

# Comparison of Online Learning during the Covid-19 pandemic against the traditional face-to-face learning experience for a STEM related subject, Analytical Mathematics

**Original Research  
Article**

---

## Abstract

The Coronavirus (Covid-19) pandemic put a halt provisionally to face-to-face teaching throughout the educational sector impeding in addition, university students from receiving their traditional on campus teaching learning experience. Educators, academics, and the higher institutional authorities had to act fast and change their mode of teaching delivery to online platforms. With the sudden changes brought in by the UK Government and the health sector, many students had to transfer their learning habits and customs to various online mediums and tools. Some students struggled to come to terms with the new method of teaching, taking them a while even to adjust to it. Due to this impact and this new intervention of online delivery, a research study was conducted to identify whether online learning had an effect on student performance for a Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) related module. On this purpose, this paper evaluates statistically the two different teaching techniques adopted by a university foundation level module, Analytical Mathematics. Results from the quantitative analysis undertaken show a decrease in the success of students' performance suggesting a lesser impact on improved learning compared to the customary face-to-face delivery of this module. With regards to engagement, observations from the qualitative analysis of the study show a lack of involvement and participation of students during online delivery, echoing its influence on student performance.

*Keywords: Mathematics; Coronavirus pandemic; online learning;*

---

---

## 1 Introduction

In December 2019, a virus was found in China which later caused a global pandemic in March 2020, causing everyone's daily lives to change [(20)]. Educational institutions had to change their ways of operations, allowing for online teaching to be introduced, thus replacing temporarily face-to-face teaching. This study will begin with an overview as to the different ways educators adapted in their teaching and will reference the challenges faced with this change of teaching environment. It was a rapid transition from traditional to online teaching whereby assignments and examinations were also submitted electronically and teaching videos became a live online or pre-recorded phenomenon [(32)].

The world was put on hold during Covid 19 and the education sector was one of the hardest to be hit due to this pandemic. The students were forced to follow their courses through online classes from their homes [(2)]. The Higher Education Providers (HEP) were put in a position to introduce new methods to deliver lessons with the tuition fees of students remaining as for a face-to-face experience [(15)]. Many students around the world suffered adversely due to the pandemic including the millions of students in the UK.

The Universities had limited time and resources to come up with a plan to give the same education for their students. They also had to face certain issues which were supposed to be addressed beforehand. The revenue from the international students who come to the country for higher education plays a vital role towards the UK economy [(30)] and the pandemic restricted the arrival of students from other countries and hence HEP had to satisfy the students from all around the world. The pressure was immense to plan and execute within the limited time restrictions.

During this unprecedented time around the world, the importance and validity of an analysis on these two types of forms of learning is key to build a similar environment for the students to rely on in the future. With the whole world going into lockdown in 2019, UK was also compelled to follow the rules to prevent spreading of the virus. With all the disruptions, the government organised funds and aids to help all the sectors around country. The education sector moved completely to online teaching and the students were expected to follow classes from their home surroundings [(10)].

Many students immediately faced issues as they did not have the necessary technological tools and mature internet connection to attend online classes [(33)]. Students were forced to adapt to these changes quickly and yet some struggled to cope with the stress it caused, experiencing also perhaps for the first time examinations online [(27)].

The face-to-face traditional way of teaching has been employed for many years everywhere whereby students physically attend the classes and lectures. The educators teach and explain the subject material making sure that students understand the concepts well. In this environment, students clarify their queries and get answers, feedback straight away without any delay in time [(31)]. The traditional classes take place at a specific time and location where students need to be physically present in order to attend them. Students are also given opportunities to participate in group activities and presentations to improve their communication and group work skills.

Online teaching in most subjects is a fairly new approach of virtual learning in the higher education sector. Here the academics or educators would normally pre-record or record lectures in immediate time with students being able to attend their classes from home through an online platform. In the case of missing an online lecture, this could be watched later thus providing a very flexible learning environment [(5)]. The benefit of this teaching method is that it can help students who have other responsibilities whilst at home to manage the time between the studies and other tasks. The economical situations can affect a student's online learning vastly and many even faced hardships with using digital devices and tools [(9)].

The main objective of this paper is to understand the two forms of teaching presented to students for this module and how the adopted methods had an impact on their academic performance towards their education as well as highlighting its drawbacks.

---

## 1.1 Literature Review

According to Chiodini [(6)] due to the pandemic many sectors around the world were affected including the education sector. Many developing countries faced many technological and financial pressure to provide a better education even during the tough times of the pandemic [(34)]. As the whole world was in lockdown many students' mental well being in learning was deteriorating and this put more pressure on the education providers to tackle this issue [(12)]. There are many issues students had to endure in their online learning during the period of the pandemic. In some hard hit countries, the students did not have proper internet connection and the necessary tools to continue their studies effectively. In some countries many had to pay more money to get the required data for the internet provider to download large files including notes and videos. Many, unfortunately, faced financial struggles to pay for these additional technological requirements.

Traditional, blended and online learning are examples of types of teaching. The concept of a traditional way of teaching is considered here as face-to-face with the presence of educators and students [(1)]. Educators prepare lectures beforehand and give assessments to students after the content is delivered and it is believed that there is more engagement amongst academics and students in this manner [(22)]. The educator provides tips to help develop students' knowledge and students can sort out queries without delay by speaking to the educator directly. In this type of teaching, group activities can occur which allows students to develop skills such as group work and communication [(29)]. In addition with this type of teaching environment, the direct supervision of educators can help the students positively to grasp the concepts [(25)].

According to Alonso et al. [(3)] and Holenko et al. [(11)] the most effective method of teaching is that of a blended learning approach, which combines live e-learning, self study, and face-to-face traditional teaching delivery. Blended teaching is increasingly showing dependency on e-learning whereby the use of technology like internet, Information and Communication and media are used to deliver this way of teaching. During online delivery, educators may provide live online or pre-recorded lectures which students can watch at their own time at home and may pause, forward or rewind the recording when they wish [(4)]. This type of teaching allows students to use technology in their learning and it is the main platform for the communication between students and educators. Communication and course design play a vital role in the online learning courses [(14)]. Online mathematics education poses particular challenges in terms of both the hardware and software necessary for effective teaching, due to issues with mathematical symbols and notation, among others [(18)]. Flipped classroom is another type of blended teaching where students can watch videos or look at resources before coming to lectures [(24)]. Although online/e-learning techniques may have positive effects on students' learning experience, there is still limited evidence about how this works in mathematically related subjects [(23)], hence this paper compliments existing literature and provides a comparison of online against traditional using statistical analysis on students' performance during the pandemic.

In this 21st century, especially after the pandemic many institutions are contemplating of combining both traditional and online learning methods towards their teachings delivery [(26)]. According to Moorhouse [(16)], the educators faced challenges during this shift of teaching methods and perhaps in the future, academics can learn from the drawbacks faced and provide a more successful teaching environment for all. For instance, in the article by Ortiz [(19)], the author explains about the difficulties the educator faced when preparing and teaching students online. Thus this transition of teaching from face-to-face to online has to be smooth and lucrative for both students and the lecturers.

## 2 Methodology

This paper begun with a literature review summarising the types of learning methods of interest and how the students were expected to adapt to the new circumstances around them. An empirical and statistical evaluation into these two different teaching techniques, were considered for the university

---

foundation level module called 'Analytical Mathematics'. With the help of questionnaires for qualitative analysis and data gathered from exams of two consecutive academic years for quantitative purpose, a comparison of online learning during the pandemic against the traditional face-to-face learning delivery is presented to examine their effects on student performance. In addition, the quantitative analysis process consisted of examining the following cases:

**(I) Comparison of results of Academic Year 2019/2020 vs Academic Year 2020/2021**

Initially results of two cohorts of students were considered from the Academic Years 2019/2020 who received the traditional teaching, and 2020/2021 who received online teaching. Group A (Academic year 2019/20) had a sample size 17 and Group B (Academic year 2020/21) had a sample size of 16.

**(II) Comparison of results within the same cohort, Academic Year 2020/2021**

In order to tackle the issue of perhaps different level of students' entrance abilities, a supplementary analysis was performed. Specifically, for the same module a topic from the syllabus was chosen to perform a comparison for the two different modes of learning environment. "Simultaneous Equations", a chapter in Basic Algebra that is not too cumbersome or too advanced to comprehend, as it deals with solving a linear system of equations was extracted from the syllabus to analyse the effect of this intervention way of teaching. For the fairness of results the class was split into two groups where one group resumed with its online teaching and the other group experienced face-to-face teaching only for the aforementioned chapter. The online group continued to be taught online incorporating pre-recorded videos, online lecture notes, online discussion forums and problem sheets and then the other group was taught by the lecturer through the traditional face-to-face environment for the duration of the topic. A written assessment in the form of an examination was given at the end of both teaching deliveries of this chapter in order to compare the impact on student performance.

## 2.1 Software and Results Processing

This paper presents results from different statistical methods that were adopted on the collected data, analysed, so as to draw conclusions on the effect of student performance for the online teaching during Covid-19 compared to the traditional face-to-face delivery.

For the qualitative component of this paper, the data were inputted into Excel and R studio for a sound analysis. The graphs of each question were plotted for descriptive purpose. This gives a preliminary viewpoint to compare the two factors, in order to compliment the final outcomes. Measures of central tendency were needed to provide the foundations for further analysis. The R studio was then used for comparing the two data sets obtained from the student performance on the chosen topic of the module for two consecutive years. One with the face-to-face teaching during the year 2019/2020 and the other with the online teaching during the year 2020/2021.

## 2.2 Statistical Measures for Analysis

The obtained data was inputted into R and different tests were calculated to identify the most effective mode of teaching for the students. Likelihood ratio, t-test, chi-squared test are chosen and a performance ratio is also calculated to provide validity. The likelihood ratio in effect produces chi-squared test value with the p- values. Furthermore, a hypothesis testing is included where the null and alternative hypothesis are considered for the two different Academic Years 2019/2020 vs 2020/2021 as:

$H_0$ : There is no difference in the mean assessment results of the two cohorts, Academic Years 2019/2020 vs 2020/2021.

$H_1$ : There is a difference in the mean assessment results of the two cohorts, Academic Years 2019/2020 vs 2020/2021.

Depending on the statistical outcome the significance of this test is given, based on the significance level allocated. In addition, a hypothesis testing is also performed for the results of the test from the

same cohort, taken on simultaneous equations, of the Academic Year 2020/2021 where they were divided into two groups of similar competencies and were taught through both methods separately. The null and alternative hypothesis considered for this instance are;

$H_0$ : There is no difference in the mean assessment results of the two teaching methods for the same cohort.

$H_1$ : There is a difference in the mean assessment results of the two teaching methods for the same cohort.

The effect size which is used to give valid evidence towards the considered hypothesis is found and is calculated using the relation below [(8; 28)],

$$\text{effect size} = \frac{\text{Difference of the means between the two groups}}{\text{Pooled standard deviation}}$$


To add to the statistical analysis of this paper, a consideration of the performance ratio is chosen to exemplify the difference if any of the performance of students on simultaneous equations comparative to the rest of the questions of the final assessment [(29)],

$$\text{Performance Ratio} = \frac{\text{Total \%marks from simultaneous equation question}}{\text{Total \%marks from rest of the questions in the exam}}$$

### 3 Results and Discussion

#### (I) Analysis of results of Academic Year 2019/2020 vs Academic Year 2020/2021

Initially box plots summarising the measures of central tendency and dispersion for the accumulated data were constructed and presented as Figure 1 below.



**Figure 1.** Box plots of Traditional face-to-face and Online teachings

The figure above depicts the impact effect of traditional face-to-face teaching compared to online teaching based on students' assessment results. It is evident that students achieved higher results in the academic year where traditional teaching was dominant.

#### Quantitative Analysis : (a) t-test

A t-test is a statistical method which provides with evidence to show whether the considered data set can agree or disagree with the null or alternative hypothesis focused in this paper. This

---

test particularly studies whether there is any difference between the two independent groups and performing t-testing, the following results are tabulated, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Results of t-test

	<i>Values:</i>
t	2.5481
Significant Value	0.05
Degrees of Freedom	31
p value	0.01692

As the p value is less than the significance level, 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected and thus accepting that there is a difference in the mean assessment results of the two cohorts.

#### **(b) Chi-Squared test**

The two independent groups studied here are used for the chi-squared test and the data inserted into R in order to complete the analysis. The following table, Table 2, presents these outputs.


Table 2: Results of Chi-Squared test

	<i>Values:</i>
$\chi - squared$	119.34
Significant Value	0.05
Degrees of Freedom	31
p value	< 2e-16

The p value shown in the above table is much less than the significance level 0.05. Thus null hypothesis will be rejected again proving the validation of presence of a difference in mean between the two cohorts. In order to compliment statistical hypothesis testing, the effect size was found to take the value of 0.31, which under the guidelines of Cohen [(7)], this suggests a medium effect for the group of data. Therefore, around approximately 63% of the values in the mean of the traditional teaching results fall above the average of the mean online teaching results.

#### **(c) Performance Ratio**

The performance ratio was obtained by comparing the question relating to simultaneous equation against the other questions of the assessments over the two Academic Years. The two groups representing the consecutive academic years were again considered and each ratio value was obtained for all the students. The figure below portrays the performance ratio values for the two analogous groups. It is clear that, group A's ratio values show that more students performed better in the simultaneous equations questions compared to the remaining questions of the exam.



**Figure 2.** Comparison of the performance ratios for both academic years

Figure 2 shows that the student group that had only face-to-face traditional teaching in the Academic year 2019/2020, had more students with high performance ratio in comparison to the online teaching group of the Academic Year 2020/2021.

**(d) Categorical Analysis using binary values**

Categorical Analysis is a useful way to deal with categorical data. Categorical variables are those that can be measured using only limited number of variables [(21)]. In this paper a binary logistic categorical analysis is considered.

**Table 3: Results of chi-squared test with categorical variable**

<i>Dependent variable:</i>	
Improved1	
Online Teaching	-0.009** (0.003)
Face-to-face Teaching	0.017*** (0.005)
Constant	-0.140 (0.510)
Observations	17
Log Likelihood	-4.677
Akaike Inf. Crit.	15.353


*Note:* \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01

The model was constructed by examining if students' results improved or not with the intervention of online teaching. If a student's assessment mark was improved with traditional teaching then it is given a value of "1" but if it did not show any improvement then it was labelled with a "0". The results from the Table 3 shows a negative value for the online teaching for the same module during the pandemic. This value of -0.009 shows that an increase in one unit of the "variable online teaching" reduces the student performance by 0.9% ( $\exp(-0.009) = 0.991$ ) whilst the other factors are kept constant. This outcome suggests that a negative impact of online teaching and learning exists on students' performance.

The "face-to-face variable" has a positive value and this shows that an increase in one unit of the "variable face-to-face teaching" increases the student performance by 1.7% ( $\exp(0.017) = 1.017$ ) whilst keeping other factors constant, deducing that face-to-face teaching actually had a positive impact on improvement of results.

### (II) Analysis of results within the same cohort Academic Year 2020/2021

This analysis is performed for the same cohort of students, during the pandemic, where the students were divided into two groups, with one group having only online teaching and other group having a face-to-face delivery for the specific topic of simultaneous equations. A comparison of results of the assessments, summarised in Figure 3, was undertaken in order to distinguish any improvements in marks due to the alternative way of teaching.



**Figure 3.** Box plot of the assessment results for Online teaching and Traditional teaching for the same cohort Academic Year 2020/2021

### Quantitative Analysis : (a) Chi-Squared test

Table 4 summarises results necessary to perform a chi-squared test. This includes the Likelihood Ratio (LR) and other statistical measures. The null and the alternative hypothesis considered in this section again prove that there is a difference in the mean assessment results of the two teaching methods. The null hypothesis is rejected allowing for the test to be treated significant. The assessment data were collected and the p value obtained, to give 0.0002. This too means that the test is significant, therefore, it can be stated that at 5% level of significance there is enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis meaning that there is a difference in mean assessment of the two teaching methods for the same cohort.

Considering the effect size once more for the data collected within the same cohort, it is found that the effect size is 0.59, allowing for a large effect size under the Cohen's effect size guidelines

[(7)]. Hence approximately 73% of the mean of the traditional teaching group fall above the mean of the online group.

Table 4: Results of chi-squared test for the same cohort

Statistic	N	Mean	St. Dev.	Min	Pctl(25)	Pctl(75)	Max
#Df	2	2.500	0.707	2	2.2	2.8	3
LogLik	2	0.428	4.952	-3.074	-1.323	2.179	3.930
Df	1	-1.000		-1.000	-1.000	-1.000	-1.000
Chisq	1	14.007		14.007	14.007	14.007	14.007
Pr(>Chisq)	1	0.0002		0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002

**(b) Categorical Analysis using binary values**

Similar Categorical Analysis can be performed for this section as well. Considering the group where online teaching and face-to-face teaching delivery was conducted to the same cohort of students, an analysis was implemented on whether student performance improved in the face-to-face learning environment comparative to the group that was already experiencing online teaching in Academic Year 2020/2021. The students were given an assessment to fulfill after their learning was delivered on the same topic. All the obtained data were utilised for a categorical analysis. Considering binary values, the results from the face-to-face teaching group was assigned the value '1' and the online group was assigned the value '0'. A binary logistic model was fitted to the data and the output examined. The values represented by the coefficients of the dependent variables, as seen in Table 5, give an interpretation about any improvements on student performance relative to the two teaching methods.

Table 5: Categorical analysis for the same cohort

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>
	Improved1
Online Teaching	-1.441 (0.841)
Face-to-face Teaching	0.592* (0.835)
Constant	0.382 (0.290)
Observations	9
Log Likelihood	-3.511
Akaike Inf. Crit.	13.022

Note: \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01

This model under consideration, clearly shows a negative impact on online teaching relative to the face-to-face teaching, with an improved index of 0.592 when taught by the lecturer in the traditional

manner. The negative value, -1.441, suggests that keeping other factors constant, an increase in one unit of "online teaching" actually gives a reduction in improvement by 35.7% ( $\exp(-0.441) = 0.643$ ).


The variable "face-to-face teaching" suggests that a rise by one unit, improves the student performance by 80.7% ( $\exp(0.592) = 1.807$ ) whilst keeping other factors fixed. This outcome exemplifies that face-to-face teaching has a positive effect on the student experience in relation to online teaching.

#### **Qualitative Analysis: Survey Results Analysis for the same cohort in Academic Year 2020/2021**

Questionnaires were adopted and were given to the students as well as to the lecturer who taught the module in the Academic Year 2020/2021. The lecturer was given a questionnaire (See appendix A.1) in order to better understand the mind set of their online teaching. In actual fact, at the start of the pandemic, the academic had to adapt very quickly to the new technological changes and to encompass them in their line of teaching. It was a challenging time for academics and the responses of the questionnaire help to envisage the struggles faced and how they were overcome. The educator also had to adapt to the new environment at home which had an impact on their own family. The time span was very small for the lecturer to come in terms with the new software and applications to conduct classes. The educator also felt the drawback of not seeing the students face-to-face at campus while teaching through the online method, noting a lack of engagement from students with their lecturer and peers.

The response of the lecturer's questionnaire gave a fruitful insight as to the main drawbacks endured by themselves whilst teaching online, with bad internet connection during live online sessions dominating the encountered problems. The lecturer realised that from the side of the students, there was certainly a lack of engagement and interaction with the educator and amongst peers. On the contrary however, online teaching was beneficial for the students as the recording of lectures gave them the opportunity to watch these sessions many times, so as to gain a better understanding of the topic taught. Moreover, the questionnaire completed by the lecturer allowed for a personal viewpoint to be transferred, that being that online teaching would most probably continue to be used in the higher educational sector, as part of a blended learning approach.

Students' questionnaire was different (See appendix A.2); it was a search of the explanatory viewpoint of how online learning impacted their learning experience. An insight into the learning hardships faced by the students during the pandemic and which teaching method was preferred by the student was identified. The two figures below, Figure 4 and Figure 5, diagrammatically portray a few of the responses from this student questionnaire.



**Figure 4. Online teaching vs face-to-face teaching**




Figure 5. Preferences of students

In essence, students disagree that online teaching replaced successfully face-to-face teaching, a result that was perhaps anticipated.

## 4 Conclusions

This paper set out to investigate the effectiveness of student performance for online teaching comparative to the traditional face-to-face teaching for a module called "Analytical Mathematics" during Covid-19 pandemic.

Many challenges were encountered in teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic. As the move to online learning was unanticipated, both lecturers and students faced difficulties in adjusting to the online teaching experience requiring access to different learning resources through a digital medium. The qualitative analysis of this paper identified and concurred with existing literature the advantages of online learning, one of which being that students had unlimited, anytime access to useful resources such as live or pre-recordings of lectures. Learning was conducted in a more flexible manner which was considered to be more convenient to students as they could listen to lectures and use teaching material at their own preferred time and pace. However, although the learning platforms were a good yet challenging mode to teach, the group in this study that undertook online learning achieved inferior results in the assessments compared to the group that underwent face-to-face delivery of the same cohort. The immense efforts of the lecturer to engage and interact with students as well as students with their peers also surfaced as a drawback to online learning.

To strengthen this inference, a comparison of test results between the two academic year cohorts tackling the different methods of learning was conducted with statistical outcomes supporting and exemplifying that face-to-face learning students did perform more successfully. The results in this paper from the performance ratio, t-test, hypothesis testing, effect size, chi-squared test and categorical variable analysis all confirm this deduction with tests showing their significance. Even if resources of the content material was provided to students online through pre-recordings, links, online discussion forums, students still performed better with face-to-face learning for this STEM related subject.

Ozadowicz (20) showed how different learning platforms and techniques were used to provide the same effectiveness as face-to-face teaching and to provide students the same satisfaction as face to face teaching. In their investigation, the use of virtual learning management systems seemed to be a good replacement to face-to-face teaching. Lecturers were able to have contact with students through these systems by providing course materials, pre-recorded videos of course contents and discussion boards. On the other hand, Naidoo (21) showed how initially adapting online learning posed difficulties as students did not have sufficient data or predicaments with connectivity issues in order to attend the live lessons, to watch Youtube videos, download documents or even videos from Whatsapp. Some students moreover, found their home environment as not accommodating to their academic needs compared to university premises.

---

Current literature has been in favour of online learning concluding its existence as effective in the absence of face-to-face teaching. With the advances in technology, lecturers are able to provide good quality teaching to students, mirroring the outcomes of the traditional face-to-face method. In order to conduct however effective teaching, educators and students should have the latest form of technology. Peimani et al. (17), noted in their study that educators had to invest in technology in order to provide this good quality teaching. Even with the cited advantages for this alternative learning approach of online delivery, the question at hand is whether the success of online learning is coherent for all subjects. In other words, how effective is online delivery for subjects in the Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) sector? It is this research question that lead to the formation of the objective of this paper and to investigate whether during the pandemic, when online teaching was adopted as a necessity, improved students' learning experience and performance compared to the traditional face-to-face delivery method for a STEM related subject.

The conclusive remarks presented in this paper support the negative influence of online learning for students' performance compared to the traditional face-to-face learning technique. The chosen qualitative and quantitative methods embrace the effectiveness of face-to-face teaching compared to online learning for this mathematical module "Analytical Mathematics".

#### **4.1 Limitations**

Although this paper focused on the statistical study of these two teaching methods and their effect on students learning experience, there are some limitations such as the ones stated below that must be considered for a wholesome analysis:

- Lack of attendance towards online lectures by the students.
- The increased duration for online examinations compared to face-to-face assessments.
- Misconduct in academic integrity during online examinations.
- Only limited research documents are available on the topic of online learning, particularly during the Covid-19 pandemic.
- The sample size considered is very small.

#### **4.2 Suggestions for future research**

Future research could consider factoring external factors to the learning experience of students. For instance, a factor such as students' socioeconomic background whereby understanding how to support students of a lower socioeconomic background in their engagement in online learning is vital. Implementing policies within universities would warrant discussions on providing a good learning experience to all students such as perhaps a laptop to students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds.

In addition, further research can be carried out for other mathematics modules or STEM related subjects in order to see if these differences in students' learning experience and performance is consistent.

In this paper the sample can be considered as small, thus it would be informative to investigate the impact of online learning amongst a larger cohort and even more so not during a health crisis. It is fair to note that this research study looked at the effects of online learning during Covid-19 pandemic therefore, it is these immediate effects of the transition to online learning that were considered and examined comparative to face-to-face delivery.

Online teaching also requires good expertise in technology use, organising and planning content online, thus it may be important to consider providing training for students and educators with using this type of advanced technology. Consequently, it can be regarded as useful to investigate whether the impact of online learning can be enhanced by training provided to all those involved in the higher education sector.

## References

- [1] Abah, J.A. (2020). An Appeal in the Case involving Conventional Teaching: Emphasizing the Transformation to Enhanced Conventional Teaching in Mathematics Education. *VillageMath Educational Review (VER)*, 1(1).
- [2] Adnan, M. and Anwar, K. (2020), 2020. Online Learning amid the COVID-19 Pandemic: Students' Perspectives. *Online Submission*, 2(1), pp.45-51.
- [3] Alonso, F., López, G., Manrique, D. and Viñes, J.M. (2005). An instructional model for web-based e-learning education with a blended learning process approach. *British Journal of educational technology*, 36(2), pp.217-235.
- [4] Bonwell, C.C. and Eison, J.A. (1991). *Active Learning: Creating Excitement in the Classroom*. ERIC Digest.
- [5] Capone, R., De Caterina, P. and Mazza, G., (2017), July. Blended learning, flipped classroom and virtual environment: challenges and opportunities for the 21st century students. In *Proceedings of EDULEARN17 conference* (pp. 10478-10482).
- [6] Chiodini, J., (2020). Online learning in the time of COVID-19. *Travel medicine and infectious disease*, 34, p.101669.
- [7] Cohen, J. (1969). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioural Science*; Academic Press: New York, NY, USA.
- [8] Coe, R. (2002) It's the effect size, stupid: What effect size is and why it is important. In *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the British Educational Research Association*, Exeter, UK, 12–14 September

- 
- [9] Cranfield, D.J., Tick, A., Venter, I.M., Blignaut, R.J. and Renaud, K., (2021). Higher education students' perceptions of online learning during COVID-19—A comparative study. *Education Sciences*, 11(8), p.403.
- [10] Dhawan, S. (2020) Online learning: A panacea in the time of COVID-19 crisis. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 49(1), pp.5-22. 7
- [11] Holenko, M. and Hoić-Božić, N., (2008). Using Online Discussions in a Blended Learning Course. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 3.
- [12] Irawan, A.W., Dwisona, D. and Lestari, M., (2020). Psychological impacts of students on online learning during the pandemic COVID-19. *KONSELI: Jurnal Bimbingan dan Konseling (E-Journal)*, 7(1), pp.53-60.
- [13] Kamalipour, H. and Peimani, N. (2015). Assemblage thinking and the city: Implications for urban studies. *Current Urban Studies*, 3(4), pp.402-408.
- [14] King, S.E. and Cerrone Arnold, K.A.T.I.E. (2012). Blended learning environments in higher education: A case study of how professors make it happen. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, 25.
- [15] Li, C. and Lalani, F., (2020). The COVID-19 pandemic has changed education forever. This is How.
- [16] Moorhouse, B.L. (2020). Adaptations to a face-to-face initial teacher education course 'forced'online due to the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 46(4), pp.609-611.
- [17] Naidoo, J. (2020). Postgraduate mathematics education students' experiences of using digital platforms for learning within the COVID-19 pandemic era. *Pythagoras*, 41(1), p.568.
- [18] Ní Fhloinn, E. and Fitzmaurice, O. (2021) Challenges and opportunities: Experiences of mathematics lecturers engaged in emergency remote teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Mathematics*, 9(18), p.2303.
- [19] Ortiz, P.A. (2020). Teaching in the time of COVID-19. *Biochemistry and molecular biology education*.
- [20] Ozadowicz, A. (2004). Modified blended learning in engineering higher education during the COVID-19 lockdown Building automation courses case study. Available online at: <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10100292>
- [21] Powers, D. and Xie, Y. (2008). *Statistical methods for categorical data analysis*. Emerald Group Publishing.
- [22] Rapanta, C., Botturi, L., Goodyear, P., Guàrdia, L. and Koole, M., (2020). Online university teaching during and after the Covid-19 crisis: Refocusing teacher presence and learning activity. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 2(3), pp.923-945.
- [23] Regmi, K. and Jones, L. (2020). A systematic review of the factors—enablers and barriers—affecting e-learning in health sciences education. *BMC medical education*, 20(1), pp.1-18.

- 
- [24] Rodriguez, R. (2011). How Learning Works: Seven Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching [review]/Susan A. Ambrose, Michael W. Bridges, Marsha C. Lovett, Michele DiPietro, and Marie K. Norman. *Journal of Applied Christian Leadership*, 5(2), pp.106-107.
- [25] Singh, A (2019). Traditional learning vs elearning: Does the latter prevail?
- [26] Singh, J., Steele, K. and Singh, L. (2021). Combining the Best of Online and Face-to-Face Learning: Hybrid and Blended Learning Approach for COVID-19, Post Vaccine, Post-Pandemic World. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 50(2), pp.140-171.
- [27] Singh, S (2020). Reflecting on Higher Education Examinations. In *The University of the Future: Responding to COVID-19*; ACPUL: Reading, UK, 2020; p. 161
- [28] Sofroniou, A. (2020). Learning and Engagement in the Flipped Classroom of Analytical Mathematics.
- [29] Sofroniou, A., and Poutos, K. (2016) Investigating the effectiveness of group work in mathematics. *Education Sciences* 6, 3 (2016), 30.
- [30] Sofroniou, A., Premnath, B. and Poutos, K.,(2020) Capturing student satisfaction: a case study on the National Student Survey results to identify the needs of students in STEM related courses for a better learning experience. *Education Sciences*, 10(12), p.378.
- [31] WADER, S.S., (2019). E-LEARNING VERSUS CLASSROOM TRAINING. *E-LEARNING*, 6(12).
- [32] Wagner, N., Hassanein, K.(2008). Who is responsible for E-Learning Success in Higher Education? A Stakeholders' Analysis.
- [33] Watermeyer, R., Crick, T., Knight, C. and Goodall, J., (2021). COVID-19 and digital disruption in UK universities: Afflictions and affordances of emergency online migration. *Higher Education*, 81, pp.623-641.
- [34] Xiong, W., Jiang, J. and Mok, K.H., (2020). Hong Kong university students' online learning experiences under the Covid-19 pandemic. Retrieved May, 11, p.2020.

## **A Appendix**

### **A.1 Questionnaire for the lecturer**

1. What subjects/ modules did you teach online?
2. How did you teach your online delivery?
3. What factors affected you during your teaching?
4. Was it a significant change from face-to-face to online teaching?
5. Did you have relevant software/programs to conduct the online teaching delivery?
6. What in your opinion are the advantages of online teaching?
7. Were there any drawbacks from students when conducting online teaching?
8. Was it easy to be in contact with students constantly?
9. Was the platform used helpful and did it support your teaching?
10. In your opinion, does the online platform need any improvements in the future?
11. Would you blend online teaching with your face-to-face teaching in the future?

---

## A.2 Questionnaire for the students

### 1. Online teaching can replace face-to-face teaching successfully?

1. Agree
2. Neither Agree or Disagree
3. Disagree

### 2. For online teaching PowerPoints are effective.

1. Agree
2. Neither Agree or Disagree
3. Disagree

### 3. For online teaching are lecturers online Notes/Videos are effective.

1. Agree
2. Neither Agree or Disagree
3. Disagree

### 4. Did you receive the same support from lecturers like in a face-to-face environment?

1. Yes
2. No

### 5. Studying new mathematics modules in an online teaching environment, is manageable.

1. Agree
2. Neither Agree or Disagree
3. Disagree

### 6. Studying simultaneous equation using videos was effective.

1. Agree
2. Neither Agree or Disagree
3. Disagree

### 7. Studying simultaneous equation using PowerPoints was effective.

1. Agree
2. Neither Agree or Disagree
3. Disagree

### 8. Studying simultaneous equation using Lecturer Notes/webinar recordings was effective.

1. Agree
2. Neither Agree or Disagree
3. Disagree

### 9. Would you recommend online teaching to be used in teaching algebra in the future?

1. Yes
2. No

### 10. Were online resources easily accessible?

1. Agree
2. Neither Agree or Disagree
3. Disagree,

### 11. Do you prefer being taught the content by your lecturer first rather than learning on your own from online content initially?

1. Yes
2. Don't mind
3. No

### 12. Did you understand the teaching during the webinar or did you have to re-watch the video to gain a better understanding?

1. Yes
2. No

### 13. Were you able to adapt to online teaching immediately?

1. Yes
2. No

