liu, W. (2013). An Empirical Investigation of the Critical Factors Affecting Students' Satisfaction in EFL. *Blended Learning*, 4(1), 3-3.
- Zeqiri, J., Alserhan, B. A. (2020), "University student satisfaction with blended learning: a cross-national study between North Macedonia and Jordan", *International Journal of Technology Enhanced Learning*, 13 (3), 325-337.