



American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation (AJMRI)

ISSN: 2158-8155 (Online), 2832-4854 (Print)

VOLUME 3 ISSUE 4 (2024)



PUBLISHED BY: E-PALLI PUBLISHERS, DELAWARE, USA

Technology Acceptance among College Students Living in Remote Areas

Queen Karezza L. Albofera¹, Dayanara A. Digan¹, Jenny Rose Torres¹, Rodeth Jane C. Quezada²

Article Information

Received: June 20, 2024

Accepted: July 27, 2024

Published: July 31, 2024

Keywords

*Perceived Usefulness (PU),
Perceived Ease-of-Use (PEU),
User Satisfaction (US),
Attribute of Usability (AU)*

ABSTRACT

The extent to which students adopt technology in their learning process has long been the focus of research. This study aimed to determine the level of technology acceptance and the differences in the level of learning style analyzed by sex, age, marital status, and year level. The participants of this study are 205 college students officially enrolled in the School Year 2021- 2022. This study used the adopted survey questions by Davis (1989). Frequency, mean, and Pearson-r were used as statistical treatment of data. Results showed that the overall level of technology acceptance of the respondents was high that the level of technology acceptance among college students, as grouped by sex and across ages, shows no significant difference. However, in terms of year level and program, third-year college students got the highest level of technological acceptance. Among all the indicators, Perceived ease-of-use (PEU) obtained the lowest mean score. With this, the researchers recommend conducting a seminar entitled “Blended Learning: The Emerging Technologies” for students to be able to know the significance of technology and to continue embracing technological advancement, especially during this time of the pandemic.

INTRODUCTION

The advancement of internet technology and new methods of sharing information has contributed to the emergence of various online learning scenarios. However, it is much harder to design an online environment for fundamental work in technology fields where students have to do hands-on exercises and work in labs as part of a course learning process (Estriegana & Barchino, 2021). The apparent COVID-19 pandemic and government ban have forced some countries to switch from face-to-face classes to online models to enable higher education for students. The factors influencing students' use and acceptance of emergency online learning are diverse and have been investigated using technology use and acceptance models. However, this cross-sectional study presents current emergencies, and students investigate the factors specific to the use and acceptance of emergency online learning (Hermida & Garza, 2021).

The technology acceptance model (TAM) was designed based on the literature review; this model aims to evaluate and investigate the usability test for Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, User Satisfaction, and Attribute of usability. TAM adapts the Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA) to the field. It posits that perceived Usefulness and ease of use determine an individual's intention to use a system to mediate actual system use. Perceived Usefulness is also seen as being directly impacted by perceived ease of use (Gefen & Larsen, 2017). Over the past two decades, technology-enhanced character education has been widely promoted and used sparingly (Deifell & Angus, 2021). Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, all educational institutions worldwide have been closed, and education delivery has now shifted to an “online-only” monopoly

model. In this regard, the perceived usability of current e-learning platforms is essential, especially in the absence of physical classrooms (Pal & Vanija, 2020).

Aburagaga and Agoyoyi (2020) recently introduced teaching technology to include online, remote, and flexible learning for some institutions to respond strategically to the growing demand for access to higher education. The significant investment in online education platforms, technologies, and infrastructure facilities makes it difficult for many developing countries to implement online learning approaches. Collectively called Emergency Distance Education (ERE), a temporary change in the delivery of guidance caused by the outbreak of a crisis. Establishing ERE does not leave traditional placement of the educational process or a creation of an entirely new educational system. It provides a temporary viable alternative for educators to conduct classes and provide students with the necessary classroom support (Hodges *et al.*, 2020).

In the Philippines, distance learning shows the digital divide among Filipino students (Santos, 2020). This current situation in distance education is likely exacerbating existing inequality; it created barriers to online learning. Data gathered in a national cross-sectional study resulted in twenty-two percent (22%) and thirty-two percent (32%) of 3,670 Filipino medical students surveyed having difficulty adapting to new learning styles and the lack of reliable internet access (Baticulon *et al.*, 2020). For some students, purchasing a learning device that makes it easy to log into online courses and return homework instantly to the online system can be challenging. Despite efforts to make education accessible to all, many challenges face Philippine university students in distance learning Mateo (2020).

¹ Faculty of the Department of Teacher Education UM Digos College, Digos City, Philippines

² University Of Mindanao Digos College, Philippines

* Corresponding author's e-mail: karezzaalbofera@gmail.com

Technology acceptance model (TAM) is an information system theory that describes how consumers come to accept the use of technology, according to Davis's (1989) idea of TAM. According to the model, a number of factors influence users' decisions about when and how to employ new technology when it is provided to them. User satisfaction, perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and usability attribute are these criteria. Furthermore, Emaeilzadeh (2016) asserts that users encompass roles other than that of technology users, such as citizens and customers. Therefore, the distinct qualities of IT users influence their adoption behavior, and the TAM model is not always the best model to describe user acceptance. According to Lim (2018), there are situations where the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) is too general and trivializes social and self-regulatory components of user behavior, changes in the socioeconomic environment, and the proliferation of technology. As a result, the TAM is not useful. Therefore, in order to examine user acceptability and the proliferation of mobile banking, Khan and Mir (2016) focused on user acceptance utilizing the diffusion innovation theory framework, TAM drivers, and internal and external factors.

This study was conducted over Davao Del Sur, Davao Occidental, via a Google form. The respondents of this study are college students living in remote areas. This study aimed to determine if they accept the technology in their areas despite having no internet connections due to limited access to internet connectivity in their location. Hence, according to the result, the data revealed that college students living in remote areas, even though they are no internet connection, can use their mobile phones by going to rural areas to have access to the signal or the internet connection.

Therefore, school administrators may find the study's conclusions useful as a reference when evaluating their learning environment and how they support students' and teachers' usage of technology in mobile learning. Additionally, it can help teachers focus on the outcomes of their students, such their academic achievements. With the aid of technology, a teacher could help a pupil develop a more optimistic view and successful learning process. Lastly, I am able to assist not just upcoming researchers but also stakeholders in education at all levels. Future scholars, educators, and students/pupils should therefore be aware of the acceptability of and strategies for using technology effectively.

Research Objectives

This study aimed to determine technology acceptance among college students living in remote areas. It sought to answer the following:

1. To identify the profile of the respondents in terms of:
 - 1.1 Sex;
 - 1.2 Age;
 - 1.3 Marital status; and 1.4-year level.
2. To determine the level of technology acceptance among college students in terms of:
 - 2.1 Perceived Usefulness (PU);
 - 2.2 Perceived Ease-of-Use (PEU);
 - 2.3 User Satisfaction (US); and
 - 2.4 Attribute of Usability (AU).
3. To determine if there is a significant difference in the technology acceptance among college students living in a remote area when grouped according to profile.

METHODOLOGY

Respondents

The target respondents of this study were college student's from 1st Year to 4th Year level enrolled in the School Year of 2021 – 2022. Using stratified random sampling, the respondents were randomly selected from various programs, year level, age, and marital status. The distribution was based on the proportion of students enrolled in the specified school year. The respondents included in this survey are only those students who consent to participate in the data gathering.

In choosing the research participant's of this study, the following inclusion criteria were strictly followed: (1) the students are officially enrolled in the UM Digos College for the AY 2021 – 2022, (2) students come from any department of UM Digos College, (3) students either; first, second, third, or fourth-year students living in remote areas. Moreover, the withdrawal criteria are the following; (1) unwillingness to participate in the study, (2) unstable internet connection, (3) if the respondents answer no from the Google form that the researchers sent.

Instruments

The instruments were composed of two parts. Part 1 dealt with the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of their sex, age, marital status, and year level. Part 2 dealt with technology acceptance among college students, which has four indicators; perceived Usefulness (PU), perceived ease-of-use (PEU), user satisfaction (US), and attribute of usability (AU). The second part was a 22-item questionnaire from Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) by Davis (1989) and modified by Nair and Das (2011). Hence, the researchers did not conduct the reliability test.

In this study, the researchers used a 5-Likert scale to interpret the students' responses to the level of technology acceptance. The scale below was used to analyze the data.

Table

Scale	Range of Means	Descriptive Levels	Interpretation
5	4.20 – 5.00	Very High	The respondents' level of technology acceptance is always practiced.

4	3.40 – 4.19	High	The respondents' level of technology acceptance is oftentimes practiced.
3	2.60 – 3.39	Moderate	The respondents' level of technology acceptance is sometimes practiced.
2	1.80 – 2.59	Low	The respondents' level of technology acceptance is seldom practiced.
1	1.00 – 1.79	Very Low	The respondents' level of technology acceptance is never practiced.

Design and Procedure

In this study, the descriptive-comparative design was used. As explained by Calderon (2006, as cited by Rillo & Alieto, 2018), descriptive research is collecting, examining, categorizing, and organizing statistics regarding existing situations, practices, procedures, trends, and cause-effect associations. It also made appropriate and precise explanations of such information with, without, or sometimes with minimal statistical procedures.

To determine the sources of technology acceptance among college students, the researchers strictly observed and followed these steps to gather data. First, the researchers wrote a letter for authorization from the Vice-President Branch Operations of UM Digos to allow the researcher to conduct the student in the school. Second, upon approval, the researchers create a Google Form for them to start a survey about the study. Third, after making the said Google Form, the link has been created, and they send it to their random respondents to answer the survey. Fourth, after answering those respondents, the researchers collect the result and tallied them. Lastly, after the results were tallied, the researchers sent them to their statistician. After tabulation, the data were analyzed and interpreted using the mean, frequency, independent sample, t-test, and ANOVA Lariosa, *et al.*, (2023).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Profile of the Respondents

Table 1 shows the distribution of the participants in the study in terms of sex, age, marital status, and year level. A total of 205 respondents voluntarily expressed their intention to participate in the study.

Sex

The table shows that out of 205 or 100% of respondents of the study, 54 are male, approximately 26.3%, and 151 are female, which is approximately 73.7% of the total respondents. Therefore, this study implies that females dominate the respondents, and Males got the lowest frequency in the study.

Age

The table revealed that ages 17-20 years old got a frequency of 27, which is approximately 13.2%; ages 21-23 years old got a frequency of 159, which is approximately 77.6%; and 24 years old and above got a frequency of 19 approximately 9.3%. Therefore, this implies that in terms of the age range of the respondents are dominated by 21-23 years old got the highest frequency while 17-20 years old and 24 years old above got the lowest frequency.

Table 1: Characteristics of 205 students included in the study

Profile	f	%
Sex		
Male	54	26.3
Female	151	73.7
Age		
17-20 years old	27	13.2
21-23 years old	159	77.6
24 and above	19	9.3
Marital Status		
Single	197	96.1
Married	7	3.4
Widowed	1	.5
Year Level		
First Year	7	3.4
Second Year	6	2.9
Third Year	162	79.0
Fourth Year	30	14.6

Marital Status

The table reveals that out of 205 respondents, 197 belong to single status, 7 are happily married, while the remaining 1 is widowed. Therefore, the results revealed in terms of marital status is dominated by single, with approximately 96.1% of the overall study.

Year Level

The table shows the respondents in terms of the year level; in the first year, there are 7, which is approximately 3.4%, second year, with a frequency of 6, which is approximately 2.9%; in the third year, there are 167 which is approximately 79.0%, and in the fourth year there are 30 which approximately 14.6%. Therefore, in terms of the year level, the results revealed that the third-year level got the highest frequency while the second- year, first-year, and fourth-year got the lowest frequency.

Students' Level of Technology Acceptance

Table 2 presents the level of technology acceptance among college students in terms of Perceived Usefulness (PU) got a mean score of 4.29, Perceived Ease-of-Use (PEU) with a mean score of 4.11, User Satisfaction (US) got a mean score of 4.18 and Attribute of Usability (AU) got a mean score of 4.14. The overall mean score of the four indicators is 4.18 (SD=0.369). Therefore, the four indicators are being measured by the student's level in technology acceptance.

Perceived Usefulness (PU)

As shown in Table 2, the level of technology acceptance in terms of Perceived Usefulness (PU) obtained a mean score of 4.29 (SD=0.555). It signifies that the respondent’s level of technology acceptance are very high.

Perceived Usefulness is “the degree to which a person believes that using a particular system will increase his or her job performance” (Davis, 1989). In previous studies, perceived usefulness is a strong and direct determinant of continuance usage intentions (Mouakket, 2015; Wu & Chen, 2017). It also has a positive influence on users’ satisfaction. Such association is found in different studies like e-learning systems, Electronic textbooks, mobile banking (Yuan *et al.*, 2016), and mobile commerce (Luqman *et al.*, 2016). For instance, Alrajawy *et al.* (2017) explored the facets that impact the intention to use and found that perceived Usefulness significantly differed in the intention to use online learning in Yemen.

Perceived Ease-of-Use (PEU)

As shown in the Table 2, the Students’ level of technology acceptance of respondents in terms of Perceived Ease-of- Use (PEU) obtained a mean of 4.11 (SD=0.467) as agree. It signifies that the respondents’ level of technology acceptance was high. Moreover, it is believed that the extent to which an individual perceives that utilizing a particular system will be effortless.

Table 2: Students’ level of technology acceptance, n = 205

Indicators	\bar{x}	SD
Perceived Usefulness (PU)	4.29	0.555
Perceived Ease-of-Use (PEU)	4.11	0.467
User Satisfaction (US)	4.18	0.398
Attribute of Usability (AU)	4.14	0.422
Overall	4.18	0.369

The perceived ease of use of a technological system and its presentation is related to its accessibility. Users’ perceived ease of use is one of the most important criteria in their acceptance of a technology, according to Davis’s (1986) Technology Acceptance Model (TAM). According to Davis (1989), ease of use refers to how much users believe a system will save them time and effort. Stated differently, users are more likely to use a system if they perceive it to be user-friendly. The fundamental presumptions of the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) state that a person’s acceptance of technology acts as a mediator in how they utilize it (Jones & Kauppi, 2018). The e-Filing system’s performance risk is influenced by perceived simplicity of use. Performance hazards will be reduced with a simpler e-Filing system. Perceived simplicity of use has an impact on the intention to utilize the system, according to certain studies (Novindra & Rasmini, 2017; Riyadh *et al.*, 2016; Zaidi *et al.*, 2017).

PEU is a crucial component in analyzing and evaluating user acceptability of innovative technologies, claim

Shahrabi *et al.* (2016).

PEU increases the likelihood that a user will approve a technology if they believe it to be more convenient to use than another, according to a study by Moslehpour *et al.* (2018). Thus, the more straightforward a technical. The more appealing an application is, the more probable it is that users will use it (Moslehpour *et al.*, 2018). The degree of experience a user has greatly influences how user-friendly a system is. According to Caffaro *et al.* (2018), people who are new to or inexperienced with new technology are more likely to experience issues engaging with it and to report it. Consequently, the effect that experience may have on the homogeneity of the sample population is taken into account in an efficient research design.

User Satisfaction (US)

As shown in Table 2, the level of technology acceptance of the respondents in terms of User Satisfaction (US) obtained a mean score of 4.14 (SD=0.398). It signifies s that the respondents’ level of technology acceptance was high. Moreover, it is believed that users get satisfied with using technology daily as a mode of communication, business transactions, and even online classes.

In ECM, one of the key ideas is satisfaction. In the research (Ouyang *et al.*, 2017). Users’ decision to continue using IS is influenced by their perception of usefulness and contentment with prior experiences, according to the ECM. Previous research has confirmed the association between consumers’ satisfaction and their intention to continue using a service (Lee, 2010; Alraimi K. *et al.*, 2016).

Attribute of Usability (AU)

As shown in Table 2, the level of technology acceptance of the respondents in terms of Attribute of Usability (AU) obtained a mean of 4.14 (SD=0.422). It signifies s that the respondent’s level of technology acceptance was high. Moreover, it is believed that how students use technology significantly impacts their behavioral use of technology. Dobozy and Reynolds (2016) assert that one of the key features of an LMS that draws users in is its usability. A key factor in the success of classroom technology is the attitudes of students regarding its use. Sheingold and Hadley (1990) conducted research on how educators used computer software in the classroom. Word processing software, educational software, analytical and informational tools, operating systems and programming, games and simulations, graphics and operating tools, and word processing software were among the technologies examined. It was shown that, if teachers are given the time and support to become knowledgeable about the technology, their attitudes toward computers and instructional software can have a considerable impact on their pupils’ attitudes toward the same. Even after many years, the attitudes of instructors continue to be crucial for integrating technology into the classroom (Demetriadis, *et al.*, 2016).

Significant Difference in the Level of Technology Acceptance among College Students as Analyzed by Sex

Table 3 shows the independent samples t-test comparing the differences in the responses in terms of sex. The result shows that there are no significant differences between male (mean = 4.19, SD = 0.408) and female (mean = 4.18, SD = 0.355) students' level of technology acceptance, $t(205) = .212$, $p = .833$. This indicates that

both sexes have almost similar levels of technological acceptance.

Furthermore, when it came to students' learning satisfaction with regard to accepting technology, there were no appreciable gender disparities (Harvey *et al.*, 2017). Popovich *et al.* (2008, quoted by Othman & Al Othman, 2016) looked at college students' opinions about technology.

Table 3: Independent samples t-test results showing the differences on students' level of technology acceptance when analyzed by sex

Indicators	Group	n	\bar{x}	SD	t	p
Perceived Usefulness (PU)	Male	54	4.24	0.552	-.823	.412
	Female	151	4.31	0.557		
Perceived Ease-of-Use (PEU)	Male	54	4.12	0.470	.182	.856
	Female	151	4.10	0.468		
User Satisfaction (US)	Male	54	4.23	0.486	.977	.332
	Female	151	4.16	0.362		
Attribute of Usability (AU)	Male	54	4.17	0.450	.565	.573
	Female	151	4.13	0.413		
Overall	Male	54	4.19	0.408	.212	.833
	Female	151	4.18	0.355		

* $p < 0.05$

They discovered the opinions of those men and women regarding technology. Gender differences in technological adoption characteristics were found to be minimal or nonexistent in other studies (Teo *et al.*, 2015 & Whitley, 1997, as mentioned by Hanham, 2021). The results showed that neither ethnic nor gender groups significantly differed in their adoption of technology. This study contributes to our understanding of how different racial and gender groups perceive new information technology, which will benefit organizations trying to leverage their technology investment through knowledge sharing and developed communications that reduce user anxiety.

Significant Difference in the Level of Technology Acceptance among College Students as Analyzed by Age

Table 4 shows that there is no significant difference in

UM Digos College student's technological acceptance in terms of age, $F(2,201) = 2.080$, $p = .128$. This indicates that the students, regardless of age, have similar levels of technological acceptance. Hence, the result fails to reject the null hypothesis. It implies that similar levels of technical competence are observed over the years. Further investigations have demonstrated the beneficial effects of an age-related component in learning software programs (Morris *et al.*, 2005, as quoted by Venkatesh *et al.*, 2018). Furthermore, a study by Wang *et al.* (2009)-cited by Terblanche & Kidd (2022)-found no evidence of a significant age difference in the relationship between performance expectancy and the perceived ease of use of an online learning system. Age did not significantly affect P.U.'s relationship to join in online communities, according to research by Chung *et al.* (2010), as reported by Shin *et al.* (2022).

Table 4: Summary of ANOVA for differences on students' level of technology acceptance when analyzed by age

Indicators		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Perceived Usefulness (PU)	Between Groups	.533	2	.267	.864	.423
	Within Groups	62.378	202	.309		
	Total	62.911	204			
Perceived Ease-of-Use (PEU)	Between Groups	1.201	2	.600	2.795	.063
	Within Groups	43.383	202	.215		
	Total	44.583	204			
User Satisfaction (US)	Between Groups	.683	2	.341	2.179	.116
	Within Groups	31.654	202	.157		
	Total	32.337	204			

Attribute of Usability (AU)	Between Groups	.858	2	.429	2.437	.090
	Within Groups	35.543	202	.176		
	Total	36.401	204			
Overall	Between Groups	.560	2	.280	2.080	.128
	Within Groups	27.198	202	.135		
	Total	27.758	204			

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$

Furthermore, with respect to age-related variations in perceived quality, younger individuals (i.e., those between the ages of 19 and 25) should be more appreciative of the features, functionalities, and designs of websites. 19 to 25 year olds are therefore more likely to be tech aware. Younger adults are also anticipated to view online platforms as more user-friendly since they are more accustomed to and connected with the new communication technologies (Chung *et al.*, 2010, as quoted by Shin *et al.*, 2022).

Significant Difference in the Level of Technology Acceptance among College Students as Analyzed by Year Level

Table 5 shows that there is no significant difference in UM Digos College students' technological acceptance in terms of year level, $F(3,200) = 1.907$, $p = .130$. This indicates that the students, regardless of year level, have similar levels of technological acceptance. The table shows first-year students have the lowest mean rank, followed by second-year, fourth-year, and third-year. It

is true of the indicators of perceived Usefulness, user satisfaction, attribute of usability, and overall technology acceptance of the students. It may mean that third-year student's have the highest level of technology acceptance compared to the other year levels among year levels because technology influences their academic activities in their classes since they were exposed to technology even before the pandemic. Note that these differences are also significantly found in the specified indicators.

According to Inozu *et al.* (2010, quoted by Dincer, 2020), undergraduate college students utilize technology, but they could use it more wisely. These results demonstrated that student motivation to learn depends critically on the external computing environment (Chen, 2020). The aforementioned findings suggest that learners' attitudes and motivation towards computer-based self-directed learning are influenced by their perception of the benefits they receive from technology use. It's probably because the growing technological modernism in the educational scene presents challenges for them (Lai *et al.*, 2016).

Table 5: Summary of ANOVA for differences on students' level of technology acceptance when analyzed by year level

Indicators		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Perceived Usefulness (PU)	Between Groups	.796	3	.265	.858	.464
	Within Groups	62.116	201	.309		
	Total	62.911	204			
Perceived Ease-of-Use (PEU)	Between Groups	.737	3	.246	1.126	.339
	Within Groups	43.846	201	.218		
	Total	44.583	204			
User Satisfaction (US)	Between Groups	.834	3	.278	1.775	.153
	Within Groups	31.502	201	.157		
	Total	32.337	204			
Attribute of Usability (AU)	Between Groups	1.032	3	.344	1.954	.122
	Within Groups	35.369	201	.176		
	Total	36.401	204			
Overall	Between Groups	.768	3	.256	1.907	.130
	Within Groups	26.989	201	.134		
	Total	27.758	204			

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$

CONCLUSION

According to the data, there is no discernible variation in the degree of technological adoption between males

and girls or between different age groups based on sex. It simply means that students accepted technology at the same rate regardless of their age or gender. Furthermore,

students utilized technology for online learning in the same way across all age groups and genders. Moreover, the results indicate a noteworthy distinction in the degree of technology use according to marital status and year level. In terms of year level, third-year students were more accepting of technology than fourth-year students. It suggests that the switch from in-person instruction to online learning happened earliest for third-year students. Fourth-year students, on the other hand, received the lowest degree of technological acceptability, indicating that they were still acclimating to the online learning environment. Finally, about the status of marriage, students who were married scored the lowest. It shows that the married students had a stronger interest in technology. Married students, on the other hand, had the lowest level of acceptance of technology since they were more likely to pursue their academic goals and their families while attending classes on campus.

RECOMMENDATIONS

After the researchers endeavor to gather data, collate, interpret, and draw conclusions, they develop the following recommendations. Among all the indicators, Perceived Ease-of-Use (PEU) obtained the lowest mean score; the researchers recommend conducting a seminar

entitled “Blended Learning: The Emerging Technologies” for students to be able to know the significance of technology and to continue embracing technological advancement, especially during this time of the pandemic to be held in UM Digos Campus.

Teachers should increase student understanding of blended learning environments’ advantages, expectations, and demands. Teachers should be required to provide students with accurate and reliable information from various campus sources, so students have well-informed judgments regarding the learning settings most suited to their learning. Additionally, they must encourage students to start their college careers with blended learning skills. Students Pupils might possess the tools and information required to take advantage of online and blended learning opportunities and use school technology to meet their academic goals. All off-campus students ought to be provided with the same information on the benefits, prerequisites, and standards of online or mixed learning environments. Students with poor, moderate, or nonexistent home internet connectivity will benefit from the provision of high-quality networks throughout campus. To help pupils acquire Institutions may also consider collaborating with neighborhood public libraries or other local

Table 6: Proposed Capability Building Action Plan

Goals/ Objectives	Specific Objectives	Strategies/ Activities	Mapped to Dimensions	Time Frame	Budget	Budget Source	Persons Involved	Expected Output
1. Facilitate instruction in the new literacies that have emerged as a result of the digital age	To talk about incorporating multimedia into lessons and presentations.	Seminar on Incorporation of Multimedia into Lessons and Presentations	Dimension 1 (Fundamental Knowledge)	February 23, 2023	c/o UMDC	UMDC	Speaker Resource Participants	Facilitate instruction in the new literacies that have emerged as a result of the digital age
2. Implement the curriculum method and technological strategies	To list the various technological approaches and strategies	Seminar on the Students’ Learning Through Technological Approaches and Strategies	Dimension 2 (Instructional Methods and Strategies)	February 24, 2023	c/o UMDC	UMDC	Speaker Resource Participants	Implement the curriculum method and technological strategies
3. Demonstrate learner mastery of expertise, skills, and digital-age work.	To show mastery of planning and design	Seminar on Planning and Design, as well as an Efficient Digital Environment	Dimension 3 (Management in using technology)	February 25, 2023	c/o UMDC	UMDC	Speaker Resource Participants	Demonstrate learner mastery of expertise, skills, and digital-age work.

Table 7: Proposed Capability Building Series Activity Design

I. Title	Blended Learning: The Emerging Technologies
II. Date And Venue	February 23 – 25, 2023/ UMDC Gymnasium
III. Participants	Teachers, Students, and Administrators
IV. Rationale	Even though the technology is present in almost every aspect of our lives, communities, and homes, most schools lag in incorporating technology into classroom learning. Many schools are only beginning to explore technology's true potential for teaching and learning. In order to integrate technology into classroom instruction, basic computer skills and software programs must be taught in a separate computer class.
V. Objectives	This program aims to: 1. To talk about incorporating multimedia into lessons and presentations. 2. To list the various technological approaches and strategies 3. To show mastery of planning and design
VI. Budgetary Requirements	The UMDC allocation will determine the budget. The institution must ensure budget allocation for the Resource Speaker's Honorarium and Materials and Logistics for the Seminar.

Table 8: Seminar Matrix

Day 1		
Time	Topic/Activities	Responsible Person
8:30 – 9:00 AM	Preliminaries	Event Committee
9:00 – 10:30 AM	Incorporation of Multimedia in Lesson and Presentations	Speaker 1
10:30 – 11:30 AM	Workshop	Speaker 1
11:30 – 12:00 NN	Closing Program	Event Committee
Day 2		
8:30 – 9:00 AM	Preliminaries	Event Committee
9:00 – 10:30 AM	Technological Approaches and Strategies in Students Learning	Speaker 1
10:30 – 11:30 AM	Workshop	Speaker 1
11:30 – 12:00 NN	Closing Program	Event Committee
Day 3		
8:30 – 9:00 AM	Preliminaries	Event Committee
9:00 – 10:30 AM	Planning and Designing and the Effective Digital Environment	Speaker 1
10:30 – 11:30 AM	Workshop	Speaker 1
11:30 – 12:00 NN	Closing Program	Event Committee

REFERENCES

Aburagaga, R., & Agoyoyi, K. (2020). Assessing faculty's use of social network tools in Libyan higher education via a technology acceptance model.

Alraimi, K. (2016). Understanding the MOOCs continuance: The role of openness and reputation. *Computers & Education*, 80, 28–38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2014.08.001>

Alrajawy, I., Norzaidi, M. D., Isaac, O., & Mutahar, A. M. (2017). Examining factors influencing the intention to use mobile learning in Yemen public universities. *Asian Journal of Information Technology*, 16(2), 287–297. <https://doi.org/10.3923/ajit.2017.287.297>

Baticulon, R. E., Alberto, N. R. I., Baron, M. B. C., Mabulay, R. E. C., & Rizada, M. J. (2021). COVID-19 pandemic and the shift to online learning: A survey of medical students' perspectives. *MedRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.12.21255101>

Davis, F. D. (1986). *A technology acceptance model for empirically testing new end-user information systems: Theory and results* (Doctoral dissertation). Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *Management Information Systems Journal*, 13(3), 319–339. <https://doi.org/10.2307/249008>

Deifell, L., & Angus, A. (2021). Chinese character instruction online: A technology acceptance perspective in emergency remote teaching. *Journal of Educational Technology Development and Exchange*, 14(1), 21–35. <https://doi.org/10.18785/jetde.1401.02>

Demetriadis, S. (2016). Cultures in negotiation: Teachers' acceptance/resistance attitudes considering the infusion of technology into schools. *Computers &*

- Education*, 41(1), 19–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2002.12.006>
- Dobozy, E., & Reynolds, P. (2016). From LMS to VLE or from supermarkets to airports: Classifying e-learning platforms using metaphors. In *Refereed proceedings of the fifth annual Learning Activity Management System (LAMS) conference* (pp. 1–10). Sydney, NSW: Macquarie e-Learning Centre of Excellence (MELCEO). <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.27085.81129>
- Emailzadeh, H. A. (2016). Intention to use smartphone through perceived compatibility, perceived usefulness, and perceived ease of use. *Jurnal Dinamika Manajemen*, 7(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jdm.v7i1.5642>
- Estriegana, C., & Barchino, A. (2021). Student acceptance of virtual laboratory and practical work: An extension of the technology acceptance model. *Computers & Education*, 160, 104029. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2020.104029>
- Foroughi, B., Iranmanesh, M., & Hyun, S. S. (2019). Understanding the determinants of mobile banking continuance usage intention. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 32(6), 1015–1033. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEIM-10-2018-0237>
- Gefen, D., & Larsen, K. (2017). Controlling for lexical closeness in survey research: A demonstration on the technology acceptance model. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 18(10), 727–757. <https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00468>
- Hermida, O., & Garza, T. (2021). Comparison of students' use and acceptance of emergency online learning due to COVID-19 in the USA, Mexico, Peru, and Turkey. *Education and Information Technologies*, 26(5), 6235–6256. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10511-2>
- Hodges, C. (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>
- Hsu, C.-L., & Lin, J. C.-C. (2018). Examining social networking O2O apps user loyalty. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 58(1), 73–84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08874417.2018.1535261>
- Jones, A. B., & Kauppi, K. (2018). Examining the antecedents of the technology acceptance model within e-procurement. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 38(1), 22–42. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-03-2016-0150>
- Khan, C. B. A., & Mir, M. (2016). A complex system perspective of technology acceptance and diffusion for mobile banking. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Computational and Business Intelligence (ISCBI)* (pp. 1–5). <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISCBI.2016.7879200>
- L. G. T., Sy, J. J., & Reyes, J. C. B. (2020). Barriers to online learning in the time of COVID-19: A national survey of medical students in the Philippines. *medRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.05.20168566>
- Lee, D., & Lehto, M. (2010). User acceptance of YouTube for procedural learning: An extension of the technology acceptance model. *Computers & Education*, 61(1), 193–208. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2011.01.002>
- Lim, C. P., Tinio, V., Smith, M., & Bhowmik, M. K. (2018). Digital learning for developing Asian countries: Achieving equity, quality, and efficiency in education. In K. J. Kennedy & J. C.-K. Lee (Eds.), *Routledge international handbook of schools and schooling in Asia* (pp. 369–381). Routledge.
- Luqman, A., Razak, R. C., Ismail, M., & Alwi, M. A. M. (2016). The influence of individual characteristics in predicting mobile commerce usage activities' continuance intention. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Business*, 4(2), 54–69. <https://doi.org/10.17687/joeb.0402.07>
- Mateo, J. (2020). As classes open, 'learning crisis' highlighted with millions of students left behind. *The Philippine Star*. <https://www.philstar.com/headlines/2020/08/12/2038932/classes-open-learning-crisis-highlighted-millions-students-left-behind>
- Matimbwa, T., & Annei, S. (2016). Teachers' and students' perceptions of ICT in education: The case of Tanzania. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(27), 115–125. <https://doi.org/10.7176/JEP/7-27-14>
- Mouakket, S. (2015). Factors influencing continuance intention to use social network sites: The Facebook case. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 53(1), 102–110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.06.046>
- Nair, I., & Das, V. M. (2011). Analysis of recent studies undertaken for assessing acceptance of technology among teachers using TAM. *International Journal of Computer Applications*, 32(8), 38–46. <https://doi.org/10.5120/3776-5535>
- Novindra, N. P. B., & Rasmini, N. K. (2017). The influence of ease of use, perceived use, and computer self-efficacy on interest in using e-SPT. *E-Journal of Accounting*, 19(2), 1116–1143. <https://doi.org/10.24843/EJA.2017.v19.i02.p20>
- Ouyang, J., Zhang, J., & Wang, L. (2017). Task technology fit aware expectation confirmation model towards understanding of MOOCs continued usage intention. In *Proceedings of the 50th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences* (pp. 1234–1243). University of Hawaii. <https://doi.org/10.24251/HICSS.2017.227>
- Pal, D., & Vanijja, V. (2020). Perceived usability evaluation of Microsoft Teams as an online learning platform during COVID-19 using system usability scale and technology acceptance model in India. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 119, 105535. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2020.105535>
- Riyadh, H. A., Sukoharsono, E. G., & Baridwan, Z. (2016). E-banking implementation and technology acceptance in the Rafidain and Rasheed banks in Iraq: An employee perspective. *The International Journal of Accounting and Business Society*, 23(2), 87–113. <https://doi.org/10.32890/ijabs.2016.23.2.87>

- Santos, L. M. (2020). The motivation and experience of distance learning engineering programs students: A study of non-traditional, returning, evening, and adult students. *International Journal of Educational Practice*, 8(2), 134–148. <https://doi.org/10.3233/EJP-200302>
- Sheingold, K., & Hadley, M. (1990). *Accomplished teachers: Integrating computers into classroom practice*. New York: Center for Technology in Education/Bank Street College.
- Wu, B., & Chen, X. (2017). Continuance intention to use MOOCs: Integrating the technology acceptance model (TAM) and task technology fit (TTF) model. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 67, 221–232. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.10.011>
- Yamin, M. (2019). Taktik mengembangkan kemampuan individual siswa. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran*, 25(2), 175–185. <https://doi.org/10.54321/jpdp.2019.25.2.175>
- Yuan, S., Liu, Y., Yao, R., & Liu, J. (2016). An investigation of users' continuance intention towards mobile banking in China. *Information Development*, 32(1), 20–34. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266666914550715>
- Zaidi, S. K. R., Henderson, C. D., & Gupta, G. (2017). The moderating effect of culture on e-filing taxes: Evidence from India. *Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies*, 7(1), 134–152. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JAEE-01-2016-0002>