

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

# **Influences on the adoption of mobile technology by students and teachers**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy in Information Systems  
at Massey University, Albany, New Zealand

Kathryn Susan Mac Callum

2011

## ABSTRACT

Technology offers new possibilities to provide effective teaching and learning. One of the most recent technologies that has ignited considerable interest by educators is mobile technology. Mobile technology has been quickly adopted in everyday life, and it is common for most people to have, and carry, a mobile device with them at all times. In addition these mobile devices are becoming more and more powerful and taking over tasks that would normally be done on traditional PCs or laptops (Dawabi, Wessner, & Neuhold, 2004). Researchers have started to explore the way mobile technology can be harnessed in the educational arena (see for example Attewell & Gustafsson, 2002; Cobcroft, Towers, Smith, & Bruns, 2006; Seppälä & Alamäki, 2003; Traxler, 2009; Zawacki-Richter, Brown, & Delport, 2009; Zeng & Luyegu, 2011). Despite the interest, little is known about the factors that will impact student and educator adoption of mobile learning. Current studies into mobile learning are mainly small scale trials and pilots with most focussing on student adoption. Factors that affect the mobile learning adoption by educators seem to have been largely ignored.

To address this gap in the literature, the present study has developed two models of student and educator adoption of mobile learning. The models posited that the perceived ease of use and usefulness of mobile technology would mediate the relationship between self-efficacy beliefs, motivation and level of self-direction of students and the intention of students and educators to adopt mobile learning.

A total of 446 students from three tertiary institutes and 196 educators from all New Zealand completed a survey that identified their learning and teaching-related beliefs and attitudes, their intentions to adopt mobile learning, and their perceptions of using mobile technology to support their learning and teaching.

The study found that educators and students are influenced by different factors to adopt mobile learning. Specifically, it found that the self-efficacy beliefs, motivation and self-directedness (students) had varying degrees of influence on ease of use and usefulness perceptions of mobile learning, and overall intention to adopt it. The study also found evidence to suggest that these factors may differ between students of different ages, genders and institute types they attend.

The study also provides recommendations to educators, researchers, learning designers and institutes who wish to implement mobile learning into their curriculum to accommodate and encourage adoption.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to everyone who, over the many years it took to complete my thesis, provided me with guidance, support, assistance and encouragement. A special thanks goes to my supervisor Associate Professor Lynn Jeffrey who has helped me through this often difficult time to give me encouragement and guidance when I most needed it. Also thanks goes to my second supervisor Professor Kinshuk whose help and support especially in the earlier days of this thesis was really appreciated. Thanks to my colleagues at Eastern Institute of Technology for generously providing me the time and encouragement to complete this thesis. Especially Kim Hagen-Hall, Professor Michael Verhart and Dr Steve Corich without your continued support I doubt I could have finished this on my own. Big thanks also go to Dr Robyn Mason and Dr Karl Pajo who gave me invaluable support with my statistics. I would also like to thank Eastern Institute of Technology for giving me support with both funding and time relief this was truly appreciated. Also thanks should go to Auckland Institute of Studies and Massey University which gave me funding for additional mobile devices. I would also like to thank the many other people who have supported me in this journey, there are too many to list but my special thanks go out to you.

On personal level I would like to thank my family and friends that have helped me with love and support. Especially thanks go to my mum and dad who provided me with so much love and support through this time. Your belief in me always made a big difference when I needed it the most. A special thanks goes to my amazing husband who has been made to put up with me over these years. Your unending patience, support and belief in me has made this journey a good experience. I love you.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract .....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Table of contents .....	v
List of Tables.....	xi
List of Figures .....	xiii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 Introduction to the Study .....	1
1.2 Resistance to Technology .....	2
1.3 Statement of the Problem .....	3
1.4 Aim of This Study .....	4
1.5 Thesis Structure .....	4
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW .....	7
2.1 Overview .....	7
2.2 Mobile Learning as a Paradigm Shift .....	7
2.2.1 Supporting student engagement.....	9
2.3 Technology Adoption in Education.....	15
2.3.1 Diffusion of innovation. ....	16
2.3.2 Innovation characteristics for the adoption of mobile technology.....	16
2.3.3 Modeling the process of acceptance.....	18
2.3.4 Modeling the adoption of mobile learning.....	23
2.3.5 Conclusion.....	26
2.4. Self-Efficacy .....	26
2.4.1 ICT self-efficacy .....	28

2.4.2 Teaching self-efficacy about integrating technology. ....	33
2.5 Motivation in Education and its Role in Adoption.....	37
2.5.1 Motivation. ....	37
2.5.2 Motivation and how it is measured.....	37
2.5.3 The role of motivation in learning.....	40
2.5.4 The role of motivation on the adoption of educators.....	40
2.5.5 Conclusion.....	41
2.6 Self-Directed Learning.....	42
2.6.1 Models of self-directed learning.....	42
2.6.2 Measurement of self- directedness.....	46
2.6.3 SDL and the adoption of technology.....	47
2.7 Conclusion.....	49
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY.....	51
3.1 Introduction.....	51
3.2 Research Approach.....	52
3.3 Sampling of Students.....	52
3.3.1 Student Characteristics.....	54
3.3.2 Sample Description.....	55
3.4 Sampling of Educators.....	58
3.4.1 Educator Characteristics.....	59
3.4.2 Sample Description.....	60
3.5 Instrument Description.....	62
3.5.1 ICT self-efficacy items.....	65
3.5.2 ICT-Teaching self-efficacy.....	69
3.5.3 Motivation.....	71

3.5.4 Self-directedness learning (in student version only).....	73
3.5.5 Mobile learning perceptions and behavioural intention to use and adopt. ....	75
3.5.6 Demographic and organisational information. ....	77
3.5.7 Open ended comments. ....	77
3.6 Pilot Study .....	77
3.7 Exploratory Factor Analysis.....	78
3.8 Instrument Validity and Reliability.....	80
3.9 Data Analysis .....	83
CHAPTER 4: STUDENT RESULTS .....	90
4.1 Overview .....	90
4.2 Structural Equation Modelling.....	90
4.2.1 Correlation analysis of the two primary relationships .....	91
4.2.2 Structural Equation: Measurement Model.....	93
4.2.3 Goodness-of-Fit Statistics. ....	94
4.2.4. Results.....	96
4.2.5 Structural Equation: Structural Model .....	98
4.2.6 Structural Equation: Multi-Group Analyses.....	113
4.2.7 Analysis of variance between student characteristics and mobile learning strategies .....	124
4.3 Qualitative Analysis.....	132
4.3.1 The barrier caused by the cost of devices and services .....	132
4.3.2 The suitability of mobile learning compared to traditional methods .....	133
4.3.3 Technology constraints and limitations.....	134
4.3.4 Convenience of mobile learning.....	135
CHAPTER 5: EDUCATORS RESULTS.....	138

5.1 Overview .....	138
5.2 Structural Equation Modelling for Educator Sample .....	138
5.2.1 Correlation Results of the Factors Included In This Study .....	138
5.2.2 Structural Equation: Measurement Model .....	141
5.2.3 Fit statistics and results .....	141
5.2.4 Structural Equation: Structural Model .....	143
5.2.5 Analysis of the Variance between Educator Characteristics and Mobile Learning Strategies .....	156
5.3 Qualitative Analysis .....	162
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION .....	166
6.1 Summary of Findings .....	166
6.1.2 Student Model .....	167
6.2.1 Educator Model .....	168
6.2 Perception of Usefulness and Ease of Use and Its Effect on Mobile Learning Adoption .....	170
6.2.1 Perception of usefulness .....	170
6.2.2 Perceived ease of use .....	176
6.2.3 Conclusion .....	178
6.3. The Impact of Self-Efficacy on Adoption of Mobile Learning .....	180
6.3.1 ICT Self-efficacy and the adoption of mobile learning .....	181
6.3.2 ICT-teaching self-efficacy use as a determinant of mobile learning adoption....	187
6.4 Motivational Orientation as a Determinant of Mobile Learning Adoption .....	191
6.4.1 Student findings related to motivational orientation .....	192
6.4.2 Educator findings related to motivational orientation .....	192
6.4.3 Conclusions .....	193
6.5 The Impact of Self-Directedness and Adoption of Mobile Learning .....	193

6.5.1 Conclusion.....	196
6.6 The Influence of Gender, Age and Institution Attendance on Students' Perception.	197
6.6.1 Gender .....	197
6.6.2 Age .....	198
6.6.3 Institution attendance .....	200
CHAPTER 7: RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION.....	202
7.1 Recommendations for the Introduction of Mobile Learning into Tertiary Education	202
7.1.1 Recommendation One: Focus on ease of use .....	203
7.1.2 Recommendation two: Highlight the benefits .....	204
7.1.3 Recommendation three: Develop strategies for those who may have negatives attitudes from previous experiences.....	205
7.1.4 Recommendation four: Provide educators with support when undertaking mobile learning initiatives .....	206
7.1.5 Recommendation five: Develop students level of self-directiveness before adopting self-directed mobile learning approaches.....	207
7.1.6 Recommendation six: Harness the novelty factor of mobile learning and use the technology to make learning more engaging.....	208
7.1.7 Conclusion.....	208
7.2 Limitations.....	208
7.4 Conclusion.....	210
References.....	212
APPENDIX A: INFORMATION SHEET FOR EDUCATORS .....	258
APPENDIX B: THE EDUCATOR SURVEY .....	262
APPENDIX C: INFORMATION SHEET FOR STUDENTS .....	266
APPENDIX D: THE STUDENT SURVEY.....	269
APPENDIX E: PARAMETER ESTIMATES FOR FINAL STRUCTURAL MODEL.....	273
APPENDIX F: PARAMETER ESTIMATES FOR MULTI-GROUP ANALYSIS (GENDER) .....	277

APPENDIX G: PARAMETER ESTIMATES FOR MULTI-GROUP ANALYSIS (AGE).....	281
APPENDIX H: PARAMETER ESTIMATES FOR MULTI-GROUP ANALYSIS (INSITUION TYPE) .	285
APPENDIX I: FACTOR ANALYSIS –STUDENT.....	289
APPENDIX J: FACTOR ANALYSIS –EDUCATORS.....	295
APPENDIX K: COMPARISON BETWEEN EDUCATOR AND STUDENTS HYPOTHESES .....	301
APPENDIX L: ETHICS NOTIFICATION.....	305

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. The four factors of the ARCS model in relation to mobile learning.....	14
Table 2: Demographic summary of student sample.....	57
Table 3: Mobile phone type based on institution type.....	58
Table 4: Demographic summary of educator sample.....	61
Table 5: The original instruments used in this thesis.....	65
Table 6: EFA results for students (by measurement cluster).....	80
Table 7: EFA results for educators (by measurement cluster).....	80
Table 8: Cronbach’s alphas for the constructs used in this study (Student Version) .....	82
Table 9: Cronbach’s alphas for the constructs used in this study (Educator Version) .....	85
Table 10: Means, standard deviations, and inter-correlations between latent constructs in the structural mode. ....	92
Table 11: Fit measures in AMOS .....	94
Table 12: Fit statistics for measurement models.....	97
Table 13: Squared correlations of the eight constructs in the fully mediated model. ....	102
Table 14: Fit Statistics for the three models .....	107
Table 15: Squared Multiple Correlations for final student adoption model .....	108
Table 16: Hypothesis description for students’ adoption model. ....	111
Table 17: Squared Multiple Correlations for male and females.....	113
Table 18: Fit statistics for nested model comparisons for gender. ....	115
Table 19: Squared Multiple Correlations for respondent under 29 years and above 30 YEARS .....	117
Table 20: Fit statistics for nested model comparisons for ages.....	119
Table 21: Squared Multiple Correlations for university and polytechnic students .....	122

Table 22: Fit statistics for nested model comparisons for two institute types .....	122
Table 23: Descriptives Results for Mobile Learning Strategies.....	125
Table 24: Analysis of variance between tertiary institution and attitude to mobile learning. .....	127
Table 25: Analysis of variance between age and attitude to mobile learning. ....	129
Table 26: Analysis of variance between students' type of mobile device and attitude to mobile learning .....	131
Table 27: Means, standard deviations, and inter-correlations amongst latent constructs in the structural model .....	140
Table 28: Fit statistics for measurement models.....	142
Table 29: Squared correlations of the eight constructs in the fully mediated model .....	146
Table 30: Fit Statistics for the three models .....	151
Table 31: Squared correlations of the eight constructs in the final model .....	153
Table 32: Hypothesis description for the adoption model of educators.....	154
Table 33: Mobile learning strategies and means ratings. ....	157
Table 34: Analysis of variance between tertiary institutes and their attitude towards a range of mobile learning initiatives .....	159
Table 35: Analysis of variance between mobile device types carried by educators and their attitude towards a range of mobile learning initiatives .....	161

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: The Theory of Reasoned Action Model. (Source: Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). .....	19
Figure 2: The Theory of Planned Behaviour Model (Source: Ajzen, 1991). .....	20
Figure 3: The Technology Acceptance Model (Source: Davis, 1989). .....	21
Figure 4: The Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (Source: Venkatesh, Morris, Gordon, & Davis, 2003). .....	22
Figure 5: The Personal Responsibility Orientation (PRO) Model. (Source: Brockett and Hiemstra, 1991). .....	43
Figure 6: Garrisons' Dimensions of self-directed learning (Garrison, 1997). .....	45
Figure 7: The structure of the model of this study. ....	62
Figure 8: The main variables that were used in this study along with their operationalised constructs. ....	63
Figure 9: The two constructs that comprise ICT self-efficacy. ....	66
Figure 10: The hypothesis related to ICT skill. ....	67
Figure 11: The hypothesis that relate to ICT anxiety. ....	69
Figure 12: The two constructs that relate to teaching self-efficacy. ....	70
Figure 13: The hypothesis that relate to ICT-teaching self-efficacy. ....	71
Figure 14: The two constructs that relate to motivation. ....	72
Figure 15: The hypothesis that relate to motivation orientation. ....	73
Figure 16: The three constructs that relate to self-directed learning. ....	74
Figure 17: The hypothesis that relate to self-directed learning. ....	75
Figure 18: The two constructs that measure to mobile learning attitudes. ....	76
Figure 19: The hypothesis that relate to mobile learning adoption. ....	76
Figure 20: Hypothesised structural model (fully-mediated). ....	100

Figure 21: Observed structural model (fully-mediated).....	101
Figure 22: Hypothesised Structural Model (Partially-Mediated). ....	104
Figure 23: Observed Structural Model (Partially-Mediated).. ....	105
Figure 24: Final Model. ....	109
Figure 25: A comparison between male and female adoption. ....	116
Figure 26: A comparison between age group adoption models.....	121
Figure 27: A comparison between institution type adoption models.....	123
Figure 28: Hypothesised structural model (fully-mediated).....	144
Figure 29: Observed Structural Model (fully-mediated).....	145
Figure 30: Hypothesised Structural Model (Partially-Mediated).....	148
Figure 31: Observed Structural Model (Partially-Mediated). ....	149
Figure 32: The final model for educator mobile learning adoption. ....	152
Figure 33: The student mobile learning adoption model .....	168
Figure 34: The educator mobile learning adoption model .....	169