

References

1. Adams, D. A., Nelson, R. R., & Todd, P. A. (1992). Perceived usefulness, ease of use, and usage of information technology: a replication. *MIS quarterly*, 227-247.
2. Agarwal, P. (2009). *Indian higher education: Envisioning the future*. SAGE Publications India.
3. Agarwal, R., & Karahanna, E. (2000). Time flies when you're having fun: Cognitive absorption and beliefs about information technology usage. *MIS quarterly*, 665-694.
4. Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 50(2), 179-211.
5. Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1977). Attitude-behavior relations: A theoretical analysis and review of empirical research. *Psychological bulletin*, 84(5), 888.
6. Al-Gahtani, S. S., Hubona, G. S., & Wang, J. (2007). Information technology (IT) in Saudi Arabia: Culture and the acceptance and use of IT. *Information & Management*, 44(8), 681-691.
7. Ahuja, M. K., & Thatcher, J. B. (2005). Moving beyond intentions and toward the theory of trying: effects of work environment and gender on post-adoption information technology use. *MIS quarterly*, 29(3), 427-459.
8. Al-Majali, M. (2010). Application of decomposed theory of planned behavior on internet banking adoption in Jordan. *Journal of Internet Banking and Commerce*, 15(2), 1.

9. Amundsen, C., & Sohbat, E. (2008). The Untapped Learning Potential of CMC in Higher Education. In *Handbook of Research on Computer Mediated Communication* (pp. 1-14). IGI Global.
10. Arquero, J. L., & Romero-Frías, E. (2013). Using social network sites in Higher Education: an experience in business studies. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 50(3), 238-249.
11. Averianova, I. (2014). Joosten, Tanya. Social Media for Educators. Strategies and Best Practices. San Francisco, CA, the USA: Jossey-Bass, 2012.120 pp. ISBN: 978-1-118-11828-3. *NUCB journal of economics and information science*, 59(1), 261-264.
12. Awoleye, M. O., Siyanbola, W. O., & Oladipupo, O. F. (2008). Adoption assessment of Internet usage amongst undergraduates in Nigeria Universities-a case study approach. *Journal of Technology Management & Innovation*, 3(1), 84-89.
13. Balavivekanandhan, A., & Arulchelvan, S. (2015). A Study on Students Acquisition of IT Knowledge and Its Implication on M-Learning. *The Scientific World Journal*, 2015.
14. Baltaci-Goktalay, S., & Ocak, M. A. (2006). Faculty Adoption of Online Technology in Higher Education. *Online Submission*, 5(4).
15. Berliner, D. C. (2002). Comment: Educational research: The hardest science of all. *Educational researcher*, 31(8), 18-20.
16. Boneva, B., Kraut, R., & Frohlich, D. (2001). Using e-mail for personal relationships: The difference gender makes. *American behavioral scientist*, 45(3), 530-549.

17. Burgoyne, J. G. (1993). The competence movement: Issues, stakeholders and prospects. *Personnel review*, 22(6), 6-13.
18. Chandra K. (2015, Sep 02). Addressing India's skill gap with massive open online courses. *The Hindu*, p.07.
19. Chang, C. C., Yan, C. F., & Tseng, J. S. (2012). Perceived convenience in an extended technology acceptance model: Mobile technology and English learning for college students. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 28(5).
20. Chang, C. W., Pearman, C., & Farha, N. (2012). Second Language Acquisition: Implications of Web 2.0 and Beyond. *Critical Questions in Education*, 3(2), 52-64.
21. Chen, K. Y., & Chang, M. L. (2013). User acceptance of 'near field communication mobile phone service: an investigation based on the 'unified theory of acceptance and use of technology' model. *The Service Industries Journal*, 33(6), 609-623.
22. Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.
23. 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.
24. Czarniawska, B. (2004). *Narratives in social science research*. Sage.
25. Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS quarterly*, 319-340.
26. Davis, F. D., & Venkatesh, V. (1996). A critical assessment of potential measurement biases in the technology acceptance model: three experiments. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 45(1), 19-45.

27. Debrand, C. C., & Johnson, J. J. (2008). Gender differences in email and instant messaging: A study of undergraduate business information systems students. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 48(3), 20-30.
28. De Vries, M. J. (2001). New media in technology education: threats and opportunities: a conference summary.
29. Edmonds, G. S., Branch, R. C., & Mukherjee, P. (1994). A conceptual framework for comparing instructional design models. *Educational technology research and development*, 42(4), 55-72.
30. El-Gayar, O. F., & Moran, M. (2006). College students' acceptance of tablet PCs: an application of the UTAUT model. *Dakota State University*, 820.
31. Fenech, T. (1998). Using perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness to predict acceptance of the World Wide Web. *Computer Networks and ISDN Systems*, 30(1-7), 629-630.
32. Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. Sage publications.
33. Fusilier, M., & Durlabhji, S. (2005). An exploration of student internet use in India: the technology acceptance model and the theory of planned behaviour. *Campus-Wide Information Systems*, 22(4), 233-246.
34. Gefen, D., & Straub, D. W. (1997). Gender differences in the perception and use of e-mail: An extension to the technology acceptance model. *MIS quarterly*, 389-400.
35. Golonka, E. M., Bowles, A. R., Frank, V. M., Richardson, D. L., & Freynik, S. (2014). Technologies for foreign language learning: a review of technology types and their effectiveness. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 27(1), 70-105.
36. Gupta, S. (1999). *Research methodology and statistical techniques*. Deep and Deep Publications.

37. Hargreaves, D. H. (1999). The knowledge-creating school. *British journal of educational studies*, 47(2), 122-144.
38. Hargreaves, D. (2000, March). Knowledge management in the learning society. In *Proceeding of Forum of OECD Education Ministers*.
39. Hartshorne, R., & Ajjan, H. (2009). Examining student decisions to adopt Web 2.0 technologies: theory and empirical tests. *Journal of computing in higher education*, 21(3), 183.
40. Herring, S. C., & Marken, J. A. (2008). Implications of gender consciousness for students in information technology. *Women's studies*, 37(3), 229-256.
41. Hsu, H. Y., Wang, S. K., & Comac, L. (2008). Using audio blogs to assist English-language learning: An investigation into student perception. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 21(2), 181-198.
42. Hsu, M. H., & Chiu, C. M. (2004). Predicting electronic service continuance with a decomposed theory of planned behaviour. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 23(5), 359-373.
43. Huang, W. H. D., Hood, D. W., & Yoo, S. J. (2013). Gender divide and acceptance of collaborative Web 2.0 applications for learning in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 16, 57-65.
44. Hu, P. J. H., & Hui, W. (2011). Is technology-mediated learning made equal for all? Examining the influences of gender and learning style. In *Technology Acceptance in Education* (pp. 101-122). Sense Publishers.
45. Jairak, K., Praneetpolgrang, P., & Mekhabunchakij, K. (2009, December). An acceptance of mobile learning for higher education students in Thailand. In *Sixth*

- International Conference on eLearning for Knowledge-Based Society, Thailand* (Vol. 17, No. 18, pp. 361-368).
46. Joosten, T. (2012). *Social media for educators: Strategies and best practices*. John Wiley & Sons.
 47. Jung, I., Choi, S., Lim, C., & Leem, J. (2002). Effects of different types of interaction on learning achievement, satisfaction and participation in web-based instruction. *Innovations in education and teaching international*, 39(2), 153-162.
 48. Kashyap A. (2016, May 1). Online platform for teaching learning. *The Hindu*, p.05.
 49. Kataoka, K. (2000). Computers for English Language Learning in Japanese Schools.
 50. Keeling, R. (2006). The Bologna Process and the Lisbon Research Agenda: the European Commission's expanding role in higher education discourse. *European journal of education*, 41(2), 203-223.
 51. King, W. R., & He, J. (2006). A meta-analysis of the technology acceptance model. *Information & management*, 43(6), 740-755.
 52. Kim, Y. J., Chun, J. U., & Song, J. (2009). Investigating the role of attitude in technology acceptance from an attitude strength perspective. *International Journal of Information Management*, 29(1), 67-77.
 53. Kim, S. W. (2016). MOOCs in Higher Education. In *Virtual Learning*. InTech.
 54. Kumar, K. L. (1996). *Educational technology*. New Age International.
 55. Lai, C., & Gu, M. (2011). Self-regulated out-of-class language learning with technology. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 24(4), 317-335.

56. Lawan, A., & Ringim, K. J. (2012). *On the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology: From Users' Perspective of Telecentre in Nigeria*. LAP Lambert Academic Publishing.
57. Lee, S. M., Kim, I., Rhee, S., & Trimi, S. (2006). The role of exogenous factors in technology acceptance: The case of object-oriented technology. *Information & Management, 43*(4), 469-480.
58. Lederer, A. L., Maupin, D. J., Sena, M. P., & Zhuang, Y. (2000). The technology acceptance model and the World Wide Web. *Decision support systems, 29*(3), 269-282.
59. Legris, P., Ingham, J., & Collette, P. (2003). Why do people use information technology? A critical review of the technology acceptance model. *Information & management, 40*(3), 191-204.
60. Ling, L. W., Downe, A. G., Ahmad, W. F. W., & Lai, T. T. (2011, September). Determinants of computer usage among educators: A comparison between the UTAUT and TAM models. In *National Postgraduate Conference (NPC), 2011* (pp. 1-6). IEEE.
61. Li, Y., Qi, J., & Shu, H. (2008). Review of relationships among variables in TAM. *Tsinghua Science & Technology, 13*(3), 273-278.
62. Luan, W. S., & Teo, T. (2011). Student Teachers' Acceptance of Computer Technology. In *Technology Acceptance in Education* (pp. 43-61). Sense Publishers.
63. Lu, Y., Zhou, T., & Wang, B. (2009). Exploring Chinese users' acceptance of instant messaging using the theory of planned behavior, the technology acceptance model, and the flow theory. *Computers in human behavior, 25*(1), 29-39.

64. Macome, E. (2002). *The dynamics of the adoption and use of ICT-based initiatives for development: results of a field study in Mozambique* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pretoria).
65. Ma, W., & Yuen, A. (2011). E-learning system acceptance and usage pattern. In *Technology Acceptance in Education* (pp. 201-216). SensePublishers.
66. Marques, B. P., Villate, J. E., & Carvalho, C. V. (2011, June). Applying the UTAUT model in engineering higher education: Teacher's technology adoption. In *Information Systems and Technologies (CISTI), 2011 6th Iberian Conference on* (pp. 1-6). IEEE.
67. McFarland, D. J., & Hamilton, D. (2006). Adding contextual specificity to the technology acceptance model. *Computers in human behavior*, 22(3), 427-447
68. McGill, T. J., & Klobas, J. E. (2009). A task–technology fit view of learning management system impact. *Computers & Education*, 52(2), 496-508.
69. Milrad, Marcelo, Michele H. Jackson, and Daniel Bergman. "Exploring the potential of mobile services to support learning and communication in university classes." *Wireless and Mobile Technologies in Education, 2005. WMTE 2005. IEEE International Workshop on*. IEEE, 2005
70. Minister for Human Resource Development (1986). *National Policy on education-1986 (1539)*. Chandigarh-2, Haryana: Manager, government of India Text Book Press.
71. Minister for Human Resource Development, (2016). *National Policy on Eductaion 2016*. Retrieved from MHRD website: mhrd.gov.in
72. (2016) *Ministry of Human Resource Development, Govt of India Some Inputs for Draft NEP*. Retrieved from MHRD website: mhrd.gov.in

73. Moran, M., Hawkes, M., & Gayar, O. E. (2010). Tablet personal computer integration in higher education: Applying the unified theory of acceptance and use technology model to understand supporting factors. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 42(1), 79-101.
74. Mun, Y. Y., & Hwang, Y. (2003). Predicting the use of web-based information systems: self-efficacy, enjoyment, learning goal orientation, and the technology acceptance model. *International journal of human-computer studies*, 59(4), 431-449.
75. Nandi K. (2016, May 02). Big history Scholarship: Macquarie University's MOOC courses are a big draw. *The Hindu*, p.04.
76. Odera, F. Y. (2011). Learning English Language by Radio in Primary Schools in Kenya. *Online Submission*.
77. Ojuloge, B., & Awoloye, M. O. (2012). Analysis of Internet diffusion and adoption in selected African countries. *International Journal of Internet of Things*, 1(3), 5-11.
78. Olaniran, B. (2008). Human Computer Interaction and the Best Mix of Face-to-Face and E-Interactions in Educational Settings. In *Handbook of Research on Computer Mediated Communication* (pp. 49-61). IGI Global.
79. Pallant, J. (2001). *SPSS Survival Manual: A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis Using SPSS for Windows (Versions 10 and 11): SPSS Student Version 11.0 for Windows*. Milton Keynes, UK, USA: Open University Press.
80. Pardamean, B., & Susanto, M. (2012). Assessing user acceptance toward blog technology using the UTAUT model. *International journal of mathematics and computers in simulation*, 1(6), 203-212.

81. Park, S. Y. (2009). An analysis of the technology acceptance model in understanding university students' behavioral intention to use e-learning. *Educational technology & society, 12*(3), 150-162.
82. Pawar, B. V. (2001). Web Based School Education In India: Problems, Considerations, Approaches & Important Features Of Web-Based Learning Environment. In *National Seminar on e-learning and e-learning Technologies, Hyderabad, August* (pp. 7-8).
83. Premkumar, G., & Bhattacharjee, A. (2008). Explaining information technology usage: A test of competing models. *Omega, 36*(1), 64-75.
84. Ralhan B. (2016, Jul 18) Get the most out of MOOCs. *The Hindu*, p.04.
85. Rauniar, R., Rawski, G., Yang, J., & Johnson, B. (2014). Technology acceptance model (TAM) and social media usage: an empirical study on Facebook. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management, 27*(1), 6-30.
86. Relles, S. R., & Tierney, W. G. (2013). Understanding the writing habits of tomorrow's students: Technology and college readiness. *The Journal of Higher Education, 84*(4), 477-505.
87. Roca, J. C., Chiu, C. M., & Martínez, F. J. (2006). Understanding e-learning continuance intention: An extension of the Technology Acceptance Model. *International Journal of human-computer studies, 64*(8), 683-696.
88. Roca, J. C., & Gagné, M. (2008). Understanding e-learning continuance intention in the workplace: A self-determination theory perspective. *Computers in Human Behavior, 24*(4), 1585-1604.

89. Rubin, B., Fernandes, R., Avgerinou, M. D., & Moore, J. (2010). The effect of learning management systems on student and faculty outcomes. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 13(1), 82-83.
90. Rukmini, S. (2014, Sep 14). The price of learning. *The Hindu*, p. 07.
91. Rukmini, S. (2015, Aug 04). Biggest jump in tech qualifications: booming numbers. *The Hindu*, p. 11.
92. Sarica, G. N., & Cavus, N. (2009). New trends in 21st century English learning. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1(1), 439-445.
93. Seidman, I. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. Teachers college press.
94. Scott, C. R., & Rockwell, S. C. (1997). The effect of communication, writing, and technology apprehension on likelihood to use new communication technologies. *Communication education*, 46(1), 44-62.
95. Shanmugham A. (2016, Jul 11) Bridging the gap: Is employability proportionate to the number of engineering graduates that we produce every year?
96. Shroff, R. H., Deneen, C. C., & Ng, E. M. (2011). Analysis of the technology acceptance model in examining students' behavioural intention to use an e-portfolio system. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 27(4).
97. Singh, A. (1992) *National Policy on education (with modifications undertaken in 1992)* Retrieved from MHRD website: mhrd.gov.in
98. Singh, K. (2007). *Quantitative social research methods*. Sage publications.
99. Smarkola, C. (2011). A mixed-methodological technology adoption study. In *Technology Acceptance in Education* (pp. 9-41). Sense Publishers.

100. Simon, M. K., & Goes, J. (2013). Scope, limitations, and delimitations. Retrieved from <http://dissertationrecipes.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/limitationsscopedelimitation1.pdf>
101. Rogers, E. M. (2003). Diffusion of innovations, edn. *Free Pres., New York*.
102. Smith, A. M. (2012). Research Methodology: A Step-by-step Guide for Beginners.
103. Solomon, P., Baptiste, S., Hall, P., Luke, R., Orchard, C., Rukholm, E. & Damiani-Taraba, G. (2010). Students' perceptions of inter professional learning through facilitated online learning modules. *Medical teacher*.
104. Special correspondent (2016, Feb. 24). Students to take digital literacy to the masses. *The Hindu*, p.06).
105. Sykorova, J. (2015). Outputs of Interactive Exploration and Project-based Teaching at Mendel University in Brno, Czech Republic. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 174, 3224-3227.
106. Tabachnick, B. G., Fidell, L. S., & Osterlind, S. J. (2001). Using multivariate statistics.
107. Tanyeli, N. (2009). The efficiency of online English language instruction on students' reading skills. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1(1), 564-567.
108. Tan, P. J. B. (2013). Students' adoptions and attitudes towards electronic placement tests: A UTAUT analysis. *American Journal of Computer Technology and Application*, 1(1), 14-23.
109. Taylor, S., & Todd, P. A. (1995). Understanding information technology usage: A test of competing models. *Information systems research*, 6(2), 144-176.

110. Theodorakis, Y. (1994). Planned behavior, attitude strength, role identity, and the prediction of exercise behavior. *The Sport Psychologist*, 8(2), 149-165.
111. Tyagi, S. (2012). Adoption of Web 2.0 technology in higher education: A case study of universities in National Capital Region, India. *International Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication Technology*, 8(2), 28.
112. Van Biljon, J., & Kotzé, P. (2007, October). Modelling the factors that influence mobile phone adoption. In *Proceedings of the 2007 annual research conference of the South African institute of computer scientists and information technologists on IT research in developing countries* (pp. 152-161). ACM.
113. Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., & Ackerman, P. L. (2000). A longitudinal field investigation of gender differences in individual technology adoption decision-making processes. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 83(1), 33-60.
114. Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *MIS quarterly*, 425-478.
115. Venkatesh, V., & Davis, F. D. (2000). A theoretical extension of the technology acceptance model: Four longitudinal field studies. *Management science*, 46(2), 186-204.
116. Vanderlinde, R., & van Braak, J. (2010). The gap between educational research and practice: views of teachers, school leaders, intermediaries and researchers. *British Educational Research Journal*, 36(2), 299-316.
117. Venkatesh, V., & Bala, H. (2008). Technology acceptance model 3 and a research agenda on interventions. *Decision sciences*, 39(2), 273-315.

118. Waldeck, J. H., & Dougherty, K. (2012). Collaborative communication technologies and learning in college courses: which are used, for what purposes, and to what ends? *Learning, Media and Technology*, 37(4), 355-378.
119. Wang, D. (2012). Self-directed English language learning through watching English television drama in China. *Changing English*, 19(3), 339-348.
120. Williams, M. D., Rana, N. P., Dwivedi, Y. K., & Lal, B. (2011, June). Is UTAUT really used or just cited for the sake of it? a systematic review of citations of UTAUT's originating article in *ECIS*.
121. Watty, K., McKay, J., & Ngo, L. (2016). Innovators or inhibitors? Accounting faculty resistance to new educational technologies in higher education. *Journal of Accounting Education*.
122. Wu, L., & Chen, J. L. (2005). An extension of trust and TAM model with TPB in the initial adoption of on-line tax: an empirical study. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 62(6), 784-808.
123. Yang, H. D., & Yoo, Y. (2004). It's all about attitude: revisiting the technology acceptance model. *Decision Support Systems*, 38(1), 19-31.