

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am grateful to **The Lord Almighty** for bestowing His choicest blessings upon me to complete this delightful and arduous task.

I record my heartfelt gratitude and respect to **Dr. M. Parthasarathy**, Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Technology, Bharathiar University, for his valuable suggestions and incessant guidance throughout the research work. I wish to acknowledge with gratitude the committed, dedicated and relentless effort of him which would enable me to complete this dissertation.

I extend my sincere thanks to **The Vice-Chancellor** and **The Registrar** of Bharathiar University for giving me an opportunity to undergo this research.

I express my sincere thanks to **Dr. G. Singaravelu**, Professor and Head (i/c), Department of Educational Technology, Bharathiar University, Coimbatore, for his support and encouragement during this research work.

I gratefully acknowledge **Prof. R. Ananthasayanam, Prof. N. Balasubramanian and Prof. P. Thirumalvalavan** Former Heads, Department of Educational Technology, Bharathiar University, for their valuable suggestions and encouragement during this research work.

My profound thanks are due to **Dr. J. Dinesh Peter**, HOD (i/c), Department of Information Technology, Karunya University, **Ms. A. Vishnupriya**, Assistant Professor, Department of Information Technology, Aditya Institute of Technology, **Er. S. Shanmugam**, Founder & Chairman, United Institute of Technology, **Dr. Murugadas**, Department of Sciences, Amrita University and **Dr S. Somasundaramoorthy**, Physical Director, PSG College of Technology for the support rendered in data collection.

I gratefully acknowledge all the **Students** who were the samples for my study for their cooperation and response.

In a special way I thank the **Office staff and Research scholars**, Departments of Educational Technology and Education for their cooperation during this research work.

I am deeply indebted to **Mr. R. Lakshmikanth, Mrs. M. Abirami and Mr. V. Aravindhan** for their timely help throughout my research work.

I deeply acknowledge my **Family Members** for their moral support and encouragement throughout my research study.

I am deeply beholden to my **Mother** who is the moving force behind me whose prayers and sacrifices saw me throughout the completion of this work.

With profound sense of gratitude I acknowledge the support, encouragement and priceless help and cooperation of my **Husband** and my **Daughter**.

P. Thiruselvi

CONTENTS

CHAPTER NO.	TITLE	PAGE NO.
	LIST OF TABLES	
	LIST OF FIGURES	
1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	30
3	METHOD OF RESEARCH INVESTIGATION	67
4	ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	96
5	SUMMARY, FINDINGS, DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	137
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	
	APPENDICES	
	LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3.1	Tools used for the study	80
3.2	Cronbach's α coefficient for the items in the UALMS tool	84
3.3	Percentage of Samples	87
3.4	Category wise distribution of the sample	89
4.1	Percentage of students having visual, auditory and kinesthetic learning styles	97
4.2	Percentage of students using the usability and accessibility features of LMS	98
4.3	Correlation between the usage of usability and accessibility features of LMS and learning styles	101
4.4	Mean score difference between male and female students in using the usability and accessibility features of LMS	102
4.5	Mean score difference between UG and PG course students in using the usability and accessibility features of LMS	103
4.6	Mean score and standard deviation of the students of different branches of study in using the usability and accessibility features of LMS	105
4.7	Mean score difference between the students of different branches of study in using the usability and accessibility features of LMS	105
4.8	Duncan's Post Hoc Multiple Range test in using the usability features of LMS among the selected students of different branches of study	106
4.9	Duncan's Post Hoc Multiple Range test in using the accessibility features of LMS among the selected students of different branches of study	107
4.10	Mean score and standard deviation of UG students of different years of study in using the usability and accessibility features of LMS	108

TABLE NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
4.11	Mean score difference between UG students of different years of study in using the usability and accessibility features of LMS.	108
4.12	Duncan's Post Hoc Multiple Range test in using the Usability features of LMS among the selected students of different years of study	109
4.13	Duncan's Post Hoc Multiple Range test in using the accessibility features of LMS among the selected students of different years of study	109
4.14	Mean score difference between first and second year PG students in using the usability and accessibility features of LMS	110
4.15	Mean score difference between different years of experience in using computers in using the usability and accessibility features of LMS	111
4.16	Mean score difference between different years of experience in using internet in using the usability and accessibility features of LMS	112
4.17	Mean score and standard deviation of daily, frequent and rare users of computers in using the usability and accessibility features of LMS	114
4.18	Mean score difference between daily, frequent and rare users of computers in using the usability and accessibility features of LMS	114
4.19	Mean score and standard deviation of daily, frequent and rare users of internet in using the usability and accessibility features of LMS	115
4.20	Mean score difference between daily, frequent and rare users of internet in using the usability and accessibility features of LMS.	116
4.21	Mean score difference between male and female students in visual, auditory and kinesthetic learning styles	117
4.22	Mean score difference between UG and PG course students in visual, auditory and kinesthetic learning styles	118
4.23	Mean score and standard deviation of students of different branches of study in visual, auditory and kinesthetic learning styles	120
4.24	Mean score difference between students of different branches of study in visual, auditory and kinesthetic learning styles	121
4.25	Duncan's Post Hoc Multiple Range test in visual learning among the selected students of different branches of study	122

TABLE NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
4.26	Duncan's Post Hoc Multiple Range test in auditory learning among the selected students of different branches of study	122
4.27	Duncan's Post Hoc Multiple Range test in kinesthetic learning among the selected students of different branches of study	123
4.28	Mean score and standard deviation of UG students of different years of study in visual, auditory and kinesthetic learning styles	124
4.29	Mean score difference between UG students of different years of study in visual, auditory and kinesthetic learning styles	125
4.30	Duncan's Post Hoc Multiple Range test in visual learning among the selected UG students in different years of study	126
4.31	Duncan's Post Hoc Multiple Range test in auditory learning among the selected UG students in different years of study	126
4.32	Duncan's Post Hoc Multiple Range test in kinesthetic learning among the selected UG students in different years of study	127
4.33	Mean score difference between PG students of different years of study in visual, auditory and kinesthetic learning styles	128
4.34	Mean score difference between different years of experience in using computers in visual, auditory and kinesthetic learning styles	129
4.35	Mean score difference between different years of experience in using internet in visual, auditory and kinesthetic learning styles	130
4.36	Mean score and standard deviation of different frequencies of using computers in visual, auditory and kinesthetic learning styles	132
4.37	Mean score difference between different frequencies of using computers in visual, auditory and kinesthetic learning styles	133
4.38	Duncan's Post Hoc Multiple Range test in visual learning style among the daily, frequent and rare users of computers.	134
4.39	Mean score and standard deviation of different frequencies of using internet in visual, auditory and kinesthetic learning styles	135
4.40	Mean score difference between different frequencies of using internet in visual, auditory and kinesthetic learning styles	135
5.1	List of variables selected for the study	143
5.2	Tools used for the study	143

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3.1	Institution wise sample	88
3.2	Gender wise distribution of sample	90
3.3	Course wise distribution of sample	90
3.4	Branch wise distribution of sample	91
3.5	Year wise (U.G) distribution of sample	91
3.6	Year wise (P.G) distribution of sample	91
3.7	Experience wise (computer usage) distribution of sample	92
3.8	Experience wise (internet usage) distribution of sample	92
3.9	Frequency wise (computer usage) distribution of sample	92
3.10	Frequency wise (internet usage) distribution of sample	93
4.1	Percentage of students having visual, auditory and kinesthetic learning styles	97
4.2	Frequency of using LMS features	99