

*

(0.05 = α)

/

(%17.06)

(165)

(46)

(.0.775)

-

"

"

:

(0.05= α)

(WebCT)

:

(Moodle)

.1

:

(Distance Education)

(Extension Education)

(Tele-Teaching)

(Correspondence Study)

2005/1/25

.2006/5/30

*

/

(2004 :84-90

(2003) (E-Learning)
(2002 :48)

(Tanquist,

Face-)

.2001; Forsyth, 2001: 5-7)

(to-Face

()

:84-90)

.(2004

(Hezel and Domonguez, 2001;

.McLoughiln and Luca, 2001)

"Electronic Tools"

(E-Learning)

"Learner"

(Flexible Learning

(Web-Based-

Model)

Learning)

(Strother, 2002)

:

.(Taylor, 1995)

(Stein et al., 2005)

(Moore's) 2003 :21)

(201)

.(0.793)

(2001)

Liaw, 2004,

(2005)

)

.(2003:139

(Milheim, 2004)

:
 -1
 -2
 -3 (650)
 -4
 (2002)
 (E-Learning)
 / (32)

-
 2006/2005
 .2
 -1
 :
 2006/2005
 (967)
 (165)
 (%17.06)
 .(1)
 (%66.7) (1)
 (%33.3)
 (%88.5) (%36) -

(1)

			%		%			
%7.9	-	13	%6.7	11	%1.2	2		
%20.6	-	34	%15.2	25	%5.5	9		
%33.9	-	56	%21.8	36	%12.1	20		
%8.5	-	14	%2.4	4	%6.1	10		
%29.1	-	48	%20.6	34	%8.5	14		
%29.1	-	48	%28.5	47	%0.6	1		
%34.5	-	57	%9.1	15	%25.5	42		
%36	-	60	%29.1	48	%7.3	12		
%11.5	-	19	%9.7	16	%1.8	3		
%88.5	-	146	%57.0	94	%31.5	52		
%14.5	-	24	%10.4	17	%4.2	7		
%75.8	-	125	%48.5	80	%27.3	45		
%9.7	-	16	%7.9	13	%1.8	3		
%49.7	*4	80	%32.9	53	%16.8	27		
%50.3		81	%32.9	53	%8.4	28		
%61.0	*11	94	%39.6	61	%21.4	33	7	
%39		60	%26	40	%13.0	20	7	/
%54.6	*68	53	%26.8	26	%27.8	27	2.99- 2.00	
%45.4		44	%44.3	43	%1.0	1	4.00-3.00	

*

(2004) (2001)
 (Milheim, 2004) (%75.8)
 (%50.3)
 - 7 (%61)
 .(2.99 -2.00) (%54.6)

(3)

	0.90	4.07		-42	-1
	1.07	3.98		-34	-2
	0.97	3.97		-37	-3
	1.25	3.88		-28	-4
	1.05	3.77		-36	-5
	0.99	3.75		-39	-6
	1.01	3.73		-40	-7
	1.11	3.69		-16	-8
	0.98	3.64		-6	-9
	1.08	3.63		-32	-10
	1.04	3.60		-44	-11
	0.95	3.60		-14	-12
	1.24	3.59		-30	-13
	1.14	3.58		-43	-14
	1.06	3.56		-8	-15
	1.14	3.50		-26	-16
	0.95	3.40		-1	-17
	0.98	3.34		-12	-18
	1.12	3.33		-20	-19
	1.07	3.32		-10	-20
	1.06	3.28		-18	-21
	1.24	3.26		-22	-22
	1.18	3.21		-24	-23
	0.95	3.18		-3	-24
	1.12	3.18		-46	-25
	0.54	3.56			

:

2003/2002

		:		(32)
	(2.33 -1.00)	-1		
	" "			:
(3.67	-2.34)	-2		
" "				
	(3.67)	-3		
	" "			
		:	(124)	(31)
			2002	
			(1871)	
			(967)	
	(3)			
	(3)			(7.8)
	" "		(3.56)	
			(8)	
	" "			
"		" (42)	(3024)	
(34)	(4.07)			(24)
"		"		
	"	(3.98)		(30)
(3.97)	"			
" (6)		(17)		
"				
" (32)	(3.64)			
"				
	" (46)			
(3.18)	"		(2005-2004)	
			()
	:			

(4)

	0.999	4.33		-33	-1
	1.15	4.04		-2	-2
	1.04	3.85		-38	-3
	1.07	3.76		-13	-4
	1.13	3.65		-27	-5
	1.29	3.54		-29	-6
	1.30	3.49		-4	-7
	1.41	3.49		-31	-8
	1.16	3.48)	-17	-9
	1.32	3.47	.(-25	-10
	1.29	3.33		-35	-11
	1.22	3.31		-15	-12
	1.11	3.19		-41	-13
	1.00	3.16		-45	-14
	1.45	2.99	.(Moodle)	-23	-15
	1.79	2.86		-19	-16
	1.21	2.84		-11	-17
	1.28	2.74	.(Web CT)	-21	-18
	1.06	2.72		-7	-19
	1.21	2.32		-5	-20
	1.09	2.05		-9	-21
	0.55	3.27			

(5)

*0.004	164	4.427	0.539	3.56	165	
			0.549	3.27	165	

.(0.05= α) *

" (2) (4.04) (124) (7.8)

" (27) (15)

" (29) (3.65)

" (3.54)

" (5) (2.32) (Smith, 2005: 3-12)

" (9) (2.05) (Kekkonen et al., 2002: 423-) (433)

David et al.,) (2005: 105-118) (4) (4) (3.27)

(33) (4.33)

(6)

0.581	3.12	0.486	3.49		
0.519	3.34	0.558	3.60		
0.363	3.32	0.611	3.29		
0.614	3.23	0.464	3.61		
0.584	3.21	0.545	3.50		
0.606	3.08	0.689	3.75		
0.469	3.41	0.492	3.66		
0.529	3.26	0.539	3.57		
0.703	3.36	0.513	3.46		
0.634	3.18	0.619	3.57	2.99 -2:00	
0.509	3.36	0.508	3.56	4.00 -3:00	
0.481	3.41	0.524	3.64		
0.572	3.26	0.554	3.54		
0.404	3.50	0.411	3.56		
0.563	3.18	0.582	3.57		
0.523	3.36	0.488	3.55		
0.516	3.35	0.521	3.56	7	
0.572	3.08	0.566	3.59	7	/
0.483	3.34	0.530	3.61		
0.578	3.21	0.519	3.52		
0.573	3.26	0.562	3.56		

:

(5)

" "

(5)

(0.05 = α)

(6)

(7)

()

0.228	163	1.211	0.486	3.49	55		
			0.558	3.60	110		
0.405	163	0.835-	0.539	3.57	146		
			0.513	3.46	19		
0.765	159	0.299-	0.582	3.57	81		
			0.488	3.55	80		
0.956	95	0.055	0.619	3.57	53	2.99 -2	
			0.508	3.56	44	4 -3	
0.659	152	-0.442	0.521	3.56	94	7	
			0.566	3.59	60	7	/

(8)

0.222	1.444	0.411	4	1.643		
		0.284	160	45.508		
			164	46.151		
0.711	0.342	0.099	2	0.198		
		0.290	162	46.953		
			162	47.151		
0.721	0.327	0.095	4	0.190		
		0.295	162	48.961		
			164	49.151		

:

(One-Way

.(8)

ANOVA)

.(One-way ANOVA)

(7)

" "

(9)

()

:

/

*0.011	163	2.56	0.581	3.12	55		
			0.519	3.34	110		
0.432	163	0.787	0.529	3.26	146		
			0.703	3.36	19		
*0.035	163	2.123	0.563	3.18	84		
			0.523	3.36	81		
0.135	95	1.507-	0.634	3.18	53	2.99 -2	
			0.509	3.36	44	4 -3	
*0.003	152	2.989	0.516	3.35	94	7	
			0.572	3.08	60	7	/

.(0.05= α)

*

(10)

0.229	1.421	0.426	2	1.702		
		0.299	162	47.906		
			164	49.662		
0.450	0.803	0.244	2	0.487		
		0.303	162	49.121		
			164	49.608		
0.122	2.132	0.636	2	1.272		
		0.298	162	48.335		
			164	49.607		

(0.05 = α)

(8)

(Mansour, 2004: 1-14)

(Milheim, 2003:

267-272)

.4

-1

:

-2

.(One-Way ANOVA)

" "

-3

.(10)

(ANOVAOne)

-4

(10)

" "

((One-Way ANOVA)

(0.05 = α)

-5

-6

= α)

-7

(0.05

7

- of an Introductory Computing Courses, *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 33(4): 423-433.
- Liaw, Shu-Sheng. 2004. Considerations for Developing Constructivists Web-Based Learning, *International Journal of Instructional Media*, 31 (3): 309-319.
- Mansour, Essam. 2004. The Status of the Internet Among University Students in Developing Countries, *Arabic Studies in Librarianship and Information Science*, 19 (3): 1-14.
- Mcloughlin, Catherine and Luca, Joe. 2001. Quality in Online Delivery: What Does It Mean fro Assessment in E-Learning Environments? *Online Journal* (<http://www.eric.ed.gov>).
- Milheim, Karen L. 2004. Strategy for Designing On-Line Courseware, *International Journal of Instructional Media*, 31 (3): 267-272.
- Smith, Peter J. 2005. Learning Preferences and Readiness for Online Learning, *Educational Psychology*, 25 (1): 3-12.
- Stein, D.S., Wanstreet, C.E., Calvin, J., Overtoom and Wheaton, J.E. 2005. Bridging the Transactional Distance Gap in Online Learning Environments, *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 19 (2): 105-118.
- Strother, Judith B. 2002. An Assessment of the Effectiveness of E-Learning in Corporate Training Programs, *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 3 (1).
- Tanquist, S. 2001. Marathon E- Learning Doing it For the Long Run, *Training and Development Magazine*, 55 (8): 22-24.
- Taylor, J.C. 1995. Distance Education Technologies, The Forth Generation, *Australia Journal of Education Technology*, 11 (2): online Journal: <http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajetll/taylor.html>.
- : 2001
- .55-32
- 2002
- 2003
- 2004
- 1425
- 2004
- 2003
- 23-21
- .2003 ()
- 2005
- "
- .24-9 2005 18-16 "
- Abdalraheem, Ahmed and Al Musawi, Ali S. 2003. Instructional Uses of Internet Services by Sultan Qaboos University Faculty Member (part1), *International Journal of Instructional Media*, 30 (1), 45-57.
- Forsyth, Ian. 2001. *Teaching and Learning Materials and the Internet*, Clays Ltd, St Ivesplc, 3rd Edition.
- Hezel, R.T. and Dominguez, P.S. 2001. Strategic Planning in E-Learning Collaborations: a Recipe for Optimizing Success, *Ed-at-a-Distance- Journal*, 15 (4).
- Kokkonen, M., Synnove, M. and Glovannl, B. 2002. E-Learning in Hong Kong: Comparing Learning Outcomes in Online Multimedia and Lecture Versions

...

E-Learning From Students' Points of View in College of Education in Sultan Qaboos University

*Salha A. Issan and Wajeha T. Al-Ani **

ABSTRACT

The aim of the study was to investigate the e-learning situation at the college of education with regards to its advantages and disadvantages from students' view points, and if there were any significant differences at ($\alpha=0.05$) between students' view points related to their gender, specialties, level of study year, grade point average, residency, knowledge in computer, attended courses in E-Learning and hour number average of using internet weekly.

Data were obtained from (165) students represented of (17.06%) of total population. To collect data, a questionnaire consisted of (46) items represented advantages and disadvantages uses of E-Learning. Using Chronpach-Alpha, the reliability of the questionnaire was (0.775).

The results indicate that one of the most advantages of E-Learning is to increase cooperative learning space, narrowing the gab between student-teacher and student-student interactive through discussion-board, and developed their computer skills. According to disadvantages, the results of the study showed that the lack of, and insufficient number of computer equipment and facing difficulties in university's site connection.

The result also showed that there were a significant differences at ($\alpha=0.05$) between students' responses average mean in the part of disadvantages related to gender in favor of female, and those who attend E-Learning course in favor of those who did not. According to these results, several recommendations and suggestion were drawn.

Keywords: Advantages of E-Learning and Disadvantages, College of Education Student-Learning, Uses of (WebCT)and (Moodle) Programs in E-Learning.

* Department of Educational Administration and Foundation, Faculty of Educational Sciences, Received on 25/1/2005 and Accepted for Publication on 30/5/2006.