

Association between preference and e-learning readiness among the Bangladeshi female nursing students in the Covid-19 pandemic: a cross-sectional study

Humayun Kabir^{a, b}, Tajrin Tahrin Tonmon^{a, c, #}, Md. Kamrul Hasan^{a, d, #, *}, and Dipak Kumar Mitra^a

^aDepartment of Public Health, North South University, Dhaka- 1229, Bangladesh

^bCRP Nursing College, Savar, Dhaka- 1343, Bangladesh

^cDepartment of Anthropology, Jahangirnagar University, Savar, Dhaka- 1342, Bangladesh

^dDepartment of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Tejgaon College, National University of Bangladesh, Gazipur- 1704, Bangladesh

Equal contribution

*Corresponding author:

Md. Kamrul Hasan;
MPH (In course)
Department of Public Health
North South University
Plot 15, Block B, Bashundhara
Dhaka- 1229, Bangladesh
Email: kamrul.hasan11@northsouth.edu

Abstract:

The COVID-19 pandemic jeopardized the traditional academic learning calendars due to the closing of all educational institutions across the globe. To keep up with the flow of learning most of the educational institutions shifted toward e-learning. However, the questions of the students' e-learning preference for various sub-domains of e-learning readiness did not identify, particularly among the female nursing students' for a developing country like Bangladesh, where those domains pose serious challenges. A cross-sectional study was conducted among the female nursing

students' perceived e-learning readiness in sub-domains of readiness; availability of technology, use of technology, self-confidence, and acceptance. About 237 nursing students were recruited, who have enrolled in e-learning at least the last 30 days of the participation. A multivariable linear regression model was fitted to find the association between students' preference and of the perceived e-learning readiness with demographic and e-learning related factors. The findings of the study revealed that more than half of the students, 56.54% (n=134) did not prefer e-learning. The students did not prefer e-learning compared to 'prefer group' has significantly less availability of technology ($\beta = -3.01$, 95% CI: -4.46, -1.56), less use of technology ($\beta = -3.08$, 95% CI: -5.11, -1.06), less self-confidence ($\beta = -4.50$, 95% CI: -7.02, -1.98), and less acceptance ($\beta = -5.96$, 95% CI: -7.76, -4.16). The age, degree, residence, parents' highest education, having a single room, having any eye problems significantly associated with the variation of availability of technology, use of technology, self-confidence, and acceptance for e-learning. The outcomes of the study could be helpful while developing an effective and productive e-learning infrastructure regarding the preparedness of nursing colleges for the continuation of academia in any adverse circumstances like the COVID-19 pandemic.

Keywords: Covid-19, e-learning, nursing students, availability of technology, use of technology, self-confidence, acceptance.

1. Introduction:

E-learning is addressed as web-applications that enabled the participation of individuals either distinctively or synergistically involving collaborative digital medium and virtual classrooms to reciprocate lessons via online settings [1]. Such pedagogical structure accedes the mentee to stay hooked asynchronously with academic learning activities continue with the access of proper internet supplementation into the adapted devices [2]. Worldwide, healthcare educators were seen adapting this evolutionary method of education strategically with the help of continuously developed technologies as a distant instructional teaching component to share their knowledge and skills around the health communities [3]. This required a fundamental shift of electronic device and internet-based teacher-learner reciprocity from the conventional physical presence-based education deliverance strategy [2].

Both locally and internationally, increased interest in nursing educational programs continuation via e-learning is seen accelerating due to the concurrent need of timekeeping in mind the prime

contents of it, which are quality, social distancing for emergency health occurrences, time flexibility, and cost-effectiveness [4]. In nursing, e-learning, when were accessible through hospital websites for the nurses, allowed them to widen their knowledge and skills by taking their necessary courses as the service deliverance heavily depends on their enriched cognizance. Besides, available nursing care information through the hospital websites implement the healthcare organizations to renovate professional and personal growth among the nursing community [5]. The widely evident term e-learning facilitated the nursing learning system since the 1960s, according to the findings of the CAL (Computer-assisted learning) studies in the nursing literature where debates were persistent about the consolidated skill accretion of the nurses and the proficiency of conventional teaching methods within the clinical environment [6]. Ironically, e-learning had a greater drop-out rate than the traditional delivered education, despite the advantages, in accordance with another study findings, due to the lacking in computer competency, browser handling, unavailability of adequate technologies, and nursing students' acceptancy towards it [7]. E-learning concentrates on three parts enormously which includes the appropriate words used for the presentations, in particular, the networking medium used for it and the pedagogic motive to bring constructive changes in people's lore [8]. This system of learning continued to grow with the growing interest of both faculty and pupils apart from the technical support upliftment with helping in courseware delivery [9]. These online course delivery models can be both coeval and nonsynchronous [10]. Regardless of the models, e-learning was adhered to globally as the timely educational plan of action to adopt during the COVID- 19 pandemic situation in medical and nursing education due to the ongoing quarantined period [11]-[12].

Though, dissensions are present regarding the e-learning educational system, by making sure the accessibility, affordability, and flexibility of this systems' teaching disquisition from both the disseminators' and receivers' sides, the learning capacity of the students can be developed for life-long study purposes [13]. The learning process should be utilized in accordance with the learners' necessity and capacity to accommodate, assess and contemplate the instructors' recitation [14]. Students should be prioritized to be trained to perform well while using the web-based educational method [12]. Although, it was found in a study that despite the training, e-learning could be depressive and stressful for visually impaired students [15]. To avoid these problems, specifications and standards using contents present in the LMS (Learning Management System) need to be created and accessed for the disabled people to access all the information given and

overcome the sufferings [16]. It was observed in studies that the quality of the training programs needs to be improved and to develop the learning experience of the nursing students, training on generalized caregiving skills, knowledge, and self-efficacy of mental health should be provided [17]. From a different point of view, in several studies, gender differences played some roles in perceiving e-learning. Perceived usage experience and the intention to learn, the benefit of technology-based learning were found slightly dominating among the males rather than the females [18].

In Brazil, the nursing web-based education was seen more practiced for the research projects of the universities linked with the nursing area [1]. In a study of Canada, Cognitive Load Theory (CLT) was used among the nursing students to limit the idiosyncratic load on their memory capacity [10]. Whereas, in a Bangladeshi study observing the challenges in continuing the e-learning, it was found that electronic and networking support is still not well built to manage the cost and accessibility affordable regardless of the regions and socioeconomic backgrounds of the country people [19]. Another study was seen bringing up the rural perspective of Bangladesh regarding e-learning where relevant online learning tools were used to deliver the lessons to evolve the predominant rural Bangladeshi learners into skilled personnel [20].

E-Learning is a fast-networking virtual process causing students to be more independent to change the conventional phenomena of the course-instructor-centered education into a student-centered learning process [18]. Virtual academic learning procedures are seen adopted worldwide including our neighboring countries bringing a transformation regardless of the variety of educational sectors [19].

In Bangladesh, very few studies were found investigating the barriers on its way to cope with the e-learning methods, also which were not directly reporting the current situation of the female nursing students' readiness towards the e-learning system along with their preference for this reason. Recent pandemic has taught us to be prepared for all the time, especially to be skilled and efficient enough to continue the educational and professional activities virtually in case of emergencies. Therefore, our study intended to investigate the association between the preference and subdomain of e-learning readiness among the Bangladeshi female nursing students with the hope to contribute in the educational system development to find newer tactics to deal with the found barriers in the steps of enlightening our knowledge.

2. Methodology:

2.1. Study design:

A cross-sectional study was conducted between December 26, 2020, and January 11, 2021.

2.2. Study Participants:

The study participants were all undergraduate female nursing students who were enrolled with e-learning during the last 30 days of the study period in Bangladesh.

2.3. Data Collection:

Data were collected online by using “Google Form”, posting the questionnaire link on nursing students’ social media groups (Facebook, Messenger, and WhatsApp) during the school closing period in Bangladesh due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Out of 252 responses, a total 237 of completed responses were recruited for the final analysis.

2.4. Questionnaire Development:

The questionnaire included an item on whether the students were willing to participate in the study, an item on perhaps the students prefer e-learning, the demographic, e-learning related characteristics, and a perceived e-learning readiness questionnaire. The first part of the questionnaire included an item on students’ willingness to participate in the study. The second part consisted of the e-learning related factors (prefer e-learning, device use, having a single room, and having any eye problems) and the demographic information (age, type of institution, degree, residence, and parent’s highest education). The preference of e-learning was accessed by binary (yes and no) response a single item. Having any eye problems has defined in the study; the student could not stay on screen for a longer time. However, the third part of the questionnaire consisted perceived e-learning readiness questionnaire.

2.5. Measurement of perceived e-learning readiness:

The readiness of e-learning can be accessed by using 39 items of the perceived e-learning readiness questionnaire (score range: 39-195) [21], [22]. The items of the questionnaire were responded to a five-point Likert scale of 1 for “strongly disagree” and 5 for “strongly agree”. The questionnaire mostly focused on five baseline subdomains of e-learning; availability of technology (6 items), use

of technology 11 items), self-confidence (12 items), acceptance (7 items), and training (3 items). In our study, we considered the first four subdomains of the readiness questionnaire (total 36 items). The probable score range of the four subdomains was 36 to 180, wherein our study the range was found 36 to 177. This 36 items questionnaire showed excellent reliability and validity in our study (Cronbach alpha= 0.94). None of the reliability coefficients (Cronbach alpha) of the subdomains was found less than 0.77 in this study are presented in table 3.

2.6. Data Analysis:

Descriptive statistics were performed for the demographic, e-learning related characteristics, and perceived e-learning readiness score. The score of the perceived e-learning readiness questionnaire was presented by mean, median, standard deviation (SD), and interquartile range (IQR). The reliability coefficient (Cronbach alpha) was calculated for the perceived e-learning readiness questionnaire. A multivariable linear regression model was fitted to find the association between students' e-learning preference and perceived e-learning readiness and with the demographic and other e-learning related characteristics. The p-value <0.05 was considered statistically significant at a 95% confident interval. Data were analyzed by using statistical software STATA-16.

2.7. Ethical Issue:

The Ethical Review Board of the Faculty of Life Science, North South University, Bangladesh approved this study. The reference number is 2021/OR-NSU/IRB/0601. The aim and objective of the study were explained on the first page of the questionnaire and the respondents who were willing to participate were only considered as respondents of this study.

3. Results:

Table 1: Demographic and e-learning related characteristics of study population (n=237)

Characteristic	n (%)
Prefer	
No	134 (56.54)
Yes	103 (43.46)
Median Age (IQR), year	21 (20-22)
Age	
<20	29 (12.24)
20-22	156 (78.06)
>22	52 (21.94)
Type of institution	
Private	226 (95.36)
Public	11 (4.64)
Degree	
B.Sc. in Nursing	67 (28.27)
Diploma in Nursing	170 (71.73)
Residence	
Rural	141 (59.49)
Urban	96 (40.51)
Parents highest education	
Bachelor's & above	41 (17.30)
H.S.C	128 (54.01)
Primary	68 (28.69)
Device Use	
Personal computer	6 (2.53)
Handset	231 (97.47)
Having a single room	
No	149 (62.87)
Yes	88 (37.13)
Having any eye problems	
No	136 (57.38)
Yes	101 (42.62)

The detailed demographics and e-learning related characteristics of the study participants are presented in Table 1. In this cross-sectional study, 237 e-learning enrolled female nursing students were recruited and more than half of the students 56.54% (n=134) did not prefer e-learning. The median age of the participants was 21 (interquartile range: 20-22) years. The majority of participants' 78.06% (n=156) age was 20-22 years, 12.24% (n=29) was less than 20 years and 21.94% (n=52) was more than 22 years. Approximately 95% (n=226) of the participants were

enrolled from private institutions and most of the students 71.73% (n=170) were from the diploma in nursing degree. More than half of the participants about 59% (n=141) were from the rural areas of Bangladesh. In terms of parents' highest education, about 54% (n=128) had higher secondary certificates (H.S.C.) education, 28.69% (n=68) had primary, and only 17.30% (n=41) bachelor's & above. Interestingly, only 2.53% (n=6) of the student participated in e-learning using the personal computer, and the majority of the participants 63% (n=149) had no single room for e-learning. However, around 42% (n=101) of the respondents reported having any eye problems.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of the scores of the different subdomain of the readiness questionnaire (n=237)

Scale	Mean	Median	SD	IQR	Cronbach alpha
Availability of technology	16.08	15	5.90	12-21	0.84
Use of technology	33.61	33	7.75	29-38	0.77
Self confidence	37.89	38	9.94	32-45	0.88
Acceptance	21.90	22	7.40	16-28	0.92
Total	109.47	109	26.19	36-177	0.94

In table 2, the mean score of the readiness questionnaire was found 109.47 (SD: 26.19) in our study. The mean score of subdomains of the questionnaire; availability of technology, use of technology, self-confidence, and acceptance were found 16.08 (SD: 5.90), 33.61 (SD: 7.75), 37.89 (SD: 9.94), and 21.90 (SD: 22) respectively.

1 **Table 3:** Association between e-learning preference and subdomain of perceived e-learning readiness and with demographic and e-
 2 learning related characteristics (n=237)

Variables	Availability of technology		Use of technology		Self-confidence		Acceptance	
	β (95% CI)	p-value	β (95% CI)	p-value	β (95% CI)	p-value	β (95% CI)	p-value
Prefer								
No	-3.01 (-4.46, -1.56)	<0.001	-3.08 (-5.11, -1.06)	0.003	-4.50 (-7.02, -1.98)	0.001	-5.96 (-7.76, -4.16)	< 0.001
Yes	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
Age								
<20	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
20 - 22	-0.07 (-2.15, 2.02)	0.949	1.98 (-0.93, 4.90)	0.182	1.59 (-2.04, 5.22)	0.389	0.10 (-2.50, 2.70)	0.940
>22	2.73 (0.33, 5.14)	0.026	4.30 (0.93, 7.66)	0.013	5.78 (1.59, 9.97)	0.007	2.33 (-0.67, 5.32)	0.127
Institution type								
Public	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
Private	-1.66 (-4.92, 1.59)	0.315	1.52 (-3.04, 6.08)	0.512	-3.90 (-9.56, 1.77)	0.177	0.45 (-3.60, 4.51)	0.826
Degree								
B.Sc.	-2.83 (-4.47, -1.18)	0.001	0.41 (-1.90, 2.71)	0.729	1.57 (-1.29, 4.43)	0.281	-2.69 (-4.73, -0.64)	0.010
Diploma	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
Residence								
Rural	-1.48 (-2.86, -0.09)	0.037	-2.43 (-4.37, -0.49)	0.014	-1.43 (-3.84, 0.99)	0.246	-1.62 (-3.35, 0.11)	0.066
Urban	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
Parents highest education								
Bachelors & above	2.47 (0.29, 4.64)	0.027	3.98 (0.93, 7.03)	0.011	5.33 (1.54, 9.12)	0.006	1.71 (-1.00, 4.42)	0.216
H.S.C	1.06 (-0.48, 2.60)	0.177	2.21 (0.05, 4.37)	0.045	3.58 (0.90, 6.27)	0.009	1.31 (-0.61, 3.23)	0.179
Primary	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
Device use								
Handset	-1.81 (-6.27, 2.65)	0.425	-3.63 (-9.87, 2.62)	0.254	-0.76 (-8.53, 7.02)	0.848	2.61 (-2.95, 8.16)	0.356
Personal	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
Computer								
Having a single room								
No	-2.01 (-3.50, -0.53)	0.008	-0.62 (-2.70, 1.45)	0.554	-1.96 (-4.55, 0.62)	0.136	-1.08 (-2.93, 0.76)	0.249
Yes	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
Having any eye problems								
No	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
Yes	-1.91 (-3.31, -0.52)	0.007	-1.02 (-2.97, 0.93)	0.303	-1.99 (-4.41, 0.44)	0.108	-2.26 (-4.00, -0.53)	0.011

3 Note: CI, confidence interval

4 In Table 3, a Multivariable Linear Regression Model was explored to find the association between
5 e-learning preference and subdomains of perceived e-learning readiness and with the demographic
6 and e-learning related characteristics. The result revealed students did not prefer e-learning
7 compared to prefer group has significantly less availability of technology ($\beta = -3.01$, 95% CI: -
8 4.46, -1.56), less use of technology ($\beta = -3.08$, 95% CI: -5.11, -1.06), less self-confidence ($\beta = -$
9 4.50, 95% CI: -7.02, -1.98), and less acceptance ($\beta = -5.96$, 95% CI: -7.76, -4.16). The older age
10 group, more than 22 years of age compared to age less than 20 years found significantly has more
11 availability of technology ($\beta = 2.73$, 95% CI: 0.33, 5.14), more use of technology ($\beta = 4.30$, 95%
12 CI: 0.93, 7.66), and more self-confidence ($\beta = 5.78$, 95% CI: 1.59, 9.97). However, compare to
13 diploma degree the students from B.Sc. degree found significantly having less availability of
14 technology ($\beta = -2.83$, 95% CI: -4.47, -1.18), and less acceptance ($\beta = -2.69$, 95% CI: -4.73, -0.64).
15 The students enrolled e-learning from rural area compared to urban found significantly having less
16 availability of technology ($\beta = -1.48$, 95% CI: -2.86, -0.09), and less use of technology ($\beta = 3.98$,
17 95% CI: 0.93, 7.03). The parents' highest education bachelors & above compared to primary found
18 significantly having more availability of technology ($\beta = 2.47$, 95% CI: 0.29, 4.46), more use of
19 technology ($\beta = 3.98$, 95% CI: 0.93, 7.03), and more self-confidence ($\beta = 5.33$, 95% CI: 1.54,
20 9.12). Similarly, parents' highest education H.S.C. compared to primary found significantly having
21 more use of technology ($\beta = 2.21$, 95% CI: 0.05, 4.37). On the other hand, not having single room
22 compared to having showed significantly having less availability of technology ($\beta = -2.01$, 95%
23 CI: -3.50, -0.53). However, having any eye problems compared to not having showed significantly
24 having less availability of technology ($\beta = -1.91$, 95% CI: -3.31, -0.52) and less acceptance ($\beta = -$
25 2.26, 95% CI: -4.00, -0.53).

26 **4. Discussion:**

27 Our study investigated the prevalence of e-learning preference and its association with the
28 subdomains of perceived e-learning readiness and the demographic and e-learning related
29 characteristics among the female nursing students of Bangladesh.

30 The results of the study showed that among all the participants, more than half of the students did
31 not prefer e-learning. When we tried to figure out the factors may affect this prevalence, it was
32 observed that less acceptance and lack of self-confidence are two of the reasons significantly
33 associated with not to prefer the e-learning among the female nursing students, along with that,

34 lack of technology usage and its' non-availability was also found strongly associated with the non-
35 preference. Having said that, age differences, degree variation, residency, not having a single room
36 while having online classes, and having any eye problems are also evidently associated with the
37 non-preference among the female nursing students.

38 The results of this cross-sectional study are consistent with earlier reports showing the effects of a
39 higher frequency of not adopting e-learning due to several reasons among which the readiness and
40 other technological factors are affecting significantly among the female nursing students. The
41 perceived readiness of mind contemplates a person's capability to inculcate e-learning in
42 themselves [23]. Thus, a learner's acceptance to use the newer technology-based method and the
43 self-efficacy of the person is the impactful factors affecting the growth of e-learning in the nursing
44 academia. In this study, the students' perception of readiness was reported in a similar trend in
45 accordance with other studies conducted in different circumstances which confirmed this claim of
46 significant association [23], [7].

47 A study conducted on the context of the effectiveness of e-learning in Bangladesh showed that e-
48 learning is a valuable system for the students' pedagogical development, though the students'
49 perception calling out the lack of acceptance, technological efficacy, and motivation could hinder
50 the way of this development which is one of the prime indicators of our study investigating the
51 factors affecting the female nursing students' readiness on adopting e-learning [24].

52 To digitalize Bangladesh, the internet-based education system is expanding country-wide, but
53 overseeing the access to the information and the programs, lagging behind the female nursing
54 students of the nation to be more familiar with the system, which could be causing the lackings in
55 preparing themselves to prefer the e-learning system more enthusiastically. A study conducted in
56 Vienna also reported similar problems with e-learning adaptation, likewise in our study, we found
57 [25].

58 The results of this study showed that students aged more than 22 years were found more inclined
59 to prefer e-learning as they were more confident and had the technological support more available
60 compared to the younger age group students, wherewith slight inconsistency, H. Pillay et al.,
61 (2007) reported in his study conducted in Australia that students more than 40 years were with less
62 self-efficacy and technological support pointing out the younger age groups less than 25 years
63 possess higher capability on both of these constructs [26]. From our country's perspective, it could

64 be explained as the more the students become experienced and exposed to this newer technology
65 adaptation, they tend to use more of it and hence have it more available rather than the younger
66 citizens.

67 In this study, the association was found significant between educational degree variation and the
68 lack of readiness among the female nursing students into all the subdomains except for use of
69 technology and self-confidence where it showed they have instead a lack of availability of
70 technology and acceptance among them, whereas, in several studies around the globe concerning
71 e-learning preference and readiness, it was also found significantly associated with the concerned
72 associated factors [27], but a study conducted on the same context with the midwives had shown
73 difference significance where the higher degree holders with more experiences showed more
74 tendency to accept the e-learning than the junior degree holders [28].

75 A relatively higher tendency of the students with more inclines to use smartphones were found to
76 be more accepting towards the online learning in studies of USA and India, where the present
77 study differ from these studies and could not find any significant establishment among the
78 association between preference and e-learning readiness in accord with availability, use of
79 technology and self-efficacy as well as the factor ‘device use’ has no association with readiness
80 [29], [30].

81 Though this study didn’t show any signified association between the fact of having a single room
82 & its effect on lacking of e-learning readiness, however, it showed that those who were not having
83 a single room were having a lack of availability of technology and O. Ivwighreghweta et al., (2014)
84 in Nigeria observed those majority participants accessed the internet for e-learning in a quiet and
85 calm environment like cybercafé than from home which was only one-fourth of the students [31].

86 This study also suggested that the lack of readiness for e-learning is also to some extent significantly
87 associated with the residency of the female nursing students. In a similar study conducted in India,
88 T. Muthuprasad et al., (2020) reported that the majority of the students living in a rural setting are
89 associated significantly with the lack of readiness due to unavailability and self-efficacy was
90 another study also found the residency to be a potential factor [32]. The advancement of technology
91 and availability of it, with the speed it has reached the urban areas, did not find reaching in rural
92 settings comparing that speed where the students studying from a rural setting perceiving online
93 education are not being privileged with available technical support and thus not enough confident

94 to use it. It was shown in the present study that the types of the university did not have any
95 significant association with readiness, while, a study in Kenya had also shown similar outcomes
96 by reporting that both private and public universities were adopting the e-learning technique for
97 the educational deliverance [33].

98 However, having an eye problems showed significant association with having lack of availability
99 of technology and being less acceptant towards the e-learning preparedness in our study, whereas
100 a study addressing the problem faced by the disadvantaged people similarly showed that e-learning
101 readiness including self-confidence, acceptance, and technical availability influenced on their
102 preference of technology-based learning [34]. Insufficiency of instructional study for the
103 disadvantaged people including the people having physical discomfort like having any eye
104 problems in general results in making it difficult for them to endorse the technology-based
105 pedagogy.

106 **5. Strength and Limitation:**

107 Very few studies were found conducting the effectiveness of the e-learning for the Bangladeshi
108 students, where no such studies were found specifically investigating the efficacy of this method
109 among the female nursing students of Bangladesh so far which is a strength of this study. However,
110 a study was found reporting the effectiveness of online learning, the study considered a limited
111 number of variables where the factors affecting the readiness for e-learning system were not
112 covered with a wide range of variables.

113 Although a readiness evaluation is important, this research only highlighted the four aspects of
114 readiness addressing the availability of technology, use of technology, self-confidence, and
115 acceptance. As it was a cross-sectional study, the study could not investigate the range of its
116 variables over a large group of female nursing students. Hence, it is recommended for future
117 research to assess the various other readiness factors (sociological, environmental, human
118 resource, financial, and content) on a larger scale study to report how ready the female nursing
119 students of Bangladesh are to implement e-learning.

120 **6. Conclusion:**

121 To reduce the spread of COVID-19, the closing of academic institutions as well as the installation
122 of e-learning was appreciated globally. However, it may not be easy to say that all students
123 welcomed e-learning initiative in a developing country like Bangladesh and they were ready
124 enough. This study documented female nursing students' preference for e-learning and association
125 with the sub-domains of readiness (availability of technology, use of technology, self-confidence,
126 and acceptance). The outcome of the study showed that students' preference has a significant
127 association with the readiness of e-learning. The findings also suggested that the sub-domains of
128 e-learning varied by different demographic and e-learning related factors. Henceforth, this study
129 can help the policy makers to create a sustainable nursing education environment considering the
130 students' readiness and preference in any emergency situation like epidemic and pandemic in the
131 era of technology.

132

133 **Funding:**

134 Authors received no funding for this research.

135

136 **Conflict of Interest:**

137 The authors declare no competing interest regarding this study that may arise from third party.

138

139 **Acknowledgments:**

140 The authors cordially thank all the research assistants of the project (notable names can be found in the
141 supplementary file).

142

143 **Reference:**

144 [1] Y. Padalino and H. H. C. Peres, "E-learning: a comparative study for knowledge
145 apprehension among nurses," *Rev. Lat. Am. Enfermagem*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 397–403,
146 2007, doi: 10.1590/s0104-11692007000300006.

- 147 [2] S. Horiuchi, Y. Yaju, M. Koyo, Y. Sakyō, and K. Nakayama, "Evaluation of a web-based
148 graduate continuing nursing education program in Japan: A randomized controlled trial,"
149 *Nurse Educ. Today*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 140–149, 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.nedt.2008.08.009.
- 150 [3] D. Beeckman, L. Schoonhoven, H. Boucqué, G. Van Maele, and T. Defloor, "Pressure
151 ulcers: E-learning to improve classification by nurses and nursing students," *J. Clin.*
152 *Nurs.*, vol. 17, no. 13, pp. 1697–1707, 2008, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2702.2007.02200.x.
- 153 [4] S. T. H. Sheen, W. Y. Chang, H. L. Chen, H. L. Chao, and C. P. Tseng, "E-learning
154 education program for registered nurses: The experience of a teaching medical center," *J.*
155 *Nurs. Res.*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 195–201, 2008, doi: 10.1097/01.JNR.0000387306.34741.70.
- 156 [5] L. Gega, I. J. Norman, and I. M. Marks, "Computer-aided vs. tutor-delivered teaching of
157 exposure therapy for phobia/panic: Randomized controlled trial with pre-registration
158 nursing students," *Int. J. Nurs. Stud.*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 397–405, Mar. 2007, doi:
159 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2006.02.009.
- 160 [6] J. Bloomfield, J. Roberts, and A. While, "The effect of computer-assisted learning versus
161 conventional teaching methods on the acquisition and retention of handwashing theory
162 and skills in pre-qualification nursing students: A randomised controlled trial," *Int. J.*
163 *Nurs. Stud.*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 287–294, Mar. 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2009.08.003.
- 164 [7] W. G. Mohamed Ali, "Nursing Students' Readiness for e-Learning Experience," *Gynecol.*
165 *Obstet.*, vol. 6, no. 6, 2016, doi: 10.4172/2161-0932.1000388.
- 166 [8] R. E. Mayer, "Thirty years of research on online learning," *Appl. Cogn. Psychol.*, vol. 33,
167 no. 2, pp. 152–159, 2019, doi: 10.1002/acp.3482.
- 168 [9] M. S. Beqiri, N. M. Chase, and A. Bishka, "Online Course Delivery: An Empirical
169 Investigation of Factors Affecting Student Satisfaction," *J. Educ. Bus.*, vol. 85, no. 2, pp.
170 95–100, 2009, doi: 10.1080/08832320903258527.
- 171 [10] R. Chen, "Learner Perspectives of Online Problem-Based Learning and Applications from
172 Cognitive Load Theory," *Psychol. Learn. Teach.*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 195–203, 2016, doi:
173 10.1177/1475725716645961.
- 174 [11] M. Fawaz and A. Samaha, "E-learning: Depression, anxiety, and stress symptomatology

- 175 among Lebanese university students during COVID-19 quarantine,” *Nurs. Forum*, vol. 56,
176 no. 1, pp. 52–57, 2021, doi: 10.1111/nuf.12521.
- 177 [12] M. Lahti, H. Hätönen, and M. Välimäki, “Impact of e-learning on nurses’ and student
178 nurses knowledge, skills, and satisfaction: A systematic review and meta-analysis,” *Int. J.*
179 *Nurs. Stud.*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 136–149, Jan. 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2012.12.017.
- 180 [13] S. Dhawan, “Online Learning: A Panacea in the Time of COVID-19 Crisis,” *J. Educ.*
181 *Technol. Syst.*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 5–22, 2020, doi: 10.1177/0047239520934018.
- 182 [14] J. C. Heo and S. Han, “Effects of motivation, academic stress and age in predicting self-
183 directed learning readiness (SDLR): Focused on online college students,” *Educ. Inf.*
184 *Technol.*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 61–71, 2018, doi: 10.1007/s10639-017-9585-2.
- 185 [15] S. M. Lee and Y. Oh, “The mediator role of perceived stress in the relationship between
186 academic stress and depressive symptoms among E-learning students with visual
187 impairments,” *J. Vis. Impair. Blind.*, vol. 111, no. 2, pp. 123–134, 2017, doi:
188 10.1177/0145482x1711100204.
- 189 [16] M. L. Guenaga, D. Burger, and J. Oliver, “Accessibility for e-Learning Environments,”
190 pp. 157–163, 2004.
- 191 [17] A. B. Irvine, M. Bourgeois, M. Billow, and J. R. Seeley, “Internet Training for Nurse
192 Aides to Prevent Resident Aggression,” *J. Am. Med. Dir. Assoc.*, vol. 8, no. 8, pp. 519–
193 526, 2007, doi: 10.1016/j.jamda.2007.05.002.
- 194 [18] P. E. Ramírez-Correa, J. Arenas-Gaitán, and F. J. Rondán-Cataluña, “Gender and
195 acceptance of e-learning: A multi-group analysis based on a structural equation model
196 among college students in Chile and Spain,” *PLoS One*, vol. 10, no. 10, pp. 1–17, 2015,
197 doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0140460.
- 198 [19] M. Zannat, “Challenges in implementing virtual learning in Bangladesh,” no. August,
199 2019, [Online]. Available:
200 http://dspace.bracu.ac.bd/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10361/13679/14203008_ENH.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y.
201
- 202 [20] M. Mridha *et al.*, “E-learning for empowering the rural people in Bangladesh

- 203 opportunities and challenges,” *2013 2nd Int. Conf. E-Learning E-Technologies Educ.*
204 *ICEEE 2013*, pp. 323–328, 2013, doi: 10.1109/ICeLeTE.2013.6644397.
- 205 [21] Y. Ünal, G. Alir, and İ. Soydal, “Students readiness for e-learning: An assessment on
206 hacettepe university department of information management,” *Commun. Comput. Inf. Sci.*,
207 vol. 423, pp. 137–147, 2014, doi: 10.1007/978-3-662-44412-2_13.
- 208 [22] C. H. Aydin and D. Tasci, “Measuring readiness for e-learning: Reflections from an
209 emerging country,” *Educ. Technol. Soc.*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 244–257, 2005.
- 210 [23] J. P. Bigirwa, S. Ndawula, and E. F. Naluwemba, “E-learning adoption: Does the
211 instructional design model matter? An explanatory sequential study on midwifery schools
212 in Uganda,” *E-Learning Digit. Media*, vol. 17, no. 6, pp. 460–481, 2020, doi:
213 10.1177/2042753020946286.
- 214 [24] M. Ali, S. M. Khaled Hossain, and T. Ahmed, “Effectiveness of E-learning for university
215 students: evidence from Bangladesh,” *Asian J. Empir. Res.*, vol. 8, no. 10, pp. 352–360,
216 2018, doi: 10.18488/journal.1007/2018.8.10/1007.10.352.360.
- 217 [25] M. Coopasami, S. Knight, and M. Pete, “e-Learning readiness amongst nursing students at
218 the Durban University of Technology,” *Heal. SA Gesondheid*, vol. 22, pp. 300–306, 2017,
219 doi: 10.1016/j.hsag.2017.04.003.
- 220 [26] H. Pillay, K. Irving, and M. Tones, “Validation of the diagnostic tool for assessing tertiary
221 students’ readiness for online learning,” *High. Educ. Res. Dev.*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 217–
222 234, 2007, doi: 10.1080/07294360701310821.
- 223 [27] H. C. Wei and C. Chou, “Online learning performance and satisfaction: do perceptions
224 and readiness matter?,” *Distance Educ.*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 48–69, 2020, doi:
225 10.1080/01587919.2020.1724768.
- 226 [28] A. Ngampornchai and J. Adams, “Students’ acceptance and readiness for E-learning in
227 Northeastern Thailand,” *Int. J. Educ. Technol. High. Educ.*, vol. 13, no. 1, 2016, doi:
228 10.1186/s41239-016-0034-x.
- 229 [29] M. Kobayashi, “Students’ media preferences in online learning,” *Turkish Online J.*
230 *Distance Educ.*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 4–15, 2017, doi: 10.17718/tojde.328925.

- 231 [30] M. T, A. S, K. S. Aditya, and G. K. Jha, “Students’ Perception and Preference for Online
232 Education in India During COVID -19 Pandemic,” *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2020, doi:
233 10.2139/ssrn.3596056.
- 234 [31] O. Ivwighreghweta and M. A. Igere, “Impact of the internet on academic performance of
235 students in tertiary institutions in Nigeria,” *Inf. Impact.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 47–56, 2014.
- 236 [32] M. Elnakeeb, S. Mahmoud, and A. Khalifa, “The Relationship Between Online Learning
237 Readiness and Social Interaction Anxiety among Nursing Students in Alexandria
238 University,” vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 140–152, 2016, doi: 10.5829/idosi.wjns.2016.140.152.
- 239 [33] P. Neema-Abooki and A. Kitawi, “Impact of E-Learning Strategy on Students’ Academic
240 Performance at Strathmore University, Kenya,” *Makerere J. High. Educ.*, vol. 6, no. 1, p.
241 99, 2014, doi: 10.4314/majohe.v6i1.6.
- 242 [34] J. J. P. A. Hsieh, A. Rai, and M. Keil, “Understanding digital inequality: Comparing
243 continued use behavioral models of the socio-economically advantaged and
244 disadvantaged,” *MIS Q. Manag. Inf. Syst.*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 97–126, 2008, doi:
245 10.2307/25148830.

246