



A Research Into The Implications Of Elearning On Higher Education

Dr. Dinesh Pandey, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, Department of Education, Mangalayatan University, Aligarh, (Uttar Pradesh)

Dr. AbhiramKulshestra, Professor, Department of Education

Abstract- The Internet is a technological innovation which not only has the potential to change the way society retains and accesses knowledge, but also to rethink and restructure traditional higher education systems, in particular the provision and interaction with and with the provision and interaction with course materials and related resources. The use of the Internet for the provision of e-learning programmes has created expectations in the business sector as well as in higher education institutions. In fact, eLearning has made it possible for universities to expand their current regional reach, to concentrate on new prospective students, and to evolve as global education providers. This paper discusses the issues surrounding the implementation of eLearning in higher education, including the structure and delivery of higher education, the ramifications for both students and teachers, and the effect on society worldwide.

Keywords: Internet, E-Learning, Higher Institutions, Education, Students

I. INTRODUCTION

Elearning is viewed in a multitude of forms, including distance learning, online learning, and networked learning (Wilson 2009). In the context of this article, both of these instances will be considered to clarify learning using information communication technology (ICT) to promote educational interaction between pupils, lecturers and learning classes (Holley 2012). Volery (2008) suggests that the exponential growth of the Internet and associated technological advances, in tandem with restricted budgets and social demands for greater access to higher education, have provided a significant catalyst for universities to introduce eLearning courses. It goes on to say that if universities do not adopt e-learning technologies that are publicly available, they would be left behind in search of globalisation. Ribiero (2007) indicates that if institutions are to maximise the potential of eLearning as a means to deliver higher education, they need to be fully informed of the main success factors that are involved in adopting higher models of online education. The relative benefits of eLearning in higher education are identified by several experts, however there are implications for unprepared, technology-oriented institutions while seeking to implement distance learning courses. O'Hearn (2010) contends that university programmes remain stagnant and unproven in accordance with the implementation of technical innovations. It notes that eLearning is difficult to implement without the full involvement and support of lecturers, as the degree of interaction between lecturers and students is still prevalent in eLearning settings. Finally, are current universities capable of collaborating with other independent providers of education in response to societal calls for 'life-long schooling' and globalised education systems?

Links with industry researchers from higher education institutions have shown that, in tandem with improved technologies, a more business-focused approach to higher education has resulted in an increased number of partnerships between universities and industries. Henry (2009) argues that if they are to recruit and retain sufficient students, traditional universities need to compete with other providers of education, such as training centres and corporate universities, in today's knowledge age. On the other hand, although these modern modes of education are constantly expanding, traditional universities, on the other hand, should be differentiated from these developments and focus more on internal change and development. Fry (2012) argues that universities are attracted to eLearning as a marketing tool to attract part-time students and maintain a market lead, and the rise in collaborations with other companies is imminent due to social demands for skills and the lack of public and government funding in higher education. The selection of eLearning providers is expanding rapidly and Henry (2009) indicates that the number of corporate universities will outnumber traditional universities within five years. Teare (2000) addresses the validity of corporate colleges offering product-specific education in a multitude of fields and believes that in an attempt to take advantage of reputable institutions, they are still seeking alliances with traditional universities. While traditional higher education institutions are wanting to learn more about the implementation of eLearning from external entities, they are highly cautious about partnering

with potentially precarious organisations (Dobbs 2000). Because of social demands for open learning, the business marketplace is now advancing in the more mainstream fields of higher education (Teare 2000), and if existing institutions are to remain theoretically dominant providers of education and development, they must embrace the skills and experience of emerging customers in the recent distance learning movement (Jones 2000).

II. INCORPORATING ELEARNING INTO THE PLAN FOR ORGANISATIONS

Fry (2012) argues that if universities are to thrive in a global environment for higher education, technological advances need to be embraced and used as a strategic tool capable of transforming the practises of education and industry. It argues that eLearning services would not only provide colleges with a modern instructional implementation tool, but will also facilitate strategic goals by helping asynchronous communication consortiums and networked communities. It may be that eLearning strategies could be based on technological skills in universities. Darling (2002) opposes this assumption and argues that it is not appropriate for higher education institutions to be influenced by technical features and usability instead of focusing on eLearning as a medium to promote learning. Darling (2002) also advocates that eLearning is an effective strategic business weapon that, when appropriately deployed, would modernise higher education, but it is necessary to note that when deciding an acceptable strategy, distance learning is a means to an end, not the goal itself. Hartley (2000) states that any university that incorporates eLearning services into its operating strategy must take into account the following: the financial restrictions of the scheme, the suitability of the technology, the implementation of the technology and the collection of eLearning requirements within the institution. If all of these variables are given sufficient priority, the university is responsible for future distance learning (Hartley 2000).

Darling (2002) indicates that a number of established institutions are embracing the use of technology in higher education, in particular in distance learning disciplines, without understanding or adapting to the requirements of business or education. In the opinion of Shapiro (2000), this may be fatal for universities, and should not allow fundamental educational systems to be overwhelmed by the adoption of new information technology techniques. The idea is that this will be accomplished by colleges that do not effectively implement eLearning as part of an overall learning programme at the expense of survival. A range of views are taken into account above on the implications and potential impact that eLearning can have on colleges as businesses. The use of new technology in higher education is imminent (O'Donoghue, Singh and Dorward, 2001), leading to the loss of the boundaries of communication, geography and learning inflexibility. Henry (2002) points out that eLearning will help optimise corporate practises when organisations partake in the restructuring of internal procedures which can, by shared knowledge, reduce inefficiencies and enhance communication between departments and employees. The evidence demonstrates that eLearning must be incorporated in order to be competitive within any organisation as part of a strategic strategy to facilitate learning. Shapiro (2000) claims that eLearning requires stringent application which, if not properly coordinated, may lead to uncertainty. Darling (2002) points out that an effective solution does not ensure survival for higher education institutions, as the technical obstacles in the adoption of distance learning would continue to be relevant. Perhaps this argument reflects the inexperience of universities with effective technological adoption, which justifies the need for strategic partnerships and alliances. This is especially the case for technology elements and processes for the management of internal change. This perspective is echoed by Teare (2000), who comments that the material of the eLearning course should be designed to challenge students in specific business environments, in addition to promoting research programmes by partnerships with organisations. Instead of a paradigm shift to an online model, a delicate balancing between the more traditional conventional structures and procedures of the university and the new managerial positions required to respond rapidly to changes in the online education sector and ensure the competitive advantage and potential survival of the virtual campus needs to be established.

Position of teaching staff In conjunction with new e-learning innovations, the dynamic nature of the IT industry has created stress for lecturers in higher education. New educational challenges for lecturers have reportedly been generated by ELearning services, such as shifting work patterns and the hesitant introduction of technology in some instances. Serwatka (2010) believes that by actually stopping student withdrawals from eLearning services, it is always necessary to achieve student success. The teaching approaches used by lecturers in traditional classrooms would also be necessary to revise and modify, as they do not necessarily prove effective or automatically transferable in eLearning environments. As they

develop, lecturers in networked learning environments change their courses, which means that the more a course is taught in a specific manner, the more effective it is. Many claim that, rather than changing the role of the instructor, it will gradually disappear completely with the emergence of improved eLearning technologies and methodologies. It maintains that technical information itself is not of considerable value until lecturers dream of successful ways of using it. Lecturers will also play a critical role in the effective introduction of eLearning initiatives, since the instructor is not the technology that facilitates the students' learning experience. Wilson (2009) suggests that three characteristics of the lecturer will influence the degree of learning: attitude towards technology, teaching style, and management of technology.

In support of this point of view, Holley (2012) concludes that students would have a more positive learning experience if led by a professor who holds a constructive perspective against traditional learning while promoting eLearning strategies. For such visibility, the accepted acronym is called 'Blended Learning'. Blended college is a significant building block of the new school building which offers students with mobility and flexibility, important characteristics for working adults who wish to receive post-secondary degrees. Blended learning is a mixture of standard face-to-face and online learning, meaning that teaching takes place in the classroom as well as online, and traditional classroom learning becomes a natural continuation of the online component.

III. TRAINING PROFESSIONALS IN STRATEGIES FOR ELEARNING

Latest studies suggest that the progress of eLearning methods in higher education can only be assessed by the efficacy of adoption, and that training workers can be seen as a major barrier in the implementation of eLearning programmes. In their teaching and learning systems, it is known that some higher education scholars are slow to accept elements of technology.

Contemporary lecturers are not immune to training in the use of technical applications, Charlesworth (2014) adds; they are simply unsure about how to apply these techniques in lectures or more systematic ways of teaching. Lecturers entering the profession are much more likely than in previous years to have used computers and have comprehensive access to the Internet in today's information era, and are more likely to support technological innovations in teaching techniques. Academics are often allowed to go online by their institution, either by moving or supplementing teaching in an online environment. Literally, this could be an attempt to replicate face-to-face teaching, effectively altering nothing; improving face-to-face teaching with the available technologies; or converting face-to-face teaching through the available technology. Many factors will determine the approach used, one of which will be the actual experience of the technological context being used (Coldwell 2013). Educators must participate in all phases of the eLearning course's production, including the selection of the prospective audience, the intention of the learning programme and the best format. This perspective highlights the need for lecturers not only to be educated in higher education using eLearning technologies, but also to be attentive to distance-based learning theories. Professional teaching needs both technical and academic difficulties, and increased guidance for the merits of eLearning will be offered if properly introduced. If eLearning courses are to be successful, the requisite facilitation skills must be accessible to lecturers. It says that there are three divisions of experience in facilitation, advancement of real-time events, moderation of online forums, and student coaching. It goes on to suggest that even the most effectively organized eLearning classes, if lecturers may not maintain a high standard of facilitation expertise, will be inefficient by inattention on behalf of the teacher. The report illustrates that executive recruiting is a crucial concern for colleges that implement distance learning strategies. It is crucial that the opportunity to innovate and extend university teaching activities by eLearning should not be usurped by the focus on teaching lecturers how to use hardware and software. In a finely balanced learning process, inadequately trained lecturers who use eLearning in educational contexts will become a problem that can lead to programme use difficulties and student aspirations (Volery 2008). ELearning requires lecturers to commit themselves to a constant and changing learning curve in contrast to traditional teaching skills, which may require a number of formal training courses in combination with seminars and other less formal methods if the skills expected to be a successful eLearning teacher are to be acquired and developed. In higher education institutions, the technological advances offered by eLearning must be accepted and embraced by lecturers.

Holley (2012) argues that lecturers should adopt new methods of teaching in order to preserve the continuity of lessons. Collectively, the study on the role of lecturing staff offered in contemporary eLearning courses indicates that online learning cannot be treated as an alternative to a traditional teacher. Active eLearning programmes use lecturing workers along with the appropriate software in order to provide effective learning. In addition, the teacher is not only an information conduit, but also a knowledge navigator who uses the Internet as a medium for instruction. This allows lecturers to transfer their skills to other fields of industry, such as development education and corporate courses (Ribiero 2007).

IV. STUDENTS 'ACCESSIBILITY'

One of the most critical aspects of the introduction and implementation of eLearning techniques is that they ideally give students greater access to education compared to more traditional, less versatile teaching methods. Writers such as Hemsley (2012) share the belief that full-time and part-time students can now enrol from either position in their desired degree programmes, supplying individuals who travel or who are displaced with a transferable and readily accessible learning ability and experience. Students who have not historically had access to higher education are now able to study in a position that is ideally tailored to their needs with the use of emerging technology (Sadler-Smith 2010). ELearning offers people with disabilities with the opportunity to further their education at home. While the shared perspectives demonstrate the positive effects of home work, there is also evidence that students who study from their most convenient position will not engage in a positive learning environment.

Home access to education may sound like a positive road forward, but the learning process is always interrupted because the climate is not necessarily conducive to study. Since eLearning offers students with better access to higher education, not only access to education, but also access to technology should be taken into account, since computers are an important part of effective eLearning courses (Ribiero 2007). Students who have access to networked computers may have the potential to undergo a more flexible learning environment, but students and even higher education institutions will not benefit from this privilege because students are unable to buy or use a computer. Therefore, students with no computer at home are perhaps disadvantaged in eLearning environments. Moreover, as a major result of increased attendance in higher education (Holley 2012), a large percentage of students come from low-income backgrounds and may have no disposable income to purchase computers, so increased dependency on technology to deliver higher education would potentially lead to more divisions in society. Untimely eLearning programmes generate unproductive learning environments in which students are unsure about how to plan for online exams, have issues with course material and are unable to ask lecturers for assistance. A big challenge for contemporary colleges is to provide students with a more client-oriented training experience, and this requires an intellectual understanding of the need for a more open, easily accessible learning experience that can be created through distance learning (Fry 2012). In addition, contemporary learners prefer to communicate and involve the opportunity to share knowledge and experience from a distance, offering students and universities the capacity to maximise the learning environment by networked programmes that are technically suitable and highly personal.

V. CONCLUSION

Theoretically, ELearning could have major ramifications for the infrastructure, growth and implementation of higher education by Sadler. Up to now, colleges have been unchanged in their arrangement and delivery of higher education classes. There has never been such a high appetite for instruction, though, and this could inspire colleges to implement eLearning systems in line with the need for geographically expanded learning. The same demands for education and the rising income of private education companies have raised a serious threat to the very survival of a traditional university. ELearning will provide universities with a way of exceeding the newly produced rivalry by taking full advantage of their traditional, already established reputations. For students, eLearning may provide a choice that is educationally preferable to traditional lectures, where learning can take place outside the lecture hall. ELearning will also provide students with a roadmap for how to become independent, self-directed learners, which will make them become 'life-long learners.' Networked learning can trigger changes in lecturer's work habits and also change their professional role, but eLearning also gives them the ability to analyse students in real business situations and creative ways to assess the professional

position The role of the lecturer is predominant in the successful implementation of networked learning programmes, as lecturers have the effect of eliminating technical frustrations from students, making students feel empowered and encouraging students to communicate with each other.

The eLearning services represent a transition in the style of teaching for lecturers. The precise extent of the change is difficult to calculate, but the allocation of sufficient time and resources, combined with managerial assistance, will help workers negotiate the process of transition. Successful management would also enable universities to deal with the increase in the workload of lecturers by making efficient use of resources over the past decade; the use of the Internet has seen phenomenal growth in university education, with a variety of factors driving the introduction of web-based technology. The lack of federal funding has forced colleges in the higher education sector to seek technological solutions to provide courses for a growing and rapidly diverse and scattered student population. Another cause has been the change in focus from teacher-centered to learner-centered education, leading educators to include courses that enable students to control their own learning (Sheard and Lynch 2014). In assessing the use of eLearning, educational institutions must be structurally flexible in order to be able to embrace the capacities of distance learning as a tool for facilitating overall learning. In order to leverage these resources efficiently, higher education institutions need to evaluate the most successful environments and courses for the introduction of eLearning, therefore, a successful eLearning course may be one that is paired with other more traditional face-to-face distribution techniques. Pedagogical approaches have not improved significantly in the last 25 years (Nabeth et al, 2012). Therefore, a relatively dangerous anathema for a number of staff and institutions is the idea of creating a holistic learning enterprise that empowers the learner and moves away from the didactic distribution model within the traditional lecture hall. By giving the learner greater flexibility and transitioning to systems that are less closely managed or regulated at the same time, it will create potential internal conflicts (Wolters 2013). There might not be any of these at the interface of academia. The introduction of multiple internal processes and procedures as well as multiple IT systems will also mitigate the successful implementation of an eLearning context or atmosphere that is coherent and inclusive. ELearning influences the framework of higher education in a profound way. The composition of the incoming student body allows universities to deliberately plan programmes that follow a broad range of learning requirements, while demand expansion can be accommodated by its implementation. This challenge is compounded by changes to the competitive environment in which, in the aftermath of lifelong learning, traditional institutions compete with corporate and virtual universities, especially for the mature student population. There is a need to recognise that active learning requires the establishment of a theoretical framework within a technologically driven environment as part of the learning process. This interpretation would suggest that the use of technology is not about replacing the learner's strategy, but about strengthening it and extending it. This is most important because in immersive and technology-based learning environments, which may have existed in the lecture theatre, we are not simply 'cut and paste' content.

REFERENCES

- 1) Brown, D., Cromby, J., and Standen, P. (2001). The effective use of virtual environments in the education and rehabilitation of students with intellectual disabilities. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 32(3), pp. 289-299.
- 2) Charlesworth, A. (2014). Computer tutor, PC Advisor, pp. 177-181.
- 3) Coldwell (2013) Mapping Pedagogy to Technology – A Simple Model. In *Advances in Web-Based Learning - ICWL 2003 Vol. 2783 / 2003*. Springer-Verlag GmbH. pp.180 - 192
- 4) Fry, K. (2012). ELearning Markets and Providers: some issues and prospects. *Training and Education*, 43(4), pp. 233-239.
- 5) Hemsley, C. (2012). Jones International University's focus on quality eLearning opens doors for students worldwide. *Business Media*, 39(9), pp. 26-29.
- 6) Henry, P. (2009). Learning enters the boardroom: making the connection between strategy and enterprise-wide learning. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 34(2), pp. 66-69.
- 7) Holley, D. (2012). "Which room is the virtual seminar in please?". *Education and Training*, 44(3), pp. 112-121.
- 8) Nabeth, T., Angehrn, A, and Balakrishnan, R. (2012). Some reflections and researches for the design of the next generation e-Learning Systems for the knowledge intensive organization. INSEAD/CALT (the Centre for Advanced Learning Technologies) Working Paper 2004/02.

- 9) O'Hearn, J. (2010). Challenges for service leaders: setting the agenda for the virtual learning organization. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 12(2), pp. 97-106.
- 10) Ribiero, T. (2007). From a distance: Look at distance learning's increased following. *Education*, 152(9), p. 85.
- 11) Sadler-Smith, E. (2010). "Modern" learning methods: rhetoric and reality. *Personnel Review*, 29(4), pp. 474-490. Scott, T. (2000). The Wired Campus, *Business Weekly*, p. 102.
- 12) Serwatka, J. (2010). Improving student performance in distance learning courses. *The Journal of Technological Horizons In Education*, 29(9), pp. 46-52.
- 13) Sheard J, and Lynch J. (2014). Challenges of Web-Based Learning Environments: Are We StudentCentredEnuf? In *Advances in Web-Based Learning - ICWL 2003 Vol. 2783 / 2003*. Springer-Verlag GmbH. pp. 1 – 11.
- 14) Volery, T. (2008). Critical success factors in online education. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 14(5), pp. 216-223. Wilson, J. (2009). Lessons of a Virtual Timetable: Education. *The Economist*, (17 February), p. 1 (CDROM).
- 15) Wolters, C. (2013). Understanding Procrastination From a Self-Regulated Learning Perspective. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Volume 95, Issue 1, March 2003, pp 179-187.