



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH IN PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION & DEVELOPMENT



Acceptance of UTAUT2 Model for Professional Training via Mobile among Enforcement Officers at Malaysia

Noor Husna Sharuddin, Irwan Mahazir Ismail, Mariam Mohamad

To Link this Article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v12-i1/15783>

DOI:10.6007/IJARPED/v12-i1/15783

Received: 09 November 2022, **Revised:** 13 December 2022, **Accepted:** 30 December 2022

Published Online: 16 January 2023

In-Text Citation: (Sharuddin et al., 2023)

To Cite this Article: Sharuddin, N. H., Ismail, I. M., & Mohamad, M. (2023). Acceptance of UTAUT2 Model for Professional Training via Mobile among Enforcement Officers at Malaysia. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 12(1), 676–689.

Copyright: © 2023 The Author(s)

Published by Human Resource Management Academic Research Society (www.hrmars.com)

This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license. Anyone may reproduce, distribute, translate and create derivative works of this article (for both commercial and non-commercial purposes), subject to full attribution to the original publication and authors. The full terms of this license may be seen at: <http://creativecommons.org/licences/by/4.0/legalcode>

Vol. 12(1) 2023, Pg. 676 - 689

<http://hrmars.com/index.php/pages/detail/IJARPED>

JOURNAL HOMEPAGE

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
<http://hrmars.com/index.php/pages/detail/publication-ethics>



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH IN PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION & DEVELOPMENT



www.hrmars.com

ISSN: 2226-6348

Acceptance of UTAUT2 Model for Professional Training via Mobile among Enforcement Officers at Malaysia

Noor Husna Sharuddin, Irwan Mahazir Ismail, Mariam Mohamad

Centre for Instructional Technology and Multimedia, Universiti Sains Malaysia
Corresponding Author's Email: noorhusna@kpdn.gov.my

Abstract

M - Learning is a new innovation in professional training for enforcement officers in Malaysia to achieve their key performance indicators in training attended. According to UTAUT2, there are seven components of acceptance that must be known in order to determine the level of acceptability among Enforcement Officers. This is a case study that includes a questionnaire with seven constructs and 35 questions was analyzed using mean and standard deviation. The construct for UTAUT2 model is (i) performance expectancy, (ii) effort expectancy, (iii) social influence, (iv) facilitating conditions, (v) hedonic motivation, (vi) price value, and (vii) habit are the independent construct while the behavioral intention is the dependent construct. In Malaysia, 30 respondents were chosen randomly selected from among Enforcement Officers. The reliability value of the questionnaire through the pilot study was 0.962 Cronbach's Alpha. The results obtained from this study found that five of the seven constructs had a high level of acceptability. While two constructs based on the UTAUT2 element show a moderate level of acceptance. It is related to the fact that enforcement officers do not have experience with mobile learning before and must be enhanced to reflect the seven UTAUT2 constructs in this M-Learning. The findings show that by integrating the constructs of facilitating condition and price value, the level of acceptance of mobile training Enforcement Officers can be strengthened. Because enforcement officers are willing to go through M-Learning to improve their job performance. The implications of this study, to improved acceptance of these two UTAUT2 model constructs along with existing constructs must be enhanced in order to produce mobile materials to contributed for professional training as a new medium to follow professional training continuously for government employees.

Keywords: Enforcement Officers, Professional Training, M-Learning₃, UTAUT2, Case Study₅.

Introduction

M-Learning as a new learning medium for professional training among enforcement officers at the Malaysia to improve their skills and knowledge in enforcement activities. From Uther (2019) shows that mobile devices will become increasingly widespread in our culture to be

used in working place, social life, and daily life anywhere and at any time. According to a statement Mohammadi et al., (2020) mobile learning also useful as a supplementary teaching aid in learning progress. They may now be utilised to provide information and activities that allow learning to take place in a larger range of situations than before. To achieve what Uther indicated, 2019 researchers studied the level of acceptance of mobile as a professional training opportunity among enforcement officers. UTAUT was developed by Venkatesh et al (2003) by combining eight models with four primary variables: performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, and facilitating condition. Then UTAUT was extended to UTAUT2 by Venkatesh et al (2012), which added with another three new primary constructs: hedonic motivation, price value, and habit. Nowadays there are three types of UTAUT versions have been produced, namely UTAUT by Venkatesh et al (2003), UTAUT2 by Venkatesh et al (2012) and UTAUT3 is by (Farooq et al., 2017).

However, UTAUT2 was chosen for this study because it focuses on end users' behavioural intentions toward new technology acceptance. According to Xu et al (2022) the effect of learning using technology tools is dependent on the learner behavioral intention in self-learning. Which is the construct for UTAUT2 model are contains (i) performance expectancy, (ii) effort expectancy, (iii) social influence, (iv) facilitating conditions, (v) hedonic motivation, (vi) price value, and (vii) habit are the independent construct while the behavioral intention is the dependent construct. According to the UTAUT2 model, all of these variables must be at a high level in order to achieve the best results, especially when creating a training medium via mobile use. Beside Dang et al (2021) said that instead of using the term "professional development," academics use the term "professional learning" (PL) to describe the activities and processes that they engage in to improve learning and teaching. The problems of this study are related to the actual work assignments that make it difficult for Enforcement Officers to follow conventional training for the professional training purposes. According to a statement in the study of Yin Ling et al (2018) that heavy workload is among the reasons why adult students delay their desire to pursue professional training. However, there is still no professional training provided for enforcement officers to take online courses that could assist them to improve their knowledge and skills. Therefore, professional training from this study is about the activities was involved in this learning method. The activities which including the online note, offline note, video, animation, gaming and training referring to enforcement activities. Therefore, this study is really significant to find out acceptance of UTAUT2 model for professional training via M-Learning among Enforcement Officers at Malaysia.

Methodology

This is a case study that used quantitative methods. The respondents were selected randomly of this study from 30 Enforcement Officers from northern regions of Malaysia. The Enforcement Officers are selected of various positions which is 10 respondents from the job position of Assistant Enforcement Officers, 10 respondents from the Assistant Enforcement Officer, and 10 respondents Enforcement Officer. The reliability of this study instrument is 0.962 Alpha Cronbach. Finally, the questionnaire data were analyzed using mean and standard deviation data.

Acceptance

M-Learning for Enforcement Officer

M-Learning has been defined in a variety of ways in the research using a native app. M-learning is an educational training paradigm that incorporates a wide range of mobile technology. M-Learning, also known as mobile learning, refers to online or network-based learning using personal mobile devices such as smartphones, tablets, laptops, and iPads (Singh, 2020). M-Learning is a type of self-learning in which information is accessed through mobile devices. M-learning training can be done at any time and from anywhere. M-Learning offers various benefits and can leverage in terms of flexibility and access to M-Learning, according to (Flasher, 2020). M-Learning is a concept for a new learning technique in which students and tutors can properly manage their learning time by using mobile devices to learn (Al-Adwan et al., 2018). M-Learning is a medium for professional training development in this study. M-Learning is a way for officers to gain access to M-Learning at their pace.

To strengthen their knowledge and abilities in the MDTCA, (2021) Act, enforcement officers requires professional training through M-Learning. According to Saad et al (2017), having the right expertise, abilities, and techniques can help you advance in your career. Enforcement officers can benefit from professional training to improve their work quality. Sheeba et al (2020) revealed that training and development play a significant impact in improving employee performance and behavioral intentions.

Acceptance Model- UTAUT2

UTAUT is for the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Integrated Technology, and it is a theoretical model that combines the previous eight theories (Venkatesh et al., 2003). The UTAUT2 is a descriptive-analytic framework that provides independent variables: performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, facilitating condition, hedonic motivation, price value, and habits (Venkatesh et al., 2012). Using the UTAUT2 theory, Macedo (2017) investigated the acceptance of ICT use among adult students in his study. While Ahmed (2016) discovered that the variables of effort expectancy and hedonic motivation do not influence instructor behavior in learning in his study. In addition, Mehta et al (2019) discovered that employees' interest in using E-Learning to improve knowledge and skills was determined by performance expectations, price value, and facilitating conditions. Researchers Nawaz and Mohamed (2020) wanted to explore the elements that influence students' behavioral intentions in M-Learning utilising the UTAUT2 theory method. While, Juningsih et al (2020) used UTAUT2 to study at students' perceptions of utilising the Google Meet to follow online learning by involving all seven constructs in theory. As a result, the researchers used the UTAUT2 theoretical framework with seven primary constructs to analyze the level of acceptance of professional training via M-Learning among Malaysian Enforcement Officers in this study.

Research design for this study is using case study to evaluate the level of acceptance and use of professional training via M-Learning among Enforcement Officers. The data in this study are analysed using a descriptive analysis approach. A questionnaire was used as the quantitative instrument, and data from 30 respondents was evaluated for frequency and percentage statistics. Frequency and percentage data were used to examine the results. The study's respondents of this case study were involved is depicted in the table 1 below:

Table 1

Respondents of the case study

| Number of groups of enforcement positions in the northern zone: 523 Enforcers | | | |
|---|--------|------------|-----------|
| Position | Number | Case Study | Real Data |
| Enforcement Officer | 45 | 10 | 40 |
| Assistant Enforcement Officer | 176 | 10 | 40 |
| Enforcement Assistant | 281 | 10 | 40 |

Instrument

This research instrument is divided into two sections: (A) and (B). Part A contains ordinal and nominal type questions to collect demographic profile data from the sample, such as gender, age, ethnicity, education level, position, years of working experience, M-Learning experience, and the number of training attended in the previous year. The demographic profile information of Enforcement Officers as a sample in this case study was conducted using a total of ten questions. Meanwhile, part B contains questions to test the hypothesis on seven independent variables namely performance expectancy (PE), effort expectancy (EE), social influence (SI), facilitating condition (FC), hedonic motivation (HM), price value (PV) and habits (HT). The Enforcement Officer's behavioral intention (BI) was the dependent variable in this study, whereas M-Learning experience was the moderator variable. The data content of this questionnaire is based on five Likert scales with values in the range from one (1) to five (5). Which is (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Disagree, (4) Agree, and (5) Strongly Agree. The total number of survey questions in section B was 35 items as a table 2 below:

Table 2

Number of items

| Section | Construct | Item |
|---------|-----------------------------|------|
| A | Demographics | 10 |
| B | Performance Expectancy (PE) | 5 |
| | Effort Expectancy (EE) | 6 |
| | Social Influence (SI) | 4 |
| | Facilitating Condition (FC) | 4 |
| | Hedonic Motivation (HM) | 4 |
| | Price Value (PV) | 4 |
| | Habits (HT) | 4 |
| | Behavioral Intention (BI) | 4 |

The level of reliability in a study also depends on the use of constructs and item content in the questionnaire of a study (Othman, 2018). As a result, the validity and correctness of the required data can be determined when a large study is conducted on a sample. Cronbach's Alpha was used to assess the item's reliability in this study. According to Cronbach (1951), that the reliability statistics for research instruments using Cronbach's alpha coefficient values between 0.6 to 0.7 are satisfactory, 0.7 to 0.8 is good, 0.9 to 0.9 is very good and more or equal to 0.9 is excellent. The findings of the reliability values in the item instruments acquired from the case studies are shown in table 3 below:

Table 3

The alpha value of reliability in the item based on a case study

| Item: Part B | Alpha Cronbach Value | Total of Item |
|------------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| Performance Expectancy | 0.93 | 5 |
| Effort Expectancy | 0.90 | 6 |
| Social Influence | 0.84 | 4 |
| Facilitating Condition | 0.73 | 4 |
| Hedonic Motivation | 0.95 | 4 |
| Price Value | 0.72 | 4 |
| Habits | 0.84 | 4 |
| Behavioral Intention | 0.91 | 4 |

Findings

Part A - Demographic

The Enforcement Section of the Malaysia has 523 enforcement officers. Random sampling was used to choose samples for this research. Only 30 respondents from various enforcement positions took part in this case study. A total of seven respondents is experienced in M-Learning while the remaining 23 enforcers are novices in M-Learning as a medium to follow the professional training. However, the acceptance of professional training among enforcement officers is positive based on the constructs of UTAUT2. The case study respondent is shown in table 4.

Table 4

Case study respondent demographics

| Positions of Work | Gender | | M-Learning Experience | |
|-------------------------------|--------|--------|-----------------------|----------------|
| | Male | Female | Experienced | No-Experienced |
| Enforcement Officer | 8 | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| Assistant Enforcement Officer | 3 | 7 | 2 | 8 |
| Enforcement Assistant | 4 | 6 | 1 | 9 |

Part B –Acceptance of UTAUT2 Model

Table 5 explains the number of scales mean if item deleted, scale variance if item deleted, corrected item-total correlation and Cronbach’s alpha if item deleted of a case study in the research. There are five scales used in this research, namely (i) Strong Disagree (SD), (ii) Disagree (D), (iii) Unsure (U), (iv) Agree (A) and (v) Strong Agree (SA) scales.

Table 5

Reliability value of performance expectancy constructs in a case study

| Performance Expectancy (PE) | Scales mean if item deleted | Scale variance if item deleted | Corrected item-total correlation | Cronbach's alpha if item deleted |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| PE1 | 161.47 | 107.430 | .691 | .961 |
| PE2 | 161.50 | 107.155 | .646 | .961 |
| PE3 | 161.47 | 107.430 | .691 | .961 |
| PE4 | 161.47 | 107.637 | .658 | .962 |
| PE5 | 161.53 | 106.809 | .631 | .961 |

Table 5 above explains the number of reliability values for performance expectancy constructs in a case study through M-Learning. A total of 30 respondents was involved with six statements in items for this performance expectancy constructed. Statements for PE1 is "I found that the M-Learning application can help me learn more about the MDTCA Act". PE2 statements is "I found that the M-Learning application can improve my work performance because the offer is accessible to all Enforcement Officers". Next is PE3 is "I found that the M-Learning application allows me to access work-related information more easily because it can be accessed anytime and any location". Then, PE4 is "I found that the M-Learning application can enhance my work productivity because work-related reference materials can be downloaded through personal devices. Lastly, for PE5 is "overall, I found that with the M-Learning application, it can assist me in my daily work". Findings showed that the M-Learning medium can help improve the performance and productivity of enforcement activities as it is easily accessible only through their personal devices.

Table 6

Reliability value of effort expectancy constructs in a case study

| Effort Expectancy (EE) | Scales mean if item deleted | Scale variance if item deleted | Corrected item-total correlation | Cronbach's alpha if item deleted |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| EE1 | 161.50 | 105.776 | .844 | .961 |
| EE2 | 161.53 | 105.430 | .812 | .961 |
| EE3 | 161.67 | 107.678 | .414 | .963 |
| EE4 | 161.47 | 107.430 | .691 | .961 |
| EE5 | 161.50 | 106.466 | .744 | .961 |
| EE6 | 161.50 | 105.776 | .844 | .961 |

Table 6 above explains the number of reliability values for effort expectancy constructs in a case study through M-Learning. A total of 30 respondents was involved with six statements in questionnaire for this effort expectancy constructed. Items statements for EE1 is "I found that the M-Learning application interesting for me to follow". The next EE2 questionnaire is "I found the interaction through the M-Learning application easier to understand". Next EE3, is "I found that this M-Learning application can help me make a reference for the job confirmation exam". Then, EE4 is "I found that the M-Learning application can help me make a reference to an interview offered". Then, EE5 is "I found that, I'm not bored with the M-Learning application". Lastly, for EE6 is "Overall, I feel comfortable following the M-Learning

application because it can use through my own personal devices”. The findings showed that this construct related to knowledge sharing, which is can help enforcement officers get job-related information only from their personal devices.

Table 7

Reliability value of social influence constructs in a case study

| Social Influence (SI) | Scales mean if item deleted | Scale variance if item deleted | Corrected item-total correlation | Cronbach’s alpha if item deleted |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| SI1 | 161.83 | 107.316 | .411 | .963 |
| SI2 | 161.73 | 105.582 | .603 | .962 |
| SI3 | 161.90 | 104.507 | .544 | .962 |
| SI4 | 161.53 | 104.189 | .796 | .960 |

Table 7 above explains the number of reliability values for social influence constructs in a case study through M-Learning. A total of 30 respondents was involved with four statements for this social influence constructed. Items statement for SI1 is “A friend's suggestion influenced my behavior to take the course through this M-Learning application”. The next SI2 statements is " The workplace environment encouraged me to take courses through the M-Learning application". Then, SI3 is “The suggestion of a senior officer influenced my behavior to follow the M-Learning application”. Lastly, for SI4 is “In general, this Enforcement Section supports courses through the M-Learning application”. Findings showed that Enforcement Officers voluntarily participated in the M-Learning environment developed based to enhance their skills based on the UTAUT2 research construct.

Table 8

Reliability value of facilitating condition constructs in a case study

| Facilitating Condition (FC) | Scales mean if item deleted | Scale variance if item deleted | Corrected item-total correlation | Cronbach’s alpha if item deleted |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| FC1 | 161.53 | 105.637 | .785 | .961 |
| FC2 | 161.60 | 105.076 | .635 | .961 |
| FC3 | 162.00 | 103.586 | .533 | .963 |
| FC4 | 161.63 | 105.482 | .574 | .962 |

Table 8 above explains the number of reliability values for facilitating condition constructs in a case study through M-Learning. A total of 30 respondents was involved with four statements for this facilitating condition constructed. Items statement for FC1 is “I use my personal devices to follow the course through the M-Learning application”. The next FC2 statements is " The M-Learning application can also be accessed using other technologies". Then, FC3 is “I seek the help of a friend when has difficulty while following the M-Learning application”. Lastly, for FC4 is “I use my own internet data to follow this M-Learning application course”. Findings showed that the availability of facilities in data subscriptions and personal devices is required to follow M-Learning so that it is easy to access and use.

Table 9

Reliability value of hedonic motivation constructs in a case study

| Hedonic Motivation (HM) | Scales mean if item deleted | Scale variance if item deleted | Corrected item-total correlation | Cronbach's alpha if item deleted |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| HM1 | 161.47 | 106.189 | .893 | .961 |
| HM2 | 161.47 | 106.189 | .893 | .961 |
| HM3 | 161.60 | 101.697 | .862 | .960 |
| HM4 | 161.53 | 102.257 | .872 | .960 |

Table 9 above explains the number of reliability values for hedonic motivation constructs in a case study through M-Learning. A total of 30 respondents was involved with four statements in instruments for this hedonic motivation construct. Items statements for HM1 is "I found the course through the M-Learning application easy to be used". Next HM2 statements is "I found that using the M-Learning application to take the course was enjoyable for me". Then, HM3 is "I found that using the M-Learning application to take the course was exciting for me". Lastly, for HM4 is "I found the course through the M-Learning application was interesting". Findings showed that M-Learning must be able to provide a fun learning as attractive design modules can make them feel excited to follow.

Table 10

Reliability value of price value constructs in a case study

| Price Value (PV) | Scales mean if item deleted | Scale variance if item deleted | Corrected item-total correlation | Cronbach's alpha if item deleted |
|------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| PV1 | 161.73 | 106.133 | .425 | .963 |
| PV2 | 161.83 | 106.902 | .395 | .963 |
| PV3 | 162.33 | 103.816 | .481 | .964 |
| PV4 | 161.60 | 106.662 | .568 | .962 |

Table 10 above explains the number of reliability values for price value constructs in a case study through M-Learning. A total of 30 respondents was involved with four statements for this price value constructed. Items statement for PV1 is "I found this M-Learning application needs to use a personal device". The next PV2 statement is "I found that this M-Learning application needs to use internet data". Then, PV3 is "I found that to access this M-Learning application requires personal money to subscribed internet data". Lastly, for PV4 is "I found that the course through the M-Learning application offered is free". The findings showed that M-Learning requires the internet and a personal device to access professional training and to download online or offline notes.

Table 11

Reliability value of behavioral intention constructs in a case study

| Behavioral Intention (BI) | Scales mean if item deleted | Scale variance if item deleted | Corrected item-total correlation | Cronbach's alpha if item deleted |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| BI1 | 161.53 | 105.637 | .785 | .961 |
| BI2 | 161.53 | 105.637 | .785 | .961 |
| BI3 | 161.70 | 105.183 | .659 | .961 |
| BI4 | 161.53 | 105.637 | .785 | .961 |

Table 11 above explains the number of reliability values for behavioral intention constructs in a case study through M-Learning. A total of 30 respondents was involved with four statements for this behavioral intention constructed. Items statement for BI1 is "I intend to continue to follow the course through the M-Learning application using my personal devices in the future". The next BI2 statement is "I intend to use reference materials through the M-Learning application for work matters". Then, BI3 is "I intend to continue to follow the course through the M-Learning application which is offered periodically". Lastly, for BI4 is "I intend to recommend to friends to follow the course through this M-Learning application". The findings showed that Enforcement Officers are prepared to follow the M-Learning training, even if they are new to M-Learning, to improve their work performance.

Discussions

Part A - Demographic

This case study was conducted to ensure that the content and items of the instrument in the M-Learning used are appropriate and meet the criteria of reliability, clarity and easy to understand before being used by real users later. In section A contains ordinal and nominal type questions for the collection of demographic profile data from the sample including gender, age, ethnicity, education level, position, years of work experience, experience in the use of M-Learning, number of trainings attended for the current year. The demographic profile information of Enforcement Officers as a sample in this study was collected using a total of ten questions.

In Part-A Demographic, the experience in the use of M-Learning constructs are separated into two parts: experienced and novices. Thus, previous experience of the use of M-Learning was a moderator of the study to determine acceptance, behavioral intentions towards M-Learning among Enforcement Officers whether experienced or inexperienced in that constructs.

Part B –Acceptance of UTAUT2 Model

Performance Expectancy

The degree to which a person believes that employing the system that will enable them improve their work performance (Venkatesh et al., 2003; Al-Gahtani et al., 2007). According to research by Chao (2019) the performance expectancy factor shows the effect on learners' belief in the use of m-learning will help improve their learning performance. The performance expectancy used in this study is to see how significantly acceptance and use of M-Learning through M-Learning will help Enforcement Officers enhance their work performance by using it as a medium to increase knowledge and skills. Finally, this study was accepted for the

performance expectancy constructs in the use of M-Learning. Where this construct will help Enforcement Officers improve their work performance by using it as a medium to enhance their enforcement activities.

Effort Expectancy

According to Venkatesh et al (2003), the effort performance construct is defined as a simple level related to the use of the system. As a result, the effort performance variable is analysed with professional training facilities developed for enforcement officers to follow M-Learning via using personal devices and own internet data. And finally, this study showed that the effort expectancy constructs were accepted into this study to follow M-Learning using their own devices and internet data. Where it relates to Enforcement Officers' readiness to complete training through the M-Learning method.

Social Influence

Social influence is defined as the extent to which an individual considers that it is important that others believe in using a new system (Venkatesh et al., 2003). There is a relationship between user experience with information systems and peer influence, according to (Alawadhi and Morris, 2008). As a result, the researchers in this study aim to investigate if there is any influence from teammates, senior officers, or even self-initiative that causes Enforcement Officers to believe that M-Learning is a great idea. And finally, this research showed that enforcement officers agreed to participate in M-Learning, training on their own initiative, without being persuaded by teammates or senior officers.

Facilitating Condition

Facilitating condition is defined as a variable that influences a person's perception in relation to ease or difficulty in performing a task (Venkatesh et al., 2003; Badan & Igeria, 2018). As a result, the easily visible condition variables in terms of device availability and internet connectivity to access learning on mobile will influence the Enforcement Officer's behavioural intention to use it in this study. Enforcement officers feel that there is a slight difficulty in following the training via M-Learning because they have to use personal devices and their own data. And they also never had experience in following the training through this method. So that, this facilitating condition constructs needs to be improved to be lined with the objectives of the study.

Hedonic Motivation

Hedonic motivation is defined as the pleasure derived from using technology, and has been shown to play an important role in determining the acceptance and use of technology (Van der Heijden, 2004; Brown and Venkatesh, 2005; Thong et al., 2006). As a result, the hedonic motivation in this study is based on the Enforcement Officer's behaviour in elements of perceived pleasure when studying on a mobile device, which will impact its acceptance and use. Finally, hedonic motivation constructs were accepted by the Enforcement Officer because they found it enjoyable to follow the M-Learning, training because the activities accessible in this training are very attractive.

Price Value

Venkatesh et al (2012) stated that consumers will usually bear the financial cost of the use of technology. As a result, the price value variable in this study refers to the use of personal

devices and the internet to pursue professional training through mobile learning, which will influence the behavior intentions and acceptance of use of M-Learning. So that, the researcher should study how to improve this construct so that it is in line with the objectives of the study.

Behavioral Intention

According to Ajzen (1991); Venkatesh et al (2003) behavioral intentions also include the factors that motivate the student to determine how much effort the student puts into a particular behavioral intention. The acceptance of M-Learning has been positively influenced by learners' behavioral intentions, as has been shown in previous research (Vinnik, 2017). As a result, this study will benefit from past research in which Enforcement Officers' behavioural intentions through M-Learning in the future for professional training facilities. According to the findings of this study, enforcement officers can attend professional training via M-Learning in order to improve their knowledge and expertise. Because minimizing congestion via conventional training is in accordance with the current situation. For this study, the construct of behavioral intention via UTAUT2 is acceptable.

Conclusions

The conclusion from this study found that the level of acceptance of M-Learning among enforcement officers based on the components found in UTAUT2 is still at an early stage. Because only five constructs were accepted for a total of seven for this study. The hedonic motivation constructs, which have a Cronbach's alpha of 0.95, have the highest level of constructing acceptance, followed by performance expectations (0.93), behavioral intention (0.91), effort expectancy (0.90), social influence (0.84), and habits (0.84). While there are two constructs in the acceptance of M-Learning that need to be improved and strengthened, namely the constructs of facilitation conditions (0.73) and pricing value (0.72). This is due to the fact that the enforcement officers have never attended training using the M-Learning approach, making it difficult for them to accept because it is still new. In this study, the price value also has to be enhanced. Enforcement officers must spend their own personal internet data to access training through this method in the price value constructs, which makes it difficult for them. As a result, two constructs should be improved in order to improve the general acceptance of the UTAUT2 components employed in this study.

The use of M-Learning will be able to provide space and opportunities for continuous professional training to all Enforcement Officers in Malaysia. UTAUT2 has been expanded with three more new constructs where it focuses on the end user on the acceptance of a product. The implications of this study, the improved acceptance of these two UTAUT2 model constructs along with existing constructs must be enhanced in order to produce mobile materials for professional training purposes in Malaysia. And finally, greater research can be done, with a focus on continuous professional learning to government employees through M-Learning. Therefore, the next study is proposed to use this UTUAT2 construct in the development of new learning technology in various other sectors to test the behavioral intention of users.

References

- Ahmed, M. S. (2016). *Technology Acceptance of Smartphones As Mobile Learning Tools: a Contextual Comparative Study of Engineering and Education Colleges*. 1–307.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision*

- Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Alawadhi, S., & Morris, A. (2008). *The Use of the UTAUT Model in the Adoption of E-Government Services in Kuwait*. Suha AlAwadhi Department of Information Science. S.Alawadhi@lboro.ac.uk Department of Information Science. March 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HICSS.2008.452>
- 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 and Management*, 44(8), 681–691. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2007.09.002>
- Badan, U. N. O. F. I., & Igeria, N. (2018). Performance expectancy, effort expectancy, and facilitating conditions as factors influencing smart phones use for mobile learning. *Interdisciplinary Journal of E-Skills and Lifelong Learning*, 14, 095–115.
- Brown, S. A., and Venkatesh, V. (2005). "Model of Adoption of Technology in the Household: A Baseline Model Test and Extension Incorporating Household Life Cycle," *MIS Quarterly* (29:4), pp. 399-426. <https://doi.org/10.2307/25148690>
- Chao, C. M. (2019). Factors determining the behavioral intention to use mobile learning: An application and extension of the UTAUT model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10(JULY), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01652>
- Cronbach L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika* 16,297-334
- Dang, T. K. A., Bonar, G., & Yao, J. (2021). Professional learning for educators teaching in English-medium-instruction in higher education: a systematic review. *Teaching in Higher Education*, January. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1863350>
- 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>
- Farooq, M. S., Salam, M., Jaafar, N., Fayolle, A., Ayupp, K., Radovic-Markovic, M., & Sajid, A. (2017). Acceptance and use of lecture capture system (LCS) in executive business studies: Extending UTAUT2. *Interactive Technology and Smart Education*, 14(4), 329–348.
- Singh, H. (2020). Why Mobile Learning Is Now More Than Just A Nice-To-Have. <https://elearningindustry.com/why-mobile-learning-is-more-than-just-nice-to-have>
- Juningsih, E. H., Aziz, F., Ismunandar, D., Sarasati, F., Irmawati, I., & Yanto, Y. (2020). Penggunaan Model UTAUT2 Untuk Memahami Persepsi Pengguna Aplikasi G-Meet. *Indonesian Journal on Software Engineering (IJSE)*, 6(2), 289–295. <https://doi.org/10.31294/ijse.v6i2.10075>
- Macedo, I. M. (2017). Predicting the acceptance and use of information and communication technology by older adults: An empirical examination of the revised UTAUT2. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 75, 935–948. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.06.013>
- Mehta, A., Morris, N. P., Swinnerton, B., & Homer, M. (2019a). The Influence of Values on E-learning Adoption. *Computers and Education*, 141(December 2018). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103617>
- Ministry of Domestic Trade and Consumer Affairs. (2021) *Act/ Policies/ Guidelines*. <https://www.kpdnhep.gov.my/en/public/acts-policies-guidelines.html>
- Mohammadi, M., Sarvestani, M. S., & Nouroozi, S. (2020). Mobile Phone Use in Education and Learning by Faculty Members of Technical-Engineering Groups: Concurrent Mixed

- Methods Design. *Frontiers in Education*, 5(February), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2020.00016>
- Othman, M. S., & Kassim, A. Y. (2018). Kajian Rintis Bagi Pelaksanaan Kompisisi Pengajaran Guru Pendidikan Islam Yang Mengintegrasikan Kemahiran Berfikir Aras Tinggi (KBAT) Menerusi Pendidikan Akidah Sekolah Rendah Di Malaysia. *Attarbawiy: Malaysian Online Journal of Education*, 2(2), 55–60. <http://journal.kuis.edu.my/attarbawiy/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/55-60.pdf>
- Saad, K. A., Walsh, B., Mallaburn, A., & Brundrett, M. (2017). Exploring the Implementation of a Professional Learning Communities in Malaysian's Schools. *International Journal of Education Psychology and Counseling*, 2(5), 1–18.
- Flasher, S. (2020). The Top Benefits and Challenges of Mobile Learning. <https://www.skillbuilderlms.com/top-benefits-challenges-mobile-learning>
- Thong, J. Y. L., Hong, S. J., and Tam, K. Y. (2006). "The Effects of Post-Adoption Beliefs on the Expectation–Confirmation Model for Information Technology Continuance," *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* (64:9), pp. 799-810. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2006.05.001>
- Uther, M. (2019). Mobile learning—trends and practices. *Education Sciences*, 9(1), 10–12. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci9010033>
- Van der Heijden, H. (2004) User acceptance of hedonic information systems. *MIS Quarterly* 28(4): 695–704 <https://doi.org/10.2307/25148660>
- Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *MIS Quarterly: Management Information Systems*, 27(3), 425–478. <https://doi.org/10.2307/30036540>
- Venkatesh, V., Thong, J. Y. L., & Xu, X. (2012). Consumer acceptance and use of information technology: Extending the unified theory of acceptance and use of technology. *MIS Quarterly: Management Information Systems*, 36(1), 157–178. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41410412>
- Vinnik, V. (2017). *User adoption of mobile applications* : <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2009.02.002>
- Xu, W., Shen, Z. Y., Lin, S. J., & Chen, J. C. (2022). Improving the Behavioral Intention of Continuous Online Learning Among Learners in Higher Education During COVID-19. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13(April), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.857709>