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Abstract

Blended learning (BL) is positive development in education. This method provokes the learner’s critical thinking and given different ways for implementation of their knowledge in real life. The objective of the study is to determine the difference of blended learning teaching strategy and lecture-based teaching strategy on the learning outcome of the undergraduate nursing students in Lahore, Pakistan.

Quasi experimental study design was used by utilizing control and experimental groups for comprising two methods of students learning. 197 participants were recruited in control group and experimental groups. The study sample was determined through the convenient sampling method.

In this study the establishing reliability and construct validity of the tool was 0.7 and 0.75 respectively. In addition to this internal consistency Cronbach’s coefficient alpha was computed 0.70. Generally, the reliability and validity were considered acceptable and satisfactory above 0.70.

The results findings revealed that blended learning has significant relationship with awareness (p= < 0.02) learning strategies (p= < 0.07) learning activities (p= < 0.06), evaluation (p=0.04) among the experimental groups.

In the conclusion, blended learning significantly improves the learning of the students and provides the space for better skills in the clinical setting simultaneously. Thereafter, institutions, policy makers and regulatory bodies should incorporate this strategy in the nursing curriculum in Pakistan.
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Introduction

In recent era educators identify the different learning styles such as face-to-face learning or traditional method, virtual learning, problem-based learning, project base learning, blended learning etc. In the learning process there is one of the particular relations between a students and fellow students as well as with teacher. Moreover, direct contact in learning enhance this relation¹. Lots of information and long-term experiences are outcome of the positive behavior that depends upon a body language including gestures, tones, rhythm, stress, and volume of voice. Lecture based learning is direct contact in training that give action, response and reaction are directly perceived by the participants². Lecture based teaching environment in the first priority of the students, because of the reason is the direct front face to face education gives more valid instructions and guidance³. There is no doubt that face to face courses are a great source of learning for students where they have positive feeling and great interest in learning⁴. Others are interested in the distance self-directed learning focusing their own convenience. Blended learning (BL) is positive development in education. This method provokes the learner critical thinking and given different ways for implementation of their knowledge in real life. Blended learning facilitates and inspires the student learning and creativity⁵. Open the way of new teaching opportunities and enhance the student engagement. Blended learning enhances students’ competency, satisfaction, motivation, and achievement, therefore to explore in-depth the researcher in this study re-designed and re-developed a combined teaching method for the course⁶. The objective of this study is to explore the effect of blended learning and lecture-based learning on learning outcome of the
undergraduate students using Self-rating scale of self-directed learning tool in Lahore Pakistan.

**Objective:** To find out the impact of different factors affecting nursing students learning styles as well as compare the Lecture Based Learning v/s Blended Learning in an Elective Nursing Course the University of Lahore, Pakistan.

Objective 1: Is there significant difference among the student’s awareness who used blended learning and the student’s awareness who used lecture-based learning?

Objective 2: Is there significant difference among the student’s learning strategies who used blended learning and the student’s learning strategies who used lecture-based learning?

Objective 3: Is there significant difference among the student’s learning activities who used blended learning and the student’s learning activities who used lecture-based learning?

Objective 4: Is there significant difference among the student’s interpersonal skills who used blended learning and the student’s interpersonal skills who used lecture-based learning?

**Null hypothesis:** There is no significant difference in the blended teaching and lecture-based teaching strategies on nursing students learning outcomes.

**Alternative hypothesis:** There is a significant difference in the blended teaching and lecture-based teaching strategies on nursing students learning outcomes.

**Methodology**

To answer the research, question the researcher adopted quasi experimental study design. The population of this study was B.Sc Nursing students in Lahore Pakistan. In Pakistan B.Sc Nursing program has two categories one program is Generic B.Sc Nursing with the minimal entry requirement of successful completion of 12 grade with at least 50 % and the other program is Post RN B.Sc Nursing with the requirement of diploma in Nursing and one year of Post Basic specialization diploma with two years of experience. Participants were recruited through convenience sampling technique. Males and females studying the subject of Leadership and Management (The same course taught in both semesters having same objectives) in nursing program (Generic B.Sc Nursing and Post RN B.Sc Nursing program) of Fall-2016 and Fall-2017 in Lahore School of Nursing, the University of Lahore, were approached. The total sample size of the study was 197.

**Table 1.** Intervention strategy of the study

| Semester | Experiment Group          | No of Students | Control Group          | No of Students |
|----------|---------------------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------|
| Fall 2016| Post RN B.Sc Nursing      | 49             | Generic B.Sc Nursing   | 50             |
| Fall 2017| Generic B.Sc Nursing      | 49             | Post RN B.Sc Nursing   | 49             |

The permission to conduct the study was taken from the Texila American University Guyana and the Institutional Review Board of the University of Lahore.
Table 2. Data Collection Procedures of the Research for fall 2016 and fall 2017 semesters

| Time             | Tasks                                                                 |
|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| July 2016 and 2017 | • Teacher / Faculty participants recruited                           |
| August 2016 and 2017 | • Syllabus teaching strategies drafted by researcher                 |
|                   | • Teacher training conducted by researcher                           |
|                   | • Student participants enrolled                                      |
| September 2016 and 2017 | • Researcher starts observing both classes daily (experiment and    |
|                   |   control group)                                                      |
|                   | • Faculty hold first planning meeting with students                   |
| October 2016 and 2017 | • Researcher starts observing both classes daily (experiment and    |
|                   |   control group)                                                      |
|                   | • Faculty meet daily only for one hour to plan.                       |
|                   | • Researcher observe the meeting                                     |
| November 2016 and 2017 | • Researcher starts observing both classes daily (experiment and   |
|                   |   control group)                                                      |
|                   | • Faculty meet daily only for one hour to plan.                       |
|                   | • Researcher observe the meeting                                     |
| December 2016 and 2017 | • Researcher starts observing both classes daily (experiment and    |
|                   |   control group)                                                      |
|                   | • Faculty meet daily only for one hour to plan.                       |
|                   | • Researcher observe the meeting                                     |
| January 2017 and 2018 | • Researcher starts observing both classes daily (experiment and    |
|                   |   control group)                                                      |
|                   | • Faculty meet daily only for one hour to plan.                       |
|                   | • Researcher observe the meeting                                     |
|                   | • Students questionnaires administered to both groups                 |
|                   | • Student interviews conducted                                       |
|                   | • Faculty post semester questionnaire administered                   |
|                   | • Faculty participants interviewed                                   |

“Self-rating scale of self-directed learning” (SRSSDL) tool was used for this research. Pilot study was executed after build of the tool on 10% of the learners to test the tools and necessary changes were done according to the results of finding and the opinions of experts in the pilot study. Cronbach’s alpha shows a very high level of reliability at \( \alpha = .901 \). Based on these results it concludes that the instrument is a reliable and valid for this study.

Table 3. Cronbach alpha coefficients for questionnaire

| Scales                | Cronbach’s Alpha | N  |
|-----------------------|------------------|----|
| Awareness             | .915             | 42 |
| Learning Strategies   | .888             | 30 |
| Learning Activities   | .911             | 36 |
| Evaluation            | .901             | 33 |
| Interpersonal Skills  | .892             | 30 |
| Total                 | .901             | 171|

Results
In the methodology it is discussed that students taking Lecture based learning were the ‘control’ group and the students taking the students taking blending learning semester were in the ‘experimental’ group. There were also two data set one set comprised of generic BSN student and the other group comprised of Post RN BSN students. In 2016 the Generic BSN students were in the control group and Post RN students were in the experimental group and in 2017 the Post RN group was in control group and Generic BSN students were in experimental group.
In figure 1 sociodemographic frequencies of Generic B.Sc Nursing Students in taking lecture based learning were displayed. The mean age of the students were 23 years and 100% of the students were unmarried. All the participants were full time students. Majority of the students were Punjabi (50%) and Pathan (40%). In this session majority of the students were Christian (60%) and Muslims were (40%).

In figure 2 sociodemographic frequencies of Generic B.Sc Nursing Students in taking blended learning were displayed. The mean age of the students were 24 years and 98% of the students were unmarried. All the participants were full time students. Majority of the students were Pathan (50%). In this session majority of the students were Muslims (70%).
Table 4. Normality Test analysis by Shapiro- Wilk Test

| S. No | Variables          | P    |
|-------|--------------------|------|
| 1     | Awareness          | 0.7  |
| 2     | Learning Strategies| 0.6  |
| 3     | Activities         | 0.27 |
| 4     | Evaluation         | 0.71 |
| 5     | Interpersonal Skills| 0.8  |

In table 4, normality test of the variables was displayed. The mean of mean is calculated of the five different sections of the outcome learning variables and then the normality test was run. The assumption of the null hypothesis in Shapiro Wilk test was that the data is normally distributed. In the results of the normality test all the p values were above 0.5 which is the cutoff. Hence, all the variables were normally distributed.

Table 5. T- Test comparison of Lecture Based Method and Blended Learning among Generic B.Sc Nursing Students

| Standard                          | Blended Learning | Lecture Based Learning | T(df)   | Significance p |
|----------------------------------|------------------|------------------------|---------|---------------|
|                                  | X    | SD      | X    | SD       |          |
| Awareness                        | 2.5  | 0.53    | 4.1  | 0.5      | -14.2(96)| 0.0001  |
| Learning Strategies              | 2.01 | 0.77    | 4.13 | 0.07     | -14.5 (96)| 0.0001  |
| Learning Activities              | 2.2  | 0.6     | 4.2  | 0.46     | -0.173 (96)| 0.0001  |
| Evaluation                       | 2.2  | 0.5     | 3.9  | 0.6      | -13.2(96)| 0.001   |
| Interpersonal Skills             | 2.3  | 1.0     | 4.3  | 0.5      | -12.2 (96)| 0.001   |

In table 5 independent T test comparison was conducted between the lecture-based learning methods and blended learning to that of the different sections of the outcome variables. There was significant difference between the means of lecture based learning and blended learning. In all the sections the p value is below 0.05 which shows that the both the learning methods were quite different from each other in terms of student ‘awareness’, ‘learning strategies’, ‘learning activities’, ‘evaluation’, and ‘interpersonal skills.'
In figure 3, Socio-demographic frequencies of Post RN B.Sc Nursing Students in taking lecture based learning were displayed. The mean age of the students were 30 years and 40% of the students were unmarried. All the participants were full time students. Majority of the students were Punjabi (80%) and Pathan (40%). In this session majority of the students were Christian (60%) and Muslims were (40%).

In figure 4, Sociodemographic frequencies of Post RN B.Sc Nursing Students in taking lecture based learning were displayed. The mean age of the students were 35 years and 100% of the students were unmarried. All the participants were full time students. Majority of the students were Punjabi (80%) and Pathan (40%). In this session majority of the students were Christian (40%) and Muslims were (50%).

| S. No | Variables            | P     |
|-------|----------------------|-------|
| 1     | Awareness            | 0.7   |
| 2     | Learning strategies  | 0.6   |
| 3     | Activities           | 0.27  |
| 4     | Evaluation           | 0.71  |
| 5     | Interpersonal Skills | 0.8   |

In table 6, normality test of the variables was displayed. The mean of mean is calculated of the five different sections of the outcome learning variables and then the normality test was run. The assumption of the null hypothesis in Shapiro-Wilk test was that the data is normally distributed. In the results of the normality test all the p values were above 0.5 which is the cutoff. Hence, all the variables were normally distributed.
In Table 7 independent T test comparison was conducted between the lecture-based learning methods and blended learning to that of the different sections of the outcome variables. There was significant difference between the means of lecture based learning and blended learning.

In all the sections the p value is below 0.05 which shows that the both the learning methods were quite different from each other in terms of student ‘awareness’, ‘learning strategies’, ‘learning activities’, ‘evaluation’, and ‘interpersonal skills.’

**Discussion**

Results of the study reject the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the blended teaching and lecture-based teaching strategies on nursing students learning outcomes. Because this study results depict that blended learning method is superior to lecture based learning. As significant finding obtained from students undergoing blended learning than lecture-based learning. Similar results were obtained and showed that blended learning is prioritized on lecture based learning7. Study reveal that blended learning encourages students as it promotes students’ critical thinking and learning abilities8. Beside this, it is observed that blended learning enhances students’ skills and satisfaction level than other types of learning. Also, blended learning is beneficial to get remarkable outcomes. In comparison to this study, blended learning fosters positive outcomes as students get more scores through blended learning9.

Blended learning promotes more group discussion among students than lecture-based learning which is coherent to the study10. Furthermore, blended learning is also useful as it leads to a two-way communication process more than traditional teaching method. The findings are also consistent with the study11. The result of this study shows that retention of new lessons, enhanced focus on important learning points and comprehension of diversified information were more effective in nursing students in blended learning methods compare to lectured-based learning method. Also, study showed that the effect of the learning rate in blended learning was more than the lecture-based learning method12.

The study reveal that blended learning helps to learn about monitoring the goals accomplishment activity during evaluation and finding new learning challenges by appreciating peer feedback. Moreover, in another study who compared blended learning and lecture -based learning on nursing students. The results showed that blended learning had a more impact on students’ learning and behaviour outcome13. The importance of blended learning in students’ knowledge acquisition highlighted in the study which described that blended learning help students to relate the knowledge with practice14.

In the current study findings reveal that blended learning intensifies student concentration, satisfaction and help to analyse new ideas, information and learning experiences. This enable the students to openly listen others point of view. According to this study students were more satisfied in blended teaching method. In some studies, the students’ satisfaction in blended learning was greater than that in the lecture method15. The study showed that the students’ satisfaction in blended teaching method was greater than that in the traditional lecture method.
Students in blended teaching method are provoked with a new kind of educational learning strategies that leads to more inducement, professionalism, contribution, satisfaction and competency. Besides raising the students’ knowledge, theirs’ other skills will be challenged. Students will be encouraged actively to participate in achievement of the required knowledge by blended learning and students are more satisfied with this method in comparison with the lecture method. The positive aspect of this study is the use of modern teaching methods by using blended learning as a useful and efficient tool. In comparison the result of other study showed that the blended learning method is effective in increasing the students’ learning rate. As this method of teaching increases the students’ knowledge, satisfaction and attention16. 

There is a statistically significant difference between the achievement of students who used blended learning and the achievement of students who used lecture-based learning supporting the prior group17. The addition of blended learning to lecture based method provides students with opportunities for self-directed learning and a decentralized transfer of knowledge18.

There are few limitations of this study. Pre-existing factors and other influences are not taken into account because variables are less controlled in quasi-experimental research. In addition to this human error also plays a key role in the validity of any project as discussed in previous modules. Moreover, the research must adhere to ethical standards in order to be valid. These will be discussed in the next module of this series.

Conclusion

The objective of the study is to determine the difference of blended learning teaching strategy and lecture-based teaching strategy on the learning outcome of the undergraduate nursing students in Lahore, Pakistan. Moreover, to explore the experiences of the nursing students enrolled in blended learning teaching strategy semester and lecture based teaching strategy semester among Generic B.Sc Nursing and Post RN B.Sc Nursing students. In the quantitative analysis the findings revealed that blended learning has significant relationship with awareness, learning strategies learning activities, evaluation among the experimental groups.

Recommendations

Following are the recommendations for adoption of the blended learning as a teaching strategy in the institutional and on the national level.

- The regularities should formulate the interventions and evaluation criteria regarding blended learning for the improvement of the learning environment. Ideally, evaluation should take account of, learning outcomes, participants’ learning styles, and motivation, clarity of goals content, interaction, perceived value and satisfaction.
- Where possible, standardized, reliable and valid measures should be employed to facilitate replication and appropriate comparison.
- As with any new approach to delivering learning, comprehensive support for all stakeholders should be available as and when required.
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