

# Predictors for adoption of e-learning among health professional students during the COVID-19 lockdown in a Private University in Uganda

Alimah Komuhangi (✉ [akomuhangi@ciu.ac.ug](mailto:akomuhangi@ciu.ac.ug))

Clarke International University

Hilda Mpirirwe

Clarke International University

Lubanga Robert

Clarke International University

Florence Wamuyu Githinji

Clarke International University

Rose Clarke Nanyonga

Clarke International University

---

## Research Article

**Keywords:** E-learning adoption, health professional students, Coronavirus diseases 2019 lockdown

**Posted Date:** April 27th, 2022

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1544508/v1>

**License:**  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

---

1 **Predictors for adoption of e-learning among health professional students during the**  
2 **COVID-19 lockdown in a Private University in Uganda**

3  
4 **Authors:**

5 Alimah Komuhangi<sup>1</sup>, Hilda Mpirirwe<sup>1</sup>, Lubanga Robert<sup>1</sup>, Florence Wamuyu Githinji<sup>1</sup>, Rose  
6 Clarke Nanyonga<sup>1</sup>

7 **Institutional affiliations:**

8 1. Clarke International University

9 **Corresponding author address**

10 **Alimah Komuhangi, BPH, MPH, MMS/ME**

11 Email: [akomuhangi@ciu.ac.ug](mailto:akomuhangi@ciu.ac.ug)

12 **Co-author email addresses**

13 **Hilda Mpirirwe, BIT, Msc. IS**

14 Email: [hkyobe@ciu.ac.ug](mailto:hkyobe@ciu.ac.ug)

15 **Lubanga Robert, BITC, SSCP, MICT**

16 Email: [lrobert@ciu.ac.ug](mailto:lrobert@ciu.ac.ug)

17 **Florence Wamuyu Githinji, BBA (HM), MDS, PGD ME**

18 Email: [fgithinji@ciu.ac.ug](mailto:fgithinji@ciu.ac.ug)

19 **Rose Clarke Nanyonga, RN, Ph.D., APN**

20 Email: [nanyongaclarke@ciu.ac.ug](mailto:nanyongaclarke@ciu.ac.ug)

21

22

23

24

25 **Abstract**

26 **Background.** Universities have come to terms with the fact that education, as we have  
27 traditionally delivered it, cannot be sustained under the current circumstances imposed on us by  
28 the Coronavirus diseases 2019 pandemic. Adoption of e-learning is one obvious way to foster  
29 continuity of learning. During the lockdown in Uganda, it was not known whether health  
30 professional students were willing to adopt e-learning as a way to foster continuity of learning. We  
31 therefore adopted a Technology Acceptance Model to determine the predictors for adoption of e-  
32 learning using learner and information technology variables.

33  
34 **Methods.** A cross-sectional study among 109 health professional student's  $\geq 18$  years at Clarke  
35 International University was conducted. Adoption of e-learning was measured as self-report. Data  
36 were obtained using a smart survey and descriptively summarized. The differences in the study  
37 outcome were compared using the chi-square test. The factors that independently influenced  
38 adoption of e-learning were determined using binary logistic regression and reported as adjusted  
39 odds ratios (aORs) with a 95% confidence interval (CI).

40  
41 **Results:** Of the 109 respondents, 71 (65.1%) adopted e-learning. Our data showed low odds of  
42 adoption of e-learning among participants in first year (aOR, 0.34: 95%CI, 0.14-0.79), low e-  
43 learning expectations (aOR, 0.01: 95%CI, 0.01-0.34), no confidence in using IT devices (aOR,  
44 0.16: 95%CI, 0.00-0.77), no prior experience in e-learning (aOR, 0.11: 95%CI, 0.02-0.68), not  
45 considering e-learning flexible (aOR, 0.25:95%CI, 0.08-0.86) and high cost of internet (aOR, 0.13:  
46 95%CI, 0.02-0.84).

47  
48 **Conclusion:** We identified predictors of e-learning adoption which include: having completed at  
49 least one year of study, high e-learning expectations, and confidence in using IT devices, prior  
50 experience in e-learning, considering e-learning to be flexible and internet access. This  
51 information can be used by universities to enhance infrastructure and prepare potential e-  
52 learners.

53 **Keywords:** E-learning adoption, health professional students, Coronavirus diseases 2019  
54 lockdown.

55 **Word count:** 286 Abstract; 2,350 main text.

56  
57

58 **Background**

59 E-learning (electronic learning) has emerged as one of the ways to foster education during the  
60 Coronavirus diseases 2019 pandemic. Worldwide, the new paradigm of the learning market has  
61 a growth rate of 35.6% (1). E- learning includes; online learning, virtual learning, distance  
62 education, m-learning, and learning management systems (2). In the developing world, ministries  
63 of education in different countries have recommended or made it mandatory to implement online  
64 learning at all school levels in various countries (3). E-learning initiatives are strongly tied to  
65 information and communication technologies (ICTs) (4). ICTs provide an advanced e-learning  
66 environment to stimulate and enhance teaching and self-directed learning (5).

67 The Coronavirus diseases 2019 pandemic introduced the need for less human physical contact  
68 to prevent spread in what has been christened “social distancing” (6). This underscored the strong  
69 need for e-learning and for continued academic operations both of which could be achieved at a  
70 distance. In September, 2020, the Uganda National Council of Higher Education  
71 (NCHE) established the Emergency Open Distance e-Learning strategies for health professional  
72 students to continue learning remotely during the protracted university continuing lockdown. The  
73 introduction of e-learning was not intended to replace face-to -face classroom teaching, but to  
74 provide new opportunities for continued learning during Coronavirus diseases 2019 lockdown in  
75 Uganda (7).

76 However, the rapid shift to online learning underscored the need to understand health  
77 professional students’ adoption of the new learning virtual environment and learning tools. Yet  
78 given the scarcity of health professional workers in the control of the ongoing Coronavirus  
79 diseases 2019 pandemic, e-learning needed to be adopted in universities to hasten the  
80 continuation of health professional training (7).

81 Accordingly, understanding students’ adoption of e-learning was imperative to enable universities  
82 to design effective e-learning programs amidst the rising Coronavirus diseases 2019  
83 pandemic. Adoption of e-learning was proven to be a reliable proxy for the success of any IT-  
84 based initiative in the education sector (8). Thus, this prompted the study on adoption of e-learning  
85 among health professional students during the Coronavirus diseases 2019 lockdown. The study  
86 adopted a Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) to understand whether health professional  
87 students who have been introduced to new technology can accept and use it considering  
88 constructs of perceived ease of use, perceived usefulness (9) in form of learner and Information  
89 Technology (IT) aspects.

90 **Methods**

91  
92 **Aim of the study**

93 The study aimed at determining the predictors for adoption of e-learning among health  
94 professional students during the Coronavirus diseases 2019 lockdown in a Private University in  
95 Uganda.

96  
97 **Study design**

98 The study employed a cross sectional study design where quantitative data were collected from  
99 participants electronically. Emails were only sent to students that were health professionals. Data  
100 on learner and IT aspects were obtained for the purpose of comparing differences in adoption of  
101 e-learning.

102  
103 **Setting and study participants**

104 The study was conducted at Clarke International University (CIU). This is one of the private  
105 universities located in Kampala city with a population of nearly 1000 students of which  
106 approximately 150 are health professionals. E-learning at CIU progressively became popular  
107 during the national Coronavirus diseases 2019 lockdown (10). Before the pandemic, e-learning  
108 was only restricted to post graduate students taking Master's in Public Health with a blended  
109 approach. Currently e-learning at CIU has been integrated in all university programs both at  
110 undergraduate and postgraduate levels.

111 We included all continuing health professional students aged  $\geq 18$  years at Clarke International  
112 University by the time of the lockdown in Uganda (18<sup>th</sup> March 2020). We excluded the following  
113 categories of health professional students: 1) students in their final year of study who were only  
114 left with research to complete the program, and 2) students who were enrolled on remote learning  
115 before the lockdown. Data was collected over a period of three weeks.

116  
117 **Measurements**

118 **Outcome variable**

119 Our outcome variable was adoption of e-learning, measured by self-report on a binary scale.  
120 Respondents were asked whether they were satisfied with the decision to continue taking the  
121 course online, whether e-learning would satisfy their learning needs and if they would gladly take  
122 another program fully via the internet in any institution of higher learning given an

123 opportunity. Responses were later categorized as a binary outcome (Yes- adopted e-learning  
124 and No- did not adopt e-learning).

125

### 126 **Independent variables**

127 The independent variables included, learner aspects (age, sex, time management, e-learning  
128 expectations) and IT aspects were confidence in using IT and online communication tools, prior  
129 experience with e-learning, flexibility of e-learning and internet cost.

130 We collected quantitative data using a smart survey where emails were distributed using the  
131 mailing list feature. This enabled ease of questionnaire distribution and collection of reliable data  
132 in real-time. Prior to data collection, the questionnaire was pre-tested outside the study area  
133 (Kampala International University). Unique identifiers like email and names of participants were  
134 removed before data analysis to ensure confidentiality of the collected data.

135

### 136 **Data analysis**

137 The analysis was done using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20. In the  
138 descriptive analysis, frequencies and percentages were summarized. In the bivariate analysis,  
139 we conducted the Chi-square test for differences in e-learning adoption as long as all the cell  
140 counts were  $\geq 5$ , else, Fisher's exact test was used. In the multivariate analysis, all variables with  
141 probability value (p-value) less than 5% at bivariate analysis and statistically significant variables  
142 from the literature particularly age and sex were included in the regression model. Consequently,  
143 we computed crude odds ratio (cOR) and adjusted odds ratio (aOR) at multivariate analysis using  
144 binary logistic regression. We reported aORs with the corresponding 95% confidence interval  
145 (CI). We did not report probability values (p-values) since Confidence Intervals (CIs) are  
146 satisfactory for recording the precision of the measure of effect and establishing statistical  
147 significance (11). Furthermore, CIs are more enlightening than probability-values (12) and are  
148 henceforth preferred in reporting the outcome (13).

149

### 150 **Results**

151 A total of 109 continuing health professional students at CIU participated in the study. The study  
152 included those who had not completed their courses by the time of the first National Coronavirus  
153 diseases 2019 lockdown on the 18<sup>th</sup> March 2019. Students who had initially applied for the remote  
154 learning program before the national lockdown were excluded from the study. Overall, we  
155 analyzed 109 participants.

156

157 **General characteristics of participants**

158 Table 1 describes the participant characteristics. Overall, we studied 109 participants. The highest  
159 proportion 65 (59.6%) of respondents were female, 69 (63.3%) were in the 20-29 years age  
160 bracket, 63 (57.8%) were in their first year of study, 68 (62.4% were single and 57 (52.3%) were  
161 not in the frontline of COVID 19 management.

162 **Table 1: Participant characteristics**

Characteristics	Categories	Total (n= 109), No. (%)
Sex	Female	65 (59.6)
	Male	44 (40.4)
Age group (years)	20 – 29	69 (63.3)
	30 – 39	33 (30.2)
	40 and above	7 (6.5)
Year of study	1	63 (57.8)
	2	46 (42.2)
Marital status	In union	41 (37.6)
	Not in union	68 (62.4)
In the frontline of COVID 19 management	Yes	52 (47.7)
	No	57 (52.3)

163 **Differences in adoption of e-learning with learner and IT aspects**

164 The differences in adoption of e-learning with learner aspects and IT aspects are shown in Table  
165 2. Overall 72 (65.1%) adopted e-learning during COVID 19- Lockdown. E-learning adoption was  
166 more prevalent among female health professional students (67.7%), participants aged 30-39  
167 years (72.7%), in the first year of study (77.8%), in union/married or cohabiting (75.6%), and in  
168 the frontline of COVID 19 management (66.7%). We observed statistically significant differences  
169 in e-learning adoption concerning year of study ( $p= 0.002$ ), time management ( $p= 0.030$ ), high e-  
170 learning expectations ( $p= 0.001$ ), confidence in using IT devices ( $p= <0.001$ ), Prior experience in  
171 e-learning ( $p= 0.001$ ), considering e-learning to be flexible ( $p= 0.006$ ) and affordable internet ( $p=$   
172  $0.005$ ).

174

175

**Table 2: Bivariate analysis of differences in e-learning adoption with learner and IT aspects**

	Total	E-learning adoption		p-value
	Overall n = 109	No (34.9%) n= (38)	Yes (65.1%) n=(71)	
<b>Sex</b>				
Female	65 (59.6)	21 (32.3)	44 (67.7)	0.496
Male	44 (40.4)	17 (38.6)	27 (61.4)	
<b>Age</b>				
20-29 years	69 (63.3)	26 (37.7)	43 (62.3)	1.868
30-39 years	33 (30.3)	9 (27.3)	24 (72.7)	
40 and above	7 (6.4)	3 (42.9)	4 (57.1)	
<b>Year of study</b>				
One	63 (57.8)	14 (22.2)	49 (77.8)	0.002
Two	46 (42.2)	24 (52.2)	22 (47.8)	
<b>Marital status</b>				
In union	41 (37.6)	10 (24.4)	31 (75.6)	0.054
Not in union	68 (62.4)	28 (41.2)	39 (58.8)	
<b>In COVID 19 management frontline</b>				
No	52 (47.7)	19 (36.5)	33 (63.5)	0.807
Yes	57 (52.3)	19 (33.3)	38 (66.7)	
<b>I manage time well</b>				
No	37 (29.4)	18 (48.6)	19 (51.4)	0.030
Yes	72 (70.6)	20 (27.8)	52 (72.2)	
<b>High expectations in e-learning</b>				
No	9 (8.3)	8 (89.0)	1 (11.0)	0.001
Yes	100 (91.7)	30 (30.0)	70 (70.0)	
<b>I feel confident using IT devices</b>				
No	32 (29.4)	19 (59.4)	12 (40.6)	<0.001
Yes	77 (70.6)	19 (24.4)	59 (75.6)	
<b>Prior experience in e-learning</b>				
No	30 (27.5)	18 (60.0)	12(40.0)	0.001
Yes	79 (72.5)	20 (25.3)	59 (74.7)	
<b>I consider e-learning to be flexible</b>				
No	31(28.4)	17 (54.8)	14 (45.2)	0.006
Yes	78 (71.6)	21 (26.9)	57 (73.1)	
<b>Affordable internet</b>				
No	73 (67.0)	32 (43.8)	41 (56.2)	0.005
Yes	36 (33.0)	6 (16.7)	30 (83.3)	

178 **Factors associated with adoption of e-learning at the unadjusted and adjusted analysis**

179

180 Table 3 shows low odds of adoption of e-learning among participants in their first year of study  
 181 (aOR, 0.34: 95%CI, 0.14-0.79), low e-learning expectations (aOR, 0.01: 95%CI, 0.01-0.34), no  
 182 confidence in using IT devices (aOR, 0.16: 95%CI, 0.00-0.77), prior use of e-learning tools (aOR,  
 183 0.11: 95%CI, 0.02-0.68), not considering e-learning flexible (aOR, 0.25:95%CI, 0.08-0.86) high  
 184 cost of internet (aOR, 0.13: 95%CI, 0.02-0.84).

185

186 **Table 3: Factors associated with adoption of e-learning at unadjusted and adjusted**  
 187 **analysis**

188

Variable	Binary Logistic Regression			
	Unadjusted analysis		Adjusted analysis	
	OR	95%CI	aOR	95%CI
<b>Sex</b>				
Male	0.71	0.32-1.59	0.998	0.27-3.75
Female	1		1	
<b>Year of study</b>				
One	0.37	0.17-0.84	0.34	0.14-0.79*
Two	1		1	
<b>I manage time well</b>				
No	0.41	0.18-0.93	0.62	0.16-2.47
Yes	1		1	
<b>I have high expectations in e- learning</b>				
No	0.05	0.01-0.45	0.01	0.01-0.34*
Yes	1		1	
<b>I feel confident using IT devices</b>				
No	0.20	0.08-0.50	0.16	0.00-0.77*
Yes	1			
<b>Prior experience in e-learning</b>				
No	0.23	0.09-0.55	0.11	0.02-0.68*
Yes	1		1	
<b>Consider e-learning to be flexible</b>				
No	0.30	0.13-0.72	0.25	0.08-0.86*
Yes	1		1	
<b>Affordable internet</b>				
No	0.26	0.10-0.69	0.13	0.02-0.84*
Yes	1		1	

189 **Note:** Significance codes at 5% level: p<0.001\*\*\*, p<0.01\*\*, p<0.05\*.

190

191 **Discussion**

192 This study focused on the predictors for adoption of e-learning as a way to foster continuity in  
193 learning during the lockdown at Clarke International University in Uganda. The data show that  
194 65.1% of the continuing health professional students adopted e-learning. This finding is consistent  
195 with a recent finding in Ghana (14) where university students had a positive attitude towards e-  
196 learning during the lockdown. However, the rate of e-learning adoption in the current study was  
197 twice higher than in a recent study conducted at a university in Nigeria (32.5%) and five times  
198 higher in Uganda (14.4%) (15). The discrepancy could be attributed to the fact that the previous  
199 studies were conducted in Public Universities with high volume of students compared to the  
200 current study setting which is a private university with relatively low numbers of students that are  
201 health professionals. Our results suggest that universities' transition from face to face teaching to  
202 e-learning during the lockdown was not smooth as evident in a recent study (16). Accordingly,  
203 Universities in Uganda must develop strategies to ensure that all students continue to learn during  
204 the lockdown and beyond any unprecedented time.

205

206 Our study shows that, health professional students in their first year of study are less likely to  
207 adopt e-learning compared to those in second year. Though no study has directly linked e-  
208 learning adoption to year of study, a previous study (17) revealed that IT adoption in universities  
209 is incremental. This could probably imply that first year health professional students have not  
210 adequately utilized IT in education, so adopting any IT- based initiative such as e-learning would  
211 be slow paced compared to students in a higher year of study.

212

213 The current study revealed a low likelihood to adopt e-learning among health professional  
214 students with low e-learning expectations. This could be due to the low anticipation of what e-  
215 learning can contribute towards continuity of learning especially during such unprecedented times  
216 of coronavirus diseases 2019. This finding is consistent with (18) where adoption of e-learning  
217 was found to be dependent on student expectations. Additionally (19) argues that e-learning does  
218 not, *in itself*, result in improved educational outcomes, probably students were concerned about  
219 the teaching methodology and assessment hence hesitant to adopt e-learning.

220

221 Our finding that students with low confidence in using IT devices are less likely to adopt e-learning  
222 is not surprising. This is because e-learning is largely premised on IT. This argument is supported  
223 by (20) who found that one of the challenges of implementing e-learning in medical education was

224 issues related to IT information technology. This implies that IT improvement is an integral part to  
225 introducing e-learning in any academic institution.

226  
227 Our data show that students with no prior e-learning experience are less likely to adopt e-learning.  
228 This can be explained by the fact that having prior e-learning experience exposes students to  
229 some level of online skills and a level of online system competency. This finding is consistent  
230 with a study in Saudi Arabia (21) where dental students' readiness to adopt e-learning was due  
231 to acceptable levels of online system competency. It is important to note that acceptability to adopt  
232 technology depends largely on prior use or recommendations from previous users (22).  
233 Therefore, it is imperative for universities in Uganda to adopt a blended learning for students in  
234 preparation for any unforeseen event such as Coronavirus diseases 2019.

235  
236 We found that students who never considered e-learning a flexible way to study were less likely  
237 to adopt e-learning. This could be potentially attributed to the fact that these students had enrolled  
238 for the traditional face- to- face learning, therefore it would be impossible for them to envision the  
239 flexibility of an online education system they had never experienced. Though previous studies  
240 (23) have demonstrated flexibility as an additional fascinating feature of e-learning; emphasizing  
241 that a student can plan their time for completion of courses available virtually.

242  
243 Our study revealed that participants who found the cost of the internet unaffordable were less  
244 likely to adopt e-learning during the lockdown. This finding was also not surprising based on the  
245 fact that the majority of e-learning is enabled by access to the internet. This finding is consistent  
246 with a previous study (24) where unreliable internet potentially affected student adoption of e-  
247 learning. This clearly implies that access to the internet is a necessary factor for students'  
248 successful adoption of e-learning. Though students in high-income countries had the ability to  
249 transition from traditional face- to- face education to e-learning during the Coronavirus diseases  
250 2019 pandemic, students in low- and middle-income countries like Uganda, where access to the  
251 internet is not free, might struggle to fully adopt online education. This argument is also supported  
252 by another study (25). Therefore, it is imperative for universities to advocate for internet policy  
253 reforms to accelerate adoption to e-learning during the Coronavirus diseases 2019 pandemic and  
254 even beyond.

255 This study also confirms the applicability of TAM where students who have been introduced to  
256 new technology can accept and use it based on perceived easiness to use and flexibility.

257

258 **Study strengths and limitations**

259 Our study has strengths and limitations. Regarding the strength, to the best of our knowledge this  
260 study is among the first few studies that were conducted on adoption of e-learning among health  
261 professional students during lockdown in a private university in Uganda. The limitation is that the  
262 study setting has relatively low numbers of students, especially those that are health  
263 professionals. So the small sample size makes the findings limited to private universities.

264  
265 **Conclusions**

266 Our study shows that predictors of e-learning adoption are year of study, high e-learning  
267 expectations, confidence in using IT devices, prior experience of e-learning, considering e-  
268 learning to be a flexible way to study and affordable internet. Our findings suggest a need to  
269 prepare students intending to engage in online learning on costs related to internet activity and  
270 internet bundles and offer ICT training to all potential e-learners for easy adoption.

271  
272 **List of abbreviations**

273  
274 **aORs:** Adjusted odds ratios

275 **CI:** Confidence Interval

276 **CIU:** Clarke International University

277 **cORs:** Crude odds ratios

278 **E-learning:** Electronic learning

279 **ICTs:** Information Communication Technologies

280 **IT:** Information Technology

281 **NCHE:** National Council for Higher Education

282 **TAM:** Technology Acceptance Model

283 **SPSS:** Statistical Package for the Social Sciences

284 **Declarations**

285 **Consent for publications**

286 Not applicable (Since no identity revealing information has been included in this study).

287 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

288 Our study was reviewed and approved by the Clarke International University Research Ethics  
289 Committee (Reference No: CLARKE-2021-123) and the participants provided informed consent.

290 I confirm that all methods performed were in accordance with relevant guidelines and regulations.

291 **Data availability**

292 The dataset for the current study is available and can be provided by the corresponding author  
293 upon reasonable request.

294 **Conflicts of interest**

295 All authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article.

296 **Funding statement**

297 Research reported in this publication was supported in part by the Fogarty International Center of  
298 the National Institutes of Health under Award Number 1R25TW011213. The content is solely the  
299 responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National  
300 Institutes of Health.

301 **Author contributions**

302 AK: Study conception and design. AK and FWG: Acquisition of data. AK: Analysis and  
303 interpretation of data. AK, FWG, HM and LR: Drafting of manuscript. AK, FWG and RCN: Critical  
304 revision. AK, FWG, HM, LR and RCN: Final approval of manuscript.

305 **Acknowledgments**

306 We thank Health Professional Education Partnership Initiative (HEPI) for the funding. We are  
307 indebted to Clarke International University Research Ethics Committee for the review and  
308 approval of the study protocol and the health professional students that participated in the study.

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321 **References**

- 322 1. Mihajlović I, Tomičić I. E–LEARNING AND INNOVATIVE EDUCATION. B.:79.
- 323 2. Da Silva VG, De Souza RMS. E-learning, B-learning, M-learning and the technical and  
324 pedagogical aspects on the new platform trends as massive open online courses. ICERI2016  
325 Proc. 2016; 5521–9.
- 326 3. Ferri F, Grifoni P, Guzzo T. Online learning and emergency remote teaching: Opportunities and  
327 challenges in emergency situations. *Societies*. 2020; 10(4):86.
- 328 4. Al-Adwan A, Smedley J. Implementing e-learning in the Jordanian Higher Education System:  
329 Factors affecting impact. *Int J Educ Dev using ICT*. 2012; 8(1).
- 330 5. Sarikhani R, Salari M, Mansouri V. THE IMPACT OF E-LEARNING ON UNIVERSITY  
331 STUDENTS ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AND CREATIVITY. *J Tech Educ Train*. 2016; 8(1).
- 332 6. Salmi J. COVID's Lessons for Global Higher Education: Coping with the Present While Building  
333 a More Equitable Future. *Lumina Found*. 2020;
- 334 7. Olum R, Atulinda L, Kigozi E, Nassozi DR, Mulekwa A, Bongomin F, et al. Medical education and  
335 E-learning during COVID-19 pandemic: awareness, attitudes, preferences, and barriers among  
336 undergraduate medicine and nursing students at Makerere University, Uganda. *J Med Educ  
337 Curric Dev*. 2020; 7:2382120520973212.
- 338 8. Kukulska-Hulme A. Mobile usability in educational contexts: what have we learnt? *Int Rev Res  
339 open Distrib Learn*. 2007; 8(2).
- 340 9. Masrom M. Technology acceptance model and e-learning. *Technology*. 2007; 21(24):81.
- 341 10. Mpirirwe H, Mirembe DP, Lubega J, Agaba JE. E-learning platforms and security mechanisms  
342 used by educational institutions in Kampala, Uganda. *Int J Inf Technol Commun Converg*. 2021;  
343 4(1):47–62.
- 344 11. Attia A. Why should researchers report the confidence interval in modern research Middle East  
345 *Fertil Soc J*. 2005; 10(1):78–81.
- 346 12. Gupta SK. The relevance of confidence interval and P-value in inferential statistics. *Indian J  
347 Pharmacol*. 2012; 44(1):143.
- 348 13. Ranstam J. *Why the P-value culture is bad and confidence intervals a better alternative*. Elsevier;  
349 2012.
- 350 14. Aboagye E, Yawson JA, Appiah KN. COVID-19 and E-learning: The challenges of students in  
351 tertiary institutions. *Soc Educ Res*. 2021; 1–8.

35215. Hamiza O, Sambo M, Tsuma C. Students Adoption of E-Learning Platforms: A Comparative Study  
353 in Uganda and Nigeria'. *Int J Educ Res Dev.* 2020; 2(2014):5–13.
35416. Adeoye IA, Adanikin AF, Adanikin A. COVID-19 and E-learning: Nigeria tertiary education system  
355 experience. 2020;
35617. Thanaraj A, Williams S. Supporting the adoption of technology enhanced learning by academics  
357 at universities. *J Teach Learn with Technol.* 2016; 5(1):59–86.
35818. King E, Boyatt R. Exploring factors that influence adoption of e-learning within higher education.  
359 *Br J Educ Technol.* 2015; 46(6):1272–80.
36019. Kirkwood A. E-learning: you don't always get what you hope for. *Technol Pedagog Educ.* 2009;  
361 18(2):107–21.
36220. O'Doherty D, Dromey M, Loughheed J, Hannigan A, Last J, McGrath D. Barriers and solutions to  
363 online learning in medical education—an integrative review. *BMC Med Educ.* 2018; 18(1):1–11.
36421. Linjawi AI, Alfadda LS. Students' perception, attitudes, and readiness toward online learning in  
365 dental education in Saudi Arabia: a cohort study. *Adv Med Educ Pract.* 2018; 9: 855–63.
36622. Assaker G. Age and gender differences in online travel reviews and user-generated-content  
367 (UGC) adoption: extending the technology acceptance model (TAM) with credibility theory. *J Hosp*  
368 *Mark Manag.* 2020; 29(4):428–49.
36923. Dhawan S. Online learning: A panacea in the time of COVID-19 crisis. *J Educ Technol Syst.* 2020;  
370 49(1):5–22.
37124. Wanga H, Ngumbuke F, Oroma JO. Challenges of e-learning in developing countries: The  
372 Ugandan experience. Retrieved. 2012; 12(12):2015.
37325. Dawidziuk A, Kawka M, Szyszka B, Wadunde I, Ghimire A. Global Access to Technology-  
374 Enhanced Medical Education During the COVID-19 Pandemic: The Role of Students in Narrowing  
375 the Gap. *Glob Health Sci Pract.* 2021; 9(1):10–4.
- 376  
.377  
378  
379