# TENTH GRADE STUDENTS' PERCEPTION TOWARD MOBILE ASSISTED LANGUAGE LEARNING (MALL) IN LEARNING ENGLISH IN BULELENG REGENCY IN ACADEMIC YEAR 2017/2018

P.A. Widiana<sup>1</sup>, M.H Santosa<sup>2</sup>, & I. P. N. W. Myartawan<sup>3</sup>

Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha Singaraja, Indonesia

e-mail: agusdfa@yahoo.co.id , mhsantosa@undiksha.ac.id , wmyartawan@gmail.com\_

### Abstract

The characteristics of today's mobile technology (Smartphone) which are wireless, personal, networking, and ubiquitous have influenced every aspect of human life. Using mobile technology in learning would decrease learning English problems in EFL setting, including lack of opportunity to learn. By using Smartphone, the learners could access information and develop it across space and be connected to the others. This study aimed at investigating tenth grade students' perception toward Mobile Assisted Language Learning (MALL) in learning English and comparing the perception between the students who had mobile technology and the students who had no mobile technology in three parts of Buleleng regency. This study was quantitative approach which employed Cross-sectional survey as the method. The study involved 174 tenth grade students in six schools in Buleleng regency. The questionnaire on Unified Theory of Accept and Use Technology (UTAUT) was developed and used as instrument of collecting data in this study. The students' perception toward MALL respected to three dimensions of UTAUT theory (Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, and Social Influence). As the result, tenth grade students in Buleleng regency had positive perception toward MALL in learning English. Students who had mobile technology tend to have more positive perception rather than students who had no mobile technology. This study also confirmed that Performance Expectancy was the stronger factor of students' perception on MALL in learning English. Thus, MALL should be integrated in learning English process since it is perceived to be useful to enhance students' performance in learning English.

Keywords: Perception, Mobile technology, m-learning, MALL, UTAUT.

### Abstrak

Perkembangan mobile technology telah mempengaruhi setiap aspek kehidupan manusia. Penggunaan mobile technology seperti smartphone dan tablet dalam pendidikan akan mengatasi masalah keterbatasan kesempatan dalam belajar bahasa Inggris di negara-negara dimana bahasa Inggris merupakan bahasa asing. Dengan menggunakan smartphone, siswa dapat mengakses informasi dan mengembangkan informasi tersebut kapanpun dan dimanapun serta membentuk komunitas belajar. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui persepsi siswa kelas sepuluh terhadap penggunaan smartphone dalam belajar bahasa Inggris (Mobile Assisted Language Learning/MALL) dan membandingkan persepsi antara siswa yang memiliki smartphone dengan siswa yang tidak memiliki smartphone di kabupaten Buleleng. 174 siswa di enam sekolah di kabupaten Buleleng digunakan sebagai sampel penelitian. Kuisioner Unified Theory of Accept and Use Technology (UTAUT) dikembangkan dan digunakan sebagai instrument dalam mengumpulkan data. Persepsi siswa terhadap penggunaan smartphone dalam belajar bahasa Inggris di pengaruhi oleh tiga dimensi yaitu Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, dan Social Influence. Hasil penelitian ini menunjukan bahwa siswa kelas sepuluh di kabupaten Buleleng memiliki persepsi yang

# e-Journal JPBI Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha

# Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris (Volume Tahun 2018)

positif terhadapa penggunaan *smartphone* dalam belajar bahasa Inggis. Siswa yang memiliki *smartphone* cendrung memiliki persepsi yang lebih positif dari pada siswa yang tidak memiliki *smarthphone*. Dalam penelitian ini, Performance Expectancy adalah factor yang paling kuat dalam menentukan persepsi siswa. Jadi dapat diimplikasikan bahwa pembelajaran bahasa Inggris harus lebih sering mengintegrasikan penggunaan *smartphone* untuk meningkatkan fungsi dari *smartphone* dalam mendukung pembelajaran bahasa Inggris.

Kata kunci: Persepsi, Mobile technology, m-learning, MALL, UTAU

### Introduction

English has been an important requirement to compete in this era where the technology has been developing rapidly (EF EPI, 2016). By using English, the updated information can be explored through today's technology. Based on the data on EF EPI (2016), English proficiency in Indonesia was in moderated level which means that Indonesian should increase their English proficiency.

However, Learning English in EFL country including Indonesia is claimed challenging. It was discussed by McCarty et al. (2017) that EFL countries offer very limited exposure of English in daily life. Students may only learn English in their school hours. Thus, the opportunity to learn and develop English is very limited. Informal education may have to be emphasized by integrating ICT elements to create new learning environment and fulfill English learning needs (Surf Net, 2016). However, since the existence of mobile technology including smartphone, learning English would not be difficult anymore.

Smartphone is a combination of the capabilities of cell phone, camera, mp3 player, video player, recorder, mass storage, and networking connection in one compact system (Corbeil & Valdes-Corbeil, 2007). Smartphone is claimed as the most interactive and powerful mobile technology today because of its portability and the capabilities (Miangah & Nezarat, 2012; UNESCO, 2013).

According to Sharples et al. (2007), the evolution of mobile phone brings learners to learn on the move. The learners could move from topic to topic in one location, develop it in another location and they could manage a range of personal project. The learners are increasingly in a position to take lead and engage activities that motivate by their personal needs and circumstances of use because the use of mobile technology is personal and ownership (Kukulska-Hulme, Agnes, & Shield, 2008).

Moreover, internet connection on mobile technology brings capability to access information anywhere and anytime and be connected to others. The learners could exchange information with their peers and make the learning becomes effective (Vyas & Nirban, 2014). According to Sharples et al (2007), the learning would be effective if the learners actively engaged with their peers in acquiring knowledge and skill.

Technology has move to mobility (UNESCO, 2013). In 21<sup>st</sup> century, smartphone is increasingly used (Kukulska-Hulme, Agnes, & Shield, 2008; Oz, 2015; Pimmer, Mateescu, & Gröhbiel, 2016). It grows exponentially to become affordable and ubiquitous due to game, business. lifestyle, information and learning (Hashemi, Azizinezhad, Najafi, & Nesari, 2011; Vyas & Nirban, 2014). It affects every aspect of human life.

Numerous studies (Al-husain, Hammo & Arabia, 2015; Calabrich, 2016)

had found that students' technology ownership has move to mobility. Smartphone is mobile technology that students mostly used.

Nowadays, most of children and teenager have their own mobile technology (Surf Net, 2016). They are considered as digital natives because they live surrounded by technology which means that they learn, play, and socialize by using technology (European Network of Education Council, 2014). Hence, the technology would change how the children learn (Kee, 2014).

According to Santosa (2017) both students and teachers would face the changing of learning styles and needs. The technology would keep develop to the new shape and form to support learning. Hence, the use of mobile technology including smartphone in learning English may be possibly adopted and diffused. The study which using mobile technology to support learning is called mobile learning.

According to Kukulska-Hulme, Agnes, and Shield, (2008) mobile learning is a learning mediated via handheld devices which is potentially available anywhere and anytime. Moreover, Sharples et al. (2007) viewed mobile learning as a process of coming to know through continuous conversation across multiple contexts among people and interactive technologies which raises the issues where the ownership lies. Sharples et al. (2007) showed relation between new technologies on mobile phone that influence the learning (the relation between new technology and new learning by Sharples et al. (2007) could be seen on Table 1).

r

Table 1: Relation between New Learning and New Technology

(Adapted from Sharples et al., 2007, p. 3)

From those statements, mobile learning could be defined in term of the use of handheld devices, mobility of the learners and emphasized in informal learning situation. Mobile learning which deals to second language acquisition is namely Mobile Assisted Language Learning (MALL) (Yang, 2013).

MALL is different to CALL (Computer Assisted Language Leaning) in its portability and personal use. MALL and CALL bring new learning situation to learn in informal situation, but MALL is different to CALL in its personal usage and the mobility. Moreover, MALL could generate learning content by using the capability of camera, video recorder, and voice recorder to capture learning contents (McCarty et al., 2017).

MALL is argued suit for social context and collaborative learning (Kukulska-Hulme, Agnes, & Shield, 2008). MALL activity developed materials that the learners can respond rather receive passively. The learners could send and receive information from their friend,

peers, group, and also to the teacher (Dashtestani, 2013; Kukulska-hulme, 2008). In general, MALL is expected to use mobile phone, mp3/mp4, PDAs, and laptop (Kukulska-Hulme, Agnes, & Shield, 2008).

Numerous studies had been conducted which related to the use of mobile technology to support learning Azar Nasiri English. & (2014)investigated Iranian English for foreign learners' attitudes toward the effectiveness of Mobile Assisted Language Learning on their listening comprehension. The result showed that the experimental group significantly outperformed the control group in their listening comprehension. Hwang and Chen (2013) found that the use of personal digital assistant really help the students to do more practice. The students could repeatedly record their own voice and listen to themselves and re-play others' recordings in order to improve their language proficiency.

Numerous studies (Kétyi1, 2013; So, 2016) developed MALL activity by installing learning apps on smartphone. It that smartphone implied could be modified by useful apps to support learning English needs. The studies support Hussin, Manap, Amir and Krish statement (2017)that educational institution should look the possibilities of mobile phone in academic program regarding to the availability of various apps that could be installed to support learning and teaching process.

Dashtestani (2013) mentioned some problems that could possibly occur when applying MALL in the class room. The students may use their mobile technology for non-academic purposes that could disrupt the learning process. Moreover, there are some limitations of MALL such as small screen size and keyboard, low speed internet connection, limited mass storage, and battery life. (Hashemi, Azizinezhad, Nafaji, & Nesari, 2011; Dashtestani, 2013).

However, since mobile technology has been developing to be better and powerful, those limitations may not be prevailed anymore. According to Oz (2015), the successfulness of technology in supporting learning does not depend on the technology, but it depends on how the user perceives toward the technology which could give contribution to the learning. Thus, the user's perception toward technology to support their learning is important to achieve further successful implementation (Shorfuzzaman & Alhussein, 2016).

Unified Theory of Accept and Use Technologies (UTAUT) was used in this study in providing aspects of MALL that would be perceived by the participants. UTAUT was done by Venkatesh et al. (2003). UTAUT was claimed capable to explain around 70% of variance why an individual intent to use the technology or the system.

UTAUT provided four variable constructs that influence user's behavior (Performance expectancy, Effort

expectancy, Social Influence, and facilitating condition) and moderated by some variables including age, gender, experience, and voluntariness.

Numerous studies (Marchewka & Kostiwa, 2007; Bogart & Wichadee, 2015; Chaka & Govender, 2017) used Technology adoption theory to investigate students' perception toward the technology. Those studies had similar finding that the student believed toward the usefulness of the technology and it

perceived to be positive. It also stated that students intend to use the technology as long as it is perceived useful for them

In the current study, the moderated variables and Facilitating condition were not included as long as facilitated condition directs effect to user behavior (UTAUT model figure could be seen on Figure 1).



Figure 1: UTAUT Model (Venkatesh et al., 2003, p. 447)

Consequently, the current study intended to investigate students' perception toward MALL in learning English viewed from three UTAUT factors (Performance expectancy, Effort expectancy, and Social influence). The researcher was also interested in students' perception viewed by their gadget ownership. According to McCarty et al. (2013) students' gadget ownership may make differences. The students who have no mobile technology may not use the technology as well as the students who have mobile technology. Hence, the current study also investigated students' perception viewed by their gadget ownership and compared their perception.

Therefore, the current study had two aims. The first was to investigate students' perception toward MALL and the second was comparing students' perception between students who had mobile technology and students who had no mobile technology. The finding of

Study was related to the findings in previous studies such as Marchewka and Kostiwa (2007), Al-husain, Hammo, and Arabia (2015), Bogart and Wichadee (2015), Calabrich (2016), So (2016), Chaka and Govender (2017).

This study was expected to contribute in mobile learning literature especially in technology adoption theory.

### Methodology

The study adopted quantitative research approach and cross-sectional survey was employed in collecting the data (Creswell, 2012). The data of the study was present and discussed in form of tables.

The participants of this study were 174 tenth grade students in six schools in Buleleng regency. Simple random sampling was employed in determining the sample of the study. The researcher only took 1 class in each school which was determined by lottery.

A modified Venkatesh et al. (2003) questionnaire was employed as the instrument of this study. The questionnaire was made up of three section including demographic information, students gadget ownership, and perception toward MALL. In third section consisted of 22 items measured on a Five-point Likert scales. Some of items were adapted from Venkatesh et al (2003) which had been validated and modified for specific purposes regarding to MALL study.

The content validity was ensured by the expert judgments and had been tried out to 100 students in a school in Buleleng regency. After being tried out, two items were dropped out. As the result, 20 items were left. Cronbach's alpha and 'table distribution were employed in testing the reliability and validity.

#### Table 2: Reliability

Cronbach's	rtabel	Status
Alpha	(n=100)	
0.856	0.195	RELIABLE

Descriptive Analysis was conducted on Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) 16.0 to determine the percentage of student responses toward the items regarding to three UTAUT factors. Positive and negative perception were determine by classifying five-point Likert scales responses into positive, neutral, and negative responses. Second, the responses between students who had mobile technology and students who had no mobile technology were measured and compared.

 Table 3: Respondents' Demographic Data (n=174)

Item		Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	70	40.2%
	Female	104	59.8%
Age	14 years	7	4.0%
	15 years	112	64.4%
	16 years	52	29.9%

#### Table 4: Respondents' Gadget Ownership Data (n=174)

Item		Frequency	Percent
Having gadget		142	79.3%
Having no gadget		32	17.9%
Type of gadgets that are	Smartphone	148	82.7%
mostly used	Tablet	12	6.7%

### **Result and Finding**

Table 5: Total percentages of students' responses toward MALL (n= 174)

Item	Negative	Neutral	Positive
PE1	1 (0.6%)	38 (21.8%)	135 (77.6%)
PE2	4 (2.2%)	25 (14.4%)	145 (83.3%)
PE3	2 (1.2%)	27 (15.5%)	145 (83.3%)
PE4	4 (2.3%)	47 (27.0%)	123 (70.7%)
PE5	4 (2.3%)	59 (33.9%)	111 (63.8%)
PE6	1 (0.6%)	17 (9.8%)	156 (89.6 %)
PE7	9 (5.2%)	46 (26.4%)	119 (68.4%)
PE8	12 (6.9%)	77 (44.3%)	85 (48.9%)
PE9	12 (6.7%)	79 (45.4%)	83 (47.7%)
PE10	6 (3.5%)	28 (16.1%)	140 (80.5%)
EE1	5 (2.9%)	47 (27.0%)	122 (70.1%)
EE2	44 (25.3%)	75 (43.1%)	55 (31.6)
EE3	14 (8.1%)	76 (43.7%)	84 (48.3%)
EE4	6 (3.4%)	51 (29.3%)	117 (67.2%)
SI1	48 (27.6%)	91 (52.3%)	35 (20.1%)
SI2	40 (22.9%)	89 (51.1%)	45 (25.8%)
SI3	19 (10.5)	64 (36.8 %)	91 (52.3%)
SI4	42 (24.2)	54 (31.0%)	78 (48.8%)
SI5	83 (47.7)	60 (34.5%)	31 (17.8%)
SI6	46 (26.4%)	87 (50.0%)	41 (23.5%)

A descriptive analysis is described to provide richer understanding of students' perception. Based on Table 5, 100% items on performance expectancy were perceived positive which means that they believed toward the usefulness mobile technology in learning English. On effort expectancy, 75% items were perceived positive. It means that mobile technology in supporting English was perceived lees of effort. However, it seems neutral in term of social influence.

Item	Negative	Neutral	Positive
PE1	-	11 (34.4%)	21 (65.6%)
PE2	1 (3.1%)	6 (18.8%)	25 (78.1%)
PE3	-	9 (28.1%)	23 (71.8%)
PE4	3 (9.4%)	10 (31.2%)	19 (59.4%)

Table 6: Total Responses of Students who have no Mobile Technology toward MALL (n= 32)

PE5	2 (6.2%)	11 (34.4%)	19 (59.4%)
PE6	1 (3.1%)	1 (3.1%)	30 (93.7%)
PE7	3 (9.4%)	11 (34.4%)	18 (56.2%)
PE8	1 (3.1%)	19 (59.4%)	12 (37.5%)
PE9	6 (21.8%)	14 (43.8%)	11 (34.4%)
PE10	4 (12.5%)	4 (12.5%)	24 (59.4%)
EE1	3 (9.4%)	10 (31.2%)	19 (59.4.1%)
EE2	12 (37.5%)	16 (50.0%)	4 (12.5%)
EE3	8 (24.0%)	15 (46.9%)	9 (28.1%)
EE4	4 (12.5%)	14 (43.8%)	14 (43.7%)
SI1	16 (50.0%)	13 (40.6%)	3 (9.4%)
SI2	13 (40.6%)	15 (46.9%)	4 (12.5%)
SI3	9 (28.2%)	10 (31.2 %)	13 (40.6%)
SI4	17 (53.1%)	9 (28.1%)	6 (18.8%)
SI5	23 (71.9%)	6 (18.8%)	3 (9.4%)
SI6	14 (43.7%)	15 (46.9%)	3 (9.4%)

<b>Table 7: Total Res</b>	oonses of Students who h	nave Mobile Technology	toward MALL (n=142)	)
I MOIO / I I OUMI ILOS	sources of sequences which	ave mobile reenholds,		

Item	Negative	Neutral	Positive
PE1	1 (0.7%)	27 (19.0%)	114 (80.3%)
PE2	3 (2.1%)	19 (13.4%)	120 (84.5%)
PE3	2 (1.4%)	18 (12.7%)	122 (85.9%)
PE4	1 (0.7%)	37 (26.1%)	104 (73.3%)
PE5	2 (1.4%)	48 (33.8%)	92 (64.8%)
PE6	-	16 (11.3%)	126 (88.7%)
PE7	6 (4.2%)	35 (24.6%)	101 (71.1%)
PE8	11 (7.7%)	58 (40.8%)	73 (51.4%)
PE9	5 (3.5%)	65 (45.8%)	72 (50.7%)
PE10	2 (1.4%)	24 (16.9%)	116 (81.7%)
EE1	2 (1.4%)	37 (26.1%)	103 (72.6%)
EE2	32 (22.5%)	59 (41.5%)	51 (35.9%)
EE3	6 (4.2%)	61 (43.0%)	75 (52.8%)
EE4	2 (1.4%)	37 (26.1%)	103 (72.5%)
SI1	32 (22.5%)	78 (54.9%)	32 (22.5%)
SI2	27 (19.0%)	74 (52.1%)	41 (28.8%)
SI3	7 (10.0%)	54 (38.0 %)	78 (55.0%)
SI4	25 (17.6%)	45 (31.7%)	72 (50.7%)
SI5	60 (42.3%)	54 (38.0%)	28 (19.7%)
SI6	32 (22.5%)	72 (50.7%)	38 (26.7%)

Based on Table 6 and Table 7, the students who had mobile technology tend to had more positive perception toward MALL. It could be seen from three UTAUT factors. In term of performance expectancy, 100% percent items were responded positive compared to the students who had no mobile technology which was 75%. In term of effort expectancy, 75% items were perceived positive by the students who had mobile technology meanwhile, the students who had no mobile technology seems to be neutral. In term of social influence, both

of them were neutral. They might not be influenced by others that think they should use mobile technology in learning English.

## Conclusion

Based on the finding and discussion of the study, tenth grade students in Buleleng regency had positive perception toward MALL in learning English. The students who had mobile technology tend to had more positive perception toward MALL in learning English. Viewed on three UTAUT factors, the study supported for UTAUT theory that performance expectancy was the strongest factor. The students may have been familiar toward the capability and the usefulness of today's mobile technology that could support their activity especially in learning English needs.

Since performance expectancy was perceived to be positive, the teacher should look the possibilities of mobile technology to support learning process. It should be more integrated to the learning English to maximize the usefulness of mobile technology to facilitate English learning needs.

Due the limitation of the sample size of the study, further investigation is needed. It might be in different grade, age, and community. Moreover, research in area of MALL which using UTAUT is relatively limited. It might need some additional factors to better explain specific of MALL. This study could provide helpful direction for further exploration of MALL research.

## References

Al-husain, D., Hammo, B. H., & Arabia, S. (2015). Investigating The Readiness of College Students for ICT and Mobile Learning: A Case Study from King Saud University. *International Arab Journal of e-Technology*, 4(1), 48–55.

- Azar, A. S., & Nasiri, H. (2014). Learners' Attitudes toward the Effectiveness of Mobile Assisted Language Learning (MALL) in L2 Listening Comprehension. *Procedia - Social* and Behavioral Sciences, 98, 1836– 1843. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.613
- Barreh, K. (2015). Students 'Attitudes and Perceptions toward the Effectiveness of Mobile Learning in University of Djibouti. *International Journal of Education and Research, 3*(1), 601– 612
- Bogart, W. Van De, & Wichadee, S. (2015). Exploring Students ' Intention to Use LINE for Academic Purposes Based on Technology Acceptance Model. International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 16(3), 65–85.
- Bradley, J. (2009). The Technology Acceptance Model and Other User Acceptance Theories.
- Candiasa, I. M. (2010). Pengujian instrumen penelitian disertai aplikasi ITEMAN dan BIGSTEPS. Singaraja: Unit Penerbitan Universits Pendidikan Ganesha.
- Calabrich, S. L. (2016). Learners ' Perceptions of the Use of Mobile Technology in a Task-Based Language Teaching Experience.

International Educcation Studies, 9(12), 120–136. doi:10.5539/ies.v9n12p120

- Chaka, J. G. (2017). Students 'perceptions and r eadiness towards mobile learning in colleges of education : A Nigerian perspective. South African Journal of Education, 37(1), 1–12. doi:10.15700/saje.v37n1a1282
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). Survey design in Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4th ed., p. 386). Boston, the United States of America: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Dashtestani, R. (2013). language learning (MALL) in an EFL context : Iranian EFL teachers ' perspectives on challenges and a ff ordances. *JALT CALL journal*, 9(2), 149–168.
- Education First. (2016). EF English Proficiency Index.
- European Network of Education Council (EUNEC). (2014). Learning in the digital age. Report of The Seminar of The European Network of Edication Council, Athen 5-6 May 2014 with the support of the European Commission.
- Gregory, R. L. (1978). *Eye and brain the psychology of seeing* (Third edit). New York: World university library. Retrieved from http://www.arghive.org/details/ey ebrainpsycholo00rlgr
- Hashemi, M., Azizinezhad, M., Najafi, V., & Nesari, A. J. (2011). Social and What is Mobile Learning? Challenges and Capabilities.

*Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 30, 2477–2481.* doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.10.483

- Hussin, S., Manap, M. R., Amir, Z., & Krish, P. (2017). Mobile Learning Readiness among Malaysian Students at Higher Learning Institutes. *Asian Social Science*, 8(12), 276–283. doi:10.5539/ass.v8n12p276
- Hwang, W. Y., & Chen, H. S. L. (2013). Users' familiar situational contexts facilitate the practice of EFL in elementary schools with mobile devices. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 26(2), 101–125.
- Joseph, B., Corbeil, R., & Valdes-corbeil, M. E. (2007). Mobile Learning? Are You Ready for Mobile Learning. *Educause Quarterly*, (2), 51–58.
- Ju, Y., Sunyoung, J., Eui, J., Shin, K., Lim, E., & Choi, M. (2014). Factors influencing actual use of mobile learning connected with e-learning. *Computer Science & Information Technology*,, 169–176. doi:10.5121/csit.2014.41116
- Kee, L. (2014). Mobile devices : toys or learning tools for the 21 st century teenagers?. *TOJET: The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology, 13*(3), 107–122.
- Kukulska-Hulme, Agnes, Shield, L. (2008). An overview of mobile assissted language. Learning: from delivery supported content to collaborative and interaction. Cambridge Journals Online Re-CALL, 20(3), 249-252. doi:10.1017/CBO9781107415324.00

4

Kukulska-hulme, A. (2008). An overview of mobile assisted language learning: From content delivery to supported collaboration and interaction.

doi:10.1017/S0958344008000335

- Marchewka, J. T., & Kostiwa, K. (2007). An Application of the UTAUT Model for Understanding Student Perceptions Using Course Management Software. *Communications of The IIMA*, 7(2), 93–104.
- McCarty, S., Sato, T., & Obari, H. (2017). Implementing Mobile Language Learning Technologies in Japan. *SpringerBriefs in Education*, 19–33. doi:10.1007/978-981-10-2451-1
- Miangah, T. M., & Nezarat, A. (2012). Mobile-Assisted Language Learning. International Journal of Distributed and Parallel System, 3(1), 309–319. doi:10.5121/ijdps.2012.3126
- Oz, H. (2015). An Investigation of Preservice English Teachers' Perceptions of Mobile Assisted Language Learning. English Language Teaching, 8(2), 22–34. doi: 10.5539/elt.v8n2p22
- Pickens, J. (1998). Attitudes and Perceptions.
- Pimmer, C., Mateescu, M., & Gröhbiel, U. (2016). Mobile and ubiquitous learning in higher education settings . A systematic review of empirical studies. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 1–21.
- Santosa, M. H. (2017). Learning approaches of Indonesian EFL Gen

Z students in a Flipped Learning context. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 7(2), 183-208.

- Sharples, M., Taylor, J., Vavoula, G. (2007). A Theory of Learning for the Mobile Age A Theory of Learning for the Mobile Age. In R. Andrews and C. Haythornthwaite (eds). *The Sage Handbook of Elearning Research*, 221-246.
- Shorfuzzaman, M., & Alhussein, M. (2016). Modeling Learners' Readiness to Adopt Mobile Learning: A Perspective from a GCC Higher Education Institution. *Mobile Information System, 2016.* doi: 10.1155/2016/6982824.
- So, S. (2016). Internet and Higher Education Mobile instant messaging support for teaching and learning in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *31*, 32–42. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2016.06.001
- Surf Net. (2016). Trend report 2016 how technological trends enable, *November 2016.*
- UNESCO. (2013). Policy guidelines for mobile learning UNESCO policy guidelines for mobile learning.
- Viswanath Venkatesh., Michael, G., Morris., Gordon, B. Davis., & Fred, D. Davis. (2003). User Acceptance of Information Technology : Toward a Unified View. Published by : Management Information Systems Research Center, University of Minnesota. *MIS Quaterly, 27*(3), 425–478.
- Vyas, N., & Nirban, V. S. (2014). Students 'Perception on the Effectiveness of Mobile Learning in an Institutional

Context. *ELT Research Journal*, 3(1), 26-36.

Yang, J. (2013). Mobile Assisted Language Learning : Review of the Recent Applications of Emerging Mobile Technologies. *English Language Teaching*, 6(7), 19–25. doi:10.5539/elt.v6n7p19