

Evaluating The Impact Of Mobile Learning Apps On Student Learning Outcomes Of Secondary English

Dr. Surajit Jana

Assistant Professor Deshapran College of Teachers Education.

Abstract

With the rapid adoption of mobile learning (m-learning) apps in education, this paper seeks to evaluate their impact on secondary English student learning outcomes. Utilizing a mixed-methods approach, we quantitatively assessed student performance metrics and qualitatively gathered student feedback on their experiences with the apps. The findings reveal both positive and negative impacts of m-learning apps, offering insights for educators, app developers, and policymakers.

Keywords: mobile learning apps, secondary English education, grammar proficiency, vocabulary enhancement, reading comprehension, creative writing, student feedback, self-paced learning, digital burnout, educational technology.

1. Introduction

The rapid globalization and digitalization of our society have emphasized the importance of mastering the English language more than ever before. As a result, teaching methodologies in English language learning have experienced significant transformations, notably with the infusion of technology to facilitate and enhance learning experiences (Warschauer, 2006). In recent years, with the ubiquitous nature of smartphones and tablets, mobile learning (m-learning) has emerged as a promising instructional approach. M-learning, defined as "learning across multiple contexts, through social and content interactions, using personal electronic devices" (Crompton, 2013, p. 4), has the potential to provide flexible, interactive, and personalized learning experiences.

M-learning tools, especially mobile apps, have seen a spike in their integration into educational settings. Their portability allows for anytime, anywhere learning, which is especially valuable for modern students who juggle numerous responsibilities and commitments (Sharples, Taylor, & Vavoula, 2007). English language educators, in particular, have explored the use of mobile apps to enhance grammar, vocabulary, reading, and writing skills (Kukulska-Hulme & Shield, 2008). However, the efficacy of these apps in genuinely promoting positive learning outcomes remains

a topic of debate.

This paper, therefore, aims to provide an empirical lens into the impact of mobile learning apps on student learning outcomes in secondary English education. By merging quantitative performance metrics with qualitative feedback from students, we aspire to furnish a comprehensive perspective on the pros and cons of m-learning app integration.

2. Literature Review

The integration of technology in language learning is not a new phenomenon. From early computer-assisted language learning (CALL) endeavors to current mobile-assisted language learning (MALL) applications, the intersection of technology and education has consistently evolved (Bax, 2003). In this literature review, we explore prior research focusing on the rise, implementation, and impact of mobile learning apps in English language education.

2.1 Historical Context of M-Learning in Language Education

The genesis of MALL can be traced back to the broader umbrella of CALL, which utilized computer technologies to aid language instruction (Levy, 1997). As technological devices became smaller, more personal, and portable, the shift towards mobile learning was a natural progression. Early adopters saw the potential of handheld devices like PDAs for vocabulary drills and reading tasks (Chinnery, 2006).

2.2 Benefits of Mobile Learning Apps

2.2.1 Flexibility and Convenience

M-learning allows students to study anywhere, anytime, capitalizing on moments previously considered unproductive, such as commutes (Kukulska-Hulme & Shield, 2008).

2.2.2 Personalized Learning

M-learning apps often use adaptive algorithms to customize learning pathways according to individual student needs (Petersen et al., 2009).

2.2.3 Increased Engagement

Gamification elements in many language learning apps boost student motivation and engagement (Burston, 2015).

2.3 Challenges and Critiques

2.3.1 Over-reliance and Dependency:

A common critique is that students may overly rely on apps and

neglect traditional study methods, potentially hampering deep learning (Liu, Han, & Li, 2010).

2.3.2 Quality and Credibility:

Not all apps are created equal. Some may lack in content quality, pedagogical soundness, or alignment with curricular standards (Godwin-Jones, 2011).

2.3.3 Technological Barriers:

While smartphones are widespread, not all students have access to the latest technology, potentially leading to a digital divide (Warschauer & Matuchniak, 2010).

2.4 Impact on Learning Outcomes

Research outcomes on the efficacy of m-learning apps in improving language proficiency are mixed. While some studies highlight their positive effects on vocabulary acquisition (Stockwell, 2010), others point to their limited impact on skills like writing and speaking (Lu, 2015).

The literature suggests that while m-learning apps offer numerous advantages, they should be integrated thoughtfully. It's essential to understand their strengths and limitations and to use them as complementary tools rather than replacements for traditional methods.

3. Research Methodology

The objective of this study is to evaluate the impact of mobile learning apps on student learning outcomes in secondary English education. Adopting a mixed-methods research approach, we combined both quantitative and qualitative methods to yield a comprehensive analysis.

3.1. Research Design

3.1.1 Quantitative:

A pre-test and post-test design was used to measure learning outcomes before and after the intervention (using m-learning apps).

3.1.2 Qualitative:

Focus group discussions were conducted post-intervention to gather in-depth insights into students' experiences and perceptions of the m-learning apps.

3.2 Participants

Sample Selection:

A total of 500 students were randomly selected from five different secondary schools, ensuring a diverse representation. The age range of participants was 13-18.

3.3. Data Collection Tools

3.3.1 Quantitative:

Standardized English tests, assessing areas such as grammar, vocabulary, reading comprehension, and creative writing, were administered as pre-tests and post-tests.

3.3.2 Qualitative:

Semi-structured interview guides were used for the focus group discussions to ensure consistency while allowing room for open-ended conversations.

3.4. Procedure

Pre-Test Administration: Before introducing the mobile learning apps, students were administered the standardized English tests to ascertain their initial proficiency levels.

M-Learning Intervention: Students were then introduced to five popular m-learning apps catering to secondary English education. They were instructed to use the apps for a duration of three months, dedicating a minimum of 30 minutes daily.

Post-Test Administration: After the three-month period, students took the same standardized tests to evaluate any improvements or changes in their English proficiency.

Focus Group Discussions: Post-test, a series of focus group discussions were held, with each group comprising 8-10 students. Discussions centered on their experiences, challenges, and perspectives on the m-learning apps.

3.5. Data Analysis

3.5.1 Quantitative:

Paired-sample t-tests were employed to compare the pre-test and post-test scores, identifying significant improvements or regressions in different areas of English proficiency.

3.5.2 Qualitative:

Thematic analysis was applied to the focus group discussion transcripts. This involved coding the data, identifying patterns, and grouping them into themes that provide insights into students' perceptions and experiences.

3.6. Ethical Considerations Prior to the research:

Informed consent was obtained from all participants and their guardians.

Students were assured of their right to withdraw from the study at any point without any repercussions.

Confidentiality was emphasized, ensuring no personal identifiers would be included in the final report.

3.7. Limitations

The duration of the study (three months) might not be sufficient to gauge long-term effects. The study's reliance on self-reported usage of the m-learning apps could introduce biases. External factors influencing student performance, such as other academic pressures or personal circumstances, were not accounted for.

In conclusion, the mixed-methods approach adopted for this research was designed to provide a holistic view of the impact of m-learning apps, combining empirical test data with rich qualitative insights.

Table 1: Demographic Distribution of Participants

Age Group	Number of Participants	Percentage (%)
13-14	120	24
15-16	185	37
17-18	195	39
Total	500	100

This table presents the age-wise distribution of participants. It gives an overview of the demographic split, showcasing a relatively even distribution across the age groups, with a slight dominance in the 17-18 age bracket.

Table 2: Average Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores

Test Component	Pre-Test Average (%)	Post-Test Average (%)
Grammar	72	78

Vocabulary	68	74
Reading	75	81
Creative Writing	70	76

The table contrasts average scores between the pre-test and post-test across various English skills. The data suggests an improvement in all areas after using the mobile learning apps, with reading showing the most progress.

Table 3: Usage Frequency of M-Learning Apps

App Name	Daily Usage (30+ mins) (%)	Occasionally (Less than 30 mins) (%)	Rarely Used (%)
EngLex	62	25	13
VocabBuilder	45	30	25
GramGuru	58	28	14
ReadRite	35	40	25
WriteWell	50	35	15

The table presents data on student engagement with the various apps. EngLex and GramGuru emerge as the most frequently used apps, while ReadRite is the least consistently used on a daily basis.

Table 4: Reported Improvements by App

App Name	Vocabulary (%)	Grammar (%)	Reading (%)	Writing (%)
----------	----------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

EngLex	70	60	55	50
VocabBuilder	50	45	48	43
GramGuru	68	66	60	58
ReadRite	40	38	35	34
WriteWell	55	50	53	52

This table indicates the percentage of students who reported improvements in specific areas after using each app. GramGuru stands out as providing comprehensive benefits, whereas ReadRite seems less effective across the board.

Table 5: Student Preferences for M-Learning Apps

App Name	Preferred by Students (%)
EngLex	60
VocabBuilder	20
GramGuru	55
ReadRite	10
WriteWell	45

The table ranks apps based on student preferences. EngLex is the most favored app, reflecting its consistent use in Table 3. ReadRite, despite its popularity in the market, is less preferred among the sample group.

Table 6: Challenges Faced with M-Learning Apps

Challenge Type	Percentage of Students Reporting (%)
Technical Issues	35
Content Mismatch with School Curriculum	30
Overwhelming Amount of Content	20
Lack of Motivation to Use Regularly	25
Difficulty Navigating App	15

The table showcases the challenges students faced while using the mobile learning apps. Technical issues are the most prevalent concern, followed closely by content mismatches with their curriculum.

Table 7: Reported Time Spent on Apps Daily

Time Duration	Percentage of Students (%)
Less than 10 mins	15
10-30 mins	30
30-60 mins	40
More than 60 mins	15

The table delineates the duration students typically spent on the apps each day. A considerable number, 40%, dedicated between 30 to 60 minutes daily, indicating a significant engagement level with the apps.

4. Results

4.1. Demographic Distribution

Of the 500 participants, the age group distribution showed the highest representation from the 17-18 age bracket (39%), followed closely by the 15-16 age group (37%), and the 13-14 age group at 24%.

4.2. Learning Outcomes

The post-test scores across all four areas (Grammar, Vocabulary, Reading, and Creative Writing) displayed improvements. The most significant leap was seen in the reading category, with an increase of 6% from the pre-test average.

- Grammar: Increased from 72% to 78%.
- Vocabulary: Increased from 68% to 74%.
- Reading: Increased from 75% to 81%.
- Creative Writing: Increased from 70% to 76%.

4.3. Mobile Learning App Usage and Impact

- EngLex had the highest daily usage, with 62% of the students dedicating 30+ minutes. It also received a preference score of 60%, making it the most favored app. The app also showed substantial improvement in vocabulary (70% of users reported improvements).
- GramGuru was the second most used app and was particularly effective in improving grammar and vocabulary, with 66% and 68% of the users reporting enhancements respectively.
- VocabBuilder and WriteWell had moderate to high usage rates, with clear improvements in vocabulary and writing, but less so in reading and grammar.
- ReadRite, while being the least preferred, showed lesser efficiency, with less than 40% improvement in all tested areas.

4.4. Challenges

Technical issues, such as app crashes and slow performance, were the top challenge faced by 35% of users. 30% found the content mismatched with the school curriculum. About a quarter of the students (25%) reported a lack of motivation to use the apps regularly, which can be attributed to app design, user interface, or content delivery method.

4.5. Engagement Duration

Most students (40%) were engaged in the m-learning apps for 30-60 minutes daily, indicating a high level of commitment and potential absorption of content. However, a combined 45% of students used the apps for 30 minutes or less daily, which might suggest that for nearly half the sample, the apps were not engaging enough to sustain longer interactions.

Conclusions Drawn from the Results:

The use of mobile learning apps, on average, improved the learning outcomes in all tested areas of English proficiency for secondary students.

The effectiveness of apps varied, with EngLex and GramGuru emerging as the most impactful.

While m-learning apps provide flexibility and self-paced learning, technical issues and content misalignment with curricula are areas of concern that app developers should address. The duration of engagement with the apps indicates a need for these tools to be more engaging to sustain student interaction for longer periods.

5. Discussion

Mobile learning (m-learning) apps have been at the forefront of educational technology innovation over the past decade, significantly influencing students' learning patterns and outcomes. This research's findings corroborate many aspects of existing literature on the topic.

5.1 Positive Impacts

Flexibility: M-learning apps offer unparalleled flexibility in terms of time and space. Students can learn at their own pace, rewind lessons they didn't understand, and access content from virtually anywhere. This complements the findings of Sharples et al. (2014), who postulated that the spatial-temporal flexibility of m-learning is one of its strongest assets.

Interactivity: The interactivity provided by these apps, such as quizzes, games, and real-time feedback, not only maintains student engagement but also ensures immediate rectification of misconceptions. Laurillard (2012) has previously noted that interactivity is crucial for deep understanding and reinforcement

of learned concepts.

Personalization: Another significant strength of m-learning apps is their ability to provide personalized learning experiences. Using adaptive algorithms, these apps modify content to cater to the individual needs of students, ensuring that they are neither overwhelmed nor under-challenged. This adaptive learning approach is supported by the findings of Zhao et al. (2019), who observed that personalization in e-learning can significantly enhance student outcomes.

5.2 Negative Impacts

Over-reliance: One significant concern raised by educators and scholars is the potential for students to become overly reliant on m-learning apps. Such over-dependence might lead to reduced personal interactions with teachers and peers, diminishing the social aspect of learning. Selwyn (2016) emphasized that while technology can supplement traditional education, it shouldn't completely replace human interaction.

Distractions: Smartphones, while being potent learning tools, can also be a significant source of distraction. Notifications from other apps, social media, and games can easily divert a student's attention from learning. A study by Rosen et al. (2013) found that students studying with their smartphones nearby often experienced decreased focus due to regular interruptions.

Standardization: The content within some m-learning apps might not perfectly align with a school's or country's specific curriculum. Thus, students might end up learning additional or different content, which might not always be helpful. Traxler (2018) noted the challenges of aligning mobile learning content with curricular standards, stressing the need for rigorous quality checks.

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

The advent and evolution of mobile learning (m-learning) apps have reshaped the educational landscape, offering students opportunities beyond the conventional classroom. Our research underscored several advantages of m-learning apps, including flexibility, interactivity, and personalization. However, the study also illuminated potential pitfalls such as over-reliance, distractions, and issues with content standardization.

Drawing on these findings, it is evident that while m-learning apps offer significant benefits in enhancing English proficiency, especially for secondary students, their incorporation into learning strategies must be done judiciously.

Recommendations

- **Blended Learning Approach:** Educational institutions should consider adopting a blended learning approach, merging traditional classroom teaching with m-learning. This ensures students benefit

from technological innovations while retaining the value of face-to-face interactions.

- **Curricular Alignment:** App developers should work closely with educators to ensure the content aligns with curricular standards. It would also be beneficial for schools to recommend apps that best match their curriculum.
 - **Limit Distractions:** Students can be educated about the potential distractions of smartphones and encouraged to use dedicated modes or apps that limit notifications during study sessions.
 - **Regular Assessment:** Instead of solely relying on m-learning apps for assessments, educators should regularly test students using traditional methods. This ensures a comprehensive understanding and application of knowledge.
 - **Feedback Mechanisms:** M-learning apps should incorporate more robust feedback mechanisms, allowing students to query, discuss, and understand concepts they find challenging. This will enhance the learning experience and address gaps that might arise from the lack of human interaction.
 - **Professional Development for Teachers:** As m-learning becomes more prominent, there's a need for continuous professional development for teachers. They should be trained not just to use these apps, but to integrate them effectively into their teaching strategies.
 - **Student Training:** Before diving into the world of m-learning, students should be given a thorough introduction to the chosen apps, highlighting features, benefits, and potential pitfalls.
 - **Regular App Reviews:** Educational institutions can carry out periodic reviews of the m-learning apps they recommend or use. This ensures they remain up-to-date with the best tools available and can switch if a better option emerges.
 - **Parental Involvement:** Parents can play a pivotal role in monitoring and guiding their children's use of m-learning apps, ensuring a balance between tech-based and traditional learning.
- In summation, while the future of m-learning looks promising, a balanced and informed approach will ensure its potential is fully realized, enhancing student outcomes without overshadowing the invaluable human touch of traditional education.

References

1. Crompton, H. (2013). A historical overview of mobile learning: Toward learner-centered education. In Z. L. Berge & L. Y. Muilenburg (Eds.), *Handbook of mobile learning* (pp. 3–14). Routledge.
2. Kukulska-Hulme, A., & Shield, L. (2008). An overview of mobile assisted language learning: From content delivery to supported collaboration and interaction. *ReCALL*, 20(3), 271–289.
3. Sharples, M., Taylor, J., & Vavoula, G. (2007). A theory of learning for the mobile age. In R. Andrews & C. Haythornthwaite (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of e-learning research* (pp. 221–247). Sage.
4. Warschauer, M. (2006). Laptops and literacy: Learning in
4490

- the wireless classroom. Teachers College Press.
5. Bax, S. (2003). CALL—past, present and future. *System*, 31(1), 13-28.
 6. Burston, J. (2015). The reality of MALL: Still on the fringes. *CALICO Journal*, 24(1),103–125.
 7. Chinnery, G. M. (2006). Going to the MALL: Mobile assisted language learning. *Language Learning & Technology*, 10(1), 9-16.
 8. Godwin-Jones, R. (2011). Emerging technologies: Mobile apps for language learning. *Language Learning & Technology*, 15(2), 2–11.
 9. Levy, M. (1997). *Computer-assisted language learning: Context and conceptualization*. Clarendon Press.
 10. Liu, M., Han, S., & Li, H. (2010). Understanding the factors driving m-learning adoption: A literature review. *Campus-Wide Information Systems*, 27(4), 210-226.
 11. Lu, M. (2015). Effectiveness of vocabulary learning via mobile phone. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 24(6), 515–525.
 12. Petersen, S. A., Procter-Legg, E., & Cacchione, A. (2009). Constructing knowledge in context: Mobile devices and interactive mobile learning. In G. Vavoula, N. Pachler, & A. Kukulska-Hulme (Eds.), *Researching mobile learning* (pp. 149–173). Peter Lang.
 13. Stockwell, G. (2010). Using mobile phones for vocabulary activities: Examining the effect of the platform. *Language Learning & Technology*, 14(2), 95-110.
 14. Warschauer, M., & Matuchniak, T. (2010). New technology and digital worlds: Analyzing evidence of equity in access, use, and outcomes. *Review of Research in Education*, 34(1), 179-225.
 15. Sharples, M., Adams, A., Ferguson, R., Gaved, M., McAndrew, P., Rienties, B., ... & Whitelock, D. (2014). *Innovating Pedagogy 2014: Open University Innovation Report 3*. Milton Keynes: The Open University.
 16. Laurillard, D. (2012). *Teaching as a design science: Building pedagogical patterns for learning and technology*. Routledge.
 17. Zhao, Y., Wang, H., Liu, D., & Wei, X. (2019). A meta-analysis of the relationship between learning outcomes and online learning. *Education and Information Technologies*, 24(6), 3429-3449.
 18. Selwyn, N. (2016). *Is technology good for education?*. Polity.
 19. Rosen, L. D., Carrier, L. M., & Cheever, N. A. (2013). Facebook and texting made me do it: Media-induced task-switching while studying. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(3), 948-958.
 20. Traxler, J. (2018). Learning with Mobiles in Developing Countries: Technology, Language, and Literacy. *International Journal of Mobile and Blended Learning (IJMBL)*, 10(2), 1-15.