Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies (JETERAPS) 16(5): 144-150

scholarlinkinstitute.org/jeteraps

Technology-Assisted Reading in Language Education: Opportunities, Limitations and Pedagogical Implications

Md. Absar Uddin
Assistant Professor, Department of English Language and Literature
International Islamic University Chittagong, Bangladesh

ABSTRACT
This review synthesizes published studies on technology-assisted reading for additional-language learners. It examines how digital supports, feedback, adaptation, and design choices relate to comprehension, vocabulary growth through reading, and strategy use. The conceptual lens combines affordances, cognitive load and multimedia principles, scaffolding and feedback research, new literacies, accessibility, and teacher knowledge. Across the literature, effects are positive when support is brief and timely, interfaces are simple and text-first, and scaffolds and feedback are calibrated then fade, while benefits weaken with crowded screens, opaque adaptation, uneven measures, and limited access. Opportunities include in-text glosses, actionable feedback, calibrated adaptivity, strategy scaffolds, access-first personalization, and authentic tasks that require sourcing and synthesis. Challenges include cognitive overload, measurement inconsistency, equity and accessibility gaps, and limits on classroom orchestration. Pedagogical guidance emphasizes clear goals, clean layouts, short supports, feedback for action, digital-literacy tasks, and inclusion, supported by teacher workflows. Future work should strengthen comparability of measures, test mechanisms linking design to processing, document classroom use, and specify dosages and personalization. Overall, technology supports reading when it serves clear goals and is woven into coherent teaching.

Keywords: Technology-Assisted Reading, Additional-Language Learners, Cognitive Load, Multimedia Learning, In-Text Glosses, Feedback, Adaptivity

INTRODUCTION

Reading sits at the heart of language education, but the places and ways in which learners meet texts now include print, tablets, phones, and web platforms that mix text with audio, images, links, and prompts. These changes renew a long-standing question in computer-assisted language learning: rather than treating technology as an add-on, how can tools be used to strengthen comprehension, vocabulary growth through reading, and strategic behavior [9]. The answer depends less on the novelty of a device and more on how it fits the learner, the task, and the text.

Several well-known perspectives explain why technology can both help and hinder reading. The cognitive theory of multimedia learning proposes that people learn more deeply when words and pictures work together to highlight key ideas and reduce extra mental effort [11]. When screens are cluttered or help appears at the wrong time, mental effort increases and comprehension decreases. An ecological perspective adds that technology provides affordances—genuine options for action—only when students notice them and know how to use them [21]. The "new literacies" view also emphasizes that online reading is not simply print on a screen; it requires locating information, evaluating credibility, and integrating ideas across sources and media [8]. These points lead to clear design goals: make useful actions easy to find, minimize unnecessary effort for users, and target the specific literacies that digital environments demand.

Published studies report consistent, yet context-dependent, benefits. Meta-analyses of mobile-assisted language learning show positive average effects, with gains varying by skill area and learning setting [18] [2]. A review of EFL/ESL reading finds that mobile tools can enhance comprehension compared with traditional methods, although results depend on how activities are designed [10]. At the feature level, hypermedia glosses—short, on-demand definitions, examples, images, or audio—support vocabulary growth during reading, especially when the support is quick to process and closely tied to the text [26]. Overall, these findings indicate that small, well-placed aids can make a practical difference for additional-language readers.

There are clear limits. Research shows that screen reading can work worse than print when pages are crowded or hard to navigate—problems that may be bigger for additional-language readers, who already face higher language demands [4] [3] [17].

Assessment poses another challenge: many studies use researcher-created tests, which makes it difficult to compare findings or judge how far improvements

carry over to other settings [17]. Issues of equity and accessibility also remain significant.

Without adjustable typography, text-to-speech, captions, device-agnostic delivery, and low-bandwidth options, technology can widen gaps rather than close them [1]. These issues point to priorities for practice: simple, text-first interfaces; brief, timely help; and inclusive features built into the core experience.

The overall motivation for this review is therefore practical. By drawing together published studies in language education, the review aims to identify where technology aligns with reading development and where it does not. It highlights opportunities such as concise, in-place support; clear, actionable feedback; calibrated adaptation; and scaffolds that make strategies visible and then fade. It also examines limitations, including cognitive overload from complex screens, variable measures, and uneven access [11] [4] [17] [1]. The goal is to provide usable guidance for teachers and designers: keep interfaces clean and text-centered; offer small supports at the moment of need; match features to learner level and task goals; and plan for inclusion across devices and bandwidth. When these principles guide choices, technology is more likely to serve clear reading aims rather than becoming an end in itself [9] [8] [11].

Conceptual and Theoretical Framework

This review approaches technology-assisted reading as the meeting point of learners, tools, texts, and tasks. The central claim is straightforward: technology does not improve reading on its own. Gains appear when design makes useful supports easy to notice and use at the right moment, and when these supports are part of sound teaching. The framework below explains how and why this works—and where it can fail.

First, consider affordances: the actionable possibilities a tool offers in a given context [21]. In reading, a clickable gloss affords quick access to meaning; an annotation layer affords a place to record inferences or questions. These options help only if learners can perceive them and if they fit the task. Cues in the interface shape what users think is possible, so signaling and placement matter [13]. If glosses are buried in menus or if annotations clutter the page, learners may miss help or become distracted. Affordances are therefore not just properties of a tool; they are relationships among learner, interface, and task that either reveal or hide helpful actions.

A cognitive perspective explains both the benefits and the risks of multimedia support. The cognitive theory of multimedia learning argues that understanding improves when words and pictures are combined in ways that match how people handle limited visual and auditory capacity [11]. Design should cut unnecessary processing, focus attention on key ideas, and help learners connect them. Cognitive load theory strengthens this point: when interfaces split attention across many items or demand frequent navigation, they use up working memory that should be used for making meaning [19]. In practice, a careful use of audio, graphics, and pop-ups—introduced only when relevant and faded when no longer needed—can reduce extra load and maintain comprehension.

A sociocultural perspective adds the value of guided support. Learners advance when assistance is placed just beyond what they can do alone, known as the zone of proximal development [22]. Scaffolding is the process of providing this help and then withdrawing it as learners gain control, so responsibility gradually shifts to them [25].

Digital tools broaden what scaffolding can be. They can offer short pre-reading prompts to activate background knowledge, hints that address common mistakes, or teacher dashboards that make problems visible. But these tools can become crutches if they are fixed, too frequent, or poorly timed. Good scaffolding is diagnostic, responsive to the learner, and temporary [20] [14].

Feedback links design choices to learning gains. Reviews show that feedback works best when it states the goal clearly, arrives in time to guide the next step, and focuses on the task or process—not on the learner's identity [6] [15]. In reading, immediate item-level feedback can fix local misunderstandings or prompt rereading, while delayed comments can build strategies like summarizing or judging sources. Adaptive systems that adjust text difficulty, gloss density, or question types can help when the settings match learner needs; poor settings can either under-challenge learners or push them too quickly [24] [23]. Digital environments also change what it means to read. The "new literacies" view holds that online reading involves finding information, judging credibility, and combining ideas across linked, multimodal texts [8]. Tasks and assessments should therefore capture sourcing, evaluation, and synthesis across media—not just comprehension of a single passage. Social reading and light gamification can increase time on task, but they work best when tied to meaningful inquiry rather than points alone.

Equity and accessibility decide whether these features work in real classrooms. The Universal Design for Learning framework calls for multiple ways to present information, engage learners, and allow expression so that students with different needs can access texts and show understanding [1]. Accessibility features—such as adjustable typography, text-to-speech, captions, keyboard

navigation, and low-bandwidth or offline modes—should be built into the core design, not added later. Without these options, technology can reproduce—or even widen—gaps in participation and achievement.
Teacher expertise also shapes whether potential becomes practice. The TPACK framework says effective use of tools depends on the blend of technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge [12]. In reading, this means judging text complexity, teaching strategies, aligning assessments, and knowing each tool's strengths and limits. Even strong platforms can produce weak results if teachers lack time, training, or a coherent curriculum to use them in purposeful sequences.

In short, good design and good teaching—not technology alone—make digital reading effective. Technology supports learning when learners can notice and use meaningful features; when cognitive load is managed; when scaffolds and feedback are well tuned and then gradually withdrawn; when tasks build the literacies that digital spaces truly require; when accessibility is planned from the start; and when teachers integrate tools into coherent instruction with clear goals [21] [13] [11] [19] [22] [25] [6] [15] [24] [23] [8] [1] [12].

Research Gap and Rationale

Evidence on technology-assisted reading is promising yet fragmented. Many studies are short and use different tests, so it is unclear whether gains last or transfer to paper reading and new genres. Mechanisms remain vague: few studies isolate how design choices—such as gloss density, highlighting, or timing—shape attention, mental effort, and strategy use. Implementation details are often missing; teacher workflow, class time, and uneven access to devices or bandwidth are treated as background. Equity is rarely examined with subgroup analyses. Dosage and personalization are seldom aligned to proficiency or task.

This review addresses these gaps by bringing findings together, naming which supports help most, and turning them into simple, classroom-ready guidance. Design choices are made explicit, feedback stays transparent, and scaffolds are adaptable and easy to fade. The goal is to turn scattered results into clear, durable principles

METHODOLOGY

This review includes only published, peer-reviewed studies on technology-supported reading in language education. I examined each study closely and summarized its purpose, the learners involved, the types of texts and tools used, and the reported outcomes.I then grouped the studies by common themes, such as how support was offered during reading, how feedback was given, and how design choices affected understanding, vocabulary growth, strategy use, and motivation. Within each theme, I compared results to see where findings agreed, where they differed, and what conditions seemed to matter for success or failure. I paid attention to factors that may shape results, including learner proficiency, text difficulty, setting, and usability. I also noted clear limits in the body of work, such as mixed measures and uneven reporting. My goal throughout was to give a balanced, practical account that teachers and designers can use to plan reading activities that fit tools, texts, and learners.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Across the studies, social media generally increases Across a wide range of tools and settings, published studies point to generally positive—but conditional—effects of technology on additional-language reading. Most interventions show gains on at least one outcome—comprehension, vocabulary gained through reading, strategy use, or motivation—when designs fit the learner, the task, and the text. Reviews of mobile-assisted language learning usually find positive average effects. The size of the gains depends on the skill being taught and the teaching context; a review focused on EFL/ESL reading also finds that mobile tools can beat traditional methods, with results shaped by how activities are organized [18] [2] [10]. Studies comparing media warn that on-screen reading can perform worse than print when pages are crowded or navigation is complex—risks that may be higher for additional-language readers [4] [3] [17].

A consistent finding is that brief, well-timed support at the point of need is effective. Clickable glosses that provide short definitions, examples, images, or audio tend to improve comprehension and incidental vocabulary learning—especially when the assistance is easy to process and clearly tied to the text. A meta-regression on glossing finds consistent benefits and fits with multimedia design principles that cut extra processing and connect words to pictures [26] [11]. Overall, the evidence shows that small, in-place prompts keep readers engaged while lowering unnecessary effort.

A second thread centers on feedback and adaptivity. Immediate, item-level responses and timely hints that prompt rereading or inference generally yield stronger short-term results than comparable conditions with no feedback. A large synthesis concludes that feedback is most effective when it is specific, actionable, and timed to guide the next step, and design work emphasizes the value of helping learners understand and use feedback. Adaptive systems that tune text difficulty, gloss density, or question type can support progress, particularly for lower-proficiency readers, though problems arise when adaptation is too aggressive or opaque [24] [23].

A further set of results concerns scaffolding for strategies and self-regulation. Digital annotation spaces, pre-reading prompts, and light-touch guides help learners plan, monitor, and evaluate their reading; effects are strongest when supports are introduced early and then faded as control grows. Reviews of scaffolding and self-regulated learning converge on the value of contingent, well-timed support that strengthens strategy use and persistence [20] [14]. Motivation often rises with social reading, light gamification, and mobile access, but engagement tends to last when tied to meaningful purposes such as collaborative inquiry that requires synthesizing multiple texts, a view consistent with research on "new literacies" [8].

Access and personalization determine who benefits. Built-in options—such as adjustable typography, text-to-speech, captions, delivery across devices, and offline access—enable more learners to participate, especially when these features are planned from the start rather than added later. The Universal Design for Learning framework offers practical guidance for addressing learner variability and sustaining broad participation [1].

Two issues appear repeatedly in the research. The first is measurement: many studies use researcher-developed tests with uneven validity, which limits comparisons and makes it unclear whether gains transfer beyond the original tasks or settings [17]. A second issue is classroom orchestration: even high-quality tools have limited impact when teachers lack time to integrate them, when tasks and assessments are misaligned, or when routines do not provide opportunities for guided practice and reflection. Recent models of technology–pedagogy–content knowledge emphasize combining these forms of knowledge in coherent ways that fit real constraints [7].

Opportunities

Improvements should prioritize just-in-time, multimodal supports that protect attention and keep readers engaged with the text. Brief glosses, targeted highlights, carefully chosen images, and short audio cues can clarify meaning without pulling learners away from the passage. Meta-analytic evidence on glossing and principles from multimedia design point to the same conclusion: aligning words with visuals and maintaining a restrained presentation reduces unnecessary processing and preserves attention for comprehension [26] [11]. For developers and teachers, this implies placing help directly in the reading space, limiting the amount shown at once, and ensuring that retrieval is effortless so support feels like part of the text rather than a detour.

A second opportunity is feedback that learners can use right away and adaptivity calibrated to their needs. Embedded questions with clear, task-focused responses can prompt rereading, correct local misunderstandings, and surface patterns for later coaching. Practices that help learners interpret and act on feedback—plain language, chances to try again, and simple views of progress—raise the likelihood that feedback changes behavior. Adaptivity that adjusts text difficulty, gloss density, or hint type can be especially helpful for lower-proficiency learners, and transparent signals about why adjustments happen can support both confidence and success [24] [23] [18] [2] [10].

A third opportunity is to teach strategies and self-regulation while avoiding dependence. Features that make strategies visible—brief pre-reading activators, prompts that guide inference or summarizing, and short reflections—help learners plan, monitor, and evaluate their reading. The most effective designs keep these supports contingent and temporary so responsibility shifts to the learner as control increases. Simple "show-then-fade" patterns—for example, prompts that later collapse to a small reminder—can protect autonomy while encouraging deliberate practice [20] [14].

Access-first personalization widens who can benefit and under what conditions. Building adjustable typography, captions, text-to-speech, keyboard navigation, device-agnostic interfaces, and low-bandwidth or offline modes into the core product lowers barriers for students with diverse needs and contexts. The UDL framework offers a ready blueprint for making these options defaults rather than add-ons, so inclusion is part of the main experience [1]. In classrooms with shared devices or unstable connectivity, these features often determine whether the intended routines are even possible.

There is value in tasks that match the literacies needed online. Assignments that ask learners to find information, judge credibility, and combine ideas across linked, multimodal texts make purposeful use of the web. Social reading and light gamification can help attention when tied to inquiry, comparison, or explanation—not to points alone—matching "new literacies" work that stresses sourcing and synthesis [8]. Orchestration improves when tools make planning and adjustment simple. Short plan–try–reflect cycles help set text difficulty, time feedback well, and fade scaffolds so technology fits a coherent sequence. Updated TPACK views describe this as the overlap of tool knowledge, pedagogy, and content, adapted to local limits. Platforms with simple, privacy-aware indicators—such as paragraphs with many glossary clicks—can trigger just-in-time explanations and targeted mini-lessons [7]. When these pieces align—brief, timely support; usable feedback; fading scaffolds; access by design; authentic digital-literacy tasks; and feasible

orchestration—technology becomes a lever for comprehension, vocabulary growth, and strategy development rather than a distraction.

Limitations and Challenges

The clearest limit is cognitive overload from complex interfaces. Dense layouts, decorative media, and frequent navigation split attention and drain the working memory needed for meaning. Research on cognitive load and multimedia design explains why busy dashboards, constant notifications, or layered pop-ups can hurt comprehension, especially for novice L2 readers [19] [11]. Studies of media effects also show that screen reading can fall behind print when interfaces are cluttered or navigation is hard, underscoring the need for restraint and clarity in design [4] [3]. Calm screens, progressive disclosure, and short, in-place supports are therefore not just aesthetic choices; they are conditions for understanding. Clearer reporting of tasks, scoring, reliability, and alignment would also strengthen syntheses and help practitioners judge what fits their settings [17].

Equity and accessibility also determine who benefits. Access to devices, bandwidth, assistive-technology compatibility, and institutional support varies widely. Without designs that follow accessibility guidance and provide low-bandwidth or offline options, technology can widen gaps in participation and outcomes. Reporting subgroup effects and explaining how to configure accessibility features would strengthen claims about generalizability and show where added support is needed [1].

Feedback and adaptivity create problems when they are poorly calibrated. Vague, overly frequent, or badly timed responses can distract or discourage; difficulty adjustments that are abrupt or opaque can weaken confidence and break reading flow. Synthesis studies recommend prioritizing clarity, timing, and student uptake, and being transparent about when and why adjustments occur so readers understand the purpose and maintain agency [24] [23].

Classroom orchestration also places real limits on daily practice. Even well-designed tools may have modest effects if teachers lack time for training, if tasks and assessments are misaligned, or if routines leave little room for guided practice and reflection. Updated accounts of technology–pedagogy–content knowledge argue that strong integration requires all three forms to work together within local constraints on time, devices, and support [7]. Designs that assume one-to-one devices or constant connectivity may not match typical conditions, reducing fidelity and outcomes. The practical takeaway is clear: crowded screens, opaque adaptivity, weak measures, and misaligned routines hold results back, while simplicity, transparency, stronger measurement, and realistic planning move results forward.

Pedagogical Implications

Instructional planning benefits from starting with a clear goal and then selecting features to serve that goal. If a lesson aims to build inference, grow vocabulary through reading, or practice synthesis across sources, the interface and supports should reflect that focus. Explaining the purpose to learners helps them make sense of when and why help appears, reduces on-screen clutter, and keeps attention on meaning rather than navigation [11] [7].

A simple, text-first interface should be the default. Present the passage cleanly, place brief supports at the point of need, and reveal extra help progressively rather than all at once. As readers gain control, visible guidance should taper so that strategies become internalized rather than prompted by the screen. This approach aligns with research showing that restrained multimedia and managed cognitive load protect comprehension [19] [11].

Scaffolding deserves a deliberate plan that covers before-, during-, and after-reading moments. Short pre-reading prompts can activate knowledge; concise cues during reading can guide predicting, questioning, or summarizing; and brief reflections can support evaluation and transfer. Making the plan-monitor-evaluate cycle explicit helps students understand what skilled readers do. Over time, prompts should fade so responsibility shifts to learners, consistent with evidence that contingent and temporary support strengthens strategy use [20] [14].

Feedback works when it leads to action. Immediate local responses can prompt rereading or clarification, while delayed comments can focus on strategy quality and planning for the next text. Opportunities to apply feedback right away—for example, a quick chance to reread with a gloss—build uptake. Reviews emphasize clarity, timing, and actionable next steps; classroom designs should build in these elements so feedback leads to improvement [24] [23].

Beyond comprehension, instruction should target the literacies that digital reading requires. Assignments that ask students to locate information, evaluate credibility, and synthesize across linked, multimodal texts leverage online environments and make strategy use visible. Social reading features can support these aims when tied to meaningful inquiry rather than points, and assessment can capture both product and process by requiring source citation and explanations of how reliability was judged [8].

Equity and accessibility should be built in from the start. Adjustable typography, captions, text-to-speech, keyboard navigation, and low-bandwidth or offline options are core requirements, not add-ons. Treating

these as defaults aligns with UDL guidance and keeps participation broad and stigma-free. In settings with shared devices or unstable connectivity, planning rotations and offline packets that mirror on-platform tasks ensures continuity and fairness [1].

Comparable and transparent measures are also needed. Shared comprehension tasks, common rubrics for strategy use, and clear reports of reliability and validity would make synthesis more persuasive. When bespoke instruments are necessary, publishing sample items and scoring procedures would aid interpretation and replication. Measurement for vocabulary gains during reading can draw on practices used in glossing research to ensure that results are interpretable across contexts [26].
Mechanisms of impact should be tested directly, not assumed. Pairing comprehension outcomes with indicators of cognitive load and attention—such as brief validated scales, eye-movement measures, or simple secondary-task probes—can refine designs that reduce unnecessary processing while preserving helpful support. We need evidence that shows exactly how specific design choices change processing and performance. This would make cause-and-effect claims clearer [19] [11].

Equity and accessibility must be treated as non-negotiable from the start. Studies that plan for spotty bandwidth, shared devices, and assistive-technology use—and that report subgroup effects—produce findings that generalize across contexts. The Universal Design for Learning framework gives clear principles for offering multiple ways to represent information, engage learners, and allow expression, making inclusion visible in both design and reporting [1]. Digital-literacy outcomes also need more attention. Tasks and assessments should capture sourcing, credibility judgments, and synthesis across linked, multimodal texts—not just comprehension of one passage. Research on online reading offers models for designing these performances and for testing transfer to academic and real-world settings [8].

Classroom orchestration should be described in more detail. Clear accounts of how teachers plan, sequence, and assess technology-supported reading within real curricula—including how time is used and how instruction is adapted for diverse learners—can guide professional learning aligned with technology–pedagogy–content knowledge [7]. Transparent and ethical learning analytics can support this work when studies state what data are collected, how they are interpreted, and how insights are shared with learners and teachers, following rules for privacy, consent, and student agency [5] [16].

Dosage and personalization also need clearer definitions. Future studies should test how much support is enough for features like glossing or text-to-speech at different proficiency levels, set the pace for fading scaffolds, and compare adaptive with static designs across contexts. Precise reporting of exposure time, feature use, and adherence will link design choices to outcomes and help plan instruction in varied settings [18] [2] [10]. Together, these steps can move the field toward durable, transferable gains backed by comparable measures, transparent mechanisms, and inclusive designs.

CONCLUSION

Evidence from published studies points to a practical message for technology-assisted reading in additional-language contexts: technology helps when it serves reading, not the other way around. Gains are most likely when designs are simple and text-first, when support is brief and delivered at the moment of need, and when feedback guides the next step rather than interrupting thinking.

Small, well-placed features—such as concise glosses, focused prompts, and clear progress cues—reduce unnecessary effort and keep attention on meaning. Scaffolds that make strategies visible and then fade help readers take more control over time. When access features—adjustable typography, text-to-speech, captions, device flexibility, and offline options—are built in from the start, more learners can take part fully.

The limits are equally clear. Crowded screens, heavy navigation, and opaque adaptivity can overload attention and weaken comprehension. Uneven measures make comparisons difficult and blur claims about what endures or transfers to new texts. Gaps in access and support can widen outcome differences. These are not reasons to avoid technology; they are signals to improve design, reporting, and implementation.

For teaching, start with a clear goal—such as making inferences, building vocabulary through reading, or synthesizing information—and choose features that directly support that goal. Keep interfaces calm and supports brief. Give feedback that is specific, timely, and usable. Teach the core literacies of digital reading: how to search, how to judge credibility, and how to connect ideas across multiple sources. Treat inclusion as a basic requirement, not an add-on. Give teachers the tools and time to sequence tasks, set the right level of difficulty, and interpret simple signs of where learners struggle.

Priorities for research and development include stronger, comparable measures; clearer tests of how design changes affect readers' processing; and steady attention to equity and accessibility. Studies should report not only what improved but also how learners interacted with the texts. When these principles guide

decisions, technology becomes a reliable partner in reading development—supporting comprehension, vocabulary growth, and strategic behavior—within the real limits of attention, time, and classroom routines.

REFERENCES

[1] CAST. *Universal Design for Learning Guidelines version 2.2*. (2018)

[2] Chen, Z., Chen, W., Jia, J., & An, H. The effects of using mobile devices on language learning: A meta-analysis. *Educational Technology Research and Development,* 68, 1769–1789.(2020) https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-020-09801-5

[3] Clinton, V. Reading from paper compared to screens: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Research in Reading,* 42(2),288–325.(2019) https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9817.12269

[4] Delgado, P., Vargas, C., Ackerman, R., & Salmerón, L. Don't throw away your printed books: A meta-analysis on the effects of reading media on reading comprehension. *Educational Research Review, 25*, 23–38. (2018) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2018.09.003

[5] Ferguson, R. Learning analytics: Drivers, developments and challenges. *International Journal of Technology Enhanced Learning, 4*(5/6), 304–317. (2012) https://doi.org/10.1504/IJTEL.2012.051816

[6] Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(1),81–112.(2007) https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

[7] Koehler, M. J., Mishra, P., & Cain, W. What is technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK)? *Journal of Education,* 193(3), 13–20. (2013) https://doi.org/10.1177/002205741319300303

[8] Leu, D. J., Forzani, E., Rhoads, C., Maykel, C., Kennedy, C., & Timbrell, N. The New Literacies of Online Research and Comprehension: Rethinking the Reading Achievement Gap. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *50*(1),37–59.(2015)

[9] Levy, M. *Computer-Assisted Language Learning: Context and Conceptualization*. Oxford University Press. (1997)

[10] Li, R. Effects of Mobile-Assisted Language Learning on EFL/ESL Reading Comprehension. *Educational Technology & Society, 25*(3), 15–29.(2022)

[11] Mayer, R. E. *Multimedia Learning* (3rd ed.). University of California. (2020) https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316941355

[12] Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge: A Framework for Teacher Knowledge. *Teachers College Record, 108*(6),1017–1054.(2006) https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00684.x

[13] Norman, D. A. *The Design of Everyday Things* (Revised and expanded ed.). Basic Books. (2013)

[14] Panadero, E. A Review of Self-regulated Learning: Six Models and Four Directions Rfor research. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*, 422. (2017) https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00422

[15] Shute, V. J. Focus on Formative Feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 78*(1),153–189.(2008) https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654307313795

[16] Slade, S., & Prinsloo, P. Learning Analytics: Ethical Issues and Dilemmas. *American Behavioral Scientist, 57*(10), 1510–1529.(2013) https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764213479

[17] Singer, L. M., & Alexander, P. A. Reading on Paper and Digitally: What the Past Decades of Empirical Research Reveal. *Review of Educational Research, 87*(6), 10071041.(2017) https://doi/10.3102/0034654317722961

[18] Sung, Y.-T., Chang, K.-E., & Yang, J.-M. How effective are mobile devices for language learning? A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review, 16*, 68–84. (2015) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2015.09.001

[19] Sweller, J., van Merriënboer, J. J., & Paas, F. Cognitive Architecture and Instructional Design: 20 Years Later. *Educational Psychology Review, 31*, 261–292. (2019) https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-019-09465-5

[20] van de Pol, J., Volman, M., & Beishuizen, J. Scaffolding in teacher–student interaction: A decade of research. *Educational Psychology Review, 22*(3), 271–296. (2010) https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-010-9127-6

[21] van Lier, L. From Input to Affordance: Social Interactive Learning from an Ecological Perspective. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning: Recent Advances* (pp. 245-259). Oxford University Press. (2000)

[22] Vygotsky, L. S. *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press. (1978)

[23] Winstone, N., & Carless, D. *Designing Effective Feedback Processes in Higher Education: A Learning-Focused Approach*. Routledge. (2019)

[24] Wisniewski, B., Zierer, K., & Hattie, J. The power of feedback revisited: A meta-analysis of educational feedback research. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*, 3087. (2020) https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.03087

[25] Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17(2),89–100. (1976) https://doi.org/10.1111/j.14697610.1976.tb 381.x

[26] Yanagisawa, A., Webb, S., & Uchihara, T. How do different forms of glossing contribute to L2 vocabulary learning from reading? A meta-regression analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 42(2), 411 438.(2020) https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263119000688