

AWARENESS REGARDING HOW MODERN TECHNOLOGY IS IMPACTED IN EDUCATION Dr. C. Pashmitha^{*1}, Dr. K. V. N. P. Proton², Dr. T. Madhavi Padma³, Dr. Shiva Kalvan⁴, & Dr.

Dr. C. Rashmitha^{*1}, Dr. K. V. N. R. Pratap², Dr. T. Madhavi Padma³, Dr. Shiva Kalyan⁴ & Dr. V. Srujan Kumar⁵

*1Student (BDS), Department of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental College, Khammam, India
²Professor&HOD, Department of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental College, Khammam, India
³Professor, Department of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental College, Khammam, India
⁴Reader, Department of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental College, Khammam, India
⁵Senior Lecturer, Department of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental College, Khammam, India

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.6854238

Keywords: Awareness, Technology, dental students.

Abstract

Background: The era of 21st century is often regarded as an era of technology. Technology today plays a very important role in our life. The impact of technology can be felt in every possible field one such field is Education. It is revealed that use of modern equipment technology and tools, the learning and interactivity of students increases.

Aim: This study attempts to determine about dental student's awareness on impact of modern technology on education.

Materials and methods: A cross sectional study was conducted among the dental students (II-year, III-year, IV year, interns) in a tertiary care teaching hospital Khammam, using a web-based tool called Google forms, a semi-structured online questionnaire was designed and distributed via link to the students in order to fill. Descriptive statistics were given. A p-value <0.05 was used to evaluate statistical significance.

Observations & results: A total of 310 dental students participated in the survey. Age of participants ranges from 18-25 years. Majority of them were aware of impact of modern technology on education. About (58.1 %) of them are somewhat familiar with involvement of technology in education and most of them (49.7%) think technology made their work more efficient.

Conclusion: Based on current study results, students were aware of impact of modern technology on education.

Introduction

Technology is a gift of God. After the gift of life it is perhaps the greatest of god's gifts. Technology has certainly the way we live. Undoubtedly technology plays an important role in every sphere of life. It has impacted different facts of life and redefined living. Technology has revolutionized the field of education. The importance of technology in education cannot be ignored. In fact, with the onset of computers in education it has revolutionized the field of education, it has become easier for teachers to impact knowledge and for process of teaching and learning enjoyable.

Aim

To assess awareness regarding how modern technology is impacted on education.

Objectives

1.To determine awareness regarding impact of modern technology on education among dental students based on gender.

2.To determine awareness regarding impact of modern technology on education among dental students based on year of study.

Methodology

Study design and area

A cross sectional study is carried out at Tertiary care teaching hospital, Khammam.

Study population

Undergraduate dental health care students.

http:// www.ijrsm.com



Study instruments

A pre tested online questionnaire which consists of 16 closed ended questions. Each participant has to fill their demographic data like name, gender and year of study. Participants has to select one option from the answers provided against each question.

Pilot study

A pilot study was conducted on group of students to assess the validity and reliability of study.

Sample size determination

Sampling methodology

The sampling used in convenience sampling.

Inclusion criteria

Students who were interested and were willing to participate are included.

Exclusion criteria

Students who were not willing to fill questionnaire were excluded.

Ethical clearance

The ethical clearance was obtained from ethical committee of Mamata Educational Society, Khammam, Telangana to conduct a study.

Data collection

An online questionnaire was prepared in google forms and sent by copying a link via social networking site (What's app)

Informed consent

An informed consent was already taken prior to study.

Organizing the study

The purpose of study was explained to students and an online questionnaire was forwarded to them. Participants were asked to select an option from the answers provided against each question.

Statistical analysis

Data from the filled questionnaires was conducted in a tabular form in excel worksheet and evaluated for analysis.

Out of 310 subjects,129(41.6%) of them belonged to 18-21 years of age,181(58.4%) of them belong to 22-25 years of age. There were 64(20.6%) male students and 246(79.4%) of them were female students. 77(24.8%) belonged to II BDS, 61(19.7%) belonged to III BDS, 54 (17.4%) belonged to IV BDS,118 (38.1%) were INTRENS. The demographic data is depicted in Table 1.

Results

Demographic data (Table 1)

Table 1: Demographic Profile Of Respondents

| Demographic profile | No of respondents | % Of respondents | |
|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|--|
| AGE GROUPS | | | |
| 18-21 | 129 | 41.6 | |



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH SCIENCE & MANAGEMENT

| 22-25 | 181 | 58.4 |
|----------------------|---------|------|
| Mean age | 5.5000 | |
| SD age | 2.06965 | |
| GENDER | | |
| MALE | 64 | 20.6 |
| FEMALE | 246 | 79.4 |
| YEAR OF STUDY | | |
| 2 nd year | 77 | 24.8 |
| 3 rd year | 61 | 19.7 |
| 4 th year | 54 | 17.4 |
| Interns | 118 | 38.1 |
| Total | 310 | 100 |



Graph- 1a: Demographic details – age

Out of 310 participants, majority of them belonged to 22-25 years age group, with a mean age of 5.9278 + 2.27699 years. Most of the participants (79.4%) are females, in the present study most of participants were interns (38.1) followed by second years (24.8) third years (19.7) and fourth years (17.4).

http:// www.ijrsm.com





Graph-1b: Demographic details – gender



Graph 1C: Demographic details- Year of Study

| - | Resp | Responses (Options) | | | | | | | | |
|-------|------|---------------------|-----|------|----|------|-----|------|--|--|
| Items | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | |
| | А | | В | | С | | D | | | |
| | Ν | % | Ν | % | Ν | % | Ν | % | | |
| Q1 | 90 | 29.0 | 180 | 58.1 | 25 | 8.1 | 15 | 4.8 | | |
| Q2 | 66 | 21.3 | 43 | 13.9 | 13 | 4.2 | 188 | 60.6 | | |
| Q3 | 82 | 26.5 | 154 | 49.7 | 48 | 15.5 | 26 | 8.4 | | |
| Q4 | 109 | 35.2 | 114 | 36.8 | 58 | 18.7 | 29 | 9.3 | | |
| Q5 | 108 | 34.8 | 130 | 41.9 | 60 | 19.4 | 12 | 3.8 | | |

Table-2: Distribution of study subjects based on responses to items



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH SCIENCE & MANAGEMENT

| Q6 | 63 | 20.3 | 173 | 55.8 | 55 | 17.7 | 19 | 6.1 |
|-----|-----|------|-----|------|----|------|-----|------|
| Q7 | 49 | 15.8 | 195 | 62.9 | 50 | 16.1 | 16 | 5.2 |
| Q8 | 70 | 22.6 | 42 | 13.5 | 19 | 6.1 | 179 | 57.7 |
| Q9 | 238 | 76.8 | 72 | 23.2 | - | - | - | - |
| Q10 | 71 | 22.9 | 128 | 41.3 | 91 | 29.4 | 20 | 6.5 |
| Q11 | 42 | 13.5 | 46 | 14.8 | 19 | 6.1 | 203 | 65.5 |
| Q12 | 217 | 70.0 | 93 | 30.0 | - | - | - | - |
| Q13 | 33 | 10.6 | 40 | 12.9 | 32 | 10.3 | 205 | 66.1 |
| Q14 | 32 | 10.3 | 35 | 11.3 | 28 | 9.0 | 215 | 69.4 |
| Q15 | 33 | 10.6 | 31 | 10.0 | 23 | 7.4 | 223 | 71.9 |
| Q16 | 83 | 26.8 | 151 | 48.7 | 61 | 19.7 | 15 | 4.8 |

Table-3: Mean comparison of awareness on the impact of modern technology based on variables

| Variables | | Mean | SD | P value | |
|---------------|--------|--------|---------|---------|--|
| Age | 18-21 | 5.5000 | 2.06965 | 0.093 | |
| | 22-25 | 5.9278 | 2.27699 | | |
| Gender | Male | 5.7031 | 2.39497 | 0.848 | |
| | Female | 5.7623 | 2.15090 | | |
| Year of study | 1 | 5.7922 | 1.72701 | 0.000* | |
| | 2 | 5.0678 | 2.50423 | | |
| | 3 | 5.1111 | 2.01566 | | |
| | 4 | 6.3559 | 2.23998 | | |

Age & gender -Mann-Whitney U test

Year of study – Kruskal Wallis test

P,0.05 considered statistically significant.

NOTE: The responses for all the questions except Q2. Q6, Q8 and Q16 were considered to assess the overall awareness on the impact of modern technology. The responses that represent positive were scored as 1 and the negatives are scored as 0. Thus, higher the mean scores, higher the awareness.



Graph-3: Mean comparison of knowledge based on variables

Discussion

(58.1%) of them are somewhat familiar with involvement of technology in education, (60.6%) are familiar with all kind of online teaching tools, (49.7%) of students think that to a moderate extent technology made their work more efficient.

On an average (55.8%) used technology to complete their task (62.9%) agree that technology intimidates students. About (76.8%) students heard of online degree and (41.3%) feel it beneficial to a limited extent. Majority (70%) of students know ICT. Majority (71.9%) of them think modern technology has a positive impact on education such as enhanced learning, globalization and having no geographical limitation. (48.7%) students has good proficiency in modern technology

Conclusion

On comparison of awareness between females and males, females have more awareness regarding impact of modern technology compared to males.

Among these, INTERNS shows to have maximum awareness followed by second, third and fourth years. Table 3.

References

- Beringer, V. (2009, October 20) For kids, pen's mightier than keyboard. futurity.org. Retrieved February 25th 2013 from http://www.futurity.org/society-culture/forkids-pens-mightier-thankeyboard/#more-4909.
- [2] Bounds, G. (2010, October 5) How handwriting trains the brain forming letters is key to learning, memory, idea. wsj.com. Retrieved February 25th 2013 from http://online.wsj.com/article/SB1000142405274870463 1504575531932754922518.html
- [3] Bransford, J., Brown, A., & Cocking, R. (2000). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school. Washington, DC: National Academic Press.
- [4] Brill, J. M., & Galloway, C. (2007). Perils and promises: University instructors' integration of technology in classroom-based practices. British Journal of Educational Technology. 38(1), 95-105.
- [5] Leising, J. (2013 January 30) The new script for teaching handwriting is no script at all. wsj.com Retrieved February 25th 2013 from http://online.wsj.com/article/SB1000142412788732364 4904578272151551627948.html?KEYWORDS= handwriting.

http:// www.ijrsm.com



- [6] Roschelle, J., Pea, R., Hoadley, C. Gordin, D., & Means, B. (2000). Future of children, 10(2), 76-101. Shah (2011, July 16) Why does writing make us smart ? huffingpost.com. Retrieved February 25th 2013 from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/07/16/whydoes-writing-make-us-_n_900638.html.
- [7] Wenglinski, H. (1998). Does it compute? The relationship between educational technology and student achievement in mathematics. Princeton, NJ: ETS.