EXPLORING STUDENTS' PREFERENCES FOR OPEN DISTANCE LEARNING (ODL) DURING COVID-19 PANDEMIC: A CASE STUDY AMONG UITM STUDENTS

Anis Idayu Aziz
Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Kelantan
anis818@uitm.edu.my

Siti Khadijah Omar
Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Kelantan

Mohd Faiez Suhaimin
Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Kelantan

Aina Athirah Rozman Azram
Universiti Teknologi MARA Shah Alam

Madaha Hanafi @ Mohd Ghani
Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Perak

Abstract: This research explored students' preferences for open distance learning (ODL) during COVID-19 pandemic. It aims to determine students' preferences for ODL as well as to explore contributing factors for such preferences. A quantitative method approach was adopted for the data collection, and IBM SPSS 25 was used to analyse the data. The questionnaire was distributed to 360 participants which involved three (3) Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM) campuses; UiTM Kelantan Campus, UiTM Tapah campus and UiTM Shah Alam. The findings showed that there were no significant differences in students' gender on ODL preferences. In addition, for item ODL preference 3, only the groups of faculties have significant difference compared to others. Furthermore, for item ODL preference 1, only the groups of ODL location and device preference have significant difference compared to the others. For the rest of the ODL preference, there was no significant difference between groups.

Keywords: Learning strategies, ODL, students' preference

1. Introduction

Open Distance Learning (ODL) reflects an access to a flexible and open gate education to those with constraints of time and place. The system ranges from a fixed mission or goal to optimum services offered by the members of relevant organization. The ODL system aims to cater tertiary level education in general and now expands the horizon to both primary and secondary education too (Ghosh, Nath, Agarwal & Nath, 2012). Tertiary level education via this system targets students to complete degrees or diplomas and imparts a continuous education approach in acquiring knowledge (Nigam & Joshi, 2007). It is also mentioned that ODL is a practical teaching-learning method for distant students in surviving one reason or another.

According to World Health Organization (2020), it was reported that Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) has infiltrated Malaysia with its first wave of infection on 24th January 2020 with a total of 22 cases and it is sporadic without specific direction. COVID-19 is a global disease outbreak which overrides the humanity and societal system as soon as it officially pronounces increased death rate all over the world. In response to the outbreak, many governments especially Malaysia has opted to enforce the quarantine movement known as Movement Control Order (MCO). Therefore, ODL has come to the rescue for all level of education amid COVID-19 outbreak to replace face-to-face learning (Rashid, 2020).

Essentially, Ghosh et al. (2012) explained ODL system in two modes; asynchronous and synchronous whereby asynchronous is essential for precise and functional educational procedures

whilst synchronous mode focuses on compiling and recording materials to be accessible. Hence, Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM) has shifted its classes to blended learning mode in consideration to available limitations and teaching-learning efficiency effective April 13 (News Straits Time, 2020). Either mode requires students to curate a new routine in balancing the combination of personal commitments and education (Mohanachandran & Ramalu, 2013). On the other hand, Hrastinski (2008) highlighted that a comprehensive understanding is crucial for the instructors and institutions to assess the benefits and limitations of both modes of ODL to ensure their effectiveness and efficiencies.

The ideal concept of having e-learning or currently referred as ODL is to have the knowledge transferred to students despite the challenges and limitations. Most universities have implemented a blended learning model to incorporate the use of technology and interactive teaching-learning in their syllabus. Primarily, this resulted with the Ministry of Education allowing universities to resume the service on the open distance learning basis during the Movement Control Order (MCO) restriction. UiTM asserts itself in resuming classes as usual since the members of the organization are familiar with blended learning model. This institution utilizes its own platform initiated by the university; iLearn. Now, it has been upgraded into an integrated system called UFuture. Besides, the instructors and lecturers optimize every single commercial application such as Google Suites, Microsoft Suite and many social platforms namely Skype, Facebook and YouTube to deliver the lessons.

According to Siti, Mohd, Rosilawati, Aini and Rusydi (2020), previous studies on ODL majorly focus on monitoring the quality of academic activities. Nevertheless, only few studies intended to explore the students' preferences. This research intends to dive further into students' preferences with the purpose to create better ODL experiences since UiTM has successfully normalized it from March 2020. Evidently, this research discloses new insights on how ODL has been conducted until the present days. This research aims to establish a comprehensive understanding of UiTM students' preferences in regard to teaching-learning system introduced during the pandemic period; Open Distance Learning. This paper intends to determine the significant mean difference of ODL preference among student's gender, faculty, ODL location and device preference.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Open distance learning

Open Distance Learning (ODL) is one of the most rapidly growing fields of education. It has been recognized as a teaching method that facilitates the learning activities. The learning activities take place in the environment where students and teachers are separated geographically and even removed in time. According to Kaufman, Watkins and Guerra (2000), ODL can be defined as a situation in which students are able to access the knowledge at appropriate place and time. Jimoh (2013) proposed that ODL involves the separation of students and teachers in time and space which can be divided into four different typologies; 1) same time-same place, 2) same time-different place, 3) different time-different place, and 4) different time –same place. The author also claimed ODL has few other distinguished characteristics such as it permits a two-way communication between students and teachers, the openness in the use of multimedia devices and the opportunity of face-to-face learning. Therefore, based on the following features, the concept of ODL acknowledges many new ways of learning which made flexible learning opportunities available at a distance in order to get access to education (Adamu & Alhaji, 2020; Alaezi, 2005; Dhanarajan, 2001; Ghosh et al., 2012; Siti, 2018; Yusuf, 2006).

Due to this current COVID-19 pandemic where it is impossible for the students to attend to the traditional classroom learning system, ODL is proven to be the most widely accepted and ideal mode of education. According to UNESCO (2004), ODL is a vital worldwide strategy that focuses on ensuring the learning activities achieve its objectives despite the nature of the teaching. The ODL environment is notably different from the traditional face-to-face learning system as it offers flexibility, accessibility, affordability. Unlike traditional classroom learning, ODL concentrates on cost, convenience and freedom in terms of the discussion opportunities, faster and more frequent feedbacks, enrolment size and self-paced learning (Adamu & Alhaji, 2020; Raffo, Gerbing, & Mehta, 2014; Vanides, 2018). This concept of ODL is not a new phenomenon. Generally, ODL is often conducted by asynchronous mode but most of the time, learners opt for ODL because of the synchronous mode of delivery. To date, ODL is available in both modes which undeniably easing the learning process. According to Ghosh et al.

(2012), ODL is therefore students-centred approach whereby the learners are given flexibility and comfort to choose their learning sessions between asynchronous and synchronous mode. In other word, ODL is one of the learning systems that has grown and dominated today's educational environment as it amalgamates both face-to-face teaching methods and numerous instructional technologies (Lim, Morris & Kupritz, 2009; Valdes, Comendador, Sanz, & Castan, 2018).

2.2 Past studies on open distance learning

Originally, prior studies (Angelo, 1995; Cravener, 1999; Rowntree, 1996) done on ODL mainly explored and discussed on the concept, trends, process and practices of ODL. Over a period of time, ODL has become a favoured range of research interests and a significant body of studies has been executed to explore all facets of ODL. Resulting from the current worldwide outbreak of COVID-19, ODL has received great deal of attention and developed into a present trend in research. Today, most of the researches explored students' preferences and experiences of ODL (Dyrbye, Cumyn, Day, & Heflin, 2009; Ellis & Goodyear, 2010; Goodfellow & Lea, 2007; Holmes & Gardner, 2006; Morris, 2011; Paechter, Maier, & Macher, 2010). These studies highlighted most of the learners showed high level of satisfaction and positive perception towards the execution of ODL. The results also revealed that the success of ODL largely depends on the mode of teaching learning delivery. This finding also supported the study conducted by Keskin and Yurdugül (2019) who examined the learners' mode of teaching and learning delivery preferences and the contributing factors that affect the choice. The finding showed that majority of the respondents favoured video material for interactivity, and an effective approach for the ODL environment.

In addition, quite a few of the authors (Hegarty, 2006; Jimoh, 2013; Matthew & Iloanya, 2016; Nwaocha & Iyiama, 2008) have examined the benefits of ODL. These past studies emphasized on the significant benefits of ODL that contributed to a high degree of flexibility on the approaches, both in terms of time and geographic location. This finding is in-line with Smith and Northcote (2017) who reported that most of the participants approved ODL in providing flexibility of time. It facilitates and encourages group interaction without reorganizing everyone's schedule as opposed to the traditional face-to-face learning system. Improving students' engagement and enhancing students' motivation were also reported as another advantage of ODL (Messo, 2014). This finding also supports the study conducted by Matthew and Iloanya (2016) who examined the benefits in the usage of technology for ODL in two institutions of higher learning in Botswana. The results of this study were similar to Musingafi, Mapuranga, Chiwanza and Zebron (2015) where the researchers revealed that ODL promotes interaction, encourages higher-order thinking skills and allows opportunities for real-time student assessment. The findings of these past studies are in tune with the previously mentioned findings that agree with ODL as an effective teaching approach that allows access to learners who are educationally deprived.

On the other hand, a few studies (Asogwa, 2007; Darling-Hammond, Flook, Cook-Harvey, Barron, & Osher, 2019; Goodfellow & Lea, 2007; Garland, 2007; Idris & Osman, 2017; Jimoh, 2013; Letseka & Pitsoe, 2013; Mnyanyi & Mbwette, 2009; Mbukusa, 2009; Molawa, 2009) have investigated the challenges faced by the ODL students. These studies revealed that although ODL has created many great benefits, there are also several challenges evolved. According to Palvia et al. (2018), challenges faced by the ODL learners are not limited to the least developed countries alone. Learners in the developing countries too are no exception. Numerous challenges emerge despite the vast development of ODL and Musingafi et al. (2015) classified them into three major categories namely individual, institutional and instructional. In the same tenet, Musingafi's findings were also parallel with Bhalalusesa (1998), Mnyanyi and Mbwette (2009), Mbukusa (2009) and Mushi (2001) in which individual challenges are due to the lack of sufficient time to study, financial problem and also accessibility issues. According to Kentnor (2015), institutional related challenges include poor administration system such as loss of scripts or unrecorded grades. Besides, incompetent evaluation of students' assignments and delayed examinations results were also recognized as the institutional constraint faced by the ODL students (Kruger & Casey, 2000).

The results of Hara and Kling (2003) resonate in Mahlangu (2018) where the authors revealed that students who enrolled in ODL were unhappy. They also experienced anxiety and disappointment due to ineffective and delayed feedback of their performance. On the other hand, instructional

challenges are related to insufficient learning materials, lack of guidance in resolving personal or psychological problems and inadequate provision of professional assistance, academic support as well as administrative services (Kamau, 2007). Moreover, the implementation of ODL also presents other several challenges. A study conducted by Ilonga, Ashipala and Tomas (2020) showed that majority of the respondents faced challenge related to internet connection. This explanation was supported by Kanwar, Carr, Ortlieb, and Mohee (2018), revealing poor infrastructure in the rural areas could possibly affect the internet coverage. Thus, this result showed there is a substantial link between accessibility issue and students' academic performance as students are frequently falling behind their learning schedule as a result of slow an unreliable internet connection (Ndongfack, 2016). Therefore, based on the previous literatures, ODL inevitably offers imbalance opportunities to the learners and this issue needs to be thoroughly addressed.

3. Research Methodology

This research employs a descriptive research design. It uses a set of scientific method and procedure to collect data and create data structures that describe the characteristics of such as preference of a target population (Zainudin, 2013). The study seeks to determine the preferences for Open Distance Learning (ODL) and explore factors contributed to students' preferences.

3.1 Population and sample

The sample size is determined by Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) table. According to the table, a total sample size of three hundred and sixty (360) students were selected from the total population of five thousand six hundred and forty-two (5642) students who enrolled English for Oral presentation (ELC590) course during 2019/2020 semester. This course requires students to develop their speaking strategies in effective oral presentations. The only difference is that it is conducted virtually due to the outbreak of COVID-19. Hence, it is crucial to identify students' preferences for their online distance learning session particularly among ELC590 students with oral presentation as their primary assessment. The total number of samples were taken from three UiTM campuses; UiTM Shah Alam campus, UiTM Kelantan campus and UiTM Perak campus.

3.2 Sampling method and method of data collection

Probability sampling method was chosen as the sampling technique and simple random sampling was used as the sampling method in this research. As for data collection method, questionnaires were constructed and distributed to 360 undergraduate students who enrolled ELC590 course during 2019/2020 semester. The set of questionnaire consisted of seven (7) items which were adapted from Çağlar and Turgut (2014).

4. Research Findings

4.1 Normality test

In statistics, normality test is used to determine whether a data set is normally distributed. This research uses skewness to measure asymmetry of the probability distribution of a random variable about its mean. The skewness value can be positive or negative, or even undefined. Garson (2012) stated that -1 to 1 is an acceptable range for the data to be normally distributed.

Table 1: Skewness Result

	Skewness value
Skewness	-0.564

Since the measure of skewness is -0.564 in Table 1 and this falls within the range of -1.0 and 1.0, the research can conclude that the data distribution is normally distributed.

4.2 Reliability test

The reliability analysis was conducted by computing the Cronbach's Alpha for each section of independent and dependent variables. The closer Cronbach's alpha coefficient is to 1.0, the higher the internal consistency of items in the scale (Goforth, 2015). Table 2 below shows the internal consistency between ODL preference items. The Cronbach's Alpha values are 0.870. These values indicate excellent level of Cronbach's alpha thus representing a good reliability and internal consistency.

Table 2: Cronbach's Alpha Values

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
0.870	0.874	7

4.3 Descriptive statistics

The descriptive analysis of this research comprises the respondents' gender, faculty, ODL location and device preference. Table 3 below shows percentages of distribution of frequency for the item gender. Total number of samples is 360 and 73.6 percent (265) of the respondents are females while the balance 26.4 percent (95) are males.

Table 3: Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	95	26.4
Female	265	73.6
Total	360	100

Table 4 below shows percentages of distribution of frequency for the item faculty, ODL location and device preference, respectively. Faculty of Business Management have the highest respondent compared to other faculties (43.8%). Furthermore, students from East Coast region (Kelantan, Pahang, Terengganu) becomes the highest respondent in this research (44.3%). In addition, the commonly used devices by students are laptop (45.9%) and smartphone (45.6%).

Table 4: Distributions based on Demographics

No.	Faculty	Frequency	Percentage
1	Applied Sciences	54	15.1
2	Computer & Mathematical Sciences	45	12.6
3	Architecture, Planning & Surveying	26	7.1
4	Art & Design	16	4.4
5	Accountancy	43	11.9
6	Business Management	158	43.8
7	Information Management	17	4.8
8	Administrative Science and Policy Studies	1	0.2
	Total	360	100
No.	**ODL Location**	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
1	Central region (Selangor, Kuala Lumpur and Putrajaya)	73	20.4
2	East Coast region (Kelantan, Pahang, Terengganu)	159	44.3
3	East Malaysia (Sabah, Sarawak, Labuan)	6	1.6
4	North region (Perlis, Kedah, Penang, Perak)	82	22.7
5	South region (Johor, Melaka, Negeri Sembilan)	40	11.0
	Total	360	100
No.	**Device Preference**	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
1	Laptop	165	45.9
2	Smartphone	164	45.6
3	Desktop	21	5.7
4	Tablet	10	2.8
	Total	360	100

Table 5 below displays the mean for each of 7 items in the questionnaire. Most of the items mean were more than 3.5 except for items 5 and 6. This means the respondents mostly agree with all items with regard to ODL preference. Only for items 5 and 6, the respondents have neutral views regarding

questions of 'ODL is a learning environment which can be used in all platform' and 'ODL is a learning environment which can be used in different devices'. This means that neither respondents agree or disagree that ODL can take part in any platform or can be used in different devices. The overall mean for item 7 was more than 3.9 (close to 4). This implies that all respondents mostly agree with ODL assessment as they preferred to do online assessment more rather than conventional method.

Table 5: Mean scores on items for ODL preference

No.	Items for ODL Preference	Mean
1	ODL offers the possibility to efficiently manage your time.	3.5436
2	ODL offers the possibility of presenting data more efficiently	3.5459
3	ODL assures schedule flexibility.	3.8853
4	ODL reduces students' educational costs.	3.7982
5	ODL is a learning environment which can be used in all platform	3.2683
6	ODL is a learning environment which can be used in different devices	3.3968
7	ODL assessment is much more preferred	3.9518

4.4 Inferential statistics

In determining the objectives, a series of test need to be accomplished. For objective to determine the significant mean difference of ODL preference among student's gender, independent sample t-test needs to be carried out whereas the remaining objectives (faculty, ODL location and device preference) are tested using one-way ANOVA.

Independent sample t-test was used to assess whether there is significant difference between male and female students on ODL preference. As shown in Table 6, there is no significant difference in male and female students on ODL preference ($t = 0.126$, $p>0.05$).

Table 6: t-test results for gender students

	Gender				t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Male		Female				
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
ODL Preference	3.6335	0.67753	3.6248	0.62307	0.126	434	0.9

To find out any group differences with respect to faculty, ODL location and device preference, one-way ANOVA is used. Detailed results for each item can be followed at Table 7, 8 and 9 respectively. Table 7 indicates that the groups of faculties have significant differences for item ODL preference 3 (ODL assures schedule flexibility) whereas there is no significant difference for other groups of faculties for the rest of item ODL preference. Accordingly, Faculty of Art & Design has lower ODL preference scores compared to the other faculties. Moreover, Faculty of Applied Sciences has higher ODL preference scores that imply the faculty has become in favour of ODL.

Table 7: ANOVA results for faculty

Item		F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8	F	Sig.
ODL Preference 1	Mean	3.818	3.564	3.516	3.368	3.673	3.456	3.286	4	1.79	0.087
	SD	1.036	0.660	0.962	0.761	0.964	0.850	0.717			
ODL Preference 2	Mean	3.409	3.691	3.484	3.316	3.635	3.550	3.571	5	1.187	0.309
	SD	1.022	0.858	0.962	0.885	0.768	0.818	0.507			
ODL Preference 3	Mean	4.167	3.836	3.677	3.842	4.000	3.801	3.905	5	2.469	0.017
	SD	0.815	0.764	0.945	0.688	0.560	0.769	0.700			
ODL Preference 4	Mean	3.864	3.873	3.710	3.579	3.962	3.754	3.667	5	1.182	0.312
	SD	1.021	0.771	0.864	0.692	0.656	0.779	0.577			
ODL Preference 5	Mean	3.212	3.218	3.355	3.421	3.519	3.204	3.333	2	1.094	0.366
	SD	1.074	0.832	0.915	0.692	0.828	0.987	0.796			
ODL Preference 6	Mean	3.530	3.564	3.323	3.263	3.558	3.267	3.524	4	1.5	0.165
	SD	1.070	0.811	0.871	0.806	0.777	0.922	0.680			
ODL Preference 7	Mean	4.091	4.036	3.839	3.790	4.000	3.901	3.905	5	1.013	0.421
	SD	0.890	0.769	0.735	0.855	0.767	0.758	0.700			

Notes:* F1: Applied Sciences, F2: Computer & Mathematical Sciences, F3: Architecture, Planning & Surveying, F4: Art & Design, F5: Accountancy, F6: Business Management, F7: Information Management, F8: Administrative Science and Policy Studies.

Table 8 indicates that the groups of ODL location have significant differences for item ODL preference 1 (ODL offers the possibility to efficiently manage your time) whereas there is no significant difference for other groups of ODL locations for the rest of item ODL preference. Accordingly, ODL locations in East Coast region (Kelantan, Pahang, Terengganu) and East Malaysia (Sabah, Sarawak, Labuan) have lower ODL preference scores compared to the other ODL locations. Moreover, ODL location of North region (Perlis, Kedah, Penang, Perak) has higher ODL preference scores which imply the students in North region ODL location are in favour of having classes on the internet.

Table 8: ANOVA results for ODL Location

Item		L1	L2	L3	L4	L5	F	Sig.
ODL Preference 1	Mean	3.652	3.394	3.429	3.667	3.708	2.716	0.029
	SD	0.867	0.907	0.976	0.795	0.874		
ODL Preference 2	Mean	3.607	3.482	3.429	3.657	3.479	0.903	0.462
	SD	0.874	0.896	0.787	0.797	0.772		
ODL Preference 3	Mean	3.876	3.798	3.857	3.970	4.083	1.727	0.143
	SD	0.781	0.781	0.900	0.735	0.739		
ODL Preference 4	Mean	3.899	3.679	4.000	3.889	3.875	1.973	0.098
	SD	0.739	0.817	0.816	0.807	0.815		
ODL Preference 5	Mean	3.191	3.218	3.429	3.444	3.229	1.230	0.297
	SD	0.976	0.954	0.976	0.917	0.857		
ODL Preference 6	Mean	3.360	3.301	3.286	3.566	3.521	1.718	0.145
	SD	0.908	0.891	0.951	0.928	0.850		
ODL Preference 7	Mean	4.067	3.845	3.571	4.040	4.042	2.312	0.057
	SD	0.704	0.827	0.787	0.727	0.798		

Notes:* L1: Central region (Selangor, Kuala Lumpur and Putrajaya), F2: East Coast region (Kelantan, Pahang, Terengganu), F3: East Malaysia (Sabah, Sarawak, Labuan), F4: North region (Perlis, Kedah, Penang, Perak), F5: South region (Johor, Melaka, Negeri Sembilan).

Table 9 indicates that the groups of device preference have significant differences for item ODL preference 1 (ODL offers the possibility to efficiently manage your time) whereas there are no significant difference for other groups of device preference for the rest of item ODL preference. Accordingly, device preference laptop has lower device preference scores compared to the other device preference. Moreover, device preference tablet has higher ODL preference scores which imply the students are more comfortable of using tablet when accessing ODL content.

Table 9: ANOVA results for device preference

Item		D1	D2	D3	D4	F	Sig.
ODL Preference 1	Mean	3.415	3.643	3.680	3.750	2.732	0.043
	SD	0.876	0.864	0.988	0.754		
ODL Preference 2	Mean	3.535	3.553	3.480	3.750	0.291	0.832
	SD	0.862	0.850	0.918	0.754		
ODL Preference 3	Mean	3.875	3.874	3.960	4.083	0.366	0.777
	SD	0.750	0.765	0.978	0.793		
ODL Preference 4	Mean	3.745	3.844	3.800	3.917	0.596	0.618
	SD	0.839	0.753	0.913	0.793		
ODL Preference 5	Mean	3.215	3.342	3.000	3.500	1.542	0.203
	SD	0.961	0.890	1.118	1.000		
ODL Preference 6	Mean	3.350	3.422	3.440	3.667	0.606	0.611
	SD	0.934	0.830	1.121	1.073		
ODL Preference 7	Mean	3.915	3.960	4.120	4.083	0.652	0.582
	SD	0.775	0.771	0.927	0.793		

Notes:* D1: Laptop, D2: Smartphone, D3: Desktop, D4: Tablet.

5. Conclusion

The primary objective of this research was to establish a comprehensive understanding of UiTM students' preferences in regard to teaching-learning system that is being implemented during pandemic COVID-19; Open Distance Learning. This paper intends to determine the significant mean difference of ODL preference among student's gender, faculty, ODL location and device preference.

Based on the results of this study, it can be concluded that the groups of faculties have significant differences for item ODL preference 3 (ODL assures schedule flexibility) while the groups of ODL

location and the groups of device preference have significant differences for item ODL preference 1 (ODL offers the possibility to efficiently manage your time). Therefore, the findings revealed that the main factors of the participants' preferences towards ODL are owing to its flexibility and possibility of managing time effectively despite the fact that there are other insignificant factors. Thus, it is of utmost importance for both students and lecturers to be more creative and innovative in using various methods to enjoy the implementation of ODL. Besides, the finding convincingly confirmed that gender was insignificant in affecting the participants' ODL preference. Although Faculty of Business Management has the highest number of respondents, however, the result indicated that Applied Sciences students prefer ODL more than other faculties. Additionally, with higher ODL preference scores of ODL location North region (Perlis, Kedah, Penang, Perak), it exposes that the students in North region ODL location have more preference in online class and students are more favourable to use tablet in accessing ODL content. Consequently, the study contributes an added value to bodies of literature of the ODL preference among student's gender, faculty, ODL location and device preference towards better ODL implementation.

It is worth noting at this point that the findings of this study are valuable for the educators, faculties and the institution as a whole to provide better services in relevance to students' preferences. On this note too, the research findings benefit all level of education not confining to tertiary alone despite enduring difficulties without physical classes. Some considerations require thorough planning to create and conduct activities according to the preferences of the students during ODL implementation. However, this study only represents a small ratio of population; focusing on only three out of thirty five UiTM campuses and bachelor's degree students. This research is a preliminary study to display ODL preference levels of university students. On that note, further studies are needed to extend the limits of knowledge on ODL preferences. It will especially be more helpful to examine ODL preference in relation to other variables in order to have a clearer vision on the issue.

6. Acknowledgement

All praise be to Almighty Allah for the perseverance and patience to complete this study. Our greatest appreciation also goes to all of the respondents of this study; UiTM Cawangan Kelantan, UiTM Shah Alam and UiTM Cawangan Perak's ELC590 students as well as the committed research members.

References

Adamu, B. & Alhaji, A. I. (2020). Open and Distance Learning: Educational solution to COVID-19 pandemic in Nigeria. *International Journals of Educational Benchmark,* 1-11.

Alaezi, O.A. (2005). *National open university plan: Enhancing higher education in Nigeria through open and distance learning delivery systems*. Lagos: NOUN.

Angelo, T. A. (1995). Reassessing (and defining) assessment. *AAHE Bulletin, 48*(3), 7–9.

Asogwa, U. D. (2007). E-learning: A panacea for access, equity and quality in higher education in Nigeria. In Babalola, J. B., Akpa, G. O., Ayeni, A. O. & Adedeji, S. O. (Eds.). *Access, equity and quality in higher education.* NAEAP Publication.

Bhalalusesa, E. (1998). The distance mode of learning in higher education: The Tanzanian experience. *Open Learning: The Journal of Open, Distance and e-Learning, 14*(2), 14–23.

Çağlar, E. S. & Turgut, T. (2014). Factors effecting e-learning preference: An analysis on Turkish university students from government and private institution. *Emerging Markets Journal, 4*(1), 43-48.

Cravener, P. A. (1999). Faculty experiences with providing online courses: Thorns among the roses. *Computers in Nursing, 17*(1), 42-47.

Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B. & Osher, D. (2019). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science, Taylor & Francis Online, 24*(2), 97-140.

Dhanarajan Gajaraj. (2001). Distance education: Promise, performance and potential. *Open Learning: The Journal of Open, Distance and e-Learning, 16*(1), 61-68.

Dileep Kumar Mohanachandran & Subramaniam Sri Ramalu. (2013). Work and schooling challenges of open distance learning: Case study. *The International Journal of Social Science and Management, 2*(10), 198-207.

Dyrbye, L., Cumyn, A., Day, H., & Heflin, M. (2009). A qualitative study of physicians' experiences with online learning in a masters degree program: Benefits, challenges, and proposed solutions. *Medical Teacher, 31*(2), 40-46.

Ellis, R. A. & Goodyear, P. (2010). *Students' Experiences of E-Learning in Higher Education: The Ecology of Sustainable Innovation.* Routledge Falmer.

Fadl elmoula Abd alla Idris & Yassin Osman. (2017). Implementation of e-learning in the University of Gezira barriers and opportunities. *Educational Science and Research,* 24-35.

Garland, M. (1993). Ethnography penetrates the "I didn't have time" rationale to elucidate higher order reason for distance education withdrawal. *Research in Distance Education, 8*(2), 181-198.

Garson, G. D. (2012). *Testing Statistical Asumptions.* G. David Garson and Statistical Associates Publishing.

Ghosh, S., Nath, J., Agarwal, S. & Nath, A. (2012). Open and Distance Learning (ODL) education system: Past, present and future – A systematic study of an alternative education system. *Journal of Global Research in Computer Science, 3*, 53-57.

GoForth, C. (2015). *Using interpreting Cronbach alpha*. http://data.library.virginia.edu/using-and-interpreting-cronbachs-alpha/

Goodfellow, R. & Lea, M. (2007). *Challenging E-learning in the University: A literacies Perspective.* McGraw-Hill Education.

Hara, N. & Kling, R. (2003). Students' distress with a web-based distance education course: An ethnographic study of participants' experiences. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education-TOJDE, 4*(2), 1-27.

Holmes, B. & Gardner, J. (2006). *E-Learning: Concepts and Practice.* Sage Publications.

Hrastinski, S. (2008, November 17). Asynchronous and Synchronous E-Learning. *EDUCAUSE Review.* https://er.educause.edu/articles/2008/11/asynchronous-and-synchronous-elearning.

Ilonga, A., Ashipala, D. O. & Tomas, N. (2020). Challenges experienced by students studying through Open and Distance Learning at a higher education institution in Namibia: Implications for strategic planning. *International Journal of Higher Education*, *9*(4), 116-127. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v9n4p116

Jimoh, M. (2013). An appraisal of the Open and Distance Learning programme in Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice, 4*(3), 1-8.

Kamau, J. (2007). *Retraining primary school teachers against diminishing resources: Is distance education the answer?* Conference paper, UNESCO, Second Regional Seminar for Africa, Accra Ghana.

Kanwar, A. S., Carr, A., Ortlieb, K. & Mohee, R. (2018). Opportunities and challenges for campus-based Universities in Africa to translate into dual-mode delivery. *Institute of Education Sciences*, *39*(2), 140-158.

Kaufman, R., Watkins, R. & Guerra, I. (2000). The future of distance learning: Defining and sustaining useful results. *Education Technology, 41*(3), 19 – 26.

Kentnor, H. E. (2015). Distance Education and the evolution of online in the United States. *Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue, 17*(1&2), 21.

Keskin, S. & Yurdugül, H. (2020). Factors affecting students' preferences for online and blended learning: Motivational vs. cognitive. *European Journal of Open, Distance and E-Learning, 22*(2), 72-86.

Krejcie, R. V. & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *SAGE Journals, 30*, 607-610.

Krueger, R. A. & Casey, M. A. (2000). *Focus groups: A practical guide for Applied Research* (3rd ed.). SAGE.

Letseka, M. & Pitsoe, V. (2013). Reflections on assessment in Open Distance Learning (ODL): The case of the University of South Africa (UNISA). *International Council for Open and Distance Education, 5*(3), 197–206.

Lim, D. H., Morris, M. L., & Kupritz, V. W. (2019). Online vs. blended learning: Differences in instructional outcomes and learner satisfaction. *Online Learning, 11*(2). https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v11i2.1725

Mahlangu, V. P. (2018). The good, the bad and the ugly of distance learning in higher education. *Trends in E-Learning*. https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.75702

Mathew, I. R. & Iloanya, J. E. (2016). Open and Distance Learning: Benefits and challenges of technology usage for online teaching and learning in Africa. *Commonwealth of Learning, Learning for Sustainable Development.*

Mbukusa, N. R. (2009). *Barriers to rural remote students' access of distance education supports services offered by the Centre for External Studies at the University of Namibia* [Unpublished thesis]. University of South Africa.

Messo, I. N. (2014). Students' perception on the quality of Open and Distance Learning programmes in Tanzania. *Huria: Journal of the Open University of Tanzania, 18*(1), 119-134.

Mnyanyi, C. B. F. & Mbwette, T. S. A. (2009). *Open and Distance Learning and developing countries: The past, the present and the future*. Paper presented at the ICDE 2009.

Molawa, S. (2009). The "first" and "third world" in Africa: Knowledge access, challenges and current technological innovations in Africa. *First International Conference on African Digital Libraries and Archives.* Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Morris, T. (2011). Exploring community college student perceptions of online learning. *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning, 8*(6), 31-43.

Murniati Abu Karim. (2020, April 22). UiTM moves to online learning mode. *NST Online.*

Musingafi, M. C. C., Mapuranga, B., Chiwanza, K. & Zebron, S. (2015). Challenges for Open and Distance Learning (ODL) students: Experiences from students of the Zimbabwe Open University. *Journal of Education and Practice, 6*(18), 59-66.

Ndongfack, M. N. (2016). *Baseline Study on the Current State of Open and Distance Learning in Cameroon*. Commonwealth of Learning.

Nigam, A. & Joshi, V. (2007). Science education through Open and Distance Learning at higher education level. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education, 8*(4), 20-33.

Nwaocha, V. O. & Iyiama, H. C. (2008). Open and Distance Learning: Successful implementation in Nigeria. *ACDE Conference and General Assembly*, 332-338.

Paechter, M., Maier, B. & Macher, D. (2010). Students' expectations of, and experiences in e-learning: Their relation to learning achievements and course satisfaction. *Elsevier Ltd. Computers & Education, 54*, 222–229.

Palvia, S., Aeron, P., Gupta, P., Mahapatra, D., Parida, R., Rosner, R. & Sindhi, S. (2018). Online education: Worldwide status, challenges, trends and implications. *Journal of Global Information Technology Management, 21*(4), 1-9.

Raffo, D. M., Gerbing, D. W., & Mehta, M. (2014). Understanding student preferences in online education. *Proceedings of PICMET'14 Conference: Portland International Centre for Management of Engineering and Technology; Infrastructure and Service Integration,* 1555-1564.

Rashid Ating. (2020, June 30). *Challenges to Learning and Teaching in Malaysia in the Time of Covid-19.* SHAPE SEA. https://shapesea.com/op-ed/covid-19/challenges-to-learning-and-teaching-in-malaysia-in-the-time -of-covid-19/

Rowntree, D. (1996). *Exploring Open and Distance Learning.* Open University

Siti Hajar Halili. (2018). *Flipped learning 4.0 framework.* UMCRIC, University of Malaya.

Siti Nurshahidah Sah Allam, Mohd Sufiean Hassan, Rosilawati Sultan Mohideen, Aini Faezah Ramlan & Rusydi Mohd Kamal. (2020). Online Distance Learning Readiness During Covid-19 Outbreak Among Undergraduate Students. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 10*(5). https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v10-i5/7236

Smith, L. A. A. & Northcote, M. (2017). Community in online higher education: Challenges and opportunities. *Electronic Journal of e-Learning, 15*(2), 188-198.

UNESCO. (2004). *Open and Distance Learning: Trends, Policy and Strategy Considerations.* Division of Higher Education.

Valdes, R. A., Comendador, V. F. G., Sanz, A. R. & Castan, J. P. (2018). Aviation 4.0 more safety through automation and Digitization. *Aircraft Technology, 2*(4), 25-41. http://dx.doi.org/10.5772/intechopen. 73688

Vanides, J. (2018). *Let's talk online learning: The New Media Consortium (NMC).* https://www.nmc.org/blog/ talking-sensibly-online-learning/

World Health Organization. (2020). *COVID-19 in Malaysia Situation Report 01.* https://www.who.int/malaysia/internal-publications-detail/covid-19-in-malaysia-situation-report-01

Yusuf, M. O. (2006). Problems and prospects of Open and Distance Education in Nigeria. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education-TOJDE, 7*(1).

Zainudin Awang. (2012). *Research Methodology and Data Analysis.* UiTM Press.