



الجامعة
UNIVERSITI
TEKNOLOGI
MARA

Fakulti
Pengurusan
dan Perniagaan

FBM INSIGHTS

UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MARA CAWANGAN KEDAH

Volume 4

2021

e-ISSN 2716-599X

UiTM *di hatiku*

eISSN 2716-599X



9 772716 599000

FBM INSIGHTS

**Faculty of Business and Management,
Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Kedah
e-ISSN 2716-599X**

The editorial board would like to express their heartfelt appreciation for the contributions made by the authors, co-authors and all who were involved in the publication of this bulletin.

Published by : Faculty of Business and Management,
Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Kedah, Malaysia.

Published date : 30 September 2021

Copyright @ 2020 Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Kedah, Malaysia.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, copied, stored in any retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission from the Rector, Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Kedah, Kampus Sungai Petani, 08400 Merbok, Kedah, Malaysia.

The views, opinions, and technical recommendations expressed by the contributors and authors are entirely their own and do not necessarily reflect the views of the editors, the publisher and the university.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| Editorial board | iii |
| Rector's message..... | iv |
| From the desk of the head of faculty..... | v |
| | |
| 1. CROWDFUNDING: A NEW NORMAL IN MALAYSIA | 1 |
| <i>Anita Abu Hassan, Fauziah Mohamad Yunus & Mohd Syazrul Hafizi Husin</i> | |
| 2. DEVELOPMENT OF THE ARCHAEOLOGY SITE: DOES DONATION- CROWDFUNDING IS THE ANSWER? | 3 |
| <i>Anita Abu Hassan, Mohd Syazrul Hafizi Husin & Fauziah Mohamad Yunus</i> | |
| 3. IMPACT OF MICROCREDIT PROGRAMME ON PARTICIPANTS' BEHAVIOUR IN MALAYSIA: AN OVERVIEW | 6 |
| <i>Zuraidah Mohamed Isa, Dahlia Ibrahim & Zaiful Affendi Ahmad Zabib</i> | |
| 4. A QUEST ON THE STUDENTS LEARNING PREFERENCES | 8 |
| <i>Nurul Hayani Abd Rahman, Shaira Ismail & Nani Ilyana Shafie</i> | |
| 5. LEVERAGING ON VISITOR'S HERITAGE TOURISM MOTIVATION | 11 |
| <i>Khairul Azfar Adzahar, Mohd Fazil Jamaludin & Mohd Shafiz Saharan</i> | |
| 6. GREEN HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL SUSTAINABILITY | 13 |
| <i>Nurul Hayani Abd Rahman, Shaira Ismail & Nani Ilyana Shafie</i> | |
| 7. FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO HUMAN CAPITAL PRODUCTIVITY | 16 |
| <i>Hamizah Hassan</i> | |
| 8. WEBSITE QUALITY: ITS IMPACT ON THE USERS | 18 |
| <i>Norhidayah Ali, Azni Syafena Andin Salamat & Nor Zaini Zainal Abidin</i> | |
| 9. BRIEF HISTORY OF WAQF: THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE | 21 |
| <i>Dahlia Ibrahim & Zuraidah Mohamed Isa</i> | |
| 10. HALAL FOOD SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT: ISSUES IN MALAYSIA HALAL FOOD AND BEVERAGES INDUSTRY | 24 |
| <i>Musdiana Mohamad Salleh & ETTY Harniza Harun</i> | |
| 11. SOCIAL ENTERPRISE: NEW WAY TO DO BUSINESS IN MALAYSIA | 30 |
| <i>Roseamilda Mansor & Nurul Hayani Abd Rahman</i> | |
| 12. THE ADVANCEMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN THE NEW AGE | 34 |
| <i>Sarah Sabir Ahmad & Azfahanee Zakaria</i> | |
| 13. VOICE OR SILENCE: DOES IT REALLY MATTER? | 37 |
| <i>ETTY Harniza Harun, Musdiana Mohamad Salleh & Nor Aslah Adzmi</i> | |

| | | |
|----|--|----|
| 14 | TAWARRUQ AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO AR RAHNU STRUCTURE | 40 |
| | <i>Mohd Shafiz Sharan, Mohd Fazil Jamaludin, Khairul Azfar Adzahar & Norwahida Wagiran</i> | |
| 16 | A SNAPSHOT OF HIGH-PERFORMANCE ORGANIZATION (HPO) | 45 |
| | <i>Azfahanee Zakaria, Syed Mohammed Alhady Syed Ahmad Alhady & Sarah Sabir Ahmad</i> | |
| 16 | WORKING FROM HOME AND STRESS AMONG LECTURERS: A REVIEW | 47 |
| | <i>Zainuddin Mohd Piah, Azyyati Anuar & Bawani Selvaraj</i> | |
| 17 | A BRIEF HISTORY OF LEAN | 51 |
| | <i>Azyyati Anuar, Daing Maruak Sadek & Bawani Selvaraj</i> | |
| 18 | SUSTAINABILITY OF MICRO AND SMALL ENTERPRISES DURING COVID-19 PANDEMIC | 54 |
| | <i>Baderisang Mohamed & Mohd. Sukor Bin Md. Yusoff_</i> | |
| 19 | THE USAGE OF ONLINE PAYMENT TRANSACTION DURING COVID-19 PANDEMIC | 59 |
| | <i>Ramli Saad, Wan Shahrul Aziah Wan Mahamad & Mursyda Mahshar</i> | |
| 20 | COVID-19 PANDEMIC: THE INSIGHTS ON ONLINE LEARNING | 62 |
| | <i>Ramli Saad, Yong Azrina Ali Akbar & Mursyda Mahshar</i> | |
| 21 | IS TIKTOK A NEW JOB BOARD? | 65 |
| | <i>Mohd Fazil Jamaludin, Mohd Shafiz Saharan & Khairul Azfar Adzahar</i> | |
| 22 | GENDER AS A MODERATING VARIABLES OF E-PAYMENT | 67 |
| | <i>Khairul Azfar Adzahar, Mohd Shafiz Saharan & Mohd Fazil Jamaludin</i> | |
| 23 | ODL'S POSTMORTHEM, STUDENTS AS CUSTOMER OR PRODUCT? | 69 |
| | <i>Shakirah Mohd Saad, Intan Nazrenee Ahmad & Rosliza Md Zani</i> | |

A QUEST ON THE STUDENTS LEARNING PREFERENCES

Nurul Hayani Abd Rahman

nurulhayani@uitm.edu.my

Faculty of Business and Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Kedah

Shaira Ismail

sheeraz@uitm.edu.my

Faculty of Business and Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Pulau Pinang

Nani Ilyana Shafie

nani.ilyana@uitm.edu.my

Faculty of Business and Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Selangor

Individual learning preferences is seen in how students' way of exchanging information, whether visual (learning by seeing), auditory (learning by hearing), and kinesthetic (learning by doing). Dunn and Dunn's learning style defines how each learner begins to concentrate on, process, absorb, and remember new and complex ideas (Dunn, 2001). Some students sequentially process their experiences and knowledge, while others do it randomly; some students make decisions analytically, while others decide on the whim of their feelings. Meanwhile, some students are visually orientated, others geared to be vocally focused, and some students thrive in learning in groups, while others prefer to learn in isolation at home and other examples (Ismail et al., 2010). The wide range of ages, experiences, levels of preparedness, culture, gender, and other factors in the student population have produced various learning styles and preferences. Consequently, it compels academicians, academic boards, learning providers, or lecturers to satisfy students' needs and preferences and enhance their understanding level and successful learning process (Dantas & Cunha, 2020).

Numerous works concerning learning preferences have been conducted, resulting in various results on students' learning preferences was reported (French et al., 2007; Penger et al., 2008; Prajapati et al., 2011; Tulbure, 2012; Uzun et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2013; Wehrwein et al., 2007). Most of the works focus on examining the learning styles based on various factors such as age, gender, the field of study, academic performance, culture, teaching method and others. However, the findings are still questionable as no style is deemed to be superior to another. In addition, as Elizabeth and Chirayath (2013) concluded, students are not constantly adapting similar learning styles as they are flexible to change their styles based on the context of learning. Kazu (2009) noted that most individuals would equip themselves with other learning preferences to accompany their dominant learning preferences. Another claim seen in the literature is that students' preferences are subjected to change. In addition, Mahmood et al. (2020) stated that the development of high-impact vital thinking skills under the 21st-century learning ideas necessitates the consideration of students' learning styles. Thus, lecturers are hardly to adapt suitable teaching methods that will suit each student learning style. In fact, lecturers are found to apply teaching methods that suit their preferences in some situations. Consequently, students are not able to learn effectively. With such findings, instructors must include motivational and self-directed elements in their lectures and deliver information and expertise. Daouk (2013) reported that their motivation and attitude levels increased when teaching and learning instructions were tailored to students' preferred learning methods.

Based on various findings and conclusions from previous research, it is challenging to pin students' learning preferences. Individual learning styles are impacted by the learner's experience, culture, and learning process (Penger et al., 2008) and by various factors, changing over time, depending on different circumstances, and different activities (Chen & Cheng, 2021), including adaptive e-learning system in learning process (Gomede et al., 2020). Thus, it can be concluded that every student's group and enrolment year will present lecturers with various learning

techniques. Hence, it will be obligatory for the lecturers to appraise the variations of the students' learning styles before the semester commences. Knowing student's preferences or learning styles might assist lecturers in being more sensitive to the needs of their students and making required adjustments to fit their various learning styles.

REFERENCES

- Chen, I. J., & Cheng, K. R. (2021). Learning Style Preferences in College Students with Different Majors. *American Journal of Educational Research and Reviews*, 6, 81-81.
- Dantas, L. A., & Cunha, A. (2020). An integrative debate on learning styles and the learning process. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 2(1), 100017.
- Daouk, C. (2013). Effects on Dunn and Dunn Learning Styles Model on Achievement and Motivation: A Case Study. MA(Education) Thesis. Lebanese American University.
- Dunn, R. (2001). Learning style differences of nonconforming middle-school students. *NASSP bulletin*, 85(626), 68-74.
- Elizabeth, G. N., & Chirayath, S. (2013). Influence of emotional intelligence on learning style—An exploratory study on management students. *Journal of Business Management & Social Sciences Research*, 2(3), 14-23.
- French, G., Cosgriff, T., & Brown, T. (2007). Learning style preferences of Australian occupational therapy students. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*, 54, S58-S65.
- Gomede, E., Miranda de Barros, R., & De Souza Mendes, L. (2020). Use of deep multi-target prediction to identify learning styles. *Applied Sciences*, 10(5), 1756.
- Ismail, A., Hussain, R. M. R., & Jamaluddin, S. (2010). Assessment of students' learning styles preferences in the faculty of science, Tishreen University, Syria. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 4087-4091.
- Kazu, I. Y. (2009). The effect of learning styles on education and the teaching process. *Journal of social sciences*, 5(2), 85-94.
- Mahmood, M. S., & Othman, M. K. (2020). Learning Style Practices and Critical Thinking of Students in Malaysia. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(8), 3570-3578.
- Penger, S., Tekavcic, M., & Dimovski, V. (2008). Comparison, validation and implications of learning style theories in higher education in Slovenia: an experiential and theoretical case. *International Business & Economics Research Journal (IBER)*, 7(12).
- Prajapati, B., Dunne, M., Bartlett, H., & Cubbidge, R. (2011). The influence of learning styles, enrolment status and gender on academic performance of optometry undergraduates. *Ophthalmic and Physiological Optics*, 31(1), 69-78.
- Tulbure, C. (2012). Learning styles, teaching strategies and academic achievement in higher education: A cross-sectional investigation. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 33, 398-402.
- Uzun, A., Goktalay, S. B., Öncü, S., & Şentürk, A. (2012). Analyzing learning styles of students to improve educational practices for computer literacy course. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 4125-4129.

- Wang, P., Lee, W., Hu, M., & Wu, Y. (2013). Learning styles of undergraduate and graduate physical therapy students in Taiwan. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 93, 1254-1258.
- Wehrwein, E. A., Lujan, H. L., & DiCarlo, S. E. (2007). Gender differences in learning style preferences among undergraduate physiology students. *Advances in physiology education*, 31, 153-157.