Attitudes of faculty members towards using learning management system "desire2learn" in learning

Hassan A. El-Sabagh¹,²* and Hanaa A. Yamani¹

¹E-learning Deanship, Umm Al-Qura University, Saudi Arabia.
²Faculty of Specific Education, Mansoura University, Egypt.

*Corresponding author. E-mail: dr.haelsabagh@gmail.com; haelsabagh@uqu.edu.sa.

Accepted 12th November, 2020

Abstract. This research aims to investigate faculty members' attitudes towards using learning management system "Desire2Learn" (D2L) at Umm Al-Qura University (UQU) in the kingdom of Saudi Arabia. In addition, it examines the impact of some personal and organizational variables on the faculty members' attitudes. The paper aims as well to identify the principal obstacles that limit their use of eLearning platform (Desire2Learn). To achieve these aims, a descriptive analysis methodology was used in this research, and the research sample consists of 160 participants that were selected randomly from various faculties at the university. The sample participants are asked to complete a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire to gather the required data. Validity and reliability of the questionnaire were guaranteed. The research results revealed positive attitudes of the faculty members at UQU towards eLearning platform (D2L), although it has not activated enough yet. Results also indicated there are differences of statistical significance level (0.05) in the attitudes of faculty members towards using LMS "D2L" due to the colleges classification, whether they are humanities, scientific or medical colleges. However, there are significant statistically differences in faculty members' attitudes with respect to using D2L which are found in favor of males than females and the scientific colleges whose faculty members are more desire to use the learning management system than those in the humanities colleges. The results revealed that the most important obstacles are the administrative and academic obstacles which is ranked first, followed by the physical obstacles and the personal obstacles exist at the final. The research findings help stakeholders and decision makers at higher education to take into account the implication of designing more e-courses to fulfill the needs of faculty member and activate the LMS usage to increase the efficiency of eLearning. The contribution of this research is clarified to direct faculty members' practice in various learning activities environment that lead to a successful implementation of eLearning platform and afford the stakeholders better understanding to promote positive attitudes and effective use toward LMS.
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INTRODUCTION

The rapid development in knowledge and technology has increased in recent years. The technology has played a significant role in education to overcome the obstacles of space, time and risk for both faculty members and students. Furthermore, support in augmenting the learning situations and enriching the educational process, and its quality is needed. (El-Sabagh, 2011; Trayek, 2013; Tatli et al., 2019; El-Sabagh and Hamed, 2020).

eLearning has emerged as one of the rapids trends in today's education, it becomes the foundation of online learning environment. (Scott, 2015; Khlifi and El-Sabagh, 2017; El-Sabagh and Hamed, 2020). eLearning is now an
important approach for universities and educational institutions to increase the practical impact that support teaching and learning environment. eLearning allows students to be more flexibility to learn and interact with others and e-content. Moreover, e-Learning environments aid the educational systems resist any temporal barriers, and augment tworad high meaningful learning, and supporting ease of use (Mtebe, 2015). The increasing number of students and the growth in information transfer have made it difficult to deliver instruction to individuals (Yamani, 2013). However, the success of this process is depended on instructors, student’s acceptance and their usage. (Sumk et al., 2011).

Consequently, numerous higher education institutions across the Saudi Arabia have been progressed at the lead regarding the use of e-Learning platforms and have testified that such systems have a positive effective on the learning and development of their students. Concerning faculty members usage, they should make use of the modern technology, to stay up to date and transfer what they have learned to all students. Although the previous benefits of eLearning platforms, there are many obstacles that face such usage at higher education institutions (Aldiab et al., 2019).

According the literature review, it has been indicated that there are some reasons and obstacles that limit the spread of eLearning or activating it systematically or using it in effective way. According to the authors knowledge, there is no paper dealt with the attitudes issue of faculty members towards eLearning system (Desire2Learn) at Umm Al-Qura University or at saudi universities, especially the whole other saudi universities uses another LMs (Black Board). According to many articles and studies (Hussien, 2011; Mazroua et al., 2013; Mtebe, 2015; Alomari, 2015; Alghamdi and Bayaga, 2016; Bervell and Umar, 2017; Alenezi, 2018; Alshorman and Bawaneh, 2018), the attitudes of faculty members to learning management systems usage were investigated and discussed via various perspectives. This paper differs from other studies as it represents a case study at Umm Al-Qura University, and the closed learning management system (D2L), to identify the perspectives of faculty members and provide necessary data to decision makers to work at the future to find solutions for these obstacles and overcome it.

Therefore, this research aims to investigate faculty members’ attitudes towards using learning management system “Desire2Learn” (D2L) at Umm Al-Qura University (UQU) in the kingdom of Saudi Arabia. In addition to, it investigates the impact of some personal and organizational variables on their attitudes.

In order to achieve these research aims; the articulated research questions are:

Q1: What are faculty members’ attitudes toward utilizing (D2L) LMS? 
Q2: What are the factors that influence faculty members’ attitudes towards LMS “D2L” according to personal and organizational factors such as gender, college, academic rank, experience, training sessions? 

Q3: What are the usage obstacles from view points of faculty members at UQU to use D2L in learning environment?

Subsequently, this research paper is structured as follow: The next section presents review of literature, followed by methods, and discussion of results are provided in subsequent sections, respectively; and the last section provides conclusion.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This section briefly presents the literature review related two subsections, first Desire2Learn “D2L” as a pedagogical tool, the other related to Attitudes towards online learning and Learning Management Systems (LMSs).

Desire2Learn “D2L” as a pedagogical tool

Technology use should be taken into consideration as a tool to afford a platform for accomplishing learning objectives (Reigeluth, 2012). According to e-learning systems development, the Learning management systems (LMSs) have become reliable resources in the learning environments (Jones et al., 2005; Zakaria and Daud, 2013). The learning management system (LMS) refers to integrated system which is responsible in administrating the electronic educational process via web. It includes registration, assignments, learners tracking, e-exams, synchronous and Asynchronous tools (Al-mousa, 2005).

Learning management systems are used to plan, implement, and evaluate a specific learning process, and the learning management system usually provides the instructor with a way to create and present content, monitor student participation and evaluate their performance, and also they can provide students with the ability of using interactive features such as discussion of topics, video meetings and discussion forums (Al-Jarf, 2008). LMS provides "functionalities separated from e-content such as management tracking, personalized learning and the system interaction (Watson and Watson, 2007). LMS can efficiently enhance and facilitate learning process using "learning structure" to deliver the appropriate support for learning (Hussein, 2011; Song, 2014; Shin and Kang, 2015; Alenezi, 2018; Alshorman and Bawaneh, 2018). In addition, LMS continuous well beyond the classroom through emails, discussion groups, student-faculty questions and answers, the transfer one (Ozdamli, 2007). LMS helps faculty members to achieve learning outcomes through several instructional materials
and activities that occur usually in the classroom. Accordingly, ICT integration aims to create a learning community among stakeholders and peers (Ziphorah, 2014). It is also a significant tool for developing course design and students’ learning management to motivate them to learn (Ozdamlı, 2007). Besides, learning through the LMS attains efficiency in teaching practices and student learning development (Boticario and Santos, 2007). LMS can support instruction and facilitate learning using an organized "learning structure" to deliver learning environment support effectively (Sang et al., 2010; Cavus et al., 2010; Zakaria and Daud, 2013) Subsequently, after a complete review and assessment of available learning management systems such as (Blackboard, Desire2Learn, and other various LMSs), LMS (Desire2Learn (D2L)) was further chosen by Umm Al-Qura University at Saudi Arabia at end of 2011.

As presented in Figure 1, D2L provides further tools and capabilities in addition to a satisfying user interface for both faculty members and students. "The fundamental functions among all these programs are essentially the same characteristics, delivering, testing Desire2Learn turned out to be the outstanding choice. It includes more tools, capabilities and contained a nicer user interface for both faculty members and students. One of the deciding factors was that it took about social-constructivist nature, and allows instructors to plan, design, and follow up learners (Chawdhry, 2011; Cavus et al., 2006) explored the use of using learning management systems in web-based learning of programming languages, and the study results showed that using the LMS was effective, as it was dependent on collaborative learning tools. The study revealed also the accomplishment of the programming languages courses towards realizing learning outcomes through the LMS.

Attitudes towards online learning and Learning Management Systems (LMSs)

Faculty perceptions is a significant factor in the successful adoption of D2L. Attitude refers to perception of the person toward definite behavior (Munasinghe and Wijewardana, 2016). To promote the learning value of D2L, the learners have to track educational behaviors such as collaboration. Several studies of online learning have been conducted. Schultz (2001) found that learners enjoyed in online learning, however they complained due to interaction shortage. Similarly, Palmer and Holt (2009), revealed that students were responded with higher desire and satisfaction that reflected toward online learning environment positively. Angulo and Bruce (1999) stated that additional web-based instruction presented the assistance to their learning. Similarly, Koohang and Durante (2003) and Tatti et al. (2019) stated the more experience of learner in using technology, the more acquire concerning accepting it. Naqvi (2006) determined that students who were exposed to online learning environment had positive attitudes toward such environment than others. Regarding LMS "MOODLE", Ayse (2008) discovered that 66.7% of faculty members liked to use LMS environment and 53.3% found out their control of their own learning was more valuable. Additional study by Gower and Barr (2005) reported that the learners responses were positive in relation to the usefulness and user friendliness of LMS. Asiri (2012) revealed that faculty members attitudes were positive towards utilization of "JUSUR" LMS. The results also showed that the faculty members use toward LMS was adequate, and the faculty members showed also positive attitudes toward LMS. A study by Santamaria and Antolin (2012) proved that student-teachers LMS usage was very
positive toward LMS, however, one of the obstacles identified by the faculty members regarding the use of LMS is the lack of training to use it, still there have been limited discussions about how students' views and their reaction to e-learning. In the same frame, Browne (2014) assured that the learning management system "Moodle" proceeded a positive attitude if used to satisfy learners duties in the classroom. Faculty members and students are agreed of the LMS view as an useful tool that provided additional knowledge and shared easily within classroom situations.

Several studies dealt with the obstacles facing the faculty in other universities, such as studies of Tshabalala et al. (2014) and Oliveira et al. (2016), that explained the use of e-learning system, through the knowledge of their views, and to provide information and data for decision-makers to work in the future to find solutions for overcome the obstacles of using of LMS. From other perspective, study results of Alshorman and Bawaneh (2018) indicated that there are significant differences in terms of faculty members' attitudes due to gender variable in favour of males. However, in terms of faculty members experience and academic track, there is no significant difference. Further researches are recommended to focus on how to activate e-courses within learning management systems to engage students for effective use (Aldiab et al., 2019).

In conclusion, the paper aims to identify and measure faculty members' attitudes towards learning Management System "Desire2Learn" (D2L) at Umm Al-Qura University (UQU) in the kingdom of Saudi Arabia. In addition to, investigate the impact of some personal and organizational variables on their attitudes; finally, the paper purposes to identify the principal obstacles that limit their use of Desire2Learn. To achieve these goals, a qualitative methodology used in this study, the random sample included 160 participants in this research were selected from eight faculties (colleges) asked to complete a 5-point likert scale questionnaire to collect the required data. The importance of current paper is derived from significant of eLearning, which is considered that its usage is not completely enough at Umm Al-Qura University.

Purpose and objectives

This research was conducted at Saudi Arabia, at Umm Al-Qura University. The second term of the academic year 2017/2018. The specific objectives of the present study include: (1) Investigate faculty members' attitudes towards using learning management system "Desire2Learn" (D2L) at Umm Al-Qura University (UQU), (2) investigates the impact of some personal and organizational variables on their attitudes, (3) identify the usage obstacles from viewpoints of faculty members at UQU to use D2L in learning process.

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to examine faculty members’ attitude towards LMS D2L, to identify factors that influence Faculty members’ attitudes to e-learning and examine their experience in using D2L. The Study was conducted at Umm Al-Qura University, Saudi Arabia.

Research design

The researcher used the descriptive analytical method to identify the faculty members’ attitudes towards LMS at Umm Al-Qura University; the method also was used in describing and analyzing the literature related to the research problem and creating the research instrument.

Research sample

The sample size of the study consisted of 160 Faculty members that have been requested to participate in the questionnaire -in Arabic Language- through D2L link and Faculty members’ email. The Faculty members list was taken from one of the university core data bases so that all colleges and academic discipline involved in this survey. The study had a suitability sample surveying faculty member from the colleges of Arts and Humanities, Business, Science and Match, Engineering, Computer Science, Information Technology. The population in the study consisted of university faculty members at Umm Al-Qura University’s in Makkah Campus; specifically, the concern with all faculties using the most learning management system provided by the university. The target sample for this study counts 215 faculty members. After pre-treatment by eliminating missed and uncompleted responses, the complete responses were 160. The sample obtained composed by 160 composed by 59% male and 41% female faculty members respecting the real university faculty members' distribution. All sample participants were chosen in the academic year 2017–2018 at the second term. The distribution of faculty members’ sample ""Demographics Characters" was shown in Table 1 and Figure 2.

As shown in Table 1 and Figure 2, the results showed that the sample consisted of 59% males and 41% females of the faculty members, and on the other hand, the Saudi faculty members were 43%, however the non-Saudi faculty members were 57% from the total sample.

Research instruments

D2L attitudes questionnaire

Questionnaires are a common method for collecting data in education research (McMillan and Schumacher, 2006).
The scale had been organized electronically and distributed to faculty members through a link via e-mail registered on the UQU system. The questionnaire was conducted using Google forms. The questionnaire instrument used in this study was presented (Appendix 1). The completed responses were (160) faculty members.

A preface for the questionnaire to explain the objective was presented, the assurance of confidentiality and privacy of respondents, and the voluntary nature of respondent participation. The scale of ‘attitude towards LMS’ was developed based on the literature review research and other past scales directed to measure faculty members’ attitudes towards LMSs (Mishra and Panda, 2007; Gasaymeh, 2009). It consisted of nine positive statements to determine participants' experiences towards LMS. Participants were requested to use a rating scale (from “1” ‘strongly disagree’ to “5” ‘strongly agree’) to specify the degree to which they perceived their attitude towards LMS, the following scale dimensions have been identified.

The scale instrument consisted of 29 closed-ended questions, classified in four main dimension and (9) items as multiple-choice statements related to experiment of faculty member in teaching via using LMS "D2L".

Validity and reliability were guaranteed. The author used statistical treatments such as percentages, means, frequencies, and analysis of variance ANOVA. Structure of attitudes questionnaire of faculty members at Umm Al-Qura University towards using D2L "Learning Management System" was established. The first five questions focused on faculty member demographics; they included gender, age, education, academic ranking, nationality and college.

Based on the faculty member experience in using of Desire2Learn, the first dimension "9 items" focused on their preferences of online management systems. The second dimension "6 items'' focused on faculty members expectations toward LMS platforms in education, the third dimension focused on personal vision and ease of use, the fourth category focused on the need of training and technical support, the fifth dimension focused on faculty members experiences in teaching via e-courses, the sixth dimension focused on the potential benefits and awareness, however the last dimension focused on the challenges and concerns that face faculty members for not using LMS platform. The questionnaire outcomes were analysed using SPSS.

Reliability and validity of the questionnaire:

Reliability

The reliability analysis of a questionnaire aims to identify its capabilities to produce the similar results based on conducting it several times, however, the validity states that the measurement of what the questionnaire is supposed to measure (Cooper and Schindler, 2008). Cooper and Schindler (2008) pointed that “reliability is a necessary contributor to validity but is not a sufficient condition for validity”. Thus, it is well accepted that it is essential to assess the reliability and validity of the research instrument to increase the credibility and integrity of the study conclusion. For reliability analysis, Cronbach's alpha, which is one of the most frequently operated methods for evaluating and assessing research internal consistency, is calculated by SPSS. Internal consistency was calculated through the calculation of correlation of each item with each dimension to fit correlation among other dimensions and the calculated value was normally recognized as high reliability value (Usoro and Omekara, 2015).

The results of Table 2 showed that the reliability for whole attitudes questionnaire has enough internal consistency, as the Cronbach’s Alpha correlation coefficient was 0.83, thus, it indicated that the questionnaire was reliable and appropriate for preceding such research.

As shown in Table 3, internal consistency was calculated through the calculation of correlation of each dimension within the whole scale to which it belongs and correlation among other dimensions, the results were explained. A strong and good relationship applied to all

| Table 1. Demographic information "Nationality and Gender". |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Age                | Gender              | Total | Percent (%) |
|                    | M     | F     |        |                |
| Saudi              | 25    | 44    | 69     | 43             |
| Non-Saudi          | 70    | 21    | 91     | 57             |
| Total              | 95    | 65    | 160    | 100            |

Figure 2. Demographic information "gender distribution".
Table 2. Alpha Cronbach coefficient.

| N of Items | Alpha Cronbach |
|------------|----------------|
| 28         | 0.826          |

Table 3. The internal consistency of the scale dimensions

| Spearman's rho | 1st Dimension (Expectations and beneficiary) | 2nd Dimension (Training and technical support) | 3rd Dimension (Faculty experiences in e-courses design) | 4th Dimension (Obstacles and challenges) | Total |
|---------------|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------|
|               | Correlation coefficient                     |                                               |                                                       |                                         |       |
| 1st Dimension |                                           |                                               |                                                       |                                         |       |
|               | Sig. (2-tailed)                             |                                               |                                                       |                                         |       |
| 2nd Dimension |                                           |                                               |                                                       |                                         |       |
|               | Correlation coefficient                     |                                               |                                                       |                                         |       |
|               | Sig. (2-tailed)                             |                                               |                                                       |                                         |       |
| 3rd Dimension |                                           |                                               |                                                       |                                         |       |
|               | Correlation coefficient                     |                                               |                                                       |                                         |       |
|               | Sig. (2-tailed)                             |                                               |                                                       |                                         |       |
| 4th Dimension |                                           |                                               |                                                       |                                         |       |
|               | Correlation coefficient                     |                                               |                                                       |                                         |       |
|               | Sig. (2-tailed)                             |                                               |                                                       |                                         |       |
| Total         | Correlation coefficient                     |                                               |                                                       |                                         |       |
|               | Sig. (2-tailed)                             |                                               |                                                       |                                         |       |

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

dimensions between each item and the overall sum of the four dimensions.

Validity

Validity was calculated to the scale through a group of experts in measurement, evaluation, teaching methods, curricula, and educational psychology that consisted from nine faculty members. The questionnaire was presented in its initial form to explain their opinion about: suitability of the questionnaire phrases for its purpose, and the linguistic accuracy of the questionnaire items, the suitability of the questionnaire design method to achieve its goal. Experts and specialists added some items and agreed on the items of the questionnaire, with the amendment of the linguistic wording of some of the items of the questionnaire.

Their requested modifications have been changed. The final form of the questionnaire was consisted of 29 items divided into 4 Dimensions and in addition 9 items as MCQ questions. In this research, content validity and predictive validity were analysed to confirm the validity of the research instrument (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994). Construct validity of instrument was analysed through factor analysis.

RESULTS

Attitudes of faculty members

To answer the current research question: What are the factors that influence faculty members’ attitudes towards D2L LMS according to personal and organismal factors such as gender, college, academic rank, experience, training sessions?. The following tables revealed the statically data related to research question. The demographic and background information were further detailed in relation to gender.

The total academic population in the current study was N=160, 95 female and 65 male faculty members.

Table 4 and Figure 3 depict the academic rank of the participant into academics based on their gender and
Table 4. Distribution of faculty research group according to "Academic Rank and Gender".

| Academic rank | Gender | Total | Percent (%) |
|---------------|--------|-------|-------------|
|               | M      | F     |             |
| Demonstrator  | 3      | 5     | 8           | 5            |
| Lecturer      | 17     | 22    | 39          | 24           |
| Assistant Prof.| 52     | 25    | 77          | 48           |
| Associate Prof.| 12     | 9     | 21          | 13           |
| Professor     | 11     | 4     | 15          | 9            |
| **Total**     | 95     | 65    | 160         | 100          |

Figure 3. The academic rank classification according to gender of research sample.

Table 5. Distribution of faculty research group according to "Colleges classifications and Gender".

| Academic disciplines | Gender | Total | Percent (%) |
|----------------------|--------|-------|-------------|
|                      | M      | F     |             |
| Medical Colleges     | 13     | 14    | 27          | 17           |
| Scientific Colleges  | 19     | 10    | 29          | 18           |
| Humanities Colleges  | 48     | 37    | 85          | 53           |
| University Colleges  | 8      | 3     | 11          | 7            |
| Institutes and Deanships | 7   | 1     | 8           | 5            |
| **Total**            | 95     | 65    | 160         | 100          |

academic rank. As shown, around half of sample are assistant professors, the percentage is 48%, from percent of assistant professors, 68% were males while 32% were females; on the other hand, the quarter of faculty members were lecturers, the percentage was 24%, from percent of lecturers, 44% were males while 56% were females.

As shown from Table 5 and Figure 4, the results related to the college classifications showed that around half of the sample were from Humanities and educational colleges (n = 85, 53%). 56 out of 160 academic participants from Scientific and Medical Colleges with combination between 18 and 17% respectively. The rest of the sample were from University Colleges and Institutes and Deanships with a percentage of 7 and 5, respectively.

The demographic and background information were further investigated in relation to gender variable. As revealed in Table 6, the results related the sample age, showed that the most of sample (79%) were between 30-
49 years.

From the Table 7, it looked that there were differences of statistical significance level (0.05) in the attitudes of faculty members towards using LMS "D2L" due to the college classification, whether they are humanities, scientific or medical colleges in favour of scientific colleges.

The authors used ANOVA test, since the p-value is less than a significant level 0.05 (p-value = 0.009), the study determined that there is a statistically significant difference in the mean of (3rd Dimension) between the males and females (Table 8).

As shown in Table 9, there are significant statistically differences in faculty members' attitudes with respect to using D2L were found in favour of males than females.

From Table 10, it looked that there were differences of statistical significance level (0.05) in the attitudes of faculty members towards using LMS "D2L" due to the faculty's academic ranking classification, whether they are professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and lecturer in favour of assistant professors.

As shown in Table 11, there are not significant differences in faculty members' attitudes with respect to using D2L were found regarding nationality either Saudi or not Saudi.

Since the p-value is less than a significant level 0.05 (p-value = 0.006), The authors can conclude that there is a statistically significant difference in the mean length of (fourth Dimension) related to obstacles and challenges that face faculty members and lead to not activating LMS "D2L" between the specialty (Table 12).

From Table 13, since the p-value is less than a significant level 0.05 (p-value = 0.009), the authors stated that there is a statistically significant difference in the
Table 8. Differences between attitudes of faculty members toward LMS “D2L” according to “Gender”.

| Dimension                              | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F   | Sig. |
|----------------------------------------|----------------|----|-------------|-----|------|
| 2nd Dimension (Expectations & Beneficiary) | Between Groups  | .057 | 1 | .057 | .004 | .950 |
|                                        | Within Groups  | 2307.918 | 157 | 14.700 |     |      |
|                                        | Total          | 2307.975 | 158 |      |     |      |
| 1st Dimension (Training & Technical Support) | Between Groups  | 13.374 | 1 | 13.374 | .949 | .332 |
|                                        | Within Groups  | 2226.970 | 158 | 14.095 |     |      |
|                                        | Total          | 2240.344 | 159 |      |     |      |
| 3rd Dimension (Faculty Experiences in e-courses Design) | Between Groups  | 163.045 | 1 | 163.045 | 6.920 | .009 |
|                                        | Within Groups  | 3675.493 | 156 | 23.561 |     |      |
|                                        | Total          | 3838.538 | 157 |      |     |      |
| 4th Dimension (Obstacles & Challenges) | Between Groups  | 475.948 | 1 | 475.948 | 3.531 | .062 |
|                                        | Within Groups  | 21164.479 | 157 | 134.806 |     |      |
|                                        | Total          | 21640.428 | 158 |      |     |      |

Table 9. Descriptive differences between male and females of the sample.

| Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F   | Sig. |
|----------------|----|-------------|-----|------|
| Between Groups | 1240.942 | 1 | 1240.942 | 5.489 | .020 |
| Within Groups  | 35718.552 | 160 | 226.067 |     |      |
| Total          | 36959.494 | 160 |     |      |      |

Table 10. Descriptive differences with Respect to Academic Rankings.

| Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F   | Sig. |
|----------------|----|-------------|-----|------|
| Between groups | 4080.159 | 4 | 1020.040 | 4.809 | .001 |
| Within groups  | 32879.335 | 160 | 212.125 |     |      |
| Total          | 36959.494 | 160 |     |      |      |

Table 11. Descriptive differences between Saudi respondents and non-Saudi respondents.

| Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F   | Sig. |
|----------------|----|-------------|-----|------|
| Between groups | 57.781 | 1 | 57.781 | .247 | .620 |
| Within groups  | 36901.713 | 158 | 233.555 |     |      |
| Total          | 36959.494 | 159 |     |      |      |

mean length of (third dimension) between the different colleges and departments. As well, the p-value of (first dimension) was closed to significant level (p-value=0.06). It indicated if there are more data, maybe have a significant result. The faculty members’ responses indicated that scientific faculties whose faculty members were more desire to use the eLearning platform than those in the faculties.

To answer the third research question: What are the usage obstacles from viewpoints of faculty members at UQU to use D2L in learning process? the following tables revealed the statically data related to research question. Regardless of the positive attitudes of faculty members, it is observed that there is a shortage of the LMS "D2L" activation satisfactorily; as results showed in Table 14 the arithmetic means and standards deviations and the relative weight for each obstacle item. The results showed the academic and administrative items came at

Usage obstacles from viewpoints of faculty members

To answer the current research question: What are the usage obstacles from viewpoints of faculty members at UQU to use D2L in learning environment? Table 14 revealed the statically data related to research question.
Table 12. Differences between attitudes of faculty members toward LMS "D2L" according to "Academic Ranking of faculty members".

| Dimension                              | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig.  |
|----------------------------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------|
| 2nd Dimension                          |                |     |             |       |       |
| (Expectations and Beneficiary)         | Between Groups | 16.016 | 4 | 4.004 | .269 | .898 |
|                                        | Within Groups  | 2291.959 | 154 | 14.883 |     |       |
|                                        | Total          | 2307.975 | 158 |       |     |       |
| 1st Dimension                          |                |     |             |       |       |
| (Training and Technical Support)       | Between Groups | 51.353 | 4 | 12.838 | .909 | .460 |
|                                        | Within Groups  | 2188.991 | 155 | 14.123 |     |       |
|                                        | Total          | 2240.344 | 159 |       |     |       |
| 3rd Dimension                          |                |     |             |       |       |
| (Faculty Experiences in e-courses Design) | Between Groups | 134.323 | 4 | 33.581 | 1.387 | .241 |
|                                        | Within Groups  | 3704.215 | 153 | 24.211 |     |       |
|                                        | Total          | 3838.538 | 157 |       |     |       |
| 4th Dimension                          |                |     |             |       |       |
| (Obstacles & Challenges)               | Between Groups | 1906.615 | 4 | 476.654 | 3.720 | .006 |
|                                        | Within Groups  | 19733.812 | 154 | 128.142 |     |       |
|                                        | Total          | 21640.428 | 157 |       |     |       |

Table 13. Differences between attitudes of faculty members toward LMS "D2L" according to "colleges classifications" (humanities-medical-scientific-religious).

| Dimension                              | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig.  |
|----------------------------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------|
| 2nd Dimension                          |                |     |             |       |       |
| (Expectations & Beneficiary)           | Between Groups | 23.835 | 4 | 5.959 | .402 | .807 |
|                                        | Within Groups  | 2284.140 | 154 | 14.832 |     |       |
|                                        | Total          | 2307.975 | 158 |       |     |       |
| 1st Dimension                          |                |     |             |       |       |
|                                        | Between Groups | 124.911 | 4 | 31.228 | 2.288 | .062 |
|                                        | Within Groups  | 2115.432 | 155 | 13.648 |     |       |
|                                        | Total          | 2240.344 | 159 |       |     |       |
| 3rd Dimension                          |                |     |             |       |       |
| (Faculty Experiences in e-courses Design) | Between Groups | 236.125 | 4 | 59.031 | 2.507 | .044 |
|                                        | Within Groups  | 3602.413 | 153 | 23.545 |     |       |
|                                        | Total          | 3838.538 | 157 |       |     |       |
| 4th Dimension                          |                |     |             |       |       |
| (Obstacles & Challenges)               | Between Groups | 919.882 | 4 | 229.970 | 1.709 | .151 |
|                                        | Within Groups  | 20720.546 | 154 | 134.549 |     |       |
|                                        | Total          | 21640.428 | 158 |       |     |       |

The first concerning usage such as "Lack of e-learning coordinators at colleges", "The absence of obligatory from colleges or scientific departments", "Lack of training programs and introductory workshops available to activate the e-Learning platform", and followed by physical obstacles, such as "The few numbers of computers available in the e-learning laboratories", however the personal obstacles were existed at the third order, the final order was "Lack of persuading and encouragement of the faculty members regarding the e-learning platform to activate it".

**DISCUSSION**

This paper investigated the faculty members' attitudes and perceptions from different colleges and different department towards Learning Management System LMS "D2L". The researchers have analysed the answers to the qualitative questions in the questionnaire to increase an understanding of how current faculty members view the use of LMS in learning environments.

Based upon the research results and the analysed data discussed in the prior section, these results can be
Table 14. Arith Means and Standard deviations of the faculty members views in terms of the obstacles towards using D2L at Umm Al-Qura University.

| Obstacle/constraint item                                                                 | Arith Mean | St. Dev. | Relative weight |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|----------|-----------------|
| Academic "administrative" obstacles:                                                    |            |          |                 |
| Lack of e-learning coordinators at colleges.                                              | 3.78       | 1.3      | 58.13           |
| Academic "administrative" obstacles:                                                    |            |          |                 |
| The absence of obligatory from colleges or scientific departments.                        | 3.69       | 1.2      | 55.26           |
| Physical Obstacle:                                                                      |            |          |                 |
| The few numbers of computers available in the e-learning laboratories.                    | 3.43       | 1.1      | 53.72           |
| Academic "administrative" obstacle:                                                     |            |          |                 |
| There is no encouragement from the scientific department to activate the e-learning platform "D2L". | 3.31       | 1.1      | 52.34           |
| Academic "administrative" obstacle:                                                     |            |          |                 |
| Lack of training programs and introductory workshops available to activate the e-Learning platform. | 3.25       | 1.0      | 49.64           |
| Personal obstacle                                                                        |            |          |                 |
| Persuasion of the faculty members' deficiency regarding the E-learning platform to activate it.  | 3.14       | 0.98     | 48.49           |
| Academic "administrative" obstacles                                                      |            |          |                 |
| Lack of training programs in the field of designing and developing courses electronically. | 2.98       | 0.91     | 45.83           |
| Personal Obstacle                                                                        |            |          |                 |
| There is no motivation for a faculty member to activate eLearning platform.               | 2.86       | 0.89     | 44.32           |

discussed in two approaches: (1) Determining the LMS attitudes by gender, nationality, academic ranking level, and colleges classifications; (2) investigate the main obstacles that face faculty members towards using D2L at Umm Al-Qura University. In conclusion, faculty members at Umm Al-Qura University have positive attitudes towards using D2L the E-learning Management System generally and in the questionnaire Dimensions, respectively. However, the findings vary between college classification types, whether humanities, scientific and healthcare college, where faculty members work. The results indicated also that there are significant differences at the level (0.05) in the attitudes towards using D2L due to gender variable of faculty members between males and females of the research sample, in favour of male participants. Thus, gender variable reflects a significant correlation towards using LMS.

The results indicated that there are statistically significant differences at the level (0.05) in the attitudes towards using LMS "D2L" due to the college classification in their attitudes in general and in the third dimension related to faculty experiences in e-courses design in particular. The results indicated also that there are significant differences at the level (0.05) in the attitudes towards using D2L due to the academic ranking of faculty members in their attitudes in general and in the fourth dimension related to obstacles and challenges that face faculty members particularly.

Despite the positive attitudes of faculty members, it is observed deficiency of LMS activation acceptably; that is due to the next reasons: first, the academic and administrative items such as "Lack of e-learning coordinators at colleges". Second, "the absence of obligatory from colleges or scientific departments". Third, "lack of training programs and introductory workshops available to activate the e-Learning platform". Fourth: the physical obstacles, such as: "the few numbers of computers available in the e-learning laboratories", however the personal obstacles came at the third order and the final such as "awareness deficient in terms of significance of the learning management system "D2L" from some scientific departments (Aldiab et al., 2019) and their conviction to activate it".

These results are consistent with other research including: (Hussien, 2011; Mazroua et al., 2013; Pollock
and Wayne, 2009; Alghamdi and Bayaga, 2016; Alenezi, 2018; Alshorman and Bawaneh, 2018); that have assured the effectiveness of LMS usage in developing competences and skills of the faculty members as well as inspiring the e-learning environment.

The finding stated that there was a significant correlation between gender and academic rank is inconsistent with Alharbi and Drew’s (2014) as they stated that academic rank did not correlate with other variables. This could be interpreted considering the different variables in the two studies, as Alharbi and Drew’s study conducted in Shaqra University, which unlike Umm Al-Qura University is considered a new university. This could greatly affect the academic attitude towards new technologies.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following conclusions are based upon the data and the results from the previous statistical analyses. A set of recommendations can be proposed as follow:

- Necessity of adopting strategic planning for eLearning platforms in higher education institutions;
- Providing the necessary training programs that fulfill both faculty members and students;
- Distribution of the culture of eLearning platforms among faculty members and students’ communities to be aware of its importance;
- Conducting more research to scope the most effective solutions to overcome the obstacles that prevent the introduction of eLearning system within higher education institutions.

This research, nevertheless, has useful implications for stakeholders at the higher education institutes, in the meantime LMS usage and attitudes among faculties was high to exploit from eLearning platforms. In addition, increasing LMS usage and faculty satisfaction within LMS, faculty members are recommended to get training regarding not only LMS procedures but also concerning designing the e-courses within LMS and its content.

The contribution of this research is clarified as well to investigate LMS usage in many learning activities that lead to successful LMS implementation by faculty members and afford the stakeholders better understanding to promote positive attitudes and effective use toward LMS.
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