

AWARENESS AND SELF-EFFICACY OF UNIVERSITIES LECTURERS' IN THE USE OF CANVAS IN KWARA STATE

BY

Ahmed Adedolapo Abdulahi

Department of Science Education, Al-Hikmah Universities Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria

Email: ahmedabdulahiadedolapo@gmail.com

Abstract

Canvas is a learning management system and also a social learning platform which enhance effective delivery of instruction, virtually and increases interaction among the users (lecturers, students and peers). However, with its great potential of enhancing teaching / learning process, lack of skills, inadequate ICT resources, over dependence on conventional method of teaching among other factors militating against the adoption of Canvas which also affect its awareness among lecturers in some Nigerian Universities. Hence, this study investigated universities lecturers' awareness and self-efficacy in the use of Canvas in Kwara State. This study adopted a descriptive research design of the survey type, the population for this study were all lecturers in Kwara State, the target population were lecturers in three (3) selected universities in Kwara State, proportionate sampling was used to select 350 lecturers in the three selected universities. A researcher designed questionnaire was used to collect data from the respondents, the instrument was validated and pilot tested using Cronbach alpha. The data gathered was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The study reviewed that: lecturers were aware of Canvas and highly proficient in using Canvas for teaching; there was no significant influence on lecturers' awareness in the use of Canvas for teaching based on gender; and there was no significant difference on lecturers' self-efficacy in the use of Canvas for teaching based on gender. The study concluded that majority of the lecturers were aware of the existence of Canvas, and the study recommend that Institutions should endeavor to expose lecturers to canvas through faculties or departments to improve its level of use.

Keywords: Canvas, learning Management System, Self- efficacy

Introduction

Information and Communication Technology (ICT) is an epitome of the rapidly changing world, and this has changed the dynamics of teaching and learning in almost every corner of the globe. This brought about the origin of "digital revolution". These evolutions had an impact on lecturers, students, and schools particularly school curricula, including instructional methods (Aleksander et al., 2016). The new shift has provided a paradigm shift for teachers and instructors to move from the traditional approaches to the use of ICT in supporting their job roles, especially regarding delivery of instruction, course management, assessment and evaluation, among others. In fact, newer evidences have shown that technology cannot be detached from the educational field because they mutually complement each other (Ateş Çobanoğlu, 2018). Aderoju and Olumorin (2017) submitted that the use of ICT tools has improved the productivity of universities academic staff as they use ICTs for information collection, processing, reporting, teaching, educating, managerial capacities, organization, storage, dissemination, and research purposes. Bindu (2016) opined that the use of ICT in education is divided into two main categories: ICTs for education; and ICTs in Education. ICTs for education identifies the development of ICT especially for instructional purposes; while ICTs in education includes the adoption of basic elements and principles of ICT for instruction. Generally, the role of ICT for instructional purposes, both as a tool and principle is driven by global forces aimed to transform the teaching and the learning process from the conventional instructional instructor-focused to a student-focused approach (Voogt, 2017). Information and Communication Technology (ICT) with the aid of Internet has developed into a progressively vital feature of the learning environment and make education accessible to all (Ateş Çobanoğlu,

2018 & Cahyono, 2015). As regards this, the trend has now shifted from the traditional way of face-to-face to the online community of practices and e-learning (Trust, 2015).

The significant of e-learning is to support students and lecturers with some unique skills, such as interactivity, active search, physical closeness and mobility, independent learning and training, and techniques for acquiring active knowledge and lesson delivery through asynchronous and synchronous learning network models (Mohammadi, 2015). The inception and the evolution of the web and internet eventually led to the introduction of electronic learning which is popularly known as e-learning (Ansong, 2015). However, many higher education institutions are integrating e-learning systems into their traditional learning to keep pace with the global developments in information technology and to meet the learning needs, as well as supporting the educational process (Aleksander et al., 2016). This information technology will continue to influence higher education institutions to change the delivery methods of traditional courses (Val, Ahmed, & Tim, 2013). E-learning is the use of these information and communication technologies (ICTs) in learning and training to enhance knowledge sharing and the delivery of courses (Randa et al., 2016). Sarkar (2016) opined that there is an increase in online learning in the institutions level, both lecturers and students can access the internet and communicate with each other. The researcher stressed that students are more active and more interactive during online learning activities and e-learning have become the solution to distance and time gap that used to be experienced in education (Sarkar, 2016). The recognition of the importance of e-learning had prompted learning institutions to adopt it, let alone the majority of today's students are digital natives (Hussein, 2017 & Tarun, 2019).

The widespread use of e-learning has resulted in higher educational institutions around the world going through rapid changes as they adapt to the new methods and benefits brought by technology (Macfadyen & Dawson, 2010). It is necessary for the institutions to comply with the growing expectations to help students strive effectively in the technology-based world. Understanding that education is a dynamic and pragmatic tool which faces constant changes requires the society to keep abreast with the new way of acquiring knowledge through various means such as virtual learning platforms (Kodriyah, 2016). Virtual learning platforms help learning to be relevant to learners and this is an important aspect as the new age learner's experience rapid learning via technology (Kongchan, 2017). Enriquez (2014) also stressed on the motivation and empowerment factors of the virtual learning platforms such as learning management systems (LMS) which are essential in the 21st century learning. The LMS is an adapted innovation for education. From the technical perspective, LMS is an Internet-Based information system serving a big number of remote users (Cochran, 2015; Ramani, 2017; Uzunboylu et al., 2015). Sejzi and Arisa (2013) described LMS as software or application for the management, recording or reporting of educational courses. Pappas (2016) asserted that LMS offers unlimited access to learning material in education. This helps lecturers to monitor the progress of their students. Common LMS functionalities include libraries of educational materials, course announcements, file repositories, curriculum descriptions, file exchange, discussion forums, chats, email exchange, online quizzes, opinion polls, document annotation and evaluation facilities (Dobre, 2015; Ramani, 2017; Uzunboylu et al., 2015).

Learning Management Systems (LMS) provides lecturers and students with an online classroom that reinforces learning processes. In online classroom environments, Learning Management Systems (LMS) strengthen lecturers and students in the learning process. A standard LMS supports a comprehensive learning environment for academic progress with interceding structures that promote online collaborative-groupings, expert training, discussions, and communication among other LMS users (Dias & Dinis, 2014). Learner's engagement is sustainable as online users make use of an LMS to monitor their progress (Al-Fraihat, 2020). LMS compositions include a variety of media and communications tools which promote learner's choice (Kehrwald & Parker, 2019). The LMS is an adapted innovation for education. From the technical perspective, LMS is an Internet-Based information system serving a big number of remote users (Cochran, 2015; Ramani, 2017; Uzunboylu et al., 2015). Sejzi and Arisa (2013) described LMS as software or application for the management, recording or reporting of educational courses. Pappas (2016) asserted that LMS offers unlimited access to learning material in education. This helps lecturers to monitor the progress of their students. Common LMS functionalities include libraries of educational materials, course

announcements, file repositories, curriculum descriptions, file exchange, discussion forums, chats, email exchange, online quizzes, opinion polls, document annotation and evaluation facilities (Dobre, 2015; Ramani, 2017; Uzunboylu et al., 2015).

Learning Management Systems (LMS) provides lecturers and students with an online classroom that reinforces learning processes. In online classroom environments, Learning Management Systems (LMS) strengthen lecturers and students in the learning process. A standard LMS supports a comprehensive learning environment for academic progress with interceding structures that promote online collaborative-groupings, expert training, discussions, and communication among other LMS users (Dias & Dinis, 2014). Learner's engagement is sustainable as online users make use of an LMS to monitor their progress (Al-Fraihat, 2020). LMS compositions include a variety of media and communications tools which promote learner's choice (Kehrwald & Parker, 2019). An LMS platform cultivates an environment for engagement and learner's achievement, allowing learners to register for classes, track their grades, and check updates and course announcements (Al-Fraihat, 2020). LMS has been widely used and proven to be reliable in implementing systems e-learning (Courts & Tucker, 2012). One of the current trends of LMS is Canvas. Canvas is a free web platform that educators can use to create and manage an effective online teaching and learning (Didem, 2017). Canvas was launched in 2011 by Brian Whitmer and Devlin Daley to bridge the gap between students' usual exercise and formal learning as well as introduce learning in the 21st century setting. This online learning platform is free and safe (Kongchan, 2017). Trust (2014) stated that there were more than 6.5 million lecturers and students who use Canvas in learning. The Canvas official site shows an account of 800 learning institution from 190 countries as of December, 2022. Canvas is an online platform which could be used for interaction and learning; managing an online classroom community and lecturers' professional development (Trust, 2014; Balasubramanian, et al., 2014).

As canvas could be installed into mobile devices, students were found to have positive perception towards using canvas in learning in which they pointed out that Canvas allowed for effective communication to take place as well as able to save time (Al-Said, 2015). Canvas was also nominated as a successful supplementary tool in learning 21st century skills (Enriquez, 2014). Canvas was recognized by the American Association of School Librarians (AASL) as one of the top 25 websites that fosters the qualities of innovation, creativity, active participation and collaboration (Enriquez, 2014). Canvas as an LMS is supported on web and mobile platforms to enhance mobile learning (Al-Khatiri, 2015). In addition, Canvas as a social networking site can be incorporated into the curriculum and within lecturers' locus of control (Anbe, 2013). A study conducted by McClain and Brown, (2013) revealed that students who participated in a study related to Canvas showcased four cognitive skills while using the platform namely; remembering, applying, evaluating, and creating. Another advantage of Canvas is the leniency for students to be mobile while participating in a class's online discussions (Chandler & Redman, 2013). Canvas is a platform that has modest features, an intuitive interface, and media richness (Thien et al., 2013).

The Canvas platform is one of the main choices for adoption in the education process. It is an academic communication platform that allows lecturers to provide their courses online and links lecturers with students and their parents (Cheong, 2010). Canvas gives students the pleasure and convenience to learn according to learning objectives (Balasubramanian, et al., 2014). The use of Canvas strongly supported by a large number of lecturers and students relying on mobile devices as the primary means of communication and using these devices to access social learning sites. Furthermore, Canvas is free and secure education learning platform that is used to provide a simple way for lecturers to create and manage an online classroom community and allows students to connect and work with lecturers wherever and whenever (Balasubramanian et al., 2014). Also, students can easily connect to lecturers, post questions, upload files and link (e-library), submit assignments, take quizzes, collaborate, share, discuss, and participate in elections (Alshawi & Alhomoud, 2016). Al-Khatiri, (2015) stated that Canvas has different learning advantages; not just a training site but also a database of documents; and all-time access to classroom content, which means that learning can be done as a continuum rather than a structured environment.

Awareness can be referred to as the condition of being having knowledge or consciousness about the existence of Canvas for learning purposes. In other words, it is the condition of having the knowledge that Canvas exists as a learning management system. Canvas can work in unidirectional process as it can serve the lecturers' strategies and styles on one hand and students' awareness, understanding, and effective participation in different classroom skills on the other hand (Mahmoud et al., 2019). Awareness is an indispensable factor in the implementation of every learning management system and influences the extent of its use. End-users of a system will not benefit from its value if they are not aware of it. Mtebe (2015) stated that "lack of awareness amongst users on the existence or value of LMS has an impact on LMS usage". In the light of this background, it is therefore imperative for students to be aware of the Canvas tools for its intended purpose to be achieved. An end-user may be aware of a system but if its various functional tools are not known, the system will not be fully utilized (Juhary, 2014). This is analogous to the Canvas. Users may be fortunate to get informed about the existence of the Canvas however, users will not fully benefit from the Canvas tools if they are not made known for both lecturers and students.

Using Canvas clearly effects differences in the classroom environment for both students and lecturers. Majid (2017) submitted that around 66% of students believe that Canvas is useful, 79% think that it helps them in their study, and 78% feel comfortable with using them in their lesson. Therefore, it could be seen that lecturers are aware of Canvas and its use in mostly the developed countries but not in most developing countries like Nigeria where majority of the universities have not fully adopted the use of Canvas as a learning management system. With the fact that students have access to different devices and resources, some still complain of their inability to get the desired or anticipated results. It is due to their lack of technology know-how and self-efficacy. In a study conducted by Shu et al., (2011). Bandura, (1989) cited that self-efficacy (also known as social cognitive theory or social learning theory) as people's assessments of their abilities to coordinate and implement courses of action necessary to achieve specific performance styles, which are not about the skills you have but about what you can do with what you possessed. Self-efficacy comes from learning from the complex cognitive, personal, linguistic and or physical abilities. The automatic structure is a dynamic one which changes with the acquisition of new knowledge and experiences (Saadé & Kira, 2009).

Lunenburg, (2011) identified four principal sources of self-efficacy which are; past performance, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and emotional cues. Self-efficacy plays an important role in the accomplishment of goals, as it not only affects attitudes, but also the thinking and emotions of the individual (Van Dinther et al., 2018). In other words, self-efficacy influences the confidence of people in their ability to perform specific tasks. Self-efficacy is described as people's belief in their ability to achieve specified levels of performance which influence life-changing events (Lunenburg, 2011). Martalya et al., (2018) also expressed that Self-efficacy provides motivation to improve learning methods, learning achievement outcomes, and problem solving. Self-efficacy is an assessment of students' abilities in determining beliefs and choices, striving for progress, persistence and perseverance in the face of difficulties, degrees of anxiety or calmness in maintaining a task (Nadia & Isnarto, 2017; Damaryanti, 2017). The role of self-efficacy in successful experiences of distance education has been a frequent theme of recent research. For example, (Kozar, 2015) investigated the relationship between self-efficacy and vicarious learning in PhD studies at a distance learning. Their results suggested the more opportunities to engage in meaningful contact, the stronger the students' self-efficacy in completing their degree, and the more satisfying will be their experience. Similarly, Cho and Shen, (2013) investigated the role of self-efficacy and goal orientation in student achievement in an online course. The results indicated the importance of individuals' self-efficacy and intrinsic goal orientation in academic achievement.

Self-efficacy for Canvas use is an important factor for student participation and performance. With courses being taught fully online or in blended settings (face-to-face and online), it has become important for students to be confident in their technology skills. Therefore, knowing whether the students have that confident in using Canvas is also needed for the lecturer or teacher to create the more effective class. Several factors such as gender, age, social class, cultural beliefs play important role in the lecturers and students' self-efficacy (Cho & Shen, 2013).

Gender is a universal word which refers to male and female and it is a critical factor that affects both lecturers and students in delivering of instruction and students' academic performance. In a research by Ayelaagbe, (2015) reported the gap in performance between male and female students. Sanda and Mustapha (2019) viewed gender as a socio-economic variable for the analysis of roles, responsibilities, constraints and needs of men and women in a given context. This refers to the social and cultural stereotypes that each society assigns to behaviors, characteristics, and values attributed to men and women. In spite of the fact that women make up the majority of the population as well as their workforce of any society and women also play a pivotal role in the development of their societies but still their impact has not been felt or has been silenced in this new technology due to lack of access and the necessary skills for the operation amongst other several obstacles. Gender acts as an influential factor in the adoption of technology, as men are said to be more technologically adept compared to women (Goswami & Dutta, 2016). Bassi and Camble (2017) recorded that there is an empirical comparison gap between males and females using electronic media, as females find information online more difficult than males. In another research, however, it has been revealed that females use the Internet more than males in a study on gender differences in computer literacy among students in some selected Nigerian institutions (Ikolo & Okiyi, 2012).

The expectation for post Covid-19 pandemic is for all learning institutions to fully embrace LMS as the new opportunity to extend conventional education. Sadly, reverse is the case. Alimi and Olumorin (2018) posited that one of the reasons why Nigeria education is lagging behind is because educational technologies are rarely used and inadequately embraced, as well as meagerly explored to benefit from its potentials to revolutionize Nigerian education. Afolabi (2019) and Patrick (2014) revealed that there was a low level of awareness of and access to ICT infrastructure in Nigerian Universities because, availability of these infrastructures by the universities' proprietor were still inadequate. Researchers such as Shittu et al., (2020) averred that some LMS lack interactivity, interoperability, and collaboration. These features are key to making academic job responsibility efficient and effective. This may account for the lack of awareness among academic staff members. However, Shittu et al., (2020) and Hoerunnisa, Suryani, and Efendi (2019) expatiated that LMS platform such as Canvas meets all the requirements that could make academic staff embrace it.

Despite all the benefits accrued to Canvas, the researcher observed that some unapparent factors seem to militate against the full adoption of LMS, especially Canvas among universities lecturers. This raises questions on the probability of universities lecturers not been aware of Canvas as an LMS that could be contributing to its lack of adoption. Similarly, it was observed that few lecturers are confident in using a wide range of ICT resources, and limited confidence affects the way lecturers conducted their lessons. This was why Afolabi (2019) concluded that lecturer's technological phobia, lack of adequate awareness and access to new technologies prevent them from making much use of new technologies in their teaching. This might have prompted lecturers adhering to their traditional method of chalkboard, paper and pencil assessment and method of communication. This prompted the researcher to embark on this study to examine universities lecturers' awareness and self-efficacy in the use of Canvas in Kwara State.

Purpose of the study

The main purpose of this study was to examine universities lecturers' awareness and self-efficacy in the use of Canvas in Kwara State. Specifically, this study addressed the following questions;

1. What is the lecturers' awareness in the use of Canvas for teaching?
2. What is the proficiency level of universities lecturers in the use of Canvas for teaching?
3. What is the influence of gender on universities lecturers' awareness in the use of Canvas for teaching?
4. What is the gender difference of universities lecturers' self-efficacy in the use of Canvas for teaching?

Methodology

Descriptive research design of the survey type was adopted to examine universities lecturer’s awareness and self-efficacy in the use of Canvas. The population for this study were all universities lecturers in Kwara State. The target population were lecturers in the three (3) selected universities in Kwara State. A multi-stage sampling procedure was adopted for this study. Purposive sampling technique was used to select the three sampled universities for this study based on ownership (one federal, state and private). Proportional sampling techniques was used to allocate the number of respondents in each school based on their estimated population using Israel Model (2013) at a 5% level of precision, simple random sampling technique was used in the selected school to select Three Hundred and Sixty-Four (364) lecturers from sampled universities to serve as the respondents in this study. Data was collected using a researcher-designed questionnaire titled; Universities Lecturers’ Awareness and Self-efficacy in the Use of Canvas in Kwara State. The questionnaire was constructed to specifically reflect on the various research questions of the study. The questionnaire was subjected to both face and content validity. The reliability of the instrument was tested in order to measure the internal consistency of the instrument and the Cronbach alpha value on awareness was 0.96, and on self-efficacy was 0.61.

Data Analysis

A total of three hundred and sixty-four (364) copies of questionnaires were administered to Universities Lecturers in Kwara State. But only three hundred and fifty (351) were able to retrieve back. All analyzed data are presented in tables.

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	190	54.3
Female	161	45.7
Total	351	100

Table 1 revealed the distribution of respondents based on gender where 54 percent were male while 46 percent were female. This implies that the majority of the respondents were male.

Research Questions

Research Question One: What is the Awareness of Lecturers in the Use of Canvas for Teaching?

Table 2:

Awareness of Lecturers in the Use of Canvas for Teaching

S/N	Items	A Freq. (%)	NA Freq. (%)
1.	I am aware of the use of Canvas for teaching	245 (70.0)	106 (30.0)
2.	I am aware that using Canvas makes teaching more efficient	220 (62.9)	131 (37.1)
3.	I have heard that using Canvas saves time	210 (60.0)	141 (40.0)
4.	I am aware that using Canvas to teach motivate learners	169 (48.3)	182 (51.7)
5.	I am aware that using Canvas platform improve academic performance	143 (40.9)	208 (59.1)
6.	I am aware that Canvas helps to promote lecturers’ participation during class session	223 (63.7)	128 (36.3)
7.	I am aware that Canvas can be used with either a mobile phone or computer	223 (63.7)	128 (36.3)
8.	I am aware of the cost benefit of using Canvas to facilitate teaching	157 (44.9)	194 (55.1)

	process		
9.	I am aware that using Canvas for teaching is more effective than face-face method of learning	149 (42.6)	202 (57.4)
10.	I am aware that using Canvas makes teaching more flexible	175 (50.0)	176 (50.0)
	Grand Total	1914 (54.7)	1596 (45.3)

In order to examine universities lecturers' awareness of Canvas for teaching, a percentage point scale of 50.0% was adopted. Data collected was analyzed using frequency counts and percentages. As indicated in Table 2, majority of the lecturers were aware of the use of Canvas (70.0%), aware that Canvas helps to promote lecturers' participation during class session (63.7%), aware that Canvas can be used with either mobile phone or computer (63.7%), aware that using Canvas makes teaching more efficient (62.9), and have heard that the use of Canvas saves time (60.0). In spite the positive review of awareness, some of the universities lecturers claimed that they were not aware that Canvas helps improve students' academic performance (59.1%), not aware that Canvas can help motivate students to learn (51.7%), and not aware of the cost benefit of using Canvas (55.1%). Perhaps, there was indecision on the awareness of Canvas making teaching more flexible. Cumulatively, the grand total of 54.7% which is greater than the benchmark implies that majority of the universities lecturers are aware of the use of Canvas for teaching.

Research Question Two: What is the Proficiency Level of Lecturers in the Use of Canvas for Teaching?

Table 3:

Lecturers' Self-Efficacy in the use of Canvas for Teaching

S/N	Items	HP Freq. (%)	P Freq. (%)	NP Freq. (%)
1.	I can create an account on Canvas platform	151 (43.1)	108 (30.9)	91 (26.0)
2.	I can create a class or group on Canvas platform	154 (44.0)	125 (35.7)	71 (20.3)
3.	I can present lesson using Canvas platform	137 (39.1)	118 (33.7)	95 (27.1)
4.	I can use Canvas platform to post notes for students	132 (37.7)	100 (28.3)	119 (34.0)
5.	I can confidently use Canvas to grade my students	93 (26.6)	149 (42.3)	109 (31.1)
6.	I can conveniently upload materials and files on Canvas platform	120 (34.3)	138 (39.1)	93 (26.6)
7.	I can give assignment to students using Canvas without stress	110 (31.4)	140 (39.7)	101 (28.9)
8.	I am able to manage group on Canvas platform	110 (31.4)	100 (28.3)	141 (40.3)
9.	I can use Canvas platform to post quiz for students	98 (28.0)	114 (32.3)	139 (39.7)
10.	I am confident that I can add post to library on Canvas platform	104 (29.7)	96 (27.1)	151 (43.2)
	Grand Total	1209 (34.5)	1189 (33.7)	1110 (31.7)

In order to determine universities lecturers' self-efficacy in the use of Canvas for teaching, a percentage point scale of 33.3% was adopted. Data collected was analyzed using frequency counts and percentage. As indicated in Table 3, it was revealed that majority (34.5%) of the universities lecturers are highly proficient in creating a class group (44.0), creating a Canvas account (43.1%), presenting lesson using Canvas platform (39.1%), and using Canvas platform to post notes for students (37.7%). Meanwhile, 33.7% claimed to be proficient in confidently using Canvas to grade students (42.3%), give assignment to students using Canvas without stress (39.7%), and conveniently upload materials and files on Canvas platform (39.1%). Perhaps, 31.7% claimed not to be proficient in using

Canvas. Summarily, the grand total of 34.5 which is greater than the benchmark and the greatest among the grand total implies that universities lecturers are highly proficient in using Canvas for teaching.

Research Hypothesis One: There is no Significant Influence between Male and Female Lecturers' Awareness in the Use of Canvas for Teaching

Table 4:

Influence of Gender on Lecturers' Awareness in the Use of Canvas for Teaching in Kwara State

Variable	N	X	SD	Df	t	Sig (2-tailed)
Male	190	1.49	0.35	348	1.882	0.061
Female	161	1.41	0.34			

From Table 4, it can be deduced that there was no significant influence between male and female lecturers' awareness in the use of Canvas for teaching. This is reflected in the findings of the hypothesis tested $df = 348$, $t = 1.882$, $p > 0.05 = 0.061$. This means that the hypothesis was accepted. This was as a result of t-value of 1.882, resulting in 0.061 p value greater than 0.05 significant alpha level. Therefore, this implies that there is no gender difference in universities lecturers' awareness of Canvas for teaching in kwara State.

Hypothesis Two: There is no Significant Difference between Male and Female Lecturers' Self- Efficacy in the use of Canvas for Teaching.

Table 5:

t-test statistics on gender difference of lecturers' self-efficacy in the use of Canvas for teaching.

Variable	N	X	SD	Df	t	Sig (2-tailed)	
Male	190	2.01	0.64	348	1.232	0.219	0.05 alpha level
Female	161	1.92	0.69				

From Table 5, it can be deduced that there was no significant difference between male and female lecturers' self-efficacy in the use of Canvas for teaching. This is reflected in the findings of the hypothesis tested $df = 348$, $t = 1.232$, $p > 0.05 = 0.219$. This means that the hypothesis was accepted. This was as a result of t-value of 1.232, resulting in 0.291 p value greater than 0.05 significant alpha level. Therefore, this implies that there is no gender difference in universities lecturers' self-efficacy in the use of Canvas for teaching in Kwara State.

Discussion of Findings

This study investigated universities lecturers' awareness and self-efficacy in the use of Canvas in Kwara State, Nigeria. The mean score established that lecturers were aware of the use of Canvas for teaching. The findings of this study is similar to the earlier findings of Reinhardt et al, (2018) findings which revealed that as having knowledge of the activities of learners provides a context or background for own's activity as a lecturer. Research question 2 seeks to check the universities lecturer's self-efficacy in the use of Canvas for teaching in Kwara State. The findings of this study are similar to that of Ünal et al., (2017) which indicated that lecturers' beliefs about the competency of technology use in education demonstrate their instructional activities.

Lecturers' beliefs associated with using technology in education and is the perception of confidence of lecturers while integrating technology for instruction. The influence of gender on universities lecturers' awareness in the use of Canvas for teaching was research question 3 and also hypothesis 1. From the analyzed data, it was deduced that there was no significance influence on universities lecturers' awareness in their use of Canvas for teaching based on gender. It showed that lecturers' awareness in the use of Canvas was not gender-based. The findings from the current study contrast that of Goswami & Dutta, (2016) whose study revealed that men are claimed to be more technologically adept compared to women. It was revealed that there was no significant difference on universities lecturers' self-efficacy in the use of Canvas based on gender. Hence, this finding is similar with the study of Sohni (2020) which revealed that no differences among females and males in terms of self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation, career motivation, self-determination and academic achievements.

Conclusion

Utilizing learning management system as a supplementary tool for motivating and empowering independent learning and innovative teaching is becoming a crucial part of a 21st century education. Canvas is one example of social learning platform which is now being used by lecturers and students in many institutions of higher learning in the country to facilitates the delivery of instruction. Canvas is a good supplementary tool for lecturers because it allows students to improve their learning through an active participation in online discussions and tasks. Canvas have become an indispensable tool in teaching due to these helpful criteria: Mobility, Accessibility, Usability and Compatibility. Through the use of various ICT devices such as mobile phones, tablets and laptops, lecturers have the opportunity to explore ocean of information, interact, and collaborate with their students. This helps in improving the quality of knowledge acquired and also makes teaching and learning more effective.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations were made:

1. Lecturers should be encouraged of using Canvas to boost their awareness and also aid their delivery of instruction.
2. Students should embrace the use of Canvas for their learning as this would motivate and boost lecturers' self-efficacy in using it for instruction
3. Institutions should endeavor to provide adequate facilities and conducive learning environment for lecturers to aid their teaching.
4. Institutions should encourage their lecturers to incorporate the use of Canvas even if it takes organizing workshops for them.
5. Female lecturers should be encouraged to improve and do more in their teaching with the use of Canvas.

References

- Aderoju, M. A., & Olumorin, C. O. (2017). Technostress and resultant influence on job performance of Universities Lecturers in Kwara state, Nigeria. *Proceedings of Association for Innovative Technology in Education (AITIE 2017)* (pp. 273-278). Ilorin: Association for Innovative Technology in Education.
- Afolabi, E. I. (2019). Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs): New Media Tools for Language Teaching and Learning in Tertiary Institutions in Nigeria. *8th ELTT Annual Conference on Resources and Resourcefulness in English Language Teaching and Learning in the 21st Century*.

- Aleksander, A., Damijana, K., Nina, T., & Lan, U. (2016). Evaluating the Impact of Socio-Economic and Demographic Factors on Selected Aspects of E-Learning in Public Administration Education. *ICICTE 2016 Proceedings* (pp. 298–305). Slovenia: Universities of Ljubljana.
- Al-Khatiri, F. (2015). Beyond the classroom walls: Canvas in Saudi secondary school EFL instruction, attitudes and challenges. *English Language Teaching. Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(1), 189-204.
- Al-Said, K. M. (2015). Students' Perceptions of Canvas and Mobile Learning and Their Real Barriers towards Them. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, 2(14), 167–180.
- Alshawi, S., & Alhomoud, F. A. (2016). The Impact of Using Canvas on Saudi Universities EFL Students' Motivation and Teacher-Student Communication. *International Journal of Education*, 8(4), 105-121.
- Ansong, E. (2015). Universities of Ghana Determinants of E-learning Adoption in Universities: Evidence from a developing country. Department of operations and management information systems, Universities of Ghana Business School, Universities of Ghana. Ghana: Unpublished Mphil Thesis.
- Ateş Çobanoğlu, A. (2018). Student teachers' satisfaction for blended learning via Canvas learning management system. *Behaviour & Information Technology*. 37(2), 133–144.
- Ayelaagbe, S. O. (2015). Age and Gender as Predictor of Academic Achievement in Science and Technology Education. *Journal of Education and Social Research*, 7(2), 89-94.
- Ayub, A.F.M.; Tarmizi, A. R.; Wan Jaafar, W.; Wan Ali, W.; Luan, W. S. (2010). Factors influencing students' use of a Learning Management System portal: Perspective from higher education students. *International Journal of Education and Information Technology*, 2(4), 100-108.
- Balasubramanian, K., Jaykumar, V., & Fukey, L. N. (2014). *A study on "Student preference towards the use of Canvas as a learning platform to create responsible learning environment."* *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*,.
- Bassi, M. D., & Camble, E. (2017). *Gender differences in use of electronic information resources in Universities Libraries in Adamawa State, Nigeria*. Adamawa: Universities Libraries in Adamawa state. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewpoint>
- Bates, R., & Khasawneh, S. (2004). *A Path Analytic Study of the Determinants of College Students' Motivation to Use Online Learning Technologies*. Louisiana State Universities: Online Submission.
- Bindu, C. (2016). Impact of ICT on Teaching and Learning: A Literature Review. *International Journal of Management and Commerce Innovations*, 4(1), 24-31.
- Cahyono, B. Y. (2015). Teaching English by using internet resources. *Malang: State Universities of Malang*, 224-423.
- Chandler, P. D., & Redman, C. (2013). Teaching teachers for the future: Modeling and exploring personal networks. *Australian Educational Computing*, 27(3), pp. 54–62.

- Cheong, D. (2010). The effects of practice teaching sessions in second life on the change in pre-service teachers' teaching efficacy. *Computers & Education*. 55(2), 868–880.
- Cho, M.-H., & Shen, D. (2013). Self-regulation in online learning. *Journal of Distance Education*, 34(3), 290–301.
- Cochran, K. (2015). *LMS Trends 2015: Is it Time for Something Different*. Graz (Austria): Graz Universities of Technology. Retrieved from <https://www.docebo.com/blog/report-lms-trends-2015-brandon-hall/>
- Courts, & Tucker. (2012). Using technology to create a dynamic classroom experience. *Journal of College Teaching and Learning (TCL)*, 9(2), 121-128.
- Damaryanti, A. G. (2017). Gender influence in technology usage - a literature review. . *Open Journal of Science and Technology*, 4, 51-59.
- Dias, F. A., & Dinis, H. O. (2014). Self-Pace learning in online learning. *Journal of Online learning and Distance Education*, 34(5), 294–321
- Didem, I. E. (2017). The use of Canvas in creating an online learning community of practice for learning to teach science. *Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 5(2), 1–16.
- Dobre, I. (2015). Learning Management Systems for Higher Education - An Overview of Available Options for Higher Education Organizations. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 180, pp. 313-320. doi:doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.02.122
- Enriquez, M. (2014). *Students' Perceptions on the Effectiveness of the Use of Canvas as a Supplementary Tool for LeaPaper, presented at the DLSU Research Congress*. De La Salle Universities, Manila, Philippines., Philippines.
- Goswami, A., & Dutta, S. (2016). Gender differences in technology usage - a literature review. . *Open Journal of Business and Management*, 4, 51-59. Retrieved March 28, 2019, from <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ojbm.2016.41006>
- Hoerunnisa, A., Suryani, N., & Efendi, A. (2019). The Effectiveness of the Use of E-Learning in Multimedia Classes To Improve Vocational Students' Learning Achievement and Motivation. *Jurnal Teknologi Pendidikan*, 7(2), 123.
- Hussein, Z. (2017). Leading to Intention: The Role of Attitude in Relation to Technology Acceptance Model in E-Learning. *105*, 159–164.
- Ikolo, V. E., & Okiyi, R. B. (2012). *Gender differences in computer literacy among clinical medical students in selected southern Nigeria Universities*. Retrieved October 23, 2018, from <http://www.Stanford.edu/group/siqss/it and society/vol1io5/vol1io5ao4.pdf>
- Johnson, B. T. & Zanna, M. P. (Eds.) *The handbook of attitudes and gender* (pp. 173-221). Mahwah, NJ: Elbaum.
- Juhary, J. (2014). Perceived usefulness and ease of use of the learning management system as a learning tool . *International Education Studies*, 7(8), 23–34. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v7n8p23>.

- Kehrwald, B. A., & Parker, B. (2019). Implementing online learning: Stories from the field. *Journal of Universities Teaching & Learning Practice*(16), 1. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2BQ5fvq>
- Kodriyah, L. (2016). Students' perceptions toward the use of Canvas as an effective tool for learning English. *Proceedings of the 63rd TEFLIN International Conference: Creativity and Innovation in Language Materials Development and Language Teaching Method*.
- Kongchan, R. I. (2017). Assessment of computer self-efficacy and technology dependence on computer-related Concepts. *International Journal of Science and Human-Computer Interaction*, 27(10), 946–962.
- Kozar, F. S. (2015). Learners' Literacy Based on Self-Efficacy. *Educational Research Review*, 5(3), 83–102.
- Lunenburg, F. C. (2011). Self-efficacy in the workplace: Implications for motivation and performance. *International Journal of Management, Business, and Administration*, 14(1), 1–6.
- Macfadyen, L. P., & Dawson, S. (2010). Mining LMS data to develop an “early warning system” for educators: A proof of concept. *Computers & Education. The Online Journal of Distance Education and E-Learning*, 54(2), 588–599.
- Mahmoud, A., Mohammed, H., A., S., Mazuri, G., Chaker, M., & Shaalan, K. (2019). The effect of social media usage on students' elearning acceptance in higher education: A case study from the United Arab Emirates. *International Journal of Information Technology and Language Studies (IJITLS)*, 3(3), 13-26.
- Majid, D. I. (2017). Factors determining students' self-efficacy in higher education. *Educational Research Review*, 5(3), 83–102.
- Martalyana, W., Isnarto, I., & Asikin, M. (2018). Students' Mathematical Literacy Based on Self-Efficacy By Discovery Learning With Higher Order Thinking Skills-Oriented. *Unnes Journal of Mathematics Education Research*, 7(1), 54-60.
- McClain, C., & Brown, A. (2013). Literature 2.0: An exploration of character using Canvas. *Proceedings of the 18th Annual Research Forum, Department of Education Wake Forest Universities*, (pp. 55–60.). Winston-Salem.
- Mohammadi, H. (2015). Investigating users' perspectives on e-learning: An integration of TAM and IS success model. *Comput. Hum. Behav.*, 45, 359–374.
- Mtebe, J. S. (2015). Learning management system success: Increasing learning management system usage in higher education in sub-Saharan AfricaTechnology. *International Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication* , 11(2), 51-64.
- Nadia, L. N., & Isnarto, I. (2017). Analisis Kemampuan Representasi Matematis Ditinjau dari Self-Efficacy Peserta Didik melalui Inductive Discovery Learning. *Unnes Journal of Mathematics Education Research*, 6(2), 242-250.

- Pappas, C. (2016, January 7). *The Top 8 Benefits Of Using Learning Management Systems*. Retrieved November 12, 2019, from ELearning Industry: <https://elearningindustry.com/top-8-benefits-of-using-learning-management-systems>
- Patrick, P. (2014). Blended Learning for ELT. 2. *Journal of English Teaching*, 2(3), 166-178. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.33541/jet.v2i3.54>
- Ramani, R. (2017). *2017 Preview: 11 Learning Management System Technology Trends by the Industry's Top Analysts*. Austria: Graz Universities of Technology . Retrieved from Retrieved from <https://elearningindustry.com/11-learning-management-system-technology-trends-top-analysts-2017-preview>
- Randa, O., Ghadeer, G., & Aayat, S. (2016). The experience of using Moodle and Elluminate Live! as learning tools in the Hashemite Universities case study: computer skills course. *International Journal of Business Information Systems*, 23(1), 44-53.
- Saadé, R. G., & Kira, D. (2009). Computer anxiety in e-learning: The effect of computer self-efficacy. *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research*, 8(1), 177–191.
- Sanda, F. A. & Mustapha, K. J., (2019). The influence of gender on behaviour. In D. Albarracin,
- Sarkar, B. N. (2016). Learning computer networks designed for teacher learning. *International Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*, 28(5), 43-70
- Sejzi, A. A., & Arisa, B. (2013). Learning Management System (LMS) and Learning Content Management System (LCMS) at Virtual Universities. *2nd International Seminar on Quality and Affordable Education (ISQAE), Johor, Malaysia*. [Http://www. Isqae. Com](http://www.isqae.com).
- Shittu, A., Yusuf, M., Adedokun-Shittu, N. A., Ajani, A., & Lawal, S. (2020). Validation of a Localised Learning Management System for Nigerian Post-Basic Education: A Development in the Face of Covid-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Science, Technology, Mathematics and Education (JOSTMED)*, 16(3), 94-106.
- Shu, Q., Tu, Q., & Wang, K. (2011). The impact of computer self-efficacy and technology dependence on computer-related technostress: A social cognitive theory perspective. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 27(10), 923–939.
- Sohni, G. I. (2020). The Impact of ComputerAided Instruction on Student Achievement. *Education Theses, Dissertations and Projects*. Paper 127.
- Tarun, E. J. (2019). The use of *Learning Management System Technology by classroom instructors Top Analysts*. Austria: Graz Universities of Technology. *International Journal of Science and Technology*. 32(5) 432-460.
- Thien, P. C., Phan, L. V., Loi, N. K., Tho, Q. T., Suhonen, J., & Sutinen, E. (n.d.). Applying Canvas to serve an online distance learning system for undergraduate students in Nong. *Proceedings of the IETEC'13 Conference* , (pp. 1–15). PHAM Cong Thien.

- Trust, T. (2012). Professional Learning Networks Designed for Teacher Learning. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*, 28(4), 133-138. doi:10.1080/21532974.2012.10784693
- Trust, T. (2014). Professional learning networks designed for teacher learning. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*, 28(4), 24-70. Retrieved from <http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/>
- Trust, T. (2015). Deconstructing an online community of practice: Teachers' actions in the Canvas math subject community. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*, 31(2), 73–81.
- Ünal, L. M., Yamaç, J. R. & Uzun, G. G. (2017). The roles of information communication technologies in education: Review article with emphasis to the computer and internet. *Ethiopian Journal of Education and Sciences*, 6(2), 109–126.
- Uzunboylu, H., Bicen, H., & Cavus, N. (2015). The Efficient Virtual Learning Environment: A Case Study of Web 2.0 Tools and Windows Live Spaces. *Online Journal of Computers & Education*, 56(3), 720-726. doi:doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2010.10.014
- Val, Q., Ahmed, I., & Tim, T. (2013). Introducing a Sociomaterial Perspective to Investigate E-learning for Higher Educational Institutions in Developing Countries . *Australasian Conference on Information Systems (ACIS) Proceedings*. Australia: Universities of New South Wales Canberra.
- Van Dinther, M., Dochy, F., & Segers, M. (2018). Factors affecting students' self-efficacy in higher education. *Educational Research Review*, 6(2), 95–108.
- Voogt, R. S. (2017). computer self-efficacy and technology dependence on computer-related technostress. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 27(10), 923–939.