

## UHI Research Database pdf download summary

Putting “mobile” into mathematics

Fabian, Khristin; Keith, Topping

*Published in:*  
Contemporary Educational Psychology

*Publication date:*  
2019

*Publisher rights:*  
© 2019 Published by Elsevier Inc.

*The re-use license for this item is:*  
CC BY-NC-ND

*The Document Version you have downloaded here is:*  
Peer reviewed version

*The final published version is available direct from the publisher website at:*  
[10.1016/j.cedpsych.2019.101783](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2019.101783)

[Link to author version on UHI Research Database](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Fabian, K., & Keith, T. (2019). Putting “mobile” into mathematics: Results of a randomised controlled trial. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 59, Article 101783. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2019.101783>

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the UHI Research Database are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights:

- 1) Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the UHI Research Database for the purpose of private study or research.
- 2) You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- 3) You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the UHI Research Database

### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at [RO@uhi.ac.uk](mailto:RO@uhi.ac.uk) providing details; we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

## Accepted Manuscript

Putting “mobile” into mathematics: Results of a randomised controlled trial

Khristin Fabian, Keith J. Topping

PII: S0361-476X(18)30390-4

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2019.101783>

Article Number: 101783


Reference: YCEPS 101783

To appear in: *Contemporary Educational Psychology*

Received Date: 27 September 2018

Revised Date: 8 April 2019

Accepted Date: 7 June 2019



Please cite this article as: Fabian, K., Topping, K.J., Putting “mobile” into mathematics: Results of a randomised controlled trial, *Contemporary Educational Psychology* (2019), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2019.101783>

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

**Putting “mobile” into mathematics: Results of a randomised controlled trial**

Khristin Fabian<sup>a</sup>, Keith J Topping<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>University of Highlands and Islands, Perth College, United Kingdom

<sup>b</sup>University of Dundee, United Kingdom

<sup>a</sup>[khristin.fabian.perth@uhi.ac.uk](mailto:khristin.fabian.perth@uhi.ac.uk)

Author Note:

Corresponding Author:

Khristin Fabian,

University of Highlands and Islands, Perth College

Crieff Road

Perth

PH1 2NX

[Khristin.fabian.perth@uhi.ac.uk](mailto:Khristin.fabian.perth@uhi.ac.uk); +44-1738-877701

Declaration of interest: none

Funding: This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

**Abstract**

There is an increasing use of mobile technologies in the classroom, particularly its use in supporting contextual learning, but comparative research on the effects of mobile learning in mathematics are few. The aim of this research was to examine student perceptions of using mobile technologies and their effect on mathematics achievement in a randomised controlled trial. Seventy-four Grade 5 and 6 students and three teachers participated in the study. Both groups participated in six weeks of active and collaborative learning activities on math. The experimental group used tablets to support them in their activities while the control group had similarly designed activities without the tablets. The tablets were observed to have facilitated constructivist learning activities as students moved in and out of different learning contexts. Most of the experimental group had positive evaluations but their end activity ratings were not significantly different from the control group. Gender differences were found in terms of how students perceived the mobile learning activities. There was no difference found in the groups' post-test achievement scores following an analysis of covariance with pre-test as covariate. For items relating to student misconception, students in the experimental group performed better. Overall, the study highlights that the success of a mobile learning intervention is dependent on various factors, such as student characteristics, stability of the technology and content compatibility. Implications for practice and future researchers are discussed.

Keywords: mobile learning; mathematics education; student perceptions; technology-enhanced learning; mathematics achievement

## 1. Introduction

There are several issues surrounding mathematics education, among which are negative student attitudes, problems with student engagement and achievement. A recent report on Making Maths Count (Scottish Government, 2016) started with the admission that “too many of us are happy to label ourselves as *no good with numbers*” (p.3). Negative attitudes to mathematics and students’ own perception of their ability to do mathematics are linked to student perceptions of the learning environment (Fast et al., 2010), motivation (Hannula et al., 2016), and engagement (Linnenbrink and Pintrich, 2003), which consequently affects math performance. It is thus important to employ strategies that encourage students to engage fully and positively in learning mathematics.

Technology enhanced learning is one of the strategies employed to engage students with mathematics. The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (2000) considered technology as “essential in teaching and learning mathematics” (p. 3). However, technology use must not just be for technology’s sake. It must be guided by a rationale to promote transformative learning in the classroom (Puentadura, 2006). Sullivan (2011) outlined six principles for effective mathematics teaching: articulating goals, making connections, fostering engagement, differentiating challenges, structuring lessons, and promoting fluency and transfer. These principles map to Carpenter and Lehrer’s (1999) characteristics of mathematical activities that promote understanding: constructing relationships, extending and applying mathematical knowledge, reflecting about experiences, articulating what one knows, and making mathematical knowledge one’s own. On the other hand, the potential benefits of using mobile technologies for learning include: facilitating learning across contexts, facilitating contextual learning, and providing personalisation in both personal and collaborative environments (Cochrane, 2010). These potentials appear to align with the characteristics of math activities that promote understanding. The current study investigates whether the combination of mobile technologies and constructivist learning activities affect student engagement and achievement.

Hirsh-Pasek et al. (2015) suggest that students learn best when they are engaged in meaningful and socially interactive learning experiences. Previous studies on mobile learning

for math have shown that it facilitates engagement (Baya'a and Daher, 2009), contextualises mathematics learning (Tangney et al., 2010), supports collaboration (Zurita and Nussbaum, 2004) and facilitates new ways to visualise abstract math concepts in the real world (Spikol and Eliason, 2010). These findings are promising, but studies on math and mobile learning are few.

Furthermore, the research methodology adopted by mobile learning studies tends to focus on interviews, surveys or observation. Only a few studies undertook comparative studies (Sharples, 2013). In studies that used outdoor settings, these narratives and observations provided evidence of high student engagement, but evidence of student achievement was not explored, or in cases where it was explored, the implementation integrity narratives were not present (Huang, Wu, Chen, Yang and Huang, 2012; Kurti, Spikol, Milrad, 2008). In addressing this gap, the current study employed an integrated framework that allowed for different levels of evaluation, focusing on various aspects of mobile technology use. Very few mobile learning studies so far are randomised controlled trials or studies that utilise control groups that follow similarly themed activities. Using an integrated evaluation framework, the current study takes a critical-analytical approach to evaluating mobile learning.

### *1.1 Theoretical background*

Mobile learning, being a relatively new field, is short on theory in the same way that elearning theories had been sparse during the first decade of its introduction into schools. Mayes and De Freitas (2004) noted that “there are really no models of elearning per se – only e-enhancements of models of learning (p. 4)” and this is at present the same for mobile learning theories. However, constructivist learning is a dominant theory in the mathematics education research community (Dewey, 2011; Li and Ma, 2010; Piaget, 1951; Vygotsky, 1978). Among its basic tenets includes the belief that knowledge is actively created and not passively received from the environment and that ideas are constructed or made meaningful by reflection (Clements and Battista, 1990). Knuth and Cunningham (1993) outlined design principles for constructivist learning, to which the current study based the design of activities on:

1. Provide experience with knowledge construction process
2. Provide experience for multiple perspectives
3. Embed learning in realistic and relevant context
4. Encourage ownership and voice

5. Embed learning in a social experience
6. Encourage the use of multiple modes of representation
7. Encourage self-awareness of the knowledge construction process

Mobile technologies support constructivist learning through active learning by doing activities (Tangney et al., 2010), immersion in authentic environments that facilitate visualisation of abstract math concepts (Sommerauer and Müller, 2014), and promoting ownership through learner-generated context (Bray and Tangney 2016).

Context is an important factor in mobile learning research. For example, Frohberg, Göth, and Schwabe's (2009) review of state-of-the-art mobile learning studies included mobile learning activities in both formal and informal learning environments, including museums, rivers, forests, towns, and so on. These rich contexts facilitated several studies designed within the situated learning framework (Kurti et al., 2008; Sommerauer and Müller, 2014). Situated learning theories emphasise that knowledge and cognition cannot be separated from context and call for authentic learning environments (Lave and Wenger, 1991). In computer-based learning environments, some examples of applications of this framework are in microworlds, virtual reality, and simulations (Herrington and Oliver, 1995). Of course, microworlds are not “real world” either, and by the process of abstraction and simulation the authenticity of the environment is compromised. In mobile learning environments, these representations move to the real world. Mobile devices can capture data from the environment with built-in sensors, camera and communication tools and these features help facilitate learning activities designed within the situated learning framework, allowing learning to take place in an authentic context. For example, in Tangney et al.'s (2010) study of mobile learning activities based on the Realistic Mathematics Education principle, one of the activities used the mobile device to measure the height of an object, and in this instance the technology use was situated within the problem that the students were trying to work out and was therefore authentic. In this instance, the use of the mobile device facilitated learning across context, allowing the link between the “abstract (representational) and concrete (environmentally-situated) knowledge to be integrated (JISC, 2011).”

Factors that influence technology adoption is one area that research on new technologies focus on (Wang, Wu and Wang, 2009). Studies on technology acceptance model aim to understand how and why users come to use technology. Davis's (1989) Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) focuses on two constructs that explain and predict technology use: perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use. Davis's model describes that users tend to use technology they consider useful (perceived usefulness), but this belief must be coupled

with the perception that the benefits will outweigh the effort of using the technology (perceived ease of use). These two constructs provide a direct link to usability evaluation (Morris & Dillon, 1997). Davis believes these perceptions about usability affect the users' attitudes towards technology and consequently their intention to use it. An illustration of the technology acceptance model is shown in Figure 1.

INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

A modification of Davis's TAM is Venkatesh, Morris, Davis, & Davis's (2003) Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT). UTAUT adds two additional factors that affect behavioural intention to use: social influence and facilitating condition. Social influence refers to the degree to which a user cares about how others will perceive them. Facilitating conditions refer to the user's belief of support available, either in terms of technical infrastructure or organisational support, to enable system use. These factors are moderated by gender, age, experience and voluntariness of use. For example, perceived usefulness is affected by the user's gender and age while facilitating conditions are affected by the user's age and experience.

One of the frameworks used to understand how technology is integrated in the classroom is the SAMR Model (Puentadura, 2006). The framework categorises the level of technology adoption into substitution, augmentation, modification, and redefinition. A diagram of this model is shown in Figure 2. The first two levels show how learning technologies can be used to enhance learning activities, while the latter two show how technologies can transform the learning tasks. This model, while not specifically created for mobile learning, has been used in several mobile learning studies (Authors, 2014; Burden, Hopkins, Male, Martin, and Trala, 2012; Romrell, Kidder, and Wood, 2014) and has been a useful reflection tool to gauge how technologies add value to non-technology based learning activities. This framework will later be used to categorise the different activities used in this study.

INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE

### *1.2 Student views of mobile learning*

Early mobile learning studies tend to focus on user acceptance. Hwang and Tsai (2011) in their review of mobile learning studies between 2001 to 2010 found that majority of the studies focused on student perceptions of mobile use. A systematic review of mobile learning

studies on student perceptions found the majority of the studies reported positive student attitudes and enjoyment with mobile learning experiences (Pollara and Brousard, 2011). This was also true for a systematic review of math and mobile learning studies (Authors, 2016). Reasons for students liking the mobile-based math activities were in three categories: student satisfaction due to technology use (Kim, 2011), student satisfaction due to the changed pedagogy enabled by the technology (Baya'a and Daher, 2009; Zurita and Nussbaum, 2004), and student satisfaction with their own performance (Kong, 2012). Very few studies have discussed negative student perceptions, but in studies that covered these, some negative perceptions emerged from technology issues and the usefulness of the device to facilitate learning math (Liu, 2007; Perry and Steck, 2015).

Studies that looked at student perceptions can be linked to the TAM (Davis, 1989). Bray and Tangney (2016) note that it is the transformative use of technology that makes an impact on students' attitudes to using technology for learning math. This links to the TAM, wherein perceived usefulness (PU) affects attitudes towards technology (Chang, Yan, and Tseng, 2012). In the same way, the negative perceptions about technology emerged from technical issues regarding using technology (Perry and Steck, 2015) and links back to TAM's notion of perceived ease of use (PEOU) and its effect on attitudes towards technology.

A significant amount of literature suggests gender differences in attitudes towards technology use (Rabah, 2016). There is the belief that male students are better with technology than their female counterparts. As such, male students tend to have higher perceptions about the value of technology in comparison to female students (Barkatsas, Kasimatis, & Gialamas, 2009; Reed, Drijvers, & Kirschner, 2010). As for the use of mobile technologies, studies so far have found varying effects of gender. Gender differences were found in perceived affordances of the mobile device (Sabah, 2016) as well as the perceived challenges of using mobile technologies (Bao, Xiong, Hu and Kibello, 2013). There are also studies that found no gender differences in these regard (Aliaño, Hueros, Franco and Aguaded; Wang et al, 2009). Where gender differences were found, the findings were in favour of male students having higher perceptions of mobile technology use; so far, none has been identified to mention otherwise.

### *1.3 Mathematics achievement in mobile learning environments*

The literature has many primary studies on the effects of technology in mathematics achievement/performance, varying with the type of technology use and pedagogy (e.g., Slavin, Lake, and Groff, 2009). However, studies that focus on student outcomes in the use of



mobile devices are few. Systematic reviews of math and mobile learning have identified that more studies reported positive learning outcomes (Authors, 2016; Bano, Zowghi, Kearney, Schuck and Aubusson, 2018; Crompton and Burke, 2015). However, as with any other systematic reviews, publication bias might lead to studies with negative findings not being published. While there are more studies that report positive findings, there are studies that found negative results even where the same strategy in adopting technology was used. For example, Miller and Robertson's (2011) randomised controlled trial of game-based learning strategy found no significant difference between the math scores of the control group and experimental group, while Main and O'Rourke's (2011) quasi-experimental study that used the same strategy saw better improvement in the experimental groups' test scores. Similarly, Perry and Steck (2015) used a constructivist approach to learning geometry using a dynamic geometry application found a decline in performance, while other studies that used dynamic geometry systems found positive results (Crompton, 2015). This shows that the use of mobile learning strategies does not always yield positive results and even similar strategies can result in different outcomes. The nature of the intervention, the study design, the participants, and the technology are among the many factors that affect the success of the program.

#### *1.4 The present study*

One of the advantages of mobile learning is its capacity to support learners as they move in and out of different learning contexts. As previously noted, a criticism of earlier mobile learning literature is that it is mostly in the form of attitude surveys, interviews or observations, with only a few attempts to carry out comparative evaluations (Sharples, 2013); but this is still the case in a more recent systematic review (Crompton, Burke, Gregory, 2017). Studies on math have covered student perceptions, engagement, and achievement, but have done so separately. In a previous iteration of the current study, Authors (2018) considered these learning outcomes together with a quasi-experimental approach. The current study implemented a randomised controlled trial design with a new set of student cohorts. We examined students' perception of mobile learning and achievement, using the Micro Meso and Macro (M3) evaluation framework (Vavoula and Sharples, 2009). M3 provides a structured format to assess usability, educational and organisational impact and their inter-relationships (ibid. p. 12) in three evaluation processes of micro-level evaluation, meso-level evaluation and macro-level evaluation. At micro-level, the focus is on the individual activities and the use of technology; at meso-level, the focus is on the learning experience using mobile technologies; at macro-level, the focus is on the impact of using mobile

technologies on students' performance. The two specific research questions this study addressed are as follows:

- a) What are the students' views on the use of mobile technology for learning mathematics, specifically in relation to its usability and value for learning mathematics?
- b) Is there an improvement in mathematics achievement when using mobile supported math learning activities?

## 2. Method

### 2.1 Participants

Three teachers who co-taught Grade 5 and 6 mathematics from the same primary school in Scotland agreed to participate and their students also became participants. Seventy-four students were randomly assigned to the experimental ( $n=35$ ) and control ( $n=39$ ) group. A breakdown of the participants by grade level and gender is shown in Table 1. A comparison of the distribution of gender and grade level in the control and experimental groups by a chi-square test of homogeneity was not statistically significant. An independent t-test of the pre-test math test scores of the two groups showed no significant difference. Two teachers (the Grade 5/6 teacher and the Grade 6 teacher) were assigned to teach the control group while the Grade 5 teacher and a teaching assistant were assigned to teach the experimental group. The school had 20% of students receiving free school meals, around 8% less than Scotland's national average. Pupil absences were roughly 5% higher than the national average of 3.8% (Education Scotland, 2015).

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE.

### 2.2 The learning activities

The activities carried out are listed in Table 2. All the activities were carried out in pairs. While Table 2 refers to the individual activity with the mobile device and corresponding control group activity, in all lessons the structure was: (1) a discussion at the start of the lesson that covered an overview of the topic being investigated; (2) an overview of the learning task and for the experimental group, a tutorial on how to use the application; (3) the learning activity; (4) a follow up discussion on the activity. For the experimental group, this was a discussion of the artefacts created with the application. Each of the lessons were timetabled for 50 minutes. During the learning activities, the teachers went around the

classroom to check on the students' work and provide support to students who needed help or clarification. The learning activities were carried out both inside the classroom and outside the classroom, with the non-classroom setting just a few steps away from the classroom.

The objective of the learning activities carried out in these sessions was to provide a link between abstract math concepts and their concrete representations in the real world. The lessons were also delivered together with activities that were more aligned with typical classroom activities (for example, the design of symmetrical patterns in Session 2, the angle estimation game in Session 4 and use of manipulatives in Sessions 5 and 7). In the experimental group, the mobile device was used to facilitate the learning activities from the less formal and more active activities carried out outside the classroom to the more formal and structured activities done in class. In the control group, the learning activities were carried out using paper-based worksheets. Table 2 also outlines how the activities fall within the substitution, augmentation, modification and redefinition (SAMR) hierarchy (Puentadura, 2006). Control group activities are also listed.

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

### *2.3 Research design*

The study was a randomised controlled trial design using the M3 level evaluation framework. Table 3 below outlines how the data was collected for each level of evaluation.

INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

### *2.4 Instruments and measures*

#### *2.4.1 Technology used.*

Mobile devices used in the study were 7-inch tablets of different makes and models. All tablets were Android tablets costing less than \$150 each. Because several activities were carried out while students moved around, the small form factor allowed mobility and the medium screen size allowed screen sharing.

#### *2.4.2 Math test*

The test had three topics: symmetry, angles and area and perimeter. These items were from practice exercises in Grade 5 and 6 mathematics textbooks used in Scotland (Heinemann Maths and TeeJay CfE Maths). Some test items on student misconceptions (Hansen, 2014;

Harris, 2000) on each of the topics were added to the test to check whether the hands-on nature of the activities addressed common errors in the topics covered. As an additional validity measure, a mathematics teacher with more than 10 years of teaching experience checked the content of the test.

#### *2.4.3. Mobile learning evaluation questionnaire*

Two instruments were used to measure student perceptions of the mobile learning activity: the end activity evaluation questionnaire administered repeatedly during the intervention and the value of mobile technology questionnaire administered at the end of the intervention. The End Activity Evaluation was adapted from two established usability questionnaires. Eighteen adjectives from the Microsoft Desirability Toolkit (Benedek and Miner, 2002) were arranged on a semantic differential scale five units apart with two opposite adjectives at each end. This resulted in nine adjective pairs. Additionally, two questions from the Lewis (1991) After Scenario Questionnaire were added to the instrument. The resulting questionnaire thus consisted of 11 questions with three factors of usability: usefulness, ease of use and user satisfaction (Lund, 2001). Table 4 lists some items from the survey and its corresponding category. Reliability of the instrument using 250 responses from a wider study was .757 for usefulness, .860 for ease of use and .880 for satisfaction. The instrument was administered to both the control and experimental group at the end of each topic by the teacher.

INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

To assess students' perception of the value of using mobile technologies to support mathematics learning, Pierce, Stacy and Barkatsas's (2005) 4-item question on attitude to learning mathematics with technology (VMT) was administered at the end of the intervention. Students rated their agreements on statements on the value of mobile technologies for learning math on a five-point Likert scale, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 5 indicating agreement with the statement. The original scale had a published reliability score of .89.

#### *2.4.4 Interviews*

Group interviews were designed to elicit student feedback about the activities which might have been missed in the end activity survey. Students reflected upon the activities they had completed and were asked to explain which of the activities they liked and disliked. Their opinion on the advantages and disadvantages of doing these types of activities were

sought. Students also related the challenges they had experienced with the activities. Discussions were audio recorded and transcribed.

A semi-structured teacher interview was also conducted. The teacher's view on the mobile learning activities, observations on how the activities affected the students and perceived advantages and disadvantages of mobile learning were sought. The interview was audio recorded and transcribed.

### *2.5 Procedure*

All students completed the math achievement test at the start of the research project. To avoid confusion, the teacher read out the instrument to the students before having them fill out the form. The students were also encouraged to ask questions about any items they were not clear on. On the same day, following the tests, an introductory session with the experimental group was conducted to brief the participants about the nature of the activities to be carried out.

The control and experimental groups participated in eight 50-minute long sessions spread over a period of six weeks. This was originally planned for a two-month session but with a holiday approaching and the busy school schedule, this was cut to six weeks. So, during the last week, three sessions were delivered consecutively, and the post-test followed the next day. The experimental group participated in activities that used tablet devices while the control group participated in activities of a similar theme but without the aid of mobile technologies (refer to Table 2). Students worked in pairs throughout the intervention and where possible with the same partner (unless their assigned partner was not present for the day). They participated in collaborative learning activities within the classroom and shared work area just outside the classroom. There were three topics covered (symmetry, angles, area and perimeter), with two sessions each. The last two sessions covered a combination of the previous topics. Both control and experimental groups completed an End Activity Evaluation questionnaire at the end of every topic. At the end of the programme, both groups took the math test and the VMT questionnaire. An interview with the teacher and students from the experimental group was also carried out at the end.

### *2.6 Data analysis*

For the micro evaluations, the scores in the adjective pairs were grouped into the three categories of usability: usefulness, ease of use and satisfaction and activity ratings, resulting in nine adjective pairs per category. The scores for each of the items in the group were

averaged to obtain the usability score for the activity, yielding a score ranging between 0-5. The higher the score, the better the usability and vice versa. The usability ratings for each topic were compared between the experimental and control group using an independent t-test. Gender differences in the experimental group were also compared using an independent t-test.

The student and teacher interviews from the meso-level data evaluations were analysed using theoretical thematic analysis. Theoretical thematic analysis is an analysis-driven thematic analysis as opposed to the more data-driven inductive approach (Braun and Clarke, 2008). The themes identified in the study closely matched the interview questions: 1) student perception of the tablet activities, 2) advantages of using the tablets and 3) disadvantages of using the tablets and 4) issues encountered. The teacher interview was used to help validate the findings. To compare gender differences in how students perceived the value of mobile technology in supporting mathematics learning, an independent t-test of the VMT score was conducted.

An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted to test the difference in math achievement of the experimental group and control group before and after the intervention. The adjustment for pre-test score in ANCOVA ensures that the differences at post-test are not leftover differences between the groups and account for variation around the post-test means that comes from the variation in where the participants started at pre-test (Grace-Martin, 2013).

### **3. Results**

#### *3.1 Micro-evaluation*

Figure 3 shows the end activity evaluation of the control and experimental group for each of the topics covered. Evaluation for the angles session was not conducted because of the students' busy schedule on that day. An independent t-test of the ratings for each of the subscales showed no significant difference between the two groups on all factors and all activities. Control children scored higher on Symmetry and Area/Perimeter, while experimental children scored higher on Combined topics.

INSERT FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE

A comparison of the responses of male and female students in the experimental group showed that there was a significant difference between the boys' usability ratings and girls' ratings on almost all factors (Table 5). In all instances, the boys rated the activities higher

than the girls, which can be interpreted as boys having more positive perceptions of the activity than the girls.

INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

### 3.2 Meso-evaluation

#### 3.2.1 Student interviews

Thirty-one of the thirty-five students in the experimental group participated in the student interviews. Of the four students who didn't participate, one elected not to be interviewed, while the three other students were not available on the day the interviews were carried out. As the interviews were carried out in groups, not all students responded to each of the questions, so the percentages and count indicated below are the number of students who expressed that view in relation to the total number of students who participated in the interview.

Twenty-two of the 31 (71%) students gave positive feedback about the intervention while the other nine (29%) students felt negative about it. Various numbers of students found the activities fun (n=14; 45%), interesting (n=4; 13%), easier (n=2; 6.5%) and preferable to their usual math (n=2; 6.5%). The activities were overall good (n=4; 13%), challenging (n=2; 6.5%), helpful (n=1; 3%) and novel (n=1; 3%). However, some felt that the traditional way of doing math was better (n=3; 10%). These students explained that they really didn't get a lot from the intervention as it didn't teach them anything new (n=2; 6%) and did not present enough challenges (n=1; 3%). They explained that it was boring (n=2; 6%) and at times even confusing (n=2; 6%).

An analysis of the feedback by gender showed some differences. Of the 19 male students interviewed, three students felt negative about the use of tablets while the rest were more positive about the intervention. For the female students, feedback was split evenly with 6 out of the 12 students (50%) not liking the intervention and the other half being more positive about it. One of the female students explained that she found the intervention "*quite confusing because it's a lot of games and I find it hard because I don't really know a lot about technology.*"

One of the frequently mentioned advantages of doing the tablet-based activities was that it made learning fun (n=8; 26%) and consequently made them want to do it more. Another student explained that because it was fun, it made her understand the topic a bit more. Some students thought it was easier (n=5; 16%) to do math with the tablets. This concept of being easier might be related to the process of traditional classroom math which is



about drill and practice exercises. One student who discussed the activities with a student in the control group explained that the process of using the tablets in the walkabout activities made the activity a lot easier.

*“When I went next door (control group) what they were doing was so hard and I think what we did was easier and they were saying we did it but the tablets make it easier coz they were doing it on paper[in reference to the control group’s activity where students have to draw objects that fit certain geometric properties].”*

The other advantage of using the tablets with math was because of the opportunity to use technology (n=6; 19%), but again this was more on the line of using technology compared to working with jotters. One student explained that an advantage to using technology with math was because he was used to using technology and this confidence to use technology consequently made him more confident with math. Some students appeared to have a negative attitude towards jotters and having to write things down (n=5; 16%), so the use of the tablets was a break from that usual activity. Students explained that the mobile supported activities were a lot more active (n=2; 6%) than their normal math lesson. A student explained, *“it’s a lot more active and it makes you think a lot more than just sitting down and writing down on a piece of paper.”* A couple of students, however, did not see any advantage of using mobile technologies (n=2; 6%), noting their preference for jotters and learning with a teacher.

As for the disadvantages of using technology, some students thought that it could be a distraction (n=5; 16%) during math class, referring to other students who did not listen because they were fiddling with the tablets. Students who were not positive about the use of the tablets (n=3; 10%) explained that the use of technology was a step back from learning, as it required knowing technology first before doing math.

*“I just think it’s a massive step back for your learning... So you’ve got the app, you need to learn how to control the tablet, you need to learn how to control the app and that.”*

Other students felt that the disadvantage of using tablets was related to the technical issues that one could encounter (n=6; 19%). The instability of the applications used, for example, would sometimes make them lose some of their work and have to start all over.

Most of the students had negative views about working in pairs (7 girls and 5 boys), noting how it was difficult to work on just one tablet especially when they were in



disagreement with their partner. Boys (n=8) saw working in pairs more positively than the girls (n=2). The majority of the boys enjoyed working in pairs whereas the majority of the girls saw it more negatively. One of the boys commented, *“I find it easier. They could help you and you could help them... I made a friend like that.”* Some students note, however, that working with someone they didn't really know was difficult (n=4; 13%). One of the girls explained, *“I like working in pairs, working with new people, but I just think I work better alone or with my friends.”*

To students who viewed working in pairs positively, they saw how working in pairs simplified some tasks. A student explained:

*“I don't mind working with a partner because I struggle a bit with my work so it helps me to have someone who knows when I've made a mistake or not.”*

This point of view was shared by other students who scored low (<50%) in the initial math test score (n=6). The other students who scored low claimed that they liked working in pairs (n=4) but didn't explain their reasons for it.

The idea of shared work, however, did not suit half of the students who scored low in the math test (n=8). They explained that they did not like having to work in pairs because they felt that they did not have a lot of chance to use the tablets because their partner was *“hogging the tablet coz she knew what everything was.”* Students who scored high in the math test also had difficulty working in pairs (n=5), as they too experienced disagreement with their partner and finding the sharing of the tablet difficult.

In addition to the challenges of working with a partner, a few of the students mentioned some technical difficulties like unresponsiveness of the tablet (n=2), the stability of the application (n=7), network connectivity (n=2) and a battery issue. However, none of these technical issues caused a breakdown to the point that students were not able to participate. In most cases, the problems were resolved by exiting the application and logging back in. One student mentioned that the difficulty lay with the math content and another student explained that the difficulty was more to do with knowing the technology.

*“A lot of the technical difficulties were knowing what you're doing coz it's easier to just give you a pen and paper and write it all down but with the tablets you need to at least use one before you can get into it and start using them.”*

### 3.2.2 Value of mobile technologies

Student evaluations of the value of mobile technologies for learning maths based on the survey carried out at the end of the evaluation showed a significant gender difference,  $t(33)=2.343$ ,  $p=.028$ , with male students having higher perceptions of the value of mobile technologies (mean=3.43, sd=1.03) than female students (mean=2.34, sd=1.57).

### 3.2.3 Teacher interview

A semi-structured interview was carried out at the end of the study. The teacher had found the mobile learning activities good and interesting. She added that she'd *"love to use them again; it really captured the children and made them engaged."* She noted that the use of the tablets could complement the students' written work, adding that the children needed a combination of both.

For the teacher, the walkabout activity (session 8) at the end worked very well as it allowed her to *"see all their learning at the end."* She added that she also thought the angles activity worked well because it allowed the students to *"visually see one in front of them rather than a representation on the white board."* As for the one that didn't work very well, it was the symmetry session.

*"I thought it was great but I think it just had an effect because some of my children have done symmetry before so I think it was maybe too easy for some of mine and I don't know if they became disengaged because of it."*

Advantages of using the tablet were improved student engagement and visualisation of math concepts. For example, in the angle activity, the application used allowed the students to see angles rather than a representation of them. The teacher observed that it was particularly good for students who were less inclined to engage during normal math period.

*"I noticed the difference in attitudes towards their learning. They normally really don't like math, disengaged, don't want to do it. You normally have to push them to do it. Whereas [with the tablet-based activities] they actually got on really well, really enjoyed it. They were saying to me that they were looking forward to tablet math."*

### 3.3 Macro-evaluation

Descriptive statistics are shown in Table 6. An analysis of covariance was conducted to test for the differences between the experimental group and control group with pre-test as

covariate. Assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variances were met. There was no statistically significant difference in post-test scores between the experimental and control group,  $F(1, 71) = 1.000, p = .321, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .014$ . Some items in the math test aimed to measure student performance relating to common misconceptions on the topics covered. A paired t-test of student scores on these specific items showed that there was a significant improvement in the experimental group's performance for 3 out of 4 items relating to misconceptions on angles. For the control group, there was an improvement in one of the items.

INSERT TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE

#### 4. Discussion

The results section presented the data according to the M3 level evaluation. This section discusses the answers to the research questions drawing from the different levels of evaluation carried out.

##### 4.1. Student views on the use of mobile technologies for math

Both the experimental and control groups had mostly positive perceptions about their respective activities. Students in the experimental group consistently rated the activities as innovative over being old-fashioned throughout the three end activity evaluations carried out. The activities with the control group, despite being similar in themes and objectives, led to them rating the innovativeness of the activity on a declining score. This finding can be an indication of how the presence of technology changes student perception about the novelty of an activity. Novelty effect is a common theme in mobile learning studies (Baya'a and Daher, 2009; Rehm, Stan, Woldike and Vasilarou, 2015), but this is an issue that is difficult to avoid given the relative newness of mobile technologies.

While most responses in both end activity evaluation and interviews were positive, there were students who had contrary views. Reasons cited for not liking the activities were sometimes related to the difficulty of the topic. Some students didn't like the sessions on area and perimeter because they found them confusing. Some students didn't like the session on symmetry because it was something they had already covered before. The control group, despite having covered the same topic on symmetry did not seem to have an issue with the repetition. Their activity ratings did not also raise issues relating to confusion on area and perimeter.

A possible explanation for the differences might be related to the interplay of novelty and topic difficulty. In the symmetry session, while the students in the experimental group viewed the use of mobile technology as innovative, the topic it was implemented on was too easy for the students, making the sessions seem more supplementary than a truly novel learning experience. In the area and perimeter sessions, while the use of mobile technology was novel, some students did not see the benefit of using mobile devices for the activity. Lessons on area and perimeter were deemed difficult anyway and the effect of the technology was to give an added layer of difficulty. The two sessions to cover exploration of the relationship between area and perimeter using virtual manipulatives on the tablet might not have been enough and might have caused confusion to some students rather than clarified the concepts. The last session, however, was different as the use of the mobile device was instrumental in doing the activities. In this example, the mobile device facilitated the gathering of artefacts that represent geometric properties. These gathered artefacts became discussion points in the classroom as students presented their findings to the rest of the class.

The TAM framework (Davis, 1989) suggests that perceived ease of use (PEOU) affects how the user perceives the usefulness (PU) of the system and users' overall attitudes towards the technology in question. This means that users are likely to consider a system useful if they think that the system is easy to use. The relationship between the ease of using the system and students' attitudes towards mobile technology was evidenced to some extent in the student narratives about mobile use. For example, a student who found the use of mobile technology cumbersome particularly when it failed as they had to redo the activity found paper-based math activities preferable. Another student who was not familiar with technology also preferred traditional activities over the mobile supported ones as she explained that it takes one more step in the learning process by having to learn the technology first before being able to do the math. On the other hand, students who found the use of the tablets easy also had more positive views about using mobile technology, saying it was better than their normal math as well as more fun and engaging. This is consistent with technology acceptance models (TAM) for mobile learning (Chang et al., 2012; Huang, Lin and Chang, 2007) that note a relationship between PEOU and PU.

Mobile learning activities that were perceived to be useful, easy to use and fun were likely to result into more positive perceptions about mobile learning. The relationship between these three variables to attitudes to mobile learning can serve as a design guideline for mobile learning sessions. If an application is useful but awkward to use, then users might

not take to it very well. In the same way, if an application is useful and easy to use but the activities end up boring the students, then this would not be received very well.

Students explained that the mobile learning sessions were a good opportunity to learn math while using technology. This sentiment is echoed in several mobile learning studies on mathematics (Franklin and Peng, 2008; Kim, 2011). The other reason for enjoyment is the active nature of the activities carried out outside the classroom. Previous mobile learning studies carried out in outdoor settings also had positive student reception (Bray and Tangney, 2016; Kurti et al., 2008; Rehm et al., 2015). For the current study, it is possible that in addition to the outdoor setting, it was the active nature of the activities that students appreciated. This was discussed in the student interviews, and students explained that the activities were better as opposed to “*just taking it all in*” or “*just writing it on a jotter*”. The mobile learning sessions were also perceived to be useful tools for visualising mathematics. The use of technology to aid in visualisation of math concepts is embedded in mathematics education literature (Lagrange, Artigue, Laborde and Trouche, 2003). Boaler, Chen, Williams, and Cordero (2016) posit that “*when students learn through visual approaches, mathematics changes for them, and they are given access to deep and new understandings*” (p.1). Some of the student narratives discussed how the process of being able to see angles as opposed to having the teacher explain/describe it was helpful. Studies that tried to facilitate a link between real world and abstract math (Baya’a and Daher, 2009; Sommerauer and Müller, 2014) yielded similar positive feedback to the current study.

There were a few negative perceptions about tablet use. In the end activity evaluations, there were ratings that favoured the negative adjective. Some of the negative student perceptions were related to the topic being studied. When students found the topic boring or difficult, this was reflected in the end evaluation. When they encountered technical difficulties, they also rated the activities lower. The socio-cultural perspective of learning suggests that “learning is affected and modified by the tools used for learning” (Kearney et al., 2012, p. 1) and in the case of technical difficulties, students’ learning is also likely to be affected.

In the student interviews, some students shared that they did not see the benefit of using the tablets given that they had already covered some of the content in the previous year. The design of technology enhanced learning activities affects how students interact with the content (Chen, Star, Dede and Tutwiler, 2018). In studies that reported negative student perceptions of mobile learning, the activities failed to engage students and were one of the

factors that consequently resulted in negative perceptions (Liu, 2007; Roberts and Vanska, 2011).

The UTAUT model suggests that gender is a moderating factor in how users perceived technology (Venkatesh et al., 2003). There was an observed gender difference in the experimental group as evidenced by the end activity evaluation, the VMT scores and the student interviews. Male students consistently rated the activities higher than the girls. Their VMT scores were also significantly higher. In the student interviews, female students provided fewer positive responses about the intervention than male students. One possible reason for this is the nature of the paired work. Some girls that were paired with boys did not manage to work particularly well with their partner as the boys tended to take control of the tablet. This hesitation to work with the opposite sex was mentioned several times in the interviews. This shows that gender has some role in how students perceived the activities. Another possible reason for the gender difference is the technology and the familiarity of using it. Although the students all mentioned that they had used tablets before, there were students who struggled to use technology. For example, two female students specifically mentioned that they were not too familiar with using technology and this was a hurdle they had to go through to be able to do the maths.

Drawing on the theory of the Technology Acceptance Model (Davis, 1989) and UTAUT, the three aspects of usability, ease of use, usefulness and satisfaction affected overall student perception about the mobile learning activities. When students found the activity enjoyable, their engagement was also higher. If they saw the benefit of doing the activity, then they were also likely to engage. However, when they become inundated with difficulties, be it technical, social or with the topic itself, then their overall views about the usefulness of mobile technology changed. This highlights the role of careful orchestration of the learning activity and the responsibility this puts on the teacher.

#### *4.2 Student achievement and mathematics learning in mobile learning environments*

Both control and experimental groups had significant changes in their pre and post-test scores indicating that student performance had improved under their respective treatments. A comparison of the treatment effect, however, showed no significant difference between the two groups. This means that the experimental group performed just as well as the control group. Given that both groups did constructivist learning activities that had similar themes, this result is not very surprising. In principle, the set of learning activities for both groups followed the same teaching strategy of active experiential learning. In the SAMR

(Puentadura, 2006) spectrum this would classify the use of technology in most of the activities either under the augmentation or the modification spectrum rather than the higher spectrum of redefinition.

Some sessions could be classified under the modification spectrum of the SAMR model and these were sessions where mobile technology proved more useful than the paper and pencil counterpart. For example, in the angles sessions, students observed angles in their environment, captured evidence of these then explored the properties of the angles they had captured. These learning activities showed a seamless process of exploration and investigation of math concepts facilitated by the mobile technology. Using the mobile device, students captured representations of angles in their environment. They then went on to investigate these angles further by annotating the images taken and manipulating the images (for example, the process of pinching and zooming to compare angle measurement of a zoomed in picture vs. a zoomed-out image). They were then given an opportunity by the teacher to share these artefacts with the rest of the class. The control group, on the other hand was limited in the further investigation that they were able to do, as their output was limited to a description or a drawing of an object. While both groups followed a constructivist learning activity, the mobile device facilitated investigation across contexts as students did the artefact gathering outside the classroom and reflected on these artefacts through further investigations and formed mathematical conclusions from it. Thus, both the experimental and control did constructivist activities, but the activities of the experimental group were more seamless, allowing students to do further investigations on the artefacts that they previously gathered “in the wild.”. While the groups’ overall achievement scores were not statistically significant, the experimental group performed better on items relating to misconception on angles. This can be interpreted as a sign that the mobile supported learning activities on the topic angles was effective.

Some students explained that the activities made them recall the topics better and helped them visualise the concepts being learned, as was the case in other mobile learning studies (Baya’a and Daher 2009). Chen et al. (2018) suggests that students’ experience of technology makes a difference in student learning outcomes. Videos, animations and math manipulatives are typical mediums that are used to help visualise math concepts, both in mobile learning environments and computer-based environments. However, with mobile devices, an additional medium for visualisation is the learners’ environment, facilitating a connection between abstract math concepts and the real world. Some students felt that this new way of



doing math had helped them grasp abstract math concepts and as a result helped them remember better. These narratives were supported by the significant improvement of the experimental group in the items related to common misconceptions.

Context is a key concept in mobile learning research. Mobile learning studies on math that attempted to link classroom mathematics to real world math had positive results in student achievement (Shih, Kuo, and Liu, 2012; Wu, Hsiao, Chang, and Sung, 2006), as was the case in the current study. The literature of math and technology maintains that context is an important factor in adopting technology in the mathematics classroom (Li and Ma, 2010). In fact, the change in attitude and improvement in student performance comes from not only embedding technology but also the “embedded method of teaching developed from the pedagogical reform (ibid, p. 219).” For this study, it is difficult to ascertain how the incorporation of the outdoor space, the collaborative nature of the activity or the students’ perception of the activities contributed to the difference in the gains between the experimental and control group. However, it is also worth noting that these enshrine the potential of mobile technologies: to facilitate learning across contexts and provide personal and collaborative learning environments (Cochrane, 2010).

The mobile devices in this study supported constructivist learning activities through a process of learning by doing in a collaborative environment (Knuth and Cunningham, 1993). While the control group was also able to conduct constructivist learning activities, the experimental group had more opportunities to make connections (as they gather artefacts) and engage in activities that promoted ownership and voice (as they create new artefacts). The mobile device facilitated the constructivist and collaborative activities carried out as students gathered artefacts that contained geometric representations from their environment. Students then moved to a more formal learning context and carried out further reflection and investigation on the artefacts they had gathered. These artefacts and creations became discussion points enabling the covering of topics from the standard math curriculum. This process illustrates Crompton’s (2013) definition of mobile learning which is “learning across context, through social and content interaction, using personal electronic devices (p. 4)”

The multimodality, portability and multi-functionality of the mobile device facilitated a variety of learning goals, from more active and situated learning activities to more reflective classroom-based activities. The networked devices facilitated sharing of students’ works wirelessly between devices or tethered to the class’s bigger screen. Admittedly, it did not always work, but at times that it did not, the portable nature of the devices allowed sharing work simply by passing it on to another group. The process of finding concrete



representations of abstract math within the environment facilitated a personal learning environment as the students worked on their own devices. These learning scenarios map to Carpenter and Lehrer's (1999) five activities that promote mathematical understanding: constructing relationships, extending and applying mathematical knowledge, reflecting about experiences, articulating what one knows, and making mathematical knowledge one's own.

#### *4.3 Limitations of this Study*

Several limitations were present in this study. Additional data from the control group and within the study would have allowed better comparisons between the groups. While this study had a control group that followed the same theme of activities as the experimental group, data gathered from the control group was limited to the activity evaluation and their performance in a math test. This could have been improved had they been interviewed or observed as well, to allow a finer contrast between the two groups. The lack of end activity evaluation for the angles activity has also limited the comparisons that can be drawn out from the end activity evaluation.

Another limitation of the study is the duration of the programme. This study had six weeks between pre- and post-test, with one of the weeks having three consecutive mobile learning sessions. It is possible that a more intensive programme might have had better results, as the students lacked opportunities to become more accustomed to the technology. This leads on to the next limitation - the timing of the study and why the programme had to be cut short. The study started in the last week of October, close to the Christmas holidays. Schools are typically busy with extracurricular activities around December, as was the case here. So, it is possible that students might have been less focused than at other times of year, which in turn might have affected the results.

The random grouping is yet another limitation of the current study. By dividing the three classes into experimental and control groups, some students were paired with students that they did not normally interact with and this created some tensions. Gender and level assignments for the pairings were discussed in the interviews and might have affected students overall learning experience.

Due to practical constraints, the present study is limited by small sample size, relatively short duration of the intervention and the use of adapted instruments. It is recommended that future research focuses on longer interventions that follow a more integrated approach in embedding technology use. This can be achieved through closer working with teachers when designing the learning activities.

## 5. Conclusion

This study set out to investigate the effects of using tablet devices for mathematics learning in indoor and outdoor environments in terms of student perceptions and achievement. The M3 Level evaluation framework was used to evaluate the mobile learning intervention, utilising different instruments to analyse usability, learning experience and impact of technology use. This approach enabled triangulation and provided different levels of granularity in the investigation of the effects of using mobile technologies in the classroom. Student evaluations of the activities were positive for both groups but there were gender differences in student perceptions about tablet use. The intervention also saw significant improvement in performance for both groups, but there was no difference observed in the groups' performance at post-test, indicating that there was no significant treatment effect. However, the experimental group had higher scores on items relating to misconceptions on angles. So, while the current findings suggest that there was no overall difference in achievement scores, a more appropriate conclusion would be that the impact of technology use is dependent on factors such as learner characteristics, appropriateness and nature of technology use. This points the direction for future research to investigate the learning process in addition to the learning outcome. While there are advantages in adopting mobile technologies in the classroom, it is worth emphasising how the design of the activities, the technical breakdowns and learner characteristics can make a difference in results. Similarly, it is important to consider the functionalities of the device and how it can be used to integrate into the existing curriculum. It is also important to consider how the design of the activities fits with learner characteristics. Interaction with technology should be driven by the learning tasks, rather than technology driving the learning activity. This shows the onerous responsibility that teachers have in driving successful mobile learning interventions and the need for continued teacher training, support and time to develop the confidence and the skill in using novel learning technologies.

The mobile learning experiences facilitated active learning activities in math – they facilitated investigation and forming connections between abstract math and concrete representations in the environment. In these activities, there was a shift in the teacher's role and responsibility, from the person guiding and stimulating discussion to that of a “curator— a collector, organizer and guarantor of educational opportunities” (Crompton and Traxler 2015, p.230). As such, it would be worthwhile addressing how teachers are being trained to target those issues as well as being trained to use new technologies.

## References

- Aliaño, Á. M., Hueros, A. M. D., Franco, M. D. G., & Ignacio, A. (2019). Mobile Learning in University Contexts Based on the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT). *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research*, 8(1), 7–17. <https://doi.org/10.7821/naer.2019.1.317>
- Bano, M., Zowghi, D., Kearney, M., Schuck, S., & Aubusson, P. (2018). Mobile learning for science and mathematics school education: A systematic review of empirical evidence. *Computers & Education*, 121, 30-58.
- Bao, Y., Xiong, T., Hu, Z., & Kibelloh, M. (2013). Exploring Gender Differences on General and Specific Computer Self-Efficacy in Mobile Learning Adoption. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 49(1), 111–132. <https://doi.org/10.2190/ec.49.1.e>
- Barkatsas, A., Kasimatis, K., & Gialamas, V. (2009). Learning secondary mathematics with technology: Exploring the complex interrelationship between students' attitudes, engagement, gender and achievement. *Computers and Education*, 52(3), 562–570. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2008.11.001>
- Baya'a, N., & Daher, W. (2009). Learning mathematics in an authentic mobile environment: the perceptions of students. *International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies (iJIM)*, 3, 6–14. [doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v3s1.813](https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v3s1.813)
- Benedek, J. & Miner, T. (2002, December). *Measuring desirability: New methods for evaluating desirability in a usability lab setting*. Paper presented at Usability Professionals Association, Scottsdale, Arizona.
- Boaler, J., Chen, L., Williams, C., & Cordero, M. (2016). Seeing as understanding: the importance of visual mathematics for our brain and learning. *Journal of Applied & Computational Mathematics*, 5(5), 1–17. [doi.org/10.4172/2168-9679.1000325](https://doi.org/10.4172/2168-9679.1000325)
- Bray, A., & Tangney, B. (2016). Enhancing student engagement through the affordances of mobile technology: a 21st century learning perspective on Realistic Mathematics Education. *Mathematics Education Research Journal*, 28(1), 173-197. [doi.org/10.1007/s13394-015-0158-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s13394-015-0158-7)
- Burden, K., Hopkins, P., Male, T., Martin, S., & Trala, C. (2012). *iPad Scotland Evaluation*. Hull: University of Hull. [doi.org/10.3402/rlt.v20i0/14406](https://doi.org/10.3402/rlt.v20i0/14406)
- Carpenter, T.P. & Lehrer, R. (1999). Teaching and learning mathematics with understanding. In E. Fennema & T. Romberg (Eds.) *Mathematics classrooms that promote understanding*, pp. 19-32. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Chang, C., Yan, C.F., & Tseng, J.S. (2012). Perceived convenience in an extended technology acceptance model : Mobile technology and English learning for college students. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 28(5), 809–826.
- Chen, J. A., Star, J. R., Dede, C., & Tutwiler, M. S. (2018). Technology-rich activities: One type does not motivate all. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 54, 153–170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2018.06.011>
- Clements, D. H., & Battista, M. T. (1990). Constructivist learning and teaching. *Arithmetic Teacher*, 38(1), 34-35.
- Cochrane, T. (2010). Exploring mobile learning success factors. *Research in Learning Technology*, 18(2), 133–148. [doi.org/10.3402/rlt.v18i2.10758](https://doi.org/10.3402/rlt.v18i2.10758)
- Crompton, H. (2013). A historical overview of mobile learning: Toward learner-centered education. In Z. L. Berge & L. Y. Muilenburg (Eds.), *Handbook of Mobile Learning* (pp. 3–14). Florence, KY: Routledge.
- Crompton, H., & Burke, D. (2015). Research trends in the use of mobile learning in mathematics. *International Journal of Mobile and Blended Learning*, 7(4), 1–15. [doi.org/10.4018/IJMBL.2015100101](https://doi.org/10.4018/IJMBL.2015100101)
- Crompton, H. Burke, D. & Gregory, K. (2017). The use of mobile learning in PK-12 education: a systematic review. *Computers & Education*, 110, 51-63. [doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2017.03.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2017.03.013)
- Crompton, H., & Traxler, J. (Eds.). (2015). *Mobile learning and mathematics: foundations, design, and case studies*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319–340.
- Dewey, J. (2011). *The Child and the Curriculum*. Eastford, CT: Martino Books.
- Fast, L. A., Lewis, J. L., Bryant, M. J., Bocian, K. A., Cardullo, R. A., Rettig, M., & Hammond, K. A. (2010). Does math self-efficacy mediate the effect of the perceived classroom environment on standardized math test performance? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102(3), 729–740. [doi.org/10.1037/a0018863](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018863)
- Franklin, T., & Peng, L.W. (2008). Mobile math: math educators and students engage in mobile learning. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 20(2), 69–80. [doi.org/10.1007/s12528-008-9005-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-008-9005-0)
- Grace-Martin, K. (2013) *Analyzing Pre-Post Data with Repeated Measures or ANCOVA*. Retrived Feb 2, 2016 from [www.theanalysisfactor.com/pre-post-data-repeated-measures](http://www.theanalysisfactor.com/pre-post-data-repeated-measures).

- Hannula, M. S., Di Martino, P., Pantziara, M., Zhang, Q., Morselli, F., Heyd-Metzuyanin, E., ... Goldin, G. A. (2016). *Attitudes, Beliefs, Motivation and Identity in Mathematics Education: An Overview of the Field and Future Directions*. Switzerland: Springer Nature. doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-32811-9\_1
- Hansen A. (2014). *Children's Error in Mathematics*. London: Sage.
- Harris, A. (2000). Symmetry. St. Martin's College. Retrieved 26 November 2013 from <http://ictedusrv.cumbria.ac.uk/maths/pgdl/unit9/SYMMETRY.PDF>.
- Herrington, J., & Oliver, R. (1995). Critical characteristics of situated learning : Implications for the instructional design of multimedia. In ASCILITE 1995 Conference, (pp. 253–262). Melbourne, Australia.
- Hirsh-Pasek, K., Zosh, J. M., Golinkoff, R. M., Gray, J. H., Robb, M. B., & Kaufman, J. (2015). Putting Education in “Educational” Apps. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 16(1), 3-34. doi.org/10.1177/1529100615569721
- Huang, J., Lin, Y., & Chuang, S. (2007). Elucidating user behavior of mobile learning. *The Electronic Library*, 25(5), 585–598. doi.org/10.1108/02640470710829569
- Huang, S., Wu, T.-T., Chen, H., Yang, P.-C., & Huang, Y.-M. (2012). Mathematics assisted instruction system of M/U-learning environment. In *2012 IEEE Seventh International Conference on Wireless, Mobile and Ubiquitous Technology in Education* (pp. 301–305). IEEE. doi.org/10.1109/WMUTE.2012.72
- Hwang, G., & Tsai, C. (2011). Research trends in mobile and ubiquitous learning: A review of publications in selected journals from 2001 to 2010. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 42(4), 65-70. doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2011.01183.x
- JISC (2011). *Mobile learning: A practical guide for educational organisations planning to implement a mobile learning initiative*. Retrieved 10 August 2013 from [http://jisc.ac.uk/guides/mobile learning](http://jisc.ac.uk/guides/mobile%20learning).
- Kearney, M., Schuck, S., Burden, K., & Aubusson, P. (2012). Viewing mobile learning from a pedagogical perspective. *Research in Learning Technology*, 20(1), 1–17. doi.org/10.3402/rlt.v20i0/14406
- Kim, P. (2011). Stay out of the way! My kid is video blogging through a phone!: A lesson learned from math tutoring social media for children in underserved communities. *International Journal of Online Pedagogy and Course Design*, 1(1), 50–63.
- Knuth, R. A., & Cunningham, D. J. (1993). Tools for constructivism. In *Designing Environments for Constructive Learning* (pp. 163–188). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg. doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-78069-1\_9

- Kong, S. C. (2012). Using mobile devices for learning in school education. *2012 IEEE Seventh International Conference on Wireless, Mobile and Ubiquitous Technology in Education* (pp. 172-176). Takamatsu, Japan. doi:[10.1109/WMUTE.2012.12](https://doi.org/10.1109/WMUTE.2012.12)
- Kurti, A., Spikol, D., & Milrad, M. (2008). Bridging outdoors and indoors educational activities in schools with the support of mobile and positioning technologies. *International Journal of Mobile Learning and Organisation*, 2(2), 166-186. doi.org/10.1504/IJMLO.2008.019767
- Lagrange, J., Artigue, M., Laborde, C., & Trouche, L. (2003). Technology and mathematics education: A multidimensional study of the evolution of research and innovation. In *Second International Handbook of Mathematics Education* (pp. 237-269). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-0273-8\_9
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Li, Q., & Ma, X. (2010). A meta-analysis of the effects of computer technology on school students' mathematics learning. *Educational Psychology Review*, 22(3), 215-243. doi.org/10.1007/s10648-010-9125-8
- Lewis, J. R. (1995). IBM computer usability satisfaction questionnaires: psychometric evaluation and instructions for use. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 7(1), 57-78.
- Linnenbrink, E. A., & Pintrich, P. R. (2003). The role of self-efficacy beliefs in student engagement and learning in the classroom. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 19(2), 119-137. doi.org/10.1080/10573560308223
- Liu, T. C. (2007). Teaching in a wireless learning environment : A case study. *Educational Technology & Society*, 10(1), 107-123.
- Lund, A. M. (2001). Measuring usability with the use questionnaire. *Usability interface*, 8(2), 3-6.
- Main, S., & O'Rourke, J. (2011). New directions for traditional lessons: Can handheld game consoles enhance mental mathematics skills? *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(2), 43-55.
- Mayes, T., & De Freitas, S. (2004). *Review of e-learning theories, frameworks and models*. London. Retrieved July 6, 2015 from <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/elearningpedagogy/outcomes.aspx>
- Miller, D.J., & Robertson, D.P. (2011). Educational benefits of using game consoles in a primary classroom: A randomised controlled trial. *British Journal of Educational*



- Technology*, 42(5), 850–864. doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2010.01114.x
- Morris, M. G., & Dillon, A. (1997). How User Perceptions Influence Software Use. *IEEE Software*, 14(4), 58–65.
- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (2000). *Principles and Standards for School Mathematics*. Reston, VA: NCTM.
- Perry, D. R., & Steck, A. K. (2015). Increasing student engagement, self-efficacy, and meta-cognitive self-regulation in the high school geometry classroom: do iPads help? *Computers in the Schools*, 32(2), 122–143. doi.org/10.1080/07380569.2015.1036650
- Piaget, J. (1951). *The Psychology of Intelligence*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Pierce, R. Stacey, K. & Barkatsas, A. A scale for monitoring students' attitudes to learning mathematics with technology. *Computers & Education*, 48(2), 285-300.
- Pollara, P., & Broussard, K. K. (2011). Student Perceptions of Mobile Learning : A Review of Current Research. In *Proceedings of Society for Information Technology @ Teacher Education International Conference 2011* (pp. 1643–1650). Chesapeake, VA.
- Puentadura, R. (2006). Transformation, technology and education. Retrieved July 31, 2013, from <http://hippasus.com/resources/tte/>
- Rabah, J. (2016). *At the Intersection of gender & technology : A Meta-Analysis*. Concordia University.
- Reed, H. C., Drijvers, P., & Kirschner, P. A. (2010). Effects of attitudes and behaviours on learning mathematics with computer tools. *Computers and Education*, 55(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2009.11.012>
- Rehm, M., Stan, C., Wøldike, N.P., & Vasilarou, D. (2015). Towards Smart City Learning: Contextualizing Geometry Learning with a Van Hiele Inspired Location-Aware Game. In K. Chorianopoulos, M. Divitini, J. Baalsrud Hauge, L. Jaccheri, & R. Malaka (Eds.), *Entertainment Computing - ICEC 2015* (pp. 399–406). Cham: Springer International Publishing. doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-24589-8\_32.
- Roberts, N., & Vänskä, R. (2011). Challenging assumptions: mobile learning for mathematics project in South Africa. *Distance Education*, 32(2), 243–259. doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2011.584850
- Romrell, D., Kidder, L. C., & Wood, E. (2014). The SAMR model as a framework for evaluating mLearning. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Network*, 18(2), 1–15.
- Sabah, N. M. (2016). Exploring students' awareness and perceptions: Influencing factors and individual differences driving m-learning adoption. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 65, 522–533. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.09.009>

- Scottish Government (2016). *Transforming Scotland into a maths positive nation: the final report of making maths count group*. Retrieved 02 December 2017 from <http://www.gov.scot/Resource/0050/00505348.pdf>
- Sharples, M. (2013). Mobile learning: research, practice and challenges. *Distance Education in China*, 3(5), 5–11.
- Shih, S. C., Kuo, B. C., & Liu, Y. L. (2012). Adaptively ubiquitous learning in campus math path. *Educational Technology and Society*, 15(2), 298–308.
- Slavin, R. E., Lake, C., & Groff, C. (2009). Effective programs in middle and high school mathematics: A best-evidence synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(2), 839–911. doi.org/10.3102/0034654308330968
- Sommerauer, P., & Müller, O. (2014). Augmented reality in informal learning environments : A field experiment in a mathematics exhibition. *Computers & Education*, 79, 59–68. doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2014.07.013
- Spikol, D., & Eliasson, J. (2010). Lessons from Designing Geometry Learning Activities that Combine Mobile and 3D Tools. In *2010 6th IEEE International Conference on Wireless, Mobile, and Ubiquitous Technologies in Education* (pp. 137–141). Taiwan: IEEE. doi.org/10.1109/WMUTE.2010.44
- Sullivan, P. (2011). *Teaching Mathematics: Using research-informed Strategies*. Victoria: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Tangney, B., Weber, S., Hanlon, P. O., Knowles, D., Munnely, J., Watson, R., & Jennings, K. (2010). MobiMaths : An approach to utilising smartphones in teaching mathematics. *Mlearn 2010 - 9th World Conference on Mobile and Contextual Learning*, 1–16. Malta.
- Vavoula, G. & Sharples, M. (2009). Meeting the challenges in evaluating mobile learning: a 3-level evaluation framework. *International Journal of Mobile and Blended Learning*, 1(2), 54-75.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in Society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wu, L., Hsiao, H., Chang, K., & Sung, Y. (2006, March). Construct mathematic path and interactive problem solving discussion in mobile learning environment. In *Proceeding of the IADIS International Conference on Mobile Learning* (pp. 288–292). Algarva, Portugal.
- Zurita, G., & Nussbaum, M. (2004). Computer supported collaborative learning using wirelessly interconnected handheld computers. *Computers & Education*, 42(3), 289–314. doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2003.08.005



ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT




Figure 1. Technology Acceptance Model (Davis, Bagozzi, & Warshaw, 1989)




Figure 2. SAMR model of technology integration (Puentadura, 2006)

A




Figure 3. Usability evaluation of control and experimental group

Table 1.

*Demographic information*

	Experimental group	Control group	p-value
Gender			
Male	20 (57%)	17 (44%)	.176
Female	15 (43%)	22 (57%)	
Grade level			
Grade 5	15 (43%)	21 (54%)	.239
Grade 6	20 (57%)	18 (47%)	
Math pre-test (mean, sd)	16.77 (6.92)	14.33 (5.29)	.098

Table 2.

*Summary of learning activities mapped into SAMR (Puentadura, 2006) framework*

Session	Mobile Learning Activity	Learning Activity (Control Group)	SAMR Framework
Session 1 and 2 Symmetry	<b>Session 1 and Session 2a.</b> Using Skitch, students took pictures of symmetrical objects and annotated it with its line of symmetry.  <b>Session 2b.</b> Using Pixel touch, they	<b>Session 1 and Session 2a.</b> Students identified the lines of symmetry of everyday objects.  <b>Session 2b.</b>	Session 1 and the first part of Session 2 can be classified as <i>modification</i> under the SAMR framework. The mobile device afforded the students to capture artefacts from their environment which they were able to discuss later in class.  The second part of the activity in

Session	Mobile Learning Activity	Learning Activity (Control Group)	SAMR Framework
	also created designs that are symmetrical.	Using gridded paper, students created designs that are symmetrical.	Session 2 falls under <i>augmentation</i> . The mobile learning application facilitated an easier process of designing the symmetrical design through its functionality. The undo/redo button also afforded the students to be flexible in their design.
Session 3 and 4 Angles	Students took pictures of objects that corresponded to certain types of angles. They annotated the pictures (using Skitch) to show the angle and its estimated angle measurement. In the next session, using pictures that they had taken the previous week, they used Material Protractor to measure the angles. This was followed by a teacher guided activity to investigate common misconceptions on angles.	Students work in pairs and look for different types of angles in their environment. They then sketch/draw the objects they found in the worksheet provided. In the next session, students used a folded circle as a manipulative to estimate angles. As a class activity, the teacher discussed with the students' misconceptions on angles using pictures of everyday objects and a protractor to measure the angle measurements of these objects.	As described in the control group activity, the activities could be carried out without the use of the mobile device; however, the technology in this instance mediated the activity better as it allowed the students to continue their investigations outdoors to the investigations that they did relating to misconceptions on angle. As such, this activity can be classified at the level of <i>modification</i> in the SAMR model.
Session 5 and 6- Area and Perimeter	Students investigated area and perimeter of surrounding environment using Measure Map. They investigated properties of area and perimeter using a manipulative and completed task cards that contain word problems on area/perimeter tagged with visual representation using augmented reality.	Students investigate area and perimeter and their relationship using the worksheet provided. They also completed task cards to solve word problems relating to area and perimeter.	The mobile device facilitated ways to visualise area and perimeter and off-loaded the computational task from the student. However, this only falls under <i>augmentation</i> on the SAMR spectrum as the mobile activities were merely enhancements of the paper version.

Session	Mobile Learning Activity	Learning Activity (Control Group)	SAMR Framework
Session 7 (Area and Perimeter; Symmetry)	Using Area and Perimeter, a math manipulative application, students work in pairs and look for the 12 different shapes that make up a pentomino, identify its line of symmetry, area and perimeter.	Students worked in pairs and looked for the 12 different shapes that make up a pentomino, identified its line of symmetry, area and perimeter.	By the same rationale given for the area and perimeter sessions, this activity falls under <i>augmentation</i> on the SAMR model.
Session 8 (Symmetry, Angles, Area and Perimeter)	Following a scavenger hunt theme, students used Snapshot Bingo to look for objects in their environment that represented specific geometric properties. These gathered artefacts were later presented to the rest of the class.	Following a scavenger hunt theme, students looked for objects in their environment that contained specific geometric properties. The objects to look for were listed in a worksheet and students were tasked to draw or describe their findings. At the end of the session, the teacher called on a few students to give examples of what they found.	The technology in this instance facilitated data gathering which enabled the sharing session that was done in class. Based on the images presented, it was easy to identify whether these were right or wrong. For the control group, because they were limited to describing and drawing, if what they found was outside the classroom wall, it was not possible to verify whether it was a correct representation or not. And so, this activity is classified as <i>modification</i> on the SAMR hierarchy.

Table 3.

*M3 Evaluation framework*

M3 Level and Purpose	Instrument	Participants
<i>Micro-level</i> Evaluate student perceptions about each activity	End activity evaluation	Experimental and control group

<i>Meso-level</i> Evaluate student experience	Group interviews Teacher interview Value of mobile technology questionnaire	Experimental group only
<i>Macro-level</i> Evaluate the effect of mobile use to students' performance	Math test	Experimental and control group

Table 4.

*Items from end activity questionnaire grouped by scale*

Scale	Cronbach's $\alpha$	Items
Usefulness	.757	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Irrelevant vs Useful</li> <li>• Ineffective vs Effective</li> </ul>
Ease of use	.860	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear vs Confusing</li> <li>• Understandable vs Too Technical</li> </ul>
User satisfaction	.880	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfying vs Frustrating</li> <li>• Fun vs Boring</li> </ul>

Table 5.

*Usability evaluation by gender (experimental group)*

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	p-value
Usefulness (Symmetry)	Male	18	4.17	0.64	<b>.000</b>
	Female	15	2.71	1.11	
Ease of Use (Symmetry)	Male	18	4.12	0.70	.065
	Female	15	3.62	0.82	
Satisfaction (Symmetry)	Male	18	4.10	0.77	<b>.003</b>
	Female	15	3.04	1.09	
Ease of Use (Area and perimeters)	Male	16	3.74	1.42	<b>.037</b>
	Female	14	2.44	1.84	
Satisfaction (Area and perimeters)	Male	16	3.83	0.98	<b>.049</b>
	Female	14	2.95	1.33	
Usefulness (Area and perimeters)	Male	16	3.69	1.17	.089
	Female	14	2.93	1.19	
Usefulness (Combined topics)	Male	17	4.20	0.69	<b>.001</b>
	Female	15	2.57	1.54	
Ease of Use (Combined topics)	Male	17	4.43	0.44	<b>.004</b>
	Female	15	3.03	1.54	
Satisfaction (Combined topics)	Male	17	3.99	0.80	<b>.045</b>
	Female	15	3.18	1.28	

***Bold indicates statistically significant***



Table 6.

*Descriptive statistics of math test scores*

	Pre-test		Post-test		Adjusted Scores (Post-test)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SE
Tablet	16.77	6.92	20.57	6.30	20.57	.64
Control	14.33	5.29	19.72	5.70	19.62	.68

**Highlights:**

1. The study was randomised controlled trial using an integrated framework of micro, meso and macro evaluation.
2. The experimental and control groups had similar themed activities, one mobile and one not.
3. The mobile learning activities were either *augmentation* and *modification* in the SAMR framework.
4. There were gender differences found in terms of how the students perceived the use of mobile technologies in the learning activities.
5. No group differences were found in student achievement scores. However, the experimental group performed better on misconceptions on angles.
6. The mobile devices supported students in collaborative learning activities as they moved in and out of different learning spaces.