Mobile Learning Adoption by Language Instructors in Taibah University

Sabah Sadiq Hussain Bakhsh

Taibah University, Medina Munawara,
SAUDI ARABIA.

Sabah_710@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to determine Mobile Learning adoption among language instructors at English language center (ELC) in Taibah University, Saudi Arabia. It also examined the effect of gender, age, qualification and experience variables on adoption. A questionnaire, developed by the researcher, was administered to a sample of (69) language instructors. The results of statistical analysis indicated that although language instructors found Mobile learning useful and easy to use, they rarely adopted it in teaching language skills. They mainly used mobile devices to keep in contact with their students. They used applications like What'sapp, email, web browsers and text messaging feature to inform students about course alerts and share course files and documents. Adoption challenges like classroom inaccessibility, high cost of mobile fees and lack of technical support were more serious obstacles for female instructors than males. The results also indicated that there were no statistically significant differences in all domains of the questionnaire between male and female instructors in the adoption of Mobile Learning at ELC regarding to gender, age, qualification and experience variables. The study recommended language instructors to make use of the many advantages, features, and applications of mobile devices to facilitate language learning.

Keywords: Mobile Learning, Language Instructors, English Language Center (ELC)

INTRODUCTION

The Learning process can be considered the most important impetus for global evolution starting from the early existence of human beings. This learning process has been gradually transformed from the traditional systems to incorporate more modern aspects of learning. The implementation of technology is expected to facilitate the learning process further for teachers and students. The vital role of technology in designing, adopting, improving and evaluating educational applications is a great and effective feature of the learning process. It has changed our life in ways we could never have imagined. Technology has improved learning by providing more resources, greater knowledge, more interaction, more collaboration, more fun and better assessment. In the field of education, the wireless portable devices are by far the most popular technological innovations as mobile devices have been great tools, not only for communication, but also as technological tools that could be vitally facilitated in learning. Consequently, it has improved the students' achievement. As Chiang, Yang and Hwang (2014) said that the experimental results show that the mobile approach is able to improve students' learning performance and achievement. In addition, it helps teachers to provide an attractive environment regardless of both, time and location.

The world has witnessed three main Revolutions: the Industrial Revolution, the Electronics Revolution and the Wireless Revolution. The Wireless Revolution has generated what is

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713

known as Mobile Learning. El-Hussein and Cronje (2010) stated that the evolution of handheld portable devices and wireless technology has resulted in radical changes in the social and economic lifestyles of modern people. Mobile phones have a great potential in language teaching and learning because mobility and portability are the attributes of modern life. Today, many technological devices are produced in portable form. These devices are reshaping users' daily lives in different ways.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The popularity and the ownership of mobile devices among college students are high. According to Goundar (2011)such flexibility in the provision of education, there is a possibility in getting everyone educated once the constraints of attending classes at confined time slots and locations are removed. It means that connectivity, flexibility, portability, and interactivity are all features that make mobile technology more useful and attractive to students. Mobile technology has also proved very effective and helpful in learning English and enhancing language instruction which is considered quite challenging in Saudi Arabia. The level of mobile technology adoption among English language instructors might differ in Taibah University. Therefore, the current study focused on instructors' usage of mobile technology, their teaching practices, their use of different applications, and their demographic characteristics to provide a baseline of mobile technology adoption on which to build future usage across the university.

RESEARCH PURPOSES

The purposes of the study are:

1. To determine the adoption of Mobile Learning technology by male and female instructors at the English Language Centre (ELC) in Taibah University.
2. To examine the effects of gender, age, qualification and experience variables of instructors at ELC in Taibah University on adoption.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESIS

In harmony with the above stated purposes, the following research questions are posed:

1. Do male and female instructors at the ELC in Taibah University adopt Mobile Learning technology in TEFL? from this question, the following sub-questions are derived
    1.1. To what extent do male and female language instructors find Mobile Learning useful for teaching EFL?
    1.2. To what extent do EFL male and instructors find that Mobile Learning easy to use?
    1.3. To what extent do EFL male and female instructors adopt Mobile Learning in teaching language skills?
    1.4. What are the types of teaching practices do EFL male and female instructors use?
    1.5. What are the mobile features and apps do EFL male and female instructors use?
    1.6. What are the adoptions challenges do EFL male and female instructors face?
2. What are differences according to gender variable in terms of adopting Mobile Learning at the ELC in Taibah University?
3. What are differences according to age variable in terms of adopting Mobile Learning at the ELC in Taibah University?

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713

4. What are differences according to qualification variable in terms of adopting Mobile Learning at the ELC in Taibah University?
5. What are differences according to experience variable in terms of adopting Mobile Learning at the ELC in Taibah University?

Based on the above research questions and the purposes of the study, the following null hypothesis was formulated:

1. There will be no statistically significant differences in the average score of Mobile Learning adoption between male and female instructors toward using Mobile Learning technology at ELC in Taibah University according to gender variable.
2. There will be no statistically significant differences in the average score of Mobile Learning adoption between male and female instructors toward using Mobile Learning technology at ELC in Taibah University according to age variable.
3. There will be no statistically significant differences in the average score of Mobile Learning adoption between male and female instructors toward using Mobile Learning technology at ELC in Taibah University according to qualification variable.
4. There will be no statistically significant differences in the average score of Mobile Learning adoption between male and female instructors toward using Mobile Learning technology at ELC in Taibah University according to experience variable.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Definition of Mobile Learning

Mobile Learning is a type of learning that takes place via a portable or hand-held device. It takes place anywhere and anytime by giving the learner freedom of studying time and place and increasing the flexibility to teachers and instructors. Thus Mobile Learning can be defined as the ability to obtain educational content on personal pocket devices such as smart phones and mobile phones and PDs. Baran (2014, p.18) pointed that "Mobile Learning emphasize mobility, access, immediacy, stativity, ubiquity, convenience and contextually. Mobile Learning includes the characteristics of mobility in physical, conceptual, and social spaces." Mobile Learning provides flexible, informal, contextual learning with a little device. It basically means learning that can take place anywhere and anytime, learning on the go, learning on the move, using digital devices to access information at non-traditional work locations.

Advantages of Mobile Learning

Research has indicated some advantages for Mobile Learning like mobility, portability, simplicity and flexibility. Mobility increases a learner's capability to physically move their own learning environment as they move. The mobile's portability, simplicity, and affordability were argued to make it a natural fit for education where internet connectivity may be rare. Mobile Learning includes additional benefits such as the ability to exchange information and interact with other learners almost instantly. This increases social learning advantages in this world of technology and electronics as learners communicate and collaborate with one another. A major advantage of using wireless mobile technology is to reach people who live in remote locations where there are no schools, teachers, or libraries.

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713

Miangah and Nezarat (2012) pointed out to two main characteristics of mobile devices which are portability and connectivity. As for connectivity, designing the mobile system must have capability of being connected and communicated with the learning website using the wireless network of the device to access learning material including short message service (SMS) and mobile e-mail. Portability enables learners to move mobile devices and bring learning materials.

Klopfer (2002, as cited in Miangah and Nezarat, 2012) stated the following advantages of mobile devices; 1) social interactivity: exchanging data and collaboration with other learners is possible through mobile devices; 2) context sensitivity: the data on the mobile devices can be gathered and responded uniquely to the current location and time; 3) connectivity: mobile devices can be connected to other devices, data collection devices, or a common network by creating a shared network; 4) individuality: activities platform can be customized for individual learner.

The Benefits for Teachers

The widespread influence of the market increased the popularity of mobile phones, and this fulfills the need of teachers to provide applications and software for learners in teaching. Moreover, comparing with other wireless devices such as laptop computers, mobile phones are rather inexpensive having functions as Internet browsers available in most devices. With such inexpensive devices accessible to even the poorest areas and having the functionalities of e-mail or SMS, it is now possible to transfer information to and from mobile phones between instructors and learners without any difficulties.

Fritschi and Wolf (2012) explored that mobile technology can support teachers and improve their practices because it represents an exciting opportunity for educators in North America to expand their professional learning through increased access to instructors, mentors, supervisors and peers, as well as online content and resources. Professional Development (PD), focused on using mobile technology for instruction to help teachers increase student achievement and better meet their students' needs. Through careful planning and implementation, schools can develop Mobile Learning, PD programmers that support teachers, improve teaching practices that enhance the learning process.

(Retta,2009) stated that "when learners are interested in the technology, it captures their attention and makes them more interested in learning, and the right sort of learning content is introduced to them on mobile devices"(p.19)that would increase their language learning and acquisition.

Mobile Learning and Teaching English

Mobile Learning technology is more useful for both inside and outside classroom activities. Such activities enable learning to be more directly connected with the real world experiments. Moreover, learning through mobile phones outside the classroom has the advantage of better exploiting the learner's free time; even the students on the move can improve their learning skills

A number of studies have shown that EFL teachers have positive attitudes toward the adoption of mobile technology in the classroom. In fact, technology-aided learning is more effective than traditional learning which is realized in a campus-wide wireless computing environment. Many studies like Levy and Kennedy, 2005; Norbrook and Scott, 2003 have concentrated on using mobile phones as a way to distribute content from teachers to students, rather than focusing on the interaction among students or communication between students and teachers which is more useful and very productive.

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713

Gorichanaz (2011) conducted a study to find out whether there were any differences in vocabulary retention when ESL students read text with and without access to computer-mediated dictionaries. It examined the differences in short- and long-term vocabulary retention when readers using computer-mediated dictionaries versus paper dictionaries and handheld dictionaries. The study found that computer-mediated dictionaries were more effective for vocabulary retention than print-based dictionaries. One interesting finding wasthat for beginning learners, there was an apparent retention loss with the computer-mediated vocabulary learning. This may be due to the superficiality of looking up words on the computer; without a computer, the process requires more diligence that may have resulted in fewer words being learned, but with a higher quality of learning for each of those words. The study also showed that computer-aided language learning programs that focus on providing users with comprehensible input have considerable promise in promoting extensive reading and vocabulary learning. Even considering all this, it is important to note that there are some benefits to mobile technology integration that cannot be measured by test scores alone. For example, using such devices in the classroom help to prepare students to learn and use new technology in the workplace.

Abbasi and Hashmi (2013) in their study proved that using mobile phones had a significant effect on not only vocabulary learning but also vocabulary retention of EFL learners although there was not a significant difference between male and female learners in the vocabulary learning and retention while using mobile phones.

Amry(2014, p.133)stated that "face-to-face learning in the classroom is a formal academic learning process and used mostly to disseminate information to individuals rather than improve social interaction between students. The social dimension is very important to constructing knowledge and to orientating students towards new educational technology that use social networks." So, mobile devices are used at universities and higher educational institutions to enhance online interactions through discussions and to share knowledge.

Disadvantages of Mobile Learning

There are some disadvantages for Mobile Learning. As mentioned below, these disadvantages are mainly related to the technical specifications of the used devices which would affect the dependability of mobile devices for learning.

Behera (2013) mentioned some disadvantages of Mobile Learning which are: 1) the limited storage capacities; 2) device may become outdated quickly and students have to keep combating obsolescence; 3) the buttons on the keypad or styles pens are small and can be trickily for some people to manipulate; 4) too small display makes it hard to read; 5) usable with some models only; 6) network connectivity limitations and expenses / costs.

Gholami and Azarmi (2012) and Chinnery (2006) agreed that there are some limitations and barriers with mobile devices to be used as educational devices. For example, reduced screen size, limited audio-visual quality, virtual keyboarding, and one-finger data entry are some of these limitations. However, the advances in technology are trying to solve these problems as they have introduced mobiles with bigger screen size and keypads that enable to have faster typing, therefore these limitations can be solved with the developing of all technical devices they can also be limited and controlled.

Kukulska-Hulme and Traxler (2005) argued that although learning service through mobile devices has some advantages, it has its own constraints as small screen, reading difficulty on such a screen, data storage and multimedia limitations, and the like. Many of the mobile

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713

phones are not designed for educational purposes. Thus, it is difficult for learners to use them for the task given by the teachers to be carried out.

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Research Design

The current study is both descriptive and analytical. A quantitative research design is utilized to investigate language instructors' adoption of mobile and the effect of gender, age, and qualification and experience variables on adoption. The instrument of this study is a questionnaire developed by the researcher and it and administered to EFL instructors at ELC in Taibah University in Al-MadinahAl-Munawwara.

Population and Sample

The population of the study was represented by the English Language Center instructors in the male and female campuses of Taibah University, Al-Madinah Al-Munawwara. The total number of language instructors is (102),(67) are male and 35 female instructors during the implementation of the study. The researcher addressed all instructors in order to measure their adoption of Mobile Learning in teaching EFL and to examine if there are significant differences between the male and female instructors according to gender, age, and qualification and experience variables.

Research Instrument

The instrument used for the study was a questionnaire which was developed to elicit reliable and valid data regarding Mobile Learning adoption by language instructors at ELC. The questionnaire was constructed by the researcher after reviewing the literature of some studies like Fozdar and Kumar. (2007), Oz (2014),Kalloo and Mohan (2012) and Dashtestani (2013).It was divided into two sections: the first section was used to collect background information like name, gender, age, nationality, qualification, years of experience and number of sessions attended in technology field. The second section covered the following domains:

a. Usefulness of Mobile Learning adoption for EFL instructors: this area deals with language instructors perceptions towards the usefulness of Mobile Learning as perceptions usually affect adoption.

b. Ease of using Mobile Learning for EFL instructors: this area deals with whether language instructors find Mobile Learning an easy method to deliver instruction.

c. Mobile Learning adoption in teaching language skills: this area deals with which language skills and aspects taught through Mobile Learning.

d. Types of teaching practices for EFL instructors: this area investigates the types of teaching practices adopted by Mobile Learning.

e. Features and apps adoption of Mobile Learning for EFL instructors: this area deals with which features and apps they find useful to use

f. Adoption challenges of Mobile Learning for EFL instructors: this area deals with the challenges or difficulties that might face instructors in utilizing Mobile Learning.

The participants' responses were scored on a five-point Likert scale, 1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=frequently and 5=always.

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713

Questionnaire Validity and Reliability

Questionnaire validity is concerned with the "meaningfulness of research components"(Drost, N.D p106) and reliability means "the extent to which measurements are repeatable –when different persons perform the measurements, on different occasions, under different conditions, with supposedly alternative instruments which measure the same thing"(Drost, N.D p114), To check content validity of the questionnaire, it was judged by some specialists in the field of language teaching and necessary modifications were made. The researcher also calculated the Pearson correlation coefficient between each statement and the total score of the axis to which its belong, in order to check validity of the internal consistency of the questionnaire (See Table 1)

Table 1. Pearson correlation coefficients between each statement and the total score of each axis

Axis	*Question*	*Pearson Correlation Coefficient*	*P-Value (Sig)*	*Pearson Correlation Coefficient*	*P-Value (Sig)*
First	1	.741**	.000		
	2	.779**	.000		
	3	.717**	.000		
	4	.825**	.000	.555**	.000
	5	.823**	.000		
	6	.734**	.000		
	7	.569**	.000		
Second	8	.305**	.007		
	9	.290**	.010		
	10	.267*	.031	.333**	.000
	11	.747**	.000		
	12	.682**	.000		
	13	.743**	.000		
Third	14	.586**	.000		
	15	.707**	.000		
	16	.768**	.000		
	17	.713**	.000	.619**	.000
	18	.654**	.000		
	19	.703**	.000		
	20	.694**	.000		
Fourth	21	.699**	.000	.825**	.000
	22	.804**	.000		

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713

Axis	*Question*	*Pearson Correlation Coefficient*	*P-Value (Sig)*	*Pearson Correlation Coefficient*	*P-Value (Sig)*
	23	.821**	.000		
	24	.749**	.000		
	25	.795**	.000		
	26	.787**	.000		
	27	.520**	.000		
	28	.801**	.000		
	29	.731**	.000		
	30	.669**	.000		
	31	.685**	.000		
Fifth	32	.570**	.000		
	33	.614**	.000		
	34	.705**	.000		
	35	.683**	.000		
	36	.513**	.000	.788**	.000
	37	.685**	.000		
	38	.748**	.000		
	39	.688**	.000		
	40	.586**	.000		
	41	.749**	.000		
Sixth	42	.612**	.000		
	43	.813**	.000		
	44	.726**	.000	.624**	.000
	45	.901**	.000		
	46	.715**	.000		

Note: (**) means significant at the (0.01)level of significance or less

Note: (*) means significant at the (0.05) level of significance or less

The questionnaire reliability was calculated by using Alpha Cronbach Method. The results illustrated in table (2) showed that the reliability coefficients were between (0.8016-0.9124), which indicates that the tool is characterized by high stability.

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713
www.erint.savap.org.pk

Table 2. Reliability coefficient Ratios of Cronbach's Alpha

Axis	*Coefficients Cronbach's Alpha*
First	0.8629
Second	0.8016
Third	0.8115
Fourth	0.9124
Fifth	0.8552
Sixth	0.8157
Complete Questionnaire	0.8884

Research Procedures

In order to collect the required data of the current study, Two official letters were obtained from college of education (See Appendix A). The first was an official letter to Deanship of Higher Studies and Scientific Research to get permission to conduct the research instrument. The second official letter was sent to Deanship of Educational Affairs to get permission to collect the required data. After getting permission, the researcher distributed the questionnaire copies to all language instructors in both male and female campuses at ELC in Taibah University.

The questionnaire was administrated during one week from 15th of April, 2015 to 22th of April, 2015. All language instructors were informed that filling out the questionnaire was optional and they had the right to complete it or not. Instructors were also told that the information obtained would be confidential and would be used for scientific research purposes. A brief explanation of the purposes of the questionnaire was provided and instructions were given to ensure the clarity and accuracy of the statements and also to stimulate participants to responding to it items honestly.

Later, the researcher collected the questionnaire forms during two weeks. Regarding the (35) distributed copies of the female instructors, only (31) copies were returned. As for male instructors, (67) copies of the questionnaire were distributed, but only (38) copies were returned.

Data Analysis

After administration of the questionnaire, the collected data were statistically analyzed by using SPSS (version, 19). The following statistical methods were used:

a. Descriptive Statistics (frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviation) were used to describe and summarize the properties of the mass of data collected from the respondents.

b. Inferential Statistics using the Independent Samples t-test were applied to test the null hypotheses formulated for this study and to see whether the scores of male and female subjects differed in their adoption of Mobile Learning.

c. Pearson correlation coefficient to validity the validity of internal consistency.

d. Cronbach's alpha coefficient for reliability.

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data Analysis and Results

This chapter presents research results, discussion, recommendations and suggestions for further research.

The Results Concerning Demographic Information

Table 3. Frequencies and Percentages of Demographic Information

Section	*Variable*	*Answers*	*Frequencies*	*Percentages*
Personal	Gender	Male	38	55.1%
		Female	31	44.9%
		Total	69	100.0%
	Age	20-30	7	10.1%
		31-40	39	56.5%
		41-50	16	23.2%
		up to 50	6	8.7%
		Non Respond	1	1.4%
		Total	69	100.0%
	Nationality	Saudi	3	4.3%
		Non Saudi	48	69.6%
		Non respond	18	26.1%
		Total	69	100.0%
Professionally	Specialist	TEFL	38	55.1%
		Other	9	13.0%
		Non respond	22	31.9%
		Total	69	100.0%
	Last degree of the Qualification	Bachelor	13	18.8%
		Master	50	72.5%
		Ph.D	5	7.2%
		Others	1	1.4%
		Total	69	100.0%

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713

Section	*Variable*	*Answers*	*Frequencies*	*Percentages*
	Years of experience	Less than 5 years	12	17.4%
		From 5-10 years	20	29.0%
		From 11-15years	18	26.1%
		More than 15 years	14	20.3%
		Non respond	5	7.2%
		Total	69	100.0%
General Questions	Do you attend sessions or courses in applying technology into teaching	Not attend session	9	13.0%
		From 1-5 session	40	58.0%
		From 6-10 session	2	2.9%
		More than 10 session	3	4.3%
		Non respond	15	21.7%
		Total	69	100.0%
	My cell phone is:	Regular	2	2.9%
		smart phone	66	95.7%
		Non respond	1	1.4%
		Total	69	100.0%
	Type your mobile phone	Iphone	18	26.1%
		Galaxy	38	55.1%
		Sony	1	1.4%
		Nokia	2	2.9%
		Non respond	10	14.5%
		Total	69	100.0%
	Do you have any kind of tablet?	Yes	34	49.3%
		No	34	49.3%
		Non respond	1	1.4%
		Total	69	100.0%

The results as presented in table (3) are the following

1. They are (55.1%) male instructors whereas there are (44.9%) female instructors.
2. The ages of most of instructors range from (31-40) which was estimated (56.5 %).
3. Most of them are non-Saudi (69.6%) and (26.1%) did not respond whereas only (4.3%) are Saudi instructors.
4. Most of them have master degree (72.5%).
5. (17.4%) of the participants have less than 5 years of experience, (29 %) from 5-10, (26.1%) from 11-15, and (20.3%) more than 15, whereas (7.2%) did not respond.
6. Of the total participants (95.7%) use smart phones,(59.4%) use android,(26.1%) use Apple, whereas (14.5%) did not respond.
7. Half of the instructors have tablet (49.3%) and only (1.4%) did not respond.

The Results of Research Questions

The Results of the First Question

To answer the first question "Do male and female instructors at the ELC in Taibah University adopt Mobile Learning technology in TEFL? The data collected from the six sub-questions were statistically examined, analyzed and discussed.

The result of the first sub-question

To answer the first sub-question which stated that " To what extent do male and female language instructors find Mobile Learning useful for teaching EFL?" frequencies, percentages, mean and standard deviation, independent samples T- test for each statement of the first domain were calculated and illustrated in tables (4) and (5).

The obtained results from table (4, 5) are interpreted as follows:

i. Reached the General mean of all statement (3.76) with a standard deviation (0.715), and this means that the usefulness of using Mobile Learning by EFL **male** instructors "**Frequently"**.

ii. Reached the General mean of all statement (3.50) with a standard deviation (0.527), and this means that the usefulness of using Mobile Learning by EFL **female** instructors "**Frequently"**.

iii. The highest mean score in both male and female groups was obtained by the seventh statement (*Mean* for male=4.21, *Mean* for female=4.23). Both agree totally that the most useful advantage in using Mobile Learning was that it helps them to contact easily with their students and colleagues in the field.

iv. The least useful advantage for male in this domain was obtained by statement number (5), which stated that Mobile Learning helps them to accomplish teaching activities, where the least useful advantage for female was obtained by statement number (2), which stated that Mobile Learning allowed them to prepare more interesting activities.

v. There were no statistically significant differences at level of significance (0.05) in the usefulness of using Mobile Learning by EFL **male and female** instructors.

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713

Table 4. Frequencies and percentages for each statement in first domain

No	Statement	Male (38)					Female (31)				
		Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
1	Mobile learning provides instructors with new opportunities to teach English.	8 21.1%	14 36.8%	15 39.5%	1 2.6%	-	5 16.1%	10 21.4%	15 48.4%	1 3.2%	-
2	Mobile learning allows language instructors to prepare more interesting activities.	8 21.1%	11 28.9%	14 36.8%	4 10.5%	1 2.6%	2 6.5%	7 22.6%	17 54.8%	5 16.1%	-
3	Mobile learning provides more flexibility; can be used anytime, anywhere.	19 50%	12 31.6%	6 15.8%	1 2.6%	-	8 25.8%	10 32.3%	12 38.7%	1 3.2%	-
4	Mobile learning can enhance the productivity of language instructors in class.	7 18.4%	16 42.1%	10 26.3%	4 10.5%	-	2 6.5%	8 25.8%	17 54.8%	4 12.9%	-
5	Using mobile learning helps language instructors to accomplish teaching activities more quickly.	6 15.8%	10 26.3%	18 47.4%	3 7.9%	1 2.6%	2 6.5%	7 22.6%	18 58.1%	4 12.9%	-
6	Mobile learning can enhance language instructors to develop themselves professionally.	5 13.2%	9 23.7%	19 50%	3 7.9%	1 2.6%	1 3.2%	10 32.3%	15 48.4%	5 16.1%	-
7	Using mobile learning helps language instructors to contact easily with students and colleagues in the field.	18 47.4%	12 31.6%	7 18.4%	-	1 2.6%	14 45.2%	11 35.5%	5 16.1%	1 3.2%	-

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713

Table 5. Means and standard deviation, independent samples T- test for each statement in first domain

No	*Statement*	*Male*			*Female*			*Comparison*	
		Mean	*Standard Deviation*	*Interpretation*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*Interpretation*	*T-test*	*P-value*
1	Mobile learning provides instructors with new opportunities to teach English.	3.76	.820	Frequently	3.58	.886	Frequently	.887	.378
2	Mobile learning allows language instructors to prepare more interesting activities.	3.55	1.032	Frequently	3.19	.792	Sometimes	1.591	.116
3	Mobile learning provides more flexibility; can be used anytime, anywhere.	4.29	.835	Always	3.81	.873	Frequently	2.342*	.022
4	Mobile learning can enhance the productivity of language instructors in class.	3.70	.909	Frequently	3.26	.773	Sometimes	2.149*	.035
5	Using mobile learning helps language instructors to accomplish teaching activities more quickly.	3.45	.950	Frequently	3.23	.762	Sometimes	1.051	.297
6	Mobile learning can enhance language instructors to develop themselves professionally.	3.38	.924	Sometimes	3.23	.762	Sometimes	.734	.466
7	Using mobile learning helps language instructors to contact easily with students and colleagues in the field.	4.21	.935	Always	4.23	.845	Always	-.070	.944
	The General mean	*3.76*	*.715*	*Frequently*	*3.50*	*.527*	*Frequently*	*1.687*	*.096*

Note: (*) means significant at level of significance (0.05) between male and female.

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713

The Second Sub-Question

To answer the second sub-question which stated that "To what extent do EFL male and instructors find that Mobile Learning easy to use?", frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations, and independent samples T- test for each statement of the second domain were calculated and illustrated in tables (6) and (7).

Table 6. Frequencies and percentages for each statement in second domain

No	*Statement*	*Male*					*Female*				
		Always	*Frequently*	*Sometimes*	*Rarely*	*Never*	*Always*	*Frequently*	*Sometimes*	*Rarely*	*Never*
8	It is easy for me to use various features and apps in mobile devices.	19 50%	13 34.2%	5 13.2%	1 2.6%	-	8 25.8%	12 38.7%	8 25.8%	3 9.7%	-
9	I need the assistance of an experienced person before using mobile feature or apps in class.	2 5.3%	1 2.6%	15 39.5%	8 21.1%	12 31.6%	-	7 22.6%	7 22.6%	11 35.5%	6 19.4%
10	I face difficulties in using mobile devices in teaching.	1 2.6%	2 5.3%	8 21.1%	17 44.7%	9 23.7%	1 3.2%	4 12.9%	14 45.2%	6 19.4%	5 16.1%
11	I can deal with hardware components of mobile devices.	5 13.2%	10 26.3%	8 21.1%	10 26.3%	5 13.2%	2 6.4%	10 32.2%	7 22.6%	5 16.1%	7 22.6%
12	I can deal with software components of mobile devices.	9 23.7%	16 42.1%	8 21.1%	3 7.9%	2 5.3%	3 9.7%	11 35.5%	9 29%	5 16.1%	3 9.7%
13	I can fix common mobile technical problems if I face any.	5 13.2%	12 31.6%	11 28.9%	7 18.4%	3 7.9%	3 9.7%	5 16.1%	9 29%	8 25.8%	6 19.4%

Table 7. Means, standard deviations and independent samples T- test for each of the statement in second domain

No	*Statement*	*Male*			*Female*			*Comparison*	
		Mean	*Std. Dev*	*Interpretation*	*Mean*	*Std. Dev*	*Interpretation*	*T-Test*	*P-Value*
8	It is easy for me to use various features and apps in mobile devices.	4.30	.812	Always	3.81	.946	Frequently	2.303*	.024
9	I need the assistance of an experienced person before using mobile feature or apps in class.	2.29	1.113	Rarely	2.48	1.061	Rarely	-.737	.464
10	I face difficulties in using mobile devices in teaching.	2.16	.958	Rarely	2.67	1.028	Sometimes	-2.074*	.042
11	I can deal with hardware components of mobile devices.	3.00	1.273	Sometimes	2.77	1.251	Sometimes	.756	.452
12	I can deal with software components of mobile devices.	3.71	1.088	Frequently	3.13	1.106	Sometimes	2.156*	.035
13	I can fix common mobile technical problems if I face any.	3.24	1.149	Sometimes	2.55	1.121	Sometimes	2.444*	.017
	The General mean	3.12	.496	Sometimes	2.91	.626	Sometimes	1.520	.133

Note (*) means significant at level of significance (0.05) between male and female.

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713

The obtained results from table (6, 7) are interpreted as follows:

i. Reached the General mean of all statement (3.12) with a standard deviation (0.496), and this means that the extent do the EFL male instructors will see that Mobile Learning easy to use " **Sometimes "**.

ii. Reached the General mean of all statement (2.91) with a standard deviation (0.626) , and this means that the extent do the EFL female instructors will see that Mobile Learning easy to use " **Sometimes"**.

iii. The highest mean score in both male and female groups was obtained by the eighth statement (*Mean* for male=4.30, *Mean* for female=3.81). Both agree totally that it is easy for them to use various features and apps in mobile devices. There were statistically significant differences at level of significance (0.05) between male and female in favor of male group. Using various features was easier for male than female.

iv. There were statistically significant differences at level of significance (0.05) between male and female in favor of male group regarding the statement number (7), Males rarely face difficulties with hardware components of devices, while females sometimes face difficulties.

v. There were statistically significant differences at level of significance (0.05) between male and female in favor of male group regarding the statement number (13), It was easier for male to fix technical problems if they face than females.

vi. There were no statistically significant differences at level of significance (0.05) between **male and female** instructors in the easy to use domain.

The Third Sub-Question

To answer the third sub-question which stated that "To what extent do EFL male and female instructors adopt Mobile Learning in teaching language skills?", frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations and independent samples T- test for each statement of the third domain were calculated and illustrated in tables (8) and (9).

The obtained results from table (8, 9) are interpreted as follows:

i. Reached the General mean of all statement (2.50) with a standard deviation (0.784) , and this means that the extent do the EFL **male** instructors adopt Mobile Learning in teaching language skills " **Rarely "**.

ii. Reached the General mean of all statement (3.43) with a standard deviation (0.731) , and this means that the extent do the EFL **female** instructors adopt Mobile Learning in teaching language skills " **Rarely"**.

iii. Both male and female instructors sometimes adopted Mobile Learning in the teaching of vocabulary and pronunciation, and they rarely adopted it in the teaching of listening, speaking, reading, writing or grammar.

iv. There were no statistically significant differences at level of significance (0.05) between EFL **male and female** instructors regarding Mobile Learning adoption in teaching language skills and aspects.

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713

Table 8. Frequencies and percentages for each statement in third domain

No	*Statement*	*Male*					*Female*				
		Always	*Frequently*	*Sometimes*	*Rarely*	*Never*	*Always*	*Frequently*	*Sometimes*	*Rarely*	*Never*
14	I use mobile learning in teaching the listening skill.	2 5.3%	7 18.4%	11 28.9%	7 18.4%	11 28.9%	2 6.5%	4 12.9%	11 35.5%	3 9.7%	11 35.5%
15	I use mobile learning in teaching the speaking skill.	-	8 21.1%	10 26.3%	11 28.9%	9 23.7%	2 6.5%	4 12.9%	8 25.8%	8 25.8%	9 29%
16	I use mobile learning in teaching the reading skill.	-	8 21.1%	10 26.3%	10 26.3%	10 26.3%	-	2 6.5%	11 35.5%	6 19.4%	12 38.7%
17	I use mobile learning in teaching the writing skill.	-	7 18.4%	6 15.8%	11 28.9%	14 36.8%	-	3 9.7%	11 35.5%	8 25.8%	9 29%
18	I use mobile learning in teaching grammar.	-	6 15.8%	7 18.4%	14 36.8%	11 28.9%	-	2 6.5%	9 29%	9 29%	10 32.3%
19	I use mobile learning in teaching vocabulary.	2 5.3%	13 34.2%	11 28.9%	7 18.4%	5 13.2%	3 9.7%	8 25.8%	9 29%	6 19.4%	5 16.1%
20	I use mobile learning in teaching pronunciation.	1 2.6%	12 31.6%	10 26.3%	8 21.1%	6 15.8%	2 6.5%	7 22.6%	8 25.8%	9 29%	5 16.1%

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713

Table 9. Means, standard deviations, and independent samples T- test for each statement in third domain

No	*Statement*	*Male*			*Female*			*Comparison*	
		Mean	*Standard Deviation*	*Interpretation*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*Interpretation*	*T-test*	*P-value*
14	I use mobile learning in teaching the listening skill.	2.53	1.246	Rarely	2.45	1.287	Rarely	.244	.808
15	I use mobile learning in teaching the speaking skill.	2.45	1.083	Rarely	2.42	1.232	Rarely	.100	.920
16	I use mobile learning in teaching the reading skill.	2.42	1.106	Rarely	2.10	1.012	Rarely	1.258	.213
17	I use mobile learning in teaching the writing skill.	2.16	1.128	Rarely	2.26	.999	Rarely	-.386	.701
18	I use mobile learning in teaching grammar.	2.11	.979	Rarely	2.10	.960	Rarely	.046	.963
19	I use mobile learning in teaching vocabulary.	3.00	1.139	Sometimes	2.94	1.237	Sometimes	.225	.823
20	I use mobile learning in teaching pronunciation.	2.84	1.143	Sometimes	2.74	1.182	Sometimes	.339	.735
	The General Mean	*2.50*	*.784*	*Rarely*	*2.43*	*.731*	*Rarely*	*.354*	*.724*

The Fourth Sub-Question

To answer the fourth sub-question which stated that "What are the types of teaching practices do EFL male and female instructors use?, frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations and independent samples T- test for each statement of the fourth domain were calculated and illustrated in tables (10) and (11).

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713

Table 10. Frequencies and percentages for each statement in fourth domain

No	*Statement*	*Male*					*Female*				
		Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
21	I use mobile devices to send course assignments to my students.	9 23.7%	14 36.8%	10 26.3%	3 7.9%	2 5.3%	11 35.5%	5 16.1%	6 19.4%	5 16.1%	4 12.9%
22	I use mobile learning to share educational content with my students.	12 31.6%	5 13.2%	13 34.2%	6 15.8%	2 5.3%	9 29%	9 29%	5 16.1%	5 16.1%	3 9.7%
23	I use mobile devices to discuss some ideas and concepts with my students.	7 18.4%	5 13.2%	17 44.7%	5 13.2%	4 10.5%	4 12.9%	5 16.1%	9 29%	6 19.4%	7 22.6%
24	I use mobile devices to inform them about course alerts.	14 36.8%	14 36.8%	9 23.7%	-	1 2.6%	17 54.8%	4 12.9%	5 16.1%	2 6.5%	3 9.7%
25	I use mobile devices to send or receive emails from my students.	17 44.7%	12 31.6%	3 7.9%	3 7.9%	3 7.9%	11 35.5%	9 29%	4 12.9%	3 9.7%	4 12.9%
26	I use mobile devices to send course files or documents.	17 44.7%	7 18.4%	8 21.1%	4 10.5%	2 5.3%	10 32.3%	8 25.8%	7 22.6%	4 12.9%	2 6.5%
27	I use mobile devices to save course files in cloud storage like dropbox.	9 23.7%	6 15.8%	8 21.1%	6 15.8%	9 23.7%	5 16.1%	7 22.6%	6 19.4%	7 22.6%	6 19.4%
28	I use mobile devices to ask questions and receive students' answers.	7 18.4%	8 21.1%	13 34.2%	5 13.2%	5 13.2%	7 22.6%	7 22.6%	7 22.6%	4 12.9%	6 19.4%
29	I use mobile devices to provide my students with feedback on their assignments.	4 10.5%	3 7.9%	13 34.2%	9 23.7%	9 23.7%	4 12.9%	5 16.1%	10 32.3%	5 16.1%	7 22.6%
30	I use mobile devices to encourage students work collaboratively through using some applications.	6 15.8%	6 15.8%	12 31.8%	8 21.1%	6 15.8%	3 9.7%	3 9.7%	9 29%	9 29%	7 22.6%
31	I use mobile devices to fulfill some administrative class work.	8 21.1%	6 15.8%	16 42.1%	6 15.8%	2 5.3%	4 12.9%	6 19.4%	9 29%	8 25.8%	4 12.9%

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713

Table 11. means, standard deviation, and independent samples T- test for each of the statement in fourth domain

No	*Statement*	*Male*			*Female*			*Comparison*	
		Mean	*Standard Deviation*	*Interpretation*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*Interpretation*	*T-test*	*P-value*
21	I use mobile devices to send course assignments to my students.	3.66	1.097	Frequently	3.45	1.457	Frequently	.671	.505
22	I use mobile learning to share educational content with my students.	3.50	1.247	Frequently	3.52	1.338	Frequently	-.052	.959
23	I use mobile devices to discuss some ideas and concepts with my students.	3.16	1.197	Sometimes	2.77	1.334	Sometimes	1.258	.213
24	I use mobile devices to inform them about course alerts.	4.05	.928	Frequently	3.97	1.378	Frequently	.305	.762
25	I use mobile devices to send or receive emails from my students.	4.03	1.236	Frequently	3.65	1.404	Frequently	1.193	.237
26	I use mobile devices to send course files or documents.	3.87	1.256	Frequently	3.65	1.253	Frequently	.735	.465
27	I use mobile devices to save course files in cloud storage like dropbox.	2.95	1.490	Sometimes	2.94	1.389	Sometimes	.030	.976
28	I use mobile devices to ask questions and receive students' answers.	3.18	1.270	Sometimes	3.16	1.440	Sometimes	.070	.944
29	I use mobile devices to provide my students with feedback on their assignments.	2.58	1.244	Sometimes	2.81	1.327	Sometimes	-.733	.466
30	I use mobile devices to encourage students work collaboratively through using some applications.	2.95	1.293	Sometimes	2.55	1.234	Sometimes	1.301	.198
31	I use mobile devices to fulfill some administrative class work.	3.32	1.141	Sometimes	2.94	1.237	Sometimes	1.326	.189
	The General Mean	*3.38*	*.918*	*Sometimes*	*3.23*	*.936*	*Sometimes*	*.748*	*.457*

The obtained results from table (10, 11) are interpreted as follows:

i. Reached the General mean of all statement (3.38) with a standard deviation (0.918) , and this means that the EFL **male** instructors used types teaching practices of Mobile Learning" **Sometimes "**.in this domain.

ii. Reached the General mean of all statement (3.23) with a standard deviation (0.936), and this means that the EFL **female** used types teaching practices of Mobile Learning" **Sometimes "**.in this domain.

iii. The types of practices that obtained the highest means among male instructors were: 1) using mobile devices to inform students about course alerts, 2) sending and receiving emails, and 3) sending and receiving course files and documents, whereas the least used type of practices was using mobile devices to provide students with feedback on course assignments.

iv. The types of practices that obtained the highest means among female instructors were:1) using mobile devices to inform students about course alerts, 2)sending and receiving course files and documents, and 3) sharing educational content with their students, whereas the least used type of practices was using devices to encourage collaboration among students.

v. There were no statistically significant differences at level of significance (0.05) between EFL **male and female** instructors in types of teaching practices domain.

The Fifth Sub-Question

To answer the fourth sub-question which stated that "What are the mobile features and apps do EFL male and female instructors use?, frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations and independent samples T- test for each statement of the fifth domain were calculated and illustrated in tables (12) and (13).

The obtained results from table (12, 13) are interpreted as follows:

i. Reached the General mean of all statement (3.05) with a standard deviation (0.919), and this indicated that the all features and apps of Mobile Learning in this domain were used by EFL **male** instructors "**Sometimes"**.

ii. Reached the General mean of all statement (2.81) with a standard deviation (0.734) , and this indicated that the all features and apps of Mobile Learning in this domain were used by EFL **female** instructors "**Sometimes"**.

iii. The most common features and apps used by male instructors were: 1) Whatsapp, 2) apps facilitating learning English, and 3) text messaging. They rarely encouraged their students to use the "Note" feature and never used Bluetooth feature.

iv. The most common features and apps used by female instructors were: 1) What's app, 2), web browser apps, and 3) apps facilitating learning English. They rarely encouraged their students to post to the social media apps and never used Bluetooth feature.

v. There are no statistically significant differences at level of significance (0.05) between EFL **male and female** instructors in the use offeatures and apps of Mobile Learning in this domain.

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713

Table 12. Frequencies and percentages for each statement in fifth domain

No	*Statement*	*Male*					*Female*				
		Always	*Frequently*	*Sometimes*	*Rarely*	*Never*	*Always*	*Frequently*	*Sometimes*	*Rarely*	*Never*
32	I encourage my students to use the "Notes" feature to take notes.	1 2.6%	3 7.9%	10 26.3%	13 34.2%	11 28.9%	3 9.7%	2 6.5%	4 12.9%	8 25.8%	14 45.2%
33	I encourage my students to use the "camera" feature to take picture or videos related to the course.	5 13.2%	7 18.4%	12 31.6%	7 18.4%	7 18.4%	3 9.7%	9 29%	6 19.4%	6 19.4%	7 22.6%
34	I encourage my students to use the "text messaging" feature to contact with others in English.	8 21.1%	10 26.3%	11 28.9%	7 18.4%	2 5.3%	8 25.8%	4 12.9%	7 22.6%	4 12.9%	8 25.8%
35	I encourage my students to use the "Bluetooth" feature for sending and receiving documents in case of low internet access.	3 7.9%	3 7.9%	10 26.3%	8 21.1%	14 36.8%	1 3.2%	1 3.2%	4 12.9%	5 16.1%	20 64.5%
36	I encourage my students to use the " whatsapp" to keep in contact with me.	19 50%	11 28.9%	4 10.5%	-	4 10.5%	15 48.4%	5 16.1%	4 12.9%	3 9.7%	4 12.9%
37	I encourage my students to download some apps that facilitate learning English.	10 26.3%	11 28.9%	12 31.6%	2 5.3%	3 7.9%	5 16.1%	7 22.6%	12 38.7%	5 16.1%	2 6.5%
38	I encourage my students to download some educational apps to view course content.	10 26.3%	6 15.8%	13 34.2%	5 13.2%	4 10.5%	4 12.9%	8 25.8%	9 29%	5 16.1%	5 16.1%
39	I encourage my students to post status updates to social apps (like Facebook and Twitter) to contact with native speakers.	5 13.2%	4 10.5%	7 18.4%	9 23.7%	13 34.2%	2 6.5%	3 9.7%	8 25.8%	4 12.9%	14 45.2%
40	I encourage my students to search course information through using some browser apps like google and chrome.	10 26.3%	6 15.8%	14 36.8%	3 7.9%	5 13.2%	9 29%	4 12.9%	14 45.2%	3 9.7%	1 3.2%
41	I encourage my students to upload or download course videos from "YouTube" app.	4 10.5%	10 26.3%	8 21.1%	8 21.1%	7 18.4%	4 12.9%	4 12.9%	9 29%	6 19.4%	8 25.8%

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713

Table 13. Means, standard deviation, and independent samples T- test for each of the statement in fifth domain

No	Statement	Male			Female			Comparison	
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation	T-test	P-value
32	I encourage my students to use the "Notes" feature to take notes.	2.21	1.044	Rarely	2.10	1.326	Rarely	.399	.691
33	I encourage my students to use the "camera" feature to take picture or videos related to the course.	2.89	1.290	Sometimes	2.84	1.344	Sometimes	.176	.861
34	I encourage my students to use the "text messaging" feature to contact with others in English.	3.39	1.175	Sometimes	3.00	1.549	Sometimes	1.203	.233
35	I encourage my students to use the "Bluetooth" feature for sending and receiving documents in case of low internet access.	2.29	1.271	Rarely	1.65	1.050	Never	2.261*	.027
36	I encourage my students to use the " whatsapp" to keep in contact with me.	4.08	1.260	Frequently	3.90	1.448	Frequently	.550	.584
37	I encourage my students to download some apps that facilitate learning English.	3.61	1.175	Frequently	3.26	1.125	Sometimes	1.245	.218
38	I encourage my students to download some educational apps to view course content.	3.30	1.288	Sometimes	3.10	1.291	Sometimes	.606	.547
39	I encourage my students to post status updates to social apps (like Facebook and Twitter) to contact with native speakers.	2.45	1.408	Rarely	2.19	1.302	Rarely	.770	.444
40	I encourage my students to search course information through using some browser apps like google and chrome.	3.34	1.321	Sometimes	3.55	1.121	Frequently	-.690	.493
41	I encourage my students to upload or download course videos from "YouTube" app.	2.89	1.308	Sometimes	2.68	1.351	Sometimes	.663	.509
	The General Mean	*3.05*	*.919*	*Sometimes*	*2.81*	*.734*	*Sometimes*	*1.165*	*.248*

Note (*) means significant at level of significance (0.05) between male and female.

The Sixth Sub-Question

To answer the fourth sub-question which stated that "What are the adoption challenges do EFL male and female instructors face?, frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations and independent samples T- test for each statement of the sixth domain were calculated and illustrated in tables (14) and (15).

Table 14. Frequencies and percentages for each statement in sixth domain

No	*Statement*	*Male*					*Female*				
		Always	*Frequently*	*Sometimes*	*Rarely*	*Never*	*Always*	*Frequently*	*Sometimes*	*Rarely*	*Never*
42	Using different mobile features and apps requires time and effort.	4 10.5%	6 15.8%	21 55.3%	2 5.3%	5 13.2%	3 9.7%	6 19.4%	14 45.2%	6 19.4%	2 6.5%
43	It is difficult for me to use mobile learning because my classrooms are inaccessible.	4 10.5%	5 13.2%	12 31.6%	10 26.3%	7 18.4%	7 22.6%	6 19.4%	13 41.9%	1 3.2%	4 12.9%
44	It is difficult for me to use mobile learning due to high cost mobile fees.	1 2.6%	3 7.9%	6 15.8%	14 36.8%	14 36.8%	4 12.9%	4 12.9%	11 35.5%	6 19.4%	6 19.4%
45	It is difficult for me to use mobile learning because of lack of technical support.	4 10.5%	6 15.8%	10 26.3%	7 18.4%	11 28.9%	7 22.6%	6 19.4%	9 29%	5 16.1%	4 12.9%
46	I avoid using mobile learning because it is difficult to get what I want.	2 5.3%	1 2.6%	14 36.8%	8 21.1%	13 34.2%	2 6.5%	6 19.4%	8 25.8%	7 22.6%	8 25.8%

Table 15. Means standard deviations, and independent samples T- test for each statement in sixth domain

No	*Statement*	*Male*			*Female*			*Comparison*	
		Mean	*Standard Deviation*	*Interpretation*	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*Interpretation*	*T-test*	*P-value*
42	Using different mobile features and apps requires time and effort.	3.05	1.089	Sometimes	3.06	1.031	Sometimes	-.046	.963
43	It is difficult for me to use mobile learning because my classrooms are inaccessible.	2.65	1.184	Sometimes	3.35	1.253	Sometimes	-2.386*	.020
44	It is difficult for me to use mobile learning because of lack of technical support.	2.54	1.304	Rarely	3.23	1.334	Sometimes	-2.136*	.036
45	I avoid using mobile learning because it is difficult to get what I want.	2.24	1.125	Rarely	2.58	1.259	Rarely	-1.197	.236
46	It is difficult for me to use mobile learning due to high cost mobile fees.	2.03	1.052	Rarely	2.81	1.276	Sometimes	-2.784*	.007
	The General mean	*2.50*	*.852*	*Rarely*	*3.01*	*.930*	*Sometimes*	*-2.351**	*.022*

Note (*) means significant at level of significance (0.05) between **male and female**.

The obtained results from tables (14, 15) are interpreted as follows:

i. Reached the General mean of all statement (2.50) with a standard deviation (0.852) , and this means EFL **male** instructors " **Rarely** " face challenges in Mobile Learning adoption.

ii. Reached the General mean of all statement (3.01) with a standard deviation (0.930) ,and this means EFL **female** instructors "**sometimes**" face challenges in Mobile Learning adoption.

iii. There were statistically significant differences at level of significance (0.05) between EFL **male and female** instructors in favor of female instructors regarding classroom inaccessibility, lack of technical support and high costs of mobile fees. Female instructors might not adopt Mobile Learning if they face such challenges.

iv. There were statistically significant differences at level of significance (0.05) between EFL **male and female** instructors in favor of female regarding the challenges of Mobile Learning adoption. Adoption challenges were more serious obstacles that might hinder adoption for female instructors.

The Results of the Second Question

To answer the second main question which stated that "What are differences according to gender in terms of adopting Mobile Learning at the ELC in Taibah University?", and to examine the first null hypothesis which postulated that there would be no statistically significant differences in the average score of Mobile Learning adoption between male and female instructors toward using Mobile Learning technology at ELC in Taibah University according to gender variable, Independent sample t. test was run and the obtained results are illustrated in table (16).

Table 16. Means, standard deviation, and independent samples T- test for each domain

No	*Domain*	*Male*			*Female*			*Comparison*	
		Mean	*Standard deviation*	*Interpretation*	*Mean*	*Standard deviation*	*Interpretation*	*T-test*	*P-value*
1	Usefulness	3.76	.715	Frequently	3.50	.527	Frequently	1.687	.096
2	Ease of use	3.12	.496	Sometimes	2.91	.626	Sometimes	1.520	.133
3	Adoption in teaching language skills	2.50	.784	Rarely	2.43	.731	Rarely	.354	.724
4	Types of teaching practices	3.38	.918	Sometimes	3.22	.936	Sometimes	.748	.457
5	Features and apps adoption	3.05	.919	Sometimes	2.81	.734	Sometimes	1.165	.248
6	Adoption challenges	2.50	.852	Rarely	3.01	.930	Sometimes	-2.351*	.022
	All axes (Complete Questionnaire)	*3.11*	*.528*	*Sometimes*	*2.99*	*.378*	*Sometimes*	*1.031*	*.306*

Note (*) means significant at level of significance (0.05) between male and female

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713

The obtained results from table (16) are interpreted as follows:

i. Reached the general mean of all **domains** (3.11) with a standard deviation (0.528), and this means that the adoption of Mobile Learning by **male** instructors at ELC in Taibah University **"Sometimes"**.

ii. Reached the General mean of all **domains (** (2.99) with a standard deviation (0.378) , and this means that the adoption of Mobile Learning by **female** instructors at ELC in Taibah University "**Sometimes"**.

iii. There were no statistically significant differences at level of significance (0.05) between EFL **male and female** instructors in the adoption of Mobile Learning technology at ELC in Taibah University. As a result, the first null hypothesis was accepted.

iv. There were statistically significant differences at level of significance (0.05) between EFL **male and female** instructors in favor of female instructors which indicated that challenges might affect the adoption level of female instructors.

The Results of the Third Question

To answer the third main question which stated that "What are differences according to age variable in terms of adopting Mobile Learning at the ELC in Taibah University?, and to examine the second null hypothesis which postulated that there would be no statistically significant differences in the average score of Mobile Learning adoption between male and female instructors toward using Mobile Learning technology at ELC in Taibah University according to age variable", One-Way ANOVA was run and the obtained results are illustrated in table (17).The obtained results are interpreted as follows: There were no statistically significant differences at level of significance (0.05) in all domains of the questionnaire between **male and female** instructors in the adoption of Mobile Learning technology at ELC in Taibah University regarding to the age variable. As a result, the second null hypothesis was accepted.

Table 17. The results of One-Way ANOVA regarding to the age variable

Variable	*Axis*	*Sum of Squares*	*df*	*Mean Square*	*F*	*P-Value (Sig.)*
Age	First	2.439	3	.813	2.006	.122
		25.932	64	.405		
		28.370	67			
	Second	.229	3	.076	.233	.873
		20.957	64	.327		
		21.185	67			
	Third	.629	3	.210	.370	.775
		36.242	64	.566		
		36.871	67			
	Fourth	1.149	3	.383	.433	.730
		56.634	64	.885		

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713

		57.783	67			
	Fifth	2.209	3	.736	1.020	.390
		46.204	64	.722		
		48.413	67			
	Sixth	3.491	3	1.164	1.402	.250
		53.118	64	.830		
		56.609	67			
	Complete Questionnaire	.337	3	.112	.496	.686
		14.476	64	.226		
		14.813	67			

The Results of the Fourth Question

To answer the fourth main question which stated that "What are differences according to qualification variable in terms of adopting Mobile Learning at the ELC in Taibah University?, and to examine the third null hypothesis which postulated that there would be no statistically significant differences in the average score of Mobile Learning adoption between male and female instructors toward using Mobile Learning technology at ELC in Taibah University according to qualification variable", One-Way ANOVA was run and the obtained results are illustrated in table (18). The obtained results are interpreted as follows: There were no statistically significant differences at level of significance (0.05) in all domains of the questionnaire between **male and female** instructors in the adoption of Mobile Learning technology at ELC in Taibah University regarding to the qualification variable. As a result, the third null hypothesis was accepted.

Table 18. The results of One-Way ANOVA regarding to the qualification variable

Variable	*Axis*	*Sum of Squares*	*df*	*Mean Square*	*F*	*P-Value (Sig.)*
Last Degree of the Qualification	First	2.507	3	.836	2.100	.109
		25.869	65	.398		
		28.376	68			
	Second	.327	3	.109	.333	.802
		21.274	65	.327		
		21.601	68			
	Third	2.973	3	.991	1.796	.157
		35.857	65	.552		
		38.830	68			

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713

	Fourth	1.788	3	.596	.690	.561
		56.157	65	.864		
		57.945	68			
	Fifth	4.016	3	1.339	1.960	.129
		44.399	65	.683		
		48.415	68			
	Sixth	4.041	3	1.347	1.649	.187
		53.106	65	.817		
		57.147	68			
	Complete Questionnaire	1.044	3	.348	1.642	.188
		13.779	65	.212		
		14.823	68			

The Results of the Fifth Question

To answer the fourth main question which stated that "What are differences according to experience variable in terms of adopting Mobile Learning at the ELC in Taibah University?, and to examine the fourth null hypothesis which postulated that there would be no statistically significant differences in the average score of Mobile Learning adoption between male and female instructors toward using Mobile Learning technology at ELC in Taibah University according to qualification variable", One-Way ANOVA was run and the obtained results are illustrated in table (19). The obtained results are interpreted as follows: There were no statistically significant differences at level of significance (0.05) in all domains of the questionnaire between **male and female** instructors in the adoption of Mobile Learning technology at ELC in Taibah University regarding to the qualification variable. As a result, the fourth null hypothesis was accepted.

Table 19. The results of One-Way ANOVA regarding to the experience variable

Variable	*Axis*	*Sum of Squares*	*df*	*Mean Square*	*F*	*P-Value (Sig.)*
Years of Experience	First	7.461	19	.393	.913	.571
		18.928	44	.430		
		26.389	63			
	Second	6.449	19	.339	1.037	.443
		14.407	44	.327		
		20.856	63			
	Third	8.288	19	.436	.770	.727
		24.938	44	.567		

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713

	33.226	63			
Fourth	17.913	19	.943	1.202	.299
	34.510	44	.784		
	52.423	63			
Fifth	15.002	19	.790	1.453	.152
	23.912	44	.543		
	38.914	63			
Sixth	15.568	19	.819	.994	.486
	36.288	44	.825		
	51.856	63			
Complete Questionnaire	4.995	19	.263	1.330	.214
	8.695	44	.198		
	13.690	63			

DISCUSSION

This study aimed to investigate Mobile Learning adoption by language instructors at ELC in Taibah University, and to examine the effects of gender, age, qualification and experience variables on the adoption process. The results obtained from the questionnaire analysis were as follow:

1. Reached the general mean of all statement (male=3.76, female=3.50), indicated that the **usefulness** of Mobile Learning adoption by EFL male and female instructors was **"Frequently"**.
2. Reached the general mean of all statement (male=3.12, female=2.91) indicated that the ease of Mobile Learning use between male and female instructors was "Sometimes ".There were statistically significant differences at level of significance (0.05) between male and female in favor of male group. Using various features was easier for male than female. Males rarely face difficulties with hardware components of devices.
3. Reached the general mean of all statement (male=2, 50, female=3.43) indicated that male and female "rarely "adopted Mobile Learning in the teaching of language skills, but they "**sometimes**" used it to teach vocabulary and pronunciation**.**
4. Reached the general mean of all statement (male=3.38, female=3.23) indicated that male and female instructors used types of teaching practices" **Sometimes** in this domain. The most common types of teaching practices were: using mobile devices to inform students about course alerts, sending and receiving emails, and sending and receiving course files and documents, and sharing educational content with their students. This result explains that language instructors use mobile devices to contact with students more to teach language.

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713

5. Reached the General mean of all statement (male=3.05, female=2.81) and this indicated that the all features and apps of Mobile Learning in this domain were used " **Sometimes "** by EFL male and female instructors The most common features and apps used by language instructors were: What's app, text messaging, web browser apps, and apps facilitating learning English. This result supports the finding that language instructors used mobile devices mainly to keep in touch with their students.
6. There were statistically significant differences at level of significance (0.05) between EFL **male and female** instructors in favor of female regarding the challenges of Mobile Learning adoption. Adoption challenges were more serious obstacles that might hinder adoption in case of female instructors**.**
7. There were no statistically significant differences at level of significance (0.05) in all domains of the questionnaire between **male and female** instructors in the adoption of Mobile Learning ats ELC in Taibah University regarding to gender, age, qualification and experience variables.

CONCLUSION

The study results are in consistent with some previous studies such as Behera (2012) and Gorichanaz (2011) discussed the usefulness of using mobile devices in educational fields and how it could be used to contact with students. Goundar (2011), Miangah and Nezarat (2012), and Behera (2012) examined the mobile devices features and applications such as massaging service, e-mail, portability, touch screen …etc. which allowed learning activities and a high degree of user interactivity in addition Behera (2012) researched the easiness of mobile learning for instructors both male and female, whereas in this current study it favored the male group and the female group faced difficulties "sometimes" when using mobile devices as supported by Kukulska-Hulme and Traxler (2005) they argued that it had its own constraints as small screen, reading difficulty on such a screen, data storage and multimedia limitations. Gholami and Azarmi (2012) and Chinnery (2006) agreed that there are some limitations and barriers with mobile devices to be used as educational devices which are considered challenging in this field. In contrast, Kaur and Bhullar (2013) proved that Mobile learning improved language skills"it helped learners to improve their literacy and numeracy skills and to recognize their existing abilities", but Gorichanaz (2011) and Abbasi and Hashmi (2013) results were in consistent with the current study that proved that Mobile learning can be used to teach vocabulary. Concerning the types of teaching practices, Fritschi and Wolf (2012), Levy and Kennedy (2005), Norbrook and Scott (2003) and shunye (2014) emphasized that mobile technology improved teaching practices that enhance the learning process and it is used as a way to distribute contents\materials from teachers to students.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. English language instructors should participate in mobile applications workshops that cover the latest trends of teaching ESL/EFL .Well-qualified instructors have strong impact on language courses.
2. It is also important to train students to become good digital literates by helping them to develop self-independence in learning. Students should be provided with strategies for using these digital applications, and to know how they can monitor their progress and evaluate their achievements

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713

3. Language instructors need the support of ELC to implement this type of learning in delivering instruction and to make use of different applications available for language learning.

REFERENCES

[1] Abbasi, M., & Hashemi, M. (2013). The impact/s of using mobile phone on English language vocabulary retention. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences, 4*(3), 546-546.

[2] Abdul Wahab, S., Che Rose, R., & Osman, S. (2012). Defining the concepts of technology and technology transfer: A literature analysis. *International Business Research, 5*(1), 61-71.

[3] Amry, A. (2014). The impact of whatsapp mobile social learning on the achievement and attitudes of female students compared with face to face learning in the classroom. *European Scientific Journal, 10*(22), 133-133.

[4] Baran, E. (2014). A review of research on mobile learning in teacher education. Journal of Educational *Technology & Society, 17(*4), 17-32.

[5] Behera, S. (2014). E- and M-learning: A comparative study. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications, 4*(3), 65-78.

[6] Chinnery, G. (2006). Emerging technologies. Going to the mall: mobile assisted language learning. *Language Learning &Technology, 10*(1), 9-16.

[7] Dashtestani, R. (2013). Implementing mobile-assisted language learning (MALL) in an EFL context: Iranian EFL teachers' perspectives on challenges and affordances. *The Jaltcalljournal, 9*(2), 149–168.

[8] Drost, E. (n.d.). Validity and reliability in social science research. *Education Research and Perspectives, 38*(1), 106-114.

[9] El-Hussein, M., & Cronje, J. (2010). Defining mobile learning in the higher education landscape. *Educational Technology & Society, 13*(3), 12-21.

[10] Fozdar, B. I., & Kumar, L. S. (2007). Mobile learning and student retention. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 8*(2), 1-18.

[11] Fritschi, J., & Wolf, M. (2012). *Mobile learning for Teachers in North America, Exploring the Potential of Mobile Technologies to Support Teachers and Improve Practice.* UNESCO Working Paper Series on Mobile Learning. UNESCO. USA.

[12] Gholami, J., &Azarmi, G. (2012). An introduction to mobile assisted language learning. *International Journal of Managment, IT and Engineering, 2*(8), 1-9.

[13] Gorichanaz, T. (2011). Mobile learning: attitudes and effectiveness (p.12). Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/1476096/Mobile_Learning_Attitudes_and_Effectiveness

[14] Jou, Y. (2008). *The effect of email keypal project on the enhancement of reading and writing performance of elementary school-aged EFL students in Taiwan.* Published Dissertation: Alliant International University. San Diego.

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713

[15] Kalloo,V., & Mohan, P. (2012). Correlating questionnaire data with actual usage data in a mobile learning study for high school mathematics. EJEl: *Electronic Journal of E-Learning, 10*(1), 84.

[16] Kaur, A., & Bhullar, M. (2013). A new method of learning: M-Learning (Mobile Learning). *Proceedings of the World Congress on Engineering and Computer, Science, 1*, 23-25.

[17] Kumar, R. (2008). *Research Methodology.* New Delhi: APH Publishing Corporation.

[18] Levy, M., Kennedy, C. (2005). *Learning Italian via mobile SMS.* In A. Kukulska-Hulme& J. Traxler (eds.), *Mobile Learning*: A Handbook for Educators and Trainers, Abingdon: Routledge.

[19] Miangah, T., &Nezarat, A. (2012). Mobile-Assisted language learning. International *Journal of Distributed and Parallel Systems (IJDPS), 3*(1), 309 -319.

[20] Norbrook, H., & Scott, P. (2003). *Motivation in mobile modern foreign language learning.* In J. Attewell, G. Da Bormida, M. Sharples, & C. Savill-Smith (Eds.), *MLEARN 2003: Learning with Mobile Devices (pp.50-51).* London: Learning and Skills Development Agency.

[21] Öz, H. (2014). Teachers' and students' perceptions of interactive whiteboards in the English as a foreign language classroom. TOJET: *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology, 13*(3), 163-164.

[22] Ramachandran, L. (2009). *Health Education: A New Approach, 1E.* New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt.

[23] Shang, H. (2007). An exploratory study of e-mail application on FL writing performance. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 20*(1), 79 -96.

[24] Shunye, W. (2014). A new M-learning system for higher education. *Journal of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Research, 6*(7), 1301-1307.

[25] Stockwell, G. (2007). Vocabulary on the move: investigating an intelligent mobile phone-based vocabulary tutor. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 20*(4), 365-383.

[26] Tayebinik, M., & Puteh, M. (2012). Mobile learning to support teaching English as a second language. *Journal of Education and Practice, 3*(7), 56-62.

[27] Traxler, J. (2005). *Defining mobile learning. IADIS: International Conference Mobile Learning, 12*(2), 261-266). University of Wolverhampton. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/2810810/Defining_mobile_learning

ISSN: 2307-3721, e ISSN: 2307-3713
www.erint.savap.org.pk