Chapter Six

Moving beyond Basics: From CALL Coursework to Classroom Practice and Professional Development

Jeong-Bae Son
University of Southern Queensland, Australia

Abstract

This chapter addresses the issue of transfer from computer-assisted language learning (CALL) coursework to language teaching practice and teacher professional development. The study reported in this chapter specifically looks at and examines a formal CALL course offered as an optional course for postgraduate students at an Australian university. It employs surveys and follow-up interviews to investigate how language teachers, who had previously completed the CALL course, use CALL in their teaching situations and how they continue their professional development in CALL. The results of the study indicate that the teachers valued the CALL knowledge and skills they gained in the CALL course as the coursework opened their eyes to the potential of CALL in the classroom and the evaluation of CALL materials. The teachers expressed a desire for more knowledge on how best to integrate CALL as well as for further professional development and training in CALL. Findings enhance our understanding of the impact of CALL coursework on CALL practice in situated contexts and provide practical implications for language teacher education.

Introduction

While there are a number of publications (e.g., Atkins & Vasu, 2000; Ertmer, Addison, Lane, Ross, & Woods, 1999; Hargrave & Hsu, 2000; Johnson, 1999; Milbrath & Kinzie, 2000; Walker, 1994; Yildirim, 2000) describing and examining what occurs in teacher education technology courses or programs, only few studies look at transfer from the practical content of technology courses for teacher education to the classroom, particularly in the area of computer-assisted language learning (CALL). Thus, there is a gap in the literature specific to CALL teacher education and a need for exploring the transfer of CALL coursework to the language classroom further. The study reported in this chapter attempts to address the gap and the need. It aims to examine how language teachers apply their knowledge and skills gained from CALL coursework to their teaching practice and investigate ways in which teachers continue their professional development for CALL.

CALL teacher training and practice

Along with the widespread use of technology, there is a great demand for language teacher training and development in the integration of CALL into learning and teaching activities (Hong, 2010; Hubbard, 2008; Luke & Britten, 2007; Slaouti & Motteram, 2006) and in the design, implementation and evaluation of CALL (Son, 2002). In the literature, the connection between CALL teacher training and in-service teachers' use of CALL in their classrooms has been discussed in some contexts. For example, Egbert, Paulus and Nakamichi (2002) examined the impact of language teachers' CALL course experience on their teaching and professional development. Through surveys and follow-up interviews with 20 English as a second/foreign language (ESL/EFL) teachers, they found that teachers who used CALL activities were those teachers who had previous experience with CALL before they took a formal CALL course. They also found that a lack of time is the most common factor influencing

the use of CALL activities in the classroom and colleagues are the most common resource for finding out about new CALL activities.

Similarly, Ebsworth, Kim and Klein (2010) looked into the expectations and experiences of pre- and in-service language teachers in incorporating technology in their classrooms. From the results of questionnaires completed by 90 participants and interviews with 9 participants, they found that their participants came to a technology-enhanced language learning (TELL) course with different levels of TELL knowledge and goals. They also found that the pre-service teachers and in-service teachers had somewhat different expectations from the TELL course, particularly in the use of videos in lessons, the use of software and the evaluation of Internet resources. The participants recommended to improve the TELL course by reflecting their current teaching environments, including their target language and grade level, and pointed out that limited access to resources is a major barrier to the use of computer technology in the classroom.

In a different context, Kessler (2007) investigated the relationship between CALL teacher preparation and teacher attitude toward technology and found that informal CALL preparation is more closely related to teachers' attitudes toward technology than formal CALL preparation. Based on the results of a web-based survey completed by 108 graduates of Teachers of English to Speakers to Other Languages (TESOL) masters degree programs, he argued that the respondents' degree programs did not prepare them effectively to use computer-based materials for teaching speaking skills and to create computer-based audio materials for instruction in particular and recommended formal language teacher preparation programs to include a CALL component, which addresses the changing needs of language teachers.

In a way to add more insight into the link between CALL teacher training and classroom practice, this chapter explores the use of CALL by in-service language teachers who had previously completed a formal CALL course offered as an optional course for postgraduate students. It specifically examines how the teachers use CALL in their teaching contexts and how they continue their professional development in CALL after the CALL course.

The study

Participants

Participants were those who had completed a CALL course as postgraduate students at an Australian university in the past five years. Through the CALL course, the teachers were introduced to CALL and given opportunities to understand key aspects of CALL and gained a basic knowledge of the practical use of computer technology in language instruction in terms of observation, design, implementation, evaluation and management. Among 306 teachers who were contacted and invited to participate in the study via email, a total of 77 teachers responded to the invitation and filled in a consent form. Table 1 shows demographic information on the 77 teachers. Out of the 77 teachers who completed a questionnaire employed for the study, 53 teachers participated in email interviews.

Table 1
Participant Profile (*N*=77)

Gender	Male	41 (53.2%)
	Female	36 (46.8%)
Age	25-30	7 (9.1%)
(Mean: 40)	31-35	14 (18.2%)
	36-40	21 (27.3%)
	41-45	19 (24.7%)
	46-50	8 (10.4 %)
	51-55	5 (6.5%)
	56-60	3 (3.9%)
First language	English	50 (64.9%)
	Chinese	5 (6.5%)
	Korean	5 (6.5%)
	Indonesian	2 (2.6%)
	Japanese	2 (2.6%)
	Vietnamese	2 (2.6%)
	Other	11 (14.3%)
Language currently teaching	ESL/EFL	58 (75.3%)
	French	3 (3.9%)
	Other	16 (20.8%)
Years of teaching experience	1-5	10 (13%)
(Mean: 12)	6-10	27 (35.1%)
	11-15	18 (23.4%)
	16-20	19 (24.7%)
	21-25	1 (1.3%)

	26-30	2 (2.6%)
Years of computer experience (Mean: 15)	1-5	4 (5.2%)
	6-10	21 (27.3%)
	11-15	21 (27.3%)
	16-20	20 (26%)
	21-25	9 (11.7%)
	26-30	2 (2.6%)
Current place of residence	Australia	17 (22.1%)
	Korea	15 (19.5%)
	China	11 (14.3%)
	Japan	10 (13%)
	New Zealand	3 (3.9%)
	Thailand	3 (3.9%)
	Canada	2 (2.6%)
	Indonesia	2 (2.6%)
	Qatar	2 (2.6%)
	Taiwan	2 (2.6%)
	Vietnam	2 (2.6%)
	Other	8 (10.4%)
Current teaching level (multiple responses)	Pre-school	3 (3.9%)
	Year 1-6	16 (20.8%)
	Year 7-9	10 (13%)
	Year 10-12	11 (14.3%)
	College/University	46 (59.7%)
	Adult group	28 (36.4%)

Data collection

The teachers were invited to complete a questionnaire, which was developed on the basis of a literature review and the content of the CALL course. The questionnaire consisted of four sections (i.e., profile, learning experience, teaching experience and professional development) and contained questions that asked the teachers to identify: (1) which CALL activities they had before/during the CALL course, have had after the CALL course and are using in their current teaching situations; (2) where they learn more about CALL activities after the CALL course; and (3) what factors affect the use of CALL activities in their teaching. The results of the questionnaire are analysed and reported through statistical analyses of numerical data and qualitative analyses of textual data.

The teachers were also invited to participate in a follow-up email interview respectively. The individual interview asked the questionnaire

respondents to clarify, explain and supply additional information on their CALL experience. Responses to the interview are compiled and analysed to respond to the following questions: (1) Has your CALL coursework influenced your teaching practice? If yes, how? If no, why not?; (2) Has the CALL course been relevant to your career? If yes, how? If no, why not?; (3) Do you currently use CALL? If yes, how? If no, why not?; (4) Do you continue to develop your professionalism in CALL? If yes, how? If no, why not?; (5) What factors do you think affect your use of CALL?; and (6) Please make comments on your experience in/with CALL. Patterns that emerge from the interview data are grouped into categories that address the issues raised in these questions.

Results

Questionnaires

This section presents data collected from the seventy seven questionnaires. It addresses the teachers' reasons for taking the CALL course, their level of expertise in CALL activities and their level of competence in using computer technologies. When the teachers were asked why they enrolled in the CALL course, first, the most common responses were for self-development and a personal interest in CALL. As shown in Table 2, gaining competence in using computer technologies and employment opportunities were also strong motivators.

Table 2

Reasons for Taking the CALL Course

Reason	Number*	Percentage
Self-development	70	90.9
Personal interest in CALL	67	87
Competence in using computer technologies	50	64.9
Employment opportunities	35	45.5
Easy access to CALL materials at work	13	16.9
Advice of others	9	11.7
Demand from schools	9	11.7

Note: *Multiple responses were allowed.

The teachers had a wide range of prior computer knowledge, abilities and experiences. As shown in Table 3, nearly all teachers had had a basic level of computer expertise before the CALL course: word processing (94.8%), communicating by email (96.1%) and using web search engines (88.3%). Many teachers also stated that they were experienced in using online dictionaries (76.6%), giving PowerPoint presentations (66.2%), text chatting (64.9%) and using databases (59.7%). However, the teachers were least experienced in reviewing web-based language learning sites (14.3%) and CALL software (9.1%). In addition, only a small number of teachers had had a more advanced levels of competency and experience in computer technology, which is reflected in the low proportion of teachers who stated that they were experienced in using wikis (20.8%), developing CALL lesson plans (16.9%) or using blogs (15.6%) prior to undertaking the CALL course.

Table 3
Learning Experience

CALL activity	Had previous experience before the CALL course	Learnt from the CALL course for the first time	Attempted after the CALL course	Never actually experienced	No response
Using Word processing programs	73 (94.8%)	2 (2.6%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.3%)
Communicating via e-mail	74 (96.1%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.3%)	1 (1.3%)
Text chatting	50 (64.9%)	11 (14.3%)	8 (10.4%)	7 (9.1%)	1 (1.3%)
Voice chatting	32 (41.6%)	7 (9.1%)	11 (14.3%)	25 (32.5%)	2 (2.6%)
Video conferencing	24 (31.2%)	5 (6.5%)	15 (19.5%)	30 (39%)	3 (3.9%)
Participating in online discussion groups	32 (41.6%)	34 (44.2%)	4 (5.2%)	5 (6.5%)	2 (2.6%)
Using Web-based bulletin boards	27 (35.1%)	25 (32.5%)	8 (10.4%)	14 (18.2%)	3 (3.9%)

Using language software CDs	44 (57.1%)	15 (19.5%)	8 (10.4%)	9 (11.7%)	1 (1.3%)
Using multimedia authoring tools	26 (33.8%)	21 (27.3%)	10 (13%)	18 (23.4%)	2 (2.6%)
Giving PowerPoint presentations	51 (66.2%)	1 (1.3%)	10 (13%)	13 (16.9%)	2 (2.6%)
Creating Web pages	28 (36.4%)	14 (18.2%)	12 (15.6%)	21 (27.3%)	2 (2.6%)
Creating Web-based language learning activities	16 (20.8%)	20 (26%)	6 (7.8%)	33 (42.9%)	2 (2.6%)
Using Web-based language learning activities	30 (39%)	25 (32.5%)	10 (13%)	11 (14.3%)	1 (1.3%)
Developing CALL lesson plans	13 (16.9%)	34 (44.2%)	12 (15.6%)	16 (20.8%)	2 (2.6%)
Reviewing CALL software	7 (9.1%)	55 (71.4%)	5 (6.5%)	8 (10.4%)	2 (2.6%)
Reviewing Web-based language learning sites	11 (14.3%)	54 (70.1%)	7 (9.1%)	3 (3.9%)	2 (2.6%)
Concordancing	17 (22.1%)	19 (24.7%)	4 (5.2%)	30 (39%)	7 (9.1%)
Using databases	46 (59.7%)	10 (13%)	4 (5.2%)	13 (16.9%)	4 (5.2%)
Using online dictionaries	59 (76.6%)	4 (5.2%)	9 (11.7%)	2 (2.6%)	3 (3.9%)
Using graphic programs	42 (54.5%)	4 (5.2%)	10 (13%)	17 (22.1%)	4 (5.2%)
Using Blogs	12 (15.6%)	7 (9.1%)	24 (31.2%)	29 (37.7%)	5 (6.5%)
Using Wikis	16 (20.8%)	4 (5.2%)	18 (23.4%)	36 (46.8%)	3 (3.9%)
Using Web search engines	68 (88.3%)	3 (3.9%)	2 (2.6%)	1 (1.3%)	3 (3.9%)

Note: N=77.

As shown in Table 4, the majority of the teachers agreed that the CALL coursework has influenced their use of computers for teaching purposes (76.6%) and the CALL coursework has been relevant to their teaching career (74.1%).

Table 4
CALL Coursework and Teaching

	Strongly agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No response
The CALL coursework has influenced my use of computers for teaching purposes.	16 (20.8%)	43 (55.8%)	11 (14.3%)	4 (5.2%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (3.9%)
The CALL coursework has been relevant to my teaching career.	25 (32.5%)	32 (41.6%)	10 (13%)	4 (5.2%)	1 (1.3%)	5 (6.5%)

Note: N=77.

Table 5 shows that most teachers are using word processing programs, communicating via email, using online dictionaries and searching the web in their teaching situations. It also shows that the CALL course had a significant impact on the intended future use of CALL activities by the teachers in the language classroom. What is significant to note is the increased interest in exploring the more creative use of CALL activities following the CALL course. When questioned about their future intentions, there was a strong interest in creating web-based language learning activities (44.2%), using blogs (37.7%), creating web pages (36.4%) and using web-based bulletin boards (35.1%) in the future.

Table 5
Use of CALL Activities

CALL activity	Currently try	Plan to try	Do not know	No response

Using Word processing programs	69 (89.6%)	4 (5.2%)	2 (2.6%)	2 (2.6%)
Communicating via E-mail	66 (85.7%)	6 (7.8%)	3 (3.9%)	2 (2.6%)
Text chatting	38 (49.4%)	18 (23.4%)	16 (20.8%)	5 (6.5%)
Voice chatting	23 (29.9%)	23 (29.9%)	27 (35.1%)	4 (5.2%)
Video conferencing	17 (22.1%)	24 (31.2%)	30 (39%)	6 (7.8%)
Participating in online discussion groups	43 (55.8%)	21 (27.3%)	11 (14.3%)	2 (2.6%)
Using Web-based bulletin boards	29 (37.7%)	27 (35.1%)	17 (22.1%)	4 (5.2%)
Using language software CDs	43 (55.8%)	15 (19.5%)	14 (18.2%)	5 (6.5%)
Using multimedia authoring tools	28 (36.4%)	23 (29.9%)	22 (28.6%)	4 (5.2%)
Giving PowerPoint presentations	53 (68.8%)	13 (16.9%)	8 (10.4%)	3 (3.9%)
Creating Web pages	33 (42.9%)	28 (36.4%)	14 (18.2%)	2 (2.6%)
Creating Web-based language learning activities	23 (29.9%)	34 (44.2%)	14 (18.2%)	6 (7.8%)
Using Web-based language learning activities	50 (64.9%)	19 (24.7%)	4 (5.2%)	4 (5.2%)
Developing CALL lesson plans	35 (45.5%)	24 (31.2%)	12 (15.6%)	6 (7.8%)
Reviewing CALL software	26 (33.8%)	23 (29.9%)	21 (27.3%)	7 (9.1%)
Reviewing Web-based language learning sites	38 (49.4%)	18 (23.4%)	17 (22.1%)	4 (5.2%)
Concordancing	17 (22.1%)	19 (24.7%)	32 (41.6%)	9 (11.7%)
Using databases	36 (46.8%)	16 (20.8%)	19 (24.7%)	6 (7.8%)
Using online dictionaries	61 (79.2%)	8 (10.4%)	5 (6.5%)	3 (3.9%)
Using graphic programs	35 (45.5%)	16 (20.8%)	20 (26%)	6 (7.8%)
Using Blogs	20 (26%)	29 (37.7%)	24 (31.2%)	4 (5.2%)
Using Wikis	21 (27.3%)	22 (28.6%)	28 (36.4%)	6 (7.8%)

Using Web search engines	66 (85.7%)	3 (3.9%)	4 (5.2%)	4 (5.2%)

Note: N=77.

The teachers' responses to the questionnaire also provided an insight into the main reasons why they do not use CALL activities in their classrooms (see Table 6). The reasons included a lack of confidence (76.6%), a lack of time (64.9%) and a lack of flexibility in the curriculum to incorporate CALL activities (45.5%).

Table 6
Reasons for Not Using CALL Activities

Reason	Number	Percentage
Lack of confidence	59	76.6
Lack of time	50	64.9
Lack of flexibility in the curriculum	35	45.5
Lack of support from schools	30	39
Lack of facilities	29	37.7
Lack of skills using CALL	28	36.4
Poor quality of facilities	26	33.8
Administrative restrictions	26	33.8
No need for using CALL	17	22.1
Lack of ideas using CALL	16	20.8
Lack of knowledge about CALL	13	16.9
Lack of personal interest	7	9.1
Lack of student interest	5	6.5

The teachers were also asked about factors which affect the greater use of CALL in their teaching situations (Table 7). The primary factor cited by the teachers, which was limiting their use of CALL, was time (67.5%). The teachers felt that they did not have enough time to develop or use CALL. Other major factors, which were hindering further use of CALL, were primarily institutional barriers. The teachers stated that they needed better facilities with more access to computers (57.1%), more support from school administration (53.2%), and more flexibility with the curriculum (49.4%) so that CALL can be incorporated into language learning programs. On a personal level, the teachers expressed a need for more skills using CALL (46.8%) and more ideas for using CALL (44.2%).

Table 7
Factors Affecting Greater Use of CALL

Factor	Number	Percentage
More time	52	67.5
Better facilities	44	57.1
More support from schools	41	53.2
More flexibility in the curriculum	38	49.4
More skills using CALL	36	46.8
More ideas using CALL	34	44.2
More facilities	33	42.9
Less administrative restrictions	28	36.4
More knowledge about CALL	26	33.8
Great need for using CALL	24	31.2
More confidence	18	23.4
More student interest	16	20.8
More personal interest	15	19.5

The teachers were also questioned about their methods of learning more about CALL after completing the CALL course. The majority of the teachers have adopted an informal approach to improving their professionalism in CALL. As highlighted in Tables 8 and 9, the most common methods cited by the teachers were the use of web sites (70.1%) and learning new ideas about CALL from colleagues (54.5%). It is interesting to note here that many teachers (49.4%) also intended to continue their professionalism in CALL by learning-by-doing (i.e., learning from their experiences by implementing CALL activities). As the teachers cite time as the lead factor limiting further use of CALL, these methods of improving their CALL knowledge and skills are both understandable and realistic. The low level of participation in more formal methods of professional development in CALL can be also explained by another fact that, as many teachers pointed out, there is a lack of institutional support for CALL.

Table 8
Learning More about CALL

Source	Number	Percentage
Web sites	54	70.1
Colleagues	42	54.5
Journals	26	33.8

Books	19	24.7
Conferences	17	22.1
CALL specialists	15	19.5
Teacher training courses	14	18.2
Students	13	16.9
University tutors/lecturers/professors	12	15.6
CALL-related associations	11	14.3
Electronic discussion lists	10	13
On-line communities	10	13
Degree courses	8	10.4
Mentors	7	9.1

Table 9
Ways of Further CALL Teacher Development

Action	Number	Percentage
By visiting Web sites	55	71.4
By having conversations with colleagues	49	63.6
By teaching students with computers	38	49.4
By reading journals	31	40.3
By interacting with students	28	36.4
By attending teacher training courses	28	36.4
By reading books	22	28.6
By attending conferences	21	27.3
By joining CALL-related associations	19	24.7
By participating in on-line community activities	18	23.4
By communicating with university lecturers	13	16.9
By contacting CALL specialists	11	14.3
By subscribing to electronic discussion lists	11	14.3
By meeting with mentors	10	13
By taking degree courses	6	7.8

Interviews

A total of 53 teachers volunteered to offer more explanatory information about their level of CALL use in an individual email interview. Their interview responses provided a more detailed understanding of the level of transfer from CALL coursework to classroom practice among the individual teachers. In the presentation of the data from the interviews, the participants' actual words are conveyed to reflect their opinions on the use of CALL in their teaching situations.

Q1. Has your CALL coursework influenced your teaching practice? If yes, how? If no, why not?

The teachers' responses to this question were overall positive: 44 teachers (83%) – yes; 9 teachers (17%) – no. Many teachers commented that the CALL course provided them with the necessary knowledge and skills to evaluate and use CALL activities:

> Teacher 3: *The course that I had taken has given me a lot of theoretical as well as practical knowledge about CALL.*
>
> Teacher 12: *The CALL course has positively affected my attitudes toward using computers in language classrooms; and I feel myself more confident of using technology in my classroom.*
>
> Teacher 27: *It influenced the way I approach CALL classes. It gave me a basis to start from, and gave me a sense of where CALL was headed, and what the possibilities are.*
>
> Teacher 31: *It has definitely influenced my teaching practise in that I now consider another tool for language learning which I did not do so previously. It has also made me more critical and aware of the design of websites and the suitability of their use for any lesson I might be designing.*
>
> Teacher 41: *Yes, as part of the assessment was to critique language learning websites, it made me actually look at a variety of sites and made me see how much was actually available. In turn, I have been able to utilise some of these sites in classroom teaching.*
>
> Teacher 44: *It has greatly influenced my teaching. First of all, it has influenced my choice of electronic materials. I used to download materials from the Internet for my teaching without careful conscious thinking of the real value and reliability of these materials/websites. After completing the course, I started to select Internet materials from a more professional perspective.*
>
> Teacher 47: *The lessons learnt in the course have contributed enormously to equip me with the ability to evaluate CALL material for my students and for upgrading my teaching approaches.*

A major influence of the CALL course on the teachers was their teaching practice. A number of teachers have gone on to experiment with CALL activities and incorporate more CALL activities into their teaching programs:

Teacher 13: *I have developed and taught a course on learning English on the Internet. I have also designed a website for the university that I teach at, which students use for self-study.*

Teacher 14: *I learnt that computers and education can work together and the techniques can be very helpful to students.*

Teacher 19: *I have tried to use CALL in the classroom in a reading activity as I have learned about the benefits of online reading resources to help ESL learners.*

Teacher 34: *It has furthered my understanding of the importance of CMC in language learning and has motivated my exploration of the teaching of a language.*

Teacher 37: *I realised whilst doing the CALL course, how much potential there was for using computer activities with ESOL students.*

Teacher 43: *Now, I am exploring ways of giving CALL a more central role in my teaching. One of the things I am working on is using CALL to develop my learners' listening skills.*

Teacher 52: *CALL coursework opened up new prospects for me. It gave me new options to explore. I also learned about balancing CALL and incorporating it into class work, rather than letting it sit on its own.*

Those teachers who indicated that the CALL coursework did not influence their teaching practice confessed that they do not use CALL because they have issues mainly with facilities, school administration or job requirements:

Teacher 5: *There was just one computer. I didn't try to use it.*

Teacher 6: *At the moment, no because the school administration is having some problems running the IT infrastructure in the school.*

Teacher 16: *One problem is that my university does not brief foreign teachers on how to use the electronic classroom software.*

Teacher 32: *No, not my teaching practice at this stage. ... At present there is no perceived need to do it.*

Q2. Has the CALL course been relevant to your career? If yes, how? If no, why not?

Most teachers (83%) felt that the CALL course was relevant and beneficial to their teaching career. The course provided both theoretical and practical knowledge of CALL, which the teachers have been able to apply in their teaching situations:

> Teacher 3: *Yes, it absolutely has. I have been actively using CALL in my career for the past 2 years. Everything that I do in my job now is directly related to various aspects that I studied in the course.*

> Teacher 6: *I would say yes as it opens up new possibilities for teaching and learning. I now have more resources to rely on in my teaching practice and more modes of teaching my students.*

> Teacher 10: *This course has inspired me a lot in my teaching areas. Because of this course taken, I learn to create an online program for my language teaching.*

> Teacher 12: *Yes definitely. … It is possible to teach a foreign language without using computers but I believe that language teachers need to have knowledge on how to integrate computer-based activities into their classrooms in order to facilitate their students' L2 learning process and enhance their students' learning.*

> Teacher 19: *I see CALL becoming an integral part of ESL teaching in general. I wouldn't want to be left behind in my knowledge in modern approaches to ESL teaching. I think the CALL course may help me in getting another job.*

> Teacher 26: *Yes, absolutely. The most valuable experience I gained from the CALL course was learning how to create my own online interactive language exercises for students and also how to create basic web pages with interactive exercises. This in turn led me to develop a website for my business.*

> Teacher 27: *On the basis of my CALL experience in the course, I was able to apply for a CALL position at the English Language Institute at my work.*

> Teacher 44: *It is educationally and instrumentally related to my career. The utility of computer technology is now playing an increasingly important role in language teaching and learning. … The CALL course helped me have a better understanding of the use of technology in language teaching and have a better understanding of students' interests and needs in language acquisition as well as learning.*

Teacher 50: *The CALL course was very helpful for the development of my teaching career. It provided me with new ways of teaching a language and creative ideas of using materials and resources through the Web.*

Those teachers (17%) who responded "no" to Question 2 indicated that the course had not been relevant for them either because of inadequate facilities in their workplace or a lack of opportunity to implement CALL in their teaching practice. However, they expressed a hope that they could apply the knowledge in the future:

Teacher 1: *Not yet. It has helped me do my work … but no progress on the job/salary front in that respect.*

Teacher 7: *So far, I haven't had many opportunities to implement CALL in my job, but I would like to in the future.*

Teacher 15: *The unit itself so far hasn't helped me in my career but it was good knowledge.*

Teacher 24: *Not yet, I work at a college with less than adequate facilities.*

Q3. Do you currently use CALL? If yes, how? If no, why not?

A significant proportion (69.8%) of the teachers said that they are currently using CALL in a variety of ways in their teaching situations. Their uses range from using CALL as a means for communication between the teacher and students, such as e-mail and blogging, as a means of undertaking task-based research by searching for information online, and as a valuable resource to encourage self-access language learning to using CALL for teaching writing:

Teacher 3: *Yes, I am currently offering an advanced level EAP course on an open-source course management system called Moodle.*

Teacher 6: *I use some aspects of CALL like e-mails, web-resources for students with Internet access from home for more advanced practice. … I am also trying to create a blog site as another way of engaging my students.*

Teacher 7: *I am currently developing some Moodle content for my oral English classes. … I teach a class in 'Internet English' in which students use the Internet for research on given topics and use a blog to present information found.*

Teacher 12: *Mostly I use email exchanges and discussion boards.*

Teacher 16: *I encourage students to do PowerPoint presentations when they have to do an individual or group presentation.*

Teacher 17: *I use PowerPoint for my lectures as well as the Internet for realia in the classroom. I also use a collaborative website for all homework activities and the school's 'cyber campus' site for announcements and communication with my students.*

Teacher 20: *I currently use CALL in my writing classes (managed with the help of Moodle).*

Teacher 41: *I use e-mail and web-chatting as a means of communicating with my students.*

Teacher 45: *I utilize a discussion board and chat function in my current courses. Further, I employ a video element, where students are taped and then they review their presentation on the web via an Internet portal.*

Teacher 52: *I use some CALL resources in a self-access center that I run for my students. … In other classes, I use web quests a lot.*

For teachers who are not using CALL, a number of reasons have been given. These include a lack of computer resources, curriculum restrictions, no requirement for CALL, and a lack of institutional support for the use of CALL:

Teacher 15: *I would love to but so far there hasn't been any need for it.*

Teacher 21: *Present teaching curriculum does not include using CALL.*

Teacher 22: *There is no support at my school.*

Teacher 23: *No, because my college classes don't have computers.*

Teacher 32: *No time in syllabus with present coursework load.*

Teacher 36: *Our course co-ordinator does not use CALL at all.*

Q4. Do you continue to develop your professionalism in CALL? If yes, how? If no, why not?

Out of 53 teachers, 45 teachers (84.9%) indicated that they are continuing to gain expertise and experience in CALL after undertaking the CALL course. They have undertaken various methods of improving their CALL

knowledge and skills, including reading journals, blogs, attending conferences, collaborating with colleagues and doing CALL activities with their students.

> Teacher 2: *Yes, online websites and discussion groups.*

> Teacher 7: *I have attended conferences. ... I like to read about new developments and possibilities.*

> Teacher 10: *I am trying to co-operate with co-workers who are good at computer programming to create a more friendly language learning environment.*

> Teacher 11: *I am an avid reader of educational blogs and resources regarding CALL and other methodology.*

> Teacher 12: *I regularly read articles about how to use CALL effectively and search web-based activities and tasks which can be useful for my students.*

> Teacher 13: *I'm developing my computer skills more in order to design more interactive materials.*

> Teacher 19: *I am always willing to share information at staff meetings about good websites and activities. I also get good recommendations in return.*

> Teacher 26: *Yes, simply by viewing language learning websites and looking at their language exercises and evaluating how effective the exercises would be for our students.*

> Teacher 39: *I familiarise myself with new software programs that can be used in self-access situations.*

> Teacher 47: *By further reading CALL documents and applying my little experiences into practice.*

> Teacher 49: *I read journals and review courseware.*

Time is a significant factor for many teachers who do not continue to develop their professionalism in CALL. Other reasons cited included poor facilities and a lack of information about where and how to access further information on CALL:

> Teacher 3: *I actually do not have the time or resources to take part in CALL training courses or professional development workshops or*

seminars. I would very much like to, however, but I just don't know where I can access to such resources.

Teacher 8: *I hope so. But, due to the lack of facilities, I am afraid that I cannot continue to develop my professionalism in CALL.*

Teacher 41: *Not in my current position as there is not the range of facilities available to utilise CALL a lot.*

Teacher 44: *Not really, because I am restricted by various aspects such as my weak computer skills, and time pressure in addition to the availability of equipment for teaching.*

Q5. What factors do you think affect your use of CALL?

It was found that the key factor that determines the teachers' use of CALL in the classroom is access to computers. In situations where teachers and students have access to computers both on campus and at home, teachers seem to be more easily able to incorporate CALL lessons into the curriculum.

Teacher 2: *Access to sufficient computers in the classroom.*

Teacher 8: *The facility offered in my workplace.*

Teacher 10: *No doubt, without computers or internet access students are hard to involve in my CALL program.*

Teacher 14: *Lack of facilities.*

Teacher 17: *Factors such as classroom resources, applications and logistics are keys.*

Teacher 19: *Accessibility to the computer lab – can't use it if they don't have it. In addition, many students don't have computers at home. I work in a lower income catchment area. I also need to update my knowledge more on how to use online or CALL materials.*

Teacher 20: *First, having access to a computer lab (or at least a facility where learners can plug in their laptops and access the Internet). Second, having an awareness of how CALL can/should be integrated into the curriculum.*

Teacher 23: *Workplace facilities.*

Teacher 34: *The main factor which affects my use of CALL is the lack of facilities at my university to apply CALL and therefore the difficulty to integrate CALL activities into my existing language programs.*

Teacher 48: *Availability (or lack of) CALL facilities at my institution.*

Time for developing CALL activities and professionalism is found to be another significant factor, which can hinder the use of CALL by teachers. It is difficult for many teachers to find the time in busy curriculum to improve their skills in CALL, develop new materials and teaching plans and incorporate CALL into existing language programs:

Teacher 4: *Time and the direction of my career.*

Teacher 9: *Availability of time and management support.*

Teacher 24: *Time, class aims and objectives, texts used and facilities.*

Teacher 25: *Time constraints, workload and limited time per week spent in the computer lab.*

Teacher 32: *What affects my use is the time constraint chiefly. As an organisation we have little time to make additions to courses 'on the fly' and would not be valuable from a pedagogical point of view.*

Teacher 35: *Getting free time in the computer room.*

Teacher 43: *Another important factor is time. I am not a computer wiz, so it sometimes takes longer for me to prepare materials, etc., for a CALL activity than it does for a similar non-CALL activity. However, if I think that the time investment required to prepare things with CALL has a sufficient benefit, I will make the effort to do the CALL activity.*

Teacher 52: *Equipment, budget and time are the big 3 factors for me. One of the lessons I learned in CALL was that time on the computers has to be linked to the in-class curriculum for it to be valuable. Finding class time to make the links is quite a challenge some times.*

Along with access and time constraints, technical support is another important factor which could influence the success of a CALL program. The teachers expressed frustration when faced with technical difficulties and lack of institutional support to keep computer facilities functioning:

Teacher 6: *Technical support is the biggest factor as I have little formal technical knowledge.*

Teacher 16: *The lack of institutional support, the lack of a maintenance program (we have CALL labs but only 50% of the computers ever work) ....*

Teacher 42: *Computers are too slow, and not well maintained, learners are unable to print off from computers and there are not enough of them for a whole class.*

Support from institutions for CALL and recognition of its benefits in language learning are seen as critical to the successful implementation of CALL. In situations where there are a number of teachers teaching the same core content, there needs to be consistency and the ability for all teachers to be able to provide CALL lessons. This requires administrative leadership in order to introduce CALL and to provide the necessary professional development in CALL for teaching staff.

Teacher 6: *To use it in school, it would have to have administrative support.*

Teacher 7: *Support from co-workers and department.*

Teacher 13: *My computer skills, and the openness to CALL of the university that I work for.*

Teacher 17: *The factor which overwhelmingly (other than teacher motivation) determines CALL use is the administration and its attitude/approach.*

Teacher 27: *The minimal support for CALL approaches at the institution I work at has a significant effect.*

When there is little understanding of CALL by administrators, decisions can have a detrimental effect on CALL use by teachers:

Teacher 16: *The president of our university, a pharmacist, decided which CALL suite of software the university would use without consulting the English Department, or apparently anybody with any knowledge of CALL.*

Teacher 27: *At the institution I work at the uptake of CALL is slow. A few of us are interested, but we rarely get the broader support needed to initiate new programs, or even organise effective professional development sessions around CALL.*

Teacher 45: *Primarily the difficulties I face utilizing CALL come from administrative resistance and the students themselves. Administration wants empirical data to support the implementation and cost associated*

with CALL.

Q6. Please make comments on your experience in/with CALL.

While access to computers, time to prepare CALL materials and technical and administrative support can impact the use of CALL in language classrooms, the most significant factor influencing the use of CALL seems to be the teachers themselves. When teachers believe in the pedagogical benefits of CALL, they strive to be innovative and find ways to incorporate CALL into language learning. Other teachers who may lack confidence in computer literacy or effective CALL methodology are more likely to cite barriers as to why they do not incorporate CALL into their teaching or have limited CALL usage.

> Teacher 5: *I still have some kind of fear for them and this prevents me from actively using them.*

> Teacher 17: *I believe in CALL but many teachers do not. ... I will continue to develop my understanding and indeed, my hope in the potential of CALL through the practical realization of its uses for everyday teachers.*

Some teachers (20.8%) commented that, as society becomes more technologically advanced, it is essential that the language teaching profession should also 'get on board' and integrate new technologies and ideas into the language classroom:

> Teacher 12: *I believe that it is necessary for language teachers to integrate new and advanced technologies into their syllabus in order to support their current teaching practices and provide more effective lessons. ... In today's world, technology is a valuable tool for language teachers and they need to know how to use technology in an effective way.*

> Teacher 19: *I think it is my professional duty to develop my skills through learning new teaching and learning techniques. ... I see CALL becoming an integral part of ESL teaching in general. I wouldn't want to be left behind in modern approaches to ESL teaching.*

> Teacher 51: *Although it is tough for me, I have to learn and teach myself about using CALL in my profession throughout my working life.*

There is also some apprehension about using CALL and concern that it may take over regular classroom teaching:

> Teacher 25: *I enjoy it immensely but feel quite strongly that CALL needs to*

> *be used very carefully to ensure that it does not replace up-front classroom "human" teaching. … I would not like to see CALL taking priority over classroom-based teaching with a skilled language teacher.*

> Teacher 32: *We lack the incentive to evaluate the use of CALL and implement pilot projects. I think this is partly due to our aging teachers who are not comfortable with technology and are resistant to change.*

Another area of concern for the teachers is their lack of knowledge of effective CALL methodology. While they support the use of CALL in the classroom, they felt they needed more information about *how* to use CALL in their classrooms. When they encountered technical problems or had negative experiences, they were likely to give up:

> Teacher 49: *I believe that teaching with CALL is more interesting if we know how to use it, otherwise it will just give us a headache.*

> Teacher 50: *Other teachers who are not confident in their computer skills tend to be frustrated and give up using computers in the classroom.*

The teachers recognised the importance of ongoing skill development in CALL and expressed an interest in learning how to develop their own CALL resources. They also felt the need for professional development in CALL.

> Teacher 25: *I would like to do more professional development in this field but time constraints and workload prevent this.*

> Teacher 49: *My suggestion is that since CALL is an unavoidable life phenomenon, teachers should be happy with the presence and the use of CALL, learn it and get used to using it.*

Many teachers (45.3%) spoke enthusiastically about CALL and its potential in the language classroom:

> Teacher 3: *I am truly enjoying my work in CALL. I want to continue in this area of teaching.*

> Teacher 20: *My experience with CALL has largely been positive. … I have found CALL to be highly effective in getting my students to engage more deeply in the writing process through the use of brainstorming programs and word processing software.*

> Teacher 23: *I believe CALL is the way of the future.*

Teacher 44: *My learning experience with CALL has been very impressive and exciting. It overcame barriers of time and space, making learning very flexible and convenient, and allowing students to work at their own pace.*

Another factor, which has a strong influence on the success of a CALL program, seems to be the computer literacy of students. Not all students have experience using computers and, when combined with limited second language skills, the language learning focus of the CALL lesson can be lost.

Teacher 7: *It has been difficult as times giving instructions to students unfamiliar with computers, who also have varying levels of English ability. Initial classes with CALL are therefore difficult but gradually get easier and more productive.*

Teacher 43: *Students forget passwords, or in some cases lack sufficient computer literacy to do what has been asked of them in class, etc. These can also be sources of frustration. Problems like these haven't led me to give up on CALL, but occasionally do make me hesitate when deciding whether to use CALL in a class or not.*

While many teachers are keen to integrate CALL into their language teaching programs, some teachers (13.2%) were unable to do it because of the highly structured and exam focused curriculum, which does not allow time for CALL activities:

Teacher 21: *Present teaching curriculum does not include using CALL.*

Teacher 32: *The courses are highly structured and syllabus driven and need to be revised carefully to include CALL.*

Teacher 50: *The restricted school curricula and evaluation system (testing of student progress) prevent me from the use of CALL.*

In summary, there are a number of factors which have a significant impact on the transfer of CALL coursework to classroom practice. Students' access to computers is a basic requirement, followed by the teacher's attitudes toward CALL and their level of confidence and competence in CALL. Teachers who have successfully integrated CALL into the classroom are active in exploring innovative and effective CALL teaching methodologies in order to maximise language learning opportunities for their students. Institutional support for CALL is also important and, if it is lacking, it can limit the level of CALL use by language teachers. In order

to increase the level of CALL use, many teachers have underlined the need for ongoing professional development in CALL to learn more effective methods of integrating CALL into the language classroom.

Discussion

The transfer of CALL coursework to classroom practice has been varied among the teachers who participated in the study. For the majority of the teachers, computers have become an integral part of their teaching life in researching learning materials and tools on the Internet and preparing their own teaching materials. However, not all teachers have made the leap to utilising computers for language teaching. There are many reasons for the slow transfer from the staffroom to the classroom. The primary reasons mentioned by the teachers are the lack of time, which was similarly found in Egbert, Paulus and Nakamichi (2002), and access to computer facilities, which was similarly reported in Ebsworth, Kim and Klein (2010). Without time and facilities, it must be difficult for teachers to implement CALL lessons as a regular component of their language teaching programs.

The teachers valued the skills they gained in the CALL coursework as it has opened their eyes to the potential of CALL in the classroom and helped them evaluate CALL materials effectively. For those teachers who had positive attitudes toward the use of computers, which was emphasised in Kessler (2007), the coursework has inspired them to explore innovative ways of using CALL in the classroom. This has involved moving beyond the entry level of CALL activities such as Internet research tasks, written assignment preparation and PowerPoint presentations to more creative uses of CALL such as developing online discussion forums, using web-based language learning activities and providing students in foreign language environments with more authentic language learning resources.

The CALL coursework has provided the teachers with a level of understanding of the use of CALL in the classroom which has given some teachers the confidence to incorporate it in their teaching. For other teachers, there was a level of uncertainty in how to introduce CALL into their teaching context. They expressed a desire for more knowledge on how best to integrate CALL into the classroom as well as for further professional development and training for CALL. Given the changing nature of technology and its widespread use by individuals, there is a strong requirement for ongoing mentoring and discussion among language

teachers on the use of CALL.

It was also found that a number of teachers face difficulties using CALL in their teaching situations because their curriculum is too restrictive – the focus of the curriculum is on following the prescribed text and preparing students for language examinations. Therefore, there was little room in their teaching schedule for experimentation with CALL. Some institutions also showed a lack of awareness of the potential for CALL and consequently did not provide any support for teachers to implement CALL or to gain further knowledge on CALL. For teachers to be able to influence administrative policy, they would need a deeper understanding of effective CALL activities and methodologies. CALL teachers' online communities of practice might allow further sharing of ideas and activities and provide teachers with methods of developing their confidence and professionalism in CALL.

Conclusion

As society becomes more technologically connected, the use of computers becomes a natural part of learning and teaching. Language learning is one area where computers can bring various benefits to learners in all skill areas. It can be expected that CALL will grow in importance in language programs further and teachers need to be able to take advantage of new technology and its application in the language classroom. The results of this study suggest that, in order for teachers to use the knowledge they receive during coursework, the content of a CALL course needs to provide a balance between CALL awareness and knowledge and guidance on effective CALL methodology and tools (e.g., Son, 2011) for teachers to develop CALL resources and activities to suit their own teaching context. By building these components into CALL coursework, the CALL course will improve teachers' confidence and competence in the use of CALL.

The study also highlights the need for ongoing support for teachers in CALL. It found out that there are two groups of teachers: those who have been able to integrate CALL in certain ways and those who have not been able to use CALL either because of a lack of access to computer facilities or their own limitations. Among them, some teachers felt somewhat isolated and did not know where to turn to or who to turn to for the selection of CALL methodology and activities. This could be addressed with the formation of a CALL teachers' network to enable successful

teachers to outline effective methods for implementing CALL and provide novice teachers with a way of asking for help and gaining practical assistance with pedagogical and technical issues. To improve classroom practice and professional development in CALL, further research is recommended to identify effective methods of integrating CALL into the language classroom and guiding teachers to be active and creative in the use of CALL. This will ensure that future CALL teacher training not only informs teachers about CALL but also meets the practical needs of language teachers.

Acknowledgement

References

Atkins, N., & Vasu, E. (2000). Measuring knowledge of technology usage and stages of concern about computing: A study of middle school teachers. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, 8*(4), 279-302.

Ebsworth, M. E., Kim, A. J., & Klein, T. J. (2010). Projections: From a graduate TELL class to the practical world of L2 teachers. *CALICO Journal, 27*(2), 349-375.

Egbert, J., Paulus, T. M., & Nakamichi, Y. (2002). The impact of CALL instruction on classroom computer use: A foundation for rethinking technology in teacher education. *Language Learning & Technology, 6*(3), 108-126. Retrieved from http://llt.msu.edu/vol6num3/egbert/default.html

Ermter, P., Addision, P., Lane, M., Ross, E., & Woods, D. (1999). Examining teachers' beliefs about the role of technology in the elementary classroom. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education, 32*(1), 54-72.

Hargrave, C., & Hsu, Y. (2000). Survey of instructional technology courses for preservice teachers. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, 8*(4), 303-314.

Hong, K. H. (2010). CALL teacher education as an impetus for L2 teachers in integrating technology. *ReCALL, 22*(1), 53-69.

Hubbard, P. (2008). CALL and the future of language teacher education.

CALICO Journal, 25(2), 175-188.

Johnson, M. (1999). CALL and teacher education: Issues in course design. *CALL-EJ Online, 1*(2). Retrieved from http://callej.org/journal/1-2/johnson.html

Kessler, G. (2007). Formal and informal CALL preparation and teacher attitude toward technology. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 20*(2), 173-188.

Luke, C. L., & Britten, J. S. (2007). The expanding role of technology in foreign language teacher education programs. *CALICO Journal, 24*(1), 253-267.

Milbrath, Y., & Kinzie, M. (2000). Computer technology training for prospective teachers: Computer attitudes and perceived self-efficacy. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, 8*(4), 373-396.

Slaouti, D., & Motteram, G. (2006). Reconstructing practice: Language teacher education and ICT. In P. Hubbard & M. Levy (Eds.), *Teacher education in CALL* (pp. 81-97). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Son, J.-B. (2002). Computers, learners and teacher: Teamwork in the CALL classroom. *English Language Teaching, 14*(2), 239-252.

Son, J.-B. (2011). Online tools for language teaching. *TESL-EJ, 15*(1). Retrieved from http://www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume15/ej57/ej57int/

Walker, B. (1994). EFL teachers' attitudes about CALL. *CAELL Journal, 5*(3), 12-15.

Yildirim, S. (2000). Effects of an educational computing course on preservice and inservice teachers: A discussion and analysis of attitudes and use. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education, 32*(4), 479-495.