

### **Cogent Arts & Humanities**





ISSN: (Print) 2331-1983 (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/oaah20

# Mobile learning and accounting students' readiness in tertiary and professional institutions in Nigeria

Anijesushola Ajayi, Charles Korede Ayo & Olusanmi Olamide |

To cite this article: Anijesushola Ajayi, Charles Korede Ayo & Olusanmi Olamide | (2019) Mobile learning and accounting students' readiness in tertiary and professional institutions in Nigeria, Cogent Arts & Humanities, 6:1, 1676570, DOI: 10.1080/23311983.2019.1676570

To link to this article: <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2019.1676570">https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2019.1676570</a>

<u></u>	© 2019 The Author(s). This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 license.
	Published online: 15 Oct 2019.
	Submit your article to this journal 🗷
hh	Article views: 668
Q <sup>N</sup>	View related articles 🗹
CrossMark	View Crossmark data ☑
4	Citing articles: 1 View citing articles 🗹







Received: 31 July 2019 Accepted: 26 September 2019 First Published: 08 October 2019

\*Corresponding author: Anijesushola Ajayi, Department of Accounting, Covenant University, KM. 10, Idiroko Road, Ota, Ogun State P.M.B. 1023, Nigeria

E-mail: anijesu.ajayi@covenantuniversity. edu.ng

Ajayi, AO, Ayo, CK & Olusanmi, O (2019). Mobile learning and accounting students' readiness in tertiary and professional institutions in Nigeria. In (ed.), Emmanuel O. Amoo, Covenant University Discourse on Sustainable Development. Cogent Arts and Humanities.

Reviewing editor: Emmanuel O Amoo, Covenant University, Nigeria, Nigeria

Additional information is available at the end of the article

#### **DIGITAL HUMANITIES | RESEARCH ARTICLE**

# Mobile learning and accounting students' readiness in tertiary and professional institutions in Nigeria

Anijesushola Ajayi<sup>1</sup>\*, Charles Korede Ayo<sup>2</sup> and Olusanmi Olamide<sup>1</sup>

Abstract: Mobile Learning (m-learning) a learning method facilitated by the convenience of mobile technology has a crucial role to play in the development of quality education in Nigeria which represents the fourth Sustainable Development Goal. However, Despite the advantages of mobile learning as an emerging learning method and its adoption across several disciplines, research into its adoption in accounting education and within developing contexts including Nigeria is still at infancy. This study, therefore, investigates the readiness of Accounting students in Nigeria to utilize m-learning for their accounting education. The survey research design was employed with copies of a relevant questionnaire distributed to 1,225 accounting students in three tertiary as well as three professional institutions in Nigeria, a total of 1021 of the retrieved copies were deemed suitable for data analyses. The study observes that there is a widespread usage of mobile devices and technology, especially smart devices among accounting students in both tertiary and professional institutions. It also found that the cost of internet access, instability of network as well as the level of the inexperience of students and instructors may impede the successful adoption of m-learning in Nigeria. The study recommends that m-learning adoption of m-learning in Nigerian should go in-line with the enhancement of mobile infrastructure especially network coverage and the training of students as well as instructors in the country to use mobile technology for learning. This will bring sustainable development to education in Nigeria.

Subjects: Accounting; Information Science; Education

Keywords: mobile learning adoption; accounting education; readiness; mobile technology

#### **ABOUT THE AUTHORS**

Mr. Anijesushola Ajayi is a doctoral candidate in the department of accounting at Covenant University. He is passionate about emerging education technology, accounting education as well as research in information science-based theories and frameworks.

Prof. Charles Korede Ayo is a Professor of Computer Science. His research interests include: Internet programming, ICT, Mobile computing, e-Business, e-Government and computing in general.

Mr. Olamide Olusanmi is a doctoral candidate in the department of accounting at Covenant University. His work and research centers on management accounting with a special interest in sustainability.

#### PUBLIC INTEREST STATEMENT

The adoption of mobile learning in education across several disciplines globally is exponentially on the increase, however, due to the device and technological requirements of the learning method, it becomes essential to investigate its suitability and readiness for use in developing countries and contexts from the perspective of infrastructural availability, affordability and readiness. An investigation is therefore required on the level of availability of mobile infrastructure including smartphone ownership, skilled use, frequency of engagement in mobile activities, intended learning activities, internet access and perceived implementation challenges.







#### 1. Introduction

Quality education is listed as the fourth Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) by the United Nations (Amoo, 2018) and in view of the influence of Information Communication Technology (ICT) on education globally; Mobile Learning (M-learning) made possible by the convenience of mobile technology has a vital role to play in ensuring the sustainability of quality education in Nigeria. The exponential growth and influence of mobile technology have necessitated the inclusion of the technology into all aspects of life, especially in developing countries. The ownership and use of mobile technology in Africa are among the highest globally with Nigeria alone boasting of about 174 million active mobile lines as well as the highest mobile traffic growth in the world (International Telecommunications Commission [ITU], 2018; Nigerian Communications Commission [NCC], 2019; Twinpine, 2017). The developments of mobile technology with its merits made educators realize that it can be integrated with existing learning methods to proffer solutions to the challenge of combining the ever-evolving state of information technology with education. Put differently, the portability, affordability and ease of access to information at anytime and anywhere made possible by mobile technology led to the development of mobile learning (m-learning) (Amiaya & Ranor, 2015; Stockley, 2011). This study, therefore, investigates the state of readiness of students for m-learning adoption in Nigeria which is critical to the achievement of quality and sustainable education, an SDG that is critical to the achievement of several other SDGs (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], 2017).

M-learning has been described as education facilitated through the interactions with mobile devices, and the functionalities they provide for both the learner and instructor (Rimale, El-Habib, & Tragha, 2016; Sherpherd & Vardiman, 2014). M-learning as a learning method evolved as a result of the interaction between electronic learning (e-learning) which is electronic enhanced learning and mobile technology. These mobile technology covers a spectrum of hardware such as smart devices (smartphones and tablets) and other facilities such as Global System of Mobile Communication (GSM), Wireless Application Protocol (WAP), Dynamic Adhoc Wireless networks (DAWN) and Wi-Fi among others (Akpakwu, Silva, Hancke, & Abu-Mahfouz, 2018; Amiaya & Ranor, 2015). The central point of m-learning is the facilitation of information sharing, and this makes interaction and sharing of knowledge among learners possible at any time. This kind of interaction encourages collaboration, an extension of learning beyond lecture classrooms and removes some of the limitations imposed on learning like distance and space. Furthermore, m-learning is compatible with other learning pedagogies and prior learning technologies in the sense that it can still support traditional classroom learning tools and also enhance e-learning content (Azeta, Gberevbie, Ayo, & Williams, 2016; Shonola & Joy, 2014).

Due to the prospects of m-learning, various fields of learning including mathematics, computer science and literary studies are at advanced stages of research on its deployment and adoption, however, there is still a shortage of research on m-learning adoption and its actual deployment both in developing contexts such as Nigeria and in accounting education (Akomo, Ajowi, & DVC, 2015; Baldwin, 2014; Eloff, 2017; Okafor & Ogbodo, 2015; Roux, 2016). These issues can be traced to the limitations to m-learning adoption including; the need for mobile infrastructural support, the small screen-size as well as the abysmal power level of mobile devices. These necessitate adequate power supply and the development of resources to maximize the deployment of m-learning (Oyelere, Suhonen, & Sutinen, 2016). Specifically, inadequate mobile infrastructural support refers to the irregularity of power supply, poor internet access and the lack of proper m-learning infrastructure including hardware, software and learning contents (Kaliisa, Palmer, and Miller, 2017; Nicholas-Omoregbe, Azeta, Chiazor & Omoregbe, 2016; Asiimwe & Gronlund, 2015; Shonola & Joy, 2014; Osinaike & Adekunmisi, 2012).

Additionally, since the availability of mobile infrastructure is crucial to m-learning in order to facilitate anywhere and anytime education (Griffin, 2014), it becomes important to begin the investigation of its adoption from the point of infrastructural readiness based on the opinions of the prospective end-users of the learning method. Abu-Al-Aish (2014) and Abu-Al-Aish and Love (2013) in



agreement, opine that m-learning research especially in developing contexts should begin by investigating the level of readiness of users and as well as institutions. The investigation should be based on the availability and state of mobile technology to ensure smooth deployment as well as establish the sustainability of m-learning adoption. Chaka and Govender (2017) also found that m-learning conditions significantly predicted the readiness of students to adopt m-learning in Nigeria and calls for in-depth studies on factors affecting readiness and intention to adopt m-learning in Nigeria. While prior studies have attempted to investigate m-learning adoption in Nigeria, there is still a paucity of extensive research on the readiness of students to embrace this ever-evolving learning method for their education in the country (Ajayi, 2019).

Focusing on accounting education, there is the pressure to produce graduates as well as professionals who are able to digitally compete on the global landscape due to the global adoption of the International Financial Reporting Standards and International Public Sector Accounting Standards (Haque & Islam, 2015). This has led to calls for in-depth research into the deployment of m-learning in the discipline to ensure the proper integration of the ever-evolving state of digital technology in its learning processes (Eloff, 2017; Roux, 2016; Staples, Collum, & McFry, 2016). It is based on the foregoing, that this study investigates the readiness of students in Nigeria to use m-learning for their accounting education. Specifically, the study answers the research question: To what extent are accounting tertiary and profession students ready to utilize m-learning for education in Nigeria?

#### 2. Literature review

Quite a number of researches have been undertaken in Nigeria on the potential of m-learning, however, most still point out the need for in-depth studies into the level of readiness to adopt the learning method. Oguchinalu and Sunday (2018) conducted a study to access the adoption of m-learning in Nigeria and opined that while m-learning will enhance education in Nigeria, it is faced with a lot of challenges including the availability of mobile infrastructure such as the instability and the high cost of subscription to adequate internet facilities as the most critical challenges. The study recommends that studies should be carried out to further assess the level of readiness to adopt m-learning in Nigeria. Oyelere et al. (2016) studied the readiness of students for m-learning in primary and secondary schools to accept m-learning and use specific mobile devices. The study showed that only 12% of the respondents did not own a mobile device and further reveals that students are in support of the use of social media forums, blogs, task feature and availability of course material on m-learning platforms for education. This study, however, is limited by its focus on schools in Nigeria.

Ayoade (2015) in a conceptual study looked at the ability of mobile technology to transform education and the health sectors of Nigeria. The study stated that the two components required to adopt m-learning are the universal accessibility of mobile devices and cellular connectivity. However, being a conceptual study, there is a need to gather data to substantiate the claim. Osang, Ngole, and Tsuma (2013) carried out a study on the readiness for m-learning in Nigeria by investigating faculty and students of the National Open University of Nigeria (NOUN). The study found that while mobile device ownership and use is widespread, there remains the challenge of infrastructural readiness and support including power supply, adequate security and institutional support. Chaka and Govender (2014) carried out an assessment of the status of m-learning in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Nigeria also through a conceptual approach. The study opined that there is little indication of m-learning success in Nigeria despite its huge adoption in the international education scene. Specifically, the study opined that there is no evidence of m-learning adoption or application in Nigerian Colleges of education and calls for an in-depth study in order to facilitate the development of a suitable model for the application of m-learning in Nigeria.

Moving unto the foreign context, Kaliisa et al. (2017) carried out a review on m-learning in African higher institutions. The study investigated m-learning researches in Africa based on factors including geographical spread, focus, language, the level of education, research base and the period of research. Based on these 31 studies were selected for the review. The study found significant challenges in the process of m-learning integration in HEIs in Africa. These challenges



include poor technological infrastructure, poor attitudes among instructors and students, unsuitability of mobile devices with HEIs' Learning Management Systems (LMSs), lack of policies and models for implementation, the lack of m-learning use skills among lecturers and lack of access to modern mobile devices. The study also shows that there is the absence of large-scale m-learning researches. Asiimwe and Grönlund (2015) carried out a study in Uganda investigating the use of LCMS on mobile phones at Makerere University. The study used a mixed research design and a total number of 30 students were sampled. The study showed that the positive perception of the use of LMS on mobile phones is severely challenged by technical and content issues.

Haji, Shaame, and Kombo (2013) investigated the prospects and challenges of using mobile phones as tools for Higher learning for students in the developing countries. The study which was carried out in Zanzibar used a case study approach and 106 participants. It found that the hurdles of m-learning in higher learning include poor infrastructure and the high cost of mobile devices; it also showed that in order to increase students' engagement of m-learning, self-motivation must be encouraged. Mtega, Bernard, Msungu, and Sanare (2012) studied the use of mobile phones to teach and learn in higher institutions and found that a significant challenge to the adoption of mobile phones is the high cost of purchasing internet access to download learning content.

In accounting education, Roux (2016) focused on m-learning as a model instrument to enable practical courses in an undergraduate financial information system course from a developing country's perspective. The study which was carried out in South Africa used the experiment and survey research designs to investigate the performance of accounting students in the use of mobile devices for their studies. Joseph and Rahmat (2018) explored the perception of students on the use of a video as a pedagogical tool in an accounting course. The study which employed the experiment and survey research designs administered copies of the questionnaire on specific video contents to 90 accounting students at the Universiti Teknologi MARA in Malaysia. Staples et al. (2016) focused on the use of mobile devices in an accounting classroom. The study focused on the use of Substitution Augmentation Modification Redefinition (SAMR) theory and Bloom's Revised Taxonomy for the conceptual design of a framework for m-learning. It was discovered that technology and pedagogy must be considered before introducing mobile technology into accounting courses.

Based on the review of literature, therefore, within the Nigerian as well as other developing contexts, while the call to adopt mobile learning is high, the current researches on m-learning readiness and adoption which are crucial to its successful adoption are either conceptual or do not adequately capture the various categories of HEIs. As such, they cannot substantiate on a broad level the readiness of students or institutions for m-learning adoption. Additionally, while prior studies have focused on m-learning readiness, there is a dearth of literature specifically on m-learning readiness in accounting education. Furthermore, Africa based researches as reviewed above also show that quite a number of laudable efforts at inculcating m-learning into mainstream education are being limited by the level of availability and readiness of mobile infrastructure in the various countries. This study, therefore, addresses the gap in the literature by investigating the level of readiness of students in the different categories of HEIs in Nigeria for m-learning adoption with a focus on accounting education.

#### 3. Methodology

This study analysed the readiness of accounting students to use m-learning and covered both tertiary and professional accounting institutions in Nigeria. The study employed the survey method through the administration of a series of questions in a well-structured questionnaire. The population of the study consisted of tertiary (universities, polytechnics and colleges of education) and professional accounting students (currently writing ICAN, ANAN and CITN certification examinations) in Nigeria. The choice of students from these institutions stems from the knowledge that the students in the tertiary institutions are often different from those in the professional ones. Professional students can be divided into two groups. The first consists of candidates of the basic professional levels such as the Accounting Technician Scheme (ICAN) and these are



graduates of secondary schools and students in Nigerian tertiary institutions. The second group consists of candidates of advanced professional examination levels who are tertiary institution graduates as well as working-class accountants.

All accounting students in the tertiary and professional institutions from the six geopolitical zones in Nigeria are eligible for this study. However, because of the size of this population, a subset was considered as the sample frame from which the sample size was drawn. The South-west zone which has the highest number of tertiary institutions offering accounting courses was selected for tertiary accounting students. For professional students both the South-west because of the highest concentration of ICAN and CITN study centres and the North-central zone because of the location of the only study centre of ANAN in Jos, Nigeria were selected as the sample frame (National Universities Commission [NUC], 2018; Joint Admission Matriculation Board [JAMB], 2018; Institute of Chartered Accountants of Nigeria [ICAN], 2018; Prospectus and examination syllabus—ANAN (2016); CITN accredited tuition houses, 2016). The following were selected as the tertiary institutions for the research: Covenant University in Ota, Ogun State; the Federal Polytechnic, Ilaro, Ogun State and Adeyemi College of Education, Ondo State. These institutions were selected because they represent the best ranking institutions within their categories in the South Western part of Nigeria (Chijioke, 2018; Ojerinde, 2018). They also represent institutions with varying degrees of infrastructural support for mobile learning adoption.

As this study was part of a broader study investigating the behavioural intention of accounting students to accept m-learning in Nigeria based on the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) 2, the sample size was determined based on the Tabachnick and Fidell (2001) criteria for Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) which posited that a minimum of 500 should suffice as a very good sample size for each of the institutional groups (tertiary and professional). This makes a total of 1,000 minimum for the combined sample size. The SEM method of analysis was however used in another aspect of the study which is not reflected in this particular study. The analyses of data for this study were conducted through descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. Specifically, the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test was carried out. ANOVA was used in order to compare the readiness of tertiary and professional students to accept m-learning for their accounting education. This was done to bridge the gap in literature where studies have mostly been conducted have been limited to a single institution per time.

In all, through judgmental sampling and based on the rate of response from each institution, a total of 1,225 copies of the questionnaire were distributed. 250 copies of the instrument were distributed to Covenant University students, 150 copies distributed at the college of education to a section of Business students who majored in accounting. For the Federal Polytechnic in Ilaro, 200 copies of the questionnaire were distributed making a total of 600 copies. For ICAN and CITN, 200 copies of the questionnaire were administered to students from each of the institutions. This was administered both electronically and at identified study centres. For ANAN, 225 copies of the same survey material were administered at the only institute in Jos, Plateau state making a total of 625 copies for the professional institutions. The excesses were to ensure that the minimum sample size of 1000 is achieved for the combined group.

For the survey instrument, the first section elicited questions on demographic background, mobile device ownership and experience while the second section gathered data on students' readiness to accept m-learning. Questions were asked to gather data on participants' use of mobile infrastructure including mobile devices and enabling facilities such as wireless networks and the internet. Furthermore, questions were asked about the various activities that participants use their mobile devices for ranging from online shopping to listening to music. Finally, questions on the learning activities that participants would like to use m-learning for were also asked. These questions were adapted from past studies (Abu-Al-Aish, 2014; Ahmed, 2016).



#### 4. Results

A total of 1,225 copies of the questionnaire were administered to students from the six identified institutions while 1,143 were retrieved. The retrieved data were as follows; Covenant University-250, Federal Polytechnic Ilaro-189, Adeyemi Polytechnic-130, ICAN-187, CITN-162 and ANAN-225. The data obtained were screened for missing data and 121 copies were expunged due to the lack of complete data. Therefore, 1021 copies were retained for data analyses. Specifically, 503 and 518 copies respectively were retained for the tertiary and the professional institutions.

Table 1 depicts the demographic data of the respondents based on their institutional groupings. The gender distribution of the respondents shows 48.09% males and 51.91% females. Of the 491 males, 42.74% were tertiary students while of the 530 females 57.26% were tertiary students. Data obtained shows the following age distribution; 9.9% were below 18 years of age, 17% belonged to the 18–20 years age category, 30.9% were between 21–25 years, 15.8% belonged to the 31–40 years age category and 12.4% respondents indicated ages above 40 years. Furthermore, level of study distribution for the respondents depicts, 32.5% first-year/stage students, 18.0% second level/stage students, 34% third level/stage students and 15% fourth level/stage students.

Table 2 depicts the respondents' ownership and use of mobile devices, the first part of the table shows that 71.68% of the respondents possessed smartphones, 13.86% indicated the possession of both smartphones and tablets, 3.69% reported no mobile device at all as well as feature phones. The analysis of device ownership depicts that a good number of accounting students have a smartphone which is crucial to m-learning deployment and adoption in Nigeria. The second part of the table shows the brand specification of mobile devices owned by accounting students and out of the 707 indicated devices 38.7% were Techno phones or tabs, 2.45% indicated Infinix smartphone, 15.98% had Samsung phones or tablets, Itel and iPhone/iPad ownership distribution of 7.36% and 7.78% respectively. Additionally, on the mobile device information, the third segment of Table 2 depicts the skill level of accounting students in using a mobile device, 39.47% indicated expertise in use, 51.22% showed average mobile skill and 9.30% indicated limited skills in the use of mobile devices. The data analysed show that Nigerian accounting students are ready for m-learning adoption based on mobile device ownership and usage.

#### 4.1. Descriptive analysis—mobile activities

The third segment of the survey instrument was to find out the mobile activities accounting students carry out on their devices. The activities survey include; online shopping, reading ebooks, online banking, distributing files, social networking, accessing educational content, watching movies, playing games, listening to music and distributing files.

Table 3 depicts that Social Networking was the activity with the most mobile device use with an aggregate of 86.97% responses for the often-used category. This is followed by Assessing Educational Content with 79.85% for the often category. The third most frequently engaged mobile activity was Online Banking with 70.02% closely followed by Listening to Music with 73.28% for the often category. The least engaged activity was Online shopping with an aggregate of 38.09% for the often Likert category. The Online, however, is also the only activity that elicited a "never" response of 1.8% of the students among the nine different activities listed.

Looking at the tertiary and professional institution grouping for the data obtained, Table 3 shows that similarity of responses from the two groups for the mobile activities and this is further concretized by Table 4 which shows that Online Banking, Social Networking, watching movies and Listening to Music are the only mobile activities that differ significantly (P < 0.001, 0.01, 0.05) between the groups from the nine observed activities. Looking at the distribution in Table 3, Online Banking is a mobile activity engaged more by professional students this could be due to the working class category of the students. The reverse is the case for Listening to Music which depicts a mobile activity that is more preferable among tertiary institutions students who represent a younger category of



<u>.                                    </u>
똳
ē
먹
둱
о, П
≦`
Ħ
ੁ
ដ្ឋ
片
=
ĕ
엹
SS
횬
2
ᅀ
힏
ᅙ
⋋
ﻕ
E
면
ipants (tertiary
ë.
₫
믉
≝
₽.
ڡ
<b>₹</b>
چ
⋽.
S
ڇ
Ξ.
0
S
Ĕ
<u>.</u>
ē
ᄓ
잍
2
U
브
둡
ᅙ
ਨੂ
물.
ē
۵
H.
a)
٥
0

						Gender	er						
Institutions				Male				Fe	Female			Total	
			No		%		Z	No		%			
Tertiary			215		42.74		28	288		57.26		503	
Professional			276		53.28		77	242		46.72		518	
Combined			491		48.09		53	530		51.91		1021	
						Age							
	Below 18 Yrs	8 Yrs	18–20	0 Yrs	21-2	21-25 Yrs	26–30 Yrs	O Yrs	31–40Yrs	0Yrs	Over 40 Yrs	+0 Yrs	Total
	No	%	oN	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	
Tertiary	101	20.1	154	30.6	213	42.3	35	7.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	503
Professional	0	0.00	20	3.9	102	19.7	108	20.8	161	31.1	127	24.5	518
Combined	101	6.6	174	17	315	30.9	143	14.	161	15.8	127	12.4	1021
						Level of Study	Study						
	1st	1st Year/Found.	Jd.	2nc	2nd Year/Skills	S	3rd Yr,	3rd Yr/Prof./HND1		4th Y	4th Yr/HND 2		Total
Institution	No		%	No		%	No	%		No	%		
Tertiary	6		19.3	68	1	17.7	200	00.00	00	117	23.3		503
Professional	235		45.4	98		18.3	147	28.4	.+	41	7.9		518
Grand	332		32.5	184		18.0	347	34.0	(	158	15.5		1021

Source: Authors' Computation (2019)

503 518 1021

15.44

%

15 80 **95** 

50.10 52.32 **51.22** 

No 252 271 271 **523** 

46.92 32.24 **39.47** 

No 236 167 **403** 

Professional **Combined** 

Tertiary

%

Institution

Total

	d)
	Ĕ.
	≅′
	<u>,,</u>
	~
	_
	ರ
	č.
	☴ .
	٠.
	൧
	=
	듶
	ष्ट
	d)
	Ξ.
	₹.
	≶.
	0
	<u>.</u>
	ሧ
	≌ .
	>
	a)
	o .
	-
	<u> </u>
	₹.
	mobi
	9
	₽.
	_
	10
	23
	⊂ .
	ѿ.
	Ħ.
	<b>≃</b> .
٠,	己.
	S
	Ξ.
	<u> </u>
	⊑ .
٦,	=
	⊂.
	3
	<u></u>
	ວ.
	ວ
	đ.
	<b>.</b>
١,	N
	Ψ.
	=
	므_
	0
1	

					L	<b>Type of Mobile Device</b>	ile Device						
Institution	Feature	Feature Phone	Sı	Smartphone		Tablet	et	_	Both		None		Total
	N <sub>O</sub>	%	8 N		%	ş	%	°N	%	<b>z</b>	<sub>S</sub>	%	Š
Tertiary	19	3.84	307	62	62.02	50	10.10	108	21.8	1	11	2.22	495
Professional	18	3.54	412	81	81.10	21	4.13	31	6.10		26	5.12	208
Combined	37	3.69	719		71.68	7.1	7.08	139	13.8		37	3.69	1003
		•			2	Make of Mobile Device	ile Device						
Institution	Techno/Tab	o/Tab	Infinix	nix	Samsı	Samsung/Tab	Itel	el	Iphone/iPad	∌/iPad	Otl	Others	
	°N	%	Š	%	ş	%	°N	%	N <sub>o</sub>	%	Š	%	Š
Tertiary	141	39.5	38	10.64	19	17.09	25	7.00	38	10.64	6	25.77	357
Professional	133	38.0	20	14.29	25	14.86	27	7.71	17	4.86	71	20.29	350
Combined	274	38.7	88	12.45	113	15.98	52	7.36	55	7.78	163	23.06	707
						Mobile Device Skill	ice Skill						

Source: Authors' Computation (2019)

Q	
Ü	
+	
_	
,0	
$\circ$	

Institution         Online Shopping       Tertiary         Reading Ebooks       Tertiary         Reading Ebooks       Tertiary         Online Banking       Tombined         Online Banking       Tertiary         Professional       Combined         File Distribution       Tertiary         Professional       Combined         Social Networking       Tertiary         Professional       Combined         Professional       Combined         Social Networking       Tertiary         Professional       Combined         Combined       Combined		96 38.08% 38.10% 38.09% 67.94% 60.99% 60.12% 81.41% 70.72%	Freq.  223 189 412 126 126 148 274 137 58	Sometimes/Rarely       eq.     %       123     44.69%       189     37.50%       112     41.08%       126     25.40%       148     29.31%       174     27.45%       337     27.45%		Never %	Total
60	Freq 190 192 382 382 337 308 645 300 403 703	% 38.08% 38.10% 38.10% 38.09% 67.94% 60.99% 60.12% 81.41% 70.72%	Freq. 223 189 412 126 148 274 137 58	% 44.69% 37.50% 41.08% 25.40% 29.31% 27.37%	<b>Freq</b> 86 123	%	
5	190 192 382 337 338 645 645 403 703	38.08% 38.10% 38.09% 67.94% 60.99% 64.44% 60.12% 81.41% 70.72%	223 189 412 412 126 148 274 137 58	44.69% 37.50% 41.08% 25.40% 29.31% 27.37%	86		
	192 382 337 308 645 645 703 703	38.10% 38.09% 67.94% 60.99% 64.44% 60.12% 81.41% 70.72%	189 412 126 148 274 137 58	37.50% 41.08% 25.40% 29.31% 27.37%	123	17.23%	667
	382 337 308 645 300 403 703	38.09% 67.94% 60.99% 64.44% 60.12% 81.41% 70.72%	412 126 148 274 137 58	<b>41.08%</b> 25.40% 29.31% <b>27.37%</b> 27.45%		24.40%	204
	337 308 <b>645</b> 300 403 <b>703</b> 219	67.94% 60.99% <b>64.44%</b> 60.12% 81.41% <b>70.72%</b> 51.29%	126 148 <b>274</b> 137 58	25.40% 29.31% <b>27.37%</b> 27.45%	500	20.84%	1003
	308 645 300 403 703 219	60.99% 64.44% 60.12% 81.41% 70.72%	274 274 137 58	29.31% <b>27.45</b> % 27.45%	33	%59.9	967
	645 300 403 703 219	64.44% 60.12% 81.41% 70.72% 51.29%	274 137 58	<b>27.37%</b> 27.45%	64	9.70%	202
	300 403 <b>703</b> 219	60.12% 81.41% <b>70.72%</b> 51.29%	137	27.45%	82	8.19%	1001
	703 703 219	81.41% <b>70.72%</b> 51.29%	58		62	12.42%	664
	<b>703</b> 219	<b>70.72%</b> 51.29%		11.72%	34	6.87%	495
	219	51.29%	195	19.62%	96	%99'6	766
			142	33.26%	99	15.46%	427
	228	45.33%	160	31.81%	115	22.86%	503
	<b>447</b>	48.06%	302	32.47%	181	19.46%	930
Professional Combined	416	91.63%	33	7.27%	2	1.10%	424
Combined	418	82.77%	53	10.50%	34	6.73%	202
	834	86.97%	98	8.97%	39	4.07%	929
Assessing Educational Content Tertiary	403	81.58%	75	15.18%	16	3.24%	767
Professional	358	78.00%	72	15.69%	29	6.32%	459
Combined	761	79.85%	147	15.42%	45	4.72%	953
Movies	258	65.48%	118	29.95%	18	4.57%	394
Professional	228	23.90%	126	29.79%	69	16.31%	423
Combined	987	29.49%	747	29.87%	87	10.65%	817
Games	316	64.10%	133	76.98%	77	8:92%	763
Professional	224	46.86%	166	34.73%	88	18.41%	478
Combined	240	55.61%	299	30.79%	132	13.59%	971

I able 3. (Continuea)								
	Institution	Ofi	Often	Sometim	Sometimes/Rarely	Never	ver	Total
		Freq	%	Freq.	%	Freq	%	
Music	Tertiary	422	85.60%	09	12.17%	11	2.23%	664
	Professional	258	59.31%	123	28.28%	54	12.41%	435
	Combined	089	73.28%	183	19.72%	65	7.00%	928
(3010)	6							

$\overline{}$
ď
~
7
-:=
#
<u>_</u>
,Ο
9

lable 4. Analysis of v	variance between tertial	lable 4. Analysis ot variance between tertiary and protessional groups on trequency ot use ot mobile activities	ps on trequency of u	se ot mobile activities		
			ANOVA			
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	L	Sig.
Online Shopping	Between Groups	25.055	3	8.352	4.486	+00.
	Within Groups	1859.944	666	1.862		
	Total	1884.999	1002			
Reading eBooks	Between Groups	11.113	3	3.704	3.251	.021
	Within Groups	1136.169	266	1.140		
	Total	1147.283	1000			
Online Banking	Between Groups	6.124	3	2.041	1.823	.141
	Within Groups	1119.864	1000	1.120		
	Total	1125.988	1003			
Distributing files	Between Groups	22.805	3	7.602	4.864	.002
	Within Groups	1559.595	866	1.563		
	Total	1582.400	1001			
Social Networking	Between Groups	2.999	3	1.000	1.822	.141
	Within Groups	548.693	1000	.549		
	Total	551.692	1003			
Accessing Educational	Between Groups	6.265	3	2.088	2.891	.034
Content	Within Groups	685.429	676	.722		
	Total	691.694	952			
Watching movies	Between Groups	9.068	3	3.023	2.442	.063
	Within Groups	1174.523	676	1.238		
	Total	1183.591	952			
Playing games	Between Groups	21.869	3	7.290	4.776	.003
	Within Groups	1445.550	947	1.526		
	Total	1467.420	920			

			ANONA			
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Listening to music	Between Groups	1.583	3	.528	.550	879.
	Within Groups	911.961	951	656.		
	Total	913.543	954			
Source: Authors' Computation (2019)	tion (2019)					



students. For Social Networking, the percentages of tertiary and professionals who undertake the mobile activity are quite close, however, the dissimilarity is obvious in the number of respondents who engage sometimes/rarely and those who do engage in the activity at all.

#### 4.2. Descriptive analysis of intended mobile accounting learning activities

The analysis in Table 5 shows that the accounting learning activity that participants will like to use mobile resources for the most is to search for educational resources 93.81% very closely followed by the use of mobile applications for learning supported by 93.28%. The third activity with the highest frequency is to use online resources 90.32% followed by a local collaboration with colleagues 90.26%. The least favourite accounting learning activity participants would want to use mobile resources for is taking notes during lectures 72.85% followed by local interactions with lecturers 77.14%, the third least favourite learning activity is viewing video or audio lectures 77.5% and then taking assessments, quizzes, surveys and polling 77.75%.

Table 6 displays divergent views from the tertiary and professional accounting students for most of the intended mobile accounting learning activities except using mobile applications to learn and using video and audio recorded lectures. Table 5 gives a clearer picture on the divergence, for instance, while 87.80% of tertiary students like the idea of taking assessments on their mobile devices, 66.81% of professional students support the idea with 23.23% choosing to remain neutral on the use of mobile devices for this particular activity. This divergent view could be due to the fact that tertiary institution students especially those who are familiar with Learning Management Systems such as Covenant University students are more likely to embrace the idea more professional institution students who are most familiar with the traditional pen and paper assessments.

#### 4.3. Descriptive analysis of internet access

The data contained in Table 7 depicts data on internet access by tertiary and professional accounting students. The first part was based on the question of whether the participants had constant access to use the internet and the responses were obtained using a yes or no format. The responses show that 67.09% had constant access to the internet while 23.7% did not. The second part of the table shows that 72% pay to access the internet while 17.3% do not pay. The third section of the table elicits data on the participants' opinion of the price of accessing the internet via their mobile devices and from the general responses, 27.03% participants stated that the cost of accessing the internet was high, 51.03% considered the cost as average while 5% thought that the cost was inexpensive. The missing responses from the entire population were 16.94%. The fourth section of the table sought further details on the use of the internet on mobile devices by the participants by asking the question "how often do you use the internet on your mobile device?" From the combined responses, 69.54% use the internet daily, 11.66% indicated weekly usage, and 4.9% showed monthly usage

#### 4.4. Descriptive analysis of mobile learning readiness and acceptance challenges

Table 8 show the responses to the open question on participants' opinion of the challenges that might face the implementation of m-learning in accounting. The challenges listed by the respondents were sorted into four main issues; infrastructure availability challenge cost challenges, development and implementation challenges and use challenges. From the Table, based on the combined data the highest challenge overall is the cost of internet access 43.02% followed by the internet availability and network access challenge 40.5%, the third most reported challenge was the inexperience of instructors and students 15.89% followed by mobile device availability 10.08%. Other significant challenges mentioned include the cost of m-learning resources and materials 9.5%, how to manage accounting course complexities 6.01%, students getting distracted 5.23% and the cost of training, research and implementation 4.26%. The least mentioned challenge was adjusting from the traditional teaching method 0.19% followed by how to adequately evaluate 0.39% and developing a complicated m-learning application 0.91%.

Based on the issue related groups, the category with the highest number of challenges mentioned was the cost group with 59.30% respondents indicating challenges within the group very

Institution         Institution         Freq.         9/9         Freq.         %9         Freq.         %9         Freq.         %9         Perg.         %9         %9         Perg.         %9	Table 5. Accounting students' intended M-learning	inded M-learning	activities						
ring         Freq.         %         Freq.         %         Freq.         %           ring         lettiary         473         96.33%         12         2.44%         6         1.22%           Porofessional         875         99.33%         21         2.44%         6         1.22%           Combined         875         93.28%         21         2.24%         42         4.48%           Inctiony         421         85.57%         35         7.11%         36         7.32%           Professional         274         59.31%         75         16.23%         1.13         2.4.48%           Professional         274         59.31%         75         16.23%         1.6         4.48%           Professional         449         91.26%         17         3.46%         26         5.28%           Professional         409         91.26%         17         2.84%         65         1.4.48%           Inctiony         478         93.85%         18         3.30%         44         9.52%           Inctiony         478         97.55%         2         1.0.2%         1.4.3%           Inctiony         478         9.35%		Institution	Aç	jree	Disc	igree	Nei	utral	Total
ring         Tertiany         473         96.33%         12         2.44%         6         1.22%           Professional         402         98.93%         2         2.01%         36         8.05%           Combined         875         99.28%         21         2.24%         42         4.48%           Professional         471         85.57%         35         7.11%         36         4.48%           Professional         274         59.31%         75         16.23%         149         7.32%           Intriary         449         91.26%         17         3.46%         26         5.28%           Professional         819         85.85%         44         4.61%         91         9.54%           Combined         819         85.85%         44         4.61%         91         9.54%           I ertiary         458         93.85%         14         2.87%         44         9.54%           I ertiary         458         93.55%         44         2.87%         44         9.54%           I ertiary         414         84.49%         35         1.14%         4.14%         9.44         9.54%         9.4         9.54% <th></th> <th></th> <th>Freq.</th> <th>%</th> <th>Freq.</th> <th>%</th> <th>Freq.</th> <th>%</th> <th></th>			Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	
ring         Tertiary         473         96.33%         12         2.44%         6         1.22%           Professional         402         89.93%         9         2.01%         36         8.05%           Combined         875         93.28%         21         2.24%         42         4.48%           Fundry         421         85.57%         35         77         11%         36         7.32%           Professional         274         85.35%         10         11.33%         149         7.32%           I entiary         449         91.26%         17         3.46%         25         5.28%           Professional         819         80.09%         27         5.84%         65         5.28%           Professional         40         91.26%         44         4.61%         91         9.54%           I entiary         458         93.85%         44         4.61%         91         9.54%           I entiary         458         93.85%         44         4.61%         91         9.54%           I entiary         478         93.85%         44         4.61%         9.54%         9.54%           I entiary	(a)								
Professional         402         89.33%         9         2.01%         36         80.5%           Combined         875         93.28%         21         2.24%         42         4.48%           Tertiary         421         85.57%         35         7.11%         36         4.48%           Professional         274         59.31%         75         16.23%         113         2.446%           Tertiary         449         91.26%         17         3.46%         26         5.28%           Professional         810         80.09%         27         5.84%         26         5.28%           Professional         458         93.85%         44         4.51%         91         95.4%           Intriary         458         90.32%         27         5.84%         60         5.28%         14           Professional         400         86.58%         18         3.90%         44         9.52%         14.43%           Tertiary         416         89.45%         18         3.80%         29         6.26%         14.43%           Tertiary         416         84.40%         3.83%         24         9.54%         14.43%         8.37%	Using Mobile Applications for Learning	Tertiary	473	96.33%	12	2.44%	9	1.22%	491
Combined         875         93.28%         21         2.24%         42         4.48%           Tertiary         421         85.57%         35         7.11%         36         7.32%           Professional         274         59.31%         75         16.23%         113         24.66%           Combined         695         72.85%         110         11.53%         149         5.24%           Professional         310         80.09%         27         5.84%         26         5.28%           Combined         819         85.85%         14         28.78         14.0         3.28%           Professional         400         86.58%         14         2.87%         44         9.52%           Combined         819         93.85%         18         3.90%         44         9.52%           Professional         416         86.58%         18         3.80%         44         9.52%           Combined         894         93.81%         23         2.41%         36.0         6.26%           Intiary         416         86.58%         18         3.89%         41         9.52%           Combined         42         93.81%		Professional	402	89.93%	6	2.01%	36	8.05%	447
Tertiory         421         85.57%         35         7.11%         36         7.32%           Professional         274         59.31%         75         16.23%         113         24.46%           Combined         695         72.85%         110         11.53%         149         15.62%           Tertiory         449         91.26%         17         3.46%         65         14.07%           Professional         370         80.09%         27         5.84%         65         14.07%           Professional         458         93.85%         14         2.87%         16         3.28%           Combined         858         90.32%         32         3.37%         60         6.32%           Individy         478         97.55%         5         1.02%         1.43%         1.43%           Professional         416         89.45%         32         2.41%         44         9.54%         60         6.32%           Individy         416         89.45%         32         2.41%         41         8.37%         1.43%         1.43%         1.43%         1.43%         1.43%         1.43%         1.43%         1.43%         1.44%         1.44%		Combined	875	93.28%	21	2.24%	77	4.48%	938
Professional         274         59.31%         75         16.23%         113         24.66%           Combined         695         72.85%         110         11.53%         149         15.62%           Tertiary         449         91.26%         17         3.46%         26         5.28%           Professional         370         80.09%         27         5.84%         65         14.07%           Combined         819         85.85%         44         4.61%         91         9.54%           Professional         458         93.85%         14         2.87%         16         3.28%           Combined         858         90.32%         3.37%         60         6.32%           Combined         858         90.32%         5         1.02%         7         1.43%           Professional         416         89.85%         18         3.89%         29         6.26%           Combined         894         93.81%         24         9.54%         9.5         9.56%           Combined         894         93.81%         24         9.54%         9.5         9.5           Indivis         414         84.49%         32	Taking Notes	Tertiary	421	85.57%	35	7.11%	36	7.32%	492
Combined         695         72.85%         110         11.53%         149         15.62%           Tertiary         449         91.26%         17         3.46%         26         5.28%           Professional         370         80.09%         27         5.84%         65         14.07%           Combined         819         85.85%         44         4.61%         91         95.4%           Professional         400         86.58%         14         4.61%         91         95.4%           Professional         400         86.58%         18         3.90%         44         9.52%           Professional         478         90.32%         32         1.02%         7.1         1.43%           Professional         416         89.85%         18         3.30%         44         9.52%         6.26%           Combined         416         84.49%         35         7.14%         41         8.37%         14.3%         9.56%         9.56%         9.56%         9.56%         9.56%         9.56%         9.56%         9.56%         9.56%         9.56%         9.56%         9.56%         9.56%         9.56%         9.56%         9.51%         9.56%		Professional	274	59.31%	75	16.23%	113	24.46%	462
Tertiary         449         91.26%         17         3.46%         26         5.28%           Professional         370         80.09%         27         5.84%         65         14.07%           Combined         819         85.85%         44         4.61%         91         9.54%           Professional         408         86.58%         14         2.87%         16         3.28%           Combined         858         90.32%         18         3.90%         44         9.52%           Combined         858         90.32%         5         1.02%         7         14.3%           Professional         416         89.85%         18         3.89%         29         6.26%           Combined         894         93.81%         23         2.41%         41         14.3%           Professional         323         7.07%         44         9.54%         94         5.03%           Combined         737         77.50%         70         8.31%         94         6.91%           Professional         323         77.50%         15         14.20%         14.4         9.96%         14.7         8.91%           Combined		Combined	969	72.85%	110	11.53%	149	15.62%	954
Professional Signature         810         80.09%         27         5.84%         65         14,07%           Combined         819         85.85%         44         4.61%         91         95.4%           Tertiary         458         93.85%         14         2.87%         16         3.28%           Professional         400         86.58%         18         3.90%         44         9.52%           Combined         858         90.32%         5         1.02%         7         1.43%           Professional         478         97.55%         18         3.89%         29         6.26%           Professional         416         89.85%         18         3.89%         29         6.26%           Combined         714         84.49%         35         7.14%         41         8.37%           Professional         73         77.50%         79         8.31%         14.20%         14.20%           Combined         734         77.50%         75         8.31%         14.20%         14.72%           Rombined         734         77.50%         71         3.47%         32         20.26%           Professional         88.78%	Reading eBooks	Tertiary	644	91.26%	17	3.46%	26	5.28%	492
Combined         819         85.85%         44         4,61%         91         95.4%         7           Tertiary         458         93.85%         14         2.87%         16         3.28%         18         3.90%         44         9.52%         23.8           Professional         400         86.58%         18         3.37%         60         6.32%         2.2           Tertiary         478         97.55%         5         1.02%         7         1.43%         2.2           Professional         416         89.85%         18         3.80%         29         6.26%         6.26%           Professional         414         84.49%         35         7.14%         41         8.37%         2.2           Combined         737         70.07%         44         9.54%         94         5.03%         2.2           Iertiary         432         87.80%         26         5.28%         14,72%         20.39%         14,72%         20.39%           Combined         734         77.75%         71         7.52%         139         14,72%         20.26%           Professional         366         68.06%         53         11,67%         <		Professional	370	80.09%	27	5.84%	65	14.07%	462
Tertiary         458         93.85%         14         2.87%         16         3.28%           Professional         400         86.58%         18         3.90%         44         9.52%           Combined         858         90.32%         32         3.37%         60         6.32%           Professional         418         97.55%         5         1.02%         7         1.43%           Professional         416         89.85%         18         3.89%         20         6.26%           Combined         834         93.81%         23         2.41%         41         8.37%           Professional         323         70.07%         44         9.54%         94         20.39%           Combined         737         77.50%         79         8.31%         14.20%         20.39%           Professional         302         66.81%         45         9.56%         105         23.23%           Iertiary         432         87.80%         45         9.96%         145         20.36%           Combined         734         77.55%         71         7.52%         139         14.72%           Professional         309         68.06%		Combined	819	85.85%	77	4.61%	91	9.54%	954
Professional         400         86.58%         18         3.90%         44         9.52%           Combined         858         90.32%         32         3.37%         60         6.32%           Tertiary         478         97.55%         5         1.02%         7         1.43%           Professional         416         89.85%         18         3.89%         29         6.26%           Combined         894         93.81%         23         7.14%         41         8.37%           Tertiary         414         84.49%         35         7.14%         41         8.37%           Professional         323         70.07%         44         9.54%         94         20.39%           Tertiary         432         87.80%         26         5.28%         34         6.91%           Professional         302         66.81%         71         7.55%         105         23.23%           Tertiary         435         88.78%         17         3.47%         38         7.76%           Professional         309         66.81%         71         3.47%         92         20.26%           Professional         309         68.06%	Using Online Resources	Tertiary	458	93.85%	14	2.87%	16	3.28%	488
Combined         858         90.32%         32         3.37%         60         6.32%           Tertiary         478         97.55%         5         1.02%         7         1.43%           Professional         416         89.85%         18         3.89%         29         6.26%           Combined         414         84.49%         35         7.14%         41         8.37%           Professional         323         70.07%         44         9.54%         94         20.39%           Combined         737         77.50%         79         8.31%         14.20%         9.6           Professional         302         66.81%         45         9.96%         105         23.23%           Combined         734         77.75%         71         7.52%         139         14.72%           Professional         302         66.81%         45         9.96%         105         23.23%           Tertiary         435         88.78%         71         34.7%         38         7.76%           Indicator         435         88.78%         139         14.72%         20.26%           Indicator         435         88.08%         7		Professional	400	86.58%	18	3.90%	77	9.52%	462
Tertiary         478         97.55%         5         1.02%         7         1.43%           Professional         416         89.85%         18         3.89%         29         6.26%         6.26%           Combined         894         93.81%         35         7.41%         41         8.37%         7.66%         9.6         6.26%         9.6         9.6         6.26%         9.6         9.6         6.26%         9.6		Combined	828	90.32%	32	3.37%	09	6.32%	950
Professional         416         89.85%         18         3.89%         29         6.26%           Combined         894         93.81%         23         2.41%         36         3.78%         3.78%           Tertiary         414         84.49%         35         7.14%         41         83.7%         20.39%           Professional         323         70.07%         44         9.54%         94         20.39%         20.39%           Tertiary         432         87.80%         26         5.28%         34         6.91%         6.91%           Professional         302         66.81%         45         9.96%         105         23.23%         14.72%           Tertiary         435         88.78%         71         7.52%         139         14.72%           Tertiary         435         88.78%         17         3.47%         38         7.76%           Professional         309         68.06%         53         11.67%         92         20.26%           Professional         309         68.06%         53         13.6         13.77%         92	Searching Educ. Resources	Tertiary	478	97.55%	5	1.02%	7	1.43%	7690
Combined         894         93.81%         23         2.41%         36         3.78%           Tertiary         414         84.49%         35         7.14%         41         8.37%           Professional         323         70.07%         44         9.54%         94         20.38%           Combined         73         77.50%         26         5.28%         34         6.91%           Professional         302         66.81%         45         9.96%         105         23.23%           Combined         734         77.75%         71         3.47%         38         7.76%           Professional         309         68.06%         53         11.67%         92         20.26%           Professional         309         68.06%         53         11.67%         92         20.26%		Professional	416	89.85%	18	3.89%	29	6.26%	463
Tertiary         414         84,49%         35         7.14%         41         8.37%         70.39%           Professional         323         70.07%         44         9.54%         94         20.39%           Combined         737         77.50%         79         8.31%         145.0%         14.20%           Intriary         432         87.80%         26         5.28%         34         6.91%         53.23%           Intriary         734         77.75%         71         7.52%         139         14.72%         77.6%           Intriary         435         88.78%         17         3.47%         38         7.76%         77.6%           Professional         309         68.06%         53         11.67%         92         20.26%           Combined         744         78.81%         70         74.2%         130         13.77%		Combined	894	93.81%	23	2.41%	36	3.78%	953
Professional Same and Sam	Video & Audio Recorded Lectures	Tertiary	414	84.49%	35	7.14%	41	8.37%	490
Combined         737         77.50%         79         8.31%         135         14.20%           Tertiary         432         87.80%         26         5.28%         34         6.91%         6.91%           Professional         302         66.81%         71         7.50%         105         23.23%         14.72%           Tertiary         435         88.78%         17         3.47%         38         7.76%           Professional         309         68.06%         53         11.67%         92         20.26%           Combined         74         78.81%         70         7.42%         130         13.77%		Professional	323	70.07%	77	9.54%	<del>7</del> 6	20.39%	461
Tertiary         432         87.80%         26         5.28%         34         6.91%         6.91%           Professional         302         66.81%         45         9.96%         105         23.23%         23.23%           Combined         734         77.75%         71         7.52%         139         14,72%         7.76%           Professional         309         68.06%         53         11.67%         92         20.26%           Combined         744         78.81%         70         7.42%         130         13.77%		Combined	737	77.50%	79	8.31%	135	14.20%	951
Professional         302         66.81%         45         9.96%         105         23.23%           Combined         734         77.75%         71         7.52%         139         14.72%           Tertiary         435         88.78%         17         3.47%         38         7.76%           Professional         309         68.06%         53         11.67%         92         20.26%           Combined         744         78.81%         70         7.42%         130         13.77%	Taking Asse., Quiz, Survey	Tertiary	432	87.80%	26	5.28%	34	6.91%	492
Combined         734         77.75%         71         7.52%         139         14,72%           Tertiary         435         88.78%         17         3.47%         38         7.76%           Professional         309         68.06%         53         11.67%         92         20.26%           Combined         744         78.81%         70         7.42%         130         13.77%		Professional	302	66.81%	45	%96'6	105	23.23%	452
Tertiary         435         88.78%         17         3.47%         38         7.76%           Professional         309         68.06%         53         11.67%         92         20.26%           Combined         744         78.81%         70         7.42%         130         13.77%		Combined	734	77.75%	7.1	7.52%	139	14.72%	<b>7</b> 76
309         68.06%         53         11.67%         92         20.26%           744         78.81%         70         7.42%         130         13.77%	Submitting Assignments	Tertiary	435	88.78%	17	3.47%	38	7.76%	7690
744 78.81% 70 7.42% 130 13.77%		Professional	309	%90'89	53	11.67%	76	20.26%	454
		Combined	744	78.81%	70	7.42%	130	13.77%	776

Table 5. (Continued)								
	Institution	Ag	Agree	Disa	Disagree	Ner	Neutral	Total
		Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	
Local Interactions with Lecturers	Tertiary	400	81.30%	31	6.30%	61	12.40%	492
	Professional	329	72.63%	31	6.84%	63	20.53%	453
	Combined	729	77.14%	62	6.56%	154	16.30%	945
(9)								
Social Network Learning	Tertiary	644	91.26%	8	0.61%	07	8.13%	492
	Professional	391	85.75%	19	4.17%	97	10.09%	456
	Combined	840	88.61%	22	2.32%	98	9.07%	876
Local Collaboration with Coll.	Tertiary	462	%85.46	9	1.23%	21	4.29%	687
	Professional	391	85.75%	15	3.29%	09	10.96%	957
	Combined	853	90.26%	21	2.22%	7.1	7.51%	945
Int. Collab. With Colleagues	Tertiary	433	88.55%	20	%60'4	36	7.36%	687
	Professional	364	80.00%	28	6.15%	89	13.85%	455
	Combined	797	84.43%	87	%80′5	66	10.49%	<b>7</b> 76
Int. Collab. With Lecturers	Tertiary	421	86.09%	27	5.52%	41	8.38%	687
	Professional	343	75.22%	36	%68.7	<i>LL</i>	16.89%	954
	Combined	764	80.85%	63	6.67%	118	12.49%	945

Source: Authors' Computation (2019)

$\leq$
~
u
-
-
2.
+
_
Č
_
7

Se
Ĕ
Ę
용
gu
į
edi
Ĭ
Σ
ed M
힏
ite
· <u>=</u>
6
ps
no
g
Ħ
de
멽
6
큹
S
8
8
وا
<u>.</u>
55
ofe
ď
Þ
ē
5
ţį
ter
딦
Jee
Ę
ھ
Ce
au
ari
<b>-</b>
0
sis
9
Ā
6.
a
<del>g</del>
ם

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	L.	Sig.
	Between Groups	3.764	33	1.255	3.105	.026
Applications for learning $$	Within Groups	384.634	952	707		
	Total	388.397	955			
Taking notes during B	Between Groups	6.479	3	1.493	1.617	.184
	Within Groups	876.850	950	.923		
<u>                                     </u>	Total	881.329	953			
Reading eBooks	Between Groups	3.525	3	1.175	2.167	060.
	Within Groups	514.946	950	.542		
	Total	518.471	953			
Using online resources E	Between Groups	3.323	3	1.108	2.453	.062
	Within Groups	427.108	946	.451		
	Total	430.431	646			
	Between Groups	1.507	3	.502	1.279	.280
educational resources	Within Groups	372.919	946	.393		
	Total	374.426	952			
oipno	Between Groups	11.972	3	3.991	5.029	.002
recorded lectures	Within Groups	751.505	746	794		
	Total	763.476	950			
	Between Groups	3.867	3	1.289	1.702	.165
quiz, surveys and polling $$	Within Groups	711.658	046	757.		
	Total	715.524	943			
Submitting assignments	Between Groups	761.	3	900.	.087	<i>L</i> 96°
	Within Groups	696.484	940	.741		
	Total	829.969	943			

Table 6. (Continued)						
			ANOVA			
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	L	Sig.
Local Collaboration with	Between Groups	366.	3	.332	.425	.735
Interacting Lecturers	Within Groups	734.205	941	.780		
	Total	735.200	946			
Using Social Networking Between Groups	Between Groups	2.721	3	706.	1.822	.141
for learning	Within Groups	868.694	944	867.		
	Total	472.619	947			
Local Collaboration with	Between Groups	.719	3	.240	.514	.673
Colleagues	Within Groups	438.896	941	997.		
	Total	439.615	776			
Int. Collaborating with	Between Groups	1.341	3	744.	.755	.519
colleagues	Within Groups	556.235	046	.592		
	Total	557.576	943			
Int. Collaboration with	Between Groups	.300	3	.100	.141	936
instructors or lecturers	Within Groups	668.616	941	.711		
	Total	668.916	546			
Source: Authors' Computation (2019)	tion (2019)					



Table 7. Accounting students' perceived level of internet access

#### **Constant Internet Access**

	Υ	es	N	lo	То	tal	
	No	%	No	%	No		
Tertiary	395	81.11%	92	18.89%	487		
Professional	290	65.91%	150	34.09%	440		
Combined	685	73.89%	242	26.11%	927		

#### **Payment for Internet Access**

	Y	es	N	lo	То	tal
	No	%	No	%	No	
Tertiary	375	77.64%	108	22.36%	483	
Professional	359	83.88%	69	16.12%	428	
Combined	735	80.59%	177	19.41%	912	

#### **Opinion of Cost**

	High	Price	Ave	rage	Inexp	ensive	Total
	No	%	No	%	No	%	
Tertiary	140	31.25%	281	62.72%	27	6.03%	448
Professional	136	34.00%	240	60.00%	24	6.00%	400
Combined	276	32.55%	521	61.44%	51	6.01%	848

#### Frequency of Usage

	Ever	yday	Every	week	Mon	ithly	Total
	No	%	No	%	No	%	
Tertiary	374	80.78%	66	14.25%	23	4.97%	463
Professional	336	80.77%	53	12.74%	27	6.49%	416
Combined	710	80.77%	119	13.54%	50	5.69%	879

Source: Authors' Computation (2019)

closely followed by infrastructural issues 58.72%, the third is the use category 28.48% and the last group is the development and implementation category with 12.4% responses. Respondents indicated more than one challenge per category. Therefore, the addition of the total is irrelevant to this analysis.

#### 5. Discussions

The capacity of the Nigerian education system to achieve sustained quality education (SDG4) in this era of ever-evolving ICT and mobile technology use is dependent on m-learning and the readiness of different stakeholders including students, teachers and institutions to accept the learning method represent a crucial determinant in its eventual adoption. The discussion, therefore, centres on the readiness of accounting students in Nigeria to adopt m-learning based on various factors. In the area of smart device availability, a good number of the students from the surveyed institutions owned smart devices, ranging from smart mobile phones to tablets and some even displayed ownership of the two different categories. Furthermore, smartphone ownership also shows a fair distribution between the tertiary and professional institutions. A study of the descriptive distribution of types of smartphones shows that Techno, Infinix and Samsung smartphones were the top three devices indicated. The high rate of ownership of smart mobile devices could be attributed to the proliferation of Techno and Infinix smartphones within the Nigerian economy. The introduction of such affordable devices with the average price ranging from N35, 000 to N50, 000 for a good smart model has affected the high rate of smart device ownership among accounting students both from the tertiary and the professional platforms. Based on the evidence of smartphone ownership, therefore, it can be inferred that accounting students in Nigeria are ready for m-learning as far as device suitability is concerned.



Table 8. Accounting students' perceived M-learning challenges	earning challenge:	S				
	Ter	Tertiary	Profe	Professional	Com	Combined
	Freq.	Percent	Freq.	Percent	Freq.	Percent
	215	100	301	100	516	100
Cost Challenges						
1. Internet Access	72	33.49%	150	49.83%	222	43.02%
2. M-learning Resource/Materials	17	7.91%	32	10.63%	67	9.50%
3. Mobile Devices	13	6.05%		0.00%	13	2.52%
4. Training, Research and Implementation	5	2.33%	17	5.65%	22	4.26%
	107	49.77%	199	66.11%	306	29.30%
Infrastructural Challenges						
1. internet Availability/Network access	79	36.74%	130	43.19%	209	40.50%
2. Mobile Device Availability	7	3.26%	45	14.95%	52	10.08%
3. Institutional Policies	9	2.79%	12	3.99%	18	3.49%
4. Power Supply	11	5.12%	7	2.33%	18	3.49%
5. Government Policies		0.47%	5	1.66%	9	1.16%
	104	48.37%	199	66.12%	303	58.72%
Use Challenges (Lecturer/Student)						
Inexperience	27	12.56%	55	18.27%	82	15.89%
Distraction—Students	20	9.30%	7	2.33%	27	5.23%
Inadequate Feedback between lecturers and students	2	2.33%	9	1.99%	11	2.13%
Willingness and readiness	9	2.79%	7	1.33%	10	1.94%
Students' laziness	7	1.86%	5	1.66%	6	1.74%
Ineffective resource preparation	3	1.40%	5	1.66%	8	1.55%
	65	30.23%	82	27.24%	147	28.48%
Development and Implementation Challenges						

Table 8. (Continued)						
	Tert	Tertiary	Profes	Professional	Com	Combined
	Freq.	Percent	Freq.	Percent	Freq.	Percent
	215	100	301	100	516	100
Managing Accounting Course Complexities	19	8.84%	12	3.99%	31	6.01%
Implementing Student Demands	0	0.00%	19	6.31%	19	3.68%
Sourcing Appropriate Content	7	1.86%	2	0.66%	9	1.16%
Evaluation	$\leftarrow$	0.47%	1	0.33%	2	0.39%
Complicated M-learning Application	2	0.93%	3	1.00%	2	0.97%
Adjusting from the traditional teaching methods	0	0.00%	1	0.33%	П	0.19%
	26	12.09%	38	12.62%	79	12.40%

Source: Authors' Computation (2019)



It is obvious from the self-indicated responses that about 90% of accounting students are either experts or good at navigating through a mobile device and by implication mobile applications, this result is also evident in a question answered later on the mobile activities frequently engaged in on mobile devices where a good percentage of respondents indicated social networking. Social networking application and sites such as Facebook, Twitter and Instagram among others do require some level of skill to navigate through. It can be inferred therefore that based on the self-indicated responses to the skill of smart device usage, students are ready for the use of the m-learning application for accounting education in Nigeria.

The most frequently engaged mobile activity is Assessing Education Contents followed by Social Networking. Reading Ebooks (which is a common mobile activity) comes in the fifth position and Online Shopping comes last. The result indicates that accounting students are familiar with mobile activities and frequently engage them on their mobile devices. It can be inferred therefore especially based on the finding that accounting students are ready to use mobile applications for m-learning purpose in Nigeria. Oyelere et al. (2016) and Mtega et al. (2012) opines that students are already engaged in different activities on their mobile devices.

Having inferred that accounting students are familiar with the use of mobile activities based on the reported frequency of use, the next question listed 13 accounting education-related activities students will like to use their mobile resources for. All the activities represent one form of m-learning activity or the other with a direct one captured as "using mobile applications for learning". The that using mobile applications for learning is an idea they would like to use their mobile resources for, also there is more than average support for all the remaining 12 activities with the least being taking notes during lectures with mobile devices. It can be inferred that based on proposed accounting m-learning activities, students are ready for m-learning in Nigerian accounting education. This outcome is in line with the findings of Oyelere et al. (2016) with the opinion that students already learn on their devices through social media, blogs and also access course contents from those devices.

Looking across the responses to the enquiries, it can be deduced that a good number of accounting students have access to constant internet which they pay for. Furthermore, they opine that the cost is average, not too expensive or cheap but affordable and finally, a good portion of the respondents also make use of internet facilities on their mobile devices on a daily basis. These responses are actually favourable to the deployment of m-learning in Nigeria. While there are still rooms for improvement in the availability of constant internet access and also the need to make the cost of access more affordable, there is enough evidence to infer that m-learning can be successfully deployed for accounting education in Nigeria. Ayoade (2015) posits that for m-learning to be successful in Nigeria there is a need to improve on internet access and network availability. It is expected that as the proliferation of mobile devices and facilitating infrastructure continues; these factors will become more affordable and increasing the rate of success of m-learning deployment in the country.

Having asked various indirect m-learning readiness questions the last set of the question addressed directly students self-indicated levels of m-learning knowledge. From the responses, about 66.1% of the accounting students are quite comfortable with their current general knowledge of m-learning, and this also is favourable for its deployment in Nigeria. The final question which is an open-ended question solicited the opinion of students on the challenges they think m-learning deployment for accounting education in Nigeria might face. The challenges as highlighted by the respondents placed in groups based on cost, infrastructure, use and development and implementation challenges. Based on the tabulated responses, the following were inferred;

Students are most concerned about the costs associated with m-learning. The cost concerns cover internet access cost which takes the largest proportion of the cost group for both tertiary and professional institution students followed by the cost of accessing m-learning resources. The



cost of acquiring mobile devices and training students and instructors to use m-learning resources were also highlighted as challenges that might limit the implementation of m-learning in Nigerian accounting education. It is therefore important for institutions and providers of enabling infrastructure to ensure that these cost challenges are addressed by making internet access more affordable, m-learning developers should develop applications with reduced costs in mind, and mobile device manufacturers can develop affordable devices tailored at enabling m-learning within the Nigerian academic context. The issue of cost is in line with the findings of Haji et al. (2013) that the main issue in m-learning deployment is cost and infrastructure related.

A very paramount concern of students on m-learning implementation in Nigeria which follows the cost of internet access is the availability of internet access. This means it is one thing to have affordable internet while it entirely another matter to have internet network coverage whenever it is needed. The place of adequate internet network coverage cannot be overemphasised for m-learning because it is a major facilitator of learning on the go, at any time and anywhere. Other challenges within the infrastructure sub-group include an adequate power supply to ensure that the battery levels of mobile devices are optimal for learning purposes, institutional and government policies that create favourable enabling environments for m-learning deployment. Internet infrastructural issue in Nigeria is in tandem with the findings of Amiaya and Ranor (2015); Haji et al. (2013) Mtega et al. (2012).

Accounting students are also concerned about the level of the inexperience of lecturers and students in developing and using m-learning resources; it is important that accounting lecturers can convert their pedagogical content knowledge into technological tools appropriate for m-learning. There are authoring tools for the easy creation of m-learning applications, but even these still require a level of experience to manipulate. The inexperience of students in the use of m-learning can also be a challenging factor to their optimal use of robust m-learning applications. Also within the use challenge group is the place of ensuring that m-learning systems can facilitate adequate and timely feedback between students and instructors, this kind of interaction is important to simulate effective traditional learning environments through mobile learning. This finding is in consonance with the findings of Yusuf, Gambari, Daramola, Badmus, and Isiaka (2018), Asiimwe and Grönlund (2015), Mtega et al. (2012) on the need to give adequate training to the lecturers and students.

A challenge that is also of concern to the students is the distraction limitation of using mobile devices to learn, due to the availability of other fun, entertaining and exciting applications at the touch of the student, it becomes easy to get easily distracted and abandon the m-learning process for social networking for instance. This challenge has the potential to limit the effectiveness of m-learning unless suitable solutions are developed to it.

From the development and implementation challenge group, students are concerned about how m-learning resources will be developed to manage the complexities of accounting courses. Most accounting courses are quantitative, requiring tables, calculations and detailed explanations. Students believe that creating m-learning applications that can successfully compete with traditional teaching techniques or at the very least supplement them is a challenge that needs to be mitigated to deploy m-learning for accounting education in Nigeria successfully. This finding is in tandem with the findings of Staples et al. (2016) that pedagogical and content issues must be taken into consideration before m-learning can be successful in accounting education. Other highlighted challenges within the group include; implementing students learning demands based on frequent updates, sourcing the appropriate content to ensure the right materials are communicated, the issue of effective evaluation methods and the need to ensure that easy to navigate accounting m-learning applications are developed. The adoption of m-learning in the Nigerian education system is the future of affordable, portable and sustainable education. This statement is based on the rate of adoption of m-learning by various disciplines globally. Therefore, if the goal of sustainable development in education should be achieved in Nigeria, the challenges of development and implementation as discussed should be adequately addressed.



#### 6. Conclusions and recommendations

SDG4 which centres on quality education depends on the adoption of ICT driven learning methods such as m-learning and there is ample evidence to support the fact that students' are ready to accept m-learning for accounting education in Nigeria. The widespread and daily use of mobile devices, applications and facilitating infrastructure for various functions including learning is a clear indication that m-learning is already being practised in one form or the other. However, it can be concluded that concerns bothering on the cost of m-learning adoption, availability of internet facilities and other enabling infrastructure such as electricity should be addressed. The study concludes that, while there is significant evidence to show that students' are ready for m-learning, these issues need to be addressed on personal, institutional and national levels to ensure a higher rate of readiness for m-learning deployment in accounting education. In light of the findings, this study recommends that students and instructors begin to take adequate steps to become more experienced and acquainted with the development and use of m-learning resources for accounting education in Nigeria. Furthermore, institutions from the tertiary, professional to national levels should generate conversations and develop policies that can significantly improve the stability of mobile infrastructure in Nigeria. Policies should be introduced to favour the availability and stability of mobile infrastructure at the national level also.

#### Funding

The authors appreciate Covenant University Centre for Research, Innovation and Development (CUCRID) for funding the publication of this research output.

#### **Author details**

Anijesushola Ajayi<sup>1</sup>

E-mail: anijesu.ajayi@covenantuniversity.edu.ng ORCID ID: http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9065-5892 Charles Korede Ayo<sup>2</sup>

E-mail: charles.ayo@covenantuniversity.edu.ng Olusanmi Olamide<sup>1</sup>

- E-mail: olamide.olusanmi@covenantuniversity.edu.ng
- <sup>1</sup> Department of Accounting, Covenant University, KM. 10, Idiroko Road, Ota, Ogun State P.M.B. 1023, Nigeria.
- <sup>2</sup> Department of Computer Science, Trinity University, Yaba, Lagos State, Nigeria.

#### Citation information

Cite this article as: Mobile learning and accounting students' readiness in tertiary and professional institutions in Nigeria, Anijesushola Ajayi, Charles Korede Ayo & Olusanmi Olamide, Cogent Arts & Humanities (2019), 6: 1676570.

#### References

- Abu-Al-Aish, A. (2014). Toward mobile learning deployment in higher education (Unpublished master's thesis). London/Brunel University. Retrieved from https://bura.brunel.ac.uk/handle/2438/7998
- Abu-Al-Aish, A., & Love, S. (2013). Factors influencing students' acceptance of m-learning: An investigation in higher education. The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 14, 5. doi:10.19173/irrodl.v14i5.1631
- Ahmed, M. S. (2016). Technology acceptance of smartphones as mobile learning tools: A contextual comparative study of Engineering and Education Colleges (Unpublished master's thesis). The University of Canterbury, New Zealand. Retrieved from https://ir.canterbury.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/ 10092/13096/Syed Ahmed\_Final PhD Thesis.pdf? sequence=1andusg=AOvVaw23Wlb7cz7GBb49eoa-
- Ajayi, A. O. (2019). M-learning and accounting education in Nigeria (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Covenant University.
- Akomo, O. D., Ajowi, J. O., & DVC, J. (2015). Factors limiting the usage of ICT in the delivery of management

- services in public secondary schools in Siaya county. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences. doi:10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n2p554
- Akpakwu, G. A., Silva, B. J., Hancke, G. P., & Abu-Mahfouz, A. M. (2018). A survey on 5G networks for the internet of things: Communication technologies and challenges. *IEEE Access*, 6, 3619–3647. doi:10.1109/access.2017.2779844
- Amiaya, A. O., & Ranor, L. C. (2015). Challenges and benefits of mobile learning adoption in OTM programme in Delta state polytechnics. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 5(4), 86–91. Retrieved from www.aijcrnet.com/journals/Vol\_5\_No\_4\_August\_2015/12.pdf
- Amoo, E. O. (2018). Introduction to special edition on Covenant University's perspectives on Nigeria demography and achievement of SDGs-2030. *African Population Studies*, 32(1). Retrieved from http://aps. journals.ac.za/pub/article/view/1170
- Asiimwe, E. N., & Grönlund, A. (2015). MLCMS actual use, perceived usefulness, and experiences of use.

  International Journal of Education and Development Using Information and Communication Technology, 11(1), 101.
- Ayoade, B. (2015). Impact of mobile technology in transforming the education and health sectors of Nigeria: Strengths and challenges. In International Conference on African Development Issues (CUICADI) 2015: Information and communication technology track. Retrieved from eprints.covenantuniversity.edu.ng/5289/1/Paper 121.pdf
- Azeta, O., Gberevbie, I., Ayo, M., & Williams. (2016).

  Motivating effective ICT users' support through automated mobile edu-helpdesk system.

  International Journal of Pharmacy and Technology, 8 (4), 22915–22925.
- Baldwin, A. (2014). Lessons learned from integrating ipads into the accounting classroom. Paper presented at the American Accounting Association 2014 Annual Meeting, Atlanta, GA.
- Chaka, J. G., & Govender, I. (2014). Mobile learning for colleges of education in Nigeria: An educational analysis. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 5(16), 289–295. doi:10.5901/mjss.2014. v5n16p289
- Chaka, J. G., & Govender, I. (2017). Students' perceptions and readiness towards mobile learning in colleges of education: A Nigerian perspective.



- South African Journal of Education, 31, 7. doi:10.15700/saje.v37n1a1282
- Chijioke, J. (2018, October 5). FG releases 2018 polytechnic ranking [SEE TOP 10]. Daily Post. Retrieved from http://dailypost.ng/2018/10/05/fg-releases-2018-polytechnic-ranking-see-top-10/
- CITN accredited tuition houses. (2016, March 22).

  Retrieved from https://www.citn.org/news.php?eid=
- Eloff, A. (2017). The integration of information and information technology in accounting education: Effects on student performance. *Journal of Economic and Financial Sciences*, 9(2), 409–425. doi:10.4102/jef. v9i2.49
- Griffin, C. (2014). The transition from brick and mortar to online teaching: Middle-grade teachers' perspectives (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Georgia Southern University. Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2173 ... etd
- Haji, H. A., Shaame, A. A., & Kombo, O. H. (2013, September). The opportunities and challenges in using mobile phones as learning tools for higher learning students in the developing countries: Zanzibar context. A paper presented in AFRICON, Mauritius, 2013 (pp. 1–5). IEEE
- Haque, S., & Islam, M. A. (2015). Stakeholder pressures on corporate climate change-related accountability and disclosures: Australian evidence. Business and Politics, 17(2), 355–390. Retrieved from ttps://www. cambridge.org/core/journals/business-and-politics /article/div-classtitlestakeholder-pressures-oncorporate-climate-change-related-accountabilityand-disclosures-australian-evidencediv /74215C6182B535801C3512A5824BBADD
- Institute of Chartered Accountants of Nigeria (ICAN). (2018). Tuition centres. Retrieved from http://icanig.org/tutiton centers.pdf
- International Telecommunications Commission (ITU). (2018). ITU releases 2018 global and regional ICT estimates. Retrieved from https://www.itu.int/en/mediacentre/Pages/2018-PR40.aspx
- Joint Admission Matriculation Board (JAMB). (2018). Social sciences. Retrieved from http://www.jamb.org. ng/social\_sciences.pdf
- Joseph, C., & Rahmat, M. (2018). Exploring the perception on using the Competition based learning winning video as a pedagogical tool in an accounting course. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 8(2), 440–451. doi:10.6007/IJARBSS/v8-i2/3884
- Kaliisa, R., Palmer, E., & Miller, J. (2017). Mobile learning in higher education: A comparative analysis of developed and developing country contexts. British Journal of Educational Technology. doi:10.1111/bjet.12583
- Mtega, W. P., Bernard, R., Msungu, A. C., & Sanare, R. (2012).
  Using mobile phones for teaching and learning purposes in higher learning institutions: The case of the Sokoine University of Agriculture in Tanzania.
  UbuntuNet-Connect 2012 Promoting Regional Research and Education Collaboration, 118–129. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/.../275340682\_Using\_Mobile Phones for Teaching and
- National Universities Commission (NUC). (2018). Nigerian universities. Retrieved from http://nuc.edu.ng/ Nigerian-universities.
- Nicholas-Omoregbe, O. S., Azeta, A. A., Chiazor, I. A., & Omoregbe, N. (2016). Predicting the adoption of e-learning management system: A case of selected private universities in Nigeria. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 18(2), 106–121.

- Nigerian Communications Commission (NCC) (2019). Subscriber Statistics. Retrieved from https://www.ncc. gov.ng/stakeholder/statistics-reports/subscriberdata#quarterly-subscriber-operator-data
- Oguchinalu, N. H., & Sunday, O. O. (2018). Accessing the adoption of mobile learning in Nigeria: The library perspective. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*, 2035. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/2035
- Ojerinde, D. (2018, October 4). Covenant University ranked the best Nigerian varsity. *Punchng*. Retrieved from https://punchng.com/covenant-university-ranked-best-nigerian-varsity/
- Okafor, G. O., & Ogbodo, O. Y. (2015). Training accountants in developing countries: The relevance of information and communication technology. *Unizik Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 16(2). Retrieved from https://www.ajol.info/index.php/ujah/article/view/130255
- Osang, F. B., Ngole, J., & Tsuma, C. (2013, February 20–23). Prospects and challenges of mobile learning implementation in Nigeria. Case study National Open University of Nigeria (NOUN). International Conference on ICT for Africa 2013. Harare, Zimbabwe
- Osinaike, A. B., & Adekunmisi, S. R. 2012. Use of multimedia for teaching in the Nigerian university system: A case study of the University of Ibadan. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*, Retrieved from http://www. webpages.uidaho.edu/\*mbolin/oshi naike-adekunmisi.htm
- Oyelere, S. S., Suhonen, J., & Sutinen, E. (2016). M-learning: A new paradigm of learning ICT in Nigeria. International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies (ijim), 10(1): 35–44.
- Prospectus and examination syllabus -ANAN. (2016). Retrieved from http://www.anan.org.ng/prospectusand-examination-syllabus/
- Rimale, Z., El-Habib, B. I., & Tragha, A. (2016). A brief survey and comparison of m-learning and e-learning. *International Journal of Computer Networks and Communications Security*, 4(4), 89–95. Retrieved from www.ijcncs.org/published/volume4/ issue4/p1\_4-4.pdf
- Roux, S. (2016). Edu 02: Mobile learning (m-learning) as a paradigmatic mechanism to facilitate practical subjects in an undergraduate financial information systems course: A developing country perspective. In 2016 Southern African Accounting Association (SAAA) national teaching and learning and regional conference proceedings. Retrieved from www.saaa.org.za/ ... /EDU 02 Mobile Learning as a paradigmatic
- Sherpherd, I. J., & Vardiman, P. (2014). MLearning -A Mobile Learning/teaching Methodology. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, 14(4), 70–95. Retrieved from www.na-businesspress.com/JHETP/ ShepherdIJ\_Web14\_4\_.pdf
- Shonola, S. A., & Joy, M. (2014, July 7-9). Mobile learning security issues from lecturers' perspectives (Nigerian Universities Case Study). 6th International conference on education and new learning technologies (pp. 7081–7088). Barcelona: Spain.
- Staples, J., Collum, T., & McFry, K. (2016). Mobile devices in the accounting classroom [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://blog.cengage.com/wp-content/uploads/ 2016/05/Spring- 2016\_Staples-Collum-McFry\_Mobile-Devices-in-the-Accounting-Classroom\_5.pdf
- Stockley, D. (2011). E-learning definition and explanation. Retrieved from www.derekstockley.com
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate* statistics (4th ed. ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.



Twinpine. (2017). 2017 Nigeria mobile trends report. Retrieved from https://twinpinenetwork.com/wp-content/ ... /2017/09/2017-Nigerian-mobile-trend-report.pdf

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO]. (2017). Education for sustainable development goals: Learning objectives. Paris: The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Yusuf, H. T., Gambari, A. I., Daramola, A. I., Badmus, A. O., & Isiaka, A. B. (2018). Lecturers' awareness, readiness and self-efficacy of using a podcast for teaching in tertiary institutions in Niger state, Nigeria. *Journal of Science, Technology, Mathematics and Education (JOSTMED)*, 14(1), 188–198. Retrieved from http://jostmed.futminna. edu.ng/



#### © 2019 The Author(s). This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 license.

You are free to:

Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format.

Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially.

The licensor cannot revoke these freedoms as long as you follow the license terms.

Under the following terms:



Attribution — You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made. You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use. No additional restrictions

You may not apply legal terms or technological measures that legally restrict others from doing anything the license permits.

## Cogent Arts & Humanities (ISSN: 2331-1983) is published by Cogent OA, part of Taylor & Francis Group. Publishing with Cogent OA ensures:

- Immediate, universal access to your article on publication
- · High visibility and discoverability via the Cogent OA website as well as Taylor & Francis Online
- Download and citation statistics for your article
- · Rapid online publication
- · Input from, and dialog with, expert editors and editorial boards
- · Retention of full copyright of your article
- Guaranteed legacy preservation of your article
- Discounts and waivers for authors in developing regions

#### Submit your manuscript to a Cogent OA journal at www.CogentOA.com

