



ATTITUDE TOWARDS MOBILE LEARNING AMONG PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS

Mr. M. SENTHILKUMARAN

Assistant Professor, Department of Educational technology, Tamil Nadu Teachers Education University, Chennai – 97.

Dr. N. MUTHAIAH

Principal, Sri Ramakrishna Mission Vidyalaya, College of Education (Autonomous), SRKV Post Coimbatore – 641 020.

ABSTRACT

Along with the swift spread of 3G and wireless network, wireless technologies are applied in many areas, especially in education. Besides being used for basic functions such as making calls and texting, mobile technologies are developed to handle educational application as well. The advent of mobile learning overcomes several limitations and barriers of traditional class-room education. This research mainly focuses on the attitude of prospective teachers towards mobile learning. The findings of the study reveal that female prospective teachers are more users of mobile learning. The marital status of the prospective teachers is not significant towards mobile learning.

KEYWORDS

INTRODUCTION

Along with the development of information and communication technologies, their positive impacts particularly on universities and their extensive use, new and strategic methods have been developed related with them. The inclusion of e-learning in the learning process and its becoming widespread as a component of traditional education has caused positive changes in extend of pedagogical, technological and economic aspects (Birch & Burnett, 2009). The need to access to the information regardless of time and place has increased the effects of mobile technologies and mobile learning, and it has also brought new strategies to learning process (Uysal & Gazibey, 2010). A great number of researches have been done and plenty of methods that can facilitate learning have been developed for years. In fact, the Chinese Philosopher Confucius summarized learning 2400 years ago as his following quote:

“I hear and I forget. I see and I remember. I do and I understand.”

DEFINITION OF MOBILE LEARNING

M-learning refers to any sort of learning that happens when the learner is not at a fixed, predetermined location, or learning that happens when the learner takes advantage of the learning opportunities offered by mobile technologies (O'Malley, Vavoula, Glew, Taylor & Sharples, 2005).

Quinn (2000) considered mobile learning as the overlap of using e-learning (learning by using information technologies and devices) and mobile computing, which includes mobile applications in the small, wireless, and portable devices such as smart phones and PDAs.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The following objectives of the study are

1. To study the attitude of prospective teachers towards Mobile learning.
2. There is no significant difference in attitude of prospective teachers towards mobile learning with respect to Gender.
3. There is no significant difference in attitude of prospective teachers towards mobile learning with respect to Qualification.
4. There is no significant difference in attitude of prospective teachers towards mobile learning with respect to Medium of Instruction.
5. There is no significant difference in attitude of prospective teachers towards mobile learning with respect to Marital Status.
6. There is no significant difference in attitude of prospective teachers towards mobile learning with respect to parent's income.
7. There is no significant difference in attitude of prospective

teachers towards mobile learning with respect to Wi- fi facility in college.

8. There is no significant difference in attitude of prospective teachers towards mobile learning with respect to Basic computer knowledge.

9. There is no significant difference in attitude of prospective teachers towards mobile learning with respect to Type of Mobile.

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

The hypotheses of the study are as follows

1. There is no significant difference in attitude of prospective teachers towards mobile learning with respect to Gender.
2. There is no significant difference in attitude of prospective teachers towards mobile learning with respect to Qualification.
3. There is no significant difference in attitude of prospective teachers towards mobile learning with respect to Medium of Instruction.
4. There is no significant difference in attitude of prospective teachers towards mobile learning with respect to Marital Status.
5. There is no significant difference in attitude of prospective teachers towards mobile learning with respect to parent's income.
6. There is no significant difference in attitude of prospective teachers towards mobile learning with respect to Wi- fi facility in college.
7. There is no significant difference in attitude of prospective teachers towards mobile learning with respect to Basic computer knowledge.
8. There is no significant difference in attitude of prospective teachers towards mobile learning with respect to Type of Mobile.

METHODOLOGY

The investigator has adopted Survey method for the study. The investigator has adopted the random sampling technique for collection of Data from the Sample. The sample for the study has chosen from three colleges of Education namely, Government, Aided and Self – finance college of Education for analyzing the attitude towards Mobile learning.

STATISTICAL TECHNIQUE USED FOR THE STUDY

The following statistical technique has been adopted for analyzing the data which were collected from the sample. They are

1. Descriptive Analysis
2. Differential Analysis

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Hypothesis: 1

There is no significant difference in attitude of B.Ed. trainees towards Mobile Learning with respect to Gender.

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t Value at 5% level
Mobile Learning	Male	186	178.022	15.34556	3.772
	Female	291	183.86	17.18479	

From the above table it is clear that the calculated value is greater than the tabulated value 1.96 at 5% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis, "There is no significant difference in attitude of B.Ed. trainees towards Mobile Learning with respect to Gender" is rejected.

Hypothesis: 2

There is no significant difference in attitude of B.Ed. trainees towards Mobile Learning with respect to qualification.

Variable	Qualification	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t Value at 5% level
Mobile Learning	UG	349	177.802	16.56157	8.771
	PG	128	191.882	12.25645	

From the above table it is clear that the calculated value is greater than the tabulated value 1.96 at 5% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis, "There is no significant difference in attitude of B.Ed. trainees towards Mobile Learning with respect to qualification" is rejected.

Hypothesis: 3

There is no significant difference in attitude of B.Ed. trainees towards Mobile Learning with respect to Medium of Instruction.

Variable	Medium of Instruction	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t Value at 5% level
Mobile Learning	Tamil	117	175.332	23.57307	4.755
	English	360	183.612	13.20186	

From the above table it is clear that the calculated value is greater than the tabulated value 1.96 at 5% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis, "There is no significant difference in attitude of B.Ed. trainees towards Mobile Learning with respect to Medium of instruction" is rejected.

Hypothesis: 4

There is no significant difference in attitude of B.Ed. trainees towards Mobile Learning with respect to marital status.

Variable	Marital status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t Value at 5% level
Mobile Learning	Married	365	181.532	17.27914	0.117
	Single	112	181.742	14.82434	

From the above table it is clear that the calculated value is lower than the tabulated value 1.96 at 5% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis, "There is no significant difference in attitude of B.Ed. trainees towards Mobile learning with respect to marital status" is accepted.

Hypothesis: 5

There is no significant difference in attitude of B.Ed. trainees towards Mobile Learning with respect to Parent's income.

Variable	Parental Income	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t Value at 5% level
Mobile Learning	Less than 20,000	327	180.632	16.96265	1.840
	Greater than 20000	150	183.652	16.03979	

From the above table it is clear that the calculated value is lower than the tabulated value 1.96 at 5% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis, "There is no significant difference in attitude of B.Ed. trainees towards Mobile learning with respect to parents income" is accepted.

Hypothesis: 6

There is no significant difference in attitude of B.Ed. trainees towards Mobile Learning with respect to availability of wi-fi in college.

Variable	Wi-fi facility	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t Value at 5% level
Mobile Learning	Available	378	180.762	17.63136	2.085
	Not available	99	184.692	12.23632	

From the above table it is clear that the calculated value is greater than the tabulated value 1.96 at 5% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis, "There is no significant difference in attitude of B.Ed. trainees towards Mobile Learning with respect to availability of wi-fi in college" is rejected.

Hypothesis: 7

There is no significant difference in attitude of B.Ed. trainees towards Mobile Learning with respect to basic computer knowledge.

Variable	Basic computer knowledge	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t Value at 5% level
Mobile Learning	Yes	454	182.322	16.26121	4.407
	No	23	166.872	19.14373	

From the above table it is clear that the calculated value is greater than the tabulated value 1.96 at 5% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis, "There is no significant difference in attitude of B.Ed. trainees towards Mobile Learning with respect to basic computer knowledge" is rejected.

Hypothesis: 8

There is no significant difference in attitude of B.Ed. trainees towards Mobile Learning with respect to type of mobile.

Variable	Mobile type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t Value at 5% level
Mobile Learning	Android	262	179.872	18.99434	2.471
	Non Android	215	183.662	13.18852	

From the above table it is clear that the calculated value is greater than the tabulated value 1.96 at 5% level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis, "There is no significant difference in attitude of B.Ed. trainees towards Mobile Learning with respect to type of mobile" is rejected.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Attitude towards Mobile learning among the prospective teachers is Moderate. From the analysis it is clear that there is a gender difference attitude towards mobile learning. The mean value of Male is lower when compared to that of female. Hence, attitude towards learning is higher for the female trainees. There is no difference in learning through technology for the single or married trainees. Hence, from the analysis mobile learning is predominantly followed by the prospective teachers for their day to day learning.

REFERENCES

- Birch, D., & Burnett, B. (2009). Advancing E-Learning Policy and Practice: Influences on Academics' Adoption, Integration and Development of Multimodal E-Learning Courses. Mark Stansfield & Thomas Connolly (Eds.) Institutional Transformation Through Best Practices in Virtual Campus Development: Advancing E-Learning Policies (ss.65-80). Hershey: Information Science Reference.
- Loomba, K., & Loomba, P. (2009). Mobile Learning in Knowledge Development Scenario. DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology, 29(5), 54-56.
- Maag, M. (2006). iPod, uPod? An emerging mobile learning tool in nursing education and students' satisfaction. In Who's learning? Whose technology? Proceedings ASCILITE 2006 (pp. 483-492). Sydney: Sydney University Press.
- McConatha, D., Praul, M., & Lynch, M. J. (2008). Mobile Learning in Higher Education: An Empirical Assessment of a New Educational Tool. Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology, 7(2), p. 2.
- O'Malley, C., Vavoula, G., Glew, J. P., Taylor, J., & Sharples, M. (2005). Guidelines for Learning/Teaching/Tutoring in a Mobile Environment. Retrieved 7 July, 2009, from http://www.mobilearn.org/download/results/public_deliverables/MOBlearn_D4.1_Final.pdf.
- Quinn, C. (2000). mLearning: Mobile, Wireless, In-Your-Pocket Learning. Retrieved January 26, 2007, from <http://www.linezine.com/2.1/features/cgmmwiyw.htm>.
- Singh, D., & Zaitun, A.B. (2006). Mobile Learning In Wireless Classrooms. Malaysian Online Journal of Instructional Technology, 3, 26-42.
- Uysal, M.P., & Gazibey, Y. (2010). E-Learning in Turkey: Developments and Applications, Yamamoto, G.T., Demiray, U. ve Kesim M. (Editörler), Cem Web Ofset, Ankara, ISBN 978-605-88891-2-5.