2015 304-268 () ISSN 2070 - 3147

Smart Board

*

) (616)

(282)

The status and obstacles of using interactive smart board from the point view of tutors at UNRWA schools according to experience years and specialty at west Gaza region in Palestine

Abstract

This study aimed to investigate the current status, and drawbacks of using interactive smart board among UNRWA school tutors, and the effect of specialty, and experience years in the tutor's responses. A questionnaire was developed for collecting data, and consisted from three domains. The study population included all UNRWA school tutors in west Gaza region (616) in which interactive smart board is available. A random sample of

_ _ *

(282) tutor was selected. The results showed that the tutors using degree of interactive smart board was low while there were a high degree of awareness of its importance, and there were a high degree of obstacles. Also the results showed statistically significant differences between the tutors due to the specialist degree for the three domains. And there weren't statistically significant differences due to years of experience. The study recommendation was to hold training courses for tutors, encourage the tutors to use the interactive smart board, And to provide the schools with an adequate number of interactive smart board to provide an opportunity for the largest number of teachers to employ it in all detective.

(2012) "

.(24:2008)
Interactive Smart Board
(2009) Corcoran

Al(2012) (2012) Faki & Khamis(2014)
269

Dhindsa & Emran (2006) (2011) (2011)

**Bahadur (2013) Winzenried, et al (2010)

.

:

2015	

Smart Board								
	;			-1				
				-2				
				-3				
,	\			-4				
()		:					
		:		-1				
•				-2				
				-3				
			•	-4				
		(:)				
		:	-					
				-1				

			-2
	•		-3
	•		-4
·			-5
	(0.05)	:	-1
	(0.05)		-2
·	:	:	
	· :	:	: :
			-
		:	-
	: .2015-2014	:	-
		: :	-

: -

· ·

:

: .

:interactive smart board

· :

: -:

:

(LCD)

Video Net meeting conference
(LCD)

· : (167:2009) " "

(video projector)

(2010) "Campbell"

." : 1987

Smart (Marzano and Haystead ,2009) . 1991

.

2015					•
		.()		- - -
Swan) Al-Faki 8	& Khamis(2014)		"Campbell	(2010) et :	al.(2008
					-
					-
					-
	:			4	-
(2008)	Kennewell(2006)	; Schuc	k & Kearne (2011	ey (2007)) (200	09)

--

--

· -

--

:

Al-Faki & Swan et al.(2008) Khamis(2014)

Swan et al.(2008) · Al-Faki & Khamis(2014)

.

.

Al-Faki & :(2009) (2011) Khamis(2014)

-

. -.

)

.(..

-

: : :

: **-1** (2013)

(419) (371) (790)

(2012)

.

(2012)

(2011) .

(2011) .

(2011)

(2008)

(67)

. 279

(0.05)

· : -2

Al-Faki & Khamis(2014)

Dhindsa & . Emran (2006)

. Smith, et al. (2006)

(184)

Swan, et al. (2008)

2015

Winzenried, et al. (2010)

Bahadur (2013) .

(2006) Smith et al

(2010) Winzenried, and Dalgarno (2013)

(2013)Bahadur

· ·

: :

.(1992,187)

:

:

(616) (2014-2015)

(282) :

(%45)

:

(1)

27%	75	
33%	93	
40%	114	
100%	282	
34%	97	5
35%	98	5-10
31%	87	10
100%	282	

: :

: -1

:

. (16) : . (20) :

. (24) :

. (1,2,3,4,5) (

: -2

:

(50) :

.(2)

.(2)

0.01	0.451	1
0.05	0.360	2
0.01	0.405	3
0.01	0.514	4
0.05	0.357	5
0.01	0.386	6

0.01	0.715	7	
0.01	0.605	8	
0.01	0.455	9	
0.01	0.514	10	
0.01	0.610	11	
0.05	0.357	12	
0.01	0.386	13	
0.01	0.715	14	
0.05	0.357	15	
0.01	0.615	16	
0.01	0.718	1	
0.01	0.412	2	
0.01	0.386	3	
0.01	0.512	4	
0.01	0.617	5	
0.01	0.387	6	
0.01	0.381	7	
0.01	4.417	8	
0.01	0.428	9	
0.01	0.718	10	
0.01	0.422	11	
0.01	0.396	12	
0.01	0.522	13	
0.01	0.617	14	
0.01	0.387	15	
0.01	0.718	16	
0.01	0.638	17	
0.01	0.62	18	
0.01	0.456	19	
0.01	0.565	20	
0.01	0.453	1	
0.01	0.534	2	
0.01	0.415	3	
0.01	0.514	4	
0.01	0.411	5	

2015

0.05	0.320	6	
0.01	0.370	7	
0.01	0.623	8	
0.01	0.670	9	
0.01	0.555	10	
0.01	0.411	11	
0.05	0.320	12	
0.01	0.454	13	
0.01	0.43	14	
0.01	0.464	15	
0.01	0.417	16	
0.01	0.42	17	
0.01	0.516	18	
0.01	0.527	19	
0.05	0.338	20	
0.05	0.357	21	
0.01	0.387	22	
0.01	0.586	23	
0.01	0.654	24	
0.279	0.279=48		()
0.36	1=48	(0.01)	()
		·	(2)
			(2)

(3)

(3)

0.743	
0.812	
0.861	

(0.05 -0.01)

(3) (0.01) -3

.(4) (4)

0.782	
0.833	
0.92	
	(0.92)

(1) .

(SPSS)

(Alpha - Chronbach)

(One Way ANOVA) .Scheffe' Test

:()

: :

:(5) **(5)**

*				%		%		%		%		%		
	2	0.86	3.10	1.4	4	25.2	71	37.6	106	33.0	93	2.1	6	1
	10	0.90	2.05	33.7	95	31.6	89	29.4	83	4.6	13	0.0	0	2
	6	0.87	2.77	3.2	9	39.4	111	37.6	106	16.3	46	2.5	7	3
	11	0.85	2.01	33.7	95	35.1	99	27.7	78	2.8	8	0.0	0	4
	9	0.88	2.09	30.9	87	34.4	97	29.8	84	4.3	12	0.0	0	5
	1	1.12	3.39	11.7	33	5.7	16	25.9	73	45.7	129	9.9	28	6
	7	1.08	2.30	35.1	99	13.1	37	40.8	115	9.2	26	1.4	4	7
	13	0.74	1.48	69.9	197	14.5	41	15.2	43	0.0	0	0.0	0	8
	12	1.01	1.98	51.1	144	5.3	15	41.8	118	1.1	3	0.7	2	9
	14	0.73	1.47	70.6	199	14.5	41	14.5	41	0.0	0	0.0	0	10
	4	0.79	2.93	1.1	3	32.3	91	44.0	124	20.6	58	1.1	3	11
	5	0.94	2.88	5.7	16	32.3	91	37.9	107	19.5	55	3.5	10	12
	3	0.92	3.05	1.4	4	30.5	86	40.4	114	19.9	56	6.7	19	13
	16	0.60	1.31	81.6	230	10.3	29	8.2	23	0.0	0	0.0	0	14
	8	1.02	2.15	40.4	114	14.9	42	39.4	111	3.2	9	1.1	3	15
_	15	0.68	1.44	72.7	205	16.0	45	11.3	32	0.0	0	0.0	0	16
	-	0.4	2.25											

(5)

(3.39-2.77) .(67.8%-55.4%) (2,4,5,7,9,15) .(2.15-1.98). (8,10,14,16) (43%-39.6%) .(17.6%-26.2%) (1,48-1.31)((6)) .(3.39) (14) ((1.31)(2.25) 45%

· ":

.(6)

(6)

			%		%		%		%		%		
4	0.62	4.46	0.0	0	0.0	0	7.1	20	39.0	110	52.5	148	1
1	0.42	4.77	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.4	1	21.3	60	77.0	217	2
14	0.81	3.91	0.7	2	3.9	11	21.6	61	49.6	140	23.0	65	3
15	0.91	3.78	0.7	2	7.1	20	28.7	81	39.0	110	23.8	67	4
20	1.27	3.01	19.1	54	11.0	31	32.3	91	24.5	69	12.1	34	5
7	0.83	4.13	0.7	2	3.5	10	14.5	41	45.0	127	34.8	98	6
18	1.33	3.10	20.2	57	9.9	28	26.2	74	27.7	78	14.9	42	7
17	1.35	3.12	20.2	57	9.2	26	27.7	78	24.8	70	16.7	47	8
9	0.84	4.10	0.7	2	3.9	11	16.0	45	45.4	128	32.6	92	9
6	0.82	4.17	0.7	2	2.8	8	14.5	41	43.6	123	36.9	104	10
19	1.27	3.08	19.9	56	6.4	18	35.5	100	25.2	71	11.7	33	11
8	0.86	4.14	0.7	2	3.9	11	16.3	46	41.5	117	36.2	102	12
5	0.83	4.20	0.4	1	3.9	11	14.2	40	41.1	116	39.4	111	13
16	1.38	3.19	20.2	57	9.2	26	25.2	71	26.2	74	17.7	50	14
11	0.85	3.98	0.7	2	3.9	11	23.8	67	43.3	122	27.3	77	15
2	0.58	4.61	0.0	0	0.0	0	4.6	13	33.3	94	60.6	171	16
10	0.81	4.04	0.4	1	3.2	9	21.3	60	45.7	129	28.0	79	17
12	0.83	3.96	0.7	2	4.6	13	21.6	61	48.2	136	23.8	67	18
13	0.84	3.92	0.7	2	3.2	9	29.4	83	41.5	117	24.1	68	19
3	0.62	4.58	0.0	0	0.0	0	7.1	20	33.3	94	58.2	164	20
1	0.48	3.9											

(6)

(3.9)

(5 ,7 ,8 ,11 ,14)

1 ,4 ,3 ,6, 9,10 ,12) (4.2-3.78) (,1

(,13 ,15 ,17 ,18 ,19

.(3.19-2.77)

....
(2,16,20)
): (2) .(4.77-4.58)
(
: (14) (4.58)
(
. (3.19)
Bahadur (2010) Winzenried, and Dalgarno

(2013)

•

:

.(7)

			%		%		%		%		%		
1	0.55	4.71	0.0	0	0.4	0	3.9	11	17.4	49	77.3	218	1
20	0.94	3.78	2.1	6	6.0	11	25.2	71	42.6	120	23.4	66	2
19	0.94	3.82	3.2	9	4.6	14	22.0	62	46.1	130	23.0	65	3
3	0.66	4.57	0.0	0	2.1	1	3.2	9	29.1	82	64.5	182	4
23	1.16	3.21	9.6	27	17.4	13	27.7	78	31.9	90	12.8	36	5
7	1.01	4.21	1.4	4	8.2	12	10.3	29	27.7	78	51.4	145	6
9	0.86	4.12	0.7	2	4.6	9	13.8	39	44.3	125	35.8	101	7
4	0.68	4.55	0.0	0	2.1	1	4.6	13	29.4	83	62.8	177	8
18	0.88	3.89	0.7	2	7.4	11	19.5	55	47.5	134	23.8	67	9
8	1.38	4.18	0.7	2	5.3	11	14.5	41	42.2	119	35.5	100	10
10	0.87	4.11	0.7	2	3.9	14	17.7	50	40.4	114	36.2	102	11
16	0.83	3.97	0.7	2	5.7	17	16.7	47	51.8	146	24.1	68	12
5	0.74	4.54	0.0	0	2.5	0	7.1	20	27.0	76	62.4	176	13
6	0.82	4.53	0.0	0	5.3	6	5.3	15	22.3	63	66.0	186	14
2	0.80	4.58	0.0	0	5.3	1	3.5	10	22.3	63	67.4	190	15
14	0.99	4.06	1.8	5	7.1	9	16.3	46	36.5	103	37.2	105	16
11	1.00	4.09	1.8	5	7.1	6	16.0	45	33.7	95	40.4	114	17
15	0.94	3.99	1.4	4	7.4	12	17.0	48	42.9	121	30.1	85	18
22	1.14	3.27	9.9	28	13.8	29	33.7	95	28.7	81	12.8	36	19
12	0.97	4.07	1.8	5	6.0	10	18.1	51	36.5	103	36.5	103	20
13	1.05	4.06	1.4	4	7.8	13	23.0	65	24.5	69	41.8	118	21

. . . .

17	0.96	3.91	1.8	5							25.9		22
24	1.26	2.55	26.6	75	31.2	66	18.8	53	14.5	41	8.9	25	23
21	0.94	3.28	3.9	11	29.1	82	34.8	98	35.8	101	5.3	15	24
	0.41	3.97											

(7)

(0.41)(3.97)(5 ,19 ,23 ,24) 2 ,3 ,6 ,7 ,9 ,10 ,11 ,12 ,16) (2.55-3.28)(3.78-4.21).(,17 ,18 ,20 ,21 ,22 (1,4,8,13,14,15)(4.55-4.71)): (1) .(4.71)) : (23)(2.55)(Bahadur (2010) Winzenried, and Dalgarno

Al-Faki & Khamis(2014)

(2013)

(2013)

.

":

(0.05)

One Way ."

ANOVA
.(8)

(8)

		43.62	75	
0.001*	143.45	33.54	93	
		33.04	114	
		87.36	75	
0.001*	30.66	76.64	93	
		77.57	114	
		86.17	75	
0.001*	65.61	99.25	93	
		98.21	114	

0.01 *

(8)

••••

(0.01) (143.45) ()
) (30.66) () ()
(0.01) (36.89) () ()

•

.

.(9) (9)

*10.59	*10.07	ı	43.62	
0.51	-	-	33.54	
-	-	-	33.03	
*9.78	*10.71	-	87.36	
0.93	-	-	76.64	
-	-	-	77.57	
12.04*	13.08*	-	86.16	
	-		98.21	
_	1.03		99.25	

(8.1) =0.01 (6.4) = 0.05 (9)

(0.01) (10.07)

(0.01) (10.59)

2015

(0.51)

()

((0.01) (10.71)

(0.93)

. (

(0.01) (9.78)

(0.01) (13.08)

(0.01) (12.04)

(1.03)

(0.05)

One ."

Way ANOVA

.(10)

(10)

		36.01	86	5		
0.937	0.065	35.83	112	5-10		
		36.16	84	10		
	1.65	79.69	86	5		
0.192		1.65	81.14	112	5-10	
		78.35	84	10		
		95	86	5		
0.07	2.63	94.15	112	5-10		
		97.33	84	10		

(10)

(3-1) (0.05) (0.065) () (0.05) (1.65) () (2.63) ()

.

: -.

--

: 2011 .**1**

. 2012 .**2**

•			2015
.3	/ 2012	23 .	.183-154
.4	2011		
.5	2008	.edu.eg/jupd/ar/default.asp:	http://udc.mans.
.6	2010	•	
.7	.3 23 2011	·	
.8	2013)	.(2) (
.9		,	2008
.10).	2009 .(·	
.11	.,	20	

. . . .

:

- **1.** Al-Faki, I., Khamis, A. 2014: Difficulties Facing Teachers in Using Interactive Whiteboards in Their Classes, American International Journal of Social Science 3(2),136-158.
- **2.** Bahadur,G.2013: Interactive whiteboard for primary schools in Mauritius: An effective tool or just another trend? International Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication Technology (IJEDICT), (9) 1, 19-35
- **3.** Campbell, C. 2010: Interactive whiteboards and the first year experience: Integrating IWBs into pre-service teacher education, Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 35(6), 67–75.
- **4.** Corcoran, E. 2009: Getting to the Top of the class, Forbes, 40-41.
- **5.** Dhindsa H. S.and Emran S. H. 2006: Use of the interactive whiteboard in constructivist teaching for higher student achievement, Proceedings of the Second Annual Conference for the Middle East Teachers of Science, Mathematics, and Computing, Abu Dhabi, UAE. 175-188
- 6. Kennewell, S. 2006: Reflections on the interactive whiteboard phenomenon: A synthesis of research from the UK, Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education Conference, 26-30 November, Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved February 28, 2011 from http://www.aare.edu.au/06pap/ken06138.pdf
- **7.** Schuck, S. and Kearney M. 2007: Exploring pedagogy with interactive white boards: A case study of six schools. Retrieved December 19, 2010 fromhttp://www.edev.uts.edu.au/teachered/research/iwbproject/pdfs/iwbreportweb.pdf
- **8.** Smith, F. Hardman, F. and Higgins S. 2006: The impact of interactive whiteboards on teacher-pupil interaction in the national literacy and numeracy strategies, British Educational Research Journal, 32(3), 443-457.
- **9.** Swan K. Schenker, J. and Kratcoski, A. 2008: The effects of the use of interactive whiteboards on student achievement, In Luca J. and Weippl E. (Eds.). 2008: Proceedings of World Conference on Educational Multimedia, Hypermedia and Telecommunications Chesapeake, VA: AACE.
- **10.** Winzenried, A., Dalgarno, B. and Tinkler, J. 2010: The interactive whiteboard: A transitional technology supporting diverse teaching practices, Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 26(4), 534-552.

(1) 1 Smart board :) -1 -1 (-2 -3 10 -3 🛮 10-5 -2 🗍 5 -2 -1 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 1 2 3

			4
			5
			6
			7
			8
			9
			1
			0
			1
			1
			1
			1
			1
			1
		<u>:</u>	
			1
		j	ı
			2
			3
			4
			5
			5
			6
			7
			,
			8

			9
			10
			11
			12
			13
			14
			15
			16
			17
			18
			19
		,	20
		:	
			1
			2
			3
			4
		·	5
			6

_			
			7
			8
			9
			10
			11
			12
			13
			14
			15
			16
			17
			18
			19
			20
			21
			22
			23
			24

 	 	 • •