

CAN ONLINE COURSES REPLACE THE TRADITIONAL UNIVERSITY?

by

Henry Mak

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for Departmental Honors in
the Department of Economics

Texas Christian University

Fort Worth, Texas

May 2, 2016

CAN ONLINE COURSES REPLACE THE TRADITIONAL UNIVERSITY?

Project Approved:

Supervising Professor: Robert Garnett, Ph.D.

Department of Economics

Zackary Hawley, Ph.D.

Department of Economics

Ellen Broom, Ph.D.

Department of Psychology

Abstract

In response to the rising cost of higher education, students are considering more efficient methods of obtaining a university education. One method is online courses, but most research analyzing the benefits of online courses looks only at learning outcomes. It is important to also consider the importance of human relationships when weighing the benefits of higher education. Relational goods arise through various encounters in our daily lives and play an important role in how we allocate our time. As we form relationships with our peers and community around us, we derive pleasure and social approval from these relationships. The high levels of relational goods cultivated in a traditional university experience can impact our learning outcomes and satisfaction. Although there are various benefits within an online classroom such as convenience and lower costs, it is unable to develop relational goods as efficiently.

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	5
II.	Framework of Relational Goods	6
	• Characteristics of Relational Goods	7
	• Encounters of Relational Goods	8
	• Motivation of Relational Goods	9
III.	Relational Goods in a Traditional University Experience	11
	• Admissions Process	12
	• Personal Development	14
	• Utilization of Relational Goods	15
IV.	Relational Goods in the Traditional vs. Online Classroom	17
	• Benefits and Costs of Traditional Classroom	17
	• Benefits and Costs of Online Classroom	20
V.	Conclusion	23

CAN ONLINE COURSES REPLACE THE TRADITIONAL UNIVERSITY?

I. Introduction

With the rise in student debt and average tuition costs at U.S. public and private colleges and universities, many parents, students, legislators, and other stakeholders are questioning the benefits of US higher education. After adjusting for inflation, the average cost of tuition at universities has increased by over 300% in the last thirty years while real income has remained relatively constant (Bowen 2013). Students and parents increasingly want a college degree to be cost-efficient and immediately useful in the job market (Roth 2015). They consider a traditional liberal arts education to be a luxury and are gravitating towards online courses and degrees due to their greater convenience and lower price. Between 2002 and 2007, “online enrollments have grown 21%, whereas growth for traditional classroom instruction registers only 2%” (Ni 2013). While many researchers tend to look at the benefits and costs of traditional vs. online coursework in strictly financial terms, such comparisons ignore the relational components of higher education.

Most research focusing on learning outcomes and satisfaction has concluded that distance and online education compare favorably to traditional classroom education, and students enjoy higher levels of satisfaction (Phipps and Merisotis 1999; Hannay and Newine 2006); Means et al 2010; Ni 2013). Online courses give students greater flexibility by allowing them to study at their own pace and create their own schedule while maintaining other life commitments such as a career. This freedom permits students to focus on topics they are more interested in or to focus on topics that are more difficult to understand. At the same time, students tend to dislike the digital classroom

because of their lack of ability to interact and create meaningful relationships with their professor and classmates (Hannay and Newvine 2006). Moreover, online courses may carry hidden costs inasmuch as the relational dimension positively affects learning outcomes and the development of personal and communication skills conducive to student success during and after their undergraduate education.

My goal in this thesis is to contribute to the ongoing debate over traditional vs. online forms of higher education by highlighting the relational aspects of each and offering a preliminary assessment of their respective contributions to the learning outcomes and social capital that determine the overall benefits of a college degree. The following section defines the concept and characteristics of relational goods, drawing from the growing literature on relational goods in economics and across the social sciences. Section three looks at where relational goods can be found in the traditional university experience. Section four considers the benefits and costs of the traditional classroom versus the online classroom. The final section assesses the contribution of relational goods to overall value of traditional vs. online college experiences. I argue that the traditional college experience can go beyond the classroom and provide greater benefits through other university activities that lead to the development of relational goods. These relational goods enhance learning outcomes and student satisfaction within a traditional university experience in ways that online courses are unlikely to replicate.

II. Framework of Relational Goods

Traditionally, most economic theories and models assume that human interactions are strictly impersonal and exist only in order to increase income and utility (Gui 1996).

But this is rarely if ever the case. Humans are social animals that are influenced by relations with other humans. With each impersonal interaction, there is also an interpersonal dimension that is considered and can be viewed as a set of relational goods (Gui 1996). Relational goods can arise of various service or consumption transactions and are valued by the individuals participating in the transaction (Gui 2000). The value that individuals place on these goods is subjective, but relational goods can increase our satisfaction with an interaction and increase the efficiency of working with other individuals.

Characteristics of Relational Goods

First developed by Carole Uhlaner in reference to political participation, relational goods are a specific type of goods that cannot be consumed by one self (Uhlaner 1989). The production and consumption process happens simultaneously and only occurs with at least two individuals. The value of these goods depends on sincerity; therefore, they cannot be bought or sold. Instead, relational goods have to be a mutual exchange between individuals and the effect depends on time, experiences, and common interest. Because relational goods depend on past experience, they are considered local goods. These goods only exist between the individuals that share a particular experience, and the experience will have no effect on the relationships with others outside of the experience.

For example, one can consider two cases of a football game. In the first case, an individual can watch a football game by himself. In the second case, an individual can watch a football game with other people. In both cases, the football game is being consumed, but in the second case there is the extra dimension of the relationships and the shared experience. Because we are sharing the experience, we can develop relational

goods and derive greater enjoyment. We can choose to invest in relational goods for many different reasons, and it plays a role in our everyday lives.

Encounters of Relational Goods

Economist Benedetto Gui has developed a basic framework concerning how relational goods are created. It is difficult to characterize these goods as externalities because it implies that the relational aspect was unintentional. He views each interaction as an “encounter” which has certain inputs and outputs that will lead to the creation of relational goods. Each encounter occurs simultaneously within another transaction such as a consumption transaction or a service transaction (Gui 2004).

Inputs to each encounter include the non-human resources such as transportation and cost for the transaction in order to facilitate the encounter. In addition, humans contribute their time and effort, which can be influenced by their external environment and their mood. The effects of the relational goods depend on the amount of time and effort invested. Humans also contribute social capital. Social capital is the network of people an individual knows and the experiences that the individual shared with each of the people. This comes in varying forms and depends in part on an individual’s personality and prior history. These assets are relationship-specific and include shared experiences and mutual understandings (Gui 2000). In order to be successful in developing relational goods, social capital must be accumulated through social participation (Antoci et al 2001). Everything comes together to form of an encounter that will complete a transaction such as providing a service or transfer.

Through this process, two outputs are created. The social capital between the individuals will change because they have shared an additional experience together. This

will later become an input in a future encounter. Relational goods are also formed. There are two extra dimensions that allow for the creation of relational goods. Adam Smith introduces these values as fellow feeling and correspondence of sentiments (Smith 1976). Fellow feeling is similar to empathy. It is the ability to understand another person's emotions such as happiness or pain. The correspondence of sentiments is the fact that we derive pleasure from the knowledge that someone else can understand our emotions (Gui and Sugden et al 2005). We can be supported by others who can empathize with our happiness or pain. Both of these effects are stronger when there is greater social capital between the two individuals.

Relational goods require sincerity. In a game study, compulsory meetings do not create relational goods because of its forced nature while significant change has been observed from individuals who choose to meet voluntarily (Becchetti et. al. 2010). Since both of these factors depend on the sincerity of the individual being able to understand the other, it is an explanation for why relational goods depend on genuineness.

Motivation of Relational Goods

Although transactions can exist in an impersonal approach, what motivates us to pursue interpersonal relationships? We begin without any prior relationships and very little social capital. This will go against a traditional rational decision to invest in relational goods, but when seeking the benefits of being liked by our peers, we can choose to momentarily suspend our rationality. This is trust. All relationships are built upon trust and a single act of trust can provide additional social capital to be trustworthy in future encounters. It is a responsive behavior that can adapt to situations and starts with self-reflection (Gui and Sugden et al 2005). Since these investments are based on

trust, they are non-contractible and can be easily be destroyed through time or human action, which makes them fragile. Trust can only be created through relational goods and can be considered a unique aspect of social capital.

One reason we are motivated to pursue relational goods is because of the benefits they can provide. This motivation can act like a catalyst, and our attitude can change over time with each encounter. This can change the nature of the good because for relational goods to be fully enjoyed, our interactions must be genuine (Gui 2000). One of the main effects and goals of relational goods is social approval. We want other people to like us, but since relational goods cannot be bought, we cannot force other people to like us. This brings in the idea of reciprocity. The value of relations is dependent on the fact that it is given like a gift (Kolm 2008). Like relational goods, reciprocity is a non-contractual exchange for mutual benefit. It can be viewed as the cause for “encounter” where relational goods can arise.

There are multiple types of reciprocity each with different characteristics. According to Kolm, there are three classes of reciprocity. *Continuation reciprocity* is giving with the hopes of getting something in return while *balance reciprocity* involves trying to balance the giving deficit between two individuals (Kolm 2008). Although relational goods can arise out of these transactions, the value of relational goods is affected by the sincerity and genuine of the gesture. In both of these cases, the individuals value the consumption good they are receiving in the transaction more than the relational good. Because of this, the output of social capital does not change from the input, so in their next encounter, the output will be once again similar. Therefore, the value and quantity of the relational goods produced will not increase.

Motivation is one of the inputs that can influence the encounter, which is why the third case, *liking reciprocity*, can produce the strongest relational goods. This is when we give in order for other people to like us (Kolm 2008). Through this, we can develop trust that will continue to facilitate the relationship while generating relational goods in the form of social approval from our peers. An individual would not even have to give to a specific person in order for them to gain approval. The individual could instead give to a charity as long as it falls within the social norm of their society.

When we can generate relational goods, one of the greatest benefits is social approval from our peers. We can only be judged by others because we are unable to provide approval for our own actions. Since the creation of relational goods is a mutual process, giving approval or disapproval is also a mutual process. This contributes to our sense of identity and self-esteem. Approval relies on social norms of the group, and we are likely to change our standards in order to better fit in with the prevailing norms. This creates a tendency for a group of society to have similar norms (Gui and Sugden et al 2005). When others can understand our emotions through fellow feeling and correspondence of sentiment, they can give us approval for our beliefs and actions. Adam Smith classifies this concept as the mutual validation of ends. We gain pleasure from social approval. Ultimately, we want to be liked by others, and we derive great pleasure from it, which motivates us to pursue relational goods.

III. Relational Goods in the Traditional University Experience

College is often seen as the ticket to the middle class, and many students consider it the best four years of their lives. The university creates a community for students and

professors to learn together and participate in activities within the community. It is a time for individuals to explore the world around them through different university courses and activities while developing themselves as people. This exploratory process facilitates the production and consumption of relational goods while developing relationships with their professors, peers, and the university as a whole. Relational goods shape our experiences both inside and outside of the classroom and contribute to our education. Within a traditional university experience, relational goods facilitate our choice in a college, allows us to develop personally, and work efficiently with others.

Admissions Process

Universities begin to cultivate relational goods as early as the admission process for prospective students. As students come to visit, schools try to market themselves by allowing high school students to develop relationships with faculty or current students. This immediately creates a sense of community where prospective students could see themselves “fitting in” for the next four years based on their own preferences. Through the creation of an emotional tie or emphasizing an already existing tie such as the parent’s alma mater, universities can sell a personal experience to prospective students (Bok 2008). Different schools try to emphasize the relationships within the university in different ways. Larger schools with a heavy sports influence tout their “school spirit” while smaller schools focus on the intimate class sizes.

By creating a sense of community, the university is also creating an atmosphere of trust, which is the foundation of all relational goods. If a student believes that they can trust the people within the community, they will also believe they can build relationships and create relational goods within that community. Once these relationships are created,

students can utilize these initial connections as a basis to a potential relationship at the university if they choose to attend that particular school.

In addition to trust, prospective students will also decide on a university based on the type of community and the social norms of that community. Each student has different preferences and values that influence the type of people they will produce relational goods with. Although trust is the foundation of relational goods, it must be initiated by the motivation of a common interest or belief (Gui and Sugden et al 2005). These commonality can lie within a student's academic major, their past experiences, or their hobbies. Once initiated, the end goal of relational goods is the social approval we gain from our relationships. Social approval can be gained by adhering to the social norms and values of the community. At the same time, when we follow the social norm of a group, we are also reinforcing these norms (Bok 2008). Over time, these norms can change and be replaced by new standards if enough members of the community actively change their beliefs. By joining community with similar values, prospective students can envision the long-term gain of social approval which choosing a university.

Students will also try to attend the most competitive school that can obtain. Competitive schools have a level of prestige that creates a social norm of high achieving students in the classroom and involved individuals in the community, which attracts a higher level of students. Studies have shown that students attending high achieving colleges are more likely to graduate (Bowen 2013). Students feel the desire to fulfill these social norms in order to develop relational goods with their peers, which in turns grant social approval. We try to live up to other people's expectation of our actions or live up to our belief of what we think others are expecting in order to gain their approval.

By offering a strong support system through faculty or peers, students are more likely to do better in school because of the reinforcement of social norms created by relational goods.

Personal Development

College is traditionally a time for exploration. Students move away from their family to develop their individual life and find their interests. Although they may face challenges along the way, it helps build their character while developing their values. They are also exposed to new, diverse views from various backgrounds that they may not have interacted with before (Bok 2004). With each encounter with different people, we can either reinforce our current beliefs or change our beliefs. We tend to befriend people and join communities with similar values and beliefs as us because we want to gain social approval. This also adds to the production of relational goods. If we are closer to a person or share more relational goods with someone, it has a greater effect on our current belief system. Through encounter and social approval, we develop as a person based on the people around us.

A traditional college experience can be the ideal place to develop relational goods with many people in a relatively short amount of time. The key is proximity (Kahn 2014). This provides numerous opportunities for encounters to initiate a relationship while reducing the cost of relational goods. The two biggest costs to relational goods are time and the risk of rejection. Through the proximity of student living communities and campus activities, universities provide ample amounts of interactions with other individuals in order to start the production of relational goods. Every member of the

university already has one common ground: they chose that particular university of one reason or another.

When initiating a relationship, there is always the risk that the other individual does not reciprocate the action (Gui and Sugden et al 2005). In order for relational goods to develop, the relationship must be mutual and genuine. When a student first begins their college journey, they often feel moments of isolation and loneliness. Through fellow feelings and correspondence of sentiments, students can use their emotions to identify with other students and create a bond. This gives them greater motivation to initiate a relationship. Others are also more likely to return the action because they have the same feelings of loneliness. Relational goods develop much faster in these situations because of the uncertain environment requiring greater cooperation. Universities create more encounters for interaction and give individuals greater motivation in order to pursue the relationships from the interactions.

Utilization of Relational Goods

Most faculty members would agree that learning to think critically is the most important aspect of a college education. It has been shown the best way to succeed in critical thinking and quantitative reasoning is through group studying and discussion (Bok 2008). Group work is also much more difficult in the absence of a pre-existing relationships (Kahn 2014). The existing relational goods within a group project provide the foundation of trust whereas in the absence of it, there is uncertainty about the ability of the other members. These previous relationships can be created through other courses or university activities. By utilizing the relational goods they already share, it reduces the hurdle of having to start a new relationship. These relational goods increase our social

capital, which allow students to more efficiently instead of having to initialize a completely new relationship.

In addition to improving learning outcomes through social capital, relational goods allow us to cultivate our soft skills. These skills are associated with communication ability, leadership potential, and social grace (Bok 2008). Like any other skills, the soft skills also improve with practice. As we form and maintain our relationships, we try to follow social norms on what is accepted communication and relationship behavior. If we follow the social norm of the group, we are more likely to be perceived as trustworthy with individuals with whom we have no previous relationship. This reduces the barrier in establishing a relationship with others. In order to practice these skills, relational goods are developed simultaneously. This grants us pleasure and social approval if we follow the social norm of the relationship.

Throughout college, students are able to explore different paths to find their career. Career services provide an excellent resource that can help students find prospective positions. Some employers go as far to only hiring students from their alma mater because they personally know the value of the education a student will receive. Undergoing the same experience even in different years provides a common interest that can lead to the production of relational goods because there is a sense of understanding. Many companies also like to hire someone they know or promote within because they understand how that person will interact with others in their new environment. Relational goods help provide the soft skills need and initial interaction in order to succeed in a career.

IV. Relational Goods in Traditional vs. Online Classrooms

With the increase of technology, higher education has become more easily accessible to the general public through various platforms such as online courses. Measuring the quality of higher education is a difficult task. When considering the cost and benefits of changes to the traditional four-year university system, an extra dimension in addition to cost and educational outcome should also be taken into account. With online classes, one of the biggest concerns is the ability to interact with other students and the professor. The social interaction or encounter can lead to the creation and consumption of relational goods. These relational goods could be between peers or professors, and it could aid in the key-learning objective of college. By interacting with other individuals, relational goods could facilitate learning and development of various skills.

The learning outcomes of a traditional classroom and an online classroom are comparable (Ni 2013). There are no significant differences between the two (Means et al 2000). Instead, it depends more on the method of teaching and the material being taught (Ni 2013). Many educational authorities are skeptical about these past researches. There is a lack of hard evidence about the effectiveness of these classes because of the difficulty to research due to small sample sizes and inability to isolate variables (Phipps and Merisotis 1999). Even if their learning outcomes are similar, there are various benefits and costs between the traditional classroom and the online classroom.

Benefits and Costs of Traditional Classroom

The main purpose of a university is teaching and learning, which can be considered a nexus of relational goods. Lecture style of teaching may not be as likely to

develop relational goods compared to a discussion based classroom. Teaching through discussion cannot be done by just the professor or just the students. It is act of both the teacher and the student coming together in order to share knowledge. Although teaching can be seen as just an impersonal exchange of knowledge between the professor and students, it also creates the initial interaction that can lay the foundation of a relationship.

Lectures tend to be the most popular method in teaching, but its passive nature does not allow for the necessary engagement that can lead to the development of relational goods. Different students respond to different methods of teaching, and within a classroom, the professor can adapt their class in response to students' feedback. The classroom creates a community and a sense of trust. Like other university activities, the traditional classroom sets aside a specific opportunity to produce relational goods and provides a common interest in the course topic.

Also learning is not just memorizing because it provides a weak basis for future concepts (Kahn 2014). The greatest learning outcomes can be achieved through discussion and debate (Ni 2013). Through discussion, students can clarify new concepts, challenge their old assumptions, practice new skills, and create new ideas. All of this is aided by the formation of relational goods with the professor and other students. As relational goods are produced and consumed within the classroom, individuals feel more comfortable engaging with the class. With higher levels of engagement and participation even more relational goods are developed. They develop the social capital in order to challenge the social norm and each other's beliefs. These relationships lead to greater learning outcomes and development of relational goods.

Teaching can also create more effective mentoring relationships. The classroom provides a starting point for the teaching-student mentoring relationship by establishing trust and an initial amount of relational goods. As both individuals develop social capital with each other, the mentor is better equipped to serve the needs of their student (Bowen 2013). By sharing stories and advising the student throughout college, the professor can help the student develop as an individual. This relationship can last a lifetime if the right amount of social capital and time is invested.

Although there are many benefits within a traditional classroom, it comes at a high cost. In addition to the increasing cost of tuition, there is a high opportunity cost (Selingo 2013). Students are giving up almost four years of their lives in order to pursue a university degree. In that time, they are unable to maintain a full time job or many other life commitments. They are putting aside part of their life in order to invest their time into a college degree.

The biggest advantage of the traditional classroom is the human face-to-face interaction between professors and students. As students and professors engage in dialogue, they can learn from each other and expand each other's view on a subject. This adds a personal dimension to the class. Students are able to trust their professors and peers in order to reach out if they have any issues understanding a topic. These relationships, once initiated within the classroom, can continue to grow even once the course is over. Students will be able to interact with their professors and peers in possibly a future class or outside activity. Through the development of relational goods, it reduces a barrier between students and professors.

Communication skills are vital in job interviews and navigating a career. Our relationships within a traditional experience allow us to improve our communication skills and understand the social etiquette in different situations. We are able to practice presenting ourselves in a professional manner and communicating our thoughts clearly and precisely. These opportunities are absent within the setting of an online course because these courses depend heavily on writing with no face-to-face interactions (Bowen 2013).

Benefits and Costs of the Online Classroom

Online courses are often ideal especially for the non-traditional students trying to pursue a higher education degree. There is greater freedom and flexibility within the schedule that allows them to have other major life commitments in addition to their education because there is not need to travel to a campus. These individuals are able to continue with activities such as a professional career or family life. With an online class, there is also no physical limit to the size, which makes it more readily available to a larger audience (Selingo 2013). The online classroom is more convenient and can offer comparable learning outcomes.

In an experimental liberal arts class conducted with 200,000 students, students were able to use various medium such as social media in order to replace the in person social interaction (Bowen 2013). They formed online study groups based on location, language, and other interests. This grouping helped students receive the smaller feel of a classroom without making them feel like a massive group. In replacement of class discussions, they used online discussion boards. By removing the intimidating factor for some students of speaking in front of a class, online discussions encourage greater

participation from everyone. It also reduces the cost of initiating trust that will eventually lead to the formation of relational goods. Although their writing skills have increased, their oral communication skills did not improve. Some students benefited from this while other reported feeling isolated (Ni 2013). This could be due to various preferences of the individual.

Students are able to study at their own pace. Instead of having a professor dictate a specific timeline, an online schedule is much more fluid. It is often personalized to the individual allowing them to work at their convenience and comfort. There are also fewer distractions because students are in an environment of their choice instead of a chosen classroom with other students. This requires a greater sense of self-motivation. Students are also more likely to find the textbook and outside sources more helpful in order to complement their learning because they do not have the ability to approach the professor in his office (Hannay and Newvine 2006).

Online courses tend to have higher exam scores and higher rates of satisfaction. Other factors not related to the course medium could explain both of these situations. Students could have higher exam scores because they might have access to their notes and/or textbook while taking an exam because there is nobody to monitor each online student's exam environment. Also students could feel more comfortable taking an exam in the comfort of their home instead of a classroom with other students. They could be more satisfied with the course because the type of students that an online classroom attracts or the novelty effect. The novelty effect states that individuals gain higher satisfaction because the technology is new and unique, not because of the actual course (Phipps and Merisotis 1999).

There are also some disadvantages of the online classroom that can be related to the absence of relational goods. First, online classes tend to have much higher drop out and failure rates of as high as 80% (Ni 2013). Because they cannot develop relational goods within the classroom as easily, students reported feeling more isolated within the online classroom. When they are struggling, they do not have the option to reach out to their peers or their professors like a traditional classroom student would. Students could also be more likely to drop out of an online classroom because of other life commitments. Online students tend to be older with other obligations such as work and family. This influences the amount of time that they can invest within the classroom. Both of these could have an effect on the higher drop out rates in the online classroom.

The online classroom places more responsibility on the students. It takes a highly motivated individual with a need for self- accomplishment to excel because attendance and course work is dictated by the individual students in accordance with their schedule. The traditional classroom is much more structured, which gives students more guidance along the way. There is a set time for class that students are highly encouraged and sometimes required as part of their grade to attend. Students are also motivated by the prevailing social norm that attending class is necessary in college. They are held accountable by their peers and professors because of the relational goods that they share.

The biggest hurdle is changing the mindset of online education. Within the traditional student population, most still view online education as inferior to the traditional education methods. The non-traditional student population tends not to have as many options when pursuing higher education because of other obligations. They are not as concerned with the interaction with the instructor and are focus on just obtaining a

degree instead of the learning outcomes. Instructors also have conflicting attitudes because they view online education as lower in quality (Hannay and Newvine 2006). Many professors want to teach because they value the interaction and the ability to mentor students. Without the relational dimension, professors and students are unable to gain pleasure from the relational goods they develop.

A Harvard Business professor believes that online education will follow Disruptive Innovation Theory. It will start at the bottom with the new innovation and slowly makes its way up to more elite colleges as it becomes more accepted in society (Selingo 2013). Even if these online classes can create online relationships, it will not be able to replace the campus experience. There is much more in a traditional four-year university than going to class and earning a degree. The social aspect of college could be just as important. From joining clubs and organizations to living in a freshman dorm, the social activities in college help develop us as a person while creating relational goods in the process. This can later grant better communication skills and create a passion that we work towards in the future.

V. Conclusion

Although the learning outcomes between a traditional classroom and online classroom are comparable, the online classroom is unable to replicate the traditional college experience. The opportunity to create human relationships within a traditional university experience plays a major role in our learning and satisfaction. Through the input of time and social capital, relational goods arise out of encounters based on trust

and social approval. Using the concepts of relational goods, we can discuss the relational benefits created within a university experience.

We pursue relational goods because we seek the pleasure and social approval produced within our relationships. Relational goods developed between students and professors can increase learning outcomes and overall student satisfaction. Although an online course may be able to develop relational goods through social media and other online medium, it does not compare to the quantity that can be produced within a traditional college experience. In addition to courses and social media, students within a traditional university have more opportunities to create encounters and develop relational goods through student living communities and extra curricular activities. The relationships formed inside and outside of the classroom at a traditional university can increase learning outcomes by increasing the efficiency of groups, improve communication skills through practice, and grants pleasure and social approval through trust and social norms.

With the increase of technology, the landscape of higher education is changing dramatically, and online courses could become more prevalent. The platforms for online courses are also changing to order to try to incorporate more virtual interactions with students and professors. In future studies, one could analyze the strength and quantity of relational goods developed through online relationships compared to traditional relationships, and how these online relationships can affect students in future courses or university activities. Also one could analyze the benefits and costs of the hybrid classroom, which tried to incorporate aspects of both the traditional and online classroom. If online courses were able to replicate the relationships formed within a traditional

university experience, it could become as valuable as the traditional university in terms of learning outcomes and satisfaction from relational goods.

Bibliography

- Antoci, A., Sacco, P., & Vanin, P. (2001). Economic Growth and Social Poverty: Evolution of Social Participation. *Bonn Econ Discussion Papers*, 13, 1-29.
- Arum, Richard, and Josipa Roksa. *Academically Adrift: Limited Learning on College Campuses*. Chicago: U of Chicago, 2011. Print.
- Becchetti, L., Antoni, G., & Faillo, M. (2010). Let's meet up! The role of relational goods in promoting cooperation. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 39, 661-669.
- Bok, Derek Curtis. *Our Underachieving Colleges: A Candid Look at How Much Students Learn and Why They Should Be Learning More*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2008. Print.
- Bowen, William G. *Higher Education in a Digital Age*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2013. Print.
- Gui, B. (1996). On “relational goods”: Strategic implications of investment in relationships. *International Journal of Social Economics Int J of Social Economics*, 23, 260-278.
- Gui, B. (2000). Beyond Transactions: On the Interpersonal Dimension of Economic Reality. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 71(2), 139-169.
- Gui, B. (2004). Exchanges? Encounters! a Note on Economics and Interpersonal Relations. *Group Analysis*, 37, 5-15.
- Gui, Benedetto and Sugden, Robert, eds. (2005) *Economics and Social Interaction*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hannay, M., & Newvine, T. (2006). Perceptions of Distance Learning: A Comparison of Online and Traditional Learning. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*.

- Kahn, P. E. (2014). III. Theorizing Student Engagement in Higher Education. *British Educational Research Journal*, 40(6), 1005-1018.
- Kolm, S. (2008). *Reciprocity: An economics of social relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., Bakia, M., & Jones, K. (2010). *Evaluation of Evidence-Based Practices in Online Learning: A Meta-Analysis and Review of Online Learning Studies (Rep.)*. U.S. Department of Education.
- Ni, A. Y. (2013). Comparing the Effectiveness of Classroom and Online Learning: Teaching Research Methods. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 19(2), 199-215.
- Phipps, R., & Merisotis, J. (1999). *What's the Difference? A Review of Contemporary Research on the Effectiveness of Distance Learning in Higher Education. (Rep.)*. Washington DC: Institute for Higher Education Policy.
- Roth, Michael S. *Beyond the University: Why Liberal Education Matters*. 2015. Print.
- Selingo, Jeffrey J. *College (un)bound: The Future of Higher Education and What It Means for Students*. 2013. Print.
- Smith, A. (1976). *The theory of moral sentiments*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Uhlener, C. (1989). "Relational goods" and participation: Incorporating sociability into a theory of rational action. *Public Choice*, 62(3), 253-285.
- Vroeginday, B. (2005). *Traditional vs. Online Education: A Comparative Analysis of Learner Outcomes*. Fielding Graduate University.