International Journal for Social Studies

Available at https://edupediapublications.org/journals

ISSN: 2455-3220
Volume 03 Issue 10
September 2017

Perception and Usage of Mobile Learning among Post Graduate Students

Dr. Sushma H.B.

Assistant Professor

School of Education

Central University of Karnataka

Sushmahaigar@gmail.com

9980095126

ABSTRACT

Technology, advancement always has a vast impact on education. One such technology is mobile learning (m-Learning). It has become an emerging tool in our education system. The main objective of the study is to know the perception and usage of mobile in learning among post graduate students. For this purpose 100 sample were selected randomly, which consists of (50 post graduate girl students and 50 post graduate boy students) of Gulbarga University, Kalaburagi. Hypothesis was tested for significance at 0.05 margin in error and "t" test is applied to test the hypothesis.

Key words: *Mobile Learning, Post Graduate Students.*

INTRODUCTION

In the term M-learning, M stands for mobile. Any kind of learning that takes place through portable, hand held electronic devices is called m-learning. Though the term immediately evokes images of smart phones, but in fact also refers to, learning through various other kinds of mobiles devices such as tablet, computer and digital readers. Mobile learning is known by many different names, like M-learning, personalized learning, learning while mobile, ubiquitous learning, anytime/anywhere and handheld learning.

With the advancement of mobile technology, possibilities are emerging to provide educational services through mobile devices. Thus mobile technology and the

ISSN: 2455-3220
Volume 03 Issue 10
September 2017

concept of m-learning is an emerging new trend in education system. This embraces the idea of anytime, anywhere and anybody learning.

Mobile learning is defined in various ways by others, as the learning which takes place by means of wireless technological devices that can be pocketed and utilized where ever the learner's device is able to receive unbroken transmission signals (Mohamed & etal, 2010). Another definition is any sort of learning that happens when the learner is not at a fixed, predetermined location, or learning that happens when the learner takes advantages of the learning opportunities offered by mobile technologies (Andrew, 2004). Mike Sherples (2007) defined m-learning as, learning supported by mobile devices such as cellular (mobile) phones, portable computers and personal audio players.

NEED AND IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

Mobile learning is a new learning approach. It is often viewed as a component of a learning programme which supports the leaning process as an add-on-tool by allowing the learners to obtain learning material anywhere and anytime. It is more interesting, interactive, widely available and flexible helping students to learn more without traditional restrictions. Hence the study has taken and felt the need of the hour.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

"Perception and Usage of Mobile Learning among Post Graduate Students"

OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS

Mobile – Learning: MOBI Learn, 2003. States "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".

According to Hyman, 2014. Mobile learning (or m-learning), which means learning through mobile devices (such as smart mobile phones, tablet PCs and E-ink Book devices), is changing the education landscape by offering learners the

ISSN: 2455-3220
Volume 03 Issue 10
September 2017

opportunity to engage in asynchronous, ubiquitous instruction. O'Malley,Vavoula, Glew, Taylor & Sharples (2005) stated, 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

Post –Graduate Students: Are students who already have an undergraduate degree and who are studying a post graduate qualification which may be a diploma or a degree such as honors, masters or doctor of philosophy.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Seppala and Alamaki (2003) claimed that the core characteristic of mobile learning enables learners to be in the right place at the right time, that is, to be where they are able to experience the authentic joy of learning. Huang, Lin & Chuang (2007) according to them, Mobile learning allows users to access learning material anytime and anywhere. Mobile technologies are support communication between students and teachers. So mobile technologies may use for collaborative learning activities in the education (Uzunboylu, Cavus & Ercag, 2009; Virvou & Alepis, 2005). Al-Fahad (2009) conducted a study to better understand and measure students' attitudes and effectiveness of mobile learning. The result of his study revealed that the majority of students supported the idea that the wireless networks increase the flexibility of access to resources of learning independently in any place. Therefore, students can save their time, effort and even money. Mobile Learning is the use of mobile or wireless technology and devices for learning at anytime, anyplace and anywhere (Quinn, 2000). Many researches claimed that adopting mobile technologies in higher education could create powerful opportunities to access information anytime and anywhere to perform authentic activities in the context of students' learning (Wesam, 2013; Martin, 2013). According to (Wagner, 2005) the value of deploying mobile

ISSN: 2455-3220
Volume 03 Issue 10
September 2017

technologies in the service of learning and teaching seems to be both self-evident and unavoidable.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

To know the perception and usage of mobile learning by boy and girl post graduate students of arts and science.

HYPOTHESES

01. There would be significant difference in usage of mobile learning among boys and girls of post- graduate student.

02. There would be significant difference in usage of mobile learning among arts boys and science boys of post- graduate student.

03. There would be significant difference in usage of mobile learning among arts girls and science girls of post- graduate student.

04. There would be significant difference in usage of mobile learning among arts boys and arts girls post- graduate student.

05. There would be significant difference in usage of mobile learning among science boys and science girls of post- graduate student.

METHOD

A survey was conducted.

POPULATION AND SAMPLE

The population for this investigation consisted of arts and science, boys and girls post-graduate student of Gulbarga University, Kalaburagi. It is from this population that the sample of 100 post-graduate students (50 boys, 25 each from arts and science and 50 girls 25 each from arts and science) was drawn through simple random sampling technique.

PROCEDURE

For the present study the researcher visited various arts and science departments of Gulbarga University, Kalaburagi. Questionnaire on usage of mobile – phone was given to students and next day it was collected back. Based on the obtained data statistical analysis was tested using SPSS 20 and the significance level for all analysis was set at 0.05.

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

HYPOTHESIS 01- There would be significant difference in mobile usage by boy and girl post- graduate students.

ISSN: 2455-3220
Volume 03 Issue 10
September 2017

Table 01- shows Mean score, Standard Deviation, "t" and significance value of post graduate students and usage of mobile.

Variable	Post Graduate Students	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	"t"	Level of Significance
Usage of Mobile	**Boys**	50	2.1800	0.82536	0.885	0.378*
	Girls	50	2.0400	0.75485		

Note*- Significance at 0.05 level.

The Independent sample "t" test table-01 shows that the post graduate boy students (N=50) mean value 2.1800 and standard deviation 0.82536 is high compared to that of girl post- graduate students (N=50) mean value 2.0400 and standard deviation 0.75485, calculated "t" value is 0.885 and obtained significant value 0.378 is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the proposed hypotheses stated above can be stated as,

There is no significant difference in mobile usage among boys and girls post- graduate student.

HYPOTHESIS 02- There would be significant difference in mobile usage by arts boys and science boys of post- graduate student.

Table 02- shows Mean score, Standard Deviation, "t" and significance value of post graduate students and usage of mobile.

Variable	Post Graduate Students	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	"t"	Level of Significance
Usage of Mobile	**Arts Boys**	25	2.0000	0.91287	1.565	0.124*
	Science Boys	25	2.3600	0.70000		

Note*- Significance at 0.05 level.

ISSN: 2455-3220
Volume 03 Issue 10
September 2017

The Independent sample "t" test table-01 shows that the post graduate arts boy students (N=25) mean value 2.0000 and standard deviation 0.91287 is low compared to that of post graduate science boy students (N=25) mean value 2.3600 and standard deviation 0.70000, calculated "t" value is 1.565 and obtained significant value 0.124 is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the proposed hypotheses stated above can be stated as,

There is no significant difference in mobile usage among arts and science post- graduate boys' student.

HYPOTHESIS 03- There would be significant difference in mobile usage by arts girls and science girls of post- graduate student.

Table 03- shows Mean score, Standard Deviation, "t" and significance value of post graduate students and usage of mobile.

Variable	Post Graduate Students	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	"t"	Level of Significance
Usage of Mobile	**Arts Girls**	25	1.8400	0.74610	1.925	0.060*
	Science Girls	25	2.2400	0.72342		

Note*- Significance at 0.05 level.

The Independent sample "t" test table-01 shows that the post graduate arts girl students (N=25) mean value 1.8400 and standard deviation 0.74610 is low compared to that of post graduate science girl students (N=25) mean value 2.2400 and standard deviation 0.72342, calculated "t" value is 1.925 and obtained significant value 0.060 is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the proposed hypotheses stated above can be stated as,

ISSN: 2455-3220
Volume 03 Issue 10
September 2017

There is no significant difference in mobile usage among arts and science post- graduate girls student.

HYPOTHESIS 04- There would be significant difference in mobile usage by arts boys and arts girls' post- graduate student.

Table 04- shows Mean score, Standard Deviation, "t" and significance value of post graduate students and usage of mobile.

Variable	Post Graduate Students	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	"t"	Level of Significance
Usage of Mobile	**Arts Boys**	25	2.0000	0.91287	0.679	0.501*
	Arts Girls	25	1.8400	0.74610		

Note*- Significance at 0.05 level.

The Independent sample "t" test table-04 shows that the post graduate arts boy students (N=25) mean value 2.0000 and standard deviation 0.91287 is high compared to that of post graduate arts girl students (N=25) mean value 1.8400 and standard deviation 0.74610, calculated "t" value is 0.679 and obtained significant value 0.501 is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the proposed hypotheses stated above can be stated as,

There is no significant difference in mobile usage among arts boys and girls post- graduate student.

HYPOTHESIS 05- There would be significant difference in mobile usage by science boys and science girls of post- graduate student.

Table 05- shows Mean score, Standard Deviation, "t" and significance value of post graduate students and usage of mobile.

ISSN: 2455-3220
Volume 03 Issue 10
September 2017

Variable	Post Graduate Students	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	"t"	Level of Significance
Usage of Mobile	Science Boys	25	2.3600	0.70000	0.596	0.554*
	Science Girls	25	2.2400	0.72342		

Note*- Significance at 0.05 level.

The Independent sample "t" test table-01 shows that the post graduate science boy students (N=25) mean value 2.3600 and standard deviation 0.70000 is high compared to that of post graduate science girl students (N=25) mean value 2.2400 and standard deviation 0.72342, calculated "t" value is 0.596 and obtained significant value 0.554 is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence the proposed hypotheses stated above can be stated as,

There is no significant difference in mobile usage among science boys and girls post- graduate student.

FINDINGS

01. There is no significant difference in mobile usage among boys and girls post- graduate student.

02. There is no significant difference in mobile usage by arts and science post- graduate boys' student.

03. There is no significant difference in mobile usage among arts and science post- graduate girls' student.

04. There is no significant difference in mobile usage among arts boys and girls post- graduate student.

05. There is no significant difference in mobile usage among science boys and girls post- graduate student.

SUGGESTION AND CONCLUSION

Now a day's m-learning is a rising learning trend and a new vital

ISSN: 2455-3220
Volume 03 Issue 10
September 2017

platform for the higher educational environment. The findings of the study shows there is no significant difference among the perception and usage of mobile phone for learning among post graduate boys and girls student of Gulbarga University, Kalaburagi. Based on the findings it is very essential to suggest the post graduate students about the advantages of mobile using in learning as mobile learning is self motivated, self disciplined that supports studying with no time waste , and anywhere and at anytime. As much as possible mobile learning must be strictly implemented in teaching and learning process and must be made easily accessible.

REFERENCES

01. Al-Fahad, F. N. (April 2009), Students' Attitudes and Perceptions Towards the effectiveness of Mobile learning in King Saud University. The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology. 8(2), pp10.
02. Andrew, Josie, T. (2004). Development of a research plan for use of ambient technology to test mobile learning theories in mobile learning anytime, everywhere: A book of paper from MLEARN, eds.
03. Crescente. Mary Louise., Lee, Doris (2011). Critical issues of M-Learning: design models, adoption processes, and future trends. Journal of the Chinese Institute of Industrial Engineers 28 (2), pp 111–123.
04. Huang, J., Lin, Y., & Chuang, S. (2007). Elucidating user behavior of mobile learning: A perspective of the extended technology acceptance model. Electronic Library, 25(5), pp 585-598.
05. Hyman, J. A., Moser, M. T., & Segala, L. N. (2014). Electronic Reading and Digital Library Technologies: Understanding Learner Expectation and Usage Intent for Mobile Learning. Educational Technology Research and Development, 62, pp 35-52.
06. Martin, F., & Ertzberger, J. (2013). Here and Now Mobile Learning: An Experimental Study on the Use of Mobile Technology. Computers & Education, 68, pp 76-85.
07. MOBIlearn, (2003). Guidelines for learning/teaching/tutoring in a mobile environment. MOBIlearn, pp 6.

ISSN: 2455-3220
Volume 03 Issue 10
September 2017

08. O'Malley, C., Vavoula, G., Glew, J. P., Taylor, J., & Sharples, M. (2005). Guidelines for Learning/Teaching/Tutoring in a Mobile Environment.
09. Seppala, P. & Alamaki, H.(2003). Mobile learning in teacher training. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 19, pp 330-335.
10. Uzunboylu, H., Cavus, N. & Ercag, E. (2009). Using mobile learning to increase environmental awareness. Computers & Education, *52*(2), pp 381-389.
11. Virvou, M. & Alepis, E. (2005). Mobile educational features in authoring tools for personalized tutoring. Computers & Education, *44*, pp 53-68.
12. Wagner, E. D. (2005). Enabling Mobile Learning. EDUCAUSE Review, 40(3), pp 40-53.
13. Wesam, S., Gail, H., Elizabeth, F. G., & Colin, H. (2013). Supporting Interaction in Learning Activities Using Mobile Devices in Higher Education. 12th World Conference on Mobile and Contextual Learning (mLearn 2013), pp 35.