

**Clicks and Conversations: Analyzing Offline and Online
Communication Trends Among Students**

Dr. K. Shyamala

Associate Professor, Department of Commerce

Shrimathi Devkunvar Nanalal Bhatt Vaishnav College for Women

Chromepet, Chennai – 44.

Keshika Vikasini K & Gayathri G K, Department of Commerce

Shrimathi Devkunvar Nanalal Bhatt Vaishnav College for Women

Chromepet, Chennai – 44.

To Cite this Article

*Dr. K. Shyamala, Keshika Vikasini K & Gayathri G K,” Clicks and Conversations:
Analyzing Offline and Online Communication Trends Among Students”
Musik In Bayern, Vol. 90, Issue 3, Mar 2025, pp57-74*

Article Info

Received: 31-01-2025 Revised: 09-03-2025 Accepted: 20-03-2025 Published: 31-03-2025

Abstract:

The evolution of human communication has transformed the way we interact, form relationships, and maintain connections. This analysis explores the transition from traditional offline communication to modern online interactions, examining the impact on human relationships, identity, and community. By comparing and contrasting offline and online communication, this study provides insights into the benefits and drawbacks of each mode, highlighting the role of technology in shaping human communication. The study delves into the history of human communication, from ancient civilizations to the present day, highlighting key milestones and innovations that have influenced communication patterns. It also examines the psychological, social, and cultural implications of online communication, including the effects on mental health, social skills, and relationships. Through a comprehensive analysis of offline and online interactions, this study aims to provide a deeper understanding of the evolution of human communication and its impact on modern society. The findings of this study can inform strategies for effective communication, relationship-building, and community engagement in the digital age.

Keywords: *Human communication, traditional communication, human relationship, innovations, modern society.*

Introduction:

Human communication has undergone a significant transformation over time. From ancient civilizations to modern times, communication has evolved to accommodate new technologies, societal changes, and cultural shifts. This evolution has not only changed the way we interact with each other but also redefined the way we form and maintain relationships. In the past, human communication was primarily offline, relying on face-to-face interactions, written letters, and oral storytelling. However, with the advent of the internet and digital technologies, online communication has become an integral part of our daily lives. Today, we can connect with people across the globe through social media, messaging apps, video conferencing, and other digital platforms. This analysis aims to explore the evolution of human communication, examining both offline and online interactions. By comparing and contrasting these two modes of communication, we can gain insights into their impact on our relationships, identity, community, and society as a whole. After the COVID – 19 in 2020, students have started using the modern communication has the schools, colleges, and other educational institutions were closed for months. The advent of online interactions reached its peak during that time because as the students have no option to interact with their teachers, and friends. They learnt education through online communication such as Google meet, zoom meet, face time and other apps; even after the schools are opened but still the usage of this type of communications among the students has never faced a downfall. Many researches after 2021, has stated that the usage of digital communication among the students has never decreased after the pandemic situation. The digital mode of communication was used by them for all purpose such as discussing about topics learnt in institutions, project works etc., therefore, digital communication has transformed into a great factor of communication among students.

Scope of study:

The scope of this study is to evaluate the impact of the digital and traditional communication among the students.

Objectives:

- Understand the evolution of communication methods among students.
- Analyze the role of SDG 9 (Industries, Innovation and Infrastructure) in student's communication.
- Compare the benefits and challenges of online and offline communication.
- Assess the social, economic, and cultural impacts of advances in communication.
- Investigate students' offline communication experiences after COVID-19.

Review of literature:

Evaluation of Online and Offline Communication Skills in Higher Education: This study explores the offline and online communication skills of 402 bachelor's and master's students across various disciplines. It assesses components such as sociability, emotion decoding, self-disclosure, and assertiveness, providing insights into how students interact in both environments.

Students Online: Global Trends Report – What Can We Learn?: This report highlights that 66% of surveyed students find both online and offline resources equally important when making decisions

about higher education. It emphasizes the need for diverse university marketing strategies that incorporate both mediums.

Impact of Online Learning on Student's Performance and Engagement: A Systematic Review:

This systematic review examines how the rapid shift to online learning during the COVID-19 pandemic has influenced student engagement and performance, providing a comprehensive analysis of existing studies.

Students' Preferences and Perceptions Regarding Online versus Offline Education: Empirical Evidence from Pakistan: This study investigates students' perceptions of online learning and its effectiveness in skill development during the COVID-19 pandemic, offering insights into their preferences between online and offline education.

Having it Both Ways: Learning Communication Skills in Face-to-Face and Online Environments:

This research focuses on students' perceptions of communication skills in courses conducted both face-to-face and online, highlighting the importance of practicing communication in both settings.

Research Methodology:

Research design

Sample design	Convenience sample
Sample size	200 responses
Period of study	50 days
Data source	Primary data

Data collection method

- Data were collected using well-structured questionnaire
- Secondary data source: Books, Journals, Web sources, research articles.

Data analysis and interpretation:

Table 1: Gender

PARTICULARS	NO OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
Male	62	31
Female	128	64
Prefer not to say	10	5
TOTAL	200	100

Inference:

From the above table, it can be identified that 62 respondents are male, 128 are female, and 10 of them has preferred not to say.

Table 2: Age group

PARTICULARS	NO OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
Under 18	56	28
18-21	81	40.5
22-25	42	21
Above 25	21	10.5
TOTAL	200	100

Inference:

From Table 2, 56(28%) respondents are under 18, 81(40.5%) respondents are from 18-21, 42(21%) respondents are from 22-25, and 21 (10.5%) respondents are above 25.

Table 3: Educational qualification:

PARTICULARS	NO OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
SSLC	15	7.5
HSC	38	19
UG	110	55
PG	37	18.5
TOTAL	200	100

Inference:

Table 3, represents that 110(55%) respondents are from UG, 38(19%) are from HSC, 37(18.5%) respondents are from PG, 15(7.5%) respondents are from SSLC.

Table 4: How comfortable are you with technology?

PARTICULARS	NO OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
Very comfortable	76	38
Somewhat comfortable	74	37
Neutral	47	23.5
Not comfortable	3	1.5
TOTAL	200	100

Inference:

As usual, many respondents are comfortable with technology; from the responses collected 76(38%) of our respondents are very comfortable with technology, 74(37%) are somewhat comfortable, 47(23.5%) of them have neutral choice and 3(1.5%) of them are not comfortable with technology.

Table 5: How do you primarily communicate with friends and family?

PARTICULARS	NO OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE
Offline (face to face, phone calls, letters)	49	24.5
Online (social media, messaging apps, email)	42	21
A mix of both	109	54.5
TOTAL	200	100

Inference:

Here, 49(24.5%) of respondents prefer offline communication, 42(21%) respondents prefer online communication, 109(54.25%) of them has an opinion of mix of both.

Table 6: How many hours per day do you spend on online communication?

PARTICULARS	NO OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
Less than 1 hour	49	24.5
1-3 hours	78	39
4-6 hours	54	27
More than 6 hours	19	9.5
TOTAL	200	100

Inference:

The above table represents that 49(24.5%) of our respondents spend less than 1 hour in online communication, 78(39%) of our respondents spend 1-3 hours in online communication, 54(27%) of our respondents spend 4-6 hours in online communication, 19(9.5%) of our respondents spend more than 6 hours.

Table 7: Do you prefer offline or online interactions for meaningful conversations?

PARTICULARS	NO.OF. RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
Offline	61	30.5
Online	34	17
Both equally	56	28
Depends on the situation	49	24.5
TOTAL	200	100

Inference:

When the respondents were asked about whether they prefer online or offline interactions for meaningful conversation, 61(30.5%) of them selected offline, 34(17%) of them selected online, 56(28%) of them selected both of them and 49(24.5%) of them think that it depends on the situation.

Table 8: How do offline interactions make you feel compared to online interactions?

PARTICULARS	NO. OF. RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
More connected and engaged	76	38
Equally connected	65	32.5
Less connected than online	31	15.5
Neutral	28	14
TOTAL	200	100

Inference:

Table 8 represents the comparison between the offline and online interactions, 76(38%) of them chosen offline interaction helps them make more connected and engaged, 65(32.5%) of them has felt equal connection between both of them, 31(15.5%) of them think that offline interaction is less connected than the online interactions, 28(14%) of the respondents has neutral opinion on both the mode of interactions.

Table 9: How often do you use online communication to avoid face-to-face conversations?

PARTICULARS	NO. OF. RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
Frequently	45	22.5
Occasionally	94	47
Rarely	47	23.5
Never	14	7
TOTAL	200	100

Inference:

The above table represents that how often the respondents use online mode of communication to avoid face-to-face interactions, 45(22.5%) of the respondents selected frequently, 94(47%) of the respondents selected occasionally, 47(23.5%) of the respondents selected rarely and 14(7%) of them selected never for this question.

Table 10: Which form of communication do you find more effective for resolving conflicts?

PARTICULARS	NO. OF. RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
Offline	71	35.5

Online	48	24
Both equally	74	37
Neither	7	3.5
TOTAL	200	100

Inference:

From table 10, we can identify that which form of communication finds more effective for resolving conflicts, 71(35.5%) of the respondents chosen offline, 48(24%) of the respondents chosen online, 74(37%) of the respondents chosen both of the forms of communication, 7(3.5%) of the respondents chosen neither of them.

Table 11: Has online communication improved or reduced your confidence in face-to-face interactions?

PARTICULARS	NO. OF. RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
Improved significantly	42	21
Improved slightly	82	41
No change	48	24
Reduced confidence	28	14
TOTAL	200	100

Inference:

The above table represents the graph that whether online communication has improved or reduced the confidence in face-to-face interactions, 42(21%) of the respondents has selected their confidence has improved significantly, 82(41%) of the respondents selected the option that their confidence has slightly improved, 48(24%) of them selected that there is no change in their confidence level, and finally 28(14%) of them selected that online communication has reduced their confidence in face-to-face interactions.

Table 12: Do you feel your offline communication skills have been affected by frequent online interactions?

PARTICULARS	NO. OF. RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
Yes, negatively	38	19
Yes, positively	65	32.5
No, they are unaffected	58	29
Unsure	39	19.5
TOTAL	200	100

Inference:

Table 12 represent that how offline communication skills have been affected by frequent online interactions, 38(19%) of the respondents selected yes, but negatively; 65(32.5%) of the respondents selected yes, but positively; 58(29%) of the respondents selected No, they are unaffected at any cost, and 39(19.5%) of the respondents were unsure about it.

Table 13: How often do you feel emotionally satisfied after an online interaction compared to offline?

PARTICULARS	NO. OF. RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
Always more satisfied online	37	18.5
Equally satisfied online and offline	97	48.5
More satisfied offline	44	22
Rarely satisfied in either	22	11
TOATL	200	100

Inference:

This table describe that 37(18.5%) are always more satisfied online, 97(48.5%) are equally satisfied, 44(22%) are more satisfied, 22(11%) are rarely satisfied.

Table 14: How effective is online communication for group projects or academic discussions compared to offline?

PARTICULARS	NO. OF. RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
More effective online	44	22
Equally effective	93	46.5
Less effective online	49	24.5
Neutral	14	7
TOTAL	200	100

Inference:

This table portrays that 44(22%) are more effective in online, 93(46.5%) they are equally effective, 49(24.5%) are less effective online, 14(7%) are there of neutral.

Table 15: Do you feel online communication in professional settings is more convenient than offline?

PARTICULARS	NO. OF. RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
Always	43	21.5
Often	92	46

Rarely	55	27.5
Never	10	5
TOTAL	200	100

Inference:

The table 15 specifies that 43(21.5%) is always convenient than offline, 92(46%) are often convenient than offline, 55(27.5%) are rarely convenient than offline, 10(5%) are never convenient than offline.

Table 16: Do you think human communication will eventually become mostly online?

PARTICULARS	NO. OF. RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
Yes, definitely	58	29
Yes, to some extent	81	40.5
No, face-to-face will always be important	41	20.5
Unsure	20	10
TOTAL	200	100

Inference:

This table expresses that 58(29%) are definitely convenient, 81(40.5%) are some extent convenient, 41(20.5%) are face to face convenient, 20(10%) are unsure.

Table 17: Which is convenient and useful according to you?

PARTICULARS	NO. OF. RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE
Offline	55	27.5
Online	32	16
Both	113	56.5
TOTAL	200	100

Inference:

The table 17 marks that 55(27.5%) are convenient for offline, 32(16%) are convenient for online, 113(56.5%) are convenient for both.

Cross Tabulation:

Table 18: I find face-to-face communication with peers and professors more effective for learning than online communication * Gender

			I find face-to-face communication with peers and professors more effective for learning than online communication.					Total	Chi-square value (0.002)	Correlation value (0.001)
			Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree			
Gender	Male	Count	19	19	9	8	6	61		
		% within Gender	31.1%	31.1%	14.8%	13.1%	9.8%	100.0%		
		% within face-to-face communication	32.8%	29.2%	23.1%	36.4%	37.5%	30.5%		
		% of Total	9.5%	9.5%	4.5%	4.0%	3.0%	30.5%		
	Female	Count	37	43	26	13	10	129		
		% within Gender	28.7%	33.3%	20.2%	10.1%	7.8%	100.0%		
		% within face-to-face communication	63.8%	66.2%	66.7%	59.1%	62.5%	64.5%		
		% of Total	18.5%	21.5%	13.0%	6.5%	5.0%	64.5%		
	Prefer not to say	Count	2	3	4	1	0	10		
		% within Gender	20.0%	30.0%	40.0%	10.0%	.0%	100.0%		
		% within face-to-face communication	3.4%	4.6%	10.3%	4.5%	.0%	5.0%		
		% of Total	1.0%	1.5%	2.0%	.5%	.0%	5.0%		
Total		Count	58	65	39	22	16	200		
		% within Gender	29.0%	32.5%	19.5%	11.0%	8.0%	100.0%		
		% within face-to-face communication	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
		% of Total	29.0%	32.5%	19.5%	11.0%	8.0%	100.0%		

Inference:

From the above table, the male responses for the above asked question is 9.5% of them selected strongly agree, 9.5% of them selected agree, 4.5% of them selected neutral, 4% of them selected disagree, 3% of them has selected strongly disagree; the female responses were 18.5% of them selected strongly agree, 21.5% of them selected agree, 13% of them selected neutral, 6.5% of them selected disagree, 5% of them selected strongly disagree; some of the respondents has

prefer not to say their gender but their responses were 1% of them selected strongly agree, 1.5% of them selected agree, 2% of them selected neutral, 0.5% of them selected disagree.

Table 19: In person interactions help me build stronger relationships with classmates and teachers * Gender

			In person interactions help me build stronger relationships with classmates and teachers					Total	Chi-square value (0.000)	Correlation value (0.002)
			Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree			
Gender	Male	Count	26	16	9	5	5	61		
		% within Gender	42.6%	26.2%	14.8%	8.2%	8.2%	100.0%		
		% within in person interactions help me build stronger relationships	38.2%	28.1%	25.0%	23.8%	27.8%	30.5%		
		% of Total	13.0%	8.0%	4.5%	2.5%	2.5%	30.5%		
	Female	Count	39	40	24	15	11	129		
		% within Gender	30.2%	31.0%	18.6%	11.6%	8.5%	100.0%		
		% within in person interactions help me build stronger relationships	57.4%	70.2%	66.7%	71.4%	61.1%	64.5%		
		% of Total	19.5%	20.0%	12.0%	7.5%	5.5%	64.5%		
	Prefer not to say	Count	3	1	3	1	2	10		
		% within Gender	30.0%	10.0%	30.0%	10.0%	20.0%	100.0%		
		% within in person interactions help me build stronger relationships	4.4%	1.8%	8.3%	4.8%	11.1%	5.0%		
		% of Total	1.5%	.5%	1.5%	.5%	1.0%	5.0%		
	Total	Count	68	57	36	21	18	200		
		% within Gender	34.0%	28.5%	18.0%	10.5%	9.0%	100.0%		
		% within in person interactions help me build	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

	stronger relationships								
	% of Total	34.0%	28.5%	18.0%	10.5%	9.0%	100.0%		

Inference:

From this table expresses that, the male responses are 13% are strongly agree, 8.0% of them selected agree, 4.5% of them are neutral, 2.5% of them selected disagree, 2.5% of them selected as strongly disagree. The female responses 19% are strongly agree, 20.5% of them are agree, 12.0% of them are neutral, 7.5% of them are disagree, 5.5% of them strongly disagree. Some of the respondents has not prefer not to say their gender but their responses were 1.5% of them strongly agree, 5% of them agree, 1.5% of them are neutral, 5% of them disagree, 1% of them are strongly disagree.

Table 20: Online learning platforms offer more flexibility for managing my study schedule compared to traditional in-person classes * Gender

			Online learning platforms offer more flexibility for managing my study schedule compared to traditional in-person classes					Total	Chi-square value (0.003)	Correlation value (0.005)
			Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree			
Gender	Male	Count	11	21	16	10	3	61		
		% within Gender	18.0%	34.4%	26.2%	16.4%	4.9%	100.0%		
		% within Online learning platforms offer more flexibility	28.2%	30.4%	32.0%	33.3%	25.0%	30.5%		
		% of Total	5.5%	10.5%	8.0%	5.0%	1.5%	30.5%		
	Female	Count	26	44	34	20	5	129		
		% within Gender	20.2%	34.1%	26.4%	15.5%	3.9%	100.0%		
		% within Online learning platforms offer more flexibility	66.7%	63.8%	68.0%	66.7%	41.7%	64.5%		
		% of Total	13.0%	22.0%	17.0%	10.0%	2.5%	64.5%		
	Prefer not to say	Count	2	4	0	0	4	10		
		% within Gender	20.0%	40.0%	.0%	.0%	40.0%	100.0%		

		% within Online learning platforms offer more flexibility	5.1%	5.8%	.0%	.0%	33.3%	5.0%		
		% of Total	1.0%	2.0%	.0%	.0%	2.0%	5.0%		
Total	Count		39	69	50	30	12	200		
	% within Gender		19.5%	34.5%	25.0%	15.0%	6.0%	100.0%		
	% within Online learning platforms offer more flexibility		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
	% of Total		19.5%	34.5%	25.0%	15.0%	6.0%	100.0%		

Inference:

From this above table specifies that, male responses 5.5% of them strongly agree, 10.5% of them agree, 8% of them are neutral, 5% of them disagree, 1.5% of them are strongly disagree. Then the female responses were 13% of them agree, 22% of them are agree, 17% of them were neutral, 10% of them disagree, 2.5 % of them are strongly disagree. Some of respondents are chosen prefer not to say, 1% of them were strongly agree, 2% of theme are agree, 2% of them strongly disagree.

Table 21: I feel equally connected with my peers and instructors in online and offline interactions * Gender

			I feel equally connected with my peers and instructors in online and offline interactions					Total	Chi-square value (0.000)	Correlation value (0.4)
			Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree			
Gender	Male	Count	12	12	15	8	14	61		
		% within Gender	19.7%	19.7%	24.6%	13.1%	23.0%	100.0%		
		% within feel equally connected in online and offline interactions	27.3%	24.5%	30.0%	27.6%	50.0%	30.5%		
		% of Total	6.0%	6.0%	7.5%	4.0%	7.0%	30.5%		
	Female	Count	29	34	33	21	12	129		

		% within Gender	22.5%	26.4%	25.6%	16.3%	9.3%	100.0%		
		% within feel equally connected in online and offline interactions	65.9%	69.4%	66.0%	72.4%	42.9%	64.5%		
		% of Total	14.5%	17.0%	16.5%	10.5%	6.0%	64.5%		
		Count	3	3	2	0	2	10		
	Prefer not to say	% within Gender	30.0%	30.0%	20.0%	.0%	20.0%	100.0%		
		% within feel equally connected in online and offline interactions	6.8%	6.1%	4.0%	.0%	7.1%	5.0%		
		% of Total	1.5%	1.5%	1.0%	.0%	1.0%	5.0%		
		Count	44	49	50	29	28	200		
	Total	% within Gender	22.0%	24.5%	25.0%	14.5%	14.0%	100.0%		
		% within feel equally connected in online and offline interactions	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
		% of Total	22.0%	24.5%	25.0%	14.5%	14.0%	100.0%		

Inference:

From this above table shows that, 6% of them are from strongly agree, 6% of them are agree, 7.5% of them 4%of them are disagree, 30% of them from strongly disagree. Then the above table the responses from female, 14% are strongly agree, 17% of them are agree, 16.5% of them were neutral, 6% are disagree, 64.5 % strongly disagree; some of them are respondent has preferred not say their gender but their responses were 1.5% of them are strongly agree, 1.5% of them agree, 1% of them neutral, 1% of them are strongly disagree.

Table 22: I feel that online interactions lack the personal connection that offline communication offers * Gender

	I feel that online interactions lack the personal connection that offline communication offers					Total	Chi-	Correlati
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree			

Gender	Male	Count	22	13	14	7	5	61
		% within Gender	36.1%	21.3%	23.0%	11.5%	8.2%	100.0%
		% within online interactions lack the personal connection	34.4%	22.4%	35.9%	31.8%	29.4%	30.5%
		% of Total	11.0%	6.5%	7.0%	3.5%	2.5%	30.5%
	Female	Count	40	41	22	15	11	129
		% within Gender	31.0%	31.8%	17.1%	11.6%	8.5%	100.0%
		% within online interactions lack the personal connection	62.5%	70.7%	56.4%	68.2%	64.7%	64.5%
		% of Total	20.0%	20.5%	11.0%	7.5%	5.5%	64.5%
	Prefer not to say	Count	2	4	3	0	1	10
		% within Gender	20.0%	40.0%	30.0%	.0%	10.0%	100.0%
		% within online interactions lack the personal connection	3.1%	6.9%	7.7%	.0%	5.9%	5.0%
		% of Total	1.0%	2.0%	1.5%	.0%	.5%	5.0%
	Total	Count	64	58	39	22	17	200
		% within Gender	32.0%	29.0%	19.5%	11.0%	8.5%	100.0%
		% within online interactions lack the personal connection	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	32.0%	29.0%	19.5%	11.0%	8.5%	100.0%

Inference:

From this above table it denotes that, the male responses are 11% of them respondent strongly agree, 6.5% of them respondent agree, 7% of them are neutral, 3.5% of them are respondent has disagreed, 2.5 % of them strongly disagree. Female respondents are 20% of them strongly agree, 20.5% of them agree, 11% of them neutral, 7.5% of them are disagree, 5.5% of them

strongly agree; some of them respondent as prefer not to say their gender but their responses were 1% of them are strongly agree, 2% of them agree, 1.5% of them neutral, 0.5% of them are strongly disagree.

Finding:

From the above research undertaken the findings were:

- 64% of the respondents were female and 31% were male.
- 40.5% of the respondents belong to the age group of 18-21.
- 55% of the respondents were UG.
- 38% of the respondents are feel very comfortable with technology.
- 54.5% of the respondents prefer both offline and online communication.
- 39% of the respondents were spend 1-3 hours in an online communication.
- 30.5% of the respondents were prefer offline interactions for meaningful conversation.
- 38% of the respondents feels offline interaction were more connected and engaged then online interactions.
- 23.5% of the respondents use online communication rarely to avoid face-to-face conversation.
- 37% of the respondents finds both the online and offline communication were equally effective for resolving conflicts.
- 41% of the respondents feels online communication were improved slightly their confidence in face-to-face interactions.
- 32.5% were respondents feels that frequent online interaction has positively affected their offline communication skills.
- 48.5% of the respondents emotionally feel both the online and offline interaction are equally satisfied.
- 46.5% of the respondents find that the both offline and online communication are equally effective for group projects or academic discussions
- 46% of the respondents said that the online communication is often more convenient in professional settings than offline.
- 40.5% of respondents think human communication will become mostly online to some extent.
- 56.5% of respondents said that the both online and offline communication are convenient and useful.

Suggestion:

This can be enriched by analyzing how communication has evolved after the pandemic, focusing on its psychological effects, the role of digital literacy, and cultural variations. Comparing behaviors across different demographics, incorporating new technologies like AI, and aligning with SDG 4 and 9 would provide greater depth. Offering practical strategies to

balance online and offline interactions would make it more impactful. Furthermore, adopting advanced research methodologies, such as longitudinal studies to track changes over time or focus groups to gain qualitative insights, could deepen the understanding of the subject. Comparing behaviors across different demographics, such as age, gender, and education levels, would provide a nuanced view of how communication habits differ. Finally, offering actionable recommendations for balancing online and offline interactions in educational and professional settings would make the analysis more practical and impactful, ensuring its findings can guide future strategies effectively.

Conclusion:

Many of the students feel that online communication has creating more distractions to them while studying. Online classes will automatically lead to distraction as the mobile was constantly in their hands for a longtime; Offline communication helps them concentrate more as they are able to interact with their teachers and peers for clearing their doubts and making them feel more connected and engaged. But nowadays with the advent of technology, education has gone so far, as students are even able to connect and attend the classes of the university and institutions which was located in other countries; it has become more common to learn from other universities which was located in other countries, in such cases online classes or the only possible ways for the students who couldn't make to other countries. As there are many advantages in online communication it was where easier to handle for both the students and professional, the conclusion of this paper would be both the online and offline communication is essential for effective learning of the students as both of the modes provides different types of experience.

Bibliography:

Almazova, N., Krylova, E., Rubtsova, A., & Odinokaya, M. (2020). The Effectiveness of Online and Offline Communication Skills Development in Higher Education. *Sustainability*, 12(15), 6377. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12156377>

Ali, W. (2020). Online and Remote Learning in Higher Education Institutes: A Necessity in Light of COVID-19 Pandemic. *Higher Education Studies*, 10(3), 16-25. <https://doi.org/10.5539/hes.v10n3p16>

Barrot, J. S., Llenares, I. I., & del Rosario, L. S. (2021). Students' Online Learning Challenges During the Pandemic and How They Cope with Them: The Case of the Philippines. *Education and Information Technologies*, 26(6), 7321–7338. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10589-x>

Musik in bayern

ISSN: 0937-583x Volume 90, Issue 3 (March -2025)

<https://musikinbayern.com>

DOI <https://doi.org/10.15463/gfbm-mib-2025-385>

Dabbagh, N., & Kitsantas, A. (2012). Personal Learning Environments, Social Media, and Self-Regulated Learning: A Natural Formula for Connecting Formal and Informal Learning. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 15(1), 3-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2011.06.002>

Dennen, V. P., & Wieland, K. (2007). From Interaction to Interactivity: The Role of Social Media in Online Learning. *Distance Education*, 28(3), 281–297. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587910701611328>

Hrastinski, S. (2009). A Theory of Online Learning as Online Participation. *Computers & Education*, 52(1), 78–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2008.06.009>

Keengwe, J., & Kidd, T. T. (2010). Towards Best Practices in Online Learning and Teaching in Higher Education. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 6(2), 533-541.

Nguyen, T. (2015). The Effectiveness of Online Learning: Beyond No Significant Difference and Future Horizons. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 11(2), 309-319.

Selwyn, N. (2016). Is Technology Good for Education? *John Wiley & Sons*.

Zilka, G. C. (2017). Awareness of ICT Capabilities, Digital Literacy, and E-Safety of Students in the Digital World. *Interdisciplinary Journal of E-Skills and Lifelong Learning*, 13, 165-182. <https://doi.org/10.28945/3875>