

## **Covid 19: Perception of Hospitality Students on Online Learning Tools**

by

**OSUAGWU LUCY NKECHIYERE and Obasi Chizurumoke**

### **ABSTRACT**

*The recent outbreak of Covid -19 pandemic resulted in the lockdown of every sector of the economy to reduce the spread of this deadly disease and the educational sector is not left out. The focus of teaching and learning from face to face shifted to virtual learning using various interface such as zoom, webinar, Google and Whatsapp. Despite the enormous benefits of utilizing the online mode of learning, students were still finding it difficult to cope with the recent paradigm shift from the traditional method of learning to online mode. This study therefore, seeks to investigate the perception of hospitality students on online learning tools. The research design adopted for this study is a cross-sectional study and the population of this study were full time Hospitality students in Wavecrest College of Hospitality Lagos and Yabatech Lagos . The electronic questionnaire was used to collect data and the reliability co-efficient of the instrument is 0.72. The Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 20 was used to analyze the data collected. The study showed that almost all the participants utilize What Sapp as a platform for online learning but utilize Android phones as device for online learning while few of the respondents utilize window phones. Also, this study showed that respondents do not wish to continue utilizing online learning for further studies. It can be concluded that the benefits of utilizing online learning are enormous but still have some shortcomings that need to be overcome for the mode of study to be accepted by learners and teachers. It is recommended there is need for regular training of teachers on the utilization of online learning tools that is effective.*

**Key Words:** Online Learning, Online Learning Tools, Perception

## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY**

Online learning for the purposes of this study is defined as learning which takes place via a web browser on the internet, intranet, and extranet (Chui, Chiu, & Chang, 2007). Online learning allows student to learn through a web-based interface where the course materials are made available online and students interact with their peers and instructors through online communication tools (Bonk & Reynolds, 1997).

The useability of the learning management system is important as are its applications such as interactive video, bulletin boards, chat rooms like (whatsapp), email, instant messaging and document sharing systems (Klein, Noe, & Wang, 2006; Martins & Kellermans, 2004). Many institutions across the world have introduced online learning systems as a “platform for the implementation of online learning that encourages independent learning.

Several reserchers (Hara & Kling, 1999, 2001; Hofmann, 2002; Rourke, 2001; Schrum, 2000) have indicated that online learning enables institutions and/or instructors to reach new learners at a distance, increase convenience, and expand education opportunities. Online learning has increased flexibility in meeting the needs of students for learning, independent of time, place or circumstances, and to be a solution for the increasing demand of lifelong learning.

Modern learnings are based on the application of information and communication technologies (ICT), as an instrument for transmitting knowledge. Nowadays, online learning tools in learning have increased due to widespread use of mobile devices and the development of telecommunication services.

Social changing expanded the use of online learning tools that through chats or forums, online tests, remote laboratories, or work groups via the web have traditionally been linked to distance learning, such as videoconferences, support classes This tools are implemented, as consequence of the development of

own technology by incorporating a set of tools that that are already exist on the market (such as Tiny chat, classroom for blended learning,e.t.c). This technology facilitates the so-called “mobile learning”. Mobile learning is understood as an electronic learning and the teaching supported model by mobile devices, such as constant communication and real-time access, are what can enhance certain pedagogies, such as self-directed learning (Papadakis, 2018), which are desirable for lifelong learning.

Mobile devices are the teaching and training methodology that uses state-of –the-art mobile devices such as smartphones, tablets, I-pad, and others as a means of transmitting knowledge in educational settings. The origin of teaching through electronic devices dates from the 19<sup>th</sup> century (Keegan & Routledge, 1993, Simonson, Smaldino, Albright, Zvacek, 2006), thereby mobile learning could be misinterpreted as a form of update e-learning but using new and more modern mobile devices. However, the current conception implies transformation in the methodologies to be applied, taking the attitudes linked to learning through mobile devices into account.

Mobile computing devices can provide educational opportunities (Carvus, Biken, Akcil, 2020; Richardson, Lenarcic, 2008), improving the learning process due to better interaction (Rogriduez, 2020) and nowadays mobile learning is practically identified with distance learning due to their mutual synergy (Traxler,2007).

Despite the variety of ICTs for the generation of virtual learning and their advantages, these new teaching tools also present problems. ICT causes rapid changes in the teaching way, such as the communication channel, the technological training, economic resources,e.t.c. In addition, specific psychological aspects of the teacher and the learner must be considered, such as community feeling versus isolation feeling. The feeling of belonging to a group or community diminishes the feeling of frustration or isolation due to the lack of physical contact with peers and teachers. To address this problem, the teacher should reduce the physical and psychological distances, supplying it with what we call transactional presence (Shin, 2003)

by knowing that there is someone on the other side of the mobile device. This argument justifies the extended acceptance of video in mobile learning, by providing the positive effect due to the visualization of the teacher's image (Sanchez, Solis & Martos, 2013).

Recent research revealed the need to identify the requirements and difficulties of students in order to improve the learning environment (Kizilcec & Halawa, 2015). Several research papers have shown evidence that using ICT as teaching tools could increase students' engagement (Chen, Lambart, & Guidry, 2010) and teacher's role (Kalogiannakis & Papadakis, 2019), because these tools could improve self-directed learning (White & Robertson, 2014; Williams, Karousou & Mackness, 2011). In this way ICT tools have extended the meaning of lifelong learning and have provided new learning opportunities (Kim, 2010). Some others have shown that the mere presence of technological tools is not enough, with the context that they are applied in and the way in which they are used being more important for learning (Papadakis, 2018; Unwin, 2007). Educational technology must be combined with the use of instructional methods and work formats suitable for learning and teaching in technological environments (Molnar, 2019).

## **1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

The recent outbreak of Covid -19 pandemic resulted in the lockdown of every sector of the economy to reduce the spread of this deadly disease and the educational sector is not left out. The researcher noticed that online learning which is not new in the educational sector began to gain more recognition among educational stakeholders. The focus of teaching and learning from face to face shifted to virtual learning using various interface such as zoom, webinar, Google and what Sapp. Despite the enormous benefits of utilizing the online mode of learning, students were still finding it difficult to cope with the recent paradigm shift from the traditional method of learning to online mode. This study therefore, seeks to investigate the perception of hospitality students' on online learning tools.

### **1.3 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY**

The purpose of this study is to investigate how Hospitality Students of Yabatech and Wave crest perceive online learning tools.

### **1.4 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES**

The objectives of this research are to:

1. Examine the perception of Hospitality Students on online learning tools
2. Determine the benefit of online-learning tools among Hospitality Students
3. Determine the utilization of online learning in future among Hospitality Students

### **1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

The research questions this study aims to answer are:

1. What is the perception of Hospitality Students on online learning tools?
2. What is the benefit of online learning tools among Hospitality Students?
3. Do Hospitality student wish to continue utilizing online learning in future?

### **RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS**

Ho- there is no significant influence of student's educational level on their perceived utilization of online learning tools

### **1.6 SCOPE OF THE STUDY**

This study covers all Hospitality Students of Yabatech and Wavecrest that partook in online class around Surulere local government to find out the perception of Hospitality Students on online learning tools within the period of 6months.

## **1.7 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

Few studies have examined students' and teachers' perceptions on online learning (Trinidad, Aldridge & Fraser, 2004; Trinidad & Pearson, 2004&2005). Although prior research has examined perceptions of hospitality students on online learning tools. This study therefore seeks to address this gap in the literature.

In addition to the theoretical significance of the study discussed above, the research study also has pragmatic significance because of the following set of practical outcomes:

- Knowledge to enhance the ability of the following groups- support services personnel, University & Polytechnics teachers, curriculum specialties to understand better the learning styles of students.
- Provision for an adequate level of assistance and a set of recommendations to student to facilitate their effective use of online learning tools.
- It will also assist in improving the Polytechnic's learning management system where a students' user/centered approach is emphasized in the design process.

## **1.8. DEFINITION OF TERMS**

**Online learning:** Online learning is defined as learning which takes place via a web browser on the internet, intranet, and extranet (Chui, Chiu, & Chang, 2007).

**Online learning tools:** Any program, app or technology that can be accessed via an inter-connection and enhance a teacher's ability to present information and a student ability to access that information.

**Perception:** That which is detected within consciousness as a thought, intuition, deduction, e.t.c. personal view of someone.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

This study explores the relevant literature on the topic Perception of Hospitality Students on online learning tools in Wavecrest College of Hospitality Lagos and Yabatech Lagos. The key factors which impact student's perception on online tools are explored and these factors are synthesized to explain their inter-connectedness and how they relate to the research question.

#### **2.1. Covid-19 Pandemic and Closure of schools**

As of April 21th, 2020, approximately 1.723 billion learners have been affected with the sudden closures of school in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. According to UNESCO monitoring, as of the date above 191 countries have implemented nationwide closures and 5 have implemented local closures, impacting about 98.4 percent of the world's student population.

On 23rd March 2020, Cambridge International Examinations (CIE) released a statement announcing the cancellation of Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge O Level, Cambridge International AS & A Level Cambridge AICE Diploma, and Cambridge Pre-U examinations for the May/June 2020 series across all countries. International Baccalaureate exams were cancelled. Efforts to curtail the spread of COVID-19 through non-medical interventions and preventive measures such as social-distancing and self-isolation have prompted the widespread closure of primary, secondary, and tertiary schooling in over 100 countries. Nigeria as a country have as well ensured all schools and personnel experience a compulsory stay at home order so as to prevent further spread of this deadly virus from spreading among students and school personnel since it can easily be contacted through having direct contact with the carrier of the virus. In fact, many unified examinations have to be suspended. Most of Africa's 54 countries are now with confirmed cases and death tolls due to COVID-

19, some have closed their borders and banned international flights, local and international trade are declining at a drastic rate.

The Democratic Republic of the Congo, Rwanda, South Africa, Tunisia, Nigeria and most of the African countries have declared complete lockdowns. According to (Tamrat &Teferra , 2020) research on the April 2020 Africa economic forecasts revealed that Africa could experience economy loss of between US\$90 billion and US\$200 billion in 2020, with the GDP shrinking by three to eight points. In South Africa, growth is expected to contract by 1.5% in the first two months of the outbreak, due to its effect on key economic sectors, such as mining and tourism. Ethiopia's recent request for assistance, on behalf of the African nations to the G20 forum, for US\$150 billion emergency financing, the freezing of interest rates on loans and the cancellation of debts is a clear indication of the massive threat to the continent's economies and sustainable development.

Mathematical modeling has shown that transmission of an outbreak may be stepped down by closing of schools which are the major atmosphere for social gathering. However, effectiveness of this move depends on the contacts and social distancing principles children maintain outside their schools. School closure helps a lot when it is introduced at the early stage, but if it occurs late to an outbreak, it may be less effective and may not have any impact at all because by then the disease could have gone out of hands in the school system. This is why over the years educational sector have remain a sensitive part of the sustainable development of any country; because the tune in the development of any country is majorly dictated by the educational sector. Again in some cases where necessities are not properly managed, the reopening of schools after a period of pandemic closure may result in increased infection rates, in fact doubled the initial figures. The closures as a result of the pandemic does not only affect the educational sector, it has also led to the suspension of all public gathering; closure of major markets, religious organizations were restricted from worshipping together and many other gatherings' activities were on hold during the trying period. Even with all these, it is difficult to

measure the specific impact of school closures, because it varies from place to place, persons to persons; the impact may be positive or effective on individuals as the case may be.

Teaching is moving online, on an untested and unprecedented scale. Student assessments are also moving online, with a lot of trial and error and uncertainty for everyone. Many assessments have simply been cancelled. Importantly, these interruptions will not just be a short-term issue, but can also have long-term consequences for the affected cohorts and are likely to increase inequality. The focus of teaching and learning from face to face shifted to virtual learning using various interface such as zoom, webinar, Google and what Sapp.

## **2.2. Attitude towards Virtual Learning Environment**

Despite the advantages of online learning tools, students' acceptance is perhaps the most important factor for a successful learning (Papadakis, 2018; Martins, Kellermans, 2004), hence the need to analyze the satisfaction in virtual learning environments. Virtual environment can be self-developed or can be based on open systems. It should include only online tools whose benefits have already been corroborated. Nevertheless, to know the students' perceived utility related to online learning process. This greater knowledge will allow reconfiguring online tools in order to facilitate a better personal use in the virtual learning environment.

Within the affirmity for learning in virtual environments, the individual's attitude towards social interaction has been assessed (Kreijns, Kirschner & Jochems, 2003). Social interaction with peers and teachers, are aspects related to the problem of loneliness or isolation (Dickey, 2004), and they are usually associated to people who do not like virtual environments. Computer and internet self – confidence has been another issue analysed in students' attitude towards virtual learning environment, finding that this is a discerning factor for the feeling of belonging to a group (Holder, 2007). In this sense, the empirical analyses have shown that online feedback will be more effective if feedback tools facilitate the perception of social presence (Grieve, Padgett

& Mortfitt, 2016). In order to make sure that digital non-natives feel comfortable with the implementation of ICT, the mediating role of a teacher is required to encourage the students in mobile learning.

### **2.3. Perception of Teacher's Role**

Considering again the aforementioned idea that the method of use and the context of use of technological tools is more important than the tools themselves (Papadakis, 2019; Unwin, 2007), the teacher's role plays a priority objective. Some authors suggest that the absence of an instructor in self-directed learning could lead to errors and problems with skill acquisition (McGrath, Rowley, Rao, Tommy, Hannigan, Murphy & Dunne, 2015)

### **2.4. Perception of Online learning Tools**

Electronic assessment systems in virtual learning environments were also analysed from the point of view of the students' perception of their utility, finding a positive attitude due to the rapid feedback they offer and the reduction in rating bias (Alsatian, 2017; Silva & Rodrigues, 2019). The assessment of online tools has been focused on exploring student views on self-directed learning tools (Van Wyk, 2017), e.g., the utility of the virtual classrooms and other learning tools (Sanchez, Solis & Martos, 2013; Silva & Rodrigues, 2019; Johnson, Killion & Oomen, 2005). It has been found out that tools based on video allow a comprehensive teaching-learning strategy (Brecht & Ogilby, 2008), which would enhance the acquisition of various skills.

Resulting from the above arguments, a teaching innovation project was carried out. It was focused on improving the quality and monitoring of students in the online learning environment applied by the university (Methodological actions to improve the quality and monitoring of the students in the e-UNED environment). The improvement was focused on the utility of online tools and the analysis of explanatory relationships of the utility. This work shows the application of online tools for accounting teaching in the European Higher Education Area. The purpose is to measure the perceived utility of online tools by students and also whether personal attitudes of students (affinity) could explain the perceived utility.

## 2.5. Advantages and Disadvantages of Online learning Tools

### Advantages

### Disadvantages

<p>Learning can take place anywhere</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Learning can take place anytime and at any place</li> <li>● There is synergy between the learner, instructor and environment</li> <li>● High quality dialogue can be maintained because it is not restricted by traditional classroom or time models.</li> <li>● The environment can be student centered, in that instructor can focus on individual's learning styles and issue with greater ease.</li> <li>● There is a level playing field for all learners, regardless of visual or physical handicap, location or learning schedule.</li> <li>● Teachers can use creative teaching methods in delivery materials</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Equity and accessibility to technology in that not all student can afford top-of-the-line computers with multi-media accessibility.</li> <li>● Computer literacy- students have different degrees of familiarity with computer, internet and software program. This can adversely impact their ability to participate in fullest.</li> <li>● Limitations of technology – there are some things a computer simple cannot do such as real life simulation, chemical laboratory experiment and medical dissections.</li> <li>● Visualization are useful but not as good as actually 'being there'.</li> <li>● Lack of essential online qualities- without the necessary direction, teaching strategies and integration of student learning strategies, learning styles cannot be fully utilized and learning is limited.</li> </ul>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- |  |                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|--|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Levels of Synergy- face -to -face or voice<br/>-to -voice is still useful to establish<br/>synergy, trust and mentor effectiveness.</li></ul> |
|--|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

## 2.6. Great Education Tools for Teacher Toolboxes

1. **Wabsisabi** – An online community for lesson planning, real-time reporting against standards, media –rich student portfolios, and sharing a vibrant collaborative learning experience with students and Parents.
2. **Articulate**- A great tool for creating online learning courses.19 of 20 top-ranked universities currently employ this platform.
3. **A Web Whiteboard**- The perfect tool for class brainstorming sessions. This is an online whiteboard app for computer, tablet or smartphones **Artsy**- This is a beautiful resource for art collection and education. Lots of tools make it an ideal resource for art classes.
4. **Coursera** – What do you want to learn? Whatever it is, it’s likely on Couseara. They’ve got over 16million learners taking over 1500 courses right now.
5. **Unicheck**- This is one of the most powerful plagiarism checkers on Web today. Unplug is a safe secure tool with lots of educator features.
6. **Ed puzzle**- A big booster for flipped learning teachers. Customize regular videos with engaging interactive learning tools. You can even track students’ action and progress with this tool
7. **Edx**- Another bank of online courses for personalized learning. This tool features content from many top universities around the world.
8. **Focus Booster**- This is a time tracking and productivity app. It works off the pomodoro technique. It features instant timesheet recording and visual progress graphs.

9. **Veed** - A screen recording tool that's so simple you can use it immediately without taking any training or learning about effects.
10. **Formative**- This is an amazing formative assessment app. Create an assignment and get live results from students. Present them with real –time feedback in an instant, too.
11. **Homeroom Mom**- A unique online support community. They share tips and tools for working with parents and teachers. They've also got ideas for all sorts of class projects.
12. **Light sail** – An e-reading program that helps teachers support independent reading in students. You can monitor progress and give assessment and feedback in real time.
13. **Notability**- Note- taking was never this much fun. It's a feature – rich tool available for Mac devices. Write, sketch, and interact with your notes.
14. **Pear Deck**- A wonderful interactive presentations you control from your computer. Students respond to your built-in questions using a wide range of tools.
15. **Plickers** – This is a simple tool that lets teachers collect real- time formative assessment data. This happens without the need for student devices. It's for everything from quick checks to measuring deep understanding.
16. **Pockets** – A bookmarking tool for teachers on the go. Save articles, videos, images, and lots more for later viewing. You can also save from Twitter, Flip board, Pulse and Zite.
17. **Rescue Time**- This is a non-intrusive time tracker program. It shows you how much time you spend on your websites and apps. You get detailed reports of where your time is going online.
18. **Schoology** – A powerful K-12 and higher education learning management system. Create content, design lessons and assess understanding with this tool.
19. **Socrative**- Socrative lets you to engage and assess your students as learning happens. Tools for real –time quizzing, general results and visualizing progress.

20. **Teaching Channel-** This is a video resource for professional development. It covers the core subjects and all grades. There are also 15 professional development topics to explore here.
21. **TEDED-** TED'S tradition of excellence continues here with this teaching resource. Watch videos, explore lessons and view learning series compilations of all kinds.
22. **TurnItIn-** This is an interactive rubric for analyzing the quality of internet sources students' use in writing. Sites are evaluated based on authority, educational value, intent, originality and quality.
23. **Video Scribe-** This tool lets you create whiteboard style animations- no design or technical experience needed. You can add images, text, music and voiceover to your animations.
24. **Wolfram Alpha-** Whatever you want to calculate or research, this electronic genius can do it. Enter a topic or choose from a wide range of knowledge fields.

## **2.7 Learning Environments Research**

The quality of learning is dependent upon how a learner interacts with his or her learning environment. Learning environments research began in 1930, when Lewin proposed the Lewinian formula ( $B=f(P,E)$ ). This formula proposed that human behaviour (B) is a function of the personal characteristics of an individual (P) and his or her environment (E) (Fraser, 1998). This hypothesis has since formed the basis of further research in various situations in which human behaviour is demonstrated. Since an individual is always interacting with his or her environment, observed behaviour is a result of the combined effect of the interaction between variables P and E.

In order to understand this behavior, two psychologists, (Walberg, 1976 & Moos 1974), who were working independently, researched it further (Moos, 1974) developed instruments with social climate scales for use in a range of settings such as juvenile and adult correctional facilities, work settings and classrooms. In designing these scales, he proposed that the characteristics of these diverse environments could be classified in terms of three dimensions:

1. Relationships Dimension describes the relationship and the quality of interaction between individuals.
2. Personal Development Dimension examines the extent to which an individual 's personal growth and self-fulfillment are met.
3. Maintenance and System Change Dimension describes the extent to which the environment is orderly, clear in expectations, controlled and adaptable to change (Moos, 1974).

### **2.7.1. Blended Learning Environment**

Students preferred blended learning, as they chose both the use of technology and face-to-face interaction with their lecturers and peers. This was also evidenced in recent years, there has been an increased application of blended learning environments in higher education around the world—this has been highlighted in a number of studies (Ziegler, Paulus, & Woodside, 2006). Effective blended learning strategies allow for a seamless mix of learning activities, which are delivered face-to-face and using ICT. (Driscoll,2002) refined this further by suggesting that blended learning can be defined as —a combination of mixing of at least four different methodologies including: 1) mixing of technology based learning (online learning, collaboration, virtual classroom and so on), 2) combination of pedagogical approaches (behaviorism, cognitivism and constructivism), 3) mixing of forms of instructional technology (face-to-face, Internet, CD-ROM and so on), and 4) integrating instructional technology with actual job activities .

The blended learning approach allowed students to communicate with their peers and lecturers while in either online and offline modes (Allen & Seaman, 2003). This environment also encouraged student-centered learning and promoted student interaction (Carmody & Berge, 2005; Davies & Graff, 2005). More importantly, as (Clark & James,2005) pointed out, blended learning is —based on the assumption that there were inherent benefits in face-to-face interaction as well as the understanding that there were

advantages to using on-line methods (Clark & James, 2005,). As a consequence, the learner gets the best of both approaches.

In an evaluation study entitled —Blended learning: overview and recommendations for successful implementation, ( Harris, Connolly & Feeny, 2009) stated that blended learning should be evaluated not only by the participants, but also by the teaching and production team. According to ( Harris et al. 2009), the evaluation should focus on

1) learning outcomes, 2) participants' learning styles/preferences, 3) motivation, 4) clarity of goals, content, 5) interaction, 6) perceived value and satisfaction, 7) effectiveness, 8) appropriate support, workload and assessment, 9) access to resources, usability and design, 10) how the —blend of learning worked,

11) confidence logs if possible and 12) evidence of meta-cognition. Harris's suggestions implied that the evaluation of online environments should consider a range of factor

(Baldwin-Evans,2006) suggested that —The synchronous (real-time) domain was the more traditional instructional approach to online training and has the instructor (or mentor) and learner available at the same time to share learning experiences and interactions that happened between the instructor and the learner. He also added that only learners who were willing to adapt their learning style away from the traditional classroom or laboratory teaching would benefit from synchronous teaching via the Internet. Synchronous learning was always the preferred choice for international students, because they were more accustomed to this learning method in their home countries (Wang, 2007).

(Baldwin-Evans,2006) also stated that the asynchronous (different time) domain means that the lecturer (or in most cases, computer-based courseware) and the learner were available at different times. This tended to benefit self-directed learners who like to learn at their own pace and own time. However, because of the

teacher- directed nature of most Asian students` prior educational experiences, many international students feel isolated if they have to learn in an asynchronous learning environment. This helps to explain why many new international students who come to Australia to study often take quite a long time to adjust to asynchronous online learning activities.

(Baldwin-Evans,2006) also asserts that a blended learning environment should place proper emphasis on both the synchronous and asynchronous learning modes. It is often the case that blended learning is inappropriately implemented in Australian universities to promote both traditional classroom teaching and simultaneous use of technology advancements to facilitate teaching and learning. Instead, (Baldwin-Evans,2006) stated that —Good blending was about establishing a balance between the instructional advantages for the learner and the learning objective. Blended learning captured the best of both worlds by enabling learners to pick and choose how they wanted to learn and afforded them greater flexibility and convenience about when they wanted to learn.

Other researchers, such as (Blankson and Kyei-Blankson,2008), provided further evidence on blended learning when they studied the perceptions of 650 students enrolled in a blended course in an arts college in the USA. The researchers conclude that —synchronous online discussions may enhance interaction, elaboration, active learning as well as equal learning opportunities. These findings highlight the value that online learning could add to a blended learning environment.

(Kvavik,2005) conducted a large-scale survey (4,374 students from thirteen universities in five states in the USA) to investigate how students use technology. He found that 2.2 per cent of the students preferred taking courses that are entirely online (online learning), 2.9 per cent preferred courses with no IT usage (traditional classroom learning) and the rest (94.9 per cent) preferred limited or moderate use of IT in learning (blended learning). These findings indicate that the ( Perdisco`s ,2009) study, which noted that online learning did not necessarily mean the whole course did not have to be delivered electronically, nor did it mean the replacement of face-to-face instruction.

In (Kvavik's,2005) findings, he asserted that a student's major influenced the preferences for technology in the classroom; he found that the engineering and business students had the highest preference for online learning. He explained that the engineering and business students pointed out that classroom technology allowed for better understanding of sophisticated theories and provided them with more opportunities for practice and reinforcement.

(Edwards,2004) identified a number of factors that needed to be taken into consideration when designing and implementing successful online blended learning. Included in these factors, were the need to 1) motivate the learner, 2) focus on behavioral outcomes and 3) create meaningful and memorable experiences.

## **2.8 Instructor Characteristics**

Students attending a class with a lecturer who has a positive attitude towards distributed learning and promotes the technology are likely to experience more positive learning outcomes. In a distributed learning environment, students often feel isolated since they do not have the classroom environment in which to interact with the lecturer (Serwatka, 1999; Volery & Lord, 2000). (Beadle and Santy, 2008) described and discussed the use of online learning technology to support students' learning in a learning environment where problem-based learning was adopted. They pointed out that the lack of training to prepare staff and students to teach and learn in an online environment could be a drawback, as they might not know how to interact with each other in such an environment. (Chou,2003) stressed the importance of student interactions in a traditional face-to-face teaching session. If students were able to interact with their peers and lecturers effectively face-to-face, then this was likely to increase the learning satisfaction and positive attitudes of students towards online learning. In order to address this issue, lecturers can offer a myriad of availability hours instead of the conventional nine to five, making themselves more reachable, through alternative methods of contact for the students. Most importantly, the lecturer should

exhibit interactive teaching styles in a concerted effort to encourage interaction between the students as well as with the lecturer.

Online learning may involve activities such as investigations, critical reading, debates and necessitated responses to lecturers (Pearson, 1999). Within these types of activities, the lecturer is responsible for ensuring the active participation from students in the online learning environment. With international students who have English as a second language (for example, students from Asia) who might be hesitant, shy or intimidated to express themselves in an online learning environment, active participation may be a problem. Therefore, in the online learning environments where students are often asked to exchange and discuss ideas, it is crucial for the lecturer to ensure that the hesitant, shy or intimidated Asian students understand the purpose and goals of the online learning activities.

(Neo, 2004) summed up the role of an effective online lecturer as follows: 1) provide instruction and prerequisite knowledge to students, 2) prescribe the group project and content, 3) take responsibility for monitoring and evaluating task and process

outcomes of students, 4) act as an external consultant to the groups, 5) use web technology to modify curriculum and update materials and keep in touch with students, 6) verify web links of the students in research papers and 7) assess students formatively. Therefore, lecturers play important roles to ensure that students cope well in the online learning environment.

In a similar vein, Krause, McEwen, and (Blinco, 2009) investigated ways in which first year students could be prepared to adapt to online learning environments in Australian universities. They proposed that best practice in first year online learning was based upon lecturers' understanding of:

1. Their roles as advisors and as assessors of commencing undergraduates' readiness to engage in online learning. This may and should occur well before the students' first encounter with the formal university online

learning environment, particularly at a time when universities are encountering increased numbers of underprepared students who may have limited cultural and social capital as they enter the arena of higher education.

2. Recognizing the whole student experience, from managing pre-entry expectations, to supporting first year students with specific technology training, to providing a range of non-technical support services online as part of a top quality, technology-enabled first year experience.

## **2.9 Student Characteristics**

Neo (2004) described the actions of a student group in an effective online learning environment as being able to: 1) be autonomous and solely responsible for the decision making and negotiations in the group, 2) be responsible for learning outcomes and internal group management, 3) conduct meetings to determine best possible solution to solve group tasks, 4) conduct and acquire research information using the Internet and 5) solve and manage group dynamics and conflicts and work cooperatively with team members and group leaders.

A variety of characteristics with potential influence on student learning outcomes in an online environment have been identified in the literature (Colley, Gale, and Harris ,1994) state that variables such as prior experience, availability of a computer at home and personality-produced gender difference towards computers influence the student's reaction towards the learning environment. In addition to gender, other demographic characteristics are likely to impact on the effectiveness of online delivery. The demographic variable (of specific interest to this study) which relates to the country of origin of the students is also discussed in subsequent sections.

(Leidner and Jarvenpaa ,1995) also suggested that students lacking the necessary basic skills and self-discipline might do better in a traditionally delivered mode. Similarly, the brightest and most motivated students may prefer to learn in an individual competitive environment, rather than sharing their knowledge

with less motivated, less bright students in a traditional classroom setting. (Moore, 1993) states that students should be independent learners who can learn how to cope with learning difficulties and there is the need of possessing internal motivation to be able to cope well in the online learning environment. (Harriman, 2004) argues that age and prior computer-experiences are factors that influence how students cope with an online environment.

Many seminal thinkers in the field of online learning (Brown, 2005; Hung, 2001; Oliver, 2000) concur that constructivist learning is the most applicable pedagogy for online learning. This viewpoint has been supported by research studies conducted by (Bryceson 2001; 2002, McMahon 1997; Neo and Neo 2001). However, constructivist-based practices have not been without their critics. (Dick, 1992) claimed that the approach was—inefficient and ineffective due to the lack of specific learning objectives and outcomes. He further criticised that assessment was also a problem as constructivists were concerned about context—but more for instruction than individual assessment. (Akerlind and Trevitt, 1995) also highlighted that the introduction of computers in constructivist learning in higher education may conflict with students' past educational experiences, and this may result in stress for the students.

Earlier in this chapter, it was suggested that Asian international students, because of their cultural and educational backgrounds, may not be well suited to constructivist learning environments (Hofstede, 2001). A high level of critical thinking skills is emphasised in the constructivist learning theories, as students tend to solve problems in realistic ways and have to carry out in-depth investigations on the studied problem. (Verkroost, Meijerink Lintsen, and Veen, 2008) point out, within universities—educational practice was often more teacher-centred than student-centred because first-year students have difficulty dealing with the responsibilities they faced when they entered university. (Krause, Hartley, James, and McInnis 2005) stress that first year experience has a crucial influence on university students' performance, engagement with their peers, faculty and the learning environment. (Krause & Coates 2008) also emphasise that students' early experiences with online learning could be greatly impacted by information and communication technology.

Therefore, if the intention is to implement student-centred, online learning based on constructivist models of learning, then the research literature clearly indicates that it is imperative that students be given a lot of assistance in developing the strategies and skills necessary for self-directed constructivist learning. This is particularly the case if the first year students happen to be adult learners and/or Asian international students. According to (Conrad & Donaldson 2004), as most adult learners have been educated in teacher-centred environments, they tend to be more passive when it comes to learning in an online learning environment. Since most of the students from Asian countries have almost exclusively experienced teacher-centred learning, those who came to Australia for their tertiary studies often find it hard to adjust to a constructivist approach that is student-centred and needs a high degree of self-discipline and self-motivation.

(Walberg, 1976), in contrast, believed that psychology was a science of mental life and perception was a key aspect of human behaviour. This belief led (Walberg, 1976) to propose that participants in the learning environments (such as students and lecturers) could quite successfully express their views on various aspects of said environments. The work of (Walberg, 1976; Moos, 1974) has since led to the development of a variety of valid and reliable learning environment instruments. Each instrument was designed to quantitatively measure different variables within each dimension. The use of these instruments gives an idea of students' perceptions of their learning environment. Additionally, the quantitative data can be used to establish associations between numerous other variables, such as achievement and attitudes (Fraser, 1998). Since the development of the Learning Environment Inventory (LEI) in the 1970s, a range of instruments has been developed to understand classroom learning environments. In the last decade, learning environment instruments have been developed specifically for online environments. The Online Learning Environment Instrument (OLEI) (Trinidad & Pearson, 2004, 2005) was developed to understand more about learners' perceptions of their technology-rich learning environment. A modified version of this instrument was used in this study to ascertain students' perceptions of their online learning environment at university.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.0 INTRODUCTION**

This chapter presents the methodology that will be used to conduct the study.

#### **3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN**

This study made use of a Survey and a cross-sectional study which was carried out within the period of 6-months.

#### **3.2 POPULATION OF THE STUDY**

The study used all full time Hospitality students in Wave crest and Yabatech which makes up to 455 students. 120 students from Wave crest and 355 student from Yabatech.

#### **3.3 SAMPLING SIZE AND SAMPLING TECHNIQUE**

The respondents of the study were selected using a purposive non-probability sampling. The sample size is 212 after calculating using a Taro Yemen formula. Out of 212 students, 156 online survey were returned.

#### **3.4 RESTATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

The recent outbreak of Covid -19 pandemic resulted in the lockdown of every sector of the economy to reduce the spread of this deadly disease and the educational sector is not left out. The researcher noticed that online learning which is not new in the educational sector began to gain more recognition among educational stakeholders. The focus of teaching and learning from face to face shifted to virtual learning using various interface such as zoom, webinar, Google and what Sapp. Despite the enormous benefits of utilizing the online mode of learning, students were still finding it difficult to cope with the recent paradigm

shift from the traditional method of learning to online mode. This study therefore, seeks to investigate the perception of hospitality students' on online learning tools.

### 3.5 RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

A questionnaire was used to collect data that were subsequently analyzed to reach conclusions for this research. The questions were both open ended and close ended. 4-point likert scale variables (strongly agree to strongly disagree) were used to measure respondents' level of agreement to .5

### 3.6 VALIDITY OF INSTRUMENT

The researcher used a Face validity to test the instrument. The online survey was given to my supervisor before distributing and corrections were made. The researcher further gave it to an expert in Yabatech to check that the items is in correspondence with the objectives.

### 3.7 REALIABILITY

The reliability for the research instrument was determined through the use of Cronbach Alpha method and the reliability coefficient is 0.72. The reliability table is highlighted below

**Scale: ALL VARIABLES**

#### Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.587	.570	12

Table 2: Reliability statistics

After removing item no 18 online class is boring then the reliability increase to 0.72

**Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.722	.687	11

**3.8 METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION**

The researcher met with a lecturer who teaches in the hospitality department of Yabatech to help get access to the students WhatsApp group. The questionnaires were distributed online to students via their WhatsApp group. Google forms were also used to obtain responses from the subjects.

**3.9 METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS**

Statistical package for social science (spss) version 20 was used to analyse the data collected from the respondents. The likert scale was also analyzed by calculating the mean of all points to arrive at whether the statement was accepted or rejected. The open ended question were also be analysed using content analyses by grouping similar responses and calculating the frequency. This was done in order to capture the open expressions of the respondents and draw a better conclusion.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**4.0** This chapter presents the result of the findings from data obtained and analyzed as answers to the stated research questions raised in the study and the set hypothesis

#### **4.1 Presentation of demographic data**

##### **Demographic data of respondents**

**Table 3: Distribution of Respondents by Gender**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage %</b>
Female	137	87.8
Male	19	12.2

Table 3 shows the respondent's gender, it shows that almost all the respondents 87.8 % are female while 12.2 % are male. This means more female were sampled in the study.

**Table 4: Distribution of Respondents by Age**

<b>Age (in years)</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage %</b>
Below 20	10	6.4
20-25	106	67.9
26 -31	28	17.9
31 and above	12	7.7

Table 4 reveals the a little above average 67.9 % of the respondents are between the ages of 20 - 25 years, 17.9 % are between the ages of 26 - 31 years, 7.7% are 31 years and above. This implies most of the respondents were between the ages of 20-25 years of age

**Table 5: Distribution of Respondents by Marital Status**

Marital status	Frequency	Percentage %
Married	5	3.2
Single	151	96.8

Table 5 shows that almost all the respondents 96.8% are single while 3.2 % are married. This implies most of the respondents are not married.

**Table 6: Distribution of Respondents by Educational Level**

Educational level	Frequency	Percentage %
HND II	39	25.0
HND I	10	6.4
ND II	82	52.6
ND I	25	16.0

Table 6 reveals the educational level of students, average of the respondents 52.6% are ND II students, 25.0% of the respondents are HND II students, 16.0% are ND I students while 6.4% are HND I students. This means most of the respondents are ND II students

**Table 7: Ranking of various Platform utilized for Online Learning**

Platform	Frequency	Percentage	Rank	Remark
Whatsapp	140	89.7	1.0	1 <sup>st</sup>
Zoom	54	34.6	2.0	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Google	52	33.3	3.0	3 <sup>rd</sup>
Teams	28	17.9	4.0	4 <sup>th</sup>
Webinar	4	2.6	5.0	5 <sup>th</sup>
Others	2	1.3	6.0	6 <sup>th</sup>

Table 7, shows the ranking of various platforms utilized for online learning. It reveals that the highest proportion of the respondents 89.7% utilize what Sapp rank 1<sup>st</sup>, 34.6% utilize zoom rank 2<sup>nd</sup>, followed by 33.3% utilize Google rank 3<sup>rd</sup>. Also, 17.9% utilize Teams rank 4<sup>th</sup>, 2.6% webinar rank 5<sup>th</sup> and the least 1.3% rank least. It can be concluded that almost all the participants utilize What Sapp as a platform for online learning

**Table 8: Ranking of various Devices utilized for Online Learning**

	Frequency	Percentage	Rank	Remark
Android Phones	140	58.3	1.0	1 <sup>st</sup>
I-phones	54	34.0	2.0	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Laptop	50	32.1	3.0	3 <sup>rd</sup>
Tablet	15	9.6	4.0	4 <sup>th</sup>
Desktop	12	7.7	5.0	5 <sup>th</sup>
Windows Phones	6	3.9	6.0	6 <sup>th</sup>

Table 8, shows the ranking of various devices utilized for online learning. It was observed that above average of the respondents 58.3% utilize android phones, followed by 34.0 % utilize I-phones while 32.1% utilize laptop. Also, 9.6% utilize tablet, 7.7% utilize desktop computers while few of the students 3.9 % utilize window phones for online learning. It can be concluded that almost all the participants utilize Android phones as device for online learning while few of the respondents utilize window phones

**Table 9: Perceived Use of Online Learning Tools**

Statements	Strongly Agree (4)	Agree (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	$\bar{X}$	Remark
The battery of device utilize for online learning run down during lecture	63 (40.4)	76 (48.7)	13 ( 8.3)	4 (2.6)	3.3	Agreed
The internet connection of my service provider is slow during lecture	42 (26.9)	83 (53.2)	27 (17.3)	4 (2.6)	3.0	Agreed
The reliable internet connection enhances the flow during lecture	47 ( 30.1)	70 (44.9)	33 (21.2)	6 (3.8)	3.0	Agreed
The online learning class consume my device battery during lecture	74 (47.4)	67 (42.9)	15 (9.6)	-	3.4	Agreed
my device storage capacity is large enough to save materials from online class	22 (14.1)	54 (34.6)	53 (34.0)	27 (17.3)	2.5	Agreed
I prefer the use of short videos to normal face to face learning	6 (3.8)	43 (27.6)	70 (44.9)	37 (23.7)	2.1	Disagree d
online class is boring	47 (30.1)	66 (42.3)	29 (18.6)	14 (9.0)	2.9	Agreed
Over all Mean = 2.9						

**N.B \*Figures in parentheses is percentages**

Table 9 reveals respondents' perception on online learning tools. It reveals 48.7% agrees and 40.4% strongly agree with the statement that the battery of device utilize for online learning run down during lecture while 8.35 disagrees. Also, 53.2 % agrees that the internet connection of my service provider is slow during lecture while 26.9% strongly agree and 17.3% agrees with the statement. It also reveals 44.9 % agree and 30.1% strongly agree that the reliable internet connection enhances the flow during lecture.

Also, 47.4% strongly agree and 42.9% agree with the statement that the online learning class consume their device battery during lecture while 9.6 % disagrees. Also, 34.6 % agree and 34.0% disagree with the statement that their device storage capacity is large enough to save materials from online class while 17.3% strongly disagree with the statement. Also, 44.9% and 27.6% disagrees and agrees respectively with the statement that they prefer the use of short videos to normal face to face learning while 23.7% disagrees. Also, 42.3% agrees and 30.1% strongly agree with the statement that online class is boring while 18.6% disagrees with the statement. The mean score for the statements which the respondents agreed on are 3.4, 3.3, 3.0, 2.9, 2.5 and disagreed with statement with mean of 2.1. The average mean of the items is 2.9 which implies students have positive perception towards the utilization of online learning tools

**Table 10: Distribution on Benefits of Online Learning Tools**

<b>Statements</b>	<b>Strongly Agree (4)</b>	<b>Agree (3)</b>	<b>Disagree (2)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree (1)</b>	<b><math>\bar{X}</math></b>	<b>Remark</b>
online learning enhances my academic performance in last semester exam	14 (9.0)	29 (18.6)	62 (39.7)	51 (32.7)	2.0	Disagreed

online learning made it easy to understand some difficult topics	9 (5.8)	33 (21.2)	64 (41.0)	50 (32.1)	2.0	Disagreed
Self- assessment through online assist in learning	22 (14.1)	65 (41.7)	47 (30.1)	21 (13.5)	2.6	Agreed
short videos utilize for explanation increases mastery of concept	28 (17.9)	78 (50.0)	34 (21.8)	16 (10.3)	2.8	Agreed
the online class encourages learning at my own pace	30 (19.2)	54 (34.6)	49 (31.4)	21 (13.5)	2.6	Agreed

Table 10 reveals benefits of online learning tools, it reveals that 39.7% disagrees and 32.7% strongly disagrees with the statement that online learning enhances their academic performance in last semester exam while 18.6% agrees with the statement. Also, 41.0 % and 32.1 % disagrees and strongly disagrees respectively with the statement that online learning made it easy to understand some difficult topics while 21.2 agrees with the statement. Also, 41.7% agrees and 30.1% disagrees with the statement that self- assessment through online assist in learning while 14.1% strongly agrees and strongly disagrees with the statement. Also, half of the respondents 50.0% agree and 21.8% disagree with the statement short videos utilize for explanation increases mastery of concept while 17.9% strongly agree with the statement. Also, 34.6% and 31.4% agrees and disagrees respectively with the statement that the online class encourages learning at their own pace while 19.2% strongly agree with the statement. The mean score for the statements which the respondents agreed on are 2.6, 2.8 and disagreed with the statement with mean of 2.0. This means online learning tools have its own advantages and disadvantages

**Table 11: Perceived Continuous Utilization of Online Tools**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
Do you wish to continue utilizing online learning for further studies	42 (26.9)	114 ( 73.1)

N.B \*Figures in parentheses is percentages

Table 11 reveals studies perceived utilization of online learning, it reveals almost all the respondents 73.1% do not support the view of continuous utilization of online learning for further studies while 26.9 % are in supports. It means respondents do not wish to continue utilizing online learning for further studies

**Table 12: Reasons to continue usage of online learning tools**

	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
1	It encourages learning at your own pace	2 (1.3)
2	Short videos makes it easy for me to go back and revise when i'm during studying Spent too long learning online and the experience has been mentally draining	2 (1.3)
3	It affords me the opportunities to learn at my pace and learn anywhere at anytime	4 (2.6)
4	it helps to expose students to various use of technology and also to be civilized.	1(0.6)
5	It is my style of accumulating faster as a visual learner.	1(0.6)
6	it helps to expose students to various use of technology and also to be civilized.	2(1.3)

7	As technology takes up the trend of the world, online learn will be encouraged. This will make it easy for student to learn anywhere and anytime. It's just like life made easy.	2(1.3)
8	Online lectures keeps the lectures on their toes and lets them do enough research and pay attention during class	1 (0.6)
9	I wish to continue utilizing online learning because I can basically learn anywhere	1(0.6)
10	I can always go back to Read/listen	1(0.6)
11	Online learning makes learning faster	1(0.6)

N.B \***Figures in parentheses is percentages**

Table 12 reveals the various reasons to continue the use of online tools, 2.6% of the respondents want to continue the use of online tools because it affords them the opportunities to learn at their own pace and learn anywhere at any time. Also 1.3% of the respondents want to continue because short videos makes it easy for me to go back and revise when i'm during studying Spent too long learning online and the experience has been mentally draining. it helps to expose students to various use of technology and be civilized. Also, technology takes up the trend of the world, online learn will be encouraged. This will make it easy for student to learn anywhere and anytime. It's just like life made easy.

**Table 13: Reasons to discontinue usage of online learning tools**

	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
1	Online learning did not really help me in my grades	1(0.6)
2	. Online learning consume my data and I don't learn more.	1(0.6)
3	I don't understand the Lecturer's explanation during Online classes.	2 (1.3)
4	The need not to ignore the fact that some courses required physical class like for calculation courses and practical classes	1(0.6)
5	Assessment of student's performance is not easy	1(0.6)
6	Because it makes us lazy and we don't get to understand the topics	2(1.3)
7	Because of the data consuming and it takes a lot time	2(1.3)
8	Because most of the lecturers abusive the opportunity as they start classes whenever they're free and they forget not all students do not have access and time to their phones when at home.	2(1.3)
9	Network and battery issues .	2(1.3)
10	Occupied with daily duties at home, no enough time to study while at home.	1(0.6)
11	Physical has proven better .	1(0.6)
12	Online class is battery and data consuming.	2(1.3)
13	Because if we are to continue online learning it will make some people not to take their studies serious and it will give room to failure	2(1.3)
14	Some lecturers cannot utilize online learning effectively and it affected me in one course because she couldn't carry me along.	2(1.3)
15	This because, school premises has greater inspiration than home when you are in school premises you study more especially when studying in groups but when you are at home you can't study in groups or learn from others also online class consume data which lead the students into double expenses.	1(0.6)
16	Students don't study well because they are using their phone and with their phone they get to engage in other Things.	1(0.6)
17	Online teaching doesn't really enhance method of learning.	1(0.6)
18	Online learning makes one lazy.	2(1.3)
19	Students don't study well because they are using their phone and with their phone they get to engage in other Things	2(1.3)
20	The online class has never be friendly to is at all there are lot of challenges that we are facing, please we need to go back to the normal physical class.	2(1.3)
21	This because, school premises has greater inspiration than home when you are in school premises you study more especially when studying in groups but when you are at home you can't study in	2(1.3)

	groups or learn from others also online class consume data which lead the students into double expenses	
22	Yabatech is not equipped for online learning and the cost to data consumed during online learning is something else especially if it is video like zoom and some of the lecturers are reluctant to teach they will just come online and give you topic and ask you what you understand without teaching the topic at all.	1(0.6)
23	The online learning we did last year cannot be considered "online learning." It was more of WhatsApp learning. I wish the school had a few weeks to use to establish a proper mode of online learning for its students.	1(0.6)
24	Students don't study well because they are using their phone and with their phone they get to engage in other things	1(0.6)
25	No because most of us our phones is out of order,some of us are managing our phones	1(0.6)
26	I find it hard to meet up with the online class, most of the time there is no good network	2(1.3)
27	It affected the results of some students who were not able to easily understand lectures without the presence of lecturer.	2(1.3)
28	I wish to continue utilizing online learning for further studies so as to get used to it, because online learning is now part if the new normal, so that when anything comes up we will be able to go through online classes easily and understandably.	1(0.6)
29	I would actually like it if certain materials are used to aid our understanding better used to aid the students	1(0.6)
30	The network is unreliable and there are lots of distractions	2(1.3)
31	Is it too expensive to maintain, and also if doesnt guarantees 100% understanding	2(1.3)
32	It is a slow means in learning	2(1.3)
33	It has proven not to work well for me as other things come up between learning time.	2(1.3)
34	From not assimilating to network issues down to lecturers not giving explicit explanation on topics. Most lecturers just drop notes and that's it they don't explain topics.	1(0.6)
35	It is distracting and technology issues It wasn't easy during the online lectures	1(0.6)

**N.B: figures in parentheses are in percentage**

Table 13 reveals various reasons why they should discontinue online learning, 1.3% of the respondents because I don't understand the Lecturer's explanation during Online, I find it very difficult to comprehend all topics, Learning online is really difficult because most of the lecturers does not really knows how to explain and at times during the online lectures one get easily distracted, it has proven not to work well for me as other

things comes up between learning time. It is a slow means in learning, Is it too expensive to maintain, and also if does not guarantees 100% understanding, The network is unreliable and there are lots of distractions. Online learning makes one lazy, Students don't study well because they are using their phone and with their phone they get to engage in other Things. The online class has never be friendly to is at all there are lot of challenges that we are facing, please we need to go back to the normal physical class, This because, school premises has greater inspiration than home when you are in school premises you study more especially when studying in groups but when you are at home you can't study in groups or learn from others also online class consume data which lead the students into double expenses, Online class is battery and data consuming. Because if we are to continue online learning it will make some people not to take their studies serious and it will give room to failure and some lecturers cannot utilize online learning effectively and it affected me in one course because she couldn't carry me along.

#### **4.2 Testing of Hypothesis**

Ho- there is no significant influence of student's educational level on their perceived utilization of online learning tools

**Table 14: Chi-square test of education level on perceived online utility tools**

	<b>Value</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Assumptions (2 -tailed)</b>
<b>Pearson chi-square</b>	36.5	16	0.00
<b>No of valid cases</b>	89		

From table 14 , since the P-value is 0.05 which is significant at 0.00. Then, students educational level influences their perceive utility of online learning tools. This means there is significant influence of student's educational level on their perceived utilization of online learning tools. It implies that the various class level affects their perception on the utilization of online tools

### **4.3 Discussion of Findings**

This study revealed that almost all the participants utilize What Sapp as a platform for online learning. The findings of this study are in accordance with Klein, Noe, and Wang (2006) and Martins and Kellermans (2004) on the usability of the learning management system is important with applications such as interactive video, bulletin boards, chat rooms

This study revealed that students have positive perception towards the utilization of online learning tools which is in agreement with Hara & Kling (1999) assertion that online learning enables institutions and/or instructors to reach new learners at a distance, increase convenience, and expand education opportunities. Also, in agreement with Papadakis (2018) assertion online learning tools that students' acceptance is perhaps the most important factor for a successful learning.

This study reveals various reason to continue on the use of online learning tools which is in support of Papadakis (2018) on the greater knowledge will allow reconfiguring online tools in order to facilitate a better personal use in the virtual learning environment. Also, in accordance with Grieve, Padgett and Mortfit (2016) that empirical analyses have shown that online feedback will be more effective if feedback tools facilitate the perception of social presence

This study reveals there are enormous benefits of online learning tools which correspondence with Brecht and Ogilby (2008) found out that tools based on video allow a comprehensive teaching-learning strategy which would enhance the acquisition of various skills. Also, in agreement with Hofmann (2002) that describe online learning has increased flexibility in meeting the needs of students for learning, independent of time, place or circumstances, and to be a solution for the increasing demand of lifelong learning.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **5.1 Summary of Findings**

- (i) The study showed that almost all the participants utilize What Sapp as a platform for online learning
- (ii) This study revealed that almost all the participants utilize Android phones as device for online learning while few of the respondents utilize window phones
- (iii) This study revealed that students have positive perception towards the utilization of online learning tools.
- (iv) This study showed the benefits of online learning are Self- assessment, short videos utilize for explanation increases mastery of concept and it encourages students learning at their own pace
- (v) This study revealed the various class level affect their perception on the utilization of online tools
- (vi) The result of this study showed that respondents do not wish to continue utilizing online learning for further studies

#### **5.2 Conclusion**

Results of research study regarding the study on perception of hospitality students on online learning tools stipulated the following conclusions: The benefits of utilizing online learning are enormous but have some shortcomings that need to be overcome for the mode of study to be accepted by learners and teachers. Although students perceived the online learning tools to be accessible and useable but they do not wish to continue with the utilization of online tools

#### **5.3 Recommendations**

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations were made.

- (i) There is need for teachers to utilise blended mode of study where the online learning and physical is utilized for effective teaching
- (ii) The need for regular training of teachers on the utilization of online learning tools that is effective
- (iii) Schools should endeavor to provide free Wi-Fi for students to access INTERNET using various online learning tools
- (iv) Teacher should ensure the videos posted for online teaching are very short and accessible considering data consumption among students
- (v) There is need for further study on the new software's for online assessment of students' achievement.

#### **REFERENCES**

- Allen, E., & Seaman, J. (2003) Sizing the opportunity: The quality and extent of online education in the United States. Retrieved from <http://www.sloan.c.org/resources/sizingopportunity.pdf>
- Baldwin –Evans, K. (2006). Blended learning; the what, where, when and how. Training & Management Development Methods, 20(1), 53-66
- Beadle, M., & Santy, J. (2008). The early benefits of a problem-based approach to teaching social inclusion using an online Virtual town. Nurse Education in practice, 8(3), 190-196
- Blankson, J., & Kyei-Blankson, L. (2008). Non traditional students' perception of a blended courses integrating synchronous online discussion and face-to-face instruction. Journal Of Interactive Learning Research, 19(3), 421-432
- Bryceson, K. (2002). Scaffolding for online teaching: Using social constructivism and the concept of 'Ba' as a theoretical framework. Unpublished graduate certificate of Higher Education thesis, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia.

Carvus, N., Bicen, H., Akil., U.(2008). The opinions of information technology students on using mobile learning. In proceedings of the 08 International Conferences on Education Sciences, Eastern Mediterranean University, Magosa, North Cyprus, 23-25 Available online: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED503539.pdf>(accessed on 12 April 2020).

Chen, P.D., Lambert, A.D., Guidry, K.R.( 2010). Engaging online learners: The impact of web-based technology on college student : 54, 1222-1232.

Chou ,C.(2003). Interactivity and interactive functions in web- based learning systems: A teaching framework for designers, British Journal of Educational Technology, 34(3),265-79

Clark, L., & James,P.(2005). Blended learning : An approach to delivery science courses online.Proceedings of the blended learning in science Teaching and Learning Symposium, 19-24 Sydney: Uniserve Science

Colley, A.M.,Gale, M,=.T.,& Harris. T.A.( 1994)der role ident. Effects of gender role identity and experience on computer attitude components. Journal of Educational Computing Research,10(2), 129-137

De la Fuente Sanchez, D., Solis, M.H., Martos, I.P com., (2003). Mini Video : 16, 177-192.

Dickey, M. ( 2004). The impact of web-logs(blogs) on student perception of isolation and alienation in a web-based distance-learning environment. Open learning Journal. Open Distance e-learn.19, 279-291.

Driscoll , M(2012). Blended learning : let.s get beyond the types. Retrieved from [http://www.07.1bm.com/services/pdf/blended\\_learning.pdf](http://www.07.1bm.com/services/pdf/blended_learning.pdf)

Edward , C.(2004).Classroom Management and discipline (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: Johm Willey & son

Frazer , D.J. (1998). Classroom environment instruments; Developing, validity and applications. Learning Environment Research: An International Journal ,1(1).7-33.

Hamman, S.(2004). Learning in 3D;students' experience of online projects in NSW, paper presented at the Twenty seventh Association for Educational communication and Technology,Chicago,IL.

Harris ,P., Connolly.J., & Ferry, L. ( 2009). Blended learning : Overview and recommendation for successful implementation. Industrial & Commercial Training. 41(3), 155-163

Harry, k., Jon, M., Keegan, D. ( 1993). Typology of distance teaching systems. In Distance Education: New Perspective; ,Eds.;Routledge:London, UK;New York, USA,;pp.62-76.

Holder, B. ( 2007). An investigation of hope, academics, environment and motivation as predictors of persistence in higher education online programs. Internet Higher Education. 10,245-260.

Kalogiannakis, M., Papadakis, S. ( 2019). Evaluating pre- service kindergarten teachers' intention to adopt and use tablets into teaching practice for natural sciences. International Journal of Mobile Learning Organisation. 13, 113-127.

Kim, R.H. ( 2010). Self – Directed Learning Management System: Enabling Competency and Self – Efficacy in Online Learning Environments. Ph.D. Thesis, The Claremont Graduate University, Claremont, CA, USA.

Kizilcec, R.F., Halawa, S. (2015). Attribution and achievement gaps in online learning . In proceedings of the Second ACM Conference on Learning@ Scale, Vanncouver,BC, Canada; pp.57-66.

Kreijns, K., Kirschner, P., Jochems, W.( 2003). Identifying the pitfalls for social interaction in computer-supported collaborative learning environments: A review of the research. Computing Human Behaviour. 19,335-553.

Kvavik, R.B.( 2005 ). Convenience, Communications & Control: How students use technology . In D.Oblinger & J. oblinger(eds.), Educating the net generation (pp7.1-7.20)- Boulder, CO:EDUCAUSE. Retrieved from <http://www.educause.edu/educatingthenetgen>

Leidner, D., & Jarvenpan, S. ( 1995). The use of information technology to enhance management school education: A theoretical view. *Mis quarterly*,19(3), 265-292

Martins, L.L., Kellermanns , F.W. ( 2004). A model of business school students' acceptance of a web- based course management system. *Academic Management Learning Education*. 3, 7-26.

McGrath, D., Crowley, L., Rao, S., Toomey, M., Hannigan, A., Murphy, L., Dunne,C.P. ( 2015). Outcomes of Irish graduate entry medical student engagement with self- directed learning of clinical skills. *BMC Medical Education*. 15, 21.

Molnar,G.( 2019 ). Digital instruction or the digitalization of instruction in modern ICT environment. *Opus et Education*.

Moore , M.G.( 1993 ). Theory of transactional distance. In D.Keegan (Ed.), *Theoretical principles of distance education* (pp22-38). New York:Routledg

Murnie, J. (2001) . Adapting the online education to different learning styles. Paper presented at the 22nd National Educational Computing Conference , Chicago 11.

Neo , M. ( 2004). Cooperative learning on the web: A group based student centred learning experience in the Malaysian ar. *Australian journal of Educational Technology*, 20(2), 171-170

Pearson, J., ( 1997). Lurking,, anonymity and participation in computer confaerencing: data from a case study on an initial teacher education course. presented at the communications and Networking in Education Conference, Hameenlina, Finland.

Perdisco ( 2009). E- learning in Australian Universities opportunities and challeges. Retrieved from <http://www.perdisco.com/australianchiwp.asp>.

Richardson, J., Lenaric, J. (2008). Text Messaging as a Catalyst for Mobile Student Administration: The ‘‘Trigger’’ Experience. *int.J.Emerg.Technol.* 6, 140-155.

Rodriguez, J.E.(2020). Social Media Use in Higher Education: Key Areas to Consider For Educators. Available online:[https://our.oakland.edu/handle/10323/rodriguez\\_1211.pdf](https://our.oakland.edu/handle/10323/rodriguez_1211.pdf) (accessed on 12 April 2020).

Serwatka ,J.A.(1999). Internet distance Learning, How do I put course on the web? The journal : Technological Horizons in Educessation, 26( 10), 71-75

Shin, N. (2003). Transactional presence as a critical predictor of success in distance learning. *Distance Education*; 24, 69-86.

Simonson, M.; Smaldino, S., Albright, M.; Zvacek, S. (2006) *Teaching and Learning At A Distance: Foundations of Distance*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed.; Pearson: Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA.

Traxler, J. (2007). Defining, discussing and evaluating mobile learning: The moving finger writ. *Int.Rev.Res. Open Distribution. Learn*; 8, 1-12.

Unwin, A.( 2007). The professionalism of the higher education teacher: What’s ICT got to do with it? *Teaching Higher Education*; 12, 295-308.

Volery.T., & Lord, D. ( 2006). Critical Success factors in online education . *The international Journal of Educational Management*,14(5),216-223

Walberg,H.J.(1976). Psychology of learning environment, behavioural, structural or perceptual? *Review of Research in Education* 4 142-147

Wang , M.(2007). Designing online course that effectively engage learners from diverse cultural backgrounds. *British Journal of Educational Technology* 28(2), 294- 311

White, D.H., Robertson, L.(2014). Implementing assistive technologies : A study on co-learning in the Canadian elementary school context. *Computing Human Behaviour*.

Williams,R., Karousou, R., Mackness, J. ( 2011). Emergent learning and learning ecologies in web 2.0. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*: 12, 39-59. Available online :<http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/883> ( accessed on 4 May 2020).

Wondwosen, T.; Damtew, T. (2020). COVID-19 Poses a Serious Threat to Higher Education; the Impact of the COVID-19 Crisis. *International Network for Higher Education in Africa*.

Ziegler,M.,Paulus,T., & Wood side, M.(2003). Creating a climate of engagement in a blended learning environment. *Journal of International Learning Research* 17(3),295-318