

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Volume 15 Issue 4 2023

DOI: 10.21315/eimj2023.15.4.3

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 04-06-2022

Accepted: 19-03-2023

Online: 29-12-2023

Barriers of e-Learning Perceptions among University Students and Lecturers during the COVID-19 Crisis: A Cross-sectional Study in Malaysia, 2021

Thin Mon Kyaw^{1,2}, Mila Nu Nu Htay², Roy Rillera Marzo^{3,4}, Shantini Madurai¹, Prethyga Guvendaraju¹, Emily Ting Xiao Yan¹, Syahmy Alim Mustaza¹

¹Department of Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Cyberjaya, Selangor, MALAYSIA

²Department of Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Manipal University College Malaysia, Melaka, MALAYSIA

³Department of Community Medicine, International Medical School, Management and Science University, Selangor, MALAYSIA

⁴Global Public Health, Jeffrey Cheah School of Medicine and Health Sciences, Monash University Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, MALAYSIA

To cite this article: Kyaw TM, Htay MNN, Marzo RR, Madurai S, Guvendaraju P, Yan ETX, Mustaza SA. Barriers of e-learning perceptions among university students and lecturers during the COVID-19 crisis: a cross-sectional study in Malaysia, 2021. *Education in Medicine Journal*. 2023;15(4):41–51. <https://doi.org/10.21315/eimj2023.15.4.3>

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.21315/eimj2023.15.4.3>

ABSTRACT

The COVID-19 pandemic disrupted teaching and learning in a variety of institutions. During the pandemic, e-learning replaced traditional classes to prevent transmission among lecturers/teachers and university students. The study's main objective was to identify the attitude and barriers to e-learning perceptions among university students and lecturers during the COVID-19 pandemic in Malaysia in 2021. The specific objectives were to identify the infrastructure, attitudinal, technical expertise, and human and educational skill barriers to e-learning implementation during the COVID-19 pandemic and to identify significant differences in e-learning perceptions among university students and lecturers. A cross-sectional study collected closed-ended questionnaires from university students and lecturers shared via electronic platforms. The minimum sample size required in this study was 462; 847 respondents (217 were lecturers/teachers and 630 university students) voluntarily participated. Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the questionnaire of attitudes and barriers and its values was 0.851 and 0.96, respectively. Findings were tabulated with mean scores for the attitudes towards the use of e-learning, and barriers to e-learning included five categories: infrastructure barriers, attitudinal barriers, technical expertise barriers, human barriers, and educational skill barriers. University students and teachers/lecturers did not prefer replacing traditional teaching methods with e-learning as it affects their interaction. Administration, faculty admins, and the department of education should take note of the improvement and the necessary measures that can be applied for effective and better teaching and learning during the lockdown due to COVID-19.

Keywords: COVID-19, e-learning, University students, Lecturers/Teachers, Perceptions

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

Mila Nu Nu Htay, Department of Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Manipal University College Malaysia, Jalan Batu Hampar, 75150 Bukit Baru, Melaka, Malaysia

Email: drmlnnh@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

COVID-19 was declared a global pandemic in March 2020 (1). It was first identified on 25 January 2020, and cases increased exponentially from March onwards. The Malaysian Prime Minister made an effort to flatten the pandemic curve and reduce the number of cases by introducing the movement control order (MCO) (1). The MCO had a positive effect for two months. However, due to certain cluster origin, cases began to surge again and the overall confirmed cases in Malaysia increased to 12,813 and 137 deaths by 5 October 2020 (2, 3).

Studies done on e-learning showed the impact of e-learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. Among nursing students and teachers in Nepal, there was a significant association of selected demographic variables of the respondents with most of the statements (attitude and problems or activities) (p -value < 0.05) (4). In another study of the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on e-learning in higher education students (comparison between male and female), there was a significant positive association between the quality of e-learning and user satisfaction among male and female students (p -value < 0.05). For the next hypothesis on information quality, there was a significant positive association between male and female students' satisfaction (p -value < 0.05) (5). The quality of e-learning means that the outcome of an educational process is a result of the production process of an educational institution. Therefore, e-learning quality has to do with empowering and enabling learners (5).

Institutions were closed to control the viral spread among the public. Students and teachers were at high risk of coming into

contact with the coronavirus (6). Thus, the Ministry of Education of Malaysia advised all institutions to practice e-learning (7). Therefore, our study was conducted to investigate the attitudes and barriers to e-learning based on university students' and lecturers' perceptions.

During the COVID-19 pandemic crisis, the need for continuing academic and educational institutions rapidly shifted to online and distance learning (4, 8). Consequently, it could provide an opportunity for lecturers/teachers to choose better learning techniques for students during the COVID-19 pandemic (9–13). However, further research was needed to ensure the education system's quality, especially on e-learning among lecturers/teachers and students in Malaysia. Therefore, our study aimed to identify the attitude and barriers to e-learning perceptions among university students and lecturers during the COVID-19 pandemic in Malaysia in 2021.

METHODS

Study Context and Sample

A cross-sectional study surveyed university students, teachers, and lecturers in Malaysia to obtain information about attitudes and barriers to e-learning. Convenient sampling method was used in this study. The sample size for university students and lecturers in Malaysia was calculated using the Raosoft software, an innovative survey software program implemented by Raosoft Inc. (Seattle, WA, US). By using a margin error of 5%, confidence level at 95%, response distribution at 50%, and population size of 500,000, the minimum sample size required in this study was 385.

Data Collection

This study used a quantitative research approach with a cross-sectional survey and predetermined questionnaires. Data were collected from 20 February 2021 until 30 March 2021 during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic, when the MCO order was initiated in Malaysia. The type of data used in this study is primary data. The data-gathering instrument in this research was a questionnaire developed from previous literature (8, 9). There were 44 items divided into two parts. Part A (sociodemographic variables) comprised seven items: age, gender, race, occupation, educational level, and faculty. Part B comprised 37 items (8, 9). Seven items of the questionnaire covered participants' attitudes towards e-learning, while 30 items covered barriers to e-learning implementation during the COVID-19 pandemic. Five out of 30 items were infrastructure barriers, nine out of 30 were attitudinal barriers, seven out of 30 were technical expertise barriers, four of 30 were human barriers, and five of 30 were educational skill barriers. The scale for part B is based on a 5-point Likert scale: 1-strongly disagree, 2-disagree, 3-neutral, 4-agree, and 5-strongly agree. This method was suitable for answering the study's research questions measuring the attitudes and barriers of e-learning with expressions/opinions, suggestions/improvement, and skills. Experts approved the questionnaire's face and content validity before the questionnaire was distributed among university students and lecturers/teachers. A pilot test was also run on 20 participants. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used to test the reliability of the questionnaire, and its value was 0.96, which means that the questionnaire used in this study has excellent internal consistency. All participants provided written informed consent.

Data Analysis

The respondents' confidentiality was assured by ensuring no personal identifiers on any data instrument and only research personnel had access to the data. The data were processed and analysed with the SPSS software version 27 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, US) and an independent t-test. The independent t-test was used to compare the attitudes and barriers of e-learning perceptions between university students and lecturers during the COVID-19 crisis in Malaysia. The number of respondents (n), percentages (%), mean scores, and *p*-value were used to present the data results.

RESULTS

A total of 217 lecturers/teachers and 630 university students participated in the study, that is 94.4% university students and 12% lecturers/teachers. Among them, 6% of lecturers/teachers and 71.1% of students were female. Almost 95.4% of lecturers/teachers were tertiary educated, as were 77.9% of the university students (Table 1).

The average total score for an attitude of the e-learning of lecturers/teachers and university students was 22.28 (21.83–22.73) and 21.87 (21.61–22.14). The attitude scale was divided into seven items, and the mean scores for each attitude question are presented in Table 2. The question “e-learning has no significant impact on me in anyways” had the lowest score, 2.66 (2.54–2.79), among lecturers/teachers, while questions on “e-learning is better than the traditional method of teaching” had the lowest score, 2.50 (2.42–2.58), among university students. University students' and lecturers' attitudes were significantly different on Attitudes 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7 (Table 2).

Table 1: Sociodemographics factors of participants (n = 847)

Variable	n (%)		Total
	Lecturers/teachers	University students	
Age (years)			
<25	26 (12.0)	595 (94.4)	621
26–39	100 (46.1)	32 (50.8)	132
>40	91 (41.9)	3 (4.8)	94
Gender			
Male	66 (30.4)	182 (28.9)	248
Female	151 (69.6)	448 (71.1)	599
Educational level			
Post-secondary education (pre-university)	12 (4.6)	145 (22.1)	157
Tertiary education (Degree/Master/PhD)	205 (95.4)	485 (77.9)	690

Table 2: Attitudes towards the use of e-learning among participants using *t*-test (n = 847)

No.	Variable	Mean (SD)		p-value
		Lecturers/Teachers	University students	
1	I find that e-Learning is overall useful for me.	3.53 (3.40–3.66)	3.28 (3.21–3.36)	<0.01
2	I think e-Learning can be used as a future learning preference.	3.64 (3.48–3.79)	3.30 (3.21–3.38)	<0.01
3	I think e-Learning is better than traditional method of teaching.	2.69 (2.55–2.83)	2.50 (2.42–2.58)	<0.05
4	I satisfied with the quality of e-Learning.	3.12 (3.00–3.25)	2.95 (2.87–3.03)	<0.05
5	I find that e-Learning has no significant impact on me in anyways.	2.66 (2.54–2.79)	2.74 (2.66–2.82)	0.319
6	I think there is less effective communication between students and lecturers due to e-Learning.	3.82 (3.67–3.96)	3.95 (3.87–4.03)	0.102
7	I felt e-Learning is not secure for me.	2.82 (2.70–2.95)	3.16 (3.08–3.24)	<0.01

Table 3 presents the mean scores for each barrier question. Further barriers were divided into five categories named infrastructure barriers, attitude barriers, technical expertise barriers, human barriers, and educational skill barriers. The lowest infrastructure barriers among lecturers were “Financial problem to buy gadgets to be used for e-learning”, 2.65 95%CI (2.52–2.78). However, among university students it was, “I felt that there is no opportunity given for university students and lecturers to experience and explore e-learning”,

2.87 (2.80–2.95). Similarly, the lowest mean score among attitudinal barriers among lecturers was for the question “I have low self-confidence and ability to take part in e-Learning”, 2.2 (2.06–2.34). On the other hand, students’ lowest average barriers score was for the question “I am not sharing the information and knowledge via e-learning”, 2.72 (2.64–2.80). Likewise, technical expertise, human, and educational skill barriers are presented in Table 3 for lecturers and university students.

Table 3: Barriers to e-Learning implementation during the COVID-19 pandemic among participants using *t*-test (n = 847)

No.	Variable	Mean (SD)		p-value
Attitudinal barriers				
1	I doubt the usefulness of e-learning.	2.72 (2.59–2.86)	2.96 (2.88–3.04)	<0.01
2	I had low self-confidence and ability to take part in e-learning.	2.20 (2.06–2.34)	2.97 (2.88–3.06)	<0.01
3	I am not sharing the information and knowledge via e-learning.	2.32 (2.19–2.46)	2.72 (2.64–2.80)	<0.01
4	I am not ready to start e-Learning courses.	2.29 (2.16–2.43)	2.78 (2.69–2.86)	<0.01
5	I felt there is a lack of changes made in e-learning and its teaching methods.	2.96 (2.82–3.11)	3.32 (3.24–3.59)	<0.01
6	I think there is a lack of belief in individual interests and need variables in learning process.	3.28 (3.15–3.42)	3.52 (3.45–3.58)	<0.01
7	I think there is a low access chance for all students to e-Learning circumstances.	3.33 (3.18–3.48)	3.50 (3.43–3.58)	<0.05
8	I am not accepting e-learning as a substitute for traditional classes.	3.30 (3.14–3.47)	3.38 (2.29–3.47)	0.423
9	I cannot recognise the benefits of using communications and information technology in different sociocultural dimensions.	2.65 (2.50–2.79)	2.84 (2.76–2.92)	<0.05
Technical expertise barriers				
1	I think the software used for e-learning is of low quality.	2.73 (2.60–2.87)	2.75 (2.68–2.82)	0.825
2	I find that e-learning contains low quality curriculum content.	2.80 (2.66–2.93)	3.08 (3.00–3.16)	<0.01
3	I think lecturers lack skills in e-learning planning.	2.93 (2.79–3.07)	2.95 (2.87–3.03)	0.808
4	I think there is a lack of coordination between the presented content volume and teaching methods.	3.17 (3.04–3.30)	3.32 (3.25–3.39)	<0.05
5	I lack access to different suitable curriculum materials in e-learning.	2.93 (2.79–3.06)	3.07 (2.99–3.15)	0.063
6	I think universities are not using blended learning methods.	2.88 (2.74–3.02)	2.99 (2.92–3.06)	0.147
7	I think there is a lack of coordination between curriculums and e-learning plans.	3.03 (2.89–3.16)	3.29 (3.22–3.37)	<0.01
Human barriers				
1	I lack technical consultation on using the electronic education system.	2.77 (2.64–2.91)	3.06 (2.98–3.14)	<0.01
2	I find that there is no/less commenting and answering among students and lecturers during e-learning.	3.66 (3.50–3.82)	3.56 (3.48–3.64)	0.235
3	I think there is lack of supporting the development of e-learning.	3.27 (3.13–3.41)	3.43 (3.36–3.50)	<0.05
4	I find that there is lack of administrative support for keeping e-Learning equipment.	3.18 (3.04–3.32)	3.26 (3.19–3.33)	0.285

(Continued on next page)

Table 3: (Continued)

No.	Variable	Mean (SD)		p-value
Educational skill barriers				
1	I think there is lack of planning for the human resources to start and protect e-Learning systems.	3.27 (3.14–3.41)	3.29 (3.22–3.36)	0.830
2	I think there is a lack of necessary education for students with educational technology.	3.31 (3.17–3.46)	3.30 (3.23–3.38)	0.894
3	I personally felt that there are inadequate fellow members on new educational technologies.	3.28 (3.14–3.41)	3.33 (3.27–3.40)	0.424
4	I think students are not familiar with the English language to use it in e-learning.	2.85 (2.70–3.01)	2.84 (2.76–2.92)	0.881
5	I think e-learning courses not presenting as a classroom teaching supplement for improving teaching quality.	3.41 (3.26–3.55)	3.34 (3.26–3.42)	0.418

DISCUSSION

The key outcome of the results on participants' attitudes towards using e-learning was slightly more than neutral for university students and lecturers. Findings on the overall usefulness of e-learning were more neutral, with a mean score of 3.53 among lecturers, whereas it was 3.28 among university students. The difference in perception between university students' and lecturers' attitudes towards the use of e-learning was significant ($p < 0.01$). This finding was compatible with the study conducted by Sirtongthaworn et al. (10) and Teo et al. (11) in Thailand; they found that Thailand students' acceptance of e-learning was above average, with mean scores of 3.76 and 3.05, respectively. Furthermore, according to Ali et al., e-learning can be a future learning preference based on a study conducted on Slovenian nurses that matched with the findings in this study where both lecturers (3.64) and university students (3.30) had a mean score towards a positive attitude (12). The difference in their perceptions was significant ($p < 0.01$) (12). Numerous studies found that e-learning and traditional learning are significantly different (13–15). In this present study, e-learning was considered better than traditional methods of teaching, with a mean score of 2.69

among lecturers and 2.50 among university students towards negative attitude with significant difference ($p < 0.05$). This finding differs from the study conducted by Elfaki et al. on the impact of e-learning vs. traditional learning, with a mean score of neutral, which was 3.2 (16). Improving and enhancing the quality was crucial to the success of higher education institutions that were involved in e-learning (17). Moreover, satisfaction with the quality of e-learning had a mean score of 3.12 among lecturers and 2.95 among university students, with a significant difference ($p < 0.05$). This matched the findings from the study conducted by Elfaki et al. on students' performance and attitude due to e-learning, with a mean score of 3.60 ($p < 0.05$) (16). Dynamic and challenging environments would increase the quality of e-learning (18). Furthermore, Ali et al. showed there was a negative attitude towards the impact of e-learning, with a mean score of 2.86 that matched with this study's results that the perception of university students, with a mean score of 2.74 and lecturers of 2.66, and their perceptions were not significantly different ($p > 0.05$) (12). The classroom learners performed better than students using the e-learning platform, and also it all depended on the motivation of students and instructors to deliver lectures via e-learning (19). Alharbi found that interaction

between students and teachers was not effective through e-learning compared with traditional learning, with a mean score of 3.87 (20). This was consistent with this study's results with a mean score of 3.82 among lecturers and 3.95 among university students, but their perception was not significant in this present study ($p > 0.05$) (20, 21). However, misuse of several users' identities was considered a major issue, and it can be with or without done by students by online teaching, as evident with the results obtained where university students with a mean score of 3.16 felt insecure when using e-learning but the perception varied with lecturers with a mean score of 2.82 and the significant difference ($p < 0.01$) (22).

According to Table 3, 5 variables had been loaded to the infrastructure barriers. The perception of university students and lecturers varied with the mean score. Mousavi et al. investigated about developing and usage of e-learning (23) and their study revealed the barriers which included lack of skill, cultural, attitude, method and content, financial problem, and infrastructure (23). Furthermore, findings of Farhadi on e-learning as new paradigm and Rabiee et al. on internet used obstacles concerning e-learning confirmed the results obtained where "high cost for updating the required blogs and preparing educational information technology equipment for e-learning" was one of the most important barriers with mean score by lecturers of 3.19 and university students of 3.36 with significant difference ($p < 0.05$) (24, 25).

Moreover, many studies have shown that attitude and self-efficacy are important factors that affect learners' interest, motivation, and performance in e-learning (8). Teo found that perceived usefulness is significantly estimated by several independent variables like learning environment, course delivery, tutor attribute, and facilitating conditions (9). Smeets showed that information and communications technology (ICT) contributes to powerful learning

environments in primary education, and Piccoli et al. found that "not accepting e-learning as a substitute for traditional classes" was one of the important barriers, with the second highest mean score by lecturers/teachers of 3.30 and the highest mean score by university students of 3.38, with significant difference ($p < 0.01$) (26, 27). From the findings of Barbour et al. on students' experience in an online learning environment opposed to the results obtained were "unable to recognise the benefits of using communications", with a mean score of 2.65 among lecturers/teachers and 2.84 among university students with significant difference ($p < 0.05$) (28). Furthermore, Chong et al. found that 46% of respondents were interested, 40% were willing to consider e-learning as Continuing Nursing Education, and only 4% were not interested in e-learning (29). Hence, interest in e-learning was positively associated with attitudes towards e-learning (29). The findings of Chong et al. opposed the result obtained in this study, where "lack of belief in individual interests and need variables in the learning process" was one of the important barriers, with a mean score of 3.28 among lecturers/teachers and 3.52 among university students with significant difference ($p < 0.01$).

Inexperienced users were more likely to be afraid of the technology itself and be embarrassed in front of the students (11). A common technical barrier was the lack of user-friendliness in learning management systems (11). A study by Muilenburg and Berge stated that technical problems and cost/access to the internet were the less important barriers. The least respondents rated a lack of technical skills as a very low obstacle to learning online (30). Thus, this study supported the results obtained where "Lecturers lack skills in e-learning planning", with a mean score of neutral among both lecturers/teachers of 2.93 and university students of 2.95; the difference in their perceptions was not significant ($p > 0.05$). Moreover, Pereira et al. found an improvement in students' academic

performances when anatomy was taught via blended learning (31). According to Wang, applying blended learning to teacher education maintains and improves the quality of teaching preparation (32). Hence, these findings opposed the results of the present study where “universities are not using blended learning methods”, with a mean score among lecturers/teachers of 2.88 and university students of 2.99; the difference in their perceptions was not significant ($p > 0.05$). Afyooni et al.’s feasibility study of implementing e-learning courses and the evaluation of technology to enhance the learning experience confirmed the results, where “Low quality of used software” had a mean score of 2.73 among lecturers and 2.75 among university students (33, 34). The difference in their perceptions was not significant ($p > 0.05$); “e-learning contains low quality of curriculum’s content” with a mean score among lecturers/teachers of 2.80 and university students of 3.08 with significant difference ($p < 0.01$) (33, 34).

In this study, the lack of support in e-learning development was one of the most significant findings, with a mean of 3.27 for the lecturers, 3.43 for the students, and a significant difference ($p < 0.05$). This finding was also supported by a study done in Indonesia by Mailizar et al. (35), where lack of technical support was the second most important barrier to successfully implementing e-learning. Shirkhani et al. (36) and Keller and Cernerud (37) showed that lack of technical consultation on the electronic education system was one of the most crucial human barriers to e-learning implementation. This study supported the results in Table 3, where there was a lack of technical consultation on using the electronic education system, with a mean of 2.77 among the lecturers and 3.06 for the students, which was significantly different ($p < 0.01$). However, regarding the perception between lecturers and university students regarding educational barriers, the study showed no significant difference, as shown in Table 3 ($p > 0.05$).

The present study has some limitations. Barriers to e-learning perceptions among university students and lecturers were assessed in a cross-sectional study. Therefore, we could not observe changes in perceptions throughout the pandemic. Regarding the demographic data, only the participant’s age, gender, occupational status, whether they are a lecturer or university students, and educational level were focused on. Hence, participants’ perceptions from rural and urban areas could not be differentiated. Future studies should explore the perception of students and lecturers in rural and urban areas that might expose different perspectives and experiences.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The perceptions of e-learning among university students and teachers/lecturers were significantly different based on their attitudes and the barriers to using e-learning. Attitudinal barriers seemed to be the biggest discrepancies between these two groups since four out of five variables in this section showed significant differences. Hence, the university students and lecturers/teachers needed to improve more in the basis of e-learning’s quality, software, and updating blogs that would cost high and effective administrative support for a balanced education system. Moreover, the Malaysian government needed multiple collaborations to build engagement and motivation with course content and activities to overcome the challenges due to attitudes and barriers of e-learning perceptions among university students and lecturers, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic. Administration, faculty admins, and the department of education should note the improvement and the necessary measures that can be applied for an effective and better teaching and learning platform for both university students and lecturers/teachers for successful academic performances during the lockdown due to

COVID-19. Further research focusing on the perceptions and experiences of students and lecturers/teachers on the usage of e-learning may identify factors affecting them and whether these factors were modifiable to improve e-learning.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank the Human Ethics Committee, Centre of Research and Development (CRD) Asia Metropolitan University, Johor, Malaysia for approving the ethical application of this research. The authors wish to express their gratitude to the contributors and participants for their endless support. In this article, the findings are those of the authors and do not reflect the views of others.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

The Human Ethics Committee of the Centre of Research and Development, Asia Metropolitan University, Johor, Malaysia, granted ethical approval. The approval number was HEC20032021FOM002.

FUNDING

There was no funding provided.

REFERENCES

1. Shah AUM, Safri SNA, Thevadas R, Noordin NK, Abd Rahman A, Sekawi Z, Ideris A, Sultan MTH. COVID-19 outbreak in Malaysia: actions taken by the Malaysian government. *Int J Infect Dis.* 2020;97:108–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.05.093>
2. Arifin WN, Chan WH, Amaran S, Musa KI. A susceptible-infected-removed (SIR) model of COVID-19 epidemic trend in Malaysia under movement control order (MCO) using a data fitting approach. *medRxiv.* 2020;05.01.20084384. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.01.20084384>
3. Hamzah FB, Lau C, Nazri H, Ligot DV, Lee G, Tan CL, Mohd Shaib MK, Zaidon UH, Abdullah A, Chung MH, Ong CH, Chew PY, Salunga RE. CoronaTracker: worldwide COVID-19 outbreak data analysis and prediction. *Bull World Health Organ.* 2020;1(1):1–32. <https://doi.org/10.2471/BLT.20.255695>
4. Subedi S, Nayaju S, Subedi S, Shah SK, Shah JM. Impact of e-learning during COVID-19 pandemic among nursing students and teachers of Nepal. *Intl J of Sci Healthcare Res.* 2020;5(3):68–76.
5. Shahzad A, Hassan R, Aremu AY, Hussain A, Lodhi RN. Effects of COVID-19 in e-learning on higher education institution students: the group comparison between male and female. *Qual Quant.* 2021;55:805–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-020-01028-z>
6. Radha R, Mahalakshmi K, Sathis Kumar V, Saravanakumar AR. E-learning during lockdown of Covid-19 pandemic: a global perspective. *Int J Control Autom.* 2020;13(4):1088–99.
7. Murphy MPA. COVID-19 and emergency eLearning: Consequences of the securitization of higher education for post-pandemic pedagogy. *Contemp Secur Policy.* 2020;41(3):492–505. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13523260.2020.1761749>
8. Peng H, Tsai C-C, Wu Y-T. University students' self-efficacy and their attitudes toward the Internet: the role of students' perceptions of the Internet. *Educ Stud.* 2006;32(1):73–86. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03055690500416025>

9. Teo T. Modeling the determinants of pre-service teachers' perceived usefulness of e-learning. *Campus-Wide Inf Syst.* 2011;28(2):124–40. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10650741111117824>
10. Siritongthaworn S, Krairit D, Dimmitt NJ, Paul H. The study of e-learning technology implementation: a preliminary investigation of universities in Thailand. *Educ Inf Technol.* 2006;11(2):137–60. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11134-006-7363-8>
11. Teo T, Luan WS, Thammetar T, Chattiwat W. Assessing e-learning acceptance by university students in Thailand. *Australas J Educ Technol.* 2011;27(8):1356–68. <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.898>
12. Ali N, Jamil B, Sethi A, Ali S. Attitude of nursing students towards e-learning. *Adv Health Prof Educ.* 2016;2(1):24–9.
13. Mason R, Weller M. Factors affecting students' satisfaction on a web course. *Aust J Educ Technol.* 2000;16(2):173–200. <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.1830>
14. Zare M, Sarikhani R, Salari M, Mansouri V. The impact of e-learning on university students' academic achievement and creativity. *J Tech Educ Train.* 2016;8(1):25–33.
15. Ellis RA, Ginns P, Piggott L. E-learning in higher education: some key aspects and their relationship to approaches to study. *High Educ Res Dev.* 2009;28(3):303–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360902839909>
16. Elfaki NK, Abdulraheem I, Abdulrahim R. Impact of e-learning vs traditional learning on students' performance and attitude. *Int J Med Res Health Sci.* 2019;8(10):76–82.
17. Inglis A. Quality improvement, quality assurance, and benchmarking: comparing two frameworks for managing quality processes in open and distance learning. *Int Rev Res Open Distrib Learn.* 2005;6(1):1–13. <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v6i1.221>
18. Singh G, O'Donoghue J, Worton H. A study into the effects of eLearning on higher education. *J Univ Teach Learn Pract.* 2005;2(1):16–27. <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.2.1.3>
19. Dondrof T, Breuer R, Nacken H. Classroom vs. e-learning: a case study on the performance of students in different learning scenarios. *EDULEARN16 Proceedings, 8th International Conference on Education and New Learning Technologies; 2016 Jul 4–6; Barcelona, Spain.* 2016. p. 6507–16. <https://doi.org/10.21125/edulearn.2016.0410>
20. Alharbi H. Traditional versus e-learning language lessons courses: a comparative analysis of student perceptions and performance through Arabic language lessons: a case study [PhD dissertation]. New South Wales, Australia: University of Wollongong; 2012.
21. Fauzie S. The comparison between the results of e-learning and classroom learning: a case study on introduction to general linguistics class at Universitas Airlangga [PhD dissertation]. Surabaya, Indonesia: Airlangga University; 2006.
22. Galbraith MW, Jones MS. Understanding incivility in online teaching. *J Adult Educ.* 2010;39(2):1–10.
23. Mousavi M, Mohammadzadeh N, Pezeshki-Rad GR. Identifying and analyzing barrier and inhibitor factors for implementation and development of e-learning in Payame Noor University. *Q J Res Plan High Educ.* 2011;17(1):137–54.
24. Farhadi R. E-learning a new paradigm in the age of information. *Iran J Inf Process Manag.* 2005;21(1):49–66.
25. Rabiee A, Nazarian Z, Gharibshaeyan R. An explanation for internet use obstacles concerning e-learning in Iran. *Int Rev Res Open Distrib Learn.* 2013;14(3):361–76. <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v14i3.1412>

26. Smeets E. Does ICT contribute to powerful learning environments in primary education? *Comput Educ.* 2005;44(3):343–55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2004.04.003>
27. Piccoli G, Ahmad R, Ives B. Web-based virtual learning environments: a research framework and a preliminary assessment of effectiveness in basic IT skills training. *MIS Quart.* 2001;25(4):401–26. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3250989>
28. Barbour M, Siko J, Sumara J, Simuel-Everage K. Narratives from the online frontier: a K-12 student's experience in an online learning environment. *Qual Rep.* 2012;17(10):1–19. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2012.1800>
29. Chong MC, Francis K, Cooper S, Abdullah KL, Hmwe NTT, Sohod S. Access to, interest in and attitude toward e-learning for continuous education among Malaysian nurses. *Nurse Educ Today.* 2016;36:370–4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2015.09.011>
30. Muilenburg LY, Berge ZL. Student barriers to online learning: A factor analytic study. *Distance Educ.* 2005;26(1):29–48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587910500081269>
31. Pereira JA, Pleguezuelos E, Merí A, Molina-Ros A, Molina-Tomás MC, Masdeu C. Effectiveness of using blended learning strategies for teaching and learning human anatomy. *Med Educ.* 2007;41(2):189–95. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2929.2006.02672.x>
32. Wang Y. A case study of an accelerated blended teacher education program [PhD dissertation]. Indiana, US: Indiana University; 2009.
33. Afyooni S, Forooghi Abari A, Yarmohammadian M. Feasibility study of implementing e-learning courses in Khorasgan branch of the Islamic Azad University Isfahan. *Res Curric Plan.* 2013;10(39):80–92.
34. Chief Learning Officer. Learning delivery; 2021 [cited 2021 Oct 2]. Available from: <https://www.chieflearningofficer.com/topics/learning-delivery/>
35. Mailizar, Almanthari A, Maulina S, Bruce S. Secondary school mathematics teachers' views on e-learning implementation barriers during the COVID-19 pandemic: the case of Indonesia. *Eurasia J Math Sci Technol Educ.* 2020;16(7):em1860. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ejmste/8240>
36. Shirkhani Z, Vahedi M, Arayesh MB. Identifying barriers of e-learning implementation by M.Sc. students in Agricultural Faculty of Islamic Azad University, Ilam Branch. *Int J Agric Manag Dev.* 2016;6(3):353–62.
37. Keller C, Cernerud L. Students' perceptions of e-learning in university education. *J Educ Media.* 2002;27(1–2):55–67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1358165020270105>