Changing Paradigm in Private Tution Industry and Technology Influences on Course Delivery in India

Mahesh R Shetty

Abstract: Indian private tuition industry is a going through a disruptive mode, where this industry has moving from one-way delivery to two-way delivery model and technology is the biggest driver to cause this disruption. Instructors role has been changing from delivery to maintaining the entire delivery to tracking the development of the students as well as continuous feedbacks from them demands them to updates them frequently.

Online screening and easy accessibility of vast question banks helps to build a strong record management for the students as well as for the instructors to monitor the growth individually.

Now this technological change in course delivery has been very effective and easily available on the finger tips to the students as well as to the instructors and also provide sound resource for students.

This paper will examine the relationship of demographic as well as effectiveness of technological changes in private tuition industry.

Key words: Technology influences, Private Tuition Industryand Course delivery

Date of Submission: 21-05-2019

Date of acceptance: 06-06-2019

I. Introduction

Technology plays a large role in many features of day-to-day life, and education is no different. Technology is quickly altering the way students learn and how instructors teach.

Computers have substituted chalkboards as the go-to tool in classrooms today. And it's not just up-tothe-minute in higher education; technology is part of education for children of all ages. It's also a part of their daily lives. According to a research study by Common Sense Media published in October 2011, "computer use is pervasive among very young children, with half (53%) of all 2 to 4-year olds having ever used a computer, and nine out of 10 (90%) 5 to 8-year olds having done so."

As technology endures to evolve, it brings with it new opportunities and challenges for educators and students. Social networking is a great example of technology that can help — or hinder — education, depending on how it is used and integrated into teaching plans. Privacy and security are two concerns that can come with using social networking in the classroom. It can also become a disruption to students, or even a tool used for bullying.

However, using social networking as part of the learning process can also have benefits. Students who are more introverted may open up and connect more with faculty and other students when they are communicating through social networking. It also affords students the opportunity to collaborate and work together in a whole new way.

There are also social networking sites designed specifically for education. An article on technology in education by Education Week mentions ePals and eChalk as two sites "designed specifically for learning."

College students can be notoriously connected to technology, including social networking, through their smartphones, laptops, and tablets. Social media in education presents college students with different benefits and detriments compared to their younger counterparts. According to Mashable, "Facebook is the most used social media tool in higher education." Additionally, Mashable says that colleges can use social media to encourage school spirit, foster the growth of alumni groups, and offer virtual tours to potential students.

So, whether it is a college student studying classic literature or a grade school student first learning to read, technology is now an integral part of the education process. **Sources Jared Newnam**,2012. *Model of technological acceptance:*

Changing Paradigm in Private Tution Industry and Technology Influences on Course Delivery in ..



Technology acceptance model (TAM) (Davis, 1989: cited in Timothy, 2009).

Since there is no specific research work has been done before in the context of private tuition industry, this study will be exploratory in nature and explore that how Indian Private tuition industry has accepted this change.

Research objectives:

- To identify the demographic responses to technological changes.
- To understand the challenges in acceptance of technological changes in Indian Private Tuition industry.

Sampling Techniques: Random Sample technique has been applied to select the samples from the universe. **Research Tools:** Cross Tab technique to understand the relationship between demographics of respondents and technological acceptability.

II. Results and Discussion

AGE * Are you using Learning Management System implemented in the institute?

		U	TUSSIAD		
			Are you using Learning Management System implemented in the school?		
			Yes	No	Total
AGE	16-19 years	Count	32	6	38
		Expected Count	35.7	2.3	38.0
	19-22 years	Count	50	0	50
		Expected Count	47.0	3.0	50.0
	22-25 years	Count	12	0	12
		Expected Count	11.3	.7	12.0
Total		Count	94	6	100
		Expected Count	94.0	6.0	100.0

Interpretation: There are three categories have been selected for different age groups like16-25 years who are enrolled into different courses and familiar with online contents.

Chi-Square Tests						
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)			
Pearson Chi-Square	10.414 ^a	2	.005			
Likelihood Ratio	12.245	2	.002			
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.003	1	.005			
N of Valid Cases	100					

a. 3 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .72.

Interpretation: The Pearson chi-square value suggest that there are no difference in using the online content delivery while enrolled with the institute and belonging to different age groups.

Directional Measures					
			Value	Asymp. Std. Error ^a	
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.107	.037	
		AGE Dependent	.120	.046	
		Are you using Learning Management System implemented in the school? Dependent	.000	.000	
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	AGE Dependent	.070	.012	
		Are you using Learning Management System implemented in the school? Dependent	.104	.042	

Directional Measures Approx. T^b Approx. Sig. Nominal by Nominal Lambda 2.526 Symmetric .012 AGE Dependent 2.526 .012 Are you using Learning Management System implemented in the school? Dependent Goodman and Kruskal tau AGE Dependent .001 Are you using Learning Management System implemented .006^d in the school? Dependent

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

d. Based on chi-square approximation

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.323	.005
	Cramer's V	.323	.005
	Contingency Coefficient	.307	.005
N of Valid Cases		100	



AGE * **Are you satisfied** with the current Learning Management System implemented in the institute? The user satisfaction ratio suggest that the majority is satisfied with the LMS system and there are few responses who suggest that infrastructure need to be improved for such implementation.

		Ci	rosstab		
			Are you satisfied with the current Learning Management System implemented in the institute?		
			Yes	No	Total
AGE	16-19 years	Count	38	0	38
		Expected Count	35.0	3.0	38.0
	19-22 years	Count	42	8	50
		Expected Count	46.0	4.0	50.0
	22-25 years	Count	12	0	12
		Expected Count	11.0	1.0	12.0
Total		Count	92	8	100
		Expected Count	92.0	8.0	100.0

Interpretation: The Pearson chi square value suggest that there is no difference in users satisfaction regarding LMS as per their age categories.

Chi-Square Tests						
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)			
Pearson Chi-Square	8.696 ^a	2	.013			
Likelihood Ratio	11.787	2	.003			
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.346	1	.246			
N of Valid Cases	100					

a. 3 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .96.

Directional Measures						
			Value	Asymp. Std. Error ^a		
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.000	.000		
		AGE Dependent	.000	.000		
		Are you satisfied with the current Learning Management System implemented in the institute? Dependent	.000	.000		
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	AGE Dependent	.060	.010		
		Are you satisfied with the current Learning Management System implemented in the institute? Dependent	.087	.031		

	Dire	ctional Measures		
			Approx. T	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	b	b
		AGE Dependent	b	b.
		Are you satisfied with the current Learning Management System implemented in the institute? Dependent		b.
	Goodman and Kruskal tau	AGE Dependent		.003 ^c
		Are you satisfied with the current Learning Management System implemented in the institute? Dependent		.014 ^c

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

c. Based on chi-square approximation

Symmetric Measures

Value Approx. Sig Phi Nominal by Nominal .295 .013 Cramer's V .295 .013 Contingency Coefficient .283 .013 N of Valid Cases 100 Bar Chart Are you satisfied 50 with the current Learning Management Syštem 40 implémented in the institute? 🗖 Yes No 30 Count 20 10 19-22 years 16-19 years 22-25 years AGE

III. Conclusion

As the results suggest that the age of the respondents is not a deterrent while using technology into education. The private coaching industry has slowly but steadily moving into technological deliveries of the content and face to face teaching is well augmented with online delivery and Learning management system.

Bibliography

- [1]. Alberta Education. (2006). One-to-One Mobile Computing: Literature Review. Retrieved from http://education.alberta.ca/media/528965/litreview.pdf.
- [2]. Angrist, J., & Lavy, V. (2002). New Evidence on Classroom Computers and Pupil Learning. The EconomicJournal, 112 (October), 735-765.
- [3]. Apple Computer. (1995). Changing the Conversation About Teaching, Learning, and Technology: A Report on 10 Years of ACOT Research. Retrieved from http://images.apple.com/education/k12/leadership/acot/pdf/10yr.pdf.
- [4]. Apple Computer. (2005). Research: What It Says About 1 to 1 Learning.
- [5]. Business world 2016
- [6]. Morgan, D.L. (1997). Focus Groups as Qualitative Research. 2nd Edition. Sage Publications Inc. New Delhi. India.
- [7]. Morton, A. (1996). Factors affecting the integration of computers inWestern Sydney secondary schools. In J. G. Hedberg, J. Steele and S. McNamara (Eds), Learning Technologies: Prospects and Pathways, 107-114. Selected papers from EdTech'96. Canberra: AJET Publications. Retrieved from http://www.aset.org.au/confs/edtech96/morton.html.
- [8]. Mumtaz, Shazia. (2000). Factors affecting teachers' use of information and communications technology: a review of the literature. Journal of Information Technology for Teacher Education, 9(3), 319-342.

Mahesh R Shetty. "Changing Paradigm in Private Tution Industry and Technology Influences on Course Delivery in India." IOSR Journal of Polymer and Textile Engineering (IOSR-JPTE) , vol. 6, no. 3, 2019, pp. 56-60.