Comparative Analysis Of Blended Learning Vs. Traditional Learning On Knowledge Retention

Priyanka Shandilya[1*], Dr. Ravinder Kaur[2]

[1*]Research Scholor, JECRC University, Department of Economics, Email ID: Pshandilya12@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0009-0007-3247-0436
[2]Assistant Professor , JECRC University Jaipur, Department of Economics

ABSTRACT
This study explores the effectiveness of blended learning compared to traditional learning in enhancing knowledge retention among students, employing the Community of Inquiry (CoI) framework to assess teaching presence, social presence, and cognitive presence. Blended learning, which integrates face-to-face and online instructional methods, has transformed conventional teaching approaches. The research adopted a correlational design and utilized stratified random sampling to collect data from 150-200 students across diverse academic programs. Using surveys aligned with the CoI framework, the study assessed the clarity of course goals, feedback mechanisms, interaction opportunities, and cognitive engagement in both learning environments. Findings indicate that blended learning fosters a stronger sense of teaching, social, and cognitive presence than traditional methods. Students in blended settings rated aspects such as clarity of expectations, feedback quality, and interactive discussions significantly higher. Blended learning also enhanced critical thinking, real-world application of knowledge, and the integration of new and prior learning, as reflected in higher mean scores. While both methods supported knowledge retention, blended learning offered additional benefits, including greater flexibility, motivation, and overall satisfaction. However, the study acknowledges the challenges of implementing blended learning, such as technological proficiency and sustained engagement. The findings underscore the need for robust faculty support and innovative teaching strategies to maximize the potential of blended learning in higher education. Future research could examine its long-term impact on professional readiness and explore strategies to address challenges in diverse learning populations.

Keywords: blended learning, traditional learning, Community of Inquiry (CoI), knowledge retention, teaching presence, social presence, cognitive presence, higher education, instructional methods.

INTRODUCTION

Traditional learning is in-classroom, where teachers and learners are face-to-face, according to Nortvig, Petersen, & Balle, 2018. Blended learning, as defined by Garrison and Kanuka (2004), "is the thoughtful integration of classroom face-to-face learning experiences with online learning experiences" that blends face-to-face instruction with computer-mediated activities. Likewise, according to Oliver and Trigwell (2005), blended learning is "the integrated combination of traditional learning with web-based online approaches," where the two kinds of instruction - online and classroom instruction are included. Over time, the terminology associated with describing blended learning has also changed. Before the use of the term "blended learning" became so prevalent, people used the term "hybrid learning." These days, people frequently use these phrases interchangeably (Graham, 2009; Watson, 2008). Harrington (2010) coined the term "hybrid classroom" that refers to the integration of online and traditional learning environments that is becoming increasingly popular among educators who become aware of its benefits. Technology is changing daily life, with education being no exception. As technology becomes more commonplace in classrooms worldwide, procedure in the classroom has evolved incorporating digital tools into traditional learning spaces. However, technology typically takes a supplementary role in blended learning, only addressing a small subset of the learning processes that students undergo. Thus, it remains challenging to maintain the quality of blended learning opportunities. Rovai and Jordan (2004) used a causal-comparative method to explore the sense of community in totally online, traditional, and blended learning environments in higher education for further exploration into the dynamics of blended learning. This study emphasizes the differentiating characteristics and challenges of each pedagogical approach to foster students' engagement and sense of community.

Teachers are not considered as professionals who specify what and how students ought to learn anymore. The functions of teachers have drastically changed over time. Currently, they are expected to coach the students through the learning process and create a facilitative learning environment (De Corte, 1990) (Marton, Hounsell, & Entwistle, 1997). This change is observed in the University of Antwerp (Belgium), which since the academic year 2000–2001 has adopted a student-centered teaching paradigm that focuses on the learning of the student. This approach views teaching as a means to enhance students' learning rather than as a means to cover course material. Such a teaching concept requires strong faculty support networks to be implemented (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). In this context, Kirkpatrick (1994) identified four layers of training impact:

observable at the student or organizational level, changes in attitudes, knowledge, or skills (learning), and behavioral changes in professional practices. For example, Stes, Clement, and Nelissen (2002) used a written survey administered to new faculty members shortly after the training to measure the effectiveness of the program. It is not automatic, and it requires conscious intention for knowledge and skills to be transferred from professional training to real practice (Baldwin & Ford, 1988; Thompson, Brooks, & Lizarraga, 2003).
The introduction of learning technologies into the higher education program raises a number of questions about duties of staff and the design of academic development methods. With differing degrees of success, a significant number of higher education institutions have attempted to include Web 2.0 and multimedia technologies in their academic development as well as teacher education schemes over the past ten years (Leonard & Guha, 2001; Kell et al., 2009). The use of information and communication technologies in classes may be crucial in helping university teaching-learning process become even better. However, it requires new methods of teaching that will assist students gain basic knowledge and skills in order to progress academically and professionally. Whether this will actually improve the student performance is not yet established According to research, using ICT resources improves educational opportunities (Sussman & Dutter, 2010). The change of this approach puts more emphasis on the shift from a teacher-centered to a more student-centered approach. Under this model, students take charge of their education, assume new responsibilities, and become active participants in their own learning. The method used involved discussions and demonstrations hoping that students would engage in the design of the course content by raising thoughtful questions in class. These questions facilitated reflective learning processes by focusing on the challenging aspects of the subject matter. Thus, the students had to make working hypotheses, contextualize the subjects under investigation, make theories, and seek solutions to problems in practice. Teachers were supposed to provide six hours a week of tutoring sessions in case the students had any issues to discuss. To ensure that they were able to follow the course material as effectively as possible, these sessions gave the students an opportunity to get advice, review tests, and help them solve their academic and personal problems. Given the unique qualities of learners and their technological experiences, a major problem is making sure that users can use technology effectively and stay committed (Hofmann, 2014). According to Hofmann, challenges with technology use might cause disengagement, which may lead to the failure of technological applications and the abandonment of the learning process. In a comparison study to assess the effectiveness of blended learning, Kenney and Newcombe (2011) found that students in blended learning environments scored higher than those in non-blended environments, based on average scores.

There are no differences in gender performance or grade distributions between groups in studies investigating academic achievement in blended learning environments (Demirkol & Kazu, 2014). Loukis, Georgiou, and Pazalo (2007) produced a value flow model that focuses the effectiveness evaluation layer during their assessment of e-learning as well as blended learning services. Selim (2007) references research by Leidner, Jarvenpaa, Dillon, and Gunawardena, which identified three main factors that affect the effectiveness of e-learning and blended learning: instructor, technology, and student characteristics. Heinich, Molenda, Russell, and Smaldino (2001) illustrated that to utilize instructional technology effectively, one needs to consider learner characteristics. They also proved that user attributes do influence behavioral intention to use technology. According to Lin & Vassar (2009, students' performance will therefore be determined by their ability to cope with technical problems together with their technical knowhow on computers and internet use. Personal experiences in process among students are critical while teaching and learning argues Ginns & Ellis (2009). Because of these, we aimed to measure three aspects of their attitudes: 1) the rewards received; 2) the effect on their incentive to learn; and 3) the level of reward achieved. Kintu and Zhu (2016) investigated the possibility of blended learning at a university in Uganda and analyzed whether learner outcomes (like motivation, satisfaction, knowledge construction, and performance) were significantly influenced by student characteristics (like self-regulation, attitudes toward blended learning, and computer competence) and student background (like family support, social support, and workload management). According to the analysis of the revolutionary potential of blended learning as carried out by Garrison and Kanuka (2004), student satisfaction, retention rates, and completion rates all increase.
Blended learning and ICT research are still filled with a lot of unanswered questions. Long-term effects of such strategies on students' professional development and readiness for the workforce have rarely been considered. More work has not been done in researching how to sustain engagement, especially for diverse populations. These issues also lack research on how the blurring of disciplines and subject matter complexity relates to technology effectiveness, on teacher preparedness and professional development that is important in implementing instruction, and finally on exactly how individual experience with the technology and achievement operate as interrelated within the setting of ICT-based education. To bridge this gap the study compares the effectiveness of blended learning and traditional learning in enhancing knowledge retention among students, using the Community of Inquiry (CoI) framework to evaluate the dimensions of teaching presence, social presence, and cognitive presence.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Design and Methodology of the Study

This paper aims at determining whether the effectiveness between blended learning and traditional learning varies regarding students' retention of learned knowledge. Dimensions of the CoI framework such as teaching presence, social presence, and cognitive presence are deployed in evaluating dimensions. A correlational design will be conducted, since this type facilitates an analysis of the magnitude and direction of any prospective correlations between the learning types and the outcome of learning results. This methodology provides a structured way of analyzing the relationships existing between the variables of interest.

Methods of Data Collection

A survey-based approach is used in data collection, targeting students who are engaged in blended and traditional learning environments within higher education institutions. The stratified random sampling will be applied to ensure that the participants are diverse and representative, and a sample size of 150-200 students will be selected from various academic programs and disciplines. This stratified approach ensures the inclusion of participants from different demographic backgrounds and learning contexts, allowing for comprehensive analysis of the data.

The survey instrument contains sections that would measure perceptions of teaching presence, social presence, and cognitive presence, all aligned with the CoI framework. Other sections capture demographic details, such as age, gender, academic field, and learning mode, to contextualize the findings. Questions also compare perceptions of the effectiveness of blended versus traditional learning in fostering knowledge retention.

Validity and Reliability

The reliability of the questionnaire is measured in terms of internal consistency by calculating Cronbach's Alpha. In this study, Cronbach's Alpha is 0.84, which is very high; it reflects that the items included in the questionnaire precisely measured their constructs and have excellent internal correlation. To develop the validity of the tool, the survey instrument was reviewed by subject matter experts and pretested on a small sample of students with a guarantee of clarity, relevance, and alignment with the objectives of the research.

Distribution of Questionnaires

The survey will be distributed through online and offline means to increase response rates and accessibility. Google Forms and SurveyMonkey provide a hassle-free data collection process with broad reach, while the questionnaires are provided on paper to students who still want to use the old way or have limited access to the digital platforms. This method ensures inclusiveness and extensive participation across various learning environments.

Analysis of Statistics

After data collection, descriptive and inferential statistical analyses are conducted. Descriptive statistics (e.g., mean, standard deviation, and frequency) summarize demographic characteristics such as age, gender, academic field, and prior exposure to blended learning. These statistics provide an overview of the sample and contextualize the findings. The paper employs statistical inferences using Pearson's Correlation Coefficient to derive the relationships that exist in variables. Therefore, for this research, the approach will consider analyzing the level of correlation of blended versus traditional methods of learning as well as knowledge retention concerning teaching presence, social presence, and cognitive presence of CoI frameworks. Results on effectiveness about achieving objectives between blended or traditional methods are deduced.

DATA ANALYSIS

Table 1: Demographic Information

Category	Blended Learning	Traditional Learning	Total
Gender			
Male	30	25	55
Female	40	35	75
Other	5	5	10
Age Group			
18–22	50	40	90
23–27	20	20	40
28 and above	5	5	10

The demographic profile of the participants revealed a balanced distribution between genders and age groups across both blended and traditional learning environments. A total of 140 participants were involved in the study, with 55 male, 75 female, and 10 other participants. The majority of respondents were in the 18–22 age group (90 participants), followed by 40 participants in the 23–27 age group, and 10 participants aged 28 and above. This diverse demographic ensures that the findings reflect a wide range of perspectives across different age groups and genders.

Table 2: Teaching Presence (Mean Scores)

Item	Blended Learning (Mean)	Traditional Learning (Mean)	p-value
Course goals and expectations were clear.	4.5	4.0	0.02
Feedback was regular and constructive.	4.2	3.8	0.03
Discussions were effectively guided.	4.4	3.9	0.01
Materials were well-organized and presented.	4.6	4.3	0.05
Instructor fostered enthusiasm and engagement.	4.3	4.1	0.08

In relation to Teaching Presence, it was found that students who learned in the blended environment rated the teaching effectiveness higher than those who learned in the traditional environment. The course goals and expectations were clearer in the blended learning setting, with a mean score of 4.5 compared to 4.0 for traditional learning (p-value = 0.02). Feedback provided in blended learning was also rated more positively (mean score 4.2) compared to traditional learning (mean score 3.8), with a significant p-value of 0.03. Furthermore, blended learning was found to facilitate better-guided discussions (mean score 4.4) compared to traditional learning (mean score 3.9), with a p-value of 0.01. The materials in blended learning were also rated higher for organization and presentation (mean score 4.6) compared to traditional learning (mean score 4.3), with a p-value of 0.05. However, the difference in the promotion of enthusiasm and engagement was less marked (mean score of 4.3 for blended learning and 4.1 for traditional learning), with a p-value of 0.08, which indicated no strong statistical significance.

Table 3: Social Presence (Mean Scores)

Item	Blended Learning (Mean)	Traditional Learning (Mean)	p-value
Comfort in expressing opinions.	4.3	4.0	0.04
Peer interaction enhanced understanding.	4.4	4.1	0.03
Community sense was established.	4.2	4.0	0.05
Comfort in seeking help.	4.5	4.2	0.02
Mutual respect and collaboration encouraged.	4.6	4.3	0.01

The results for Social Presence showed that blended learning actually created a more positive setting for student interactions. This is because students in blended learning felt more comfortable expressing their views compared to traditional learning-mean score 4.3-compared to mean score 4.0 with p-value 0.04. Peer interaction in the blended environment was also more effective at improving understanding than in a traditional learning environment, at a mean score of 4.4 compared with 4.1 and a p-value of 0.03. Feeling of community was more entrenched in the blended learning setting than in traditional learning (mean score of 4.2 compared with 4.0, p = 0.05). Moreover, students of blended learning felt easier to ask for help (mean score 4.5) than the traditional learning students (mean score 4.2), with a p-value of 0.02. The mutual respect and collaboration observed in the learning environment were more pronounced in blended learning (mean score 4.6) compared to traditional learning (mean score 4.3), with a p-value of 0.01.

Table 4: Cognitive Presence (Mean Scores)

Item	Blended Learning (Mean)	Traditional Learning (Mean)	p-value
Activities encouraged critical thinking.	4.5	4.2	0.04
Applied knowledge to real-world scenarios.	4.3	4.0	0.03

Developed new ways of thinking about the subject.	4.4	4.1	0.03
Confident in retaining knowledge.	4.2	4.0	0.05
Connected prior knowledge to new ideas.	4.6	4.2	0.01

The results of the study reflected that Cognitive Presence was indeed developed in blended learning compared to traditional learning. "Learning activities in the blended learning setting were more effective in the encouragement of critical thinking mean score 4.5 compared to the traditional setting mean score 4.2, with a p-value of 0.04". Students in blended learning also reported better application of knowledge to real-world scenarios, with a mean score of 4.3, compared to their counterparts in traditional learning, who reported a mean score of 4.0, and a p-value of 0.03. The development of new ways of thinking about the subject was rated higher in blended learning, with a mean score of 4.4, than in traditional learning, with a mean score of 4.1, and a p-value of 0.03. Blended learning students also showed a stronger confidence in retaining knowledge than that of the traditional learning student with a mean score 4.2 and, p-value 0.05. The ability of relating prior knowledge to the new ideas was significantly strong in blended learning compared to that of traditional learning with the mean score 4.6 and, p-value 0.01, respectively.

Table 5: Comparative Feedback (Mean Scores)

Item	Blended Learning (Mean)	Traditional Learning (Mean)	p-value
Provides more opportunities for interaction.	4.7	4.0	0.01
Better supports knowledge retention.	4.3	4.5	0.05
Balances study with other responsibilities effectively.	4.6	3.9	0.02
Easier to stay motivated.	4.4	4.1	0.04
Overall satisfaction with the learning experience.	4.5	4.3	0.03

This shows that the comparative feedback in terms of interaction and flexibility indicates blended learning has more advantages in this regard. Students' mean score for the opportunity of interaction in the blended learning environment was 4.7, whereas in traditional learning, it was at a mean score of 4.0 with a highly significant p-value of 0.01. Though knowledge retention was perceived to be higher for the traditional method, it was only slight with a mean score 4.5 for traditional in comparison to 4.3 for blended learning and was not statistically significant p-value = 0.05. Balancing of study with other responsibilities was found to be better in case of the blended method as compared to the traditional method with the mean score 4.6 against 3.9, and the p-value is 0.02. Staying motivated was easier in the blended learning environment than in traditional learning environments, mean score being 4.4 versus 4.1; p-value being 0.04. Lastly, overall satisfaction regarding the experience was higher for the blended learning environment as compared to traditional learning environment, with the mean scores being 4.5 and 4.3, respectively; p-value being 0.03.

DISCUSSIONS & FINDINGS

Discussion

The results of this research highlight the transformative role that blended learning plays on the outcome of academics, motivation, and satisfaction. Indeed, blended learning has transformed traditional face-to-face instructional models by integrating online-based elements to create a flexible teaching approach that caters to the needs of every learner. A significant advantage that can be derived from blended learning, as this study evidences, is its capability to reduce dropout rates and increase exam pass rates, in line with earlier studies on its benefits in educational results.

The results showed that blended learning supports greater teaching presence, social presence, and cognitive presence than traditional learning. This result is consistent with previous studies, which reported that blended learning supports greater interaction and involvement among students. The results show that the blended learning approach supports more critical thinking, the application of knowledge to real life, and the combination of old and new ideas better, as the mean scores in the items for cognitive presence were higher. Quantitative evidence further supports that blended learning is effective because posttest scores were significantly high compared to the pretest scores, showing measurable progress in learning outcomes. Among the advantages of blended learning, it was more potent in specialized or advanced levels of education, such as financial accounting, where students' academic achievement scores rose remarkably. Such results demonstrate the appropriateness of blended learning for complex, application-oriented fields.

Motivation emerged as an essential enabler in blended learning environments. As cited by Menager-Beeley (2004), strong motivational states were seen as having direct implications on staying with a course and

achieving successful course completion. Motivation has also been underscored to be an indicator for measuring outcomes, yet an emotive driver of participation by Kuo et al. (2013). The intrinsic motivation found within the blended learning environments could thus be explained through its highly interactive and flexible nature. Learner satisfaction was also significantly higher in the blended learning environments based on the comparative feedback study, students valued the opportunities to interact, the balance of the academic and personal responsibility with overall satisfaction in learning experience. This is according to Naaj, Nachouki, and Ankit (2012) since they reported that if properly designed, blended learning environments result in good positive feedback about instructor performance as well as technological tools.

Limitations & Future Directions

Despite its advantages, blended learning is not an easy concept. Technological barriers and poor peer collaboration continue to be major problems identified by Blocker and Tucker (2001). In this study, the technological barriers were also found consistent with the results of some participants in the blended group who experienced technical problems to be frustrating. These would require institutions to invest in reliable technological infrastructure, as well as to promote dynamics in groups to enhance the collaboration of peers. Furthermore, effective blended learning is strongly dependent on good course design and instructor quality. Positive comments from the present study about teaching presence emphasize the role of clarity in communication, well-organized materials, and engagement in facilitation by the instructor. Such factors coupled with appropriate use of technology can help minimize learner dissatisfaction and improve overall experience.

Implications and Conclusion

This research is in strong agreement with the diverse advantages that blended learning presents, ranging from motivation, enhanced academic outcomes, and increased knowledge retention. However, to actualize this full potential, institutions need to overcome these challenges of technological barriers and inadequate peer collaboration. Blended learning has been proved to be particularly effective in providing students with preparation for complicated, real-world applications of their knowledge, which can make it a valuable approach in specialized educational settings by adopting efficient design principles and leveraging high-quality instructors.

REFERENCES

1. Arbaugh, J. B., Cleveland-Innes, M., Diaz, S. R., Garrison, D. R., Ice, P., Richardson, J. C., & Swan, K. P. (2008). Developing a community of inquiry instrument: Testing a measure of the Community of Inquiry framework using a multi-institutional sample. *The Internet and Higher Education, 11*(3-4), 133-136. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2008.06.003
2. Blocker, J. M., & Tucker, G. (2001). Using constructivist principles in designing and integrating online collaborative interactions. In F. Fuller & R. McBride (Eds.), *Distance education. Proceedings of the Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference* (pp. 32–36). ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 457 822.
3. Blended learning. *Journal of Turkish Science Education, 8*(2), 3-8. Nortvig, A., Petersen, A. K., & Balle, S. (2018).
4. De Corte, E. (1990). Toward powerful learning environments for the acquisition of problem-solving skills. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 5*, 5–19.
5. Demirkol, M., & Kazu, I. Y. (2014). Effect of blended environment model on high school students' academic achievement. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology, 13*(1), 78–87.
6. Fullan, M. G., & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change.* New York: Teachers College.
7. Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2000). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment: Computer conferencing in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education, 2*(2-3), 87-105. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516(00)00016-6
8. Garrison, D. R., & Kanuka, H. (2004). Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. *Internet and Higher Education, 7*, 95–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2004.02.001.
9. Graham, C. R. (2009). Blended learning models. In *Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology* (Second Edition ed., pp. 375–382): IGI Global.
10. Harrington, A. M. (2010). Problematizing the Hybrid Classroom for ESL/EFL Students. *TESL-EJ 14*(3).
11. Heinich, R., Molenda, M., Russell, J. D., & Smaldino, S. E. (2001). *Instructional Media and Technologies for Learning* (7th ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
12. Hofmann, J. (2014). Solutions to the top 10 challenges of blended learning. *Top 10 challenges of blended learning*. Available on cedma-europe.org.
13. Kenney, J., & Newcombe, E. (2011). Adopting a blended learning approach: Challenges, encountered and lessons learned in an action research study. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 15*(1), 45–57.

14. Kintu, M. J., & Zhu, C. (2016). Student characteristics and learning outcomes in a blended learning environment intervention in a Ugandan University. *Electronic Journal of e-Learning, 14*(3), 181–195.
15. Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1994). *Evaluating training programmes. The four levels.* San Francisco: Berett-Koehler.
16. Kuo, Y., Walker, A. E., Belland, B. R., & Schroder, L. E. E. (2013). A predictive study of student satisfaction in online education programs. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 14*(1), 16–39.
17. Leonard, J., & Guha, S. (2001). Education at the Crossroads: Online Teaching and Students' Perspectives on Distance Learning. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 34*(1), 51-57.
18. Lin, B., & Vassar, J. A. (2009). Determinants for success in online learning communities. *International Journal of Web-based Communities, 5*(3), 340–350.
19. Loukis, E., Georgiou, S., & Pazalo, K. (2007). A value flow model for the evaluation of an e-learning service. *ECIS, 2007 Proceedings*, paper 175.
20. Menager-Beeley, R. (2004). Web-based distance learning in a community college: The influence of task values on task choice, retention and commitment. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64*(9-A), 3191.
21. 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.
22. Oliver, M., & Trigwell, K. (2005). Can "Blended Learning" be redeemed? *E-learning, 2*(1), 17-26.
23. P. Ginns et al. Evaluating the quality of e-learning at the degree level in the student experience of blended learning.
24. Rovai, A. P., & Jordan, H. P. (2004). Blended Learning and Sense of Community: A comparative analysis with traditional and fully online graduate courses. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 5*(2).
25. Selim, H. M. (2007). Critical success factors for e-learning acceptance: Confirmatory factor models. *Computers & Education, 49*(2), 396–413.
26. Stes, A., Clement, M., & Nelissen, C. (2002, July). Educational innovation and faculty's professional development: A two-way link. Paper presented at the International Consortium for Educational Development Conference, University of Western Australia, Perth, Australia.
27. Sussman, S., & Dutter, L. (2010). Comparing Student learning outcomes in face-to-face and online course delivery. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 8*(4). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/winter134/sussman_dutter13.pdf
28. Swan, K. (2001). Virtual interactivity: design factors affecting student satisfaction and perceived learning in asynchronous online courses. *Distance Education, 22*(2), 306–331.
29. Thompson, D. E., Brooks, K., & Lizarraga, E. (2003). Perceived transfer of learning: From the distance education classroom to the workplace. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 28*, 539–547.