



Effectiveness of mobile apps in teaching field-based identification skills

Article

Accepted Version

Thomas, R. L. and Fellowes, M. D. E. (2017) Effectiveness of mobile apps in teaching field-based identification skills. *Journal of Biological Education*, 51 (2). pp. 136-143. ISSN 0021-9266 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00219266.2016.1177573> Available at <http://centaur.reading.ac.uk/62773/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work.

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00219266.2016.1177573>

Publisher: Taylor & Francis

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Effectiveness of mobile apps in teaching field-based identification skills

Rebecca L. Thomas* & Mark D. E. Fellowes

* Corresponding author

People and Wildlife Research Group, School of Biological Sciences, Harborne Building,
University of Reading, Whiteknights, Reading, Berkshire, RG6 6AS, UK

Email addresses: rebecca.thomas@reading.ac.uk; m.fellowes@reading.ac.uk

Tel.: +44 (0) 118 378 8167

24 **Abstract**

25 It has been suggested that few students graduate with the skills required for many ecological careers,
26 as field-based learning is said to be in decline in academic institutions. Here, we asked if mobile
27 technology could improve field-based learning, using ability to identify birds as the study metric. We
28 divided a class of ninety-one undergraduate students into two groups for field-based sessions where
29 they were taught bird identification skills. The first group has access to a traditional identification
30 book and the second group were provided with an identification app. We found no difference between
31 the groups in the ability of students to identify birds after three field sessions. Furthermore, we found
32 that students using the traditional book were significantly more likely to identify novel species.
33 Therefore, we find no evidence that mobile technology improved students' ability to retain what they
34 experienced in the field; indeed, there is evidence that traditional field guides were more useful to
35 students as they attempted to identify new species. Nevertheless, students felt positively about using
36 their own smartphone devices for learning, highlighting that while apps did not lead to an
37 improvement in bird identification ability, they gave greater accessibility to relevant information
38 outside allocated teaching times.

39 **Keywords**

40 Field-based teaching; identification skills; mobile apps; technology in teaching; teaching/learning
41 strategies; smartphone devices

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53 **Introduction**

54 Teaching in the environmental biosciences (e.g. botany, ecology, environmental biology, zoology)
55 focuses on supporting students as they gain an appreciation of the diversity of life, how species
56 interact with their environments and how we as a species affect their abundance and distribution. The
57 ability to identify taxa to appropriate levels and to study these organisms in the field is therefore a key
58 skill for field biologists (IEEM 2011a; IEEM 2011b). In spite of the importance of field skills to these
59 subjects, it has been suggested that the provision of field teaching is in decline (Scott et al. 2014;
60 Smith 2004) as we see a generational attrition in academic staff with the required knowledge of field
61 natural history to appropriately teach such courses. For example, taxonomy is under-represented in
62 many undergraduate bioscience degree programmes (Leather and Quicke 2009), which will have a
63 negative effect on global conservation efforts, as protecting species starts with putting the correct
64 name to it (Hopkins and Freckleton 2002). This also has important implications for graduate
65 employment, as many employers in the ecological sector are looking for graduates with these skills
66 (IEEM 2011a; IEEM 2011b). However, Maw et al. (2011) argue that higher education programmes
67 contain reasonable levels of field work and that this practice is not in decline. They demonstrated that
68 this field work took place in the UK as well as part of overseas field courses, which are considered
69 important for student recruitment. Either way, field work remains an important aspect of many higher
70 degree programmes, especially in the natural sciences, and also in secondary and primary education
71 (Tilling 2004, Boyle et al. 2007, Hope 2009).

72 The benefits of field experience in education as an important mode of active learning have been
73 demonstrated (Boyle et al. 2007; Easton and Gilburn 2011; Goodenough et al. 2014), and are crucial
74 in placing the subject in its real-world context. Field work can be of benefit to a wide diversity of
75 students (Fuller et al. 2006) and it provides a novel learning environment away from traditional
76 classroom teaching (Falk et al. 1978). There is a strong tradition of field work in the biosciences as a
77 way to develop practical skills (Goulder et al. 2012), as well as increasing higher order learning
78 (Rickinson et al. 2004) and student confidence (Boyle et al. 2007). For example, Hamilton-Ekeke
79 (2007) found that students learnt more about biodiversity and ecology by undertaking a field trip than
80 students taught in the classroom.

81 The ability to correctly identify species is the basis of field biology; field work can be used to actively
82 engage and encourage students to identify the species they encounter (Scott et al. 2012). Birds are a
83 tractable group for students to work with because most students start with some familiarity with the
84 group, their relative visibility and the comparative ease at which identification can be taught, when
85 compared with groups such as invertebrates or plants. In the UK, there are only around 250 regularly
86 encountered species, bird identification guides are easy to use and the bird does not need to be caught
87 to be identified. While birds therefore provide a useful entry group to enable students to gain key field

88 skills, it remains the case that finding effective methods to teach large groups in the field can be
89 challenging, and so it is important to consider a variety of teaching methods. Previous research found
90 that hands on teaching of bird identification skills using stuffed specimens led to better grades in
91 subsequent testing (Randler and Bogner 2006), although previous studies found no difference when
92 compared with a teacher centred slide presentation (Randler and Bogner 2002). To date, research
93 using field work based teaching of identification skills is lacking.

94 Tablet devices and mobile apps are increasingly being used in education to enhance learning
95 opportunities (Morris et al. 2012) and they are increasingly being used in the field (Welsh and France
96 2012). Many students now own their own personal smartphone or tablet device (Welsh and France
97 2012), and these are now often used formally or informally in classes for learning (Woodcock et al.
98 2012). This presents an opportunity to engage students in their learning while improving digital
99 literacy. They also present a novel learning tool, which could be used to improve field teaching of
100 species identification skills although whether they are a more effective learning tool compared with
101 more traditional methods remains unknown.

102 Here, we ask if the ability of students to identify bird species following three one-hour field sessions
103 was affected by the tools used to support teaching, in this case a traditional field guide and a
104 comparable mobile app. Furthermore, we asked if the use of mobile technology increased student
105 engagement with bird identification.

106 **Method**

107 *Participants*

108 Ninety-one undergraduate students from the University of Reading, UK, participated in the study (63
109 females; 28 males) in January-March 2013. All participants were enrolled in an introductory Part One
110 Ecology module and represented a variety of undergraduate disciplines, although most students were
111 undertaking BSc Zoology. It was explained to the students that participation was not compulsory, and
112 consent forms were completed by the students after the study had been explained (all students
113 consented to take part). The project was subject to ethical review, according to the procedures
114 specified by the University of Reading Ethics Committee and was formally approved.

115 *Procedure*

116 During the module, the students were divided into two groups (A and B) for practical lessons, with
117 each group getting three two-hour field-based sessions over a period of six weeks. Within the groups
118 A and B the students were divided into two further groups (A1, A2; B1, B2) with students in group 1
119 (n = 51) being allocated a traditional bird identification guide (Pocket Guide to British Birds, RSPB)
120 and students in group 2 (n = 40) being asked to download a bird identification app (Birds of Britain,

121 CleverMatrix Ltd) onto their own personal smartphone or tablet device. Twenty nine percent of the
122 students did not own their own personal smartphone and these students were automatically allocated
123 into group 1, and of the 71% who did own their own device 40 students were randomly allocated into
124 group 2 and the remainder were allocated to group 1.

125 In the field-based sessions the groups were further divided into four smaller groups where they were
126 allocated a demonstrator (to help them with bird identification) and each student spent one hour in the
127 field identifying the birds they came across, working in pairs or groups of three. The demonstrator
128 was allowed to aid in identification, but they were instructed to not give the answer straight away to
129 the student, but to instead encourage them to identify the species themselves using the book or app as
130 appropriate. The students were also asked to record weather conditions, each species encountered and
131 an estimate of the number seen, as well as any records of interesting behaviour (e.g. feeding, singing).
132 Following completion of the hour in the field, the students returned indoors, where any unidentified
133 bird species were discussed with the demonstrators.

134 *Bird identification skills*

135 To get a baseline of existing knowledge of each student's ability to identify common UK bird species
136 all students were asked to complete an initial spots test (hereafter known as spots test one). The spots
137 test was undertaken under exam conditions and consisted of individual PowerPoint slides showing
138 photographs of 30 species commonly found on the University campus. Each slide was shown for one
139 minute and each student independently wrote down the species common name if it was known to
140 them (they were not able to use an identification aid to help them). These were collected and each
141 student was given two marks out of a possible 30. The first mark was given if the student had given an
142 inaccurate but almost complete answer (e.g. if the student had written the word gull for the Black-
143 headed gull; hereafter known as the generous mark), the second mark was given if the student knew
144 the complete common name of the species (hereafter known as the harder mark). It was important to
145 distinguish the two marks as the first tests for a general knowledge of the species and the second tests
146 that the student had fully and correctly identified the species. The marking was completed by the same
147 individual to reduce bias. Neither mark contributed towards their overall module grade.

148 Following completion of the three field-based sessions, the students were asked to complete a second
149 spots test (hereafter known as spots test two). This test followed the same format as spots test one,
150 although different species and/or photographs were used, and the students were not able to use any
151 aids as before. The students were again given two sets of marks (generous and harder marks) for each
152 of the 30 species, the marking was completed by the same individual as before and the marks did not
153 contribute towards their overall module grade. A third spots test (hereafter known as the video spots
154 test) was used to test the students' ability to identify bird species that they would likely not have
155 encountered before and was carried out following spots test two. In this test, six videos were shown

156 twice for one minute. The students were told that they were allowed to use their identification aid
157 (either the book or smartphone app, depending on their group) to help them identify the species.

158 *Questionnaires*

159 Each student was asked to complete a questionnaire before the experiment began (hereafter known as
160 questionnaire one). The questions were designed to ask the students about ownership and use of
161 smartphone devices; their opinions about using smartphone technology in teaching; how the student
162 judged their interest in field biology and wild birds; and how the student rated their bird identification
163 skills. A second questionnaire was used following completion of the three field-based sessions, one
164 version for the students who had used the traditional bird identification guide and another for the
165 students who has used the smartphone app (hereafter known as questionnaire 2a and 2b respectively).
166 Each questionnaire used a 5 point Likert Scale and was subject to ethical review, according to the
167 procedures specified by the University of Reading Ethics Committee, and was formally approved.

168 *Data analysis*

169 In all cases data were tested for normality and where appropriate parametric tests were performed. All
170 analyses were carried out using Minitab (Minitab 17 Statistical Software 2010). To compare the
171 differences in bird identification knowledge in all students, between the pre and post field-based
172 sessions, paired t-tests were used. To compare the differences in learning between the app and book
173 groups, two-sample t-tests were used. Mann-Whitney tests were used to compare the change of
174 opinions in the questionnaires (Questionnaire 1 and 2a or 2b) between the pre and post field-based
175 sessions and between the app and book groups.

176 **Results**

177 *Bird identification skills*

178 There was a significant improvement in total number of birds identified between spots tests one (ST1)
179 and two (ST2) for the harsher mark ($t_{90} = 13.73$, $p < 0.001$, mean ST1 = 9.7, mean ST2 = 15.6; Figure
180 1) and the generous mark ($t_{90} = 12.44$, $p < 0.001$, mean ST1 = 15.6, mean ST2 = 20.7; Figure 1). No
181 significant differences were found between the groups of students using the app or book measured
182 with the harsher mark ($t_{88} = 1.18$, $p = 0.24$) or the generous mark ($t_{86} = 1.41$, $p = 0.16$). In the video
183 spots test, there was no significant difference in the ability of students to identify unfamiliar birds
184 between the app or book groups ($t_{80} = 1.68$, $p = 0.1$), although when students who had correctly
185 identified over 20 species in spots test one with the hasher mark were removed ($n = 9$), the students
186 from the book group were able to identify significantly more birds than students with the app ($t_{74} =$
187 2.02 , $p = 0.047$, mean app = 2.49, mean book = 3.11; Figure 2).

188 *Questionnaires*

189 Ninety one percent of students considered themselves to be interested in field biology, 70% were
190 interested in wild birds and 23% of students watched birds on a daily or weekly basis. Only 12.5% of
191 students rated their ability to identify UK bird species as good or excellent. Seventy one percent of
192 students owned a smartphone, with only 14% having used it formally and 65% having used it
193 informally in classes. In week one 70% of students thought that using a smartphone in teaching and
194 learning was a good idea, and there was no significant change of opinion between week one and seven
195 between the students in the book and app groups ($w_{40, 51} = 1962.5$, $p = 0.290$). Seventy four percent of
196 students would be happy to use their own smartphone for fieldwork when asked in week one and there
197 was no significant change of opinion between week one and seven between the students in the book
198 and app groups ($w_{40, 40} = 1659.5$, $p = 0.677$).

199 **Discussion**

200 Over the course of the three field-based sessions the students' ability to identify common bird species
201 increased significantly, although no differences were found between the students who has been using
202 the bird identification book or those using the mobile app downloaded to their smartphone device.
203 Before the field-based sessions, students on average were able to identify ten species of common UK
204 birds (out of a possible 30) and at the end this has increased to 16 species. When asked to identify
205 previously unknown bird species, using a video spots test (and having removed those students who
206 already had good bird identification skills) and either the bird identification book or the mobile app,
207 students were more likely to correctly identify the species with the field guide. This is likely due to
208 the relative ease of skimming through the book rather than searching through the smartphone app.

209 While nearly all of the students (91%) considered themselves to be interested in field biology and
210 many (70%) considered themselves to be interested in wild birds, this did not translate into an active
211 interest for many. When they were asked whether they watched birds on a daily or weekly basis, only
212 23% of students actually actively watched birds on a regular basis. This figure matches well with our
213 findings of the actual ability of the students to identify common UK bird species (using the spots
214 tests) and unless rectified would contribute to the lack of identification skills among UK graduates of
215 relevant disciplines (Leather and Quicke 2009; IEEM 2011a; IEEM 2011b).

216 Graduate employability is an important element of many higher education league tables and
217 something which universities will constantly strive to improve. It has been suggested that few
218 graduates have the identification skills to be employable in the ecological sector without further
219 training (Warren 2015), and although this has been disputed, it is acknowledged that there is still an
220 important skills gap. Using smartphone devices with identification apps could be a useful way of
221 engaging students outside of formal teaching opportunities, as many students here reported that they
222 had begun using their apps more regularly outside of classes, whereas none of the students with the
223 identification books reported using them outside of the standard teaching time. This is likely due to

224 the accessibility of the students' smartphone devices and that they were unlikely to carry their
225 identification book with them. One student commented 'I feel that the app was very helpful in
226 identifying birds, mainly for the fact that I would always have my phone with me so it was convenient
227 when I found a bird I didn't recognise to look it up'. Other students still had a preference for the book
228 arguing that it was more challenging which helped them to learn more, 'I was part of the book group
229 and find this also helped my score to increase. This is because you have to really look and remember
230 specific details on the birds in order to identify them in the book. It takes longer and is harder I feel
231 than the app'.

232 It is important to note that allocation of students to smartphone user/non-smartphone user was not
233 random, for two reasons. First, logistically, it would have been exceptionally difficult to purchase
234 sufficient smartphones for a highly replicated, randomised trial. Second, and more important, every
235 student will be familiar with using books, while not every student will be familiar with using a given
236 smartphone/operating system. Here, we assume that students who own smartphones are proficient at
237 using them, and also at using smartphone apps. If we allocated non-smartphone using students to the
238 smartphone using group, then we would expect that we would in essence be testing the difference in
239 ability to develop a competency in using the device and app, rather than the ability to use an app or
240 book to identify birds. Given the near ubiquity of smartphones among the 16-24 age group (currently
241 90% in the UK; Ofcom 2015), the relative educational similarities of the cohort tested and the
242 outcome of the initial test, we see no strong reason to assume *a priori* differences between our
243 experimental groups.

244 A large number of our students owned their own smartphone devices (71%); these figures are similar
245 to those found by Welsh and France (2012), where in 2012 they found that 70% of their students
246 owned smartphones. They suggest that educators should encourage smartphone use in the field to aid
247 students learning (Welsh and France 2012). Although very few of our students have used their
248 smartphones formally in their teaching (14%), many more have used it informally (65%) to access
249 information during lectures for example and they feel positively about using their own devices in class
250 (70%) and in field classes (74%). Increasing smartphone use in teaching has many benefits when used
251 alongside face-to-face teaching, such as improving digital literacy skills (Woodcock et al. 2012), but it
252 also comes with its own challenges as not all students own their own device. Here we used a 'bring
253 your own device' policy, but if apps were to be used more formally and consistently in our teaching
254 we would need to make devices available for those students who do not own them. This could present
255 a challenge for some higher education institutions, but this will undoubtedly change over time.

256 **Conclusions**

257 The growth of mobile, smart devices has resulted in the suggestion that this may provide a new
258 opportunity to engage students in active learning. However, we found no differences between student

259 groups tasked with improving their bird identification skills between those using traditional (field
260 guide) and new (mobile app) approaches. Indeed, once we excluded individuals who started the class
261 already possessing strong bird identification skills (nine individuals), those who used the field guide
262 were more likely to correctly identify novel species, suggesting that in this situation at least,
263 traditional technology provides a superior support to learning. Nevertheless, mobile devices offered
264 more opportunities for students to engage with the subject outside of the allocated teaching time, due
265 to their general portability and accessibility. Field-based learning is an important method for teaching
266 environmental bioscience students species identification skills, and utilising mobile smartphone
267 devices and apps is a novel approach to doing this. Here, students were both happy to use their own
268 devices and more generally were supportive of using their own smartphone devices in their learning.
269 Smartphones and other mobile devices offer a positive way to enhance field-based learning, with the
270 ever increasing development of apps for species identification and recording, note-taking, geo-
271 tagging, as well as others to enhance teaching and learning in the field.

272

273 **References**

274 Boyle, A., S. Maguire, A. Martin, C. Milsom, R. Nash, S. Rawlinson, A. Turner, S. Wurthmann and
275 S. Conchie. 2007. "Fieldwork is Good: the Student Perception and the Affective Domain. " *Journal of*
276 *Geography in Higher Education* 31 (2): 299-317.

277

278 Easton, E. and A. Gilburn. 2011. "The field course effect: gains in cognitive learning in undergraduate
279 biology students following a field course." *Journal of Biological Education* 46 (1): 29-35.

280

281 Falk, J. H., W. W. Martin and J. D. Balling. 1978. "The novel field-trip phenomenon: Adjustment to
282 novel settings interferes with task learning." *Journal of Research in Science Teaching* 15 (2): 127-134.

283

284 Fuller, I. A. N., S. Edmondson, D. France, D. Higgitt and I. Ratinen. 2006. "International Perspectives
285 on the Effectiveness of Geography Fieldwork for Learning." *Journal of Geography in Higher*
286 *Education* 30 (1): 89-101.

287

288 Goodenough, A. E., R. N. Rolfe, L. MacTavish and A. G. Hart. 2014. "The Role of Overseas Field
289 Courses in Student Learning in the Biosciences." *Bioscience Education* DOI:
290 10.11120/beej.2014.00021.

291

292 Goulder, R., G. W. Scott and L. J. Scott. 2012. "Students' Perception of Biology Fieldwork: The
293 example of students undertaking a preliminary year at a UK university." *International Journal of*
294 *Science Education* 35 (8): 1385-1406.

295

296 Hamilton-Ekeke, J. T. 2007. "Relative Effectiveness of Expository and Field Trip Methods of
297 Teaching on Students' Achievement in Ecology." *International Journal of Science Education* 29 (15):
298 1869-1889.

299

300 Hope, M. 2009. "The Importance of Direct Experience: A Philosophical Defence of Fieldwork in
301 Human Geography." *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 33 (2): 169-182.

302

303 Hopkins, G. W. and R. P. Freckleton. 2002. "Declines in the numbers of amateur and professional
304 taxonomists: implications for conservation." *Animal Conservation* 5 (3): 245-249.
305

306 IEEM. 2011a. "Ecological skills, shaping the profession for the 21st century". Institute of Ecology
307 and Environmental Management.
308

309 IEEM. 2011b. "Closing the gap: rebuilding ecological skills in the 21st century. " Institute of Ecology
310 and Environmental Management.
311

312 Leather, S. R. and D. J. L. Quicke. 2009. "Where would Darwin have been without taxonomy?"
313 *Journal of Biological Education* 43 (2): 51-52.
314

315 Maw, S. J., A. L. Mauchline and J. R. Park. 2011. "Biological Fieldwork Provision in Higher
316 Education." *Bioscience Education* 17: DOI: 10.3108/beej.17.1.
317

318 Minitab 17 Statistical Software. 2010. [Computer software]. State College, PA: Minitab, Inc.
319 (www.minitab.com).
320

321 Morris, N. P., L. Ramsay and V. Chauhan. 2012. "Can a tablet device alter undergraduate science
322 students' study behavior and use of technology? " 36 (2):97-107.
323

324 Ofcom. 2015. "The Communications Market Report." Available at:
325 http://stakeholders.ofcom.org.uk/binaries/research/cmr/cmr15/CMR_UK_2015.pdf
326

327 Randler, C. and Bogner, F.X. 2002. "Comparing methods of instruction using bird species
328 identification skills as indicators." 36 (4): 181-188.
329

330 Randler, C. and Bogner, F.X. 2006. "Cognitive achievements in identification skills." 40 (4):161-165.
331

332 Rickinson, M., J. Dillon, K. Teamey, M. Morris, M. Y. Choi, D. Sanders and P. Benefield. 2004. "A
333 review of research on outdoor learning". NfER. Field Studies Council Occasional Publication 87.
334

335 Scott, G. W., M. Boyd, L. Scott and D. Colquhoun. 2014. "Barriers To Biological Fieldwork: What
336 Really Prevents Teaching Out of Doors?" *Journal of Biological Education* 49 (2): 165-178.
337

338 Scott, G. W., R. Goulder, P. Wheeler, L. J. Scott, M. L. Tobin and S. Marsham. 2012. "The Value of
339 Fieldwork in Life and Environmental Sciences in the Context of Higher Education: A Case Study in
340 Learning About Biodiversity." *Journal of Science Education and Technology* 21 (1): 11-21.
341

342 Smith, D. 2004. "Issues and trends in higher education biology fieldwork." *Journal of Biological*
343 *Education* 39 (1): 6-10.
344


345 Tilling, S. 2004. "Fieldwork in UK secondary schools: influences and provision." *Journal of*
346 *Biological Education* 38(2): 54-58.
347

348 Warren, J. 2015. "Save field biology skills from extinction risk"
349 [https://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/comment/opinion/save-field-biology-skills-from-extinction-
350 risk/2018721.article](https://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/comment/opinion/save-field-biology-skills-from-extinction-risk/2018721.article)
351

352 Welsh, K. and D. France. 2012. "Smartphones and fieldwork." *Geography* 97: 47-51.

353 Woodcock, B., A. Middleton and A. Nortcliffe. 2012. "Considering the Smartphone Learner: an
354 investigation into student interest in the use of personal technology to enhance their learning. "
355 *Student Engagement and Experience Journal*, 1(1).
356


357 **Figures**



358

359 Figure 1: Mean number of birds identified (out of a possible 30) in the first and second spots
360 test in the generous and harsher marking for all of the students (\pm S.E.).

361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377



378

379 Figure 2: Mean number of correctly identified (out of a possible 6) 'un-encountered' birds
380 during the video spots test, when the students with good bird identification skills (n = 9) were
381 removed from the analysis (\pm S.E.).

382