

technologically supported education creates greater initial costs, alongside with uncertain outcomes (Bown, 2013).

Despite the divided opinions, it can be concluded that the decision to move education to the domain of Cloud computing/services still depends on individual preferences and numerous contextual factors, especially in the developing regions (countries), where a noticeable digital divide is still present.

Due to the conducted statistical analysis through the pilot study realized at the University of Montenegro (UoM) and Mediterranean University (MU), it can be concluded:

(a) There is a **strong positive correlation** between the dependent variable *intention to adopt Cloud services in higher education*, and the following independent variables:

- Actual use of Cloud services (0.759);
- Organizational attribute: younger users (0.694);
- Usage factors: easy to use, easy to create new content and self-evaluation possibilities (0.648);
- Technical factor: data security (0.633);
- Organizational attribute: organizational culture (0.582);
- Innovation factors: compatibility with previous systems, advantages in comparison to previous systems and measurability of obtained results (0.476).

(b) On the other hand, there is a **strong negative correlation** between the dependent variable *intention to adopt Cloud services in higher education*, and the following independent variables:

- Organizational attribute: small organization (-0.602);
- Technological factor: technology obsolescence risk (-0.570);
- Economic factor: unpredictable return of investments (-0.483).

Further research work should be done to develop efficient approaches for the assessment of real needs, when it comes to providing access, adopting and deploying new ICT solutions for generating and distributing (new) knowledge. In other words, solutions that suit the individual needs and abilities of diverse educational entities should be sought in the regions (countries) with different geo-locations. The multidimensional nature of accepting ICT innovations brings with it different levels of acceptance, which cannot be explained exclusively by economic and technological factors, but must inevitably involve socio-cultural factors, as well. In developing countries these factors are significantly different from those in (highly) developed countries.

## References

- Borgia, E. (2014). The Internet of Things vision: Key features, applications and open issues. *Computer Communications*, 54, 1–31.
- Bowen, W.G. (2013). Higher Education in the Digital Age. Princeton University Press: Princeton.
- Coakes, S.J. (2013). SPSS 20.0 for Windows – Analysis without Anguish, Wiley Publishing, Inc.
- Coolican, H. (2014). Research methods and statistics in psychology. Psychology press.
- Cruz-Jesus, F., et al. (2016). The education-related digital divide: An analysis for the EU-28. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 56, 72–82.
- Davis, F.D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived easy of use, and user acceptance of computer technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13 (3), 319–339.
- Ellucian (2016). The Cloud: a smart move for higher education. Retrived 20/7/2016, from <http://www.ellucian.com/Insights/The-Cloud--A-Smart-Move-for-Higher-Education/>
- Epstein, D. et al. (2014). Not by technology alone: the “analog” aspects of online public engagement in policymaking. *Government Information Quarterly*, 31 (2), 337–344.
- Fleisch, E., Weinberger, M, and Wortmann, F. (2014), Geschäftsmodelle im Internet der Dinge, HMD Praxis der Wirtschaftsinformatik, 51(6), pp. 812–826.
- Fleisch E. (2010), What is the Internet of Things? An Economic Perspective. Auto-ID Labs White Paper, University of St. Gallen.
- Galliers, R.D., & Currie, W.L. (2011). The Oxford Handbook of Management Information Systems – Critical Perspectives and New Directions. Oxford University Press Inc.: NY (USA).
- Gliem, J.A., & Gliem, R.R. (2003). Calculating, interpreting, and reporting Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for Likert-type scale. Midwest research-to-practice conference in adult, continuing, and community education.
- Gunkel, D.J. (2003). Second thoughts: toward a critique of the digital divide. *New Media & Society*, 5 (4), 641–654.
- Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., Anderson, R. (2010). Multivariate data analysis (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Howard, P.E.N. et al. (2001). Days and nights on internet: the impact of diffusing technology. *American Behavioral Science*, 45 (3), 383–404.
- Humphrey, M.S. et al. (2016). Conceptualizing a model for adoption of cloud computing in education. *International Journal of Information Management*, 36, 183–191.
- Kshetri, N. (2010). Cloud computing in developing economies: drivers, effects, and policy measures. *Proceedings of PTC*.
- Lyell, J. (2016). 3 Ways to Bridge Digital Divide – Access to the Internet is still Uneven. *IEEE Spectrum*, June, 7–8.
- Novo-Corti, I., & Barreiro-Gen, M. (2015). Public policies based on social networks for introduction of technology at home: demographic and socioeconomic profiles of households. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 51(part B), 1216–1228.
- OECD (2011). Guide to measuring the information society 2011. Paris: OECD publishing.

- Pallant, J.F. (2011), *SPSS Survival Manual: A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis Using SPSS*. Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Peng, G. et al. (2011). Impact of network effects and diffusion channels on home computer adaption. *Decision Support Systems*, 52 (3), 384–393.
- Pepper, R. (2015). As two digital divides close, a new one threatens, Huff Post. Retrived 19/7/2016, from <http://blogs.cisco.com/gov/as-two-digital-divides-close-a-new-one-threatens>
- Rogers, E.M. (2003). *Diffusion of Innovations* (5<sup>th</sup> Ed.). New York, NY: The Free Press.
- SUK&IB – Salesforce UK & Ireland Blog (2015). Why Move to the Cloud? 10 Benefits of Cloud Computing. Retrived 20/7/2016, from [www.salesforce.com/uk/blog/2015/11/why-move-to-the-cloud-10-benefits-of-cloud-computing.html](http://www.salesforce.com/uk/blog/2015/11/why-move-to-the-cloud-10-benefits-of-cloud-computing.html)
- Tengtrakul, P., & Peha, J.M. (2013). Does ICT in schools affect residential adoption and adult utilization outside schools? *Telecommunications Policy*, 37 (6–7), 540–562.
- THP – The Huffington Post (2016). The Connected School: How IoT Could Impact Education. Retrived 18/7/2016, from [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jeanette-cajide/the-connected-school-how-\\_b\\_8521612.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jeanette-cajide/the-connected-school-how-_b_8521612.html)
- Tichenor, P.J. et al. (1970). Mass media flow and differential growth in knowledge. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 34 (2), 159–170.
- USDC – US Department of Commerce (2002). A nation online: How Americans are expanding their use of internet. Washington, D.C.: US Department of Commerce – Economics and Statistics Administration.
- Vicente, M.R., & Lopez, A.J. (2006). Patterns of ICT diffusion across the European Union. *Economic Letters*, 93 (1), 45–51.
- Weinberger M., Bilgeri D., and Fleisch E., IoT business models in an industrial context (IoT Geschäftsmodelle im Industrie Kontext), *Automatisierungstechnik* 2016; 64(9), pp. 699–706.
- WSIS (2003). World summit on the information society: declaration of principles. Paper presented at the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS), Geneva. Retrived 11/7/2016, from [http://www.itu.int/net/wsis/documents/doc\\_multi.asp?lang=en&id=2266](http://www.itu.int/net/wsis/documents/doc_multi.asp?lang=en&id=2266)
- Wu, T.-F. et al. (2014). Is digital divide an issue for students with learning disabilities? *Computers in Human Behavior*, 39, 112–117.