

enhance performance improvement, as is seen according to the Path Coefficient (β) values.

IV. CONCLUSION

The study concludes that the quality of e-learning information sources provided by the Middle Technical University in the Administrative Technical College via e-learning courses to promote the level of students and that can be seen clearly in H6 & H7 when the value of ($\beta=0.876$; $P<0.05$) and ($\beta=0.347$; $P<0.05$) indicate with what they need from high-quality e-learning courses via the Internet is part of their educational experience. The model's results were positive. Students turn to e-learning as a supplement and alternative educational paradigm during crises. Despite its limitations, e-learning offers beneficial features that can improve education. The quality of e-learning information sources available through the educational platform might increase students' coursework and educational experiences. According to the research, the suggested method for evaluating e-learning information quality was successful.

The study found a relationship between (PEOU & PU) and behavioral intention to use. The foundational variables (PEOU & PU) and extrinsic factors (EIQ) determine behavioral intention to use that can be seen clearly in H1 & H2 when the value of ($\beta=0.715$; $P<0.05$) and ($\beta=0.204$; $P<0.05$). The simplicity of the usage of e-learning may explain this. That can be seen clearly in the (PEOU) Perceived ease of use was high compared to the perceived usefulness (PU) of using e-learning information sources to enhance performance improvement, as is seen according to the Path Coefficient (β) values. So, the Perceived ease of use promotes student output.

Therefore, these results support the technology acceptance model as a framework for understanding students' e-learning behavior intentions. Can be seen clearly in H5 when the value of ($\beta=0.643$; $P<0.05$). It is considered a high value compared to the rest of the Path Coefficient (β) values. The most crucial advantage of e-learning is its ability to be used in crises. Therefore, students must see the value and significance of the information sources used in e-learning. However, more research is required to evaluate the system's quality. Furthermore, the acceptability of e-learning may change as pedagogies change.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We thank the Technical College of Management (TCM) Department of Information Technology for supporting and encouraging this research.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. R. Garrison and H. Kanuka, "Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education," *internet High. Educ.*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 95–105, 2004.
- [2] M. V. López-Pérez, M. C. Pérez-López, and L. Rodríguez-Ariza, "Blended learning in higher education: Students' perceptions and their relation to outcomes," *Comput. Educ.*, vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 818–826, Apr. 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2010.10.023.
- [3] C. Keller and L. Cernerud, "Students' perceptions of e-learning in university education," *J. Educ. Media*, vol. 27, no. 1–2, pp. 55–67, 2002.
- [4] S. Alharbi and S. Drew, "Using the technology acceptance model in understanding academics' behavioural intention to use learning management systems," *Int. J. Adv. Comput. Sci. Appl.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 2014.
- [5] R. LaRose, J. Gregg, and M. Eastin, "Audiographic telecourses for the Web: An experiment," *J. Comput. Commun.*, vol. 4, no. 2, p. JCMC423, 1998.
- [6] S. S. Iyer, A. Seetharaman, and K. Maddulety, "Education Transformation Using Block Chain Technology-A Student Centric Model," in *Re-imagining Diffusion and Adoption of Information Technology and Systems: A Continuing Conversation: IFIP WG 8.6 International Conference on Transfer and Diffusion of IT, TDIT 2020, Tiruchirappalli, India, December 18–19, 2020, Proceedings, Part 1*, 2020, pp. 201–217.
- [7] I.-F. Liu, M. C. Chen, Y. S. Sun, D. Wible, and C.-H. Kuo, "Extending the TAM model to explore the factors that affect Intention to Use an Online Learning Community," *Comput. Educ.*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 600–610, Feb. 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2009.09.009.
- [8] M. A. Almaiah, A. Al-Khasawneh, and A. Althunibat, "Exploring the critical challenges and factors influencing the E-learning system usage during COVID-19 pandemic," *Educ. Inf. Technol.*, vol. 25, pp. 5261–5280, 2020.
- [9] M. A. Almaiah and A. Al-Khasawneh, "Investigating the main determinants of mobile cloud computing adoption in university campus," *Educ. Inf. Technol.*, vol. 25, pp. 3087–3107, 2020.
- [10] R. Vrieliink, "Predicting the use of blackboard and predicting the use of a personal digital analyser with the technology acceptance model," *Curr. Dev. Technol. Educ. FORMATEX, Badajoz*, pp. 591–595, 2006.
- [11] T. Favale, F. Soro, M. Trevisan, I. Drago, and M. Mellia, "Campus traffic and e-Learning during COVID-19 pandemic," *Comput. networks*, vol. 176, p. 107290, 2020.
- [12] L. Poinson, "On the shoulders of giants: recent changes in Internet traffic," *Cloudflare*. <https://blog.cloudflare.com/on-the-shoulders-of-giants-recent-changes-in-internet-traffic/> (accessed 20 May 2020, 2020).
- [13] V. Arkorful, N. Abaidoo, and others, "The role of e-learning, advantages and disadvantages of its adoption in higher education," *Int. J. Instr. Technol. distance Learn.*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 29–42, 2015.
- [14] A. Tarhini, K. Hone, X. Liu, and T. Tarhini, "Examining the moderating effect of individual-level cultural values on users' acceptance of E-learning in developing countries: a structural equation modeling of an extended technology acceptance model," *Interact. Learn. Environ.*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 306–328, 2017.
- [15] M. M. Jæger and E. H. Blaabæk, "Inequality in learning opportunities during Covid-19: Evidence from library takeout," *Res. Soc. Stratif. Mobil.*, vol. 68, p. 100524, 2020.
- [16] A. Al-Azawei, P. Parslow, and K. Lundqvist, "Investigating the effect of learning styles in a blended e-learning system: An extension of the technology acceptance model (TAM)," *Australas. J. Educ. Technol.*, vol. 33, no. 2, 2017.
- [17] F. V. Moghaddam Zanjani and M. Ramazani, "Investigation of e-learning acceptance in teaching English language based on TAM Model," *ARN J. Syst. Softw.*, vol. 2, no. 11, 2012.
- [18] F. D. Davis, R. P. Bagozzi, and P. R. Warshaw, "User acceptance of computer technology: A comparison of two theoretical models," *Manage. Sci.*, vol. 35, no. 8, pp. 982–1003, 1989.
- [19] S. Y. Park, "An analysis of the technology acceptance model in understanding university students' behavioral intention to use e-learning," *J. Educ. Technol. & Soc.*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 150–162, 2009.
- [20] R. Ahmed, "Employing e-learning to achieve quality standards in the educational process," *Arab J. Qual. Assur. Univ. Educ.*, vol. 5, no. 9, 2012.
- [21] A. Qader and A. Hussein, "The quality of e-learning in higher education institutions. Al-Hikma J," *Educ. Psychol. Stud.*, vol. 1, pp. 95–109, 2013.
- [22] A. Kalaivani and others, "Role of E-Learning in the Quality Improvement of Higher Education," *J. Humanit. Soc. Sci.*, vol. 19, no. 11, pp. 15–17, "Role of E-Learning in the Quality Improvement of Higher Education," *J. Humanit. Soc. Sci.*, vol. 19, no. 11, pp. 15–17, 2014.
- [23] M. F. Ibrahim, H. K. S. Aljader, and N. A. Fadhil, "Measuring Students' Intention to Use E-Learning During COVID-19 Pandemic: A Case Study in Technical College of Management-Baghdad," *Int. J. Intell. Eng. Syst.*, vol. 14, pp. 492–503, 2021.
- [24] D. Tao, "Understanding intention to use electronic information resources: a theoretical extension of the technology acceptance model (TAM)," in *AMIA Annual Symposium Proceedings*, 2008, vol. 2008, p. 717.
- [25] N. S. A. Rani, Z. Suradi, and N. H. Yusoff, "An analysis of technology acceptance model, learning management system attributes, e-

- satisfaction, and e-retention,” *Int. Rev. Manag. Bus. Res.*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 1984–1996, 2014.
- [26] H. Jeong, “An investigation of user perceptions and behavioral intentions towards the e-library,” *Libr. Collect. Acquis. Tech. Serv.*, vol. 35, no. 2–3, pp. 45–60, 2011.
- [27] G. Stocker, *Technology acceptance of electronic medical records by nurses*. Webster University, 2010.
- [28] R. Agarwal and J. Prasad, “Are individual differences germane to the acceptance of new information technologies?,” *Decis. Sci.*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 361–391, 1999.
- [29] G. Walker and N. Johnson, “Faculty intentions to use components for web-enhanced instruction,” *Int. J. E-learning*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 133–152, 2008.
- [30] C. Shao, “An empirical study on the identification of driving factors of satisfaction with online learning based on TAM,” in *5th international conference on economics, management, law and education (EMLE 2019)*, 2020, pp. 1067–1073.
- [31] D. Dwidienawati, S. B. Abdinagoro, D. Tjahjana, D. Gandasari, and others, “Forced shifting to e-learning during the covid-19 outbreak: Information quality, system quality, service quality, and goal orientation influence to e-learning satisfaction and perceived performance,” *Int. J. Adv. trends Comput. Sci. Eng.*, pp. 1518–1525, 2020.
- [32] M. Mailizar, D. Burg, and S. Maulina, “Examining university students’ behavioural intention to use e-learning during the COVID-19 pandemic: An extended TAM model,” *Educ. Inf. Technol.*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 7057–7077, 2021.
- [33] N. Ameen, “Arab users’ acceptance and use of mobile phones: a case of young users in Iraq, Jordan and UAE,” Anglia Ruskin University, 2017.
- [34] Y.-H. Lee, Y.-C. Hsieh, and C.-N. Hsu, “Adding innovation diffusion theory to the technology acceptance model: Supporting employees’ intentions to use e-learning systems,” *J. Educ. Technol. & Soc.*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 124–137, 2011.
- [35] P. Legris, J. Ingham, and P. Collette, “Why do people use information technology? A critical review of the technology acceptance model,” *Inf. & Manag.*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 191–204, 2003.
- [36] F. D. Davis, “Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology,” *MIS Q.*, pp. 319–340, 1989.
- [37] W. W. Chin and P. A. Todd, “On the use, usefulness, and ease of use of structural equation modeling in MIS research: A note of caution,” *MIS Q.*, pp. 237–246, 1995.
- [38] M. Fishbein and I. Ajzen, “Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research,” 1977.
- [39] M. Igbaria, T. Guimaraes, and G. B. Davis, “Testing the determinants of microcomputer usage via a structural equation model,” *J. Manag. Inf. Syst.*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 87–114, 1995.
- [40] V. Venkatesh and S. Goyal, “Expectation disconfirmation and technology adoption: polynomial modeling and response surface analysis,” *MIS Q.*, pp. 281–303, 2010.
- [41] H. C. Lucas and V. K. Spittler, “Extending the technology acceptance model: A field study of broker workstations,” 1996.
- [42] V. Venkatesh and F. D. Davis, “A theoretical extension of the technology acceptance model: Four longitudinal field studies,” *Manage. Sci.*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 186–204, 2000.
- [43] F. D. Davis, “User acceptance of information technology: system characteristics, user perceptions and behavioral impacts,” *Int. J. Man. Mach. Stud.*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 475–487, 1993.
- [44] V. Venkatesh and F. D. Davis, “A model of the antecedents of perceived ease of use: Development and test,” *Decis. Sci.*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 451–481, 1996.
- [45] B. H. Wixom and P. A. Todd, “A theoretical integration of user satisfaction and technology acceptance,” *Inf. Syst. Res.*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 85–102, 2005.
- [46] A. Joshi, S. Kale, S. Chandel, and D. K. Pal, “Likert scale: Explored and explained,” *Br. J. Appl. Sci. & Technol.*, vol. 7, no. 4, p. 396, 2015.
- [47] C. Ringle, S. Wende, and J. Becker, “SmartPLS 3 (<http://www.smartpls.com>),” *SmartPLS GmbH*, 2015.
- [48] J. F. Hair Jr, G. T. M. Hult, C. M. Ringle, and M. Sarstedt, *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)*. Sage publications, 2021.
- [49] J. Henseler, C. M. Ringle, and M. Sarstedt, “A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling,” *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.*, vol. 43, pp. 115–135, 2015.
- [50] J. F. Hair Jr, L. M. Matthews, R. L. Matthews, and M. Sarstedt, “PLS-SEM or CB-SEM: updated guidelines on which method to use,” *Int. J. Multivar. Data Anal.*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 107–123, 2017.