International Journal Of

Recent Scientific Research

ISSN: 0976-3031

Volume: 7(2) February -2016

STUDY INTO THE DISPOSITIONS, AVOIDANCES AND ATTITUDES OF PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS TOWARDS ONLINE LEARNING

Murat Tolga Kayalar

THE OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RECENT SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH (IJRSR)
http://www.recentscientific.com/ recentscientific@gmail.com

ISSN: 0976-3031

Available Online at http://www.recentscientific.com

International Journal of Recent Scientific Research
Vol. 7, Issue, 2, pp. 9097-9103, February, 2016

International Journal of Recent Scientific Research

RESEARCH ARTICLE

STUDY INTO THE DISPOSITIONS, AVOIDANCES AND ATTITUDES OF PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS TOWARDS ONLINE LEARNING

Murat Tolga Kayalar

Education, Erzincan University, Turkey

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 15th September, 2015
Received in revised form 21st November, 2015
Accepted 06th January, 2016
Published online 28th February, 2016

Keywords:

Online Learning, Disposition to e-learning, Avoidance of e-learning, Advantages of e-learning, Disadvantages of e-learning

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to study into the attitudes of pre-service teachers towards online learning and the factors that may affect these attitudes and to compare them in terms of different variables. This study is a descriptive survey model. The research consists of total 286 university students from five departments in the Faculty of Education. We tried to determine their dispositions, avoidances and attitudes towards online learning regarding as age, gender, and possession of technical equipment for e-learning. We applied "General Attitude Scale Towards E-learning" (GASTE) with twenty items collected under two factors such as 'Avoidance of e-learning' and 'Disposition to e-learning'. The data obtained from participants were analysed through Statistics Programme of Social Science (SPSS 20.0).We have concluded that all of the students should be provided with easy access to computer lab to use for online courses so that online learning can be efficient and effective. Also, the learners should be allowed to make choice on whether they want to participate in an online course, or face to face course in an interactive classroom environment.

INTRODUCTION

The developments in science and technology in recent years have significantly affected the education system of the countries as they affect every area from life style to any kind of management. Learning is not only confined to schools, classrooms and examination rooms, it also continues outside (Kayalar, 2016-a). Especially with the widespread use of internet, the traditional approach to education has given its place to contemporary educational approach which uses modern technology. Granting diploma or certificate to undergraduate and graduate students through E-learning has attracted to the institutions of higher education, and the traditional education systems have begun to adapt themselves to e-learning with the view that this system can be provided for students easily and more effectively. Therefore, the students' attitudes towards e-learning are expected to influence their tendency to use e-learning students. The students of the Faculty of Education, who form the research group of this study, while they are e-students at the moment, will be the potential e-teacher after graduation. For this reason, especially this student group as pre-service teachers among university students is important to examine in terms of their attitudes towards e-learning.

E-learning

Institutions of tertiary education have increasingly adopted online education, and the number of students involved in distance education programs is rapidly rising in the institutions of tertiary education throughout the world. With this recent change in learning and teaching system, many institutions and organizations have been working on strategic plans to implement online education (Kim and Bonk, 2006).

Research into faculty adoption of e-Learning for the purpose of effective teaching and its impacts on and implications for training and development in tertiary education advances applications so as to explore the technical, cognitive, and aesthetic basis of signifying human interaction as mediated by technology (Kidd, 2010).

The origins of eLearning go back to the comprehensible work of Suppes (1964) and Bitzer (1962). Uttal (1962) also referred early to this field (Fletcher, 2002), only Suppes and Bitzer clearly situated the use of technology within a broader

Corresponding author:* **Murat Tolga Kayalar
Education, Erzincan University, Turkey

educational agenda (Suppes, 1986). Not only does E-Leaning refer to the use of software-based and online learning, but it also refers to a range of online practices in Business, Tertiary Education, the Military and Training sectors (Campbell, 2004). Our focus for this paper is e-learning and the attitudes of university students towards e-learning for certain courses such as Foreign Language, Turkish Language and History of Republic in higher education.

Table 1 Advantages of Online Learning

Advantages of online learning	• It does not require commuting. • It provides convenience • It allows living anywhere, studying from anywhere • It enables one to gain extra knowledge • It ensures self-paced learning. • It is easily accessed • It gives opportunity of studying while working • It has flexibility of time • It gets less interruption of daily life

Online learning has various advantages (Table 1). It does not require commuting, which enables learners to save money and time that will be spent on travel back and forth to school. In addition the learners can schedule learning around other aspects of their personal and professional life.

The learners can complete most of the courses and lectures at their convenience. Most of the courses, classes and lectures are asynchronous, which means that the learners don't have to attend to a course at a particular time and place. The learners have the opportunity to review the assignments, academic duties and homework during off-hours away from school.

The learners, while pursuing the education of their choices, may live and study wherever they wish to be or they should be. The learners needn't live in the same place where they attend to the educational institutions. Also, they can study and participate in virtual course wherever they have access to a computer with internet connection. It is possible for the learners to transfer the computer and internet skills that they will gain in the process of e-learning experience to other aspects of their lives.

The learners don't have the same competence for learning; they may be slow or quick at learning. However, e-learning provides the chance of self-paced learning for slow learners, thus reducing stress and increasing satisfaction. Apart from all these advantageous aspects of e-learning or online learning, it facilitates physical accessibility difficulties for the learners who have limited mobility.

Instead of sitting on uncomfortable desks, they can enjoy the comfort of their home, free movement and the repetition of the courses on their own computers. On the other hand, when dealing with a classroom full of students, sometimes the most important difficulty that a teacher has in the classroom is how to keep all of their students engaged and interested in the lesson (Kayalar, 2016). However, instructors do not have such matters in online courses.

Table 2 Disadvantages of Online Learning

Disadvantages of online learning	• It needs costly and complex technology • It requires careful planning • It requires one to own a computer • It requires advance planning • It creates hidden costs • It does not offer immediate feedback • It does not always offer all the necessary courses online • It may not be acknowledged by all employers • It does not give students the opportunity to work on oral communication skills • It creates social isolation • It results in lack of seriousness, competition and learning environment

Online learning has some important disadvantages (Table 2). It has a complex and costly technology, as the technology used in online courses constantly and regularly has to be modified and updated with the new one. Online education creates many opportunities, yet it brings a lot of costs together with it. One of the main elements of online education, live video communication, requires constant maintenance and care as well as careful planning. For online learning, the learners need a computer with internet access. They may not have the chance to find required internet access everywhere. Moreover, some of the learners may technophobic, that is, they may be afraid of technology, which impedes their learning desires. The instructors and learners have to allow extra time to have online procedures done in time. The learners may encounter some hidden and unexpected costs for computer equipment such as earphone, microphone, webcam, compact disc and printer. Traditional course settings enable learners to be assessed orally or through questions on exam paper, while online course settings require learners to wait for feedback until the teacher has checked and reviewed their work. Online courses cannot be suited to all subjects. Some courses may involve practice, lab applications, experiments, mutual effect and interaction with teacher or learners, and classroom attendance. Therefore, the learners attending specific programs are unlikely to get all the courses available. Also, the learners cannot develop verbal communication skills through online education; however verbal communication and interaction of the learners with the instructorsare essential for them to socialize in their professional arena. The learners involved in online education often study and listen the courses alone, thus feeling socially isolated and missing social interactions which are possible in traditional classrooms.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Ray (2008) argues in his study that recent changes in tertiary education have created a set of circumstances requiring a new approach to enabling student learning and making it possible. The development methodologies for e-learning systems will play a significant role for the new approaches to emerge. One of the main issues in e-learning is quality. According to Penalvo (2008) the academic world is fairly used to the need to measure certain items in order to determine quality in their learning processes.

Quality in e-learning is of two-fold significance. Associated in many studies with an increase in the quality of educational opportunities, e-learning ensures that the shift to the information society is more successful. This context is named "quality through e-learning." Second, there is a separate but associated debate about ways of improving the quality of e-learning itself, which is called "quality for e-learning" (Ehlers *et al*. 2005).

A growing literature has been devoted to reviewing the strengths and limitations of Online Learning and Distance Learning in teacher education. For the strengths and limitations, Perraton (2003) did a synthesis, focusing on three topics that should be carefully considered by instructors: social expectations of teaching; identification of the beneficiaries; and the curriculum of teacher education.

According to Kim and Bonk (2006), instructors' abilities to teach online are critical to the quality of online education. They argued in their study that the most important skills for an online teacher in coming years will be how to moderate or facilitate learning and how to develop or plan for high-quality online courses.

In the literature, student achievement and student satisfaction are referred as two mediums to evaluate the quality of online education. Academic achievement has been shown differently in studies (Insung and Ilju, 2004), but Elaine and Jeff (2004) point out in their study that online education can be at least as effective as traditional classroom instruction. Hill *et al*. (2004) carried out a study on student satisfaction in online courses or programs and reported that some students were satisfied, while others were dissatisfied with online courses.

Many researchers, such as Sammons (2003) and Wingard (2004), argue that instructors play a different role from that of traditional classroom instructors when they teach online coursesas well as when they teach residential courses with Web enhancements.

Vrasidas and McIsaac (2000) stated in their study on that one of the most striking features of online learning is that it allows adults to pursue their education, setting it around their everyday lives. According to Miller (2005), adult learners have chances to bring their particular needs to the online learning environment.

According to Pallof and Pratt (2003), students and faculty should be allowed to make choiceon whether they want to participate in an online course. In questioning adult students concerning the issue of choice of online-formatted course or face-to-face-formatted course, almost all of the participants stated that the learning format mattered to them. An overwhelming majority of the students responded that they would choose a face-to-face course over an online course.

Brookfield and Preskill (2005) carried out a study and concluded that students in an online format had more time to think creatively, demonstrated imagination, and showed originality, because the response did not have to be made immediately as in a face-to-face discussion.

Kanuka and Rourke (2008) addressed the advantages and disadvantages of online education in their study. They had the conclusion that online learning technology could provide opportunities for improved access through the removal of temporal, geographical and situational hindrances, this technology could increase the quality of course setting and cost-effectiveness, on the other hand, it could give rise to a loss of cultural discourse, campus culture, academic freedom and teaching as a scholarly activity. It can provide an equitable and equalizing environment, however students are not forced to confront their biases and prejudices.

MATERIALS AND METHOD

Problems of the Research

This study is a descriptive survey model. We built the research on two main problems with sub-problems. One of the problems of the research along with its sub-problemsis "What avoidances of, what tendencies to, and what attitudes do the students of Faculty of Education have towards e-learning?". Another is "what are the students' attitudes toward e-learning in terms of gender, department and whether they have any kind of computer or not".

Participants

The research consists of total286 students, 70 from the departments of Psychological Counselling and Guidance, 39 from Pre-school Teaching, 77 from Turkish Language Teaching, 64 from Classroom Teaching, and 36 from Art Teaching. The participants, regardless of their gender and ages, were chosen randomly in five different departments in the Faculty of Education through the permission of the Dean of the Faculty. We included the 1st grade students in the study as the courses of distant education are available only for the first year of curriculum for the courses of Foreign Language, Turkish Language and History of Republic. The participants were asked of their consent for the survey. Of all the participants in our study, 184 are females and 102 males.

Research Instrument

We applied "General Attitude Scale Towards E-learning " (GASTE) with 20 items developed by Haznedar and Baran (2012).GASTE is a five-degree Likert type scale consisting of a total of 20 items collected under 2 factors such as 'Avoidance of e-learning' and 'Tendency to e-learning', and these factors were statistically examined as to relationships between each other. The data obtained from a total of 286 participants were analysed through Social Science Statistics Programme (SPSS 20.0). The data obtained with "General Attitude Scale Towards E-learning " (GASTE) were also analysed in terms of reliability through Cronbach Alpha. The alpha coefficient for the twenty items was found 0.92 for the sub-factor of tendency to e-learning, 0.83 for the sub-factor of avoidance of e-learning, suggesting that the items have relatively high internal reliability.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Out of the all participants in the study, 184were females (64,34%), and 102 were males (35,66%) as shown in Table 3.

Table 3 The number and the percentages of the participants as to gender

Variables		f	%
Gender	Male	102	35,66
	Female	184	64,34
	Total	286	100,00

We evaluated the Department ranks of the participants in five groups as 70 students in the Department of Psychological Counselling and Guidance (24,48%); 39 Pre-school Teaching (13,64%); 77 Turkish Language Teaching (26,92%); 36 Art Teaching (12,59%); and 64 Classroom Teaching (22,38%) as shown in Table 4.

Table 4 The number and the percentages of the participants as to department

Variables		f	%
Department	Psychological Counselling and Guidance	70	24,48
	Pre-school Teaching	39	13,64
	Turkish Language Teaching	77	26,92
	Art Teaching	36	12,59
	Classroom Teaching	64	22,38
	Total	286	100,0

The participants of the study were asked whether they had their own Computer or not. Of the participant students, we determined that 102 had their own computer (35,7%), while 184 participant students did not have one (64,3%), as shown in Table 5.

Table 5 The number and the percentages of the participants as to possession of computer

Variables		f	%
Possession of Computer	Yes	102	35,7
	No	184	64,3
	Total	286	100,0

The participants of the study were asked whether they had their own Tablet Computer or not. Of the participant students, we determined that 13 had their own Tablet Computer (4,5%), while 273 participant students did not have one (95,5%), as shown in Table 6.

Table 6 The number and the percentages of the participants as to Possession of Tablet Computer

Variables		f	%
Possession of Tablet Computer	Yes	13	4,5
	No	273	95,5
	Total	286	100,0

The participants of the study were asked whether they had their own Smart Phone or not. Of the participant students, we determined that 81 had their own Smart Phone (28,3%), while 205 participant students did not have one (71,7%), as shown in Table 7.

Table 7 The number and the percentages of the participants as to Possession of Smart Phone

Variables		f	%
Possession of Smart Phone	Yes	81	28,3
	No	205	71,7
	Total	286	100,0

The distribution of the values according to the items belonging to the first factor of the Scale in order to measure the participants' disposition to e-learning are given in Table 8.

Table 8 Distribution of Values in terms of Disposition to e-learning

Items of Disposition to E-learning	N	X	SS
I follow the developments related to e-learning.	286	2.28	1.39
E-learning facilitates learning.	286	2.05	1.39
E-learning should be more widespread.	286	1.99	1.37
E-learning is fun.	286	1.98	1.36
I am pleased with studying at my own pace through E-learning	286	1.98	1.39
E-learning attracts my attention	286	1.95	1.30
E-learning promotes success.	286	1.91	1.35
E-learning increases the productivity of the learner.	286	1.91	1.32
E-learning increases the motivation to learn.	286	1.88	1.28
I would like to learn in e-learning environment.	286	1.82	1.38

From the analysis of the data obtained through the replies of the participants to the items of their disposition to e-learning in Table 8, we found that the participant students disagree with e-learning. This finding shows that the pre-service teachers in the study do not have positive attitude towards online learning.

Table 9 Distribution of Values in terms of Avoidance of E-learning

Items of Avoidance of E-learning	N	X	SS
E-learning course does not fit my way of working.	286	4.06	1.32
Lack of face-to-face interaction in E-learning bothers me..	286	4.02	1.37
I do not like learning in e-learning environments.	286	3.94	1.39
I do not think e-learning will be useful.	286	3.90	1.39
Assessment in E-learning cannot be done properly.	286	3.89	1.39
I think I will encounter a lot of questions when I take courses through e-learning.	286	3.79	1.48
I do not think I can get enough teacher support in e-learning..	286	3.79	1.43
E-learning is unnecessary.	286	3.71	1.52
E-learning prevents socialization.	286	3.64	1.57
The idea of getting education through E-learning makes me feel bad.	286	3.48	1.58

Considering the distribution of the replies to which the participant pre-service teachers gave for the items of avoidance of e-learning, we determined that it was at the level of "agree" as shown in Table 9. This finding can be evaluated as pre-service teachers not having positive attitude to the parallel of the replies that the students gave to disposition items.

Table 10 T-test values of Attitudes to E-learning in terms of Gender

Factors	Gender	N	X	SS	Sd	t	p
Values of Disposition to E-learning	Male	102	21.79	11.76	284	2.54	0.012
	Female	184	18.61	9.11			
Values of Avoidance of E-learning	Male	102	36.09	9.98	284	3.00	0.003
	Female	184	39.40	8.31			
Values of Attitudes to E-learning	Male	102	45.71	19.12	284	3.04	0.003
	Female	184	39.21	16.18			

Table 10 shows the findings as to whether disposition, avoidance and attitudes of pre-service teachers to e-learning significantly differ in terms of gender. We determined that pre-service teachers' disposition to e-learning($t_{(286)}$= 2.54), avoidance of e-learning($t_{(284)}$= 3.00), and attitude to e-learning($t_{(284)}$= 3.04) significantly differ in terms of gender of the participants($p<.05$). According to the values in Table 10,

female pre-service teachers have more dispositions to e-learning and show more positive attitudes than female ones, while male pre-service teachers have more avoidance of e-learning than female ones.

Table 11T-test Values of Attitudes to E-learning in terms of having a Computer

Factors	Having Computer	N	X	SS	Sd	t	p
Values of Disposition to E-learning	Yes	102	22.39	11.05	284	3.310	.001
	No	184	18.28	9.47			
Values of Avoidance of E-learning	Yes	102	36.59	9.38	284	-2.284	.023
	No	184	39.13	8.77			
Values of Attitudes to E-learning	Yes	102	45.80	18.48	284	3.117	.002
	No	184	39.16	16.57			

Table 11 shows the findings as to whether pre-service teachers' disposition to e-learning, avoidance of e-learning and attitude to e-learning significantly differ in terms of having a computer. We determined that pre-service teachers' disposition to e-learning($t_{(286)}$= 3.310), avoidance of e-learning($t_{(286)}$= -2.284) and attitude to e-learning($t_{(286)}$= 3.117) significantly differ in terms of having computer($p<.05$). According to the statistical values in Table 11, we determined that the pre-service teachers in our study, who had their own computers had more dispositions to e-learning and more positive attitudes to e-learning than the ones who did not have their own computers, while the participants who did not have computers have more avoidance of e-learning than the ones who had their own computers.

Table 12 T-test Values of Attitudes to E-learning in terms of Having a Tablet

Factors	Having a Tablet	N	X	SS	Sd	t	p
Values of Disposition to E-learning	Yes	13	31.538	12.972	284	4.386	.000
	No	273	19.187	9.764			
Values of Avoidance of E-learning	Yes	13	33.154	10.930	284	-2.075	.039
	No	273	38.462	8.916			
Values of Attitudes to E-learning	Yes	13	58.385	20.662	284	3.622	.000
	No	273	40.725	17.003			

Table 12 shows the findings as to whether pre-service teachers' disposition to e-learning, avoidance of e-learning and attitude to e-learning significantly differ in terms of having a Tablet computer. We determined that pre-service teachers' disposition to e-learning($t_{(286)}$=4.386), avoidance of e-learning($t_{(286)}$=-2.075) and attitude to e-learning($t_{(286)}$=3.622) significantly differ in terms of having Tablet computer($p<.05$).

According to the statistical values in Table 12, we determined that the pre-service teachers in our study, who had their own Tablet computers had more dispositions to e-learning and more positive attitudes to e-learning than the ones who did not have their own Tablet computers, while the participants who did not have Tablet computers have more avoidance of e-learning than the ones who had their own Tablet computers.

Table 13 T-test Values of Attitudes to E-learning in terms of Having a Smart Phone

Factors	Having Smart Phone	N	X	SS	Sd	t	p
Values of Disposition to E-learning	Yes	81	23.9506	11.36211	284	4.511	.000
	No	205	18.0878	9.26738			
Values of Avoidance of E-learning	Yes	81	35.0494	8.94693	284	-3.807	.000
	No	205	39.4732	8.81874			
Values of Attitudes to E-learning	Yes	81	48.9012	18.25897	284	4.627	.000
	No	205	38.6146	16.39144			

Table 13 shows the findings as to whether pre-service teachers' disposition to e-learning, avoidance of e-learning and attitude to e-learning significantly differ in terms of having a Smart Phone. We determined that pre-service teachers' disposition to e-learning(t(286)=4.511), avoidance of e-learning(t(286)= -3.807) and attitude to e-learning(t(286)=4.627) significantly differ in terms of having Smart Phone($p<.05$).

According to the statistical values in Table 13, we determined that the pre-service teachers in our study, who had their own Smart Phones had more dispositions to e-learning and more positive attitudes to e-learning than the ones who did not have their own Smart Phones, while the participants who did not have their own Smart Phones have more avoidance of e-learning than the ones who had their own Smart Phones.

Table 14 ANOVA Test Values of Attitudes to E-learning in terms of Departments

Factors	Departments	N	X	SS
Values of Disposition to E-learning	Psychological Counselling and Guidance	70	17.286	9.083
	Pre-school Teaching	39	13.103	3.872
	Turkish Language Teaching	77	16.156	8.694
	Art Teaching	36	18.278	6.806
	Classroom Teaching	64	31.641	7.915
	Total	286	19.748	10.233
Values of Avoidance of E-learning	Psychological Counselling and Guidance	70	39.457	9.666
	Pre-school Teaching	39	43.744	7.294
	Turkish Language Teaching	77	41.026	7.585
	Art Teaching	36	36.333	8.536
	Classroom Teaching	64	31.188	6.688
	Total	286	38.220	9.062
Values of Attitudes to E-learning	Psychological Counselling and Guidance	70	37.829	17.745
	Pre-school Teaching	39	29.359	9.845
	Turkish Language Teaching	77	35.130	14.532
	Art Teaching	36	41.944	13.463
	Classroom Teaching	64	60.453	10.548
	Total	286	41.528	17.534

Table 15 Statistical Values of Attitudes to E-learning for Source of variances in terms of Departments

Factors	Source of Variance	Total Square	Sd	Mean square	F	p
Values of Disposition to E-learning	Inter-groups	12269.912	4	3067.478	49.048	.000
	In-group	17573.962	281	62.541		
	Toatal	29843.874	285			
Values of Avoidance of E-learning	Inter-groups	5196.617	4	1299.154	20.049	.000
	In-group	18208.505	281	64.799		
	Toatal	23405.122	285			
Values of Attitudes to E-learning	Inter-groups	32813.909	4	8203.477	42.057	.000
	In-group	54811.367	281	195.058		
	Toatal	87625.276	285			

According to ANOVA Test scores in Table 14 and Table 15, the pre-service teachers' disposition values to e-learning significantly differ in terms of the departments at which they study ($F_{(4,281)}$=49.048, p< .05). According to the scores of Scheffe test, one of the Post-Hoc Tests, we determined that pre-service teachers at the department of Classroom Teaching had more disposition to e-learning than those at the departments of Psychological Counselling and Guidance, Pre-school Teaching, Turkish Language Teaching, and Arts Teaching.

According to ANOVA Test scores in Table 14 and Table 15, the pre-service teachers' avoidance values of e-learning significantly differ in terms of the departments at which they study (F(4,281)= 20.049, p< .05). According to the scores of Scheffe test, one of the Post-Hoc Tests, we determined that pre-service teachers at the department of Classroom Teaching had less avoidance of e-learning than those at the departments of Psychological Counselling and Guidance, Pre-school Teaching, Turkish Language Teaching, and Arts Teaching, while pre-service teachers at the department of Arts Teaching had less avoidance of e-learning than those at the department of Pre-school Teaching.

According to ANOVA Test scores in Table 14 and Table 15, the pre-service teachers' values of attitudes to e-learning significantly differ in terms of the departments at which they study ($F_{(4,281)}$=42.057, p< .05).

According to the scores of Scheffe test, one of the Post-Hoc Tests, we determined that pre-service teachers at the department of Classroom Teaching had more positive attitudes to e-learning than those at the departments of Psychological Counselling and Guidance, Pre-school Teaching, Turkish Language Teaching, and Arts Teaching, while pre-service teachers at the department of Arts Teaching had more positive attitudes to e-learning than those at the department of Pre-school Teaching.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

As internet technology develops and becomes widespread, online applications increasein all educational fields Çelen *et al*. (2011). Considering the advantages provided by online education, higher education institutions tend to turn in distance education activities. In this context, planning to offer quality online learning environment, higher education institutions should establish the infrastructure of online education, should not give up necessary investments and implement relevant online educational system so that information and communication technology infrastructure can be used effectively in this system. In addition, in order to obtain effective results from learning-teaching process, it is important to determine the students' interest and attitudes towards e-learning or online education and to design the system in accordance with the needs of the students.

The learners in online learning environments have a lot of advantages and preferences to make their class-works at their homes or workplaces, to work at any place with internet access and at any time of the day, and to choose their learning materials based on their levels of interest and knowledge. However, in addition to these advantages, there may be some drawbacks such as personal inability of using computer, avoidance of technical devices and possession of computer, tablet or smart phones. Further, the learners with lower motivation can leave behind their classmates, and being away from classroom environment may reduce their rates of motivation. Slow internet can cause problems with access to course resources.

In the study, the majority of the pre-service teachers who take online Foreign Language Course, Republic History and Turkish Language Course have neither Personal Computer (PC), nor Tablet Computer, nor Smart Phones to follow the online courses at any places they wish, which creates a negative disposition to e-learning, and they would prefer face-to-face learning rather than online learning or e-learning in the frame of distance education. For online learning to be efficient and effective, all of the students should be provided with easy access to computer lab to use for online courses; otherwise, the lack of technical devices can discourage the students without computers, tablets and smart phones, which is likely to reduce their motivation and desire to learning.

Learners in online learning environment should be encouraged actively to configure new information. Therefore, some arrangements should be made for the purpose of preparation of learners, planning of the activities and interactions as well as presentation of the content. Some opportunities should be created in order for the learners to use their prior learning, and their motivation should be increased. The learners should be encouraged to create learning objectives in order to evaluate the outcomes of learning process. They should be made to access to a variety of learning activities appropriate to the outcomes of the courses and personal requirements (Pala and Erdem, 2015).

The learners should be allowed to make choice on whether they want to participate in an online course, or face to face course in an interactive classroom environment (Pallof and Pratt, 2003). In questioning adult students concerning the issue of choice of online-formatted course or face-to-face-formatted course, almost all of the participants stated that the learning format mattered to them. An overwhelming majority of the students responded that they would choose a face-to-face course over an online course. The result of the research carried out by Pallof and Pratt is compatible with our study in that the majority of the participants in our study have shown their avoidance to e-learning.

References

Bitzer, D. L., Lichtenberger, W., & Braunfeld, P. G. (1962). PLATO II: A multiple-student, computer controlled, automatic teaching device. In J. E. Coulson (Ed.), Programmed learning and computer-based instruction (pp. 205-216). New York: John Wiley.

Brookfield, S. D., Preskill, S. (2005).Discussion as a way of teaching (2nd edition). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Campbell, L. (2004). What does the "e" stand for? (Report). Melbourne, Australia: Department of Science and Mathematics Education, the University of Melbourne.

Çelen, F. K., Çelik, A. and Seferoğlu, S. S., (2011). Yükseköğretimde çevrimiçi öğrenme: Sistemde yaşanan sorunlar ve çözüm önerileri. *Journal of European Education*. 1(1) 25-34

Ehlers, U. -D., Goertz, L., Hildebrandt, B., &Pawlowski, J. M. (2005).Quality in e-learning.Use and dissemination of quality approaches in European e-learning. A study by the European Quality Observatory. Cedefop Panorama series, 116. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Elaine, A. I. and Jeff, S., (2004). Entering the Mainstream: The Quality and Extent of Online Education in the United States 2004

Fletcher, A. (2005). Guide to students as Partners in School Change. Olympia, WA: Common Action.

Haznedar, Ö., Baran, B. (2012). EğitimFakültesiÖğrencileriiçin E-öğrenmeye Yönelik Genel Bir Tutum Ölçeği Geliştirme Çalışması, Eğitim Teknolojisi Kuram Ve Uygulama, Cilt 2, Sayı 2, Yaz 2012

Hill, J. R., Wiley, D., Nelson, L. M., & Han, S. (2004). Exploring research on Internet-based learning: From infrastructure to interactions. Handbook of research on educational communications and technology, 2, 433-460.

Insung, J. and Ilju, R., (2000). Effectiveness and Cost-Effectiveness of Online Education: A Review of the Literature, Educational Technology, Vol. 40, No. 4, 2000, pp. 57–60;

Kayalar, F., (2016-a).Views of Teachers on the Benefits of After-School Programs and Summer Programs in terms of Social Emotional Learning. Merit Research Journal of Education and Review. Vol. 4(2) pp. 006-013, February, 2016.

Kayalar, F., (2016-b).Comparison of the Views of Novice and Veteran Teachers over Classroom Management. International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research, 3(2): 21-29.

Kidd, T. T. (2010).A Brief History of eLearning. Online Education and Adult Learning: New Frontiers for Teaching Practices, Chapter 4. Information Science Reference, Hershey.

Kim K. J. & Bonk C. J. (2006). The Future of Online Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: The Survey Says.. , Educause Quarterly • Number 4, 2006

Miller, R. P. (2005). Listen to the students: A qualitative study investigating adult student readiness for online learning. Research Proceedings of the 32 nd National Agricultural Education Research Conference, San Antonio, TX.

Pala, F. K. and Erdem, M., (2015). Çevrimiçi öğrenme Ortamları ve Katılım, Eğitim Teknolojileri Okumaları 2015, Eds. Buket Akkoyunlu, Aytekin İşman, Hatice Ferhan Odabaşı). 1. Baskı: Nisan 2015; Ankara

Palloff, R. M., Pratt, K. (2003). The virtual student: A profile and guide to working with online learners. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Penalvo F. J. G., (2008). Advances in E-Learning: Experiences and Methodologies, Information Science Reference, New York, 2008

Ray, W., (2008). A Reflective and Participatory Methodology for E-learning and Lifelong Learning, (Ed. Francisco José GarcíaPeñalvo) Advances in E-Learning: Experiences and Methodologies, Information Science Reference, New York, 2008

Sammons, M. (2003). Exploring the New Conception of Teaching and Learning in Distance Education, Handbook of Distance Education, M. G. Moore and W. G. Anderson, eds. (Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2003), pp. 387–400.

Suppes, P. (1964). Modern learning theory and the elementary-school curriculum. *American Educational Research Journal*, 1, 79–93.

Suppes, P. (1986). Computers and education in the 21st century. In W. Neilson & C. Gaffield (Eds.), Universities in Crisis: A mediaeval institution in the twenty-first century (pp. 137-151). Toronto, Canada: The Institute for Research on Public Policy.

Uttal, W. R. (1962). On conversational interaction. In J. E. Coulson (Ed.), Programmed learning and computer-based instruction (pp. 171-190). New York: John Wiley.

Wingard R. G. (2004). Classroom Teaching Changes in Web-Enhanced Courses: A Multi-Institutional Study. EDUCAUSE Quarterly, Vol. 27, No. 1, 2004, pp. 26–35,

Vrasidas, L.,McIsaac, M. S. (2000). Principles of pedagogy and evaluation for web-based learning. Educational Media International, 37(2), 105–111.

****

How to cite this article:

Murat Tolga Kayalar.2016, Study into the dispositions, avoidances and attitudes of Pre-service Teachers towards online learning. *Int J Recent Sci Res.* 7(2), pp. 9097-9103.

TSSN 0976-3031