ATLANTIS
PRESS

Conceptualization of MOOC E-Learning Service Quality Dimensions in Faculty of Hotel and Tourism Management, UITM, Malaysia

Safwana NurWidad Safri[1, *], Zurinawati Mohi[1], Mohd Hafiz Mohd Hanafiah[2]

[1] Department of Hotel Management Universiti Teknologi MARA, Puncak Alam, Malaysia
[2] Department of Tourism Management Universiti Teknologi MARA, Puncak Alam, Malaysia
*Corresponding author. Email: 2017688664@isiswa.uitm.edu.my

ABSTRACT

Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia has made online learning as an essential module of higher education and lifelong learning. The effort includes the conversion of conventional undergraduate courses into Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) and requiring up to 70% programs to use blended learning models. However, the new challenges in e-learning are characterized by the increased focus on users' reactions and changing needs. Thus, the primary objective of this study is to identify the e-learning service quality dimensions that preferred by undergraduate students in MOOC. This study will use qualitative method, where the researcher will interview sixteen informants from Faculty of Hospitality and Tourism Management, UiTM, Puncak Alam, Malaysia. All the informants had completed at least 3 MOOC courses in 2017 through platform of OpenLearning. The finding of this study might improve the way the instructors created their MOOC courses. Moreover, the findings also will give further knowledge on the importance of e-service quality in the online education. This will be a valuable framework for future researcher who are examining the relationships of the construct in the online education.

Keywords: e-learning, e-learning service quality, service quality, MOOC, qualitative

1. INTRODUCTION

E-learning is a rapidly growing phenomenon in the education sector, where it caters to the needs of modern-day learners [1]. Approximately, 5.5 million students worldwide were taking at least one class online [2]. In Malaysia, e-learning has become the major part of experience in teaching and learning to the instructors and students [3]. Data shown that 67.6 percent of internet user in Malaysia are using internet for study purposes [4].

In Malaysia, Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) started after Ministry of Education Malaysia created National e-Learning Policy 2.0. The policy is about online pedagogy where the Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia (MOHE) required each of the local universities in Malaysia to provide online courses by using MOOC [5]. Through the medium of MOOC, MOHE anticipate that it offers better direction on career option and education, balancing the student's morality and knowledge that prepares the students for employment and challenges in the future. With MOOCs courses, the instructors will no longer be the main source of courses information.

This leads to changes in conventional methods of teaching and learning in Malaysia. Although MOOC were new, but the finding showed positive acceptance of MOOC in teaching and learning by the students [6].

However, one of the Malaysian academicians, Prof. Tan Sri Dato' Dzulkifli Abdul Razak, in the newspaper article in The Sun Daily (11th January 2018) argued on the alarming issues and challenges pertaining the self-learning in MOOC in Malaysia. He claimed that Malaysian government was too fast in introducing new learning concept, in which may have no significant differences between the previous one. He was focusing more about the changes from heutagogy (self-determined learning) concept towards two new learnings concepts: paragogy and cybergogy [7].

Ironically, successful online learning normally requires students to commit more time and effort than they would in a traditional class. Furthermore, there is no effective correlation between the student's engagements in MOOC and motivation factors for them to complete the course. These behaviours may arise as they are no specific obligation, warning or penalty that encourage them to complete the MOOC course they enrolled [8]. Besides, most of the students who completed the MOOCs are usually the undergraduate students. They were enrolled as the fulltime or part time students at the particular university, in which raised the questions of how many non-undergraduates students might have completed the MOOCs courses [9].

Meanwhile, researchers argued that large numbers of students enrolling the MOOCs courses never received any personal knowledge or advice to encourage them to complete the course [10, 11]. This uncommon practices may lead to numerous negative outcome such as, the students might feel unhappy with the online learning, becoming frustrated, or overwhelmed, and lastly incomplete the course [10]. Thus, this paper research objective and research question:

RO1: To investigate the factors e-learning service quality in MOOC specially in the field of hospitality and tourism.

RQ1: What are the e-learning service quality preferred by undergraduate students in MOOC

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Overview of MOOC

MOOC was first developed by George Siemens and Stephen Downes in 2008. Generally, the main idea of MOOC is offering a free online course enrolled by students from all around the world without the university entry requirements. The MOOC courses was well designed and developed by the instructors, later will become the facilitator of the courses, while the students study the courses during their free time by experiencing a complete online course only by using internet connection [12].

Besides, MOOC is an unique opportunities and a tools to expand the access into the global education [13, 14]. There are more than 70 of MOOC providers and above 700 universities around the world have launched free online courses [15, 16]. At the end of 2016, approximately 58 million students take at least one MOOC [16]. The most popular website for MOOC are edX, Coursera, Futurer Learn, and Udacity. However, Ministry of Higher Education in Malaysia selected Open Learning as Malaysia National MOOC platform as its allows everyone to create, sign up and run in any course from anywhere [15, 17].

2.2. Limitation of Service Quality assessment in education sector

Service quality refers to the comparison between customer expectations of what an organization should deliver and the perceived service performance [18]. Thus, the key to measure and understand service quality is from the customer judgment of how the service is perceived and the overall impression of organization performance and it services [19].

Besides, e-service is different from traditional service as it is based on interactive information program between service providers and customers [20]. Therefore, e-Service quality can be identified as interactive, content centre, and internet based customer service and shared with the support of technologies and systems offered by service providers,

which intention to support the relationship between service provider and customers [21].

Previous researches focused on the service quality in higher education by adopting SERVQUAL model [22, 23, 24]. However, with the criticism of application of generic model in higher education, as result there are alternative models and measurements such as HiEduQual is to measure the level of service quality in higher educational institutions in India that abandonment how level of service in education has changed [25], and HEdPERF was proposed to focused on the staff, physical facilities, academic staff, and institution was not focused on the e-learning in Higher [26]. Previous studies show that there is positive and significant relationship between interaction and student learning and satisfaction [27, 28]. However, student-instructor interaction has no strong influence on student satisfaction [29]. Nevertheless, students' experience in e-services of online learning in higher education requires attention as well. Moreover, both public and private universities need valuable information to identify the e-learning service quality in order to understand the factor that can impact their students' perception or experience towards their e-learning courses.

3. METHODOLOGY

To get more comprehensive understanding on the occurrence, qualitative method will be use in this study. Besides, qualitative study can discover a fundamental research interest and the connection between them [30]. Meanwhile, for the data collection, this study will use cross-sectional study where the data will be collect once to answer the research questions. This study will use a purposive sampling technique. This technique is considered a nonprobability sampling technique that relies on the judgment of the researcher when it comes to selecting the informants that are to be studied. Meanwhile, the goal of purposive sampling was not to randomly select students with the intention of generalizing. Therefore, the main goal is to focus on characteristics of the population of interest which is students who already completed three MOOC courses in 2017 through platform of Open Learning.

Hence, the researcher will be interviewed sixteen informants from Faculty of Hospitality and Tourism Management, UiTM, Puncak Alam, Malaysia, which is consisting of eight undergraduates' students of semester 5 and eight undergraduates' students of semester 6 [31]. All the informants had experienced in learning through MOOC. All of them had completed at least 3 MOOC courses in 2017 through platform of Open Learning.

The data will be collected through an informal interview to help researcher participate in naturally unfolding events and to observe the unit study as objectively and carefully [32]. The interviews will be conducted in English and Malay language as English is not Malaysian first language and all the data collected were translated in English. The interviews will take about thirty to forty minutes for each informant. During the interview process, all the answer will be recorded in the audio form.

4. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the finding obtained may help MOHE in getting some input on how to improve and upgrade the education system more efficiently. Besides, the findings will give instructors, MOOC's website platforms the dimensions of e-learning service quality that being needed to increase the students' experience. Indirectly, the goal of MOHE where Malaysia become the region education hub by the year 2020 can be achieved.

REFERENCES

[1]. Arora A. "Using e-Learning technologies to improve educational quality of language teaching, 2015". [Online] Available from: https://elearningindustry.com/using-elearning-technologies-improve-educational-quality-language-teaching. [19th July 2018].

[2]. Hickey R. "The history of online education". 2014. [Online] Available from: https://www.petersons.com/articles/online-degrees/online-education-history. [21th December 2017]

[3]. Luaran JE, Alias NA, Jain J. Chapter 2: *Blended Learning: Examining Concepts and Practices. In: Embi MA, editor. Blended & flipped learning: Case studies in Malaysian HEIs*. Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia: Centre for Teaching & Learning Technologies, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia & Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Education Malaysia; 2014. p. 19-33.

[4]. Anonim, "Communications and multimedia: facts and figures", 3Q 2017, *Malaysian Communications & Multimedia Commission*. [Online]. Available from: https://www.mcmc.gov.my/skmmgovmy/media/General/pdf/3Q2017-Infographics.pdf.

[5]. Anonim, "Dasar e-pembelajaran negara 2.0", *Kementerian Pendidikan Tinggi*. 2011. [Online]. Available from: http://smart2.ums.edu.my/pluginfile.php/2/course/section/2/Depan-20_2.pdf.

[6]. Jalil HA, Ismail A, Bakar N, Azizan NAK, Nasir KA. "Evaluation of Malaysia Pilot MOOC". *Serdang: CADe Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM)*; 2016. [Online]. Available from: http://ctl.utm.my/meipta/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/final-report-mooc-24.7.2016-1.pdf.

[7]. Razak DA. "Factor in Spirituality". *The Sun Daily,* 2018 11th January, [Online]. Available: https://www.thesundaily.my/tag/-/meta/dzulkifli-abdul-razak

[8]. Anonim, "Top 5 issues with MOOCs". *G2 Collective, Inc*. 2011. [Online] Available from: http://www.g2collective.com/2013/05/01/top-5-issues-with-moocs/.

[9]. Ubell R. "Can MOOCs Cure the Tuition Epidemic?", 2nd October 2017. [Online] Available from: https://spectrum.ieee.org/tech-talk/at-work/education/can-moocs-cure-the-tuition-epidemic.

[10]. Konnikova M. "Will MOOCs be flukes?", 2014. [Online] Available from: https://www.newyorker.com/science/maria-konnikova/moocs-failure-solutions.

[11]. Quora. "The Future Of Massively Open Online Courses (MOOCs)" 2017. [Online] Available from: https://www.forbes.com/sites/quora/2017/03/23/the-future-of-massively-open-online-courses-moocs/#dd1ae606b830.

[12]. Jansen D, Schuwer R. *Institutional MOOC strategies in Europe: Status report based on a mapping survey conducted in October - December 2014*. EADTU; 2015.

[13]. Bonk CJ, Lee MM, Reeves TC, Reynolds TH. *MOOCs and open education around the world*, Routledge, 2015.

[14]. Porter S. *What are MOOCs? To MOOC or Not to MOOC: How Can Online Learning Help to Build the Future of Higher Education?* Chandos Publishing, 2015, p. 4-9.

[15]. Dhiman G. "80+ best MOOC (Massive Open Online Course) providers list". *Knowledge Lover*. 2015, [Online] Available from: https://knowledgelover.com/best-mooc-massive-open-online-course-providers-list/

[16]. Shah D. "Massive List of MOOC Providers Around The World. Where to Find MOOCs: The Definitive Guide to MOOC Providers". *Class-Central*, 2017, [Online], Available from: https://www.class-central.com/report/mooc-providers-list/.

[17]. Sahyoun S. "OpenLearning selected as Malaysia's national MOOC platform". *Open Learning Global Pty Ltd*. 2014, [News] Available from: https://www.openlearning.com/blog/Openlearnin gComSelectedAsMalaysiaSNationalMoocPlatfor m.

[18]. Parasuraman A, Berry LL, Zeithaml VA. *SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality*. Journal of Retailing. Vol. 64, No. 1, Pp. 12-40, 1988.

[19]. Zeithaml VA. *Consumer perceptions of price, quality, and value: A means-end model and synthesis of evidence*. Journal of Marketing. Vol. 52, no. 3, pp. 2-22, 1988

[20]. Li H, Suomi R. *A proposed scale for measuring e-service quality.* International Journal of u-and e-Service, Science and Technology, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 1-10, 2009

[21]. De Ruyter K, Wetzels M, Kleijnen M. *Customer adoption of e-service: An experimental study*. International journal of service industry management, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 184-207, 2001.

[22]. Chua C. *Perception of quality in higher education*. Proceedings of the Australian universities quality forum: Australian University Quality Agency Melbourne, pp. 181, 2004

[23]. De Oliveira OJ, Ferreira EC. *Adaptation and application of the SERVQUAL scale in higher education.* Proceedings of POMS 20th Annual Conference Orlando, Florida USA, 2009.

[24]. Pariseau SE, McDaniel J. *Assessing service quality in schools of business.* International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 204, 1997.

[25]. Annamdevula S, Bellamkonda RS. *Effect of student perceived service quality on student satisfaction, loyalty and motivation in Indian universities: Development of HiEduQual*. Journal of Modelling in Management, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 488-517, 2016.

[26]. Firdaus A, Abg Zainoren, Abg Abdurahman, Jamil H. *Managing Customer Preference for the Foodservice Industry. International* Journal of

Innovation, Management and Technology, vol. 2, no. 6, 2011

[27]. Sher A. *Assessing the relationship of student-instructor and student-student interaction to student learning and satisfaction in Web-based online learning environment*. Journal of Interactive Online Learning, vol, 8, no. 2, 2009.

[28]. Sang EYM. *Learner-content interactions and learning effectiveness: A study of student perceptions*, 2010, [Online], Available from: http://search.proquest.com.ezaccess.library.uitm. edu.my/docview/763280429?accountid=42518.

[29]. Kuo Y-C, Walker AE, Schroder KE, Belland BR. *Interaction, internet self-efficacy, and self-regulated learning as predictors of student satisfaction in online education courses*. The Internet and Higher Education. vol. 20, pp. 35-50. 2014

[30]. Silverman D. *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook*, SAGE Publications Limited, 2013.

[31]. Creswell JW. *Editorial: Mapping the field of mixed methods research*. Journal of Mixed Methods Research. Vol. 3, No. 2, Pp. 95-108. 2009

[32]. Musante K, DeWalt BR. *Participant observation: A guide for fieldworkers,* Rowman Altamira; 2010