

**FACTORS INFLUENCING LECTURERS' INTENTION TO USE ASSISTIVE
TECHNOLOGIES FOR TEACHING STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS IN
COLLEGES OF EDUCATION IN NORTH-WEST NIGERIA**

BY

**ABUBAKAR, Ibrahim Bello
PhD/SSTE/FT/2018/8029**

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY
FEDERAL UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, MINNA,
NIGERIA,**

JUNE, 2023

**FACTORS INFLUENCING LECTURERS' INTENTION TO USE ASSISTIVE
TECHNOLOGIES FOR TEACHING STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS IN
COLLEGES OF EDUCATION IN NORTH-WEST NIGERIA**

BY

**ABUBAKAR, Ibrahim Bello
PhD/SSTE/FT/2018/8029**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL, FEDERAL
UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, MINNA, NIGERIA, IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD
OF THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN
EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY**

JUNE, 2023

The global practice of training students with special needs requires the integration of assistive technologies, provided that lecturers recognize their usefulness, ease of use and technological self-efficacy in their intention to use assistive technology (AT). Therefore, the study investigated the Factors Influencing Lecturers' Intention to Use Assistive Technologies for Teaching Students with Special Needs (SWSN) in Colleges of Education (COE) in North-West Nigeria. A descriptive survey design and specifically quantitative correlation was adopted. The population of the study was 493 lecturers of SWSN in COE, North-west, Nigeria. The sample size of the study was 210 lecturers which comprised of males (128) and females (82). The instrument for data collection was a 5-point Likert-type questionnaire made up of section (Demographic Information) and section B (the predictors and criterion variables) was used for data collection. Nine objectives which were translated into 9 research questions and 6 formulated hypotheses guided the study. The research questions were analysed using Mean and Standard deviation. The null hypotheses were tested using regression analysis and Point Biserial. The findings of research questions 1, 2 & 3 show the mean and standard deviations ($X=3.49$, $SD=1.35$; $X=3.51$, $SD=1.37$ and $X=3.53$, $SD=1.35$ respectively) showing that lecturers perceived AT to be useful, easy to use and Teachers self-efficacy towards the use of Assistive technology for teaching students with special needs is high. The result of null hypotheses (H_0) 1, 2, 3 & 6 shows that the standardized Beta coefficient of lecturers Perceived Usefulness (PU), Perceived ease of use (PEU) and TSE on BI to use of AT are statistically significant and positive relationship. The result also revealed ($B=.944$, $t=41.16$, $p(0.00)<0.05$) for hypothesis one (H_{01}); ($B=.953$, $t=45.16$, $p(0.00)<0.05$) for hypothesis two (H_{02}); and ($B=.964$, $t=51.94$, $p(.89)>0.05$) for hypothesis (H_{03}). Based on the outcomes of the study, the researcher however recommended that National Commission for Colleges of Education (NCCE) and COE administration should prioritize the provision of adequate funding and resources to ensure the availability and accessibility of assistive technology devices (ATDs) in COEs. This includes allocating budgetary resources specifically dedicated to acquiring and maintaining a wide range of ATDs. COE administration should collaborate with assistive technology developers to ensure a wide range of electronic aids is readily available for lecturers to use in their teaching.

TABLE OF CONTENT

Content	Page
Cover page	
Title page	i
Declaration page	ii
Certification	iii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Abstract	vii
Table of contents	viii
List of Tables	xii
List of Figures	xv
List of Appendices	xvi
List of Abbreviations	xvii
 CHAPTER ONE	
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background to the Study	1
1.2 Statement of the Research Problem	6
1.3 Aim and Objectives of the Study	8
1.4 Research Questions	9
1.5 Research Hypotheses	10
1.6 Significance of the Study	11
1.7 Scope of the Study	12
1.8 Operational Definition of Terms	12

CHAPTER TWO

2.0	LITERATURE REVIEW	14
2.1	Conceptual Framework	14
2.1.1	Concept of Assistive Technology (AT)	15
2.1.1.1	Assistive technology and students with special needs	21
2.1.1.2	Categories of assistive technology	36
2.1.1.3	Importance of assistive technology in teaching and learning	42
2.1.1.4	Use of assistive technology in helping students with special needs	47
2.1.1.5	Problems of using AT for students with special education needs	49
2.1.1.6	Barriers to assistive technology adoption	51
2.1.1.7	Strategies for resolving barriers to assistive technology adoption	54
2.1.1.8	Educational intervention for students with special needs	56
2.1.1.9	Challenges in using assistive technology devices for students with special needs	57
2.1.1.10	Assistive technology software for students with special needs	60
2.1.1.11	Utilization of assistive technology devices by students with special needs	64
2.1.2	Lecturers perceptions on the use of assistive technology	66

2.1.2.1 Lecturers knowledge of AT	71
2.1.2.2 Lecturers awareness of AT	72
2.1.2.3 Regular lecturers and AT in inclusive education	73
2.1.2.4 Lecturers and student’s attitude towards AT	76
2.1.2.5 Gender and lectures attitude towards AT	78
2.1.3 Nigerian colleges of education system	80
2.2 Theoretical Framework	81
2.2.1 Technology acceptance model	81
2.2.2 Bandura theory of self-efficacy	84
2.2.3 Theory of connectivism of Siemen (2005) and Downes (2010)	85
2.2.4 Theory of planned behavior of Ajzen (1985)	87
2.2.5 Consumer Satisfaction Theory	88
2.3 Related Empirical Studies	89
2.3.1 Empirical Studies on lecturers perceive usefulness of AT	89
2.3.2 Empirical studies on lecturers perceive ease of use of AT	93
2.3.3 Empirical studies on lecturers’ self-efficacy on AT	96
2.3.4 Empirical studies on the general use of assistive technology	100
2.4 Summary of literature reviewed	107
CHAPTER THREE	
3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	111
3.1 Research Design	111

3.2	Population of the Study	111
3.3	Sample and Sampling Techniques	112
3.4	Research Instruments	113
3.5	Validation of the Research Instruments	113
3.6	Reliability of Instruments	114
3.7	Method of Data Collection	115
3.8	Method of Data Analysis	115
 CHAPTER FOUR		
4.0	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	116
4.1	Presentation of Results	116
4.1.1	Demographic Data	116
4.1.2	Answering Research Questions	118
4.1.3	Testing Research Hypotheses	132
4.3	Summary of the Findings	141
4.4	Discussion of Findings of Lecturers Intention to Use AT	142
 CHAPTER FIVE		
5.0	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	154
5.1	Conclusion	154
5.2	Recommendations	155
5.3	Contribution to Knowledge	158
5.4	Limitations of the Study	159
5.5	Suggestions for Further Study	160
REFERENCES		162
APPENDIXES		169

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Pages
2.1:	Illustration of listed colleges of education in the north western Nigeria	81
3.1:	Illustration of listed colleges of education in the north western Nigeria	112
3.2:	Reliability of the Construct of the Instrument	114
4.1:	Gender Distribution of the Respondents	116
4.2:	Distribution of Respondents based on Years of Experience	117
4.3:	Lecturers Mean and Standard Deviation Responses on Perceived Usefulness of Assistive Technology	119
4.4:	Lecturers mean responses on Perceived Ease of Use of Assistive Technology	121
4.5:	Lecturers Mean and Standard Deviation Responses on Technological Self-Efficacy of Assistive Technology (TSE)	123
4.6:	Mean and Standard Deviation of Perceived usefulness and Behavioural intention	124
4.7:	Mean and Standard Deviation of Perceived ease of use and Behavioural intention	126
4.8:	Mean and Standard Deviation of Self-efficacy and Behavioural Intention	127
4.9:	Mean and Standard Deviation of Years of experience and Behavioural intention	129
4.10:	Mean and Standard Deviation of Gender and Behavioural intention	130
4.11:	Shows Mean and Standard Deviation of Lecturers Perceive Usefulness, Ease of Use and Self-Efficacy Prediction on Behavioural Intention	132

4.12a:	Linear Regression Model Summary on the Influence of lecturers Perceived Usefulness on Behavioural Intention to use Assistive technology	133
	Regression ANOVA on Lecturers Perceived Usefulness on Behavioural	
4.12b:	Intention to Use Assistive Technology for Teaching College of Education students with Special Needs	134
	Linear Regression Coefficient between Lecturers Perceived Usefulness on	
4.12c:	Behavioural Intention to Use Assistive Technology for Teaching	134
	Linear Regression Model Summary on the Lecturer Perceive Ease of Use	
4.13a:	Influence of Behavioural intention to use Assistive Technology	135
	Regression ANOVA on lecturers perceived ease of use on Behavioural	
4.13b:	intention to use Assistive technology for teaching college of education students with special needs	135
	Linear Regression Coefficient between lecturers perceived ease of use on	
4.13c:	Behavioural intention to use Assistive technology for teaching college of education students with special needs	136
	Linear Regression Model Summary on the Influence of lecturers’	
4.14a:	technological self-efficacy on Behavioural intention to use Assistive technology for teaching college of education students with special needs	136
	Regression ANOVA on lecturers Technological Self Efficacy on	
4.14b:	Behavioural intention to use Assistive technology for teaching college of education students with special needs	137

4.14c:	Linear Regression Coefficient between Lecturers Perceived Technological Self-efficacy on Behavioural intention to use Assistive Technology for Teaching College of Education Students with Special needs	138
4.15:	Relationship between years of experience and behavioral intention to use Assistive technology for teaching college of education students with special needs	138
4.16	Relationship between Gender and behavioral intention to use Assistive technology for teaching college of education students with special needs	139
	Linear Regression Model Summary on Lecturers perceive usefulness, ease of use and self-efficacy on Behavioural intention to use Assistive technology for teaching college of education students with special needs	139
4.17a:	Regression ANOVA on Lecturers perceive usefulness, ease of use and self-efficacy on Behavioural intention to use Assistive technology for teaching college of education students with special needs	140
4.17b:	Linear Regression Coefficient between Lecturers perceive usefulness, ease of use and self-efficacy on Behavioural intention to use Assistive technology for teaching college of education students with special needs	140

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
2.1: Graphical illustration of Conceptual framework of the study	14
2.2: Graphical illustration of Technology Acceptance Model	82
4.1: Gender Distributions of the Respondents	117
4.2: Distribution of Respondents based on Years of Experience	118
4.3: Scattered plot relationships between perceived usefulness and Behavioural intention	125
4.4: Scattered plot relationships between perceived ease of use and Behavioural intention	126
4.5: Scattered plot relationships between self-efficacy and Behavioural Intention	128
4.6: Scattered plot relationships between Years of experience and Behavioural intention	129
4.7: Scattered plot relationships between Gender and Behavioural intention	131
4.8: Relationship between lecturers PUAT, PEUAT, TSE and BI	132

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix		Page
I:	Validation form of the instrument from experts	169
II:	Questionnaire on Lecturers Intention to Use Assistive Technologies (QLTUAT)	177
III:	Reliability Output of the instrument of pilot testing	182
IV:	Introductory letter to the field	185
V:	SPSS Output of data analysis result	191
V:	Pictures of places visited in the course field work	199

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations	Meanings
AAC	Alternative and Augmentative Communication
AAL:	Ambient Assistive Living
AT:	Assistive Technology
ATQSD	Assistive Technology Questionnaire for Students with Special needs
ASD:	Autism Spectrum Disorder
AUAT:	Attitude to Use Assistive Technology
BI:	Behavioral Intention
BIUAT:	Behavioral Intention to use Assistive Technology
CCTV:	Computer Camera Television
CD:	Computer Disc
CFA	Confirmatory Factor Analysis
CUSE:	Computer Use Self Effigy
EFA	Exploratory Factor Analysis
DVD:	Digital Video Disc
HAAT:	Human Activity Assistive Technology
Ho:	Null Hypothesis
ICT:	Information Communication Technology
IDEA:	Individual with Disability Education Act
ISO:	International Standard Organization
ITBI:	Individual with Traumatic Brain Injury
LD:	Learning Disabilities
MOOC:	Massive Open Online Course

NCCE:	National Commission for Colleges of Education
NGO:	Non-Governmental Organization
NPE:	National Policy on Education
OSEP:	Office of Special Education Programmed
PECS:	Picture Exchange Communication System
PEU:	Perceive Ease of Use
PEUAT:	Perceive Ease of Use of Assistive Technology
PU:	Perceive Use fullness
PUAT:	Perceive Usefulness Assistive Technology
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Science
SWD:	Students with Disability
TAM:	Technology Acceptance Models
TSE:	Technological Self Efficacy
UN:	United Nations
UNESCO:	United Nations Education, Science and Cultural Organization
USB	Universal Serial Bus
WHO:	World Health Organization