Article

Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Education

Volume 13, Issue 2 (2024), pp. 22-43
Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Education
ISSN: 2166-2681Print 2690-0408 Online | https://ojed.org/jise

Evaluating the Quality of Online vs. Face-to-Face Education Post-COVID-19: Perspectives from Faculty of Education Members

Saad Alshurai
Kuwait University, Kuwait

ABSTRACT

This study targets the quality of online and face-to-face education in the repercussions of the (Covid-19) pandemic from the point of view of the faculty of Education members at Kuwait University. The descriptive analytical method was adopted. A total of 65 faculty members of Kuwait University were included in the study. The results reveal that the quality of education was higher in face-to-face learning than in online learning. However, no statistically significant difference was found between the online and face-to-face evaluation methods according to the perceptions of the faculty members. The study encapsulates recommendations to increase the number of courses to train the faculty members and enhance their skills related to online education.

Keywords: Covid-19; Face-to-Face Education; Online Education; Quality; Kuwait University

INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic posed a greater challenge and created unprecedented perils for the educational systems in various parts of the world (Pokhrel & Chhetri, 2021; Belay, 2020). Consequently, negative impacts were noticeable in all parts of

the world, regardless of the place of residence, whether it was a city or a remote area in the form of uncertainty, interruption, learning poverty, and lack of active and class-based learning (Asadullah & Bhattacharjee, 2022). The crisis resulting from the pandemic had a significant impact on development conditions and its trends, as well as on the social and economic conditions in various countries of the world (Onyema et al., 2020). It made huge changes in the social interaction of individuals in all areas of life, including educational institutions at all levels, which prompted education systems to search for educational alternatives that could help transition to online education forms (Dhawan, 2020). These alternative methods must have the potential to reduce the risks of infection and help achieve spatial social distancing.

Al-Ashi (2018) elaborated on online education as a new concept that supports education systems by harnessing the reach of information technology and communication for the learning process. It begins with the use of electronic display means in traditional classes by building virtual schools. Basilaia and Kvavadze (2020) defined online education as an organized process that aims to achieve educational outcomes using technological means that provide sound, images, films, and interaction between the learner and educational content and activities at the appropriate time for. Berg and Simonson (2018) explained it as an interactive system that is linked to the educational process and visualized it as an electronic environment that presents the learner with courses and educational activities through electronic networks and smart devices. The researcher defines it as a modern interactive educational system that relies on multiple information and communication technologies in providing educational content and achieving the requirements of the educational process with its various components simultaneously or asynchronously (Abbasi et al., 2020).

Notably, online education is not new for many universities (Bordoloi et al., 2021) as some universities already had online educational platforms that they used before the pandemic, but these platforms were not the only educational outlet for these universities in the educational process (Adedoyin & Soykan, 2020). Creating educational platforms has become indispensable for educational institutes to shape an interactive educational environment that can be combined with an e-content management system with social networking and featured with receiving text, audio, and video messages and assessment tests. (Al-Sayyid, 2015).

According to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) data, in April 2020, about 1,725 students were affected by the closure of educational institutions as 192 countries stopped the activities of universities to contain the spread of the epidemic (UNESCO Covid-19, 2020). However, due to socioeconomic disparities around the world, the extent to which students responded to these transitions became enigmatic and resource-intensive which was further worsened by the low economic activities and the lack of resources (Flack et al., 2020). This coercive experience showed serious restrictions

on the prospects of Online Education. Universities faced the fact that it was difficult to convert all educational programs into a new format that matched the requirements of online education at a specific time (Bordoloi et al., 2021). As a result, the absence of the necessary e-infrastructure in universities, prompted universities to figure out urgent issues, such as: what form of online education do we adopt? What technical methods are required for this style? How to assess students' comprehension of the presented scientific material? How to take final exams and register for the next academic year, especially in countries where exams have been canceled or indefinitely postponed (Razkane et al. 2021).

Abu Khashim et al. (2020) conducted a study aiming to investigate the effectiveness of online education during the COVID-19 pandemic from the perceptions of the faculty members of Kadoorie University in Palestine. The results unveiled that the interaction between the faculty members and students was of moderate level. In Jordan, according to the study of Musa et al. (2022), students of higher education faced difficulty in studying from online portals and their interaction with teachers was low. In addition to it, 90 percent of the students expressed the lack of internet connectivity as the biggest hurdle in the way of online learning. A similar study was conducted in India by Kulal and Nayak (2020) to evaluate the viewpoints of the faculty members of the faculty as well as the students of Dakshina Kannada University in India. The findings of the study reveal that the attitudes of students towards online learning were positive along with the higher quality of internet connectivity. The support to students by teachers was satisfactory. However, from the viewpoint of the faculty members, learning in physical classrooms cannot be replaced with online learning. Besides, teachers faced difficulties and required training and technical skills. Andreea and Mirona (2020) found that the faculty members of Romanian universities asserted that online teaching affected the quality of learning that required hard work. The professors contended that they lacked the level of satisfaction that they had during face-to-face teaching. Globally, the education process was badly affected; 59 percent of the higher education institutes around the world, halted their academic activities induced by indefinite closures and lockdowns; 91 percent of the universities globally were reported to have a lack of the required infrastructure to dispense online education to the students. Among them, only 48 percent of universities could get governmental support to carry out their operations. More specifically, Yulia (2020) has highlighted that in Indonesia, the pandemic induced the need to reshape the entire educational system. Therefore, it can be construed that the pandemic posited a great challenge for the developing states as the digital revolution has not reached the top-notch as compared to the developing regions of the world. These countries have not become capable of manufacturing the required and fast electronic gadgets and the level of connectivity, especially amid a staggering rural-urban divide (Basilaia & Kvavadze, 2020).

Although the attitudes of the faculty members and students of the universities in Morocco were positive, they have reported challenges towards the pivot of online learning as a replacement for traditional learning (Razkane et al., 2021). In Saudi Arabia, Tanveer, et al. (2020) have revealed in their study that coursework was piled up due to the closure and inadequate online platforms for education. A study was conducted in six Arab states that showed that although there was higher self-efficacy of online learning. In contrast, the students' self-efficacy was reported to be very low (Baroudi & Shaya, 2022). To date, no study has been conducted to examine the perception of the students and faculty members concerning the difference in the quality of education and conventional learning in Kuwait. Therefore, this study aims to investigate the perception of the faculty members of Kuwait University to evaluate these two types of education. The study selected the Faculty of Education as they are the most deserving of the evaluation process due to their educational specializations related to the various fields of the educational process and its methods, strategies, and technologies. Also, they had vast experience with online education during the pandemic. The findings of the study will provide insights to the researchers, students, the policy-makers to derive effective policies, strategies, and training courses to increase the quality of education that is dispensed at different platforms.

Main question through this research:

- What is the degree of achievement of education quality standards in terms of the quality of learning processes, learning context, learning resources, and quality planning processes in both online and face-to-face education during the COVID-19 pandemic, according to faculty members at the College of Education, Kuwait University?
- Which of the two types of online education and Face-to-Face education achieves the goals of university education from the point of view of faculty members at the College of Education at Kuwait University?
- What aspects can benefit from the experience of online education in the development of urban education?

METHODS

I adopted the analytical descriptive approach, which is the approach that relies on studying the phenomenon as it exists in reality (Kleinheksel et al., 2020). This study method is concerned with describing an accurate description through qualitative expression that describes the phenomenon and clarifies its characteristics, or quantitative expression that gives a numerical description (Kiger & Varpio, 2020). The results show the amount and size of the phenomenon through field investigation (Abu Allam 1989, 28). This approach is also concerned with determining what the phenomena and events that the research deals with should

be, in the light of certain values or standards (Abu Hatab & Sadiq, 1996; Hayashi Jr et al., 2019).

The Study Setting and Sampling

This research was conducted at Kuwait University. It was conducted with the Faculty members of Education. The study adopted a purposive sampling technique to recruit the study participants. The study population was 90 male and female faculty members. The purposive sampling technique was employed to recruit the participants from the same sub-culture, interest, knowledge, skill set, and experiences (Afif, 2018; Iheduru-Anderson, 2020; Sezgin et al., 2022).

The Study Instrument

The study distributed an online questionnaire to all the faculty members at the College of Education at Kuwait University. Out of 90 questionnaires, a total of 65 responses were filled and included in this study. The response rate was 72 % from the original community, which is a statistically acceptable percentage. The learning process includes the ways in which teachers apply pedagogical practices, how students and teachers interact, and how instructional materials are presented and absorbed by students. Learning context discusses the settings physical or virtual where learning takes place, the cultural norms that impact interactions during the learning process, and the general environment that either promotes or undermines educational opportunities. It also takes into account how these settings affect how successful the learning process works.

Learning resources include the resources' quality and accessibility, as well as how they are incorporated into the teaching and learning process and made available to teachers and students The planning process includes covers creating curricula, planning academic schedules, allocating funds, and using evaluation techniques to gauge student progress. Planning well makes sure that instructional strategies and materials complement learning objectives, maximizing the learning process as a whole.

Ethical Consideration

Approval for the study was obtained from the University's Institutional Review Board (IRB). Before the interview, an IRB-approved informed consent was signed by every participant. For the anonymity of the respondents, each participant was assigned a pseudonym to ensure confidentiality.

Research and Design Tools

I designed a questionnaire in the light of the research problem, its objectives, and its questions, after reviewing several Arab and foreign literature, studies, and research related to the subject and content of the research (Al-Qatawneh et al., 2020). The "internal consistency validity" of the research tool was also confirmed, through the correlation coefficients between the rate of each domain and the total rate of the Constructs (de Vries et al., 2022). It was tested using the Pearson correlation coefficient (Prout et al., 2021). This is done by extracting the correlation coefficients between the dimensions of the questionnaire with each other using the (critical validity) criteria. The values of these coefficients ranged between (0.213-0.535). As for the correlation coefficients between each dimension and the questionnaire as a whole (configuration validity), the values ranged between (0.220-0.734). Therefore, a positive correlation between the dimensions of the questionnaire was found that ranged from strong to medium strength between the dimensions and the questionnaire as a whole. It indicates the validity of the research tool in measuring the research objectives of this study, and what it was designed for.

Then, the reliability coefficient was calculated using Cronbach's Alpha method. The value was 0.789 which is a statistically acceptable value. The "self-honesty coefficient" was also calculated for the research tool which is the validity of the experimental scores of the research tool concerning the real scores that were removed from the impurities of measurement errors. The subjective validity is measured by calculating the square root of the reliability coefficient of the research tool as follows: (the subjective validity coefficient = (test reliability coefficient ½). The reliability coefficient is 0.789, and its square root is equal to 0.888. It is noted in these statistical results that the relationship is close between Self-honesty and stability in the research tool. It is concluded from the foregoing that the research tool has fulfilled the psychometric conditions of the good scale and that it is valid for application to achieve the desired goal. The researcher reached the final formulation of the questionnaire, which consisted of two main parts: the first part-consisted of the desired variables studying their effect on the results, namely: the variable of gender, the variable of scientific rank - the variable of the number of years of experience. The second part - consisted of four dimensions, namely: learning processes - learning context - learning resources - quality planning processes. The responses category was category length (= higher response score - lower response score) / number of response categories. The grade distribution was as follows:

$$\frac{Higher\ Response\ Score - Lower\ Response\ Score}{Number\ of\ response\ categories} = \frac{3-1}{3} = 0.66$$

Category	Low	Moderate	High
Grade	1	2	3
Field	1	1.67-2.34	2.35 -

RESULTS

Table 1 shows the demographic details of the participants. The majority of the participants were married and male. Mostly, the participants were aged 40- 49. In addition to this, only three percent of the participants had working experience of more than 15 years. While 26 percent had working experience of fewer than 5 years.

Table 1: Demographic details of the participants

Variable		N (%) (n=65)
Sex	Female	16 (24.6%)
	Male	49 (75.3%)
Age	< 30	10 (16%)
	30–39	12 (17%)
	40–49	22 (34%)
	≥ 50	21 (30%)
Marital status	Single	13 (20)
	Married	52 (80)
Working Experience	≤ 5	17 (26)
	6–10	13 (21)
	11–15	9.7 (15)
	16–20	2 (3)

Table 2 shows that the extent to which the quality of learning processes was achieved in the two modes of online education and Face-to-Face education was (average), with an arithmetic mean of (2.30), and a standard deviation of (.343), and Construct No. 4 related to Face-to-Face education, ranked first with a high level, having an arithmetic mean of 2.74 and .644 SD. The least (weak) was Construct No. 7 which was related to "Online Education focuses on processing knowledge more than Face-to-Face education" with an arithmetic mean of 1.63, and SD .876. This confirms that faculty members see that the quality of educational processes is achieved in physical classrooms as compared to online education. This explains that conventional education provides the possibility of educational interaction between faculty members and students to achieve the goals of the educational process.

Table 2: Quality of the learning process

Ranking	No.	Quality of education process	Average	Standard deviation (SD)	Category
1	4	Face-to-Face education enables me to interact with my students more than online education.	2.74	.644	High
2	3	I have online education skills that meet the quality standards of online education.	2.57	.749	High
3	1	Face-to-face education focuses more on knowledge production than online education.	2.46	.867	High
4	9	Face-to-Face education gives students more practical and applied skills than online education.	2.45	.867	High
5	5	Face-to-Face education enables me to use teaching methods and strategies more than online education.	2.43	.883	High
6	6	My academic qualification prepared me for face-to-face teaching more than electronic teaching.	2.43	.883	High
7	8	Preparation of online education lectures takes more time compared to face-to-face education.	2.09	.980	Moderate
8	2	Online education enables me to develop the content of the course I am studying more than in-person education.	1.88	.927	Moderate

9	7	Online education focuses more on knowledge processing than on face-to-face education.	1.63	.876	Low
Overall assessment of the quality of learning processes			2.30	.343	Moderate

Table 3 shows the extent to which the quality of the learning context has been achieved in the two forms of online education and face-to-face education. It shows that the quality of the learning context was average in the two modes of online education and Face-to-Face education with an arithmetic mean of 2.13 and SD of .343. Construct No. 3 which reads "attendance education significantly develops the various aspects of the student's personality compared to online education" ranked a high level (mean= 2.74, SD=.594). While the lowest Construct was constructed 4 that have a lower level (mean=1.54, SD=.831). These results explain that Face-to-Face education achieves quality in the learning context constructs from the point of view of faculty members. Because it provides the possibilities of direct interaction and dialogue as well as an environment that stimulates creativity and innovation.

Table 3: Quality of the learning context

Ranking	No.	Quality of the learning context	Average	Standard deviation	Category
1	3	Face-to-Face education significantly develops various aspects of the student's personality in comparison with online education.	2.74	.594	High
2	1	Face-to-Face education takes into account individual differences between students more than online education.	2.55	.811	High
3	13	Face-to-Face education motivates students to be creative and innovative more than online education.	2.54	.792	High

4	9	Face-to-Face education achieves more student feedback than online education.	2.51	.812	High
5	11	Attendee education achieves a quality standard in the relationship between the University and the community more than online education.	2.42	.768	High
6	5	I noticed that students have a greater desire for attendee education compared to online education.	2.34	.834	Moderate
7	7	Online education develops students ' self-learning skills more than face-to-face education.	2.31	.917	Moderate
8	2	There were few administrative obstacles in online education compared to face-to-face education.	2.20	.905	Moderate
9	6	Online education achieves the University's goals of serving the community more than attendee education.	1.75	.902	Moderate
10	12	Online education provides the requirements of the university administration for quality standards more than attendee education.	1.65	.818	Low
11	8	The quality of Educational Service in online education is more in comparison with face-to-face education.	1.60	.844	Low
12	10	Online education provides more requirements for	1.58	.827	Low

		education quality standards than face-to-face education.			
13	4	Online education develops students ' cooperative learning skills more than face-to-face education.	1.54	.831	Low
Overall assessment of the quality of the learning context			2.13	.343	Moderate

Table 4 shows that the extent to which the quality of learning resources was achieved was average (mean= 2.32, SD=378), and Construct No. 4 “Informatics and its applications are the main criteria for competition in the quality of university education” had a high level (arithmetic mean = 2.60, SD=.746). While Construct No. 5 “I find it difficult to link the contents of the prescribed curricula and modern information technology" had a low category (mean=1.65, SD=.891). The results of Table 4 indicate that the university has provided the technical requirements for online education, concerning the availability of Face-to-Face education technologies. The difficulties in linking the contents of the prescribed curricula and modern information technology have been found because the curricula are designed for Face-to-Face education and not for online education. Thus, the quality of learning resources is achieved in face-to-face education more than in online education from the point of view of faculty members.

Table 4: Quality of learning resources

Ranking	No.	Quality of the learning context	Average	Standard deviation	Category
1	4	Informatics and its applications are the main tests of competition in the quality of university education.	2.60	.746	High
2	3	The university has provided faculty members with various online education requirements.	2.55	.771	High
3	2	The University's learning resources are more geared	2.49	.831	High

		toward face-to-face learning than toward online education.			
4	6	The infrastructure at Kuwait University is more prepared for face-to-face education compared to online education.	2.46	.831	High
5	1	Learning resources in my specialty are more abundant in online education than in face-to-face education.	2.18	.950	Moderate
6	5	I find it difficult to link the contents of the prescribed curricula with modern information technology.	1.65	.891	Low
Overall assessment of the quality of the learning context			2.32	.378	Moderate

Table 5 shows that quality in planning processes was average (mean=2.27, SD=385) and Construct No. 7 was high (mean=2.74, SD=.644). In contrast, Construct No. 1 had a low level (mean=1.58, SD=.846). It shows a clear preference for face-to-face education over online modes. Notably, traditional education scored highest in assessment credibility (average of 2.74), indicating a strong confidence in its evaluation processes. It also consistently outperformed online education in areas such as staff performance evaluation, adherence to academic standards, and alignment with research and practical skills objectives, all scoring above 2.40.

Table 5: Quality of planning processes

Ranking	No.	Quality of the learning context	Average	Standard deviation	Category
1	7	Assessment tests are more credible in face-to-face education compared to online education.	2.74	.644	High

2	1	Attendance education provides more objective criteria for evaluating the performance of teaching staff than online education.	2.62	.744	High
3	4	Attendance education meets the requirements of international academic accreditation standards more than online education.	2.46	.812	High
4	5	Attendance education achieves the University's plan in the field of scientific research more than online education.	2.45	.848	High
5	6	Face-to-Face Education meets the labor market's needs for practical skills more than online education.	2.45	.830	High
6	3	Attendance education at Kuwait University achieves the standard of design quality in planning and work more than online education.	2.42	.846	High
7	9	Attendance education achieves quality standards related to the ratio of students to faculty members more than online education.	2.37	.876	High
8	10	My students ' achievement levels were higher in face-to-face education compared to online education.	2.22	.944	Moderate
9	8	Online education brings more satisfaction to	2.00	.829	Moderate

		parents than face-to-face education.			
10	2	Online education meets the requirements of educational environment design quality standards more than attendee education.	1.65	.856	Low
11	1	Online education achieves the standard of output quality in terms of its suitability for the labor market more than attendee education.	1.58	.846	Low
Overall assessment of the quality of the learning context			2.27	.385	Moderate

Table 6 shows the overall education quality standards that have been achieved in the two types of online education and Face-to-Face education in light of the repercussions of the "Covid-19" pandemic from the point of view of faculty members at the College of Education - Kuwait University. Table 6 shows that the quality standards of education were moderate with an arithmetic mean of 2.26 and an SD of .253. The field of learning resources ranked first with an average level and an arithmetic mean of 2.32. On the contrary, the field of learning context ranked last with a low average level and an arithmetic mean of 2.13. The overall evaluation indicates that the quality of education has been achieved to a moderate degree.

Table 6: Education Quality Standards

Ranking	No.	Education quality standards in online education and in-person modes	Average	Standard deviation	Category
1	3	Learning Resources	3	1	Moderate
2	1	Learning Processes	1	2	Moderate
3	4	Quality Planning Processes	4	3	Moderate
4	2	Learning context	2	4	Moderate

Overall assessment of the quality of education in the online education and in-person modes	2.26	.253	Moderate

To study the effect of the gender variable on the results, an independent samples Test and the Levene test were applied to ensure the homogeneity of the samples. Table 7 shows the descriptive results of the T-test for independent samples according to the gender variable.

Table 7 also revealed the analytical results of the T-test and the Levene test according to the sex variable. Based on the results of Table 7, Levine's value is .920 which shows the variance of the male and female samples is equal. The level of significance of the t-test was .112 which is greater than the value of 0.05 which states that there are no statistically significant differences in the average extent to which the quality of education is achieved in the two types of online education. This indicates that the views of males and females on the axes of the quality of education in both the online and online modes are the same.

Table 7: Comparison of Average Scores by Gender with Statistical Tests (Levene's and T-Tests)

Gender	No.	Average	Standard Derivation	Levin Test Value	F Significance Level	T Test Value	T Significance Level
Male	49	2.23	.272	.920	.341	-1.612-	.112
Female	16	2.34	.163			-2.063-	.045

To study the effect of academic rank and the number of years of experience on the results, the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was applied. Table 8 shows the descriptive results of the ANOVA test and it also shows the analytical results of the single variance analysis test. Based on the results of Table 8, the value of the significance level of the test for the scientific rank variable is .958 which is greater than the significance level of the null hypothesis (0.05). The value of the level of significance of the test for the variable of the number of years of experience came out to be .404. Thus, the unity of vision of the faculty members

with their various years of experience is confirmed in terms of achieving the quality of education in both its physical and electronic forms.

Table 8: Comparison of Academic Rank and Years of Experience with ANOVA Results

Variable	Transactions	Sample size	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	ANOVA Test Value	Significance Level	Statistical Differences Level
Academic Rank	Professor	13	2.27	.329	0.42	.958	No function differences
	Associate Professor	27	2.25	.250			
	Assistant Professor	25	2.25	.221			
Number of Years of Experience	Less than (5 years)	6	2.14	.213	0.42	.958	No function differences
	5 to 10 years	13	2.31	0.163			
	More than (10 years)	46	2.26	.276			

DISCUSSION

The outcome of the current study illustrates significant differences between face-to-face and online education modes at Kuwait University, particularly concerning the quality of learning processes, resources, and planning. Faculty members consistently rated face-to-face education higher across several dimensions, highlighting its effectiveness in developing educational and social interactions which are essential in achieving educational objectives. This preference aligns with the work of Coman et al. (2022), who emphasized that on-campus education enhances various levels of interaction between faculty and students, vital for a full educational experience. These interactions facilitate not

only knowledge distribution but also the development of critical thinking and problem-solving skills among students.

In contrast, online education, while sufficient in maintaining educational continuity, appears to struggle with integrating traditional curricular contents with advanced information technologies. This challenge is underscored by faculty members' difficulties in adapting course materials designed for face-to-face delivery to online formats, a limitation also noted by Çetin (2021). However, Çetin highlighted the potential of information technology to enhance teaching skills, suggesting that the observed challenges at Kuwait University may stem from inadequate training and support rather than the inherent limitations of online education.

Moreover, the present study revealed that while Kuwait University has invested in technical resources for online teaching, there is a notable gap in faculty readiness for this mode of delivery, particularly in linking curriculum content effectively with available technology. This observation suggests a misalignment between the available technological infrastructure and the pedagogical strategies employed by the university. Such a discrepancy could potentially be addressed through targeted professional development programs, as suggested by Kulal and Nayak (2020), who found that the lack of technical training is a primary concern among faculty engaging in online education.

The quality of planning processes also reflects a significant variance between the two educational modes. Face-to-face education was seen to meet planning and quality standards more effectively than online education. This finding indicates a robust framework for traditional educational delivery at Kuwait University, which may not yet be effectively translated into the online domain. Our results are consistent with those of Marinoni et al. (2020), who suggest that existing educational frameworks are often ill-suited to sudden shifts to online modalities without substantial adaptation and support.

Interestingly, while our study noted moderate satisfaction with both forms of education, this is in contrast to Razkane et al. (2021), who reported a generally negative perception of online education among Moroccan educators. This disparity could reflect cultural or institutional differences in the acceptance and implementation of online education, suggesting the need for context-specific educational strategies.

while face-to-face education currently appears to surpass online education in quality at Kuwait University, there are clear opportunities for enhancing online learning environments. By focusing on tailored training programs for faculty, aligning curricular content with technological capabilities, and investing in comprehensive planning processes tailored for online education, Kuwait University can potentially elevate the quality of its online offerings to match or exceed that of its traditional educational modalities.

The limitations of the present study are that it has a relatively small sample size and focuses on faculty from the education department. It is recommended for future research to include a wider demographic, encompassing various departments and a larger number of participants to provide a more comprehensive view of the educational impacts at Kuwait University.

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

The present study suggests several implications to improve teaching methods and guide policy frameworks, based on the outcome of the research gained at research at Kuwait University during the COVID-19 pandemic. From the perspective of policy, governments, and academic institutions need to consider making investments in reliable digital infrastructures that facilitate smooth online learning. The digital gap can be greatly reduced by policies that subsidize internet access for educators and students, especially in less wealthy areas. In addition, it might be beneficial to promote hybrid learning models, which combine traditional and online instruction to provide flexibility and continuity in the event of unanticipated disruptions.

Educators should consider integrating more interactive tools and collaborative platforms in online settings to mimic the engagement found in face-to-face interactions. Training programs focusing on effective online teaching strategies could be developed to equip educators with the necessary skills to foster a more dynamic and inclusive virtual learning environment.

These implications seek to stimulate a more extensive discussion on educational methods and policy in many contexts in addition to addressing the weaknesses found in current study. Institutions may improve the standard of instruction in both traditional and virtual classrooms by putting these techniques into practice, which will ultimately result in a more robust educational system.

CONCLUSION

The study has found that although online education has become a popular and most commonly adopted alternative education, concerns are raised regarding the quality of the learning. This study has found that despite a plethora of promising features of online learning, in the view of the faculty members of the University of Kuwait, the quality of on-campus learning was higher. Also, the findings of the study implied that despite the development to increase the quality of learning, the curricula, learning materials, and pedagogical strategies are more effective for the traditional way of learning and teaching. Moreover, student-teacher interaction in a traditional physical classroom is higher than that in online educational settings. Therefore, there is a need to redesign the curricula and modify the way, interaction is made at the online platforms by providing more real-life

discussions and debating forums coupled with project-based learning and assessments.

REFERENCES

Abbasi, S., Ayoob, T., Malik, A., & Memon, S. I. (2020). Perceptions of students regarding E-learning during COVID-19 at a private medical college. *Pakistan journal of medical sciences*, *36*(COVID19-S4), S57. https://doi.org/10.12669/pjms.36.covid19-s4.2766

Abu Allam, R. M. (1989). An Introduction to Educational Research Methods. *Al-Falah Library for Publishing and Distribution, Kuwait*.

Abu Hatab, F., & Sadiq, A. (1996). Research methods and statistical analysis methods in psychological, educational, and social sciences I (2). *Anglo-Egyptian. Cairo*.

Adedoyin, O. B., & Soykan, E. (2020). Covid-19 pandemic and online learning: the challenges and opportunities. *Interactive learning environments*. 1-13.

Afif, A. H. (2018). The relationship between perceived organizational support with job satisfaction and organizational commitment at faculty members of universities. *Sleep and Hypnosis (Online)*, *20*(4), 290-293. https://doi.org/10.5350/sleep.hypn.2018.20.0164

Al-Ashi, F. (2018). Strategies to activate the online education system at the university. *Journal of Human Sciences*, *18*(2), 92-107.

Al-Kumaim, N. H., Mohammed, F., Gazem, N. A., Fazea, Y., Alhazmi, A. K., & Dakkak, O. (2021). Exploring the Impact of Transformation to Fully Online Learning During COVID-19 on Malaysian University Students' Academic Life and Performance. *International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies*, *15*(5). https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v15i05.20203

Al-Qatawneh, S., Eltahir, M. E., & Alsalhi, N. R. (2020). The effect of blended learning on the achievement of HDE students in the methods of teaching Arabic language course and their attitudes towards its use at Ajman University: A case study. *Education and Information Technologies*, *25*, 2101-2127. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-019-10046-w

Asadullah, M. N., & Bhattacharjee, A. (2022). Digital Divide or Digital Provide? Technology, Time Use, and Learning Loss during COVID-19. *The Journal of Development Studies*, *58*(10), 1934-1957. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2022.2094253

Awang-Hashim, R., Kaur, A., Yusof, N., Shanmugam, S. K. A. P. S., Manaf, N. A. A., Zubairi, A. M., & Malek, M. A. (2021). Reflective and integrative learning and the role of instructors and institutions—evidence from Malaysia. *Higher Education*, 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-021-00689-5

Baroudi, S., & Shaya, N. (2022). Exploring predictors of teachers' self-efficacy for online teaching in the Arab world amid COVID-19. *Education and Information Technologies*, *27*(6), 8093-8110. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-10946-4

Basilaia, G., & Kvavadze, D. (2020). Transition to Online Education in Schools during a SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus (COVID-19) Pandemic in Georgia. *Pedagogical Research. 5*(4), em0060. https://doi.org/10.29333/pr/7937

Belay, D. G. (2020). COVID-19, Distance Learning and Educational Inequality in Rural Ethiopia. *Pedagogical Research*, *5*(4). https://doi.org/10.29333/pr/9133

Berg, G., & Simonson, M. (2018). Distance learning. https://www.britannica.com/topic/distance-learning

Bordoloi, R., Das, P., & Das, K. (2021). Perception towards online/blended learning at the time of Covid-19 pandemic: an academic analytics in the Indian context. *Asian Association of Open Universities Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1108/aaouj-09-2020-0079

Çetin, E. (2021). Digital storytelling in teacher education and its effect on the digital literacy of pre-service teachers. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, *39*, 100760. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2020.100760

Coman, C., Țîru, L. G., Meseșan-Schmitz, L., Stanciu, C., & Bularca, M. C. (2020). Online teaching and learning in higher education during the coronavirus pandemic: Students' perspective. *Sustainability*, *12*(24), 10367. https://doi.org/10.3390/su122410367

de Vries, A. J., Brouwer, R. W., Veld, R. H. I. T., van der Wal, W. A., Reininga, I. H., & Hoogeslag, R. A. (2022). Translation, Validity, and Reliability of the Dutch Anterior Cruciate Ligament–Quality of Life Questionnaire. *Orthopaedic journal of sports medicine*, *10*(9), 23259671221123297. https://doi.org/10.1177/23259671221123297

Dhawan, S. (2020). Online learning: A panacea in the time of COVID-19 crisis. *Journal of educational technology systems*, *49*(1), 5-22. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047239520934018

El-Sayed, A. (2015). Educational platforms, a future vision for online education environments, E-Learning Journal. *Mansoura University, 16.* https://doi.org/10.21608/bfemu.2021.165465

Flack, C. B., Walker, L., Bickerstaff, A., & Margetts, C. (2020). Socioeconomic disparities in Australian schooling during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Melbourne, Australia: Pivot Professional Learning*, *13*, 319-340.

Hayashi Jr, P., Abib, G., & Hoppen, N. (2019). Validity in qualitative research: A processual approach. *The Qualitative Report*, *24*(1), 98-112. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2019.3443

Iheduru-Anderson, K. (2020). Barriers to career advancement in the nursing profession: Perceptions of Black nurses in the United States. In *Nursing Forum*. *55*(4), 664-677. https://doi.org/10.1111/nuf.12483

Kiger, M. E., & Varpio, L. (2020). Thematic analysis of qualitative data: AMEE Guide No. 131. *Medical teacher*, *42*(8), 846-854. https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159x.2020.1755030

Kleinheksel, A. J., Rockich-Winston, N., Tawfik, H., & Wyatt, T. R. (2020). Demystifying content analysis. *American journal of pharmaceutical education*, *84*(1). https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe7113

Kulal, A., & Nayak, A. (2020). A study on perception of teachers and students toward online classes in Dakshina Kannada and Udupi District. *Asian Association of Open Universities Journal*, *15*(3), 285-296. https://doi.org/10.1108/aaouj-07-2020-0047

Marinoni, G., Van't Land, H., & Jensen, T. (2020). The impact of Covid-19 on higher education around the world. *IAU global survey report, 23*, 1-17.

Musa, B. (2022). The challenges of online education in light of the emerging Corona pandemic (19) in postgraduate programs from the point of view of students. *Arab Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, Al-Sunbula Center for Research and Studies*. *12*(2). Amman Jordan.

Onyema, E. M., Eucheria, N. C., Obafemi, F. A., Sen, S., Atonye, F. G., Sharma, A., & Alsayed, A. O. (2020). Impact of Coronavirus pandemic on education. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *11*(13), 108-121. https://doi.org/10.7176/jep/11-13-12

Pokhrel, S., & Chhetri, R. (2021). A literature review on impact of COVID-19 pandemic on teaching and learning. *Higher education for the future*, *8*(1), 133-141. https://doi.org/10.1177/2347631120983481

Prout, T. A., Di Giuseppe, M., Zilcha-Mano, S., Perry, J. C., & Conversano, C. (2022). Psychometric properties of the Defense Mechanisms Rating Scales-Self-Report-30 (DMRS-SR-30): Internal consistency, validity and factor structure. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *104*(6), 833-843. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2021.2019053

Razkane, H., Sayeh, A. Y., & Yeou, M. (2021). University teachers' attitudes towards distance learning during COVID-19 pandemic: Hurdles, challenges, and take-away lessons. *European Journal of Interactive Multimedia and Education*, *3*(1), e02201. https://doi.org/10.30935/ejimed/11436

Sezgin, D., Dost, A., & Esin, M. N. (2022). Experiences and perceptions of Turkish intensive care nurses providing care to Covid-19 patients: A qualitative study. *International Nursing Review*, *69*(3), 305-317. https://doi.org/10.1111/inr.12740

Tanveer, M., Bhaumik, A., Hassan, S., & Haq, I. U. (2020). Covid-19 pandemic, outbreak educational sector and students online learning in Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, *23*(3), 1-14.

Weller, M. (2003). *Delivering learning on the net: The why, what and how of online education*. Routledge.

World Health Organization. (2019). Coronavirus (COVID). Retrieved from: https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019

Yulia, H. (2020). Online learning to prevent the spread of pandemic corona virus in Indonesia. *ETERNAL (English Teaching Journal)*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.26877/eternal.v11i1.6068

Manuscript submitted: ***November 5, 2013***
Manuscript revised: ***January 4, 2014***
Accepted for publication: ***March 5, 2014***