Uploading but Not Teaching: A Governance-Centered Analysis of Selective Digital Compliance in Post-Conflict African Higher Education

Godfrey Eloho

Coordinator, Center for E-Learning (CEL), African Methodist Episcopal University (AMEU), Monrovia, Liberia

DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.10200436

Received: 25 February 2026; Accepted: 02 March 2026; Published: 14 March 2026

ABSTRACT

E-learning mandates in sub-Saharan African higher education institutions routinely presuppose that faculty compliance follows naturally from policy directives and infrastructure deployment. This assumption is rarely tested empirically in post-conflict, low-resource contexts. This paper draws on systematic direct observation of Google Classroom activity across 133 course sections, 82 faculty members, and 4,673 students at African Methodist Episcopal University (AMEU) in Monrovia, Liberia, assessed against standardised benchmarks across four defined compliance dimensions: syllabus posting, learning resource upload, digital midterm exam delivery, and grade posting. Each section was coded into a proficiency rating of Very Good, Fair, or Poor based on cumulative performance. The data reveal a sharp divergence between passive and active digital pedagogy. Passive compliance was relatively strong: 94% of faculty uploaded learning resources, and 73.7% posted syllabi. Active engagement collapsed: only 28.6% delivered midterm examinations digitally, and just 24.1% posted grades through the learning management system. Overall proficiency was rated Very Good in 37.6% of sections, Fair in 60.2%, and Poor in 2.3%. Cross-referencing with parallel attendance monitoring records further revealed that 86.2% of faculty recording absences were rated Fair or Poor for digital performance, establishing a coherent pattern of professional disengagement rather than isolated non-compliance. Applying the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT), the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), and Rogers' Diffusion of Innovations alongside African higher education governance scholarship, the paper argues that the deficit reflects a structural governance failure, not a training gap. Social affiliation dynamics, absent consequence mechanisms, faith-based institutional culture, and post-conflict educational inheritance are identified as the primary systemic drivers. The paper contributes original disaggregated institutional evidence from a Liberian denominational university context that remains virtually absent from the empirical e-learning literature, with concrete implications for governance reform.

Keywords: E-learning compliance, digital pedagogy, learning management system adoption, faculty performance, higher education governance, faith-based university, post-conflict education, institutional accountability, Liberia, AMEU, sub-Saharan Africa

INTRODUCTION

The global expansion of digital education has accelerated dramatically since 2020, with COVID-19 acting simultaneously as a catalyst and stress test for institutional e-learning readiness worldwide (Almaiah et al., 2020; Hodges et al., 2020). In sub-Saharan Africa, this expansion encountered the full weight of pre-existing structural deficits: unreliable electricity, limited broadband access, device scarcity, weak institutional governance, and a faculty workforce shaped by teacher-centred pedagogical traditions that long predate the digital era (Adedoyin & Soykan, 2023; Kennedy, 2025a). Despite these documented barriers, many African higher education institutions, including those in Liberia, proceeded with formal e-learning mandates, operating under the implicit assumption that issuing a policy directive is functionally equivalent to securing its adoption.

African Methodist Episcopal University (AMEU) is a faith-based institution in Monrovia, Liberia, established under the governance of the African Methodist Episcopal Church. Like most private and faith-based higher education institutions in Liberia, AMEU navigates the dual challenge of expanding technology-enhanced learning while managing institutional resources constrained by tuition/fees dependency, limited government support, and a faculty workforce shaped by decades of disrupted professional development during and after Liberia's civil conflicts (Boateng, 2020). The structural digital readiness deficit is not unique to the faculty side. Sumo et al. (2023) found that Liberian students' ICT career orientations and digital competency baselines are shaped substantially by inequitable access to technology infrastructure across educational levels, which means the digital learning environment at institutions like AMEU involves two populations, faculty and students, both carrying significant digital preparation gaps into the e-learning encounter. In line with the National Commission for Higher Education(NCHE)'s mandate (NCHE,2020), the AME university formally institutionalised e-learning through the establishment of the Center for E-Learning (CEL), deploying Google Classroom as the primary learning management system (LMS) and developing faculty guidelines for online course delivery, content upload, assignment management, and student engagement through digital platforms.

The CEL monitoring exercise conducted in 2025 covered 133 course sections across five colleges, engaging 82 faculty members and affecting 4,673 students with an average class size of 35, in 4 months within a semester. The results documented a pattern that this paper argues is analytically more significant than any single aggregate compliance score: a sharp divergence between what faculty were willing to do on the platform and what the mandate actually required them to do there. Content delivery metrics were high; assessment and feedback delivery metrics collapsed. That divergence is the central problem this paper examines.

The analytical focus is not on rehearsing Liberia's well-documented infrastructure deficits; that literature has been thoroughly developed (Kennedy, 2025a; Kennedy, 2025b; Al-Azawei et al., 2016). The focus here is narrower and more precise: what does disaggregated monitoring data reveal about the institutional conditions that produce systematic compliance with low-effort digital tasks while generating systematic non-compliance with high-effort ones? And what does that pattern say about the governance and cultural architecture surrounding the e-learning mandate at AMEU?

The contribution of this paper is two-fold. First, it provides original disaggregated monitoring data from a Liberian faith-based HEI: a context virtually absent from empirical e-learning research. Second, it advances the argument that the compliance pattern documented here is more accurately understood as a governance and cultural problem than a training problem, with direct implications for how AMEU and similar institutions must redesign their e-learning strategies.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Understanding why faculty fail to comply with institutional e-learning mandates requires a framework that goes beyond individual-level attitudes toward technology. Three theoretical anchors structure the analytical work in this paper.

Technology Acceptance Model

Davis (1989) posited that perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use are the primary determinants of behavioural intention to use a technology system. In educational settings, TAM accounts for variance in faculty adoption of digital tools and LMS platforms by foregrounding perception as a mediating variable. Faculty who do not perceive the LMS as useful to their teaching practice, or who find its interface demanding relative to existing methods, will resist adoption regardless of mandates (Mpungose, 2021). TAM's limitation is that it operates at the level of individual cognition and does not account for the organisational and cultural variables that shape perception in the first place.

Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology

Venkatesh et al. (2003) extend TAM by incorporating social influence and facilitating conditions as additional predictors of technology use behaviour. In developing country educational contexts, these social and

organisational variables carry particular explanatory weight (Tarhini et al., 2017), where institutional peer norms and leadership signals exert stronger influence on adoption behaviour than technical interface design. UTAUT is particularly useful for institutional analysis because it includes organisational variables: leadership endorsement, peer behaviour, and technical support availability, as determinants of individual compliance patterns. Critically, UTAUT distinguishes between behavioural intention and actual use. This distinction maps directly onto the compliance gap observed at AMEU: faculty may formally acknowledge the e-learning mandate without translating that acknowledgment into sustained LMS activity. Awareness of a requirement does not produce the behavioural change necessary to meet it, particularly when facilitating conditions are insufficient or absent.

Diffusion of Innovations

Rogers (2003) identifies adoption rates in any organisation as shaped by perceived relative advantage, compatibility with existing values and practices, complexity, trialability, and observability. In a faith-based institutional context where teacher-centred instruction carries pedagogical legitimacy rooted in institutional identity and religious authority structures, the compatibility dimension becomes analytically central. Digital e-learning platforms that demand student-centred, self-directed engagement challenge not only technical habits but the foundational norms of what effective teaching is supposed to look like within the institution. That category of resistance cannot be addressed by perceived usefulness arguments or training provision alone.

INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT AND THE E-LEARNING MANDATE

AMEU operates as one of Liberia's established faith-based private higher education institutions, drawing students primarily from Monrovia and the surrounding counties. The institution's academic structure encompasses five colleges: Science and Allied Health, Education, Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, Business and Public Administration, and Theology. Faculty composition spans full-time, adjunct, and across these colleges, with a total of 82 faculty members engaged across 133 monitored course sections in the 2025 academic monitoring period, collectively serving 4,673 enrolled students.

The e-learning mandate at AMEU was formalised through the CEL, which was charged with deploying and administering Google Classroom, building faculty digital competency, and monitoring compliance with institutional digital delivery requirements. Faculty were expected to meet defined benchmarks across four core performance dimensions: posting course syllabi, uploading learning resources, delivering midterm assessments digitally, and posting grades through the platform. These four components were selected to represent the full spectrum of the digital learning experience, ranging from course orientation to active engagement and formative feedback.

The mandate structure reflects a top-down model common across institutions in the region. Administrative leadership defined expectations, the CEL deployed the platform, and directives were issued through established academic channels. What the mandate did not construct with equivalent rigour was the accountability and incentive architecture necessary to sustain compliance behaviour. There were no formal consequences for non-compliance embedded in faculty evaluation or remuneration frameworks. There was no peer accountability model. There was no structured mentoring programme connecting high-performing faculty with those struggling to meet expectations. The mandate existed. The organisational scaffolding needed to make compliance routine, expected, and consequential did not exist on a proportionate scale. This observation is consistent with broader findings on LMS adoption in higher education institutions across developing contexts. Bousbahi and Alrazgan (2015), in their study of IT faculty resistance to LMS adoption in a Middle Eastern university, found that organizational support and perceived usefulness — rather than technical ease of use — are the strongest predictors of faculty LMS acceptance. Even faculty with strong baseline digital competency will resist adoption when institutional support structures are weak, and load anxiety is high. At AMEU, neither the motivational architecture nor the institutional support infrastructure was proportionate to the compliance demands the mandate imposed.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This paper employs a single-site institutional case study design, following Yin's (2018) logic of using the case study as the appropriate research strategy when the investigator has limited control over events and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context. The compliance deficit at AMEU is precisely that kind of phenomenon: it is bounded, contextually embedded, and analytically inseparable from the institutional, cultural, and post-conflict conditions that produced it. A survey instrument or cross-institutional comparative design would have flattened the institutional specificity that makes the compliance pattern here analytically legible. The case study design preserves that specificity while enabling the kind of within-case disaggregation, across colleges, across compliance components, and across individual faculty proficiency levels, that a system-level analysis cannot achieve.

The epistemological orientation of this paper is interpretivist in the sense that the compliance data is not treated as self-explanatory. Numbers do not interpret themselves. The 71.4% digital exam non-delivery rate is a finding; the institutional conditions that make that rate stable and organisationally tolerated are the analytical object. The paper therefore moves between empirical description and theoretical explanation, using the monitoring data as the evidentiary foundation and UTAUT, TAM, and Rogers' diffusion framework as the interpretive architecture.

Data Sources and Collection

The primary data source is the institutional monitoring dataset generated by the AMEU Center for E-Learning during the 2025 academic monitoring period. The dataset covers 133 course sections across five colleges, 82 faculty members, and 4,673 enrolled students, with an average class size of 35. Monitoring was conducted through direct observation of Google Classroom activity across four defined compliance dimensions: syllabus posting, learning resource upload, digital midterm exam delivery, and grade posting through the LMS. Each section was assessed against standardised benchmarks developed by the CEL and coded into a proficiency rating scale of Very Good, Fair, or Poor based on cumulative performance across all four components.

Attendance data for October and November 2025 was drawn from the CEL's parallel monitoring records covering 94 faculty members across 29 affected courses, documenting 266 recorded absences over the two-month window. This dataset was cross-referenced with the e-learning proficiency ratings to examine the correlation between physical classroom attendance patterns and digital platform compliance, enabling the integrated behavioural analysis presented in the attendance section of the paper.

Secondary data sources informing the contextual and theoretical analysis include peer-reviewed literature on technology acceptance in African higher education, governance and accountability scholarship from West African institutional contexts, and Liberia-specific educational infrastructure studies. These sources are not treated as supplementary but as necessary analytical inputs: the compliance data from AMEU requires an explanatory framework that extends beyond what the numbers alone can sustain.

Analytical Approach

The analysis proceeds in two stages. The first stage is descriptive and disaggregated. Rather than reporting aggregate compliance figures, the paper presents component-level and college-level breakdowns that make the structural pattern within the data visible. Aggregate figures would produce a misleading picture of the institutional situation; the divergence between passive and active compliance and the substantial variation across colleges are the analytically consequential findings, and they only emerge through disaggregation. The decision to centre Table 1 and Table 2 as the paper's core evidentiary structure reflects that analytical priority.

The second stage is explanatory and theoretically grounded. The compliance patterns documented in the first stage are interpreted through the three theoretical frameworks established in the paper, TAM, UTAUT, and Rogers' Diffusion of Innovations, alongside governance and accountability literature from the African higher education context. This theoretical triangulation is intentional. No single framework accounts for the full

compliance picture. TAM explains individual-level perception dynamics. UTAUT adds the organisational and social influence variables that TAM cannot accommodate. Rogers' compatibility dimension provides the cultural resistance mechanism specific to faith-based institutional identity. The governance literature supplies what all three technology acceptance frameworks omit: the structural accountability conditions under which any adoption behaviour takes place. The analytical argument of this paper is that the compliance deficit at AMEU cannot be adequately explained by any one of these frameworks alone. The explanatory power lies in their intersection.

Positionality and Analytical Limitations

The author occupies a dual role as a Coordinator of the Center for E-Learning at AMEU. This positionality confers direct access to institutional monitoring data and deep contextual familiarity with the governance environment under analysis. It also carries a potential reflexivity challenge: institutional proximity can produce analytical blind spots or inhibit critical appraisal of the institution's governance failures. This risk is acknowledged and managed in two ways. First, the analysis is grounded throughout in the empirical monitoring data rather than in institutional narrative or administrative interpretation. Second, the paper draws systematically on external comparative literature from West African and broader sub-Saharan African higher education contexts to situate AMEU's patterns within a documented regional landscape, guarding against the temptation to treat local conditions as exceptional rather than structurally familiar.

Yin (2018) identifies the absence of systematic protocols as one of the primary threats to case study validity. The CEL monitoring protocol addressed this through standardised benchmarks applied uniformly across all 133 sections and all five colleges, reducing the risk of observer-dependent variation in compliance coding. The absence of faculty self-report data, attitudinal surveys, or structured interviews remains the most significant analytical limitation of this paper. The monitoring data establishes what faculty are, and are not doing on the platform; it does not directly access the perceptual, motivational, or cultural variables that explain why. The governance and cultural analysis offered in this paper is a theoretically grounded inference from behavioural patterns, not a direct empirical finding from faculty-level qualitative data. That deeper inquiry constitutes the next stage of the research programme from which this paper is drawn.

ANALYSIS OF THE COMPLIANCE DATA

The passive-active compliance divergence

The most analytically significant finding from the CEL monitoring data is not any single metric but the relationship between metrics. Table 1 presents the full compliance breakdown across the four monitored components and the overall proficiency rating.

Table 1. Faculty E-Learning Compliance by Component: AMEU 2025 (n = 133 Sections)

E-Learning Component	Sections (%)	Sections (n)	Non-Compliant (%)	Non-Compliant (n)
Syllabus posted	73.7%	98 sections	26.3%	35 sections
Learning resources uploaded	94.0%	125 sections	6.0%	8 sections
Midterm exams delivered digitally	28.6%	38 sections	71.4%	95 sections
Grades posted in Google Classroom	24.1%	32 sections	75.9%	101 sections
Overall faculty proficiency (Very Good)	37.6%	50 sections	62.4%	83 sections

The data reveal a structural pattern that a single aggregate figure would obscure: faculty comply with tasks requiring low behavioural change and resist tasks requiring fundamental change in how they teach. Uploading a resource file to Google Classroom is an asynchronous, low-disruption task that does not alter classroom dynamics or require a faculty member to reconceive their pedagogical role. Delivering a midterm examination digitally, managing an LMS gradebook, and providing timely graded feedback through a platform require a sustained transformation in teaching behaviour: from content delivery to process management across a digital medium. That is where compliance collapsed. On digital midterm exam delivery, 71.4% of sections (95 out of 133) recorded no digitally administered examination at all, meaning the assessment was either conducted on paper or not conducted through the platform. Separately, on grade posting, 75.9% of sections (101 out of 133) had no grades entered into Google Classroom, meaning students received no formal digital feedback record through the LMS. These are two distinct failures at two distinct points in the assessment cycle: one at delivery, the other at feedback. A faculty member could administer a paper exam and then post the grades digitally, or deliver a digital exam and never post the results. The data shows both failures occurring at scale and independently of each other, which is precisely what makes the active compliance collapse analytically significant.

The distinction matters for how the institutional problem is diagnosed and, critically, for how the institutional response is designed. A training-centred diagnosis would interpret the gap as a skills deficit: faculty do not know how to use the gradebook or the digital assessment tools. A governance-centred diagnosis recognises something more precise: faculty show platform familiarity sufficient to upload resources but withhold behavioural compliance from the platform functions that require accountability to students in real time. That is not unfamiliarity. It is selective adoption in the direction that preserves existing teaching behaviour. The CEL root-cause analysis identified two compounding obstacles: workflow confusion, where the digital assessment process differs fundamentally from the traditional paper-based one, and time perception, where faculty regard digital grading as more demanding than conventional methods. Both are rational behavioural obstacles that mandate issuance and awareness campaigns do not address.

Performance variation across colleges

The aggregate figures mask substantial variation across AMEU's five colleges that has direct implications for targeted institutional response. Table 2 presents the college-level compliance breakdown.

Table 2. E-Learning Compliance by College: AMEU 2025

College	Syllabus	Resources	Midterm Exams	Grades Posted	Compliance Gap
Science & Allied Health	100%	100%	50%	50%	Moderate
Education	100%	100%	100%	0%	Critical (grade void)
Liberal Arts & Social Sciences	79.7%	94.6%	35.1%	31.1%	Substantial
Business & Public Administration	60%	100%	15%	10%	Severe
Theology	60%	60%	10%	10%	Severe

Science and Allied Health presents the most internally balanced compliance profile of the five colleges, with 100% passive compliance and 50% active compliance across both digital exam delivery and grade posting. The moderate gap likely reflects a faculty cohort with relatively stronger digital baseline competency from professional health sciences training, but it still confirms that active compliance has not been secured even in the institution's strongest-performing college.

The Theology College presents the most severe compliance deficit: 10% digital exam delivery, 10% grades posted, and 60% in both syllabus and resource upload, indicating a faculty population that has not adopted any consistent element of the platform beyond partial passive compliance. Theological education at AMEU is positioned as inherently relational and presence-centred, with face-to-face dialogue between text, tutor, and student as the defining pedagogical mode. Digital assessment validity is not self-evident to faculty trained in homiletics, exegesis, and pastoral formation. That is a values and identity problem, not a technical one, and it requires engagement on its own terms.

The College of Education presents a different and equally instructive anomaly: 100% compliance with syllabus posting, resource upload, and digital exam delivery, but 0% grades posted. This faculty population has fully adopted three of four platform functions and stopped at the grading stage. That pattern points to a specific workflow obstacle at the grading interface rather than general resistance to digital pedagogy. Treating the Education College the same as the Theology College in any intervention design would be analytically indefensible and practically wasteful.

Business and Public Administration (15% exam delivery, 10% grades posted) and Liberal Arts and Social Sciences (35.1% exam delivery, 31.1% grades posted) represent the large middle of the compliance distribution, where partial adoption coexists with substantial non-compliance in the assessment and feedback dimensions. Liberal Arts, which is the largest college by section count, represents the institution's greatest capacity-building opportunity precisely because its compliance trajectory is incomplete rather than absent, and is therefore responsive to targeted intervention.

Faculty proficiency distribution and its implications

The proficiency distribution recorded in the monitoring data shows 37.6% of sections rated Very Good, 60.2% rated Fair, and 2.3% rated Poor. These figures are not comforting. Across 83 of 133 monitored sections, the majority of students at AMEU are receiving digital learning experiences characterised by partial compliance or worse. With 4,673 students enrolled and an average class size of 35, that figure translates to approximately 2,906 students experiencing systematically inconsistent e-learning delivery. The 2.3% Poor rating, covering 3 sections, represents a smaller but immediately high-priority intervention need: these are faculty whose compliance deficits are so pronounced that they require individual attention rather than group training.

Partial adoption at the Fair level is not a binary failure. These faculty are present on the platform but have not completed the behavioural shift required for consistent assessment and feedback delivery. That distinction matters for intervention design. The population rated Fair is not disengaged; it is stalled at a specific point in the adoption trajectory and is therefore more responsive to targeted facilitation than to remedial training.

Attendance-e-learning correlation

The monitoring data reveals a further dimension of the compliance problem that moves beyond platform usage into faculty behavioural patterns as a whole. During October and November 2025, the CEL recorded 266 faculty absences across 94 faculty members, affecting 29 courses, with an average of 2.8 absences per faculty member over two months. The severity classification documented 2 faculty in the Critical range (10 or more absences), 4 in the Severe range (five to nine absences), 17 in the Moderate range (three to four absences), and 70 in the Minor range (one to two absences).

The analytically significant finding is the cross-referencing of attendance data with e-learning proficiency ratings. Among faculty recorded as absent, the overwhelming majority were rated Fair or Poor for digital pedagogy. This convergence is not coincidental. The same faculty who disengage from face-to-face teaching responsibilities are disproportionately those who underperform on digital platform compliance. Non-compliance with the e-learning mandate and non-attendance at scheduled classes are not two separate problems requiring two separate interventions. They are expressions of the same underlying professional disengagement, sustained by the same absence of institutional accountability mechanisms. In an institution with functioning performance consequence structures, a faculty member recording 10 or more absences over two months would trigger a formal

review process. The monitoring data documents that this is not occurring at a sufficient scale. The absence of consequence for attendance directly mirrors the absence of consequence for e-learning non-compliance.

Social affiliation and the accountability gap

The absence of clear consequences for non-compliant faculty is not simply a policy design oversight. In many African higher education institutions, the enforcement of performance standards is mediated by social relationships, institutional familiarity, and informal affiliation networks that sit alongside, and frequently override, formal governance mechanisms. When performance management operates through a lens of social proximity, where the non-compliant faculty member is a colleague, a community elder, or a church member within the same denominational institution, the cost of enforcing a consequence falls disproportionately on the supervisor rather than the non-compliant party. That asymmetry erodes accountability infrastructure from the inside, regardless of what the formal mandate requires.

In faith-based institutional environments, where church authority reinforces relational deference and communal solidarity, these pressures carry additional institutional weight. Faculty non-compliance goes unchallenged not because supervisors are unaware of it but because challenging it disrupts social relationships that the institutional culture treats as prior to administrative efficiency. This is the mechanism through which a 71.4% exam non-delivery rate becomes organisationally stable rather than triggering proportionate corrective action.

Post-conflict educational inheritance

Liberia's educational system carries the specific damage of fourteen years of civil conflict that dismantled faculty development infrastructure, disrupted professional training pathways, and produced a generation of educators whose professional formation occurred under conditions of severe institutional fragility. Faculty who completed their own higher education in classrooms without stable power, limited library access, and essentially no digital infrastructure cannot be expected to adopt complex digital teaching platforms without significant, sustained, and structured support. Mandate design that treats faculty as a uniform population at a common level of digital readiness, irrespective of the structural history that shaped their actual competency profile, will consistently generate the compliance gap the data documents.

DISCUSSION

The AMEU monitoring data adds institutional specificity to a conversation that the existing Liberia-focused e-learning literature has conducted primarily at the system and policy level (Kennedy, 2025a; Kennedy, 2025b). What system-level analyses cannot produce, this data makes visible: the precise fault lines within a single institution where mandate and behaviour diverge, and the specific social, cultural, and governance conditions that explain that divergence.

The passive-active compliance split documented in Table 1 is the paper's central analytical contribution. Faculty are present on the platform at 94% resource upload. What they are not doing is teaching through it. They are using Google Classroom as a file repository rather than as a pedagogical environment, and that distinction is a governance outcome, not a technology adoption outcome. It is the predictable result of a mandate that created platform access without creating platform accountability. This pattern has independent comparative support. Turnbull et al. (2021), analysing higher education institutions navigating COVID-19-accelerated LMS transitions, established that the divergence between content upload compliance and assessment delivery compliance is not an anomaly of low-resource contexts but a structural feature of LMS adoption trajectories globally: faculty adopt the platform functions requiring least workflow transformation first, and resist those demanding reconceptualisation of how assessment and feedback are delivered. The AMEU data replicates that pattern in a post-conflict, faith-based African HEI context, extending its documented range and reinforcing its interpretation as a governance problem rather than a technology familiarity problem.

The three theoretical anchors established at the outset of this paper each find direct empirical expression in the compliance pattern the data documents. Davis's (1989) TAM accounts for the faculty population that has not perceived the LMS as useful to their core teaching function, reflected in the systematic avoidance of digital

assessment and grading. The UTAUT framework (Venkatesh et al., 2003) explains why partial adoption clusters where social influence and peer norms are absent: without visible modelling of full platform use by respected colleagues, and without leadership signals that reinforce compliance as professionally expected, behavioural intention does not translate into sustained LMS activity. The Faculty rated Fair in the proficiency distribution are the clearest expression of this mechanism: they are not opposed to the platform but have not received the social facilitation necessary to complete the behavioural shift. Rogers' (2003) compatibility dimension accounts for the deepest layer of resistance, particularly in the Theology College, where the digital medium conflicts with the foundational pedagogical identity of the discipline. No single framework is sufficient. The compliance deficit at AMEU sits precisely at the intersection of all three, which is why neither training alone nor mandate renewal alone will resolve it.

The college-level variation documented in Table 2 demands a differentiated analytical response. The Education College's complete grade-posting failure despite 100% exam delivery compliance confirms a targeted technical obstacle, not a pedagogical resistance pattern. The Theology College's near-total active non-compliance requires what Rogers (2003) would call a compatibility argument: a values-based case for digital assessment that engages the theological educational identity directly, before any technical training will be effective. Business and Public Administration requires consequence enforcement alongside skills provision. Liberal Arts, as the largest college with an incomplete rather than absent compliance trajectory, represents the institution's greatest capacity-building opportunity. Treating these as a single institutional problem requiring a uniform response would be analytically indefensible, and a monitoring system that produces disaggregated data at this level is the necessary precondition for designing interventions that actually match the problems they are meant to address.

The social affiliation dynamics documented in the results section have well-established precedent in the African higher education governance literature. Olabiyi et al. (2024), in a qualitative study of South African universities, found that cronyism and in-group favouritism were institutionally tolerated rather than merely practised, with performance expectations shaped by social allegiances rather than merit, producing cycles of mediocrity that formal policy alone could not interrupt. Kuuyelleh et al. (2025), examining organisational injustice in Ghanaian technical universities, demonstrated that managerial decision-making rooted in personal familiarity systematically distorts institutional accountability, producing conditions where compliance standards are applied selectively rather than uniformly. Ibrahim et al. (2024), through ethnomethodological research in Ghanaian organisations, argue that the condoning of non-accountability is collectively constructed through shared cultural values: social harmony, relational loyalty, and avoidance of confrontation are routinely prioritised over formal performance enforcement. Ogunode et al. (2024), examining accountability failures in Nigerian universities, identified these same dynamics as a primary structural driver of non-compliance with performance standards, noting that the networks facilitating institutional appointments frequently function simultaneously as the protection against institutional consequences. These four bodies of evidence converge on the same mechanism: in small, denominationally embedded institutional communities, enforcement is personally costly for supervisors in ways that no policy directive resolves by itself.

The post-conflict educational inheritance adds a structural dimension that the governance literature alone cannot fully account for. Liberia's fourteen years of civil conflict dismantled faculty development infrastructure and produced a generation of educators whose professional formation occurred under conditions of severe institutional fragility (Boateng, 2020). Al-Azawei et al. (2016), writing about e-learning implementation failures in Iraqi post-conflict universities, found that adoption gaps were driven less by faculty attitudinal resistance than by a mismatch between system demands and the faculty preparedness levels that decades of institutional disruption had produced. The AMEU data sits within that same structural inheritance. Acknowledging this is not an excuse for non-compliance; it is a precondition for designing interventions that match the actual competency baseline of the faculty population rather than the assumed one.

The denominational dimension of AMEU's institutional context carries strategic potential that the current e-learning implementation has not yet mobilised. The AME Church's emphasis on service, discipleship, and community responsibility offers a genuine values-based foundation for positioning digital teaching quality as a professional and missional commitment rather than a compliance burden. That reframing has not yet been

deliberately developed at AMEU, and it represents the most accessible cultural lever available within the existing institutional architecture.

The institutional response designed by the CEL, a three-tier training strategy covering emergency assessment bootcamps, capacity building through discipline-specific learning communities, and systemic improvements including a Quality Assurance Dashboard and mandatory new faculty certification, is structurally appropriate because it acknowledges the need for both targeted short-term intervention and sustained systemic change. Table 3 presents the performance targets associated with that response. The projections are ambitious: moving digital midterm delivery from 28.6% to 90% within twelve months represents a 61.4 percentage point improvement. Mpungose (2021), documenting a South African university's LMS transition under comparable institutional pressure, found that compliance trajectories of that magnitude were achievable only where consequence structures and peer accountability mechanisms were deployed simultaneously with technical training, and even then required 18 to 24 months to stabilise. The AMEU targets should be read in that light: achievable in principle, but contingent on governance decisions the training programme alone cannot substitute for. The training strategy addresses the skills dimension of the compliance deficit. Only institutional leadership can address the governance dimension, and the monitoring data makes the case for doing so with urgency.

Table 3. CEL Performance Targets: Baseline 2025 to 1-Year Projections

Performance Indicator	Baseline (2025)	6-Month Target	1-Year Target
Syllabus Compliance	73.7%	90%	95%
Learning Resources Uploaded	94.0%	98%	100%
Midterm Exam Digital Delivery	28.6%	65%	90%
Grades Posted in LMS	24.1%	70%	95%
Very Good Digital Proficiency	37.6%	55%	75%
Poor Proficiency Rating	2.3%	0%	0%

CONCLUSION

The central finding of this paper is that faculty e-learning non-compliance at AMEU is patterned, not random. It clusters in the platform functions demanding sustained pedagogical transformation — digital exam delivery at 28.6% and grade posting at 24.1% — while passive functions remain largely intact at 94% resource upload. Faculty are on the platform. They are not teaching through it. Four interacting factors sustain that deficit: a compatibility gap between active digital pedagogy and a relational faith-based teaching culture; an accountability architecture that monitors failure without interrupting it; social affiliation dynamics that make enforcement personally costly; and a post-conflict educational inheritance, the mandate was designed for but the faculty workforce does not uniformly possess. That this deficit mirrors the attendance pattern of the same faculty confirms the diagnosis. This is not a training problem wearing a compliance mask. It is a governance failure.

Three priorities follow. E-learning performance must be formally embedded in faculty evaluation with explicit consequences, because monitoring without institutional weight changes nothing. The response must be disaggregated by college, since the Education, Theology, and Business colleges present distinct and non-interchangeable problems. Senior leadership must reframe digital pedagogy as a professional and missional commitment, not a compliance requirement. The monitoring data is behavioural, not attitudinal, and the deeper inquiry into cultural determinants of adoption in Liberian higher education remains ongoing. The targets in Table 3 are conditional, not guaranteed. Whether AMEU reaches them depends entirely on the governance decisions this data makes necessary.

REFERENCES

1. Adedoyin, O. B., & Soykan, E. (2023). Covid-19 pandemic and online learning: The challenges and opportunities. Interactive Learning Environments, 31(2), 863–875. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2020.1813180
2. Al-Azawei, A., Parslow, P., & Lundqvist, K. (2016). Barriers and opportunities of e-learning implementation in Iraq: A case of public universities. International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 17(5). https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v17i5.2501
3. Almaiah, M. A., Al-Khasawneh, A., & Althunibat, A. (2020). Exploring the critical challenges and factors influencing the e-learning system usage during COVID-19 pandemic. Education and Information Technologies, 25, 5261–5280. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-020-10219-y
4. Boateng, F. (2020). Higher education systems and institutions, Liberia. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339202470
5. Bousbahi, F., & Alrazgan, M.S. (2015). Investigating IT faculty resistance to learning management system adoption using latent variables in an acceptance technology model. The Scientific World Journal, 2015. https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/375651
6. Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Quarterly, 13(3), 319–340. https://doi.org/10.2307/249008
7. Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T., & Bond, A. (2020). The difference between emergency remote teaching and online learning. EDUCAUSE Review. https://er.educause.edu/articles/2020/3/the-difference-between-emergency-remote-teaching-and-online-learning
8. Ibrahim, H., Abdulai, M., Iddrisu, S., & Konlan, I. (2024). Society and organizational leadership: Investigating the sociocultural construction of toxic and constructive leaders in Ghana. Leadership, 20(3). https://doi.org/10.1177/14705958241237698
9. Kennedy, G. M. (2025a). Digital inclusion in Liberia's education sector: Review of barriers, policy gaps, and strategic interventions. American Journal of Educational Research, 13(3), 102–110. https://doi.org/10.12691/education-13-3-1
10. Kennedy, G. M. (2025b). Integrating ICT in higher education in Liberia: A review of challenges, best practices, and opportunities. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/390626540
11. Kuuyelleh, E. N., Akanpaadgi, E., & Ansoglenang, G. (2025). Perceived organisational injustices and academic staff turnover intentions in Ghanaian technical universities. Social Sciences & Humanities Open, 11, 101278. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101278
12. Mpungose, C. B. (2021). Emergent transition from face-to-face to online learning in a South African university in the context of the Coronavirus pandemic. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 8(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-021-00871-z
13. National Commission on Higher Education. (2020). E-learning standards for higher education institutions (HEIs) in Liberia. Ministry of Education, Republic of Liberia.
14. Ogunode, N. J., Obioma, M. A., & Belloh, A. M. (2024). Accountability in university system in Nigeria: Challenges and way forward. European Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Economy, 1(2), 7–18. https://doi.org/10.61796/jaide.v1i2.212
15. Olabiyi, O. J., Du Plessis, M., & Van Vuuren, C. J. (2024). Unveiling the toxic leadership culture in South African universities: Authoritarian behaviour, cronyism and self-serving practices. Frontiers in Education, 9, 1446935. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1446935
16. Rogers, E. M. (2003). Diffusion of innovations (5th ed.). Free Press.
17. Sumo, D. Z., Zhang, L., & Sumo, P. D. (2023). Career choice for ICT among Liberian students: A multi-criteria decision-making study using analytical hierarchy process. Heliyon, 9(5), e16445. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e16445
18. Tarhini, A., Hone, K., Liu, X., & Tarhini, T. (2017). Examining the moderating effect of individual-level cultural values on users' acceptance of e-learning in developing countries: A structural equation modelling of an extended technology acceptance model. Interactive Learning Environments, 25(3), 306–328. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2015.1122635
19. Turnbull, D., Chugh, R., & Luck, J. (2021). Transitioning to e-learning during the COVID-19 pandemic: How have higher education institutions responded to the challenge? Education and Information Technologies, 26(5), 6401–6419. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10633-w

20. Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. MIS Quarterly, 27(3), 425–478. https://doi.org/10.2307/30036540
21. Yin, R. K. (2018). Case study research and applications: Design and methods (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.