Mobile Assisted Foreign Language Teaching in Turkey

Burhan Akpunar, Firat University, Turkey
Veli Batdı, National Ministry of Education, Turkey
Çetin Tan, Siirt University, Turkey
Ayşenur Kuloğlu, Firat University, Turkey
Mehmet Porgalı, National Ministry of Education, Turkey

Abstract
This study aims to determine high school students' vision upon regarding benefiting from mobiles during foreign language learning in Turkey. It was conducted in Malatya and Elazığ in the academic year of 2013-2014 with the participation of 289 state school students. Data, obtained through questionnaire and analysed in SPSS, indicated most of the students have mobiles, despite being banned in class they are used in 'silent mode'. Students leaning to mobiles for education think they can be problem if it is not used controlled. Students seeing mobiles as a communication tool cannot benefit from it in foreign language. Among students' visions towards mobile there are significant differences according to variables.

The findings were evaluated as follows: In Turkey, although the rate of having mobiles is equal to the world's average, mobile addiction is below this average. In Turkey, despite being banned, phones are used in class. However, it is not used for foreign language. The reason of this can be lack of knowledge and skills between legal-cultural barries and information technology. This is a lack or contradiction for Turkey having started FATIH Project for improving IT in education. This deficiency can overshadow to Turkey's vision of being information era and technological society.

Keywords: Mobile Education, Mobile assisted education, foreign language education, pedagogical potential of mobiles.

iafor

The International Academic Forum
www.iafor.org

1. Introduction

Mobile phones, being one of the developments in communication, are penetrating life and can have many affects in education. So it can be thought mobiles can make new ways for education. This idea is not surprised when we think effects of science and technology. Also, it is necessary for education affected by scientific and technological developments. Because most of the extant theories of learning dating back 2500 years (Sharples, Taylor, & Vavoula, 2005) with the known structure of education is not easy to adapt to the Information Age.

Even if smart phones are new phenomenon in education, it has already deputed among educators. Discussed in the context of the use of technology in education mobiles are mostly dealt with *e-learning and mobile learning* models (İpek & Sözcü, 2013). Mobile learning (Cavus & Uzunboylu, 2008) seen as a new concept in education is also named 'm-learning' (Öztürk, 2014). Despite these developments showing mobiles as a phenomenon, the discussions continue. These discussions are based on following questions: ''are mobiles new entertaining material enabling learning independent of time and space or an addictive material?''. The wievs of educators about education can based on two category; one of them is being mobiles a new phenomenon in education and the other is being mobiles are an addictive material. Turkish Ministry of Education sees mobiles as addictive and has regulations banning use of mobiles in the classes since 2008.

Despite the discussions, it is accepted mobiles has considerable effect when it is used controlled and for educational needs. The contributions can be summarized as: mobiles enables student to learn from anywhere and anytime, mobiles in the classroom can contribute to the success by increasing motivation and to the foreign language teaching. Particularly it is fast and practical as a dictionary and a tool having pronouncing feature. Also, mobiles can be used to increase motivation of students to begin lesson via multimedia and short message features (Saran, Seferoğlu & Çağıltay, 2009).

Considering the effects of mobiles on education and the researches and publishing about the issue, this phenomenon cannot be ignored. Thus, it is known the educators are in search of this issue (Cavus & İbrahim, 2009). Today, internet is a fact for English and mobiles can be seen important learning tools as 'via' (Sarıca & Cavus, 2008). Hulme (2009), defined the importance of mobiles in English teaching as: "Will mobile learning change language learning?". And, according to literature and research (Lu, 2008; Hulme & Shield, 2008; Chen, Hesieh & Kinshuk, 2008; Levy, 2009; Quinn, Mardomingo & Valentine, 2009), mobiles has made significant contribution to the teaching English. So, the thing to be done must be benefiting from educational potential of mobiles taking into account about this issue. In Turkey, this situation is more important for teaching foreign language which has become a serious problem. Knowing the advantages of mobiles in language teaching in terms of cognitive and affective is important and also the contributions to the student motivation is important to guide policy on this issue. So, knowing view of students' perceptions of mobiles in foreign language teaching and the usage in the process are important.

2. Method

2. 1 Population and Sample

The population of this study are students studying in state schools in Malatya and Elazığ in the academic year of 2013-2014. Sample is consisted of 289 students from this population. The distribution of students according to demographic variables is shown in table 1.

Table 1. The distribution of students in the sample according to demographic variables

Variables		N	%
Gender	Female	161	55.7
	Male	128	44.3
CSM ownership	Yes	243	84.1
	No	46	15.9
CSM(smart) ownership	Yes	173	59.9
	No	116	40.1
Learning domain	Quantitative	179	61.9
	Verbal	75	26.0
	Foreign Language	35	12.1
Total		289	100.0

2. 2 Data and Analysis

The data of this study conducted with descriptive survey model were obtained by questionnaire developed by researchers. Firstly, an item pool was created by doing literature review for the questionnaire. Then, the questionnaire, consisting of 22 items four of which are about personal and the others are about mobiles, was finalized in accordance with expert opinion. The questionnaire items were rated as: 1. I disagree (1.00-1.80), 2. I do not agree (1.81-2.60), 3. I am undecided (2.61-3.40), 4. I agree (3.41-4.20) and 5. I strongly agree (4.21-5.00).

In the study; arithmetic mean, standard deviation, percent and frequency techniques, variance analysis,'t' test (for homogenous items) and KWH and MWU tests (for not homogenous items) were used. Significance level   was accepted as p= 0.05.

3. Findings

3. 1. Demographic Findings

As it is shown in Table 1, it is seen of %55.7 of participants are female and %55.7 of them are male. %84.1 of the students have their own phones and %59.9 of them have smart phones. %61.9 of the students participating the study are studying quantitative, %26 of them are studying verbal and %12.1 of them are studying foreign language.

3.2. Findings About the Students' Perception Toward to Mobile Phone

Table 2. Students' perception toward to mobile phones

Item no Perceptions	$\bar{X}$	s
1. Mobile phones are basically a communication tool	4.53	.84
2. Mobile phones are nice time tool	3.47	1.31
3. I could never do without mobile phones	2.76	1.53
4. Mobile phones are necessary for modernity	3.25	1.40
5. Having mobile phones makes me happy	3.76	1.32
6. If it is not used controlled, it can be cause problems	3.69	1.39
7. Being more busy with mobile phones disorders my health	3.45	1.46

As it is shown in Table 2, it is understood mobile phones are basically a communication tool ($\bar{X}_1$=4.53) and a tool enabling to have nice time ($\bar{X}_2$=3.47) by the students. Also, they think having a mobile makes them happy ($\bar{X}_5$=3.76), if it is not used controlled, it can cause problems ($\bar{X}_6$=3.69) and disorders ($\bar{X}_7$=3.45).

According to the gender variables, there is a remarkable difference among students' view toward to 2. [(t_{287}=2.433; p=0,016)] and 3. [(t_{287}=2.598; p=0,010)] items. So, female students ($\bar{X}_1$=3.63) have more adopted to 12. item than male students ($\bar{X}_2$=3.25). Similarly, the female students have more adopted to 14. item than male students ($\bar{X}_2$=2.50).

According to having mobile variables, there is a remarkable difference among students' view toward to 3. and 4. items. The remarkable difference in 4. İtem which is parametric [(t_{287}=2.852; p=0,005)], is in favour of having mobile phones. So, the ones having mobiles ($\bar{X}_1$=3.35) have more adopted to 3. item than the ones having no mobile ($\bar{X}_2$=2.71). the remarkable difference in 3. İtem which is non-parametric [(MWU=3721.500; p=0,000)] is in favour of having mobile phones. So, the ones having mobiles (MR_1=152.69) have more adopted than the ones having no mobiles (MR_2=104.40).

According to the having smart phone variables, there is a remarkable difference toward to 2. [(t_{275}=2.773; p=0,006)] and 3. [(t_{275}=5.138; p=0,000)] items. So, the ones having smart phone ($\bar{X}_1$=3.66) have more adopted to 2. item than the ones having no smart phone($\bar{X}_2$=3.21). Similarly, the ones having smart phones ($\bar{X}_1$=3.18) have more adopted to 3. İtem that the others ($\bar{X}_2$=2.25).

3.3. Findings About Students' View Regarding Using Mobile Phones in Teaching Process

Table 3. Students' view Regarding Using Mobile Phones in Teaching Process

Item no Opinions	$\bar{X}$	s
8. Mobile phones can be used for educational needs	3.53	1.35
9. Being too busy with mobile phones distracts my attention	3.46	1.45
10. Being too busy with mobile phones affects my memory negatively	3.03	1.51
11. Mobile phones are tool leading discipline problems in the class	3.12	1.56
12. I use mobile phones mostly for homework	2.29	1.34

13. I use mobile phones mostly to follow my exam works	2.34	1.31
14. I use mobile phones mostly for lecture notes	2.55	1.39
15. I use mobile phones mostly for dictionary	2.82	1.48
16. I use mobile phone is silent mode in the class	4.22	1.23
17. Mobile phones can be used a teaching material in the class	3.02	1.51
18. I use mobile phones mostly to communicate with my friends	3.57	1.25

As it is shown in Table 3, it is understood the students use mobiles in silent mode in the class($\bar{X}_{16}$=4.22). Although students lean to using mobiles for education ($\bar{X}_8$=3.53), they use it mostly to communicate ($\bar{X}_{18}$=3.57) and it has been indicated they do not use mobiles for education $\bar{X}_{12}$=2.29; $\bar{X}_{13}$=2.34; $\bar{X}_{15}$=2.82; $\bar{X}_{17}$=3.02. Students think being too busy with mobiles can distract their attention ($\bar{X}_9$=3.46).

According to gender variables, there is a remarkable difference among students' view regarding to 16. item [(t_{287}=2.295; p=0,022)]. So, female students ($\bar{X}_1$=4.37) have more adopted to 16. item than males ($\bar{X}_2$=4.03).

There is a remarkable difference in 18. İtem taking place in table 2 among students' view [(MWU=7259.000; p=0,000)]. For this non-parametric item, female students (MR$_1$=163.91) have more adopted to 18. İtem than males (MR$_2$=121.21). according to having mobile phone variables, there is a remarkable difference among students' view regarding to 15. İtem [(t_{287}=2.036; p=0,043)]. Accordingly, having mobiles ($\bar{X}_1$=2.90) have more adopted to the item than having no mobiles ($\bar{X}_2$=2.41).

According to having smart mobile phone variables, there is a remarkable difference regarding to 8. İtem [(t_{275}=2.280; p=0,023) among students' view. Accordingly, the ones having smart phones ($\bar{X}_1$=3.69) have more adopted to the item than others ($\bar{X}_2$=3.30). and also, there is a remarkable difference among students' view regarding to 17. İtem [(t_{275}=2.954; p=0,003)]. Accordingly, the ones having smart phones ($\bar{X}_1$=3.23) have more adopted than others ($\bar{X}_2$=2.69).

Regarding to 17. [(F_{2-286}=4.043; p=0,019)] and 15. [(KWH=8.883; p=0,012)] item taking place in table 3, there is a remarkable difference among students' view regarding to *learning domain* variable. Scheffe test has indicated the difference is between *quantitative and verbal* groups regarding to parametric 17. item. Accordingly, the view of 17. İtem students studying in quantitative ($\bar{X}_2$=3.22) field have more adopted than others ($\bar{X}_2$=2.66).

MWU test done for 15. İtem which is non-parametric has indicated the remarkable difference among students' view is between 1-3 (MWU$_{1-3}$=2301.000; p=0,011) and 2-3 (MWU$_{2-3}$=872.500; p=0,004) groups. Accordingly, the view ". I use mobile phones mostly for dictionary" has been more adopted by foreign language students (MR$_3$=131.26) than quantitative students (MR$_1$=102.85). Similarly, the same view has been adopted more by foreign language students (MR$_3$=68.07) than verbal students (MR$_2$=49.63).

4. Discussion and Conclusion

4.1. Discussion and Conclusion Regarding to Demographic Results about mobile Phones

The students' having mobiles rate is %84.1 and %59.9 of them have a smart phone. This finding shows there is a similarity between the research results, these results are following; the rate of having a mobile at secondary schools and universities is about %90 (Gülmez, 2005 as cited in Karaslan and Budak 2012) and in Turkey this rate is about %90 (TÜİK,

2012 as cited in Şar and Işıklar, 2012), that most of the students have a mobile can be seen as an advantage in the way of Turkey being an information era and technological society.

4.2. Discussion and Results About Students' View regarding to Mobile Phones

The students participating the research are happy to have a mobile and they see mobiles as a communication tool and it means having nice time for them. The rate of mobiles meaning *to have nice time* is more adopted by female students. Same students are undecided in the view 'mobiles are necessary for modernity and I cannot do without mobiles '. This finding do not verify following literature information: mobiles are addictive tools (Aoki & Downes, 2003 as cited in Karaslan and Budak, 2012; Şar and Işıklar, 2012) and mobiles are necessary for modernity (Karaslan and Budak, 2012). Students verified the views ''If it is not used controlled, it can be cause problems'' and ''Being more busy with mobile phones disorders my health''. It can be said these findings shows that doupt about mobiles must be taken into account.

As it is shown in the research, when we compare the students with mobiles and students without mobiles it is determined that the students having mobile phones see mobiles as a necessity for modernity and they are more addictive to mobiles than the others.

4.3. Discussions and Results About Students' View Regarding to Mobile Phones in Teaching Process

It is understood from Table-3 that students participating in this research take their phones in the classes with them in silent mode although it is prohibited. This finding indicates that it is an insisting or necessity of this mobile phone era and mobile phones somehow enter the classes. Thus, it is more logical for the educators to spend more of their energy on finding more ways to benefit from pedagogical potentials of this new phenomenon rather than preventing it.

According to the students participating in this research, mobile phones can be used with educational purpose. This view is more dominant at students attending Science-Math classes than the ones attending Social classes. This finding can be assessed that students are aware of mobile learning's contribution on education (Oran and Karadeniz, 2007). However, the finding that students use mobile phones mostly as communication tools (girls more than boys) and they do not use with educational and academically purposes (homework, exam works, lecture notes, and dictionary) in foreign language learning is striking. Whereas, in the studies of Regan, Mabogunje, Nash and Licata (2000), Thornton & Houser (2005), and Saran and Seferoğlu (2010), they have stated that mobile phones have positive effects on foreign language

learning. Moreover, it is expected that especially the dictionary apps in mobile phones should support foreign language learning that includes memorizing vocabulary (Thornton & Houser, 2005). This finding can be interpreted that students do not benefit enough from educational potentials of mobile phones although they believe in those potentials. This situation can be related to MoNE's relevant regulations, traditional policy of school and class management, traditional attitude and behaviour of teachers, and even students being unable to be predominant on information technologies. As benefiting from mobile phones during lecturing is so new, their use during lectures has not been prevalent yet (Trifonova, 2003 as cited in Ağca and Bağcı, 2013). Nevertheless, it seems indispensable in benefiting from information and communication technologies while raising individuals who have qualifications in accordance with the Information Era. As a matter of fact, use of information and communication technologies with purpose of teaching has become a necessity in raising individuals constituting information community (Çuhadar and Yücel, 2010). Hence, Turkey should seek ways of benefiting much more from information technologies in education so as to conform to Information Era. It can be accepted that Fatih Project, which was initiated in 2012, is a concrete indicator of this seeking. Similarly, it is stated that there has been an increasing interest in benefiting from information technologies for language learning and teaching in the world recently (Warschauer & Healey, 1998). The expectancy from contributions of information technology on education is to activate it in a way that information technology supports traditional learning. Because research (Ring, 2001 as cited in Saran and Seferoğlu, 2010), has indicated that mobile phones are more effective when used by supporting traditional learning environments.

The reason of this is that class activities are not enough for effective language learning and vocabulary learning and also it is necessary to do activities out of the class Koren, 1999 as cited in Saran and Seferoğlu, 2010). Another reason which makes mobiles important in the traditional class for supportive is that mobiles enable motivations to class. So, mobile learning is not only needed in pedagogy but also new approaches are needed for learning theory Waycott, 2005 (as cited in Ağca ve Bağcı, 2013). The researches about this issue should be directed from technological dimension to teaching planning and benefits of students between theory and mobile learning (Traxler, 2005 as cited in Ağca and Bağcı, 2013).

It is determined in the research despite of the insufficient findings, students studying in foreign language department use mobiles mostly as a dictionary. This finding is parallel to the view of Saran and Seferoğlu (2010); "students have a positive perception to the mobiles during English vocabulary learning". Indeed ın literature, mobiles are used mostly to teach language in education (Kukulska-Hulme & Shield, 2008 as cited in Saran and Seferoğlu, 2010).

In the last analysis, although most of the high school students have mobile phones, it is determined that they do not use mobiles effectively in foreign language learning. this situation can be arised from MoNE's policy, traditional education methods, traditional teacher behaviours and also deficiency of the students about information technology. But, whatever the reason is, this situation detracts Turkey from information era and technological society.

References

Acartürk, C. (2012). *Barkod Teknolojilerinin Eğitimde Kullanımı: Bilişsel Bilimler Çerçevesinde Bir Değerlendirme*. Akademik Bilişim'12 - XIV. Akademik Bilişim Konferansı Bildirileri,1 - 3 Şubat 2012 Uşak Üniversitesi.

Ağca, K. R. & Bağcı, H. (2013). Eğitimde Mobil Araçların Kullanımına İlişkin Öğrenci Görüşleri. *Journal of Research in Education and Teaching,* 2(4), pp. 295-302.

Cavus, N. & İbrahim, D. (2009). M-Learning: An experiment in using SMS to support learning new English language words. *British Journal of Educational Technology,* 40 (1), pp. 78-91.

Cavus, N. & Uzunboylu, H. (2008). A Collaborative Mobile Learning Environmental Education System for Students. *Computational Intelligence for Modelling Control & Automation, 2008 International Conference*, 10-12 Dec. 2008.

Chen,N-S., Hsieh, S-W. & Kinshuk (2008). Effects of Short-Term Memory and Content Representation Type on Mobile Language Learning. *Language Learning & Technology,* 12 (3), pp. 93-113.

Çuhadar, C. ve Yücel, M (2010). Perceptions of Foreign Language Education Pre-Service Teachers on Educational Use of Information and Communication Technologies. Pamukkale University Journal of Education, Number 27, pp.199-210.

Hulme, K. A. (2009). Will mobile learning change language learning? *European Association for Computer Assisted Language Learning* 21(02), 2009, pp. 157-165.

Hulme, K. A.& Shield, L. (2008). An overview of mobile assisted language learning: From content delivery to supported collaboration and interaction. *European Association for Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 20 (03), pp. 271-289.

İpek, İ. & Sözcü, Ö. F. (2013). Birleştirilmiş E-Öğrenme Tasarımı Modeli ve Hızlı Öğretim Tasarımı Stratejileri. Akademik Bilişim 23-25 Ocak 2013 Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Antalya.

Karaaslan, A. İ. & Budak, L. (2012). Research on the Use of Mobile Phone Features by University Students and Its Impact on Their Communication Practices in Everyday Life. *Journal of Yasar University* 2012 26(7), pp.4548 – 4525.

Levy, M. (2009). Technologies in Use for Second Language Learning. *The Modern Language Journal. 93 (1),* pp.769–782.

Lu, M. (2008). Effectiveness of vocabulary learning via mobile phone. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning,* 24, (6), pp. 515–525.

Menzi, N., Önal, N. Ve Çalışkan, E. (2012). Investigating Educational Researchers' Views of Using Mobile Technologies for Educational Purposes based on Technology Acceptance Model. *Ege Eğitim Dergisi* 13(1),pp. 40–55.

Oran, M. K. & Karadeniz, Ş. (2007). İnternet Tabanlı Uzaktan Eğitimde Mobil Öğrenmenin Rolü**.** *Akademik Bilişim'07 - IX. 31 Ocak - 2 Şubat 2007 Dumlupınar Üniversitesi, Kütahya.*

Öztürk, M. (2014). Web Tabanlı Uzaktan Eğitimde Teknolojiye İlişkin Yeni Eğilimler. http://www.efdergi.ibu.edu.tr/index.php/efdergi/article/viewFile/1353/2251

Quinn, A.C., Mardomingo, R. & Valentine, C. (2009).Mobile blogs in language learning: making the most of informal and situated learning opportunities. *European Association for Computer Assisted Language Learning. 21 (01),* pp. 96-112.

Saran, M., Seferoglu, G. & Cagıltay, K. (2009). Mobile Assisted Language Learning: English

    Pronunciation at Learners' Fingertips. *Eurasian Journal of Education Research (EJER),* 34, pp. 97-114.

Sarıca, N. G. & Cavus, N. (2008). Web-Based English Language Learning. *International Educational Technology Conference, Anadolu Universty, 6-9 May, 2008, Eskişehir, Turkey.*

Sharples, M., Taylor, J., & Vavoula, G. (2005). Towards a theory of mobile learning. *Proceedings of mLearn 2005*, *1*(1), pp.1-9.

Şar, A. H. Işıklar, A. (2012). Adaptation of problem mobile phone use scale to Turkish. *International Journal of Human Sciences* [Online]. (9)2, pp.264-275.

Thornton, P. & Houser, C. (2005). Using mobile phones in English education in Japan. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning.* 21 (3), pp.217-228.

Warschauer, M. & Healey, D. (1998). Computers and Language Learning. *Language Teaching,* 31(02), pp. 57-71.

Yamamoto, T. G., Demiray, U. & Kesim, M. (2010). *Türkiye'de e-öğrenme: Gelişmeler ve uygulamalar.* https://tojde.anadolu.edu.tr.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Burhan Akpınar
E-Mail: bakpinar23@gmail.com