Chapter 5

Conclusion

Studies analyzing the mobile technology’s use in the different aspects of language learning have supported the idea that mobile technology can enhance learners’ second and foreign language acquisition. Learners’ attitudes towards technologies, their intention to use it, and the various actual uses of mobile technology integrated in their second and foreign language learning is a dominating research focus (Chang & Hsu, 2011; Cheng et al., 2010 etc.). The impact of mobile technology on language learning has often been measured by individuals’ stated perceptions. This exemplifies what Orlikowski & Iacono (2001) call the proxy view of technology.

Generally, it has been found that the teenagers have a positive attitude towards using mobile devices for educational purposes due to its convenience; however, most of them did not use the mobile devices for learning consistently. The learning performed by them was done occasionally. Teenagers lack self-direction and need to be shown the advantages and the art of practicing ubiquitous learning by using the mobile devices. Mobile devices can be used by teenagers as an extensive tool in assisting both their formal and informal learning activities. The volume of usage somehow maintained but the activities shifted from one to the other among the teenagers. Teenagers are great explorers. Young teenagers are still fumbling and exploring technology devices. They are looking to the extent of which the technology devices could bring pleasure to them. They do not keep the same interests for long but most of them “dug deep” into other type of interests in using their mobile devices. They have a tendency to look for newer and interesting sites and videos to keep themselves occupied. On the other hand, the role of the teachers in schools was found irreplaceable by mobile devices according to male teenagers;
however, female teenagers obtained some good learning experiences online and they claimed that those learning platforms are more attractive than the teachers at schools. This study suggests that mobile devices can be used to design short-span learning activities or apps for teenagers. Aspects such as engagement, usability and interestingness should be included in the study activities to prolong the teenager attachment to them. Furthermore, there are not many studies focuses on teenagers and mobile devices especially in Asian countries. Thus, more research can be carried out to find out how mobile learning can be integrated in the learning activities for teenagers rather than just let the mobile devices to serve as a social and entertainment tools.

There have been several efforts to create an evaluative framework for apps and mobile language learning projects. Martín Monje, Arús-Hita, Rodríguez-Arancón, and Calle-Martínez (2014) and Moreno and Traxler (2016) propose evaluative systems which link mobile apps to CEFR standards (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages). Zervas and Sampson (2014) outline a framework with which to categorize (as well as to adapt) OER for mobile use. Reinders and Pegrum (2015) recommend an approach that focuses on effective learning design, proposing to examine the extent to which MALL applications correspond to general pedagogical principles, with specific attention to L2 learning and accepted SLA theories. They list an additional category, affective principles, which counts less than the others in their scoring system. Rosell-Aguilar (2017) points out that many apps are designed for a very specific purpose and may not meet all the criteria in a checklist, yet still present a valuable learning opportunity. It is not necessarily the case, as Rosell-Aguilar points out, that the more criteria an app meets, the better it is. He provides evaluative frameworks for different kinds of apps, considering separately apps designed for language learning (e.g., HelloTalk or Rosetta Stone), general apps usable for language learning (writing, podcasts, texting, flashcards, reading), and
dictionary or translator apps. For apps intended for language learning, the author suggests four overriding criteria: technology and design, pedagogy, user experience, and language learning potential. (Kukulska-Hulme, 2009, p. 161) Moreno and Traxler (2016) point out that teachers tend to favor pedagogical approaches they themselves encountered in their education. They therefore propose a mobile-delivered MOOC for language teachers. This might help them rethink the use of MALL activities. Having teachers themselves engage in actual Robert Godwin-Jones 13 learning with mobile devices is likely necessary to effect change. Rosell-Aguilar (2017) suggests several areas that would benefit from further research. One important area is to look beyond mobile device use in the classroom toward an examination of how learners engage in mobile learning in the wild. This might involve looking at combinations of apps that are effective or at which apps can most effectively support different skills (sometimes beyond the stated intended use). Important as well are examples of how mobile-based informal learning can be integrated into instructed language learning. Useful too would be more longitudinal studies, following students’ language learning through time, with an examination of mobile and other tool and services used.

**Recommendations for Practitioners**

The research findings can contribute to both teachers and students who conduct and participate in foreign language courses, by helping them examine the possibility of combining mobile learning with a traditional face-to-face course. Moreover, the findings can assist developers of mobile learning applications, in order to include *gamification* options in the process of learning.
The analysis reveals that smartphones bring the substantial potentials and should be optimized for learning through systematic and purposeful activities properly designed for school learning-related activities. The problem, therefore, lies on the extent to which the school policy makers, or school curriculum designers would consider integrating the smartphone academic-related activities into the school curricula through explicit, structured and measurable classroom activities. With that in mind, the writer would suggest that anyone concerns with the strategic importance of smartphone for English language learning should take it seriously for the best possible advantage of the future activities of learning and teaching through a systematic attempt to incorporate the technological gadgets into the school curricula. They have to implement these technological innovations in their curriculum, without losing their control over the classroom. For example, there are several school apps and smart apps for preschoolers available that make the process of learning and teaching really simple. The future of education is clearly going to be personalized-tech infused learning.

**Recommendation for Future Researchers**

Researchers in the fields of educational smartphone applications and m-learning need to understand the factors enhancing the learning process, in order to develop the next generations of m-learning applications. Further examination is needed in different cultures, in order to understand if the findings are universal.
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