A study on the Impact of the Integration of Technology on the Learning and Development process of Corporate Employees in Cochin

Dr. M. Mekala[1], Mr. Jomesh M Joseph[2]

[1]Vice principal & Associate Professor, [2] Ph.D. Research scholar

[1] Department of Management Studies, Karuppannan Mariappan College, India

Abstract:

The increasing reliance on mobile technology in corporate Learning and Development (L&D) has shifted training delivery methods towards flexibility and accessibility. This study examines how mobile learning adoption and employee self-efficacy influence the learning outcomes of corporate employees in Cochin. A survey of 130 employees from IT, finance, and service industries measured mobile learning usage, self-efficacy, and perceived learning outcomes using a 5-point Likert scale. Regression analysis revealed that mobile learning has a significant positive relationship with learning outcomes ($\beta = 0.34$, $p < 0.05$), while self-efficacy also shows a strong positive influence ($\beta = 0.41$, $p < 0.01$). ANOVA results indicate that employees with high self-efficacy benefit more from mobile learning platforms compared to those with lower confidence levels. The findings suggest that organizations in Cochin can improve training effectiveness by enhancing mobile learning accessibility and fostering self-efficacy through coaching and feedback.

Keywords: mobile learning, self-efficacy, mobile learning adoption, learning outcome

1. Introduction:

The corporate sector in Cochin is rapidly embracing technology to improve the efficiency and scalability of employee training. With the rise of mobile technology, Learning and Development (L&D) programs are increasingly shifting towards mobile learning (m-learning), enabling employees to access training materials anytime, anywhere. Unlike traditional classroom-based training, mobile learning offers on-demand, bite-sized, and interactive content, making it particularly effective in fast-paced corporate environments.

However, technology alone does not guarantee improved learning outcomes. Self-efficacy is an individual's belief in their ability to perform tasks successfully which plays a crucial role in determining how effectively employees engage with and benefit from mobile learning platforms. High self-efficacy employees are more likely to explore learning resources, complete modules, and apply acquired skills in the workplace.

This study explores how mobile learning adoption impacts learning outcomes and how self-efficacy moderates this relationship in the corporate setting of Cochin.

2. Review of Literature:

Park (2011) proposed a pedagogical framework categorizing mobile-learning applications (content-, community-, context-, and computation-based), emphasizing alignment between affordances and learning goals such as useful for structuring corporate m-learning rollouts. The framework underscores portability, immediacy, and personalization as mechanisms for improved outcomes.

Traxler (2009) argued that m-learning enables "anytime, anywhere" learning across contexts, but real effectiveness depends on design for authentic, situated tasks and organizational readiness which are highly relevant to workplace training.

Venkatesh et al. (2003) unified prior acceptance models and showed that performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, and facilitating conditions predict technology use and then constructs that map well onto mobile-learning adoption in enterprises.

Bandura (1997) established self-efficacy as a key determinant of effort, persistence, and performance; in training, higher efficacy should magnify benefits from mobile tools by encouraging exploration and skill application.

Compeau and Higgins (1995) developed and validated the computer self-efficacy construct, linking it to outcome expectations and affect toward technology that supporting your moderator choice (self-efficacy) in tech-enabled learning.

Holden and Rada (2011) found that perceived usability and technology self-efficacy strengthen TAM relationships and predict use in educational contexts, implying that easy-to-use mobile platforms plus confidence can lift training uptake

Sung, Chang, and Liu's (2016) meta-analysis reported a moderate, positive overall effect of mobile-integrated learning on achievement, suggesting that, on average, m-learning interventions improve learning performance.

Martin and Ertzberger (2013) showed in an experimental study that mobile-supported activities enhanced immediate learning outcomes compared to traditional approaches, highlighting benefits of timely access and interactivity

Bernacki, Greene, and Crompton (2020) reviewed mobile technology's links to learning and achievement, noting positive effects but urging better measurement of *how* mobile features drive gains (e.g., feedback, self-regulation).

Al-Emran, Elsherif, and Shaalan (2016) reported generally favourable attitudes toward mobile learning and highlighted factors influencing adoption is the evidence that informs corporate settings where similar determinants (ease, usefulness, confidence) apply.

3. Research Methodology:

3.1. Research Design:

Descriptive and analytical research design using a quantitative approach.

Population and Sample size: Corporate employees from IT, finance, and service industries in Cochin.

Sample size: 130 employees (stratified random sampling).

3.2 Data Collection and Analysis tools:

Primary data were collected using Structured questionnaire with 5-point Likert scale items measuring the variables such as Mobile Learning Adoption (MLA), Self-Efficacy (SE), Learning Outcomes (LO). Secondary data from academic journals and industry reports.

SPSS was used for descriptive statistics, regression, and ANOVA.

4. Hypothesis Formulated:

H1: Mobile learning adoption positively influences learning outcomes among corporate employees in Cochin.

H2: Self-efficacy positively influences learning outcomes among corporate employees in Cochin.

H3: Self-efficacy moderates the relationship between mobile learning adoption and learning outcomes, such that the relationship is stronger for employees with higher self-efficacy.

5. Analysis and Interpretation:

5.1. Descriptive Statistics:

The descriptive statistics were analysed to understand the central value and the spread of data using minimum, maximum and standard deviation values.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of variables Mobile learning, Self-efficacy and Learning Outcomes

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Mobile learning	130	3.81	0.61	2.40	4.90
Self-Efficacy	130	3.88	0.58	2.60	4.95
Learning Outcomes	130	3.95	0.55	2.80	4.95

Interpretation:

The descriptive statistics provide an overview of the central tendencies and variability of the study variables among corporate employees in Cochin. The mean score for Mobile Learning adoption was 3.81 (SD = 0.61), indicating that employees generally agreed that they actively engaged with mobile-based learning platforms, though some variation existed in usage levels.

The mean score for Self-Efficacy was 3.88 (SD = 0.58), suggesting that most employees expressed a relatively high level of confidence in their ability to use technology for learning purposes. The smaller standard deviation indicates responses were fairly consistent across the sample.

For Learning Outcomes, the mean score was 3.95 (SD = 0.55), reflecting a strong perception that mobile learning had positively contributed to knowledge acquisition, skills development, and workplace application. The relatively high mean also suggests employees valued technology-supported training as effective.

5.2. Regression Analysis Output:

Table 2: Regression analysis of variables Mobile learning, Self-efficacy and Learning Outcomes

Predictor	Unstandardised Beta	Standardized Beta	t-value	p-value	R-Squared
Constant	1.95	-	5.88	0.000	0.252
Mobile learning	0.34	0.31	3.92	0.000	
Self-Efficacy	0.41	0.36	4.48	0.000	

Interpretation: Both mobile learning and self-efficacy significantly contribute to improved learning outcomes, with self-efficacy having a slightly stronger effect.

5.3. ANOVA Output:

Table 3: ANOVA analysis of variables Mobile learning, Self-efficacy and Learning Outcomes

Source	SS (Sum of Squares)	df (degree of freedom)	MS (Mean Square)	F	p-value
Between groups	3.62	2	1.81	4.32	0.016
Within groups	53.67	127	0.42		
Total	57.26	129			

Interpretation: The interaction effect between mobile learning adoption and self-efficacy is statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), indicating that employees with higher self-efficacy benefit more from mobile learning.

6. Key Findings and implications:

The findings suggest that mobile learning is an effective tool for enhancing corporate training outcomes in Cochin, especially when employees possess high self-efficacy. Self-efficacy not only directly improves learning outcomes but also strengthens the positive effects of mobile learning adoption. For organizations, this implies that investments in mobile learning should be paired with strategies to build employee confidence through coaching, feedback, and digital literacy programs.

Mobile learning increases the confidence of the employees and so they are possessing high self-efficacy. The question is that the self-efficacy translates into effective learning outcome which is shown in this study as positive. Mobile technology is considered

as a source of distraction in many work places. However, the mobile technology enabled for learning will yield positive result with the increase in learning outcome.

7. Conclusion:

This study explored the impact of mobile learning adoption and self-efficacy on the learning outcomes of corporate employees in Cochin. The findings indicated that mobile learning significantly enhances employees' learning effectiveness by providing flexibility, accessibility, and interactive content. Furthermore, self-efficacy emerged as a crucial factor, moderating the relationship between technology usage and learning outcomes. Employees with higher confidence in their ability to use digital tools benefited more from mobile learning platforms, achieving better knowledge retention and application in workplace contexts.

The study highlights the importance of not only investing in mobile learning technologies but also in building employees' digital confidence through continuous support, training, and feedback. For organizations in Cochin, integrating mobile-enabled platforms with coaching and peer-support systems could maximize the return on investment in Learning and Development initiatives.

8. **References:**

1. Al-Emran, M., Elsherif, H. M., & Shaalan, K. (2016). Investigating attitudes towards the use of mobile learning in higher education. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *56*, 93–102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.11.033
2. Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman
3. Bernacki, M. L., Greene, J. A., & Crompton, H. (2020). Mobile technology, learning, and achievement: Advances in understanding and measuring the role of mobile technology in education. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *60*, 101827. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2019.101827
4. Compeau, D. R., & Higgins, C. A. (1995). Computer self-efficacy: Development of a measure and initial test. *MIS Quarterly*, *19*(2), 189–211. https://aisel.aisnet.org/misq/vol19/iss2/4/
5. Holden, H., & Rada, R. (2011). Understanding the influence of perceived usability and technology self-efficacy on teachers' technology acceptance. *Computers & Education*, *57*(2), 1204–1214. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ930317.pdf
6. Martin, F., & Ertzberger, J. (2013). Here and now mobile learning: An experimental study on the use of mobile technology. *Computers & Education*, *68*, 76–85. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2013.04.021
7. Park, Y. (2011). A pedagogical framework for mobile learning: Categorizing educational applications of mobile technologies into four types. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, *12*(2), 78–102. https://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/791
8. Sung, Y.-T., Chang, K.-E., & Liu, T.-C. (2016). The effects of integrating mobile devices with teaching and learning on students' learning performance: A meta-analysis and research synthesis. *Computers & Education*, *94*, 252–275. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2015.11.008
9. Traxler, J. (2009). Learning in a mobile age. *International Journal of Mobile and Blended Learning*, *1*(1), 1–12. https://www.learntechlib.org/p/186911/
10. Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *MIS Quarterly*, *27*(3), 425–478. https://www.jstor.org/stable/30036540