An Assessment of Zimbabwe Secondary School Teachers' Attitudes towards the Use of Smart Phones in the Classroom: A Case of Midlands Province, Zimbabwe

Dhliwayo Alice[1] & Muchemwa Stella[2]

[1]Languages and Communication Department, Solusi University, Zimbabwe
[2]Languages and Communication Department, Solusi University, Zimbabwe
Correspondence: Muchemwa Stella, Solusi University, Zimbabwe. E-mail: muchemwas@solusi.ac.zw

Received: May 15, 2017 Accepted: August 3, 2017 Online Published: September 1, 2017

doi: 10.23918/ijsses.v4i1p12

Abstract: While technology has been embraced by most of the people, use of smart phones in the classroom has been received with mixed feelings. Some say it enhances learning while others complain that it disturbs instruction. This research wanted to find out the stance of secondary school teachers on this issue in Zimbabwe. A sample of 50 randomly selected teachers from 10 randomly selected secondary schools in Gweru District, Midlands Province in Zimbabwe was used. Data from self-constructed questionnaires were analyzed by SPSS mainly on descriptive statistics and correlation. Findings showed that teachers possess smart phones which they use for researching and other instructional purposes with moderate expertise. Teachers consider smart phones as hand-held computers that can enhance learning for they have high engagement potential and they extend classroom walls allowing students to engage with the global village. A correlation computation showed that there is a significant relationship between perceived problems of smart phones and smart phones integration factors. However, respondents felt that smart phones can cause lower levels of attention during lessons and allows cheating and copying during exams. They also concurred that teachers' technical skills lag behind those of digital native students. Thus, they foresaw instructional problems on the part of the teachers on the use of smart phones in the classroom and were against their use. They doubted if the use of smart phones can improve the pass rate and whether they wanted their students to bring cell phones and use them during lessons for they perceived problems in controlling students using them. They also doubted if schools in Zimbabwe would ever benefit if students are allowed to use their phones in class. The study concluded that teachers in Zimbabwe are not yet prepared to have students use smart phone in the classroom and recommended for further research on the potential benefits of using smart phones in the classroom.

Key Terms: Smart Phones, Technology, Student Engagement

1. Introduction

Technology, especially in the form of smart phones, is not something that secondary schools can wish away. Degraff (2014) explained that the teenagers are digital natives whose activities and understanding of the world revolves around technology. Kowalsiki (2016) defined a smartphone as a cell (or mobile) phone that can perform a host of functions which include search for information on the Internet. He expounded that in the United States, 73 percent of teens either own or have access to a phone according

to 2015 survey by the Pew Research Center in Washington D.C. Close to 90 per cent of secondary school students have smart phones (CBC News, 2015).

On the same note, Kowalsiki (2016) said that **s**mart phones, tablets and other devices can be very handy at school, as the saying goes, *there's an app for that*. Mobile devices make it easy for students to type and organize their notes while calculator apps can help with Mathematics problems. At the same time, the mobile devices can also replace the heavy, paper textbooks. CBC News (2015) also propounded that research suggests that mobile devices can be a boon to educators if managed properly.

Smart phones are mini- supercomputers with a potential for learning (Barnwell, 2016). This potential can be tapped in the classroom by the teacher for pedagogical purposes. It has also been argued that, smart phones with their numerous technological advantages can easily shrink achievement gaps in learners. This is said to be especially true with Mathematics and Literacy (Common Sense Media, 2010). Given the general view that a greater number of students especially in urban schools own smart phones, this can be a huge equalizer, that is, students will be using the same device and getting the same advantages (Beland & Murphy, 2016).

Children of all age groups generally love phones; CBC News (2015) asserted that the mere presence of a phone has the effect of arresting students' attention. This characteristic can be exploited by teachers and used to impart concepts instead of allowing the phone to play a mere distractive role in the classroom. Phones in the classroom can be exciting. Literature has it that some teachers have experimented with them connecting students to area experts through social media, recording lessons, photographing notes, using email for out of classroom tasks and sometimes peer-editing on the cloud based word processing with positive results (Barnwell, 2016).

Given the fact that smart phones have become the center of life, socially and economically, it can be argued that it would be amiss of schools to have nothing to do with them. School educates for life and banning phones from schools would not help them to produce whole beings (Lianguyue, 2014). Lei (2010) elaborated that phones can improve education in a number of ways, for instance, they can extend the classroom walls by accessing information on concepts learnt outside school; their use can improve fluency in reading where students record themselves as they practice and monitor own progress (Common Sense Media, 2016) and, smart phones can be used in personalized learning as they adapt easily to individual learners' needs (An & Reigeluth, 2011).

Since the school is where children spend most of their time from as early as four years old, it should therefore equip learners with digital literacy where they acquire skills to use phones in responsible, smart and effective ways (Common Sense Media, 2016). Such exposure may help learners come up with innovative ways of using their smart phones for learning, communication and creativity. This can bring about new creative and educational opportunities for learners which could be seriously hindered by banning them totally from schools (Degraff, 2014). This is important because phones are not likely to go away; banning them may just give a wider room for a negative impact as students tend to smuggle them and play sly games against authority on them (An &Reigeluth, 2011).

However, it's not *all roses* when we consider smart phones in the classroom. The main disadvantage that is associated with their use in the classroom is students with low literacy skills may not concentrate on the beneficial uses. Barnwell (2016) also supported this idea. Due to the problems associated with the use of smart phones in the classroom, some ministry of education and school districts are trying to fight the use. The Toronto District School Board, Canada's largest, banned cellphone use in class from 2007 to 2011 and New York City had a cellphone-in-school ban for years (CBC News, 2015). This is also the situation in Zimbabwe; smart phones are not allowed in the classrooms by law.

However, the debate on whether to have smart phone in the classroom or not still continues giving responsible decision markers a hard time. Dokora (2015) quoted in the Herald, 7 February (2015) asserted that while it is true that the observable behavior of teenagers is that they spend endless hours on the phone and that they (phones) have become an extension of their bodies, it is also true that smart phones would go a long way in making integration of technology and pedagogy a reality. This is why some countries ban their use and eventually lift the ban as well.

In Toronto, Canada, the Karsenti's study (associate with the reintroduction of smart phones) found positive results on the re-introduction of phones in the classroom; the board-wide dropout rate has fallen from nearly 40 per cent to under 20 per cent; the school district's ranking among provincial boards has shot up and students have actually become more attentive and motivated as they can research and collaborate online (CBC News, 2015). In this case of Toronto, the risks of the use of smart phones in the classroom are handled through good classroom management, clear lessons expectations and rules for the students designed to be engaging by incorporating mobile devices. Toronto therefore reintroduced the use of the smart phone in the classroom with success.

Unlike in Toronto, Zimbabwe is still on the severe ban of the use of smart phones in the classroom. The ban is severe in the sense that even the teachers are not allowed to use the smart phones during lessons. This is especially true in most public school and Mission schools, (Herald, 2015). In 2015 when the present minister of education, Honorable Dokora hinted on allowing smart phones in the classroom, both parents and teachers opposed him and some ministers showed outrage at the minister's statements (New Zimbabwe Newspaper, 2015). The common argument against smart phones by both teachers and parents in Zimbabwe is that they distract teacher-student attention in the classroom and can hinder quality output.

Kahari, (2013) argued that technology is today's reality, it is therefore logical that schools should rethink the ban from the 21st century classroom. Teachers have to be trained on how to teach their students to responsibly use their smart phones for the classroom (Karsenti, 2015). The Zimbabwean classroom can be understood by tracing the education system in Zimbabwe; Zimbabwe gained her independence from British colonial rule in 1980 and immediately declared education a basic human right (Mapoko, 2013). This was actuated by the colonial pain of a bottle-necking system of education which the colonialist availed for Blacks in the country. The new government changed the constitution making primary and secondary education free and compulsory (UNESCO, 2015).

Zimbabwe developed an education system such that after seven years of primary education, which has recently been upgraded to nine, a child graduates to secondary school where s\he spend four years before sitting for a public examination called the Ordinary level. If the child passes with five Ordinary Level subjects, which should include English, he /she proceeds to Advanced level. This is a further two years study also concluded by a national examination whose pass warrants an entry into tertiary education including the university (UNICEF, Zimbabwe 2015). This study focuses on the secondary education level in Zimbabwe assessing the attitudes of teachers towards the use of smart phones in the classroom.

Related Literature

What Barnwell (2016) said concerning the limited research in America on the use of smart phones by school student is also true for Zimbabwe. Related researches have been therefore taken worldwide where some studies have been done on the impact of smart phones on students' academic learning especially in the developed world. Findings are both for and against the use of smart phones by students. Some of such studies have been given below.

There have been several researches carried out whose results showed that phones, when properly used in the classroom, enhance learning. In North Carolina, research was carried out to ascertain the effect of using phones on Algebra studies, (Common Sense Media, 2016). The results showed that those who used smart phones to learn the concepts scored 25% better than those on whom traditional methods were used.

In the United Kingdom, research findings showed that students who did a lot of text messaging developed phonological appreciation; also, those who got phones at younger ages developed better in reading and identifying speech sound patterns (Mobile Metrics Report, 2010). Stanford University's 2014 study on the high school students looked into the impact of technology in the students' learning in the United States. The study concludes that providing "one-to-one access" to devices in school (students don't have to share) provides the most benefit. The argument was that individual phones in the classroom, when properly monitored, can bring about huge payoffs in terms of retention of the concepts that the learners engage on.

In the same country, Barnwell (2016) studied the perceptions of people on the use of smart phones at high school in the classroom; he found that, the argument by those who support the use are that smart phones have a wealth of information that it can provide and has the potential to shrink academic achievement gaps among students; the phone could be a great equalizer for it can give students from different socio-economic backgrounds the same device with the same advantages as well as allowing students to synthesize information and stay focused on a lesson or a discussion.

Research has shown that most teachers in schools today lack knowledge about how to integrate the smart phone into instruction that is learner centered (An & Reigeluth, 2011). This does not take away the fact that today's learners are growing up in a digital world and look to teachers to give them pre-requisite skills to access and benefit from that world (Common Sense Media, 2016). On the other hand, research has also shown that smart phones can be a serious drawback to learning if children are not properly monitored (Kahari, 2013). The smart phone has been labeled a distracter in the classroom as most

learners would ignore its academic potential for social activities and games (Barnwell, 2016). Research also shows that in some cases, smart phones have been seen to have a negative impact on students' academic achievement as most teens use phones more for entertainment than for learning (Stanford University Study, 2014).

Looking at the literature reviewed above, it can be concluded that the changes that the mobile phones are bringing into students' lives can no longer be ignored; changes in the way they think and learn, for instance; games are now on the mobile, and not in the street, counting, messaging and general communication have taken new forms (Degraff, 2014). The presence of digital devices in the classroom , whether legally or otherwise means ignoring their presence would impact negatively on the whole learning process while acknowledging them needs a knowledgeable base from the digital immigrant teacher (AACTE, 2011).

2. Related Theory

Technology use in the classroom is supported by several theories one of which is called Socially-shared Cognition. It states that learners are participants in a cognition sharing community in which cognition sharing happens between participants, tools and artifacts being used and the social institutions where learning is occurring (Doak, 2009). It is a requirement for learners to actively participate if cognition is to occur. According to this theory, there is distribution of cognition; learners experience the learning process together at the same time dividing and distributing the learnt material amongst themselves in the learning community (Bell& Winn, 2000 in Doak, 2009).

When considering the current study, the essence of sharing becomes relevant because secondary school students do not experience in the exact way any given learning situation. Thus cognition becomes socially distributed both among artifacts and people and situated in space and time (Gilbert &Boulte, 2012). This distribution is in an assembly that entails active participation of all the involved parties. The part of technology in this theory is to make possible the sharing of cognition in the learning community. In explaining the part of technology according to this theory, Shannon (u.d) in Doak (2009) gave an example of using computer games to learn a new skill, where the games are central to the learning community. The children make use of the games to make a belief system. The use of the socially-shared cognition in education helps in the preparation of learners for relevance in the global village. This theory strongly alludes to the fact that learning takes place in a 'community' of practice and learning (Dakers, 2005) implying active participation of those involved using artifact and tools, thus smart phones. Technology in general and smart phones in particular, thus plays an important role in assisting the learning of new skills at the same time, making learning easier for students in the classroom.

3. Statement of the Problem

Research has it that true education that really prepares students for life in the global village has to incorporate technology (Wainwright, 2014). This technology can easily be provided by smart phones; a great number of students have smart phones which are hand-held computers, more readily compliant with Wi-Fi connectivity (CBC News, 2015).However, research has also cited great disadvantages of

smart phones ((Kahari, 2013) and Zimbabwe seems to have reacted to these disadvantages by making the use of smart phones a taboo in schools for they are considered to be disruptive in the classroom learning environment. This research therefore wanted to assess the attitudes of Zimbabwean teachers towards the use of smart phones in the classroom in the Midlands Province.

4. Research Questions

1. How are teachers associated with smart phones?
2. Which are the smart phone integrating factors?
3. What is the attitude of teachers towards smart phone use by students in the classroom?
4. What are the teachers' perceived problems on the use of smart phones in the classroom?

5. Hypotheses

1. There is no significant relationship between smart phones integration factors and teacher perceptions on smart phones in the classroom.
2. There is no significant relationship between smart phones integration factors and perceived problems of smart phones.

6. Methodology

6.1 Research Design

This study used a case study research design narrowing down the geographical area of the study to Gweru District, in Midlands Province, Zimbabwe so that detailed information could be collected. A quantitative research method was also employed in this study.

6.2 Population of the Study

The population comprises all the 37 secondary school teachers in Gweru District, Midlands Province, Zimbabwe. This was the targeted population which has characteristics and experiences relevant to the research.

6.3 Sampling and Sample of the Study

The researchers used the random sampling. Ten schools were randomly selected from the 37 total schools in the district and five teachers from these schools were also randomly selected to constitute the sample for the study making a total of 50 respondents.

6.4 Research Instruments

Self-constructed questionnaires were used for data collection so that as much of the data as possible could be collected for the study.

6.5 Data Collection Procedure

The researchers sent the questionnaires to the respondents some in persons and others through reliable persons since some of the schools were far away from the researchers' residency. All the 50 questionnaires were retrieved.

6.6 Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics was mainly used to analyze the collected data. Pearson's Product Moment Correlation was used to find out if there was any significant correlation between smart phones integration factors and perceived problems of smart phones as well as between smart phones integration factors and teacher perceptions of smart phones in the classroom.

7. Research Findings

The respondents were evenly distributed accord to gender, that is, 50% male and another 48% females as shown on the table below.

Table 1: Respondents distribution according to gender

Gender of Respondents

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	MALE	25	50.0	51.0	51.0
	FEMALE	24	48.0	49.0	100.0
	Total	49	98.0	100.0	
Missing	System	1	2.0		
Total		50	100.0		

In terms of length of service, the table below shows that all the respondents have been in the teaching service for at most 5years. This means that they were relatively new in their career. However, their responses can still be considered valid.

Table 2: Respondents distribution according to length of service

Length of Service

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	50	100.0	100.0	100.0

When it comes to general knowledge about smart phones, the respondents showed that the majority of them possessed smart phones as indicated by a very high mean of 4.42. Most of them used the smart phones for researching purposes, mean 4.18. They also highly use the smart phone as a dictionary and a

calculator, mean 4.16. The low standard deviations of 1.063 and 1.131, respectively, show homogeneity in response as shown on Table 3 below.

A sizable number of respondents also used the smart phones as sources of teaching information as indicated by a moderately high mean of 3.58. It can be argued that a reasonable number of respondents have expertise to use a smart phone as teaching and learning aid as shown by a mean of 3.46.

Table 3: General Knowledge of Smart Phone

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
I have a smart phone	48	1	5	4.42	1.217
I use my phone to research on internet	50	1	5	4.18	1.063
I use my phone as a dictionary and calculator sometimes	50	1	5	4.16	1.131
I download material to use for my lessons on my phone	50	1	5	3.58	1.386
I rate myself as an expert on the use of smart phones as teaching and learning aids	50	1	5	3.46	1.313
Valid N (listwise)	48				

Most of the respondents agreed that phones are hand-held computers that can enhance teaching and learning as shown by a high mean of 4.12 on the table below. This means that smart phones are viewed as useful in the teaching-learning process and can be beneficial when properly managed. These findings are similar to those by Stanford University in 2014 on high school students which concluded that use of smart phones provides the most benefit to students. Finding by Barnwell (2016) that the use of smart phones can shrink academic achievement gaps among students also supports the findings above. Also, a moderately high number of responses concurred that phones help from a lot of photocopying and handout preparations for classroom lessons, mean 3, 46. On the same note, respondents moderately agreed that phones help students with research in group work during lessons with a mean of 3.36 an indicator that students can benefit a lot in the classroom using smart phones. These findings tally those in the United Kingdom whose results showed student academic improvement on those who used smart phones in the classroom (Mobile Metrics Report, 2010).

The fact that schools cannot provide adequate computers for students means that smart phones can come in handy as shown by a moderately high mean of 3.60.

Table 4: Smart Phones Integration Factors

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Phones are hand-held computers that can enhance teaching and learning	50	1	5	4.12	1.062
Phones help from a lot of photocopying and handout preparations for classroom lessons	50	1	5	3.46	1.216
Phones help students with research in group work during lessons	50	1	5	3.36	1.225
Examples during lessons can be studied in time, ie looking at what is current locally and elsewhere	50	1	5	3.56	1.198
*Schools cannot provide adequate computers for students, mobiles can come in handy	50	1	5	3.60	1.325
Valid N (listwise)	50				

The perceptions of teachers on the use of smart phones seemed to be similar: they however, supported the notion that phones are disruptive to lessons in a classroom and that the phones impact negatively on pupils' behavior in the classroom, mean 2.10 and 2.14, respectively. Respondent also disagreed with the perception that phones in the classroom hinder teaching and learning, mean 2.02.

Instead, they agreed that smart phones have higher engagement potential than text books in the classroom and phones extend classroom walls allowing students to engage with the global village mean 3. 64 and 4.12, respectively, as shown on the table below. Findings concur with those in North Carolina research, whose findings showed that those who used smart phones to learn the concepts scored 25% better than those on whom traditional methods were used (Common Sense Media, 2016). Socially-shared Cognition Theory Doak (2009) also supports the findings above for smart phones allow students interaction and information sharing.

However, respondents felt that smart phones can cause lower levels of attention during lessons which can result in poor performance and low pass rates, mean 3.86. This is true especially when teacher monitoring is low and when there are no clear guidelines, rules and regulations to the use of smart phones in the classroom. It can also be a challenge especially with low performing classes. Kahari (2013) had similar findings in Zimbabwe while Barnwell (2016) argued that a smart phone has been

labeled a distracter in the classroom as most learners would ignore its academic potential for social activities and games. Stanford University Study (2014) also found that in some cases, smart phones have been seen to have a negative impact on students' academic achievement as most teens use phones more for entertainment than for learning.

Table 5: Teacher Perceptions of Smart Phones in the Classroom

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
*Phones are disruptive to lessons in a classroom	49	1	5	2.10	1.262
*Phones impact negatively on pupils' behavior in the classroom	50	1	5	2.14	1.294
*Phones cause lower levels of attention during lessons which result in poor performance and low pass rates	49	1	5	3.86	1.307
*Given a choice between studying and social media, students will tend to choose social media	49	1	5	2.04	1.274
*Phones in the classroom hinder teaching and learning	50	1	5	2.02	1.134
Phones have high engagement potential than text books	50	1	5	3.64	1.208
Phones extend classroom walls, engages with the global village	49	1	5	4.12	1.053
Valid N (listwise)	46				

Respondents valued the smart phones as technological tools that can be used in the classroom to enhance learning. To this effect, they had very limited perceived problems associate with their use in the classroom. They could not believe that instant entertainment on phones is too tempting for students and impacts negatively on learning, mean 1.82, neither would they agree to the fact that phones have ready answers, students would just look up the answers instead of learning how to work it out, mean 2.00. They never perceived controlling students' use of smart phones as time consuming, mean 2.04.

However, they agreed that phones have more potential for cheating and copying in tests and examinations, mean 4.30 and they also concurred that teachers' technical skills lag behind those of digital native students, mean 3.8. They therefore foresaw instructional problems on the part of the teachers on the use of smart phones in the classroom. This finding tallies with that by An and Reigeluth (2011) who realized that most teachers in schools today lack knowledge about how to integrate the smart phone into instruction that is learner centered.

Despite foreseeing few problems associated with the use of smart phones in the classroom, the respondents were against the use of smart phones in the classroom, mean 1.394 and they doubted if the use of smart phones can improve the pass rate, mean 2.84. Respondents were indifferent on whether they

want their students to bring cell phones in class and use them during lessons, mean 2.58 for they perceived problems in controlling students if they are allowed to bring phones to class as shown on the table below. They therefore doubted if schools in Zimbabwe would ever benefit if students are allowed to use their phones in class, mean 3.02.

Table 6: Perceived Problems of Smart Phones

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
*Instant entertainment on phones is too tempting for students and impacts negatively on learning	49	1	5	1.82	1.269
*Phones have ready answers, students would just look up the answers instead of learning how to work it out	50	1	5	2.00	1.161
Teachers' technical skills lag behind those of the digital native students	49	1	5	3.80	1.099
*Difficult to manage inappropriate materials	50	1	5	3.98	1.097
*phones have more potential for cheating and copying in tests and examinations	50	1	5	4.30	.931
*Time consuming extra control of students which eats into lesson time	50	1	5	2.04	1.106
Schools in Zimbabwe would benefit if students are allowed to use their phones in class	50	1	5	3.02	1.270
Phones will help my school improve its pass rate	50	1	5	2.84	1.251
I want my students to bring cell phones in my class and use them as they learn my subject	50	1	5	2.58	1.326
I don't think I will have any problems controlling my students if they are allowed to bring phones to my class	50	1	5	2.72	1.356
I see phones as an essential tool in teaching and learning in the classroom	50	1	5	2.98	1.378
I believe that allowing students to bring their phones to class would save my school money for buying computers for use by students	50	1	5	2.98	1.378
I believe as a country we should allow cell phone use by students in the classroom	50	1	5	2.34	1.394
Valid N (listwise)	48				

A correlation computation between perceived problems of smart phones and smart phones integration factors was carried out; the results are shown on Table 7. A correlation of .432 indicates that the relationship is direct and moderate. The Null hypothesis is thus rejected since there is a significant correlation between perceived problems of smart phones and smart phones integration factors.

Table 7: Correlation Computation between Perceived Problems of Smart Phones and Smart Phones Integration Factors

Correlations

		Perceived problems of smart phones	Smart phones Integration Factors
Perceived problems of smart phones	Pearson Correlation	1	.432**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.002
	N	50	50
Smart phones Integration Factors	Pearson Correlation	.432**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	
	N	50	50

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Another correlation computation between smart phones integration factors and teacher perceptions of smart phones in the classroom was also done. A correlation of .201 was found, however it was not statistically significant. The null hypothesis is thus accepted because there is no significant correlation between smart phones integration factors and teacher perceptions of smart phones in the classroom.

Table 8: Correlation Computation between Smart Phones Integration Factors and Teacher Perceptions of Smart Phones in the Classroom

Correlations

		Smart phones Integration Factors	Teacher perceptions of smart phones in the classroom
Smart phones Integration Factors	Pearson Correlation	1	.201
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.161
	N	50	50
Teacher perceptions of smart phones in the classroom	Pearson Correlation	.201	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.161	
	N	50	50

8. Conclusion

The study concluded that teachers possess smart phones which they use for researching and other instructional purposes. A reasonable number of the teachers have expertise on using smart phones as teaching and learning aids. Respondents agreed that smart phones are hand-held computers that can enhance teaching and learning for they have higher engagement potential than text books and they extend classroom walls allowing students to engage with the global village. There is also a significant correlation between perceived problems of smart phones and smart phones integration factors.

However, the respondents felt that smart phones can cause lower levels of attention during lessons and have potential for cheating and copying during examinations. They also concurred that teachers' technical skills lag behind those of digital native students. Thus, they foresaw instructional problems on the part of the teachers on the use of smart phones in the classroom.

Despite foreseeing just a few problems associated with the use of smart phones in the classroom, the respondents were against the use of smart phones in the classroom. They doubted if the use of smart phones can improve the pass rate and they doubted if they want their students to bring smart phones in class and use them during lessons for they perceived problems in controlling students if they are allowed to bring phones to class as shown on the table below. They also doubted if schools in Zimbabwe would ever benefit if students are allowed to use their phones in class. This shows that teachers in Zimbabwe are not yet prepared to have students use smart phones in the classroom.

Recommendations

The study recommends for further research on:
i). The potential benefits of using smart phones in the classroom.
ii). How schools can minimize perceived problems of smart phone use in the classroom and maximize on the benefits.

References

An,Y. J., & Reigeluth, C. M. (2011). Creating Technology Enhanced Learner Centered Classrooms: K-12 Teachers' Beliefs, Perceptions, Barriers and Support Needs. Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education, 28(2).

Barnwell, P. (2016). Do Smartphones Have a Place in the Classroom? Retrieved from http://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/04/do-smartphones-have-a-place-in-the-classroom/480231/

CBC News. (2015). Smartphones in the classroom: a teacher's dream or nightmare?http://www.cbc.ca/news/technology/smartphones-in-the-classroom-a-teacher-s-dream-or-nightmare-1.3211652

Common Sense Media. (2010). Do Smart Phones = Smart Kids? The Impact of Mobile Explosion on America's Kids, Families and Schools. Retrieved from http://www.commonsense.org

Dakers, J. (2005). International Technology Education as Solo Activity or Socially Constructed Learning. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, 5 (1).

DeGraff, J. (2014). Digital Natives Vs Digital Immigrants. Retrieved from www.huffingtonpost.com

Doak, S. (2009). Emerging Theories of Learning and Role of Technology. Retrieved from https://sites.google.com/a/boisestate.edu/edtechtheory/

Freed, R. (2016).Wired Child Reclaiming Childhood in a Digital Age. www.richardfreed,com/wired-child/

Gilbert, J. K., & Boulter C. J. (2012). *Developing Models in Science Education*. NY Springer Science & Business Media. Retrieved from www.springer.com/us/book/9780792366522.

Kahari, L. (2013). Digital Natives/Digital Migrants. *International journal of Education and Research*, 10. Retrieved from www.marcprensky.com/writing/prensky/

Karsenti, T. (2015). Information and Communication Technologies in Education. Canada, University de Montreal.

Kowalsiki, K. (2016). When smartphones go to school. Retrieved from https://www.sciencenewsforstudents.org

Lei, J. (2010). Quantity versus quality: A New Approach to Examine the Relationship between Technology use and Student Outcomes. *British Journal of Education Technology*, 41(3), 455 – 472.

Mapako, R. M. (2013). The Concept of Free Primary Education in Zimbabwe: Myth or Reality. *Education Research International*, 1(1). Retrieved from www.norrag.org/ar/publications/norrag-new/online-version/critical.../

Savedge, J. (2015). Social Media Apps your Kids are Probably Using. Retrieved from www.mnn.com/green-tech/gadgets-electronics/blogs/7-social-media-apps-your-kids-are-probably-using/

The Herald 7 February (2015). Allow cellphones in schools. Retrieved from http://www.herald.co.zw/allow-cellphones-in-schools-says-dokora

UNICEF (2015).World Data on Education, 7th Edition.UNICEF. Retrieved from www.ungei.org/resources/index_all_resources.html

UNICEF Zimbabwe (2015).Media Centre - Sustainable Development Goals: all you need to know.UNICEF. Retrieved from www.unicef.org/agenda2030/