

Turkish EFL Learners' Views towards the Use of IWB in English Lessons

Onur Başdınc

MA Student, Istanbul Aydin University

onurbasdinc@stu.aydin.edu.tr

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0663-9721>

*This study was produced from the Master's Thesis titled "Turkish EFL Learners' Views Towards the Use of IWB in English Lessons" by researcher Onur Başdınc, a student at Istanbul Aydın University under the supervision of Dr. Hülya Yumru.

Abstract: *The aim of this investigation is to evaluate the opinions of EFL students towards interactive whiteboards in English lessons in a foundation university located in Turkey. Quantitative research technique was carried out in order to collect information. A questionnaire with four factors "Teachers' and Students' Perception of Interactive Whiteboard in the English as a Foreign Language Classroom" prepared by Oz (2014) was conducted to 267 preparatory school learners. The outcomes of the research revealed that most of the learners have positive views about using IWBs in English lectures.*

Keywords: Students' perceptions; Interactive white board; English as foreign language (EFL)

1. Introduction

In the recent ten years, the awareness in the utilization of information and communication technologies (ICT) has significantly increased for the most part in learning environment, especially for secondary or foreign languages (L2). Along with the rhetoric of articles published that empower ICT implementation, the quantity of financial sources spent into education technologies shows that numerous institutions and government agencies in industrialized and industrializing states have trust in ICT'S ability to improve their education system (Bax, 2000; Betcher and Lee, 2009; Moss et al., 2007; MoNE, 2010; Thomas and Schmid, 2010; Yang and Teng, 2014). There is indeed adequate proof to substantiate the concept of ICT that many current schools have considerably modified education systems and procedures (Duran and Cruz, 2011; Thomas & Schmid, 2010). Today's second language students are offered many options to engage through technological advances, such as interactive multimedia and the web - based cyber world event. Those students will be able to enhance and extend their cognitive and communicative abilities by being offered a chance to take part in interactive online meetings (Coyle, Yañez and Verdú, 2010; Millum and Warren, 2014).

There has also been a growing attraction toward the implementation of smart boards in institutes as the previously mentioned innovations, belief and commitment of ICTs are viewed as combining any existing training equipment, including chalkboards and whiteboards, TVs, videos, overhead projection systems, CD players, computers (Yañez and Coyle, 2011, p. 446). Despite the comparatively fresh development of IWB technology, which was primarily developed for advertising applications (DiGregorio and SobelLojeski, 2010; Higgins, Beauchamp and Miller, 2007), in courses of foreign language it is implemented growingly throughout the world. Since it was additionally stated by Coyle, Yañez and Verdú (2010), it offers the second language instructor numerous chances of teaching in new,

fascinating and interesting methods, much beyond the typical whiteboard possibilities.

The IWB is helping to enhance learners' involvement (Wood & Ashfield, 2008), the IWB inspires and encourages learners increasingly competitive and empowers collaboration among learners (Armstrong et al., 2005). Visually and audible strategies facilitate students' understanding of the lecture (Rule, Stefanich, Boody & Peiffer, 2011). These arguments are reinforced by the results of academic theoreticians who say that learners have affirmative opinions about using IWB in the lessons (Elaziz, 2008; Levy, 2002; Hall and Higgins, 2005; Türel, 2011; Türel and Johnson, 2012) and it raises students' enthusiasm and engagement (Mathews-Aydinli & Elaziz, 2010; Johnsona, Ramanaira and Brineb, 2010). As a consequence, the main objective of the research is to discover Turkish EFL learners' view toward the implementation of smart board systems in the language lessons.

2. Literature Review

The IWB is often known as a software platform with a media projection mechanism and a digital display. It is a huge, tactile, interactive projection platform which links an instructional platform with a multimedia projector to a laptop, computer or widescreen (BECTA 2003; De Vita et al., 2014; Miller and Grover, 2010). Besides becoming wide and sensitive to touch, the whiteboard shows the images displayed and permits the instructors and learners to control them. An ordinary IWB can send data from the panel to the computers right after touching the monitor (Duran and Cruz, 2011). Although many IWBs include a marker and operating systems with drag-and-drop skills, many IWBs could be managed by a fingertip.

Generally, IWBs can provide numerous significant benefits on teaching and education. For instance, instructors can implement more ICT into classes throughout normal school periods. Additionally, ICT allows instructors to take

advantage of a variety of web-based materials and it also enables them to store and print their documents they produce during their classes. In addition, IWBs have a significant capability to boost learners' pleasure and encouragement by strengthening students' individual and interpersonal capabilities, IWBs also offer more options for students' commitment and collaboration and promote productivity by presenting to their classmates in lesson (BECTA, 2003).

In a study conducted by Gray (2010), it is stated that the IWB can offer more personalized methods of education and pace of learning. It is therefore acceptable to claim that learners who engage these technological advances are much more autonomous and have a feeling of motivation. Duran and Cruz (2011) noted that L2 students are more focused, committed and supporting one another in classrooms where IWBs are adopted because they perceive courses more entertaining and engaging. According to Beeland (2002), IWBs are used very efficiently in L2 classes to improve and enhance students' participation in classroom activities for their education.

According to a research conducted by Moss et al. (2007, p. 53), it was found that the adoption of IWB technologies commonly had a positive perspective both for instructors and students in the lessons. Yáñez and Coyle (2011) carried out a small-scale investigation in Spain, focusing on a classroom where an intensive foreign language program (English) was implemented in British elementary school. This study examined L2 students' views toward using IWB in their education life. Their results showed that students wished to engage with the interactive whiteboards more and its multifunctional features were significant and attractive especially for the native speakers. In the total analysis of the present research on the views, feelings and expectations of learners on the use of IWB, learners generally have greater satisfaction.

3. Statement of Purpose

This research was mainly undertaken to explore the perspectives of Turkish EFL students toward the use of IWBs in lessons. Therefore, the research was developed to focus on the following survey question:

1) What are Turkish EFL learners' views towards the use of IWB in English lessons?

This research aimed to give valuable information and put a spotlight on the efficient use of these technological advances by evaluating students' opinions of IWB usage in EFL classroom, which it is a currently matter of teaching or educational life in Turkey. With the results of this survey, authorities, school administrations and instructors should examine the usage of this IWB equipment which is implemented in classrooms by offering perspectives of the students to the use of IWBs in Turkey. The results of this research are also predicted to enlighten teacher trainees in university education about how to implement IWBs in the methods, techniques and approaches before they start giving education in institutes.

4. Methodology

4.1 Research design

The investigation was conducted with a quantitative method utilizing a questionnaire technique. The technique of gathering and analysing statistical values is quantitative research (Bryman, 2012). The goal of the current investigation is to examine in depth the attitudes of Turkish EFL students on using IWBs in the lessons of English. The quantitative approach, which is part of the descriptive research methodology has been applied to achieve the purpose of study. The study's main objective was to answer the question of IWB research in one educational establishment. The questionnaire approach is used in order to gather descriptive data as the objective of descriptive research is to investigate what is (Borg & Gall, 1989).

4.2 Setting and participants

This research was carried out in one of the major private universities in Istanbul where IWBs are implemented and controlled by instructors in classes. Like many other private colleges, foreign language education carried much significance, thus 28 English lesson hours per week were involved in its syllabus. As the preparatory English language program exists in this private university, English language courses are more intensive than other levels in the preparatory program. The study was carried out with a target population of 267 learners aged 16-20, 21-25 and over 25 who were in the 3rd term of the four-term program in language school of the university. The study included 151 women and 113 men, only 3 of them did not intend to mention their gender. The students were selected from B1 level students from the language school by convenience selection. The degree of language skills of students has been decided by the university's placement test. The learner population was picked by randomized means to assure the availability of both men and women.

4.3 Instrument

A questionnaire prepared by Öz (2014) was the information gathering tool of the research. The tools for this research consisted of a Google form-based questionnaire about the participants' views of the usage of interactive smartboards in the language lectures in EFL classes. There were two separated parts in survey. Three questions which categorize the learners were provided in the opening phase of the survey age, level of English and gender. 26 items on Likert-scale, which measured learners' views on four factors, were part of the second phase of the questionnaire. These factors were: *Motivation, Comprehended Learning Contribution, Perceived Drawbacks, Perceived Efficiency*, and. The respondents were assessed utilizing a 5-point Likert scale according to elements in the questionnaire, picking the answers (5) strongly agree (4) agree, (3) neutral, (2) disagree, (1) strongly disagree. The survey was transferred into Turkish and edited by a colleague, in order to make it easy for the attending learners to comprehend the items mentioned in questionnaire. As a consequence, the reliability of the 26-item survey was 0,902 for the Cronbach

Alpha. This significant alpha rating suggested that the study tools have a strong inner reliability.

4.4 Data collection and analysis

O'Maley and Chamot (1990) noted that questionnaires are used as one of the most efficient data collection strategies for obtaining information from a wide group of participants. This research was carried out in one of the important private university located in Istanbul in Spring Semester in the 2020-2021 academic year. After the permission by school officials and authorities, a total of 267 participating students registered in preparatory department and having 28 lesson hours of English language in intense English curricula, volunteered to engage and take part in this research. The learners participating in the survey were Turkish and it took fifteen minutes to complete. Learners did it in one of the online lessons via Google form-based questionnaire.

The research question in the current investigation was analyzed in order to discuss the information. The information obtained from the surveys have been loaded into the computer and analyzed via SPSS 21 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) which is a sophisticated computing tool that helps investigators to conduct data analysis rapidly and correctly. The ideal ratings of learners have been entirely summarized in order to acquire a framework to illustrate the outcomes of the learners' views regarding IWB utilization. In order to describe the gathered information, measurement items such as frequency and mean were conducted. The investigation included Bartlett sphericity tests and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) data methods for the research.

5. Discussion

As it is seen in table 2, the findings of analyses demonstrated that 56.6% of the participating learners were females (N=151) and 42.3% were males (N=113). Only 1.1% (N=3) did not prefer to clarify their genders.

First of all, this study examines the attitudes of Turkish EFL students on the implementation of IWB in English lectures under four factors in one questionnaire with twenty-one items in table 1. For the first factor, ten items reviewed the students' perspectives of the motivation gained through the usage of IWBs in lectures. When it is investigated the items related the first factor closely, it can be concluded that majority of the students (65.8%) find the IWBs in the lessons as one of the key points helping them to get motivated in English lessons (item17). Vast majority of the participating students (82.1%) find using IWBs easy in the lessons (item10). From the perspective of 75.3% IWBs make English learning more enjoyable and participating (item15). As it can be understood, the volunteer students have positive perception toward using IWBs in classrooms.

The second factor, four items reviewed the students' perspectives of the perceived drawbacks through the usage of IWBs in lectures. Most of the students do not consider the possible negativities via the implementation of the IWB in lesson as a disadvantage. Furthermore, for the third factor, five items reviewed the students' perspectives of the perceived efficiency through the usage of IWBs in lectures. When it is investigated the percentages of the items, it is clearly understood that learners believe the IWBs help the lessons in terms of saving time and being organized. For the last factor, only two items reviewed the students' perspectives of the comprehended learning contribution through the usage of IWBs in lectures. The findings of these items showed that learners can comprehend the lecture more easily with the help of visual and aural sources. Additionally, IWBs help students to keep the points that they learnt during lesson hours in their minds easily.

6. Conclusion

After discussion of the data from the survey, vast majority of Turkish EFL's students who have IWBs in English courses were regarded to have positive views about the use of IWB in lessons. The IWB also provides students with a wide range of materials such as photographs, films, music that can be seen as a crucial aspect in promoting a strong perspective. Turkish EFL students found the tools delightful and beneficial in English lessons, as stated in the survey. The positive views of students about the integration of IWB can be seen in numerous studies conducted. Questionnaire results with participating EFL learners showed that IWB offers students enjoyable and beneficial information to gain significant and extensive tools throughout the course.

The results of existing study show similarity with the results Ajzen and Fishbein (1980). Students appear to be satisfied with IWB and agree that the implementation of IWBs in classrooms provides several advantages for EFL lessons. The conclusions of the research can be supported by the outcomes of Wall et al. (2005). These results seem to be similar with the investigation of Weimer (2001). Kennewell and Beauchamp (2003) feel that the IWB strengthen the ability to participation of students and foster the engagement of learners. Glover and Miller (2001) claim IWBs impress students and encourage them to study. Those findings show that participating learners like the lectures smart boards are implemented in, as assisted by the findings of Hall and Higgins (2005) and Levy (2002).

Table 2: The distribution of the participating students by their genders and numbers are below

Gender	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Women	151	56,60	56,60
Men	113	42,30	98,90
I prefer not to specify	3	1,10	100,00
Total	267	100,00	

Table 1: Item analysis for participating learners' opinions about the IWB usage in the EFL lectures
(5) strongly agree (4) agree, (3) neutral, (2) disagree, (1) strongly disagree.

Items of the Subscale Motivation	1	2	3	4	5
9. I like going to the front of the class to use the IWB	8.2%	18.7%	28.8%	27.3%	16.9%
10. It seems difficult for me to use IWBs.	52.1%	30%	11.2%	3.0%	3.7%
11. I prefer lessons that are taught with an IWB.	5.6%	5.6%	17.6%	35.6%	35.6%

13. I concentrate better when my teacher uses an IWB	5.2%	4.5%	27.3%	36.0%	27.0%
14. I get to join in lessons more when my teacher uses an IWB.	6.0%	8.6%	34.5%	29.6%	21.3%
15. IWBs make learning English more interesting and exciting	4.9%	4.1%	15.7%	37.1%	38.2%
16. It is easier to keep my attention when an IWB is used during the lesson.	4.1%	6.7%	25.5%	34.8%	28.8%
17. Use of an IWB makes it easier for me to be motivated during the lesson.	3.4%	7.1%	24.7%	35.5%	30.3%
18. IWB use increases my interest in the English lesson.	4.1%	10.5%	22.5%	31.5%	31.5%
Items of the Subscale Perceived Drawbacks	1	2	3	4	5
7. Sometimes deficiencies of the IWB screen and sunlight in the classroom make it difficult to see the things on the IWB.	4.9%	10.1%	28.1%	28.1%	28.8%
8. IWBs often break down and recalibration causes a waste of time.	14.6%	33.3%	28.5%	12.0%	11.6%
20. When my teacher uses an IWB, I cannot keep up with the lesson because the pace of the lesson.	38.2%	39.3%	10.9%	7.5%	4.1%
23. During IWB use, there is a lot of noise in class.	25.1%	36.7%	22.5%	10.9%	4.9%
Items of the Subscale Perceived Efficiency	1	2	3	4	5
6. IWBs make the teachers' drawings and diagrams easier to see.	5.2%	4.5%	8.2%	29.2%	52.8%
21. The lessons become more organized when an IWB is used	5.2%	5.2%	17.2%	40.1%	32.2%
22. Using an IWB saves time and the lesson moves smoothly.	5.6%	9.0%	19.5%	36.0%	30.0%
25. There is no difference between my English teacher's use of a traditional board and an IWB in terms of teaching techniques and methods.	29.6%	36.3%	19.9%	8.6%	5.6%
26. I think there is not much difference between an IWB and a normal whiteboard.	38.6%	39.0%	11.2%	6.7%	4.5%
Items of the Subscale Comprehended Learning Contributions	1	2	3	4	5
3. Using audio and visual materials with IWB helps me understand the lesson better.	6.0%	1.9%	2.2%	26.6%	63.3%
5. IWB use makes it easier for me to remember what I learned in class.	4.1%	6.0%	17.2%	39.0%	33.7%

References

- Armstrong, V., Barnes, S., Sutherland, R., Curran, S., Mills, S., & Thompson, I. (2005). Collaborative research methods for investigating teaching and learning: The use of interactive whiteboard technology. *Educational Review*, 57(4), 457-469. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00131910500279551>
- Bax, S. (2000). Putting technology in its place: ICT in modern foreign language teaching. In K. Field (Ed.), *Issues in modern foreign language teaching* (pp. 199-210). London, England: Routledge Falmer.
- BECTA (2003). *What the research says about interactive whiteboards*. The British Educational Communications and Technology Agency, Coventry, England.
- Beeland, W. D. (2002). Student engagement, visual learning and technology: Can interactive whiteboards help? *Annual Conference of the Association of Information Technology for Teaching Education*, Trinity College, Dublin. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.135.3542&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Betcher, C., & Lee, M. (2009). *The interactive whiteboard revolution: Teaching with IWBs*. Victoria: ACER Press. Retrieved from http://schoolnet.org.za/CoL/ACE/course/classroom/documents/iwb_revolution.pdf
- Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters
- Coyle, Y., Yañez, L., & Verdú, M. (2010). The impact of the interactive whiteboard on the teacher and children's language use in an ESL immersion classroom. *System*, 38(4), 614-625. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2010.10.002>
- De Vita, M., Verschaffel, L., & Elen, J. (2014). Interactive whiteboards in mathematics teaching: A literature review. *Education Research International*, 2014, 1-16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2014/401315>
- DiGregorio, P., & Sobel-Lojeski, K. (2010). The effects of interactive whiteboards (IWBs) on student performance and learning: A literature review. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 38(3), 255-312. <http://doi.org/10.2190/ET.38.3.b>
- Duran, A., & Cruz, M. (2011). The interactive whiteboard and foreign language learning: A case study. *PortaLinguarum*, 15, 211-231.
- Elaziz, M. F. (2008). *Attitudes of students and teachers towards the use of interactive whiteboards in EFL classrooms*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Bilkent University, Ankara
- Fishbein, M., Jaccard, J., Davidson, A. R., Ajzen, I., & Loken, B. (1980). Predicting and understanding family planning behaviors. In *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Prentice Hall.
- Gall, M. D., & Borg, W. R. (1989). *Educational Research. A Guide for Preparing a Thesis or Dissertation Proposal in Education*. Longman, Inc., Order Dept., 95 Church Street, White Plains, NY 10601 Stock No. 78164-6.
- Gray, C. (2010). Meeting teachers' real needs: New tools in the secondary modern foreign languages classroom. In M. Thomas and E. C. Schmid (Eds.), *Interactive whiteboards for education: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 69-85). New York, NY: IGI Global.
- Hall, I., & Higgins, S. (2005). Primary school students' perceptions of interactive whiteboards. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 21(2), 102-117.
- Higgins, S., Beauchamp, G., & Miller, D. (2007). Reviewing the literature on interactive whiteboards.

- Learning, Media and Technology*, 32(3), 213-225. <http://doi.org/10.1080/17439880701511040>
- [17] Johnsona, E. M., Ramanaira, J., & Brineb, J. (2010). 'It's not necessary to have this board to learn English, but it's helpful': Student and teacher perceptions of interactive whiteboard use. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 4(3), 199-212. <http://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2010.513444>
- [18] Kennewell, S., & Beauchamp, G. (2003, July). The influence of a technology-rich classroom environment on elementary teachers' pedagogy and children's learning. In *Proceedings of the international federation for information processing working group 3.5 open conference on Young children and learning technologies-Volume 34* (pp. 71-76).
- [19] Levy, P. (2002) Interactive whiteboards in learning and teaching in two Sheffield schools: A developmental study. Retrieved from <http://dis.shef.ac.uk/eirg/projects/wboards.htm>
- [20] Mathews-Aydinli, J., & Elaziz, F. (2010). Turkish students' and teachers' attitudes toward the use of interactive whiteboards in EFL classrooms. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 23(3), 235-252. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09588221003776781>
- [21] Miller, D., & Glover, D. (2010). Interactive whiteboards: A literature survey. In M. Thomas and E. C. Schmid (Eds.), *Interactive whiteboards for education: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 1-19). New York, NY: IGI Global.
- [22] Millum, T., & Warren, C. (2014). *Sharing not staring: 21 interactive whiteboard lessons for the English classroom* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- [23] MoNE (2010). FATIH Project: Movement of enhancing opportunities and improving technology. Retrieved from <http://fatihprojesi.meb.gov.tr>
- [24] Moss, G., Jewitt, Carrey, L. R., Armstrong, V., Cardini, A., & Castle, F. (2007). *The interactive whiteboards pedagogy and pupil performance evaluation: An evaluation of the schools whiteboard expansion (SWE) project*: London Challenge. Institute of Education, University of London. Research report no: 816
- [25] Öz, H. (2014). Teachers' and Students' Perceptions of Interactive Whiteboards in the English as a Foreign Language Classroom. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, 13(3), 156-177.
- [26] Rule, A. C., Stefanich, G. P., Boody, R. M., & Peiffer, B. (2011). Impact of adaptive materials on teachers and their students with visual impairments in secondary science and mathematics classes. *International Journal of Science Education*, 33(6), 865-887.
- [27] Thomas, M., & Schmid, E. C. (Eds.) (2010). *Interactive whiteboards for education: Theory, research and practice*. New York, NY: IGI Global
- [28] Türel, Y. K. (2011). An interactive whiteboard student survey: Development, validity and reliability. *Computers and Education*, 57(4), 2441-2450. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2011.07.005>
- [29] Türel, Y. K., & Johnson, T. E. (2012). Teachers' belief and use of interactive whiteboards for teaching and learning. *Educational Technology and Society*, 15(1), 381-394.
- [30] Yáñez, L., & Coyle, Y. (2011). Children's perceptions of learning with an interactive whiteboard. *ELT Journal*, 65(4), 446-457. <http://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccq069>
- [31] Yang, J. Y., & Teng, Y.W. (2014). Perceptions of elementary school teachers and students using interactivewhiteboards in English teaching and learning. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research*, 25(1), 125-154.
- [32] Wall, K., Higgins, S., & Smith, H. (2005). 'The visual helps me understand the complicated things': pupil views of teaching and learning with interactive whiteboards. *British journal of educational technology*, 36(5), 851-867.
- [33] Weimer, M. (2001). Learning more from the wisdom of practice. *New directions for teaching and learning*, 2001(86), 45-56.
- [34] Wood, R., & Ashfield, J. (2008). The use of the interactive whiteboard for creative teaching and learning in literacy and mathematics: a case study. *British journal of educational technology*, 39(1), 84-96.