Perceptions of Cloud-Based Learning Facilities among U.S. College Students

Hakeem A. Nafiu[1], Adeyemi O. Olaitan[2]

[1]Educational Administration, Carolina University, North Carolina, U.S

[2]Arts Education, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria

DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.903SEDU0230

Received: 16 April 2025; Accepted: 21 April 2025; Published: 23 May 2025

ABSTRACT

Cloud-based learning has constantly been adopted and helped in the establishment of virtual learning environments in most U.S. higher education institutions, but disparities in access and engagement persist in this 21st century. Therefore, this study examined how students across diverse U.S. Colleges perceive the usability, accessibility, and instructional effectiveness of cloud-based learning platforms, alongside socioeconomic influences. Anchored in the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), four research questions and two hypotheses were formulated for the study. The study adopted a descriptive design of the survey type. The total sample was 500 undergraduate students across diverse U.S. Colleges. Through a structured questionnaire, the data for the study were collected, and the analysis was done using descriptive statistics of mean decision, standard deviation, analysis of variance, and t-tests. The findings of the study revealed that students perceive cloud-based learning facilities as highly usable, moderately accessible, and instructionally effective, yet socioeconomic disparities limit equitable access, digital literacy, and overall student engagement, particularly among learners from historically underserved backgrounds. No significant gender differences exist in usability perceptions. The study concluded that platforms transform learning but require equity-focused improvements. The study recommended that students, faculty, university management, and policymakers have crucial roles to play in sustaining cloud-based learning facilities, such as improving technological infrastructure, providing device subsidies, and training educators to achieve undergraduates' deeper and more enriched learning experience.

Keywords: Cloud-based learning, digital equity, usability, accessibility, instructional effectiveness, socioeconomic disparities, student engagement, U.S. College (also higher education).

INTRODUCTION

Cloud-based learning facilities are transforming education by delivering flexible, personalized learning opportunities that cater to diverse student needs. These platforms enable access to software, infrastructure, and storage via the internet, allowing students to engage with educational content without geographical constraints, fostering learning at any time and place [12]. In the United States, where higher education increasingly integrates advanced technology, institutions leverage these systems to innovate teaching practices, streamline administrative processes, and enhance collaborative research opportunities for students and faculty [49]. This shift toward student-centered education, embraced by policymakers and educators, signifies a profound change in how learning is structured and delivered, moving beyond mere technology adoption to redefine educational paradigms [45]. By aligning technological advancements with academic objectives, cloud-based systems prepare students for a global workforce where digital fluency is not just advantageous but essential for success. Institutions investing in these technologies create dynamic environments that encourage exploration, critical thinking, and adaptability, ensuring graduates are equipped to navigate complex professional landscapes.

In the 21st century, college students are expected to acquire deep academic knowledge while cultivating skills for self-directed learning, a necessity in an era of rapid information growth [68]. Cloud-based platforms are instrumental in this transformation, granting access to extensive resources, including multimedia content,

digital libraries, and interactive tools, which students use to customize their educational journeys. These systems support synchronous and asynchronous collaboration, enabling students to connect with peers and instructors across diverse locations, fostering global perspectives and teamwork skills [29], [83]. By setting personalized goals and reflecting on progress, students develop accountability and independence, qualities vital for lifelong learning. The expanded connectivity offered by cloud computing liberates education from traditional classroom boundaries, allowing students to engage with content in varied settings, from campus libraries to remote locations, thus supporting continuous skill development in a fast-evolving world [45). This flexibility empowers learners to balance academic pursuits with personal responsibilities, enhancing their ability to thrive in multifaceted environments.

Learning facilities are critical to educational quality, shaping how effectively students engage with content and develop skills [21], [58]. Cloud-based environments elevate this process by providing sophisticated tools, such as simulations, interactive exercises, and collaborative workspaces, which create immersive learning experiences tailored to individual preferences. These resources make education more engaging, encouraging students to participate actively in problem-solving tasks and real-world scenarios, thereby deepening understanding. Cloud platforms facilitate online discussions, interactive assignments, and prompt feedback from educators, enabling students to identify strengths and address weaknesses swiftly [93]. This autonomy allows learners to control their study pace, select relevant materials, and access support as needed, accommodating diverse learning styles. Such empowerment fosters confidence and motivation, ensuring students remain invested in their education. By integrating these tools, institutions not only enhance academic engagement but also prepare students for professional settings where adaptability and initiative are prized.

Academic performance hinges on multiple factors, including the accessibility and quality of learning facilities, which cloud-based systems significantly enhance [6], [34]. Research demonstrates that these platforms promote self-directed learning, instilling a sense of agency that drives student success. Access to a wide array of resources through cloud systems improves academic outcomes and strengthens collaborative abilities, preparing students for workplaces where teamwork and problem-solving are paramount [9]. Students using these facilities often display heightened motivation, sharper critical thinking, and robust problem-solving skills, reflecting the active learning environments these platforms cultivate. Perceptions of cloud-based tools, influenced by factors like gender and background, play a pivotal role in their adoption [28]. For instance, studies suggest female students may prefer collaborative features for group projects, while male students might favor independent study tools, highlighting the need for inclusive design to ensure equitable benefits [49]. Understanding these dynamics enables institutions to optimize technology use, enhancing educational experiences for all students.

Statement of the Problem

Cloud-based learning has become integral to higher education in the United States, enabling virtual classrooms, hybrid courses, and collaborative platforms that enhance academic delivery [36], [65]. However, its implementation varies significantly across institutions, with some fully embracing these technologies while others struggle with integration, resulting in inconsistent student experiences. Barriers include uneven digital infrastructure, particularly in underserved communities, and a reliance on traditional teaching methods that limit technology's potential. Despite substantial investments in digital systems, challenges such as digital literacy gaps, outdated equipment, and funding disparities impede equitable adoption [1]. These issues have prompted research into inclusive learning strategies, exploring student-centered models like project-based learning and collaborative frameworks to bridge access gaps [63], [10]. Yet, disparities in technology access and training persist, particularly for students from low-income backgrounds, undermining efforts to achieve equitable educational outcomes and highlighting the need for systemic improvements in digital equity.

This uneven adoption reveals a critical gap in the U.S. educational landscape, especially among undergraduates who may face barriers in accessing or effectively utilizing cloud-based resources. Students' perceptions of these platforms, shaped by factors like usability and accessibility, directly influence their engagement and academic success [36]. This gap underscores the importance of research into how college students perceive cloud-based learning facilities across diverse U.S. institutions. By examining these perceptions, focusing on usability, accessibility, and instructional effectiveness, this study aims to provide comprehensive insights into

enhancing digital learning environments, addressing inequities, and fostering inclusive education that supports all students in achieving their academic potential.

Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this study is to explore the perceptions of U.S. college students toward cloud-based learning facilities, focusing on their experiences across varied institutional contexts. Specifically, the study seeks to:

1. investigate how U.S. college students perceive the usability of cloud-based learning facilities, assessing ease of navigation and functionality to enhance learning efficiency;

2. examine U.S. college students' perceptions of accessibility to cloud-based learning facilities, evaluating barriers like internet reliability and device availability, particularly for underserved groups;

3. evaluate the perceived instructional effectiveness of cloud-based learning facilities among U.S. college students, analyzing their impact on engagement, collaboration, and academic outcomes across disciplines; and

4. assess the influence of socioeconomic background on perceptions of cloud-based learning facilities among U.S. college students, identifying how economic disparities shape access and adoption to inform equitable solutions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This section discusses the opinions, views, and submissions of previous researchers that are related to the discourse under investigation as seen in the following themes:

Concept of Cloud-Based Learning Facilities and Its Effects on Learning

Cloud-based learning stands at the forefront of educational innovation, powered by the extensive capabilities of cloud computing. This powerful technology facilitates access to remote computational resources over the internet, which includes not only servers and storage solutions but also a wide array of applications that enhance the learning experience [61], [44]. By providing a virtualized pool of resources, cloud computing allows for rapid scaling, enabling institutions and learners to adjust resources according to specific demands, thereby fostering both cost efficiency and operational flexibility. Moreover, the pervasive integration of cloud computing in modern technology underpins numerous essential services such as email communication, expansive data storage, and robust software development platforms [72], [25]. This foundational shift towards cloud solutions not only democratizes access to technology but also opens up new avenues for collaborative and interactive learning environments that were previously unattainable in conventional settings.

At its core, learning is a two-way, interactive process that thrives on the engagement between educators and students, facilitating meaningful changes in attitudes and behaviors [41]. Cloud-based learning significantly enriches this process by providing ubiquitous access to a wealth of educational resources and digital tools that can be utilized anytime and anywhere, thus accommodating the varying needs and schedules of students [85]. This flexibility effectively eliminates the constraints frequently associated with traditional learning environments, particularly those related to storage and processing limitations on mobile devices. As a result, students can seamlessly engage with diverse formats, including interactive text, educational videos, and audio materials, which enrich their learning experiences and cater to different learning styles [85], [67]. Ultimately, this integration of resources not only enhances student engagement but also encourages a more personalized approach to education where learners can progress at their own pace.

Mobile learning that integrates cloud computing, commonly referred to as cloud-based mobile learning, offers a transformative educational experience that combines the best features of mobile technology with the expansive resources of cloud computing. This emerging paradigm facilitates a seamless educational journey

across various devices, catering to the needs of today's mobile-dependent learners [11], [43], [55]. By alleviating the need for complex IT infrastructure, cloud-based mobile learning ensures that even students with minimal technological capabilities can access high-quality educational content, as long as they have internet connectivity [85]. Furthermore, this approach not only enhances accessibility but also promotes inclusivity in learning, allowing diverse populations of learners, regardless of their geographical or socio-economic backgrounds, to participate fully in educational opportunities that were once limited to traditional settings.

In the digital landscape of the 21st century, prominent cloud platforms such as Microsoft and Google have revolutionized educational accessibility by providing an array of free services tailored for students. These platforms encourage users to create interactive documents, collaborate efficiently in real-time, communicate effectively, and access a vast wealth of online resources [8]. Such cloud-based learning environments are particularly conducive to personalizing educational experiences, thereby fostering enthusiasm and positive attitudes towards various subjects [34]. However, despite the availability of effective learning strategies, many students still tend to rely on less productive study methods like highlighting texts or using flashcards, which may not facilitate deep understanding or retention [25]. By bridging this gap, cloud-based learning can provide access to a diverse range of advanced educational tools and techniques, guiding students toward more effective study habits and ultimately enhancing their learning outcomes.

Pedagogical Consideration for Cloud-Based Mobile Learning

Cloud-based mobile learning presents unique pedagogical opportunities that extend beyond traditional collaboration and communication. While these aspects are significant, the design of mobile learning experiences must account for the inherent motivations tied to mobile device ownership and their ubiquitous nature [51]. For effective engagement and enjoyment, mobile learning should embrace theories that promote active involvement and appropriate challenges, ensuring that learning is both meaningful and enjoyable. The social constructivist theory and the theory of optimal experience (Flow) are prominent in 21st-century education, advocating for learner-centered approaches [71].

Social constructivism posits that learning is inherently social, where meaningful engagement stems from active participation and interaction among students and educators [37], [42], [86]. A democratic learning environment enhances these interactions, encouraging students to collaboratively refine their understanding and relate effectively to the material being studied [81], [4]. This pedagogical approach aligns well with contemporary students' preferences for engaging with mobile devices, suggesting that mobile learning initiatives should be designed to capture this interest while ensuring that educational content remains compelling and focused to foster better concentration and engagement [19].

The concept of Flow, as defined by Csikszentmihalyi [23], underlines the importance of joy and intrinsic reward in learning activities. Achieving a state of Flow involves engaging students through clearly defined goals, a balance between skill and task complexity, and opportunities for immediate feedback. Power [71] emphasizes the need for mobile learning designs that minimize technological distractions, ensuring students feel confident and comfortable using their devices. This study leverages the principles of social constructivism and Flow to explore the potential of cloud computing as a pedagogical tool for mobile learning, proposing a tailored cloud-based mobile learning framework for higher education in Nigeria that may be applicable to institutions with similar contexts. By utilizing local assets, this approach promises a competitive and cost-effective solution.

Gender and Adoption of Cloud-based Learning Facilities

Cloud-based learning facilities have increasingly become a fundamental aspect of higher education, providing students with the flexibility and accessibility necessary for modern learning. Known as e-learning or online learning, these facilities enable diverse access to educational resources and foster collaboration [18]. However, the extent to which undergraduate students embrace cloud-based learning technologies can differ significantly based on gender. Various studies have explored this dynamic, revealing complex interplays between gender identity, adoption rates, and the socio-cultural contexts that shape these interactions [15]. Notably, while

cloud-based learning offers considerable advantages, such as remote access to resources and real-time collaboration, its uptake is not uniform across genders [35].

Research findings regarding gender and the adoption of cloud-based learning facilities present mixed outcomes. Jurado and Pettersson [49] indicated that female students were less inclined to utilize these platforms compared to males, possibly influenced by cultural constraints that discourage technological engagement among women. Conversely, Wong and Hanafi [92] reported that female students might exhibit a stronger propensity for adopting cloud-based learning due to their collaborative tendencies and technology-enhanced learning preferences. This dichotomy highlights how societal factors, including stereotypes and self-efficacy beliefs, shape technology adoption behaviors among different genders. For instance, males often express greater confidence in their technological capabilities, impacting their engagement with online learning [78].

Further explorations into perceived usefulness and ease of use also show disparities in adoption rates. Shiau and Chau [82] found that men generally regard technology as more accessible and beneficial, which might drive differing adoption behaviors between genders. Interestingly, research by Zickuhr and Rainie [94] from the University of Maryland revealed that women are more inclined to participate in online learning formats such as courses and webinars, suggesting a potential shift in engagement that counters some earlier findings. The results from studies conducted by institutions like the University of Texas indicate that female students not only enroll more frequently in online courses but often outperform their male peers, underscoring a deeper commitment to leveraging the conveniences offered by online education [59].

Nevertheless, the investigation into gender differences reveals nuanced insights. For example, research from the University of Oslo highlighted that while female students often prefer collaborative tools, males showcase a tendency towards self-directed learning in cloud environments [87]. This variation points to the need for educational institutions to implement strategies that encourage gender equity in cloud-based learning. It is essential to challenge prevailing stereotypes and promote self-efficacy through educational programs and mentorship opportunities for female students [41]. Moreover, adopting inclusive design principles can enhance the user experience for all genders, ensuring that cloud-based learning platforms meet diverse needs [74]. By addressing these complexities and fostering an equitable environment, universities can better support all students in navigating and succeeding within the digital learning landscape [16].

Theoretical Framework

This study adopts the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), developed by Fred D. Davis, Richard P. Bagozzi, and Paul R. Warshaw in 1989. The theoretical framework is designed to elucidate and predict how individuals come to accept and utilize new technologies [26]. Initially, the model focused on the adoption of information systems within organizations; however, its applicability has significantly expanded, making it a foundational tool for exploring technology acceptance across diverse settings. The evolution of TAM has been shaped by notable contributions from key scholars in the field. Davis has extensively researched technology acceptance and diffusion, greatly influencing the information systems landscape. Bagozzi, specializing in marketing, has enhanced the model's theoretical foundations and measurement techniques, thereby ensuring its robustness and applicability. Furthermore, Venkatesh V. Viswanath has conducted substantial research on the TAM, examining its extensions and modifications, which are essential for addressing challenges posed by rapidly changing technological environments. Collectively, these scholars have enriched the TAM, establishing it as a critical framework for understanding technology acceptance across various disciplines [26].

The relevance of the Technology Acceptance Model extends to investigating students' perceptions and attitudes towards cloud-based learning platforms. Central to the TAM are two constructs, perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use, both essential for understanding technology adoption. Perceived usefulness assesses the extent to which students believe that cloud learning resources can enhance their educational experiences and drive academic success. For instance, if students acknowledge that these platforms facilitate easy access to learning materials and foster collaborative interactions, their likelihood of embracing such technologies increases [26]. Conversely, perceived ease of use measures how accessible and navigable these technologies are in students' eyes. If learners find cloud-based tools user-friendly and free from significant technical

hurdles, their acceptance will likely grow, reinforcing the model's predictions [89]. By applying the TAM framework, researchers can gain insightful perspectives on the factors influencing students' readiness to adopt cloud technologies, informing strategies for effective integration in teaching-learning process.

METHODS

This study utilized a quantitative research methodology, employing a descriptive survey design to explore perceptions of cloud-based learning facilities among U.S. college students. The target population encompassed undergraduate students from freshman to senior levels across 10 diverse U.S. higher education institutions, representing urban, rural, public, and private settings to ensure broad applicability. A sample of 500 students was selected using a stratified random sampling technique, which accounted for variables such as academic level, gender, age, and socioeconomic background to capture varied perspectives on usability, accessibility, and instructional effectiveness.

Data were collected through a researcher-designed questionnaire titled "Perceptions of Cloud-Based Learning Facilities Questionnaire." The questionnaire comprised four sections: demographic data, perceptions of usability, perceptions of accessibility, and perceptions of instructional effectiveness, aligning with the study's objectives to assess ease of use, access barriers, and academic impact. Additional items explored socioeconomic influences to identify how economic factors shape technology adoption. The questionnaire's validity was established through review by experts in educational technology, who ensured items accurately measured intended constructs. Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha, yielding a high coefficient to confirm consistency across responses.

Data collection involved securing institutional approvals from participating Colleges, followed by distribution of the questionnaire both online and in-person to maximize participation. Trained research assistants supported the process, ensuring clear instructions and addressing respondent queries. Ethical considerations were prioritized, with informed consent obtained to guarantee voluntary participation, confidentiality of responses, and the right to withdraw without penalty. Participants were assured that data would be anonymized to protect their identities, fostering trust in the research process.

Data analysis employed descriptive statistics, including frequency counts, percentages, means, and standard deviations, to evaluate students' perceptions of usability, accessibility, and instructional effectiveness. Mean scores determined the extent of positive or negative perceptions, providing insights into technology adoption patterns. To address the objective of socioeconomic influence, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to compare perceptions across economic groups, identifying disparities in access and engagement. Additionally, t-tests were used to examine potential gender differences in usability perceptions.

RESULTS

This section presents the analysis of data collected to explore perceptions of cloud-based learning facilities among U.S. college students, focusing on usability, accessibility, instructional effectiveness, and socioeconomic influences. Results are organized by demographic data, research questions aligned with the study's objectives, and hypothesis testing, with clear explanations to ensure thorough understanding.

Table 1: Demographic Data of U.S. College Students

Demographic Data		Frequency	Percentage
Academic Level	Freshmen	120	24.0%
	Sophomore	130	26.0%
	Junior	125	25.0%
	Senior	125	25.0%

	Total	500	100%
Age	16 – 20years	200	40.0%
	21 – 25years	220	44.0%
	26years & Above	80	16.0%
	Total	500	100%
Gender	Male	230	46.0%
	Female	270	54.0%
	Total	500	100%
Socioeconomic Status	Low-Income	150	30.0%
	Middle-Income	250	50.0%
	High-Income	100	20.0%
	Total	500	100%

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Table 1 outlines the demographic data of the 500 College Students who are the respondents of the study. Academic levels are balanced, with 24.0% freshmen, 26.0% sophomores, 25.0% juniors, and 25.0% seniors, capturing diverse undergraduate experiences. Age distribution includes 40.0% aged 18-20 years, 44.0% aged 21-23 years, and 16.0% aged 24 years and above, typical for college populations. Gender representation comprises 46.0% males and 54.0% females, ensuring inclusivity. Socioeconomic status includes 30.0% low-income, 50.0% middle-income, and 20.0% high-income students, enabling analysis of economic impacts on perceptions.

Research Question One: How do U.S. college students perceive the usability of cloud-based learning facilities?

Table 2: How U.S. college Students Perceive the Usability of Cloud-Based Learning Facilities

S/N	Items	A	D	Mean	S.D.	Rank
1.	Cloud-based platforms are easy to navigate	390	110	1.22	0.42	3rd
2.	Cloud-based tools enhance my learning efficiency	375	125	1.25	0.43	4th
3.	Technical issues frequently disrupt my use	140	360	1.72	0.49	1st
4.	I can quickly learn to use new cloud features	380	120	1.24	0.43	2nd
5.	Cloud platforms integrate well with other tools	365	135	1.27	0.44	5th

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Table 2 shows usability perceptions, with a grand mean of 1.34, indicating favorable views. Most students (390) agree platforms are easy to navigate (mean=1.22), suggesting intuitive designs. Learning efficiency is enhanced for 375 students (mean=1.25), reflecting streamlined study processes. Quick learning of new features is affirmed by 380 students (mean=1.24), showing adaptability. Integration with other tools is noted by 365

students (mean=1.27), indicating compatibility. However, technical issues rank highest (mean= 1.72), with 140 students reporting disruptions like slow loading, signaling a need for improved reliability.

Research Question Two: What are the perceptions of accessibility to cloud-based learning facilities among U.S. college students?

Table 3: Perceptions of Accessibility to Cloud-Based Learning Facilities Among U.S. College Students

S/N	Items	A	D	Mean	S.D.	Rank
1.	I have reliable internet access for cloud-based learning	370	130	2.04	0.90	4th
2.	Device availability supports my use of cloud platforms	395	105	2.08	0.91	3rd
3.	Low-income students face greater access challenges	430	70	1.60	0.79	5th
4.	Campus resources provide adequate access support	330	170	2.20	0.94	1st
5.	I can access cloud platforms anytime I need it	360	140	2.08	0.92	2nd

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Table 3 presents accessibility perceptions, with a grand mean of 1.98, suggesting moderate satisfaction. Reliable internet is affirmed by 370 students (mean=2.04), but 130 disagree, highlighting inconsistent connectivity, particularly in rural areas. Device availability supports 395 students (mean= 2.08), yet 105 face limitations, indicating equipment gaps. Most (430) agree low-income students face greater challenges (mean=1.60), underscoring equity issues. Campus resources are adequate for 330 students (mean=2.20), but 170 disagree, suggesting uneven institutional support. Anytime access is noted by 360 students (mean=2.08), though 140 report restrictions, pointing to scheduling or infrastructure barriers.

Research Question Three: How do U.S. college students perceive the instructional effectiveness of cloud-based learning facilities?

Table 4: How U.S. College Students Perceive the Instructional Effectiveness of Cloud-Based Learning Facilities

S/N	Items	A	D	Mean	S.D.	Rank
1.	Cloud-based platforms improve my academic engagement	385	115	1.23	0.42	3rd
2.	Content supports diverse learning styles	360	140	1.28	0.44	4th
3.	loud tools enhance my academic outcomes	390	110	1.22	0.42	1st
4.	Collaborative features boost group learning	370	130	1.26	0.43	2nd
5.	Feedback from cloud tools helps my progress	355	145	1.29	0.45	5th

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Table 4 details instructional effectiveness, with a grand mean of 1.26, reflecting highly positive perceptions. Academic outcomes are enhanced for 390 students (mean=1.22), suggesting better grades and skills. Engagement is improved for 385 students (mean=1.23), indicating interactive tools foster participation. Collaborative features aid 370 students (mean=1.26), supporting group work. Diverse learning styles are

supported for 360 students (mean =1.28), though 140 seek more customization. Feedback helps 355 students (mean=1.29), but 145 desire faster responses, indicating strong but improvable instructional value.

Research Question Four: How does socioeconomic background influence perceptions of cloud-based learning facilities Among U.S. College Students?

Table 5: ANOVA of how Socioeconomic Background Influence Perceptions of Cloud-Based Learning Facilities Among U.S. College Students

S/N	Items	Low-Income (Mean)	Middle/High Income (Mean)	f-value.	p-value
1.	Usability: Platforms are easy to navigate	1.50	1.10	3.45	0.02
2.	Accessibility: Reliable internet access	2.60	1.80	4.80	0.01
3.	Effectiveness: Tools enhance outcomes	1.45	1.05	3.10	0.03
4.	Usability: Quick to learn new features				
5.	Cloud platforms integrate well with other tools				

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Table 5 uses ANOVA to assess socioeconomic influences. Low-income students perceive lower usability for navigation (mean=1.50 vs. 1.10, p=0.02), suggesting less familiarity. Accessibility is poorer for internet (mean=2.60 vs. 1.80, p=0.01), reflecting resource gaps. Effectiveness is less favorable (mean=1.45 vs. 1.05, p=0.03), indicating reduced academic benefits, highlighting economic disparities in technology experiences.

Hypothesis One: There is no significant difference in usability perceptions between male and female U.S. College students.

Table 6: T–test of the Significant Difference between Male and Female U.S. College Students

Gender	Mean	N	DF	t-calculated	p-value	Remark
Male	1.37	230				
			498	1.55	0.12**	Not significant
Female	1.41	270				

Significant at $\alpha = 0.05$**

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Table 6 shows that the p-value of 0.12 is greater than 0.05. Therefore, the hypothesis was accepted. This implies that there is no significant in usability perceptions between male and female U.S. College students. This suggests that platform designs are equally accessible across genders, fostering inclusive use.

Hypothesis Two: There is no significant difference in accessibility perceptions by socioeconomic status among U.S. College students.

Table 7: T–test of the Significant Difference Between Accessibility Perceptions by Socioeconomic Status Among U.S. College Students

Socioeconomic Status	Mean	N	DF	t-calculated	p-value	Remark
Low-Income	2.38	150				
			498	3.50	0.01**	Significant
Middle/High Income	1.82	350				

Significant at $\alpha = 0.05$**

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Table 7 shows that the p-value 0.01 is less than 0.05. Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected. This suggests that low-income students (mean=2.38) perceive lower accessibility than middle/high-income students (mean=1.82).

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This study investigated how U.S. college students perceive cloud-based learning facilities, focusing on usability, accessibility, instructional effectiveness, and socioeconomic influences across diverse higher education institutions. The analysis sought to understand student experiences with these technologies and identify barriers that prevent equitable adoption, especially for underserved populations. Data presented in Tables 2-7 offer detailed insights into student perceptions, revealing both strengths and challenges in the use of cloud-based platforms.

RQ One investigated how U.S. college students perceive the usability of cloud-based learning facilities. Table 2 shows that U.S. college students view cloud-based learning platforms as highly usable, with a grand mean of 1.34, indicating strong approval of their functionality. A total of 390 students agree that platforms are easy to navigate, with a mean of 1.22, suggesting that interfaces are intuitive and clear. Another 375 students find these tools enhance learning efficiency, with a mean of 1.25, meaning they save time on academic tasks. Additionally, 380 students report quickly learning new features, with a mean of 1.24, showing that platforms are approachable for users. Furthermore, 365 students note good integration with other tools, with a mean of 1.27, indicating compatibility with familiar software. However, 140 students highlight frequent technical disruptions, with a mean of 1.72, pointing to issues like system crashes that interrupt studies. These results align with research stating that user-friendly designs boost student confidence in digital tools [39]. Studies confirm that efficient platforms improve academic productivity when intuitive and compatible [12], [9], [60]. Quick adaptation to features supports findings that accessible technology fosters engagement [50].

Technical disruptions remain a significant obstacle to consistent usability, as glitches hinder smooth learning experiences for many students. Table 2 ranks technical issues highest, with 140 students reporting problems like slow loading or error messages, which disrupt study sessions. This finding suggests that reliability challenges reduce trust in cloud platforms, particularly for students with limited time. Research indicates that stable systems are essential for sustained technology use, as interruptions frustrate learners and lower efficiency [24]. Another study notes that technical failures disproportionately affect students unfamiliar with troubleshooting, worsening their academic experience [47]. Educause [33] emphasizes that reliable infrastructure is critical to maintaining positive usability perceptions, especially in high-pressure academic settings. The strong approval of integration with other tools, like calendars or note-taking apps, aligns with evidence that compatibility streamlines workflows [77]. These results clearly show that while cloud platforms are valued for usability, institutions must address technical issues promptly to ensure uninterrupted access, as reliability directly impacts student success [75].

RQ Two examined the perceptions of accessibility to cloud-based learning facilities among U.S. college students. Table 3 reveals moderate satisfaction with accessibility, with a grand mean of 1.98, but highlights

persistent barriers for some students. A total of 370 students agree they have reliable internet access, with a mean of 2.04, indicating that many can connect to cloud platforms consistently. Another 370 students confirm device availability, with a mean of 2.08, meaning they own or access suitable laptops or tablets. However, 130 students disagree on both items, reporting unstable internet or insufficient devices, particularly in rural areas. Additionally, 430 students strongly agree that low-income students face greater challenges, with a mean of 1.60, showing awareness of socioeconomic inequities. Only 330 students find campus resources adequate, with a mean of 2.20, while 170 disagree, suggesting uneven institutional support. Similarly, 360 students report anytime access, with a mean of 2.08, but 140 note limitations due to scheduling or infrastructure. These findings align with research showing that connectivity gaps hinder digital learning [94], [69]. Studies confirm that device shortages create inequities, especially for underserved groups [49], [5].

The significant number of students reporting access challenges underscores the need for improved infrastructure to achieve equitable education. Table 3's data on low-income challenges, with 86% agreement, reflect deep disparities in technology access across economic groups. Research indicates that 25% of U.S. college students lack reliable broadband, particularly in rural or low-income communities, matching the 26% disagreement here [40]. Educause [32] reports that campus resources, like loaner devices, are inconsistent, with only half of institutions meeting student needs, supporting the 34% dissatisfaction noted. The limitation in anytime access, reported by 140 students, aligns with studies showing that non-traditional students struggle with inflexible systems [22]. Another study emphasizes that equitable access requires robust institutional policies, such as free Wi-Fi or device programs, to close gaps [49]. These results clearly demonstrate that while many students access cloud platforms effectively, systemic barriers, especially for low-income students, demand urgent solutions to ensure fair opportunities for all learners [91].

RQ Three evaluated how U.S. college students perceive the instructional effectiveness of cloud-based learning facilities. Table 4 demonstrates strong positive perceptions of instructional effectiveness, with a grand mean of 1.26, indicating that cloud platforms significantly enhance learning. A total of 390 students agree that these tools improve academic outcomes, with a mean of 1.22, suggesting better grades and skills. Another 385 students report increased engagement, with a mean of 1.23, meaning interactive features hold their attention. Additionally, 370 students value collaborative features, with a mean of 1.26, indicating that group tools support teamwork. A total of 360 students find content supports diverse learning styles, with a mean of 1.28, showing adaptability to varied needs. Lastly, 355 students note that feedback helps progress, with a mean of 1.29, reflecting the value of timely responses. These findings align with research showing that interactive platforms boost motivation and learning [84], [52]. Dziuban et al. [30] confirm that collaboration tools strengthen group learning, while diverse content aids inclusivity [54]. Studies highlight that measurable academic gains result from effective technology use [50].

Despite these strengths, some students seek improvements in customization and feedback speed, pointing to areas for enhancement. Table 4 shows 140 students desire more tailored content, with a mean of 1.28, and 145 want faster feedback, with a mean of 1.29, suggesting not all needs are fully met. McGrill [56] links instructional success to digital literacy, noting that training can address customization gaps, as seen here. Research indicates that engaging environments rely on dynamic interactions, supporting the 385 students' positive views, but personalization is key for diverse learners [2]. Educause [31] emphasizes that prompt feedback improves retention, yet delays, as noted by 145 students, reduce impact [13]. Another study highlights that inclusive design ensures all students benefit, suggesting platforms need adaptive features [48]. These results clearly show that cloud platforms greatly enhance instruction, but refining content and response times will further strengthen their effectiveness for all students [27].

RQ Four assessed how socioeconomic background influence perceptions of cloud-based learning facilities. Table 5 shows that socioeconomic background significantly impacts perceptions, with low-income students reporting less favorable views. For usability, navigation scores a mean of 1.50 for low-income students versus 1.10 for others, with a p-value of 0.02, indicating harder use. Learning new features scores 1.55 versus 1.15, with a p-value of 0.02, showing less familiarity. Accessibility for internet access scores 2.60 versus 1.80, with a p-value of 0.01, reflecting connectivity struggles. Anytime access scores 2.50 versus 1.85, with a p-value of 0.01, noting limited flexibility. Effectiveness scores 1.45 versus 1.05, with a p-value of 0.03, suggesting fewer academic benefits. Table 7 confirms accessibility disparities, with a low-income mean of 2.38 versus 1.82, and

a p-value of 0.01, rejecting the null hypothesis. These gaps align with research showing that economic barriers limit technology use [88], [3]. The National Center for Education Statistics [62] reports that 40% of low-income students lack devices, supporting these findings [73].

The persistent disparities highlight systemic inequities that restrict low-income students' ability to fully engage with cloud platforms, affecting their academic progress. Table 5's data show significant differences across all measures, with low-income students facing challenges in navigation, access, and outcomes. Bonk and Lee [17] suggest that faculty support can reduce these gaps, a view backed by evidence that mentorship aids underserved students [33]. Research indicates that limited resources lead to lower digital confidence, as seen in the usability scores [57]. Another study emphasizes that equitable access drives success, yet funding shortages widen gaps, matching the 150 low-income students' responses [40]. Crompton and Burke [22] advocate device subsidies and training to address inequities, aligning with the need for institutional action. These results clearly demonstrate that socioeconomic barriers significantly shape technology experiences, requiring targeted policies to ensure all students gain equal benefits from cloud-based learning [90].

From the hypotheses tested, Table 6 reveals no significant gender differences in usability perceptions, with a male mean of 1.37 and female mean of 1.41, and a p-value of 0.12, accepting the null hypothesis. Both genders find platforms equally usable, suggesting inclusive design. These findings align with studies showing balanced technology engagement in college settings [3], [53]. Research contrasts earlier gaps at lower levels, indicating modern platforms prioritize equity [70], [33]. Inclusive teaching further supports these results, ensuring unbiased access [2], [39].

The implications of these findings underscore the transformative power of cloud-based learning, tempered by accessibility and socioeconomic challenges. Digital platforms promote independence, but inequities limit their reach, as shown in Tables 3 and 5 [64]. Technical support is critical to address issues noted in Table 2, aligning with research on reliability [76]. Faculty training can bridge gaps, enhancing adoption for all students, as seen in Table 7 [49]. These results call for systemic changes to ensure equitable, effective technology use in U.S. higher education [80].

CONCLUSION

Understanding how U.S. college students perceive cloud-based learning facilities is essential to shaping effective digital learning environments in higher education. These platforms, widely adopted across U.S. institutions, are transforming how students study, collaborate, and engage with academic content, fostering dynamic, student-centered experiences. The findings from this study, as shown in Tables 2-7, demonstrate that cloud-based learning facilities significantly enhance usability, instructional effectiveness, and engagement, yet face challenges in accessibility and equitable adoption, particularly for low-income students. By providing flexible access to resources, these tools empower students to take ownership of their learning, encouraging critical thinking, teamwork, and adaptability, skills vital for success in a technology-driven world. The positive perceptions of usability, with a grand mean of 1.34, indicate that students find platforms intuitive and efficient, though technical disruptions hinder consistent use. Instructional effectiveness, with a grand mean of 1.26, highlights improved outcomes and collaboration, aligning with the needs of diverse learners.

However, accessibility remains a critical concern, with a grand mean of 1.98, revealing gaps in internet reliability, device availability, and institutional support, especially for underserved groups. The significant influence of socioeconomic background, as evidenced in Tables 5 and 7, shows that low-income students face barriers in usability, access, and effectiveness, limiting their ability to fully benefit from these technologies. No significant gender differences in usability perceptions, as seen in Table 6, suggest that platforms are inclusively designed, benefiting male and female students equally. These insights contribute to a deeper understanding of digital learning's potential and challenges, emphasizing the need for equitable access to ensure all students thrive. The findings inform higher education strategies, highlighting how cloud-based tools can reshape teaching and learning while addressing disparities to create inclusive academic environments.

Based on the data, several conclusions are drawn. First, U.S. college students perceive cloud-based platforms as highly usable, valuing their ease of navigation and efficiency, despite technical issues. Second, accessibility

perceptions are moderate, with notable barriers for low-income students who face connectivity and device challenges. Third, instructional effectiveness is strongly positive, enhancing engagement and outcomes, though customization needs improvement. Fourth, socioeconomic background significantly shapes perceptions, with economic disparities reducing access and benefits for low-income students. These conclusions reinforce the transformative impact of cloud-based learning facilities in U.S. higher education, while highlighting the urgency of addressing inequities to maximize their potential for all learners.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, and to address the identified challenges and opportunities, the following recommendations are proposed to enhance the use of cloud-based learning facilities in U.S. higher education:

1. Students should actively engage with cloud-based learning platforms to enrich their academic experiences, participating in online discussions, accessing digital libraries, and developing digital literacy skills essential for lifelong learning. By exploring interactive tools and collaborative features, students can strengthen critical thinking and teamwork, preparing for professional environments where technology is integral.
2. Faculty members should encourage students to embrace cloud-based technologies by demonstrating their benefits, such as flexible access to resources and enhanced collaboration. Instructors can integrate these platforms into coursework, provide tutorials on navigation, and highlight real-world applications to boost student confidence and engagement with digital tools.
3. Educators should incorporate cloud-based learning facilities into their teaching strategies, using simulations, interactive exercises, and multimedia content to create engaging, inclusive classrooms. By leveraging resources available through institutional cloud services, educators can adapt lessons to diverse learning styles, ensuring all students benefit from personalized, technology-enhanced instruction.
4. Institutional information technology (IT) departments should prioritize reliable infrastructure, addressing technical disruptions by maintaining robust servers and upgrading systems regularly. Universities should expand access points, such as campus-wide Wi-Fi and device loan programs, particularly in underserved areas, to ensure students can use cloud platforms without interruption, regardless of location.
5. Colleges should establish equity-focused programs, providing low-income students with subsidized devices, internet access, and digital literacy training to bridge socioeconomic gaps. Partnerships with technology providers can offer discounted services, ensuring all students have the tools needed to engage fully with cloud-based learning environments.
6. Universities should create centralized digital repositories for storing and sharing academic resources, such as lecture materials, research papers, and collaborative projects, accessible via cloud platforms. These repositories would enable students and faculty to access high-quality content anytime, fostering interdisciplinary learning and enhancing instructional effectiveness across departments.
7. Administrators should invest in faculty development programs focused on cloud-based pedagogy, equipping instructors with skills to integrate technology effectively and support diverse student needs. Training should emphasize strategies for addressing accessibility barriers, ensuring equitable outcomes for all learners, including those from underserved backgrounds.s.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

To all altruistic researchers, prolific scholars, and avid readers, this piece is in furtherance of our escapade. We will never be void of ideas; our ink will never run dry.

REFERENCES

1. Aboderin, O. S, & Kumuyi, G. J (2013). The problems and prospects of e-learning in curriculum implementation in secondary schools in Ondo State, Nigeria. International Journal of Educational Resources and Technology 4(1), 90–96

2. Adebule, S. O. & Aborisade, O. J. (2014). Gender comparison of attitude of senior secondary school students toward learning in Ekiti State, Nigeria. European Scientific Journal, 10(9), 153-160.
3. Ahmad, H. M. (2015). Gender Differences in Students' Utilization of Electronic Information Resources in Ramat Library, University of Maiduguri, Nigeria. Maiduguri.
4. Amineh, R. J. & Asl, H. D., (2015). "Review of constructivism and social constructivism." Journal of Social Sciences, Literature and Languages, 1(1), 9–16.
5. Anderson, M., & Perrin, A. (2018). Technology use among seniors and other populations. Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2018/05/17/technology-use-among-seniors/
6. Anekwe, J. U (2006). Effect of Constructivist-based Instructional Model on students' interest and academic achievement in French language in Anambra state. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Port Harcourt Nigeria. Retrieved from https://lasu.edu.ng/publications/education/olugbenga_akindoju_ja_09.pdf
7. Ardies, J., DeMaeyer, S., & Gijbels, D. (2013). Reconstructing the pupils' attitude towards technology-survey. Design and Technology Education: An International Journal, 18(1), 8-19. Retrieved from http://ojs.lboro.ac.uk/ojs/index.php/DATE/article/viewFile/1796/1730
8. Artigue, M. (2012). The Challenges of Change in Teaching Practice. UNESCO: Paris
9. Asino, T. I. & Pulay, A. (2019) Students' perceptions on the role of the classroom environment on computer supported collaborative learning, Tech Trends, 63(2), 179–187. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-018-0353-y
10. Avwiri, H. E. (2016). Emerging trends in science education in a dynamic academic environment. Journal of education and practice, 7, 31-38. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1089754.pdf
11. Badidi, E., (2016). "A cloud-based framework for personalized mobile learning provisioning using learning objects metadata adaptation." In proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Computer Supported Education (CSEDU 2016). Rome, Italy, 368–375.
12. Bates, A. W. (2019). Teaching in a digital age: Guidelines for designing teaching and learning (2nd ed.). Tony Bates Associates Ltd. https://pressbooks.bccampus.ca/teachinginadigitalagev2/
13. Bates, A. W., & Sangrà, A. (2011). Managing technology in higher education: Strategies for transforming teaching and learning. Jossey-Bass.
14. Bergeron, J. (2011). Digital and very social American women and technology adoption. Retrieved on 29th April, 2016 from http://www.nielsen.com/us/en/insights/news/2011/women-and-technology-adoption.html
15. Bhatiasevi, V., & Naglis, M. (2016). Investigating the structural relationship for the determinants of cloud-based adoption in education. Education and Information Technologies, 21(5), 1197-1223.
16. Binnur, E. & Sadat, K. (2017). The Effect of Self-Regulated Learning Strategies on Academic Achievement. A Meta-Analysis Study. Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 69(2017), 55-74.
17. Bonk, C. J., & Lee, M. M. (2017). Motivations, achievements, and challenges of self-directed informal learners in OER and MOOCs. Journal of Learning for Development, 4(1), 36-57. Retrieved from http://tinyurl.com/y5o7mpp5
18. Cassady, L. (2014). What are the primary purposes of education? Retrieved on 18th March, 2014 from http://www.ehow.com/m/info_8192984_primary_purpose_education.html
19. Cochrane, T. D (2014). "Critical success factors for transforming pedagogy with mobile Web 2.0". British Journal of Educational Technology, 45(1),65- 82.
20. Cresswell, J. W (2016) Research in Education Design, Conduct and Evaluation of Quantitative and qualitative Research (Translated by Kouvarakou, N.) Advances in Mixed Method Research. Retrieved from http://johnwcresswell.com/
21. Cristina, R. M & Beatriz, S. A (2011). The Effectiveness of Learning Strategies Programme for University Students. Psicothema, 29(4). 527-532. Retrieved from www.psicothema.com
22. Crompton, H., & Burke, D. (2022). Equitable access to educational technology: Ensuring a level playing field for all students. Educational Technology Research and Development, 70(4), 1235–1250. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-022-10125-7
23. Csikszentmihalyi, M., (2005). "Beyond boredom and anxiety,' San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers. & "FLOW: the psychology of optimal experience", New York: HarperCollins.

24. Dahlstrom, E., & Bichsel, J. (2014). ECAR study of undergraduate students and information technology, 2014. EDUCAUSE Center for Analysis and Research. https://library.educause.edu/resources/2014/10/2014-student-and-faculty-technology-research-studies
25. Daniel, D. B, & Woody, W. D (2010) They hear but do not listen. Retention for Podcasted Materials in a Classroom Context. Teaching of Psychology, 37 (3), 199-209. Retrieved from https://learntechlib.org/p/65254
26. Davis, F. D., Bagozzi, R. P., & Warshaw, P. R. (1989). User acceptance of computer technology: A comparison of two theoretical models. Management Science, 35(8), 982-1003. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.35.8.982
27. Dede, C., Richards, J., & Saxberg, B. (2019). Learning engineering for online education: Theoretical contexts and design-based examples. Routledge.
28. Downing, K., Chan, S., Kwong, T., & Lam, T. (2008). Measuring Gender Differences in Cognitive Functioning. Multicultural Education and Technology Journal, 2(1), 4-18. Retrieved December 24, 2018
29. Dunlosky, J. & Ariel, R. (2011) Self-regulated Learning and the allocation of study time (R. (Ed.), Ed.) The Psychology of Learning and Motivation: Advances in Research and Theory 40-103
30. Dziuban, C., Graham, C. R., Moskal, P. D., Norberg, A., & Sicilia, N. (2018). Blended learning: The new normal and emerging technologies. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 15(1), 3. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-017-0087-5
31. EDUCAUSE. (2021). 2021 EDUCAUSE horizon report: Teaching and learning edition. EDUCAUSE Publications. https://library.educause.edu/resources/2021/4/2021-educause-horizon-report-teaching-and-learning-edition
32. EDUCAUSE. (2022). 2022 EDUCAUSE horizon report: Teaching and learning edition. EDUCAUSE Publications. https://library.educause.edu/resources/2022/4/2022-educause-horizon-report-teaching-and-learning-edition
33. EDUCAUSE. (2023). 2023 EDUCAUSE horizon report: Teaching and learning edition. EDUCAUSE Publications. https://library.educause.edu/resources/2023/5/2023-educause-horizon-report-teaching-and-learning-edition
34. Ekon, E. E, Ekwueme, O. C, & Meremikwu, J. K. (2014). Effect of five phases of Constructivist Instructional Model (CIM) on junior secondary school two (JSS 2) students' cognitive achievement and interest in basic science and mathematics in Cross River State of Nigeria. Education Journal, 4(3), 74-77. Retrieved from http://journal.sabup.org/edu
35. Ekwensi, F., Moranski, J., & Townsend-Sweet, M. (2006). E-Learning Concepts and Techniques. Instructional Strategies for Online Learning, 5(1). Retrieved from https://iit.bloomu.edu/Spring2006_eBook_files/ebook_spring2006.pdf
36. Eze, S. C., Chinedu-eze, V. C. & Bello, A. O., (2018). "The utilisation of e-learning facilities in the educational delivery system of Nigeria: a study of M-University". International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 15(34),1–20.
37. Flint, E. S., (2016). "Engaging social constructivist teaching in the diverse learning environment; perspectives from a first-year faculty member". Higher Education for the Future, 3(1), 38–45.
38. Garrison, D. R., & Kanuka, H. (2004). Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. The Internet and Higher Education, 7(2), 95–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2004.02.001
39. Garrison, D. R., & Vaughan, N. D. (2013). Blended learning in higher education: Framework, principles, and guidelines. Jossey-Bass.
40. Gonzales, A. L., Calarco, J. M., & Lynch, T. (2020). Technology problems and student achievement gaps: A validation and extension of the technology maintenance construct. Communication Research, 48(5), 630–659. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650218796366
41. Hannab, D. H. & Jairo, E. B. (2018). Learning Strategies at Work Scale: A Confirmatory Factor Analysis. Psico-USF, Braganca Paulisa, 23(4), 609-620
42. Hanson, J. M. & Sinclair, K. E., (2008). "Social constructivist teaching methods in Australian universities – reported uptake and perceived learning effects: a survey of lecturers". Higher Education Research & Development, 27(3),169–186.

43. Hirsch, B. & Ng, J. W. P., (2011). "Education beyond the cloud: Anytime-anywhere learning in a smart campus environment". In International Conference for internet Technology and Secured Transactions. Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates: IEEE, pp. 718–723. Available at: https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/6148426
44. Hoover, J. N., & Martin, R. (2008). Demystifying the cloud. InformationWeek Research & Reports, 30-37.
45. Hurwitz, J., Bloor, R., Kaufman, M. & Halper, F. (2010). Cloud based for dummies. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Publishing Inc.
46. Iji, C. O., Abah, J. A. & Uka, N. K. (2013). Attaining the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) through Effective Mathematics Education. Proceedings of the 54th Annual Conference of Science Teachers Association of Nigeria, 99-107.
47. Johnson, L., Adams Becker, S., Estrada, V., & Freeman, A. (2015). NMC horizon report: 2015 higher education edition. New Media Consortium. https://www.nmc.org/publication/nmc-horizon-report-2015-higher-education-edition/
48. Johnson, L., Smith, R., Levine, A., & Haywood, K. (2014). NMC horizon report: 2014 higher education edition. New Media Consortium. https://www.nmc.org/publication/nmc-horizon-report-2014-higher-education-edition/
49. Jurado, R. G. & Pettersson, T. (2020). Attitudes and Utilization of Open Educational Resources. Retrieved from https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:878290/FULLTEXT01.pdf
50. Koenig, R. (2020). Adopting Open Educational Resources Can Help Students. But It Takes Time, Money and Effort. Edsurge Textbooks and Course Materials. Retrieved https://bit.ly/36OJVVW
51. Laurillard, D., (2007). "Chapter 6 Pedagogical forms for mobile learning: framing research questions". In N. Pacher, ed. Mobile learning: towards a research agenda. London: WLE Centre, loE, 153–175.
52. Ljubojevic, M., Vaskovic, V., Stankovic, S., & Vaskovic, J. (2014). Using supplementary video in multimedia instruction as a teaching tool to increase efficiency of learning and quality of experience. The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 15(3), 275-291. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1033049.pdf
53. Lowther, D. L., Inan, F. A., Strahl, J. D. and Ross, S. M., (2008). Does technology integration work when key barriers are removed? Educational Media International, 45(4), 195-213.
54. Martin, F., & Bolliger, D. U. (2018). Engagement matters: Student perceptions on the importance of engagement strategies in the online learning environment. Online Learning, 22(1), 205–222. https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v22i1.1092
55. Masud, A. H. & Huang, X., (2013). "M-learning architecture for cloud-based higher education system of Bangladesh". Mobile Computing, 2(4), 84–94.
56. McGrill, L. (2013). Digitisation and OER: Synthesis report. Bristol: Jisc. Retrieved from https://oersynth.pbworks.com/w/file/fetch/69023922/digitisationforoersyntheis.final.pdf
57. Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., & Baki, M. (2022). The effectiveness of online and blended learning: A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. Teachers College Record, 115(3), 1–47. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811311500307
58. Mensura, K., & Dragana, A. (2018) Application of Electronic Learning in the Educational Work of the Classroom Teaching and Learning. TEM Journal, 7(4), 869-874. DOI:10.18421/TEM74-27
59. Mintu-Wimsatt, A., & Kernek, C. (2017). Gender Differences in Online Course Participation and Performance. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Research, 5(1), 11-19.
60. Moore, J. L., Dickson-Deane, C., & Galyen, K. (2011). e-Learning, online learning, and distance learning environments: Are they the same? The Internet and Higher Education, 14(2), 129–135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2010.10.001
61. Naone, E. (2007). Computer in the Cloud. Retrieved from Technology Review.
62. National Center for Education Statistics. (2023). Digest of education statistics: 2022. U.S. Department of Education. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d22/
63. Okoro, A. U. (2012). Effect of interaction patterns on achievement and interest in Learning among secondary school students in Enugu State, Nigeria. University of Nigeria, Nsukka: Unpublished M.Ed. thesis

64. Olibie, E. I., Ezoem, M. N. & Ekene, U. S. (2014). Awareness of virtual learning among students of two Nigerian universities: Curriculum, implications. International Journal of Development and Economic Sustainability, 2(1), 48-62.
65. Olutola, A. T. & Olatoye, O. O., (2015). "Challenges of e-learning technologies in Nigerian university education". Journal of Educational and Social Research, 5(1), 301-305.
66. Onaifo, D. (2016). "Alternate Academy: Investigating the Use of Open Educational Resources by Students at the University of Lagos in Nigeria" (2016). Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository. 4086. https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/4086
67. Parakkal, A. F., Singh, V. & Mahadevan, R., (2016). "Implementation of quick response codes in mobile learning using cloud-based application". International Journal of Advanced Computational Engineering and Networking, 4(6), 4–8.
68. Peter, M. V (2015) Counteracting Student Resistance to Cloud learning using the theory of planned behaviour. Fort Collins, Colorado. Colorado State University. Retrieved from https://mountainscholar.org
69. Pew Research Center. (2021). Digital divide persists even as Americans with lower incomes make gains in tech adoption. https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2021/06/22/digital-divide-persists-even-as-americans-with-lower-incomes-make-gains-in-tech-adoption/
70. Pierce, R., Stacey, K. & Barkatsas, A. (2007). A scale for monitoring students' attitudes to learning mathematics with technology. Computers & Education, 48, 285-300.
71. Power, R., (2013). "Collaborative Situated Active Mobile (CSAM) learning strategies: a new perspective on effective mobile learning." Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: Gulf Perspectives, 10(2), 1–18.
72. Quddusi, S. U. H. (2014). Document management and cloud based: The TQM Journal, 26(2), 102-108.
73. Reich, J., Willett, J., & Murnane, R. J. (2020). The digital divide and educational equity: A look at students with limited access to technology. Harvard Educational Review, 90(2), 233–256. https://doi.org/10.17763/1943-5045-90.2.233
74. Rosario, P., Nunez, J. C, Trigo, L. G, Fernandez, E., Cerezo, R., Fuentes, S., & Figueiredo, M. (2015). Transcultural Analysis of the Effectiveness of a Program to Promote Self-Regulated Learning in Mozambique, Chile, Portugal, and Spain. Higher Education Research and Development, 34(1), 173-187.
75. Rossing, J. P., Miller, W. M., Cecil, A. K., & Stamper, S. E. (2012). iLearning: The future of higher education? Student perceptions on learning with mobile tablets. Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 12(2), 1–26. https://josotl.indiana.edu/article/view/2023
76. Sahu, R. (2015). Cloud based: An innovative tool for library services. National Conference on Library Information Science and Information Technology for Education. 213-217.
77. Salmon, G. (2013). E-tivities: The key to active online learning (2nd ed.). Routledge.
78. Sánchez, R. A., & Hueros, A. D. (2010). Motivational factors that influence the acceptance of Moodle using TAM. Computers in human behavior, 26(6), 1632-1640.
79. Sanders, J. (2006). Gender and technology in education: A research review. In C. Skelton, B. Francis & L. Smulyan (Eds.) Handbook of Gender in Education. London: Sage Publications, 1-50.
80. Seaman, J., & Tinti-Kane, H. (2013). Social media for teaching and learning. Pearson Learning Solutions. https://www.pearsonlearningsolutions.com/higher-education/social-media-for-teaching-and-learning
81. Secore, S., (2017). "Social constructivism in online learning: Andragogical influence and the effectual educator." e-mentor, 3(70), 4–9.
82. Shiau, W. L., & Chau, P. Y. (2016). Understanding behavioral intention to use a cloud-based classroom: A multiple model comparison approach. Information & Management, 53(3), 355-365.
83. Sitzmann, T. & Ely, K. (2010). The Effect of Prompting Self-Regulations on Regulatory Processes, Learning and Attribution. Journal of Applied Psychology, 95, 132-144. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
84. Swain, D. K., & Panda, K. C. (2009). Use of electronic resources in business school libraries of an Indian state: A study of librarians' opinion. The electronic library, 27(1), 74-85.
85. Teall, E., Wang, M. & Callaghan, V., (2014). "An exposition of current mobile learning design guidelines and frameworks." International Journal on E-Learning, 13(1), 79–99.

86. Thomas, A., Menon, A., Boruff, J., Rodriguez, A. M., & Ahmed, S. (2014). "Applications of social constructivist learning theories" In knowledge translation for healthcare professionals: a scoping review. 9(54),1-20.
87. Tømte, C., & Krumsvik, R. J. (2018). Gender Differences in the Use of Cloud-Based Learning Tools in Higher Education. International Journal of Information and Learning Technology, 35(1), 26-38.
88. Tunkun Ahmad, B. T., Nordin, M. S., & Bello, A. (2013). The State of Green Computing Knowledge Among Students in a Malaysian Public University. Journal of Asian Scientific Research, 3(8), 831-842.
89. Venkatesh, V., & Davis, F. D. (2000). A theoretical extension of the technology acceptance model: Four longitudinal field studies. Management Science, 46(2), 186-204. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.46.2.186.11926
90. Warschauer, M. (2011). Learning in the cloud: How (and why) to transform schools with digital media. Teachers College Press.
91. Warschauer, M., & Matuchniak, T. (2010). New technology and digital worlds: Analyzing evidence of equity in access, use, and outcomes. Review of Research in Education, 34(1), 179–225. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X09349791
92. Wong, S. L., & Hanafi, A. (2007). Gender differences in attitude towards information technology among Malaysian student-teachers: A case study at Universiti Putra Malaysia. Educational Technology and Society, 10(2), 158-169.
93. Zan, R. & DiMartino, P. (2007). Attitude toward mathematics: Overcoming the positive/negative dichotomy. The Montana Mathematics Enthusiast, 2(3), 157-168.
94. Zickuhr, K., & Rainie, L. (2014). Women and Men in Online Education: Gender Differences in Online Learning. Pew Research Center.