

Editorial Board

Mehmet ÖZCAN

Editor-in-Chief

Reviewers for this issue

Ferit KILIÇKAYA

Mehmet ÖZCAN

Mustafa ŞEVİK

Is Communicative Language Teaching a Panacea in ELT? - Student and Teacher Perspectives

Ali KARAKAŞ¹

Abstract

This exploratory research sets out to investigate the interrelatedness between theoretical assumptions and practical dimensions of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), viewed as a cornerstone language teaching method. The focal goal is grounded in determining whether CLT alone is an all-cure approach that may resolve the long-standing problem of deficient English language teaching and learning in the Turkish context. To this end, the data were collected from two groups of people, i.e. university teachers and students, via survey questionnaires. The findings show that although both students and teachers had ambiguous views and concerns regarding the effectiveness and implementation of CLT, teachers were keener to gravitate towards implementing CLT. Albeit its strong theoretical assumptions, CLT has seemed far from being a single answer to effective language teaching due to some other external and internal variables, which are presented and discussed in the main body of the paper.

Keywords Communicative language teaching, English language teaching, methodology

1. Introduction

Communicative Language Teaching (hereafter CLT) has been in existence as a teaching methodology since the 1970s, and has been widely accepted as a branded language teaching approach in many contexts where English is learned and taught. There is a raft of critical reasons why CLT has become so widespread in the teaching of English. That the purpose of language learning is to acquire ‘communicative competence’ with a focus on meaning and communication is among the most salient reasons (Nunan, 1989). As such, an assumption of this kind can be seen as “a shift of attention from the language system as an end in itself to the successful use of that system in context; that is to say, from an emphasis on form to an emphasis on communication” (Cook, 2003, p. 36). Therefore, it may be claimed that reactions to the traditional methods and approaches such as grammar translation method (GTM) and audio-lingual approach led to the birth of CLT, which supplanted these methods in the years to come as the prominent language teaching method, with a shift “... from the teaching of discrete grammatical structures to the fostering of communicative ability” (Warschauer & Kern, 2000, p. 1). In the light of these changes witnessed for more than four decades in the teaching of English, this present research aims at exploring teachers’ and students’ perspectives on CLT, with a further consideration of its implementation, particularly in a non-English speaking site, Turkey.

¹ Bio: **Ali KARAKAŞ** is a research assistant in the Faculty of Education at Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Burdur, Turkey. He holds a BA degree from the University of Uludag, Bursa, Turkey. He was accepted to the Integrated PhD program in Applied Linguistics by the University of Southampton, UK. Currently, he is continuing his PhD at the same university. He has presented papers in national and international conferences and published articles in reputable journals and educational magazines. His research interests include English as a Lingua Franca, Language Teacher Education, Applied Phonetics, and Computer Assisted Language Learning. Contact: akarakas@mehmetakif.edu.tr

1.1 Literature review

The roots of CLT date back to the 1960s when the British Situational Language Teaching approach was in its heyday (Rodgers & Richards, 2001). Changes in this approach partially paved the way for the emergence of CLT. Moreover, works of scholars like Hymes (1971), Wilkins (1976) and Widdowson (1978) and the Council of Europe (see Trim, 2001) contributed to the consecutive development of the approach. Hymes' (1971) name is often equated with CLT in the literature on teaching approaches, as he reformulated Chomsky's (1965) view of language competence (i.e. "linguistic competence and performance"), in which language is deemed as comprised of abstract grammatical rules. He re-defined the concept of language competence and argued that there existed another rule system, in addition to linguistic competence, which he called "communicative competence". He basically means that language is not only about 'grammar', but also about functions and notions (see Wilkinson, 1976). To him, language could not only be taken as an entity composed of de-contextualized syntax and linguistic forms, but it must be considered as a social and cognitive entity. Thus, to be able to communicate effectively, apart from being linguistically competent, learners are bound to be equipped with communicative competence by knowing how to use language appropriately in a given speech community, for example, being aware of "when to speak, when not, what to talk about with whom, when, where and in what manner" (Hymes, 1972, p. 277).

Shortly after Hymes' (1971) proposal, Canale and Swain (1980) expanded this model of teaching by identifying four dimensions of communicative competence: grammatical competence, socio-linguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence. It is strongly emphasized that communicative competence is more than recognizing and producing the distinctive linguistic structures of a particular language (i.e. linguistic competence in Chomsky, 1965). As Canale (1983) maintains, learners also need sociolinguistic competence (i.e. how language is "produced and understood appropriately in different socio-linguistic contexts") and discourse competence (i.e. the ability "to combine grammatical forms and meanings to achieve a unified spoken or written text in different genres") and lastly strategic competence (i.e. "mastery of verbal and non-verbal communication strategies" that learners employ to compensate and enhance communication) (pp. 7-11, see Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 160).

In general, CLT has two main objectives. One is to "... (a) make communicative competence the goal of teaching" and the other one is to "(b) develop procedures for the teaching of the four language skills that acknowledge the interdependence of language and communication" (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 155). In this interdependence, language serves as a tool of conveying messages, knowledge and meaning, which are transmitted through communication between parties. In this cycle of exchange of knowledge, as Breen and Candlin (2001) point out, "communication is not only a matter of following conventions but also of negotiating through and about the conventions themselves" (p. 10). This communicative model of language has been devised for practical implementations in actual teaching and learning, with a special focus on

instructional system, materials to be used, teacher and learner roles, and classroom practices. Besides these pragmatic concerns, theoretical issues, such as theory of language learning and learning theory behind CLT have been also identified and meticulously discussed. Based on a review of works of scholars (e.g. Bachman, 1991; Breen & Candlin, 1980; Brumfit, 1988; Littlewood, 1981; Nunan, 1989; Richard, 2001; Richards & Rodgers, 2001; Thompson, 1996) on CLT, the following table is presented to demonstrate the main points concerning the practical and theoretical matters discussed above, with some key principles of CLT.

Table 1
Summary of the practical and theoretical characteristics of CLT

Theory of Language and Theory of Learning	Chief Principles	Student Roles	Teacher Roles
* Language is a system for expressing meaning.	*Focus on fluency and communication not only accuracy and forms	* Negotiators between the self, the learning process and the object of learning	* Needs analyst * Counsellor * Group process manager * Facilitator * Participant * Observer * Learner
*Theory of language as communication is paramount.	*Interaction-based Activities - negotiation of meaning	* Must interact with each other and be more cooperative than competitive	*Must use text-based materials,
* The goal of language teaching is to develop communicative competence:	*Use of authentic materials rather than drills	*Active participant in the production of language rather than passive recipient	-dialogues -sentence patterns, -visual and taped cues
- grammatical, - sociolinguistic, - discourse - strategic - pragmatic - fluency	*Focus on learner autonomy	* co-operator with teacher and other students	*Must use task-based materials and realia.
*Underlying learning theory	*Focus on Learner's Real-world communication needs		- role plays - simulations - magazines - maps, - advertisements - newspapers
-communication principle - task-based principle - meaningfulness principle			

Table 1 shows that language teaching is no longer seen as a one-way knowledge transmission from teachers to students. Both parties should be working together for the production of language (Bygate, 2001). Therefore, cooperation lies at the heart of CLT. Moreover, unlike former approaches (e.g. GTM, audolingualism), students are engaged in real-life situations through authentic materials and meaningful tasks, particularly focusing on functions (i.e. what can be done through language) and notions (i.e. what can be talked about through language). The main purpose for using realia is to approximate language teaching to the needs of learners in real-life contexts. The key to teaching English is based on the actual use of language to learn it rather than attempting to learn how to use it. In this regard, two

versions of CLT are discussed by scholars: weak version and strong version. In Howatt's (1984) words, the weak version "...stresses the importance of providing learners with opportunities to use their English with communicative purposes and, characteristically, attempts to integrate such activities into a wider program of language teaching", whereas the strong version claims that "language is acquired through communication, so that it is not merely a question of activating an existing but inert knowledge of the language system itself" (quoted in Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 155). Howatt (1984) refers to the weak version as 'learning to use' English but the strong version as 'using English to learn it' (in Richards & Rodgers, p. 155). However, weak version is criticized for not fully engaging learners in language use to learn it. For instance, footprints of structuralism appear still available in the weak version like combination of linguistic study, and controlled practice and wide use of PPP (present-practice-produce) principle. However, strong version is highly appreciated, as it intends to get learners to experience language use through comprehensible and meaningful input, real-life tasks, and project-based activities.

1.2 CLT in Turkey

Turkey is one of the countries, which has spent huge effort and a quite large amount of money to adopt CLT. Kirkgöz (2005, 2007) stated that CLT was, for the first time, included in the English language teaching (ELT) curriculum in Turkey in 1997 with the change of curricula for English from structural to communicative approach at all levels of public education. The primary impetus for such a drastic change stemmed from the driving force that traditional methods proved to be less effective and had almost no contribution to language teaching, considering the amount of time and money spent for teaching English. Currently, though CLT has been believed to be successful in ELT in all types of schools in Turkey; scholars have, as of late, started to question the feasibility of CLT in English language teaching for some reasons. Questioning CLT is not only unique to Turkey, as practitioners have already questioned its effectiveness in other settings (e.g. see Li, 1998, for Asian context). However, despite the growing concerns about CLT, there has not been a scientific attempt to scientifically report how effective CLT is in practice as yet, which constitutes the impetus for initiating this research.

1.3 Criticisms of CLT

Having dominated the language teaching methodology for over 30 years, CLT has been substantially subject to hot debates since the 80s. There have been many attempts to question a number of assumptions of it, and many scholarly papers have been written on these issues. In the mid-1980s, Swan (1985a, 1985b) wrote two influential articles questioning the four fundamental assumptions of CLT. In his first article (1985a), he particularly discussed: "(1) the idea of a 'double level meaning' associated with such terms as 'rules of use' and 'rules of communication' and the related concept of 'appropriacy'; and (2) some confusions regarding 'skills' and 'strategies'" (p.2). In his second article (1985b), Swan dealt with "(3) the idea of a semantic ('notional/functional') syllabus, and (4) the 'real life' fallacy in

materials design and methodology” (p.76). Also, Tan (2005) questioned the role of culture in the applicability and success of CLT in English language teaching, and she concluded that CLT is not entirely suitable for primary school children in Singapore. Other writers such as Ellis (1996) and Collins (1999) argued that CLT is inappropriate in terms of cultural aspects in Asian contexts. Besides, the materials used such as text books claim to have notional-functional syllabuses but in fact they are just based on the weak version of CLT.

Added to these criticisms, Stern (1992) points out that CLT has become more successful in ESL (English as a second language) settings, but failed to make classroom interaction as communicative as possible in EFL (English as a foreign language) contexts. In ESL contexts, learners have a real need to use language, and their learning is usually tutored with native English teachers. Yet, in EFL settings, learners’ exposure to language is confined to only classroom instruction, with limited class hours, which means poor language input for learners. Besides, many problems are encountered in such contexts relating to the proficiency of non-native teachers, availability of required materials, crowded classrooms, teacher-dependent learners. More recently, Bax (2003) emphasizes the significance of the local needs and conditions of particular EFL contexts by suggesting that “good teachers everywhere pay attention to context; good training courses pay attention to context” (p.286). In his study, he found that teachers’ attention to context in CLT was secondary; even worse, the inexperienced teachers were seen to act against the context. Finally, he concludes that learning context together with learner variables, which are the key factors in successful language learning, should be recognized. CLT is also criticized by scholars, from a different perspective, for propagating “the native speaker-based notion of communicative competence” in the age when non-native speakers of English far outnumber the native speakers of English (Alptekin, 2002, p. 57). Alptekin (2002) writes that this model is based on standardized native speaker norms and he, therefore, finds the model “utopian, unrealistic, and constraining” in respect to the current role of English as a global lingua franca (p. 58). Emphasizing the need of a new concept of communicative competence, he puts forward the notion of ‘intercultural communicative competence’, which occurs both in local and international contexts of language use including native and non-native speakers. What can be concluded from the weaknesses cited above is that CLT without adaptation and innovation to a certain educational context of teaching, and without paying attention to the profile of the speakers of the language (be they natives or non-natives) is not a cure-all teaching approach to overcome the difficulties encountered in the teaching and learning of English.

Not all these criticisms have a rigorous foundation, however. Thus, Thompson (1996) attempted to clarify some misconceptions about CLT. He handled four misconceptions, which are frequently discussed in the literature, and then he explained and discussed why they are misconceived. Thompson argued that the role of the grammar, the assumption that “CLT means teaching only speaking” (p.11), the ways in which role plays and pair work are used, and its expectations from teachers are misjudged by the critics. Despite his influential defence for CLT, he himself concedes that “CLT

is by no means the final answer” as a teaching method, and adds that a revolution in language teaching is inevitable due to the innovations in language teaching, but he stresses that whatever changes and innovations take place, they should be built upon the main building-blocks of CLT (p.14). There is a plethora of research on students’ and teachers’ views on CLT. For example, Sariçoban and Tılfarlıoğlu (1999) explored the attitudes of 23 teachers towards communicative-learner centred approach in Turkey. They found that teachers, generally, held positive attitudes towards this approach, but there were ambivalent attitudes as regards its features, resulting from teachers’ previous teaching experiences, administrative and contextual factors. In Thailand, Jarvis and Atsilarat (2004) investigated practitioners’ and students’ opinions about CLT. They discovered that they were committed towards CLT in essence, but barriers were faced in actual practice such as big classroom size, untrained teachers, and lack of appropriate materials. In an earlier study, the attitudes of Chinese teachers towards CLT were elicited (Anderson, 1993). It was shown that teachers and students were not motivated enough to shift from structural approaches to CLT for a number of reasons: high demands on teachers, untrained teachers, reluctant students to participate in classes, fear of committing mistakes, and examination system. Li (1998), in South Korea, dealt with the difficulties of CLT application teachers faced. The detected difficulties fell into four categories: teacher-, student-, education system- and CLT-related problems. For instance, teachers were bothered with deficient students, overfilled classes, conventional methods and high expectations. Finally, primary school students were involved in research in Singapore to decide on the suitability of CLT (Tan, 2005). However, it was not feasible enough for these students, as the local needs and cultural values of students were ignored. In that respect, the researcher suggested taking cultural background of students into consideration in CLT implementations. Bearing the above discussion and the review of past research in mind, this study attempts at investigating teachers’ and students’ views of CLT, not necessarily by name, and consider its application in an EFL context. The following research questions were set out to be answered in this study:

- a. What are the university teachers’ and students’ views on Communicative Language Teaching? Do they differ in their views towards CLT?
- b. Is CLT a panacea method in language learning-teaching for Turkish learners? If not, why? What might be the underlying reasons?

2. Methodology

2.1 Setting and Participants

The sample of this study comprised a total of 46 participants, of who 15 were teachers and 31 English-major third-grade students from MAKU (Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Burdur, Turkey). The majority of the students were female (n= 23) and the number of male students amounted to almost one-fourth of the total number of student participants (n=8). Their ages ranged from 21 to 24, thereby having a very narrow age range. The distribution of teacher participants on grounds of their gender was more balanced and even than that of students, with a total number of eight female and seven male

teachers. Their age range was, however, fairly broader than that of students in that the youngest teacher was 26 years old whilst the oldest was 41. The participants were randomly selected, and the participation in the study was voluntary. The overarching objective was to offer a critical examination of CLT with specific reference to experiences of these university teachers and students. All teachers were Turkish, with a teaching experience varying from less than 2 years to more than 10 years. Seven of the teachers reported that they were not exposed to CLT before, but eight of them reported to have received some training in it during their undergraduate education.

2.2 Data collection tools

The tools were adopted from Jarvis and Atsilarat, (2004) with modifications of the items in the survey to render them more relevant to the current study. Two questionnaires were used: one for the teachers (Appendix 1) and the other for the students (Appendix 2). The teacher questionnaire is comprised of two parts: the first part deals with teachers' conceptions of CLT, and the second part is about teachers' CLT implementations and the problems they face in practice. The student questionnaire also comprises two parts: the first part investigates their attitudes towards learning English in relation to the premises of CLT, while the second section handles students' beliefs about 'teacher and teaching' in CLT.

2.3 Data Collection and Data Analysis

The data analyses are based on 31 student and 15 teacher responses in total. The expected responses were based on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'. The participants' responses were entered into SPSS 19.0 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) program. These responses were coded as strongly agree (5), agree (4), neither agree nor disagree (3), disagree (2), and strongly disagree (1). Subsequently, the data were analysed by utilizing descriptive statistics tools available in SPSS to calculate various statistics for the given variables.

3. Findings and Discussion

3.1 Teachers

Question 1, which asked teachers (Ts) to comment on the most important aspect of CLT in their opinions, was answered by a minority of the participants. Many skipped this question without writing any remarks, and those having answered it (19.35 %) pointed out that the shift from working on linguistic structures to interactively using language to learn it was radically revolutionary in CLT. In response to question 2, which asked whether they used CLT in their teaching, a few participants (16.13 %) reported that they used CLT while teaching. Notwithstanding the claims that CLT is the dominant teaching method, these two questions indicated that the majority of the practitioners denied the defining characteristic of CLT, and made no attempt to apply it in their teaching. Question 3 composed of a set of survey items investigated some of the conceptions and misconceptions about CLT in practice. Below is a summary of the responses.

Table 2
Average and frequency scores of Teachers' opinions about CLT

<i>Statements (n=15)</i>	<i>SA</i>		<i>Agree</i>		<i>Neutral</i>		<i>Disagree</i>		<i>SD</i>	
	(%)	(f)	(%)	(f)	(%)	(f)	(%)	(f)	(%)	(f)
1. Teaching should focus on fluency .	6,6	1	33,3	5	40,0	6	20,0	3	0	0
2. Teaching should focus on accuracy.	20,0	3	26,6	4	13,3	2	26,6	4	13,3	2
3. Teaching should focus both on fluency and accuracy.	53,3	8	26,6	4	20,0	3	0	0	0	0
4. The students should be the centre of learning.	6,6	1	80,0	12	6,6	1	6,6	1	0	0
5. The teacher should be a facilitator for students.	40,0	6	33,3	5	6,6	1	20,0	3	0	0
6. The teachers should primarily encourage students to communicate.	20,0	3	60,0	9	13,3	2	6,6	1	0	0
7. The teacher should spend a lot of time on role play/ games/ group and pair work.	46,6	7	46,6	7	6,6	1	0	0	0	0
8. The teacher should devote time to teaching structures explicitly.	20,0	3	26,6	4	6,6	1	13,3	2	33,3	5
9. The lesson should focus mostly on communicative skills.	13,3	2	46,6	7	20,0	3	20,0	3	0	0
10. The teacher should not correct the students' mistakes unless they may cause communication breakdown.	20,0	3	46,6	7	6,6	1	26,6	4	0	0
11. The students should be exposed to authentic language and material all the time.	20,0	3	53,3	8	13,3	2	13,3	2	0	0
12. Language task should be meaningful and purposeful.	73,3	11	26,6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
13. CLT is an effective approach for my students.	0	0	80,0	12	20,0	3	0	0	0	0

Statements (S) 1 and 2 indicate that teachers failed to arrive at a compromise as to the significance of fluency and accuracy in teaching when assessed separately. However, in S3, the figures show that teachers (n=12, 80%) achieved consensus on the significance of the fluency and accuracy when integrated in teaching. A clear majority of them (S4 & S5) believed that the teaching should be student-centred, and the teacher should facilitate language learning, by prompting students to engage in real communication (S6). Accordingly, almost all teachers favoured the inclusion of activities and practices (e.g. role plays, games) that will create rooms for students' engagement in communicative behaviours, which will enhance their communicative capabilities in the long term (S7 & S9). On the other hand, a paradox was observed among teachers concerning the explicit teaching of grammar rules, half backing it while the other half opposing to explicit teaching (S8). Views on error correction, in S10, indicate that although more than one-fourths of the practitioners (26, 6 %) are against the absence of error correction, the majority of them (66, 6 %) are in favour of omission of corrections of mistakes, unless they cause a loss of healthy communication. The role of authentic language and materials is highly recognized by teachers in S11 (73, 3 %). All teachers hold the same view that language tasks should be meaningful and purposeful, as seen in S12 (n= 15, 100 %), and the

majority of them (S13) find CLT pedagogically functional for their students in practice, while just a few remain indecisive. These findings indicated similar directions in accordance with what other researchers already observed in other contexts of EFL (e.g. Sariçoban & Tılfarlıoğlu, 1999, Turkey; Jarvis & Atsilarat, 2004, Thailand; Anderson, 1993, China; Li, 1998, South Korea).

Part 2 deals with the issues that surround CLT in implementation. Question 4 explores the problems that teachers encountered while implementing CLT in their classrooms. In response to question 4 (Q), all the participants stated that they were confronted with a variety of problems, as the table below illustrates. Despite being varied, the problems mainly pertain to the proficiency level of students, the lack of time, the examination format, and the unsuitability of the available materials for CLT implementation. When they were asked to give any further explanation for the problems they perceived relevant to their situation, and to identify any other limitations that precluded them from effectively implementing CLT, the vast majority of practitioners reported that students’ proficiency level and their learning styles (e.g. shyness) made CLT difficult to implement, and some students felt uncomfortable with CLT. Here, the data indicate that there are a range of problems coming mainly from the learning context and student-based factors (see Table 2). Similar pitfalls were earlier unclosed by scholars, such as Bax (2003), Tan (2004, 2005), Jarvis and Atsilarat (2004) and Li (1998).

Table 3
Problems encountered while implementing CLT in order of frequency

<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Problems</i>
% 66,6	10	1. The students’ English proficiency level is too low.
% 53,3	8	2. Time is limited.
% 46,6	7	3. The examination format is not totally CLT-based.
% 46,6	7	4. Material does not facilitate CLT implementation.
% 46,6	7	5. Class size is too big.
% 40	6	6. Students do not take responsibility for their own learning.
% 33,3	5	7. The students are not comfortable with CLT.
% 26,6	4	8. The students need accuracy rather than fluency.
% 6,6	1	9. Both students and I want the teacher to be central and give clear guidance.
% 6,6	1	10. I am not clear what CLT expects me to do.

3.2 Students

The student questionnaire comprises two parts: the first part explored students’ attitudes, and the second one required students to rate the given statements depending on their beliefs about CLT. In the first part (see Appendix 2), it is clear to see that students differed in their preferences for accuracy and fluency, which is in stark line with teachers’ preferences as many of them expressed different views when asked separately to opt for

either of the two (see Table 1, S1). Both for fluency and accuracy, students were almost equally divided into two poles in their responses. It might be surmised that students attached importance to the integration of these teaching styles, thinking that one would be incomplete without the other for effective teaching. Most students (n=21, 67%) reported that they do not feel discouraged from using language actively because of personality and affective factors such as shyness, loss of face or an unwillingness, and speaking English publicly; however, they hesitated to question the teacher's teaching techniques if even they have a sound reason, which is an evident indication of students' reliance on teacher-fronted learning (see S3, S4 & S5). Although some students (n=5, S6) expressed a preference for struggling to communicate by themselves without teacher and textbook dominance, the vast majority of them (n=26, 83, 87 %) were in favour of teachers' explanation and overt correction, namely, a deductive teacher-centred learning (see S8 & S9). These views showed inconsistency with some of the main premises of CLT: learning should be learner-centred and inductive, and errors should be regarded as constructive feedback signalling the progress, and should not be corrected by the teacher as long as there is no danger of communication breakdown. It is the teacher, as a facilitator, who should guide them towards self-correction, thereby helping students gain autonomy and take responsibility for their own learning. The overall summary of students' views on learning styles regarding CLT is given in Table 4.

Table 4

Students' attitudes and preferences in respect to CLT

<i>n=31</i> Student needs (fluency or accuracy)	<i>True</i>		<i>False</i>	
	%	(f)	%	(f)
1. I want my English to be as accurate as possible even if I am a little less fluent.	51,61 %	16	48,39 %	15
2. I want my English to be as fluent as possible even if I am a little less accurate.	58,07 %	18	41,93 %	13
3. I will lose face and feel very embarrassed if I make a mistake or ask a question in the classroom.	32,25 %	10	67,75 %	21
4. I do not like speaking in front of the class.	35,48 %	11	64,52 %	20
5. It is impolite for me to disagree with the teacher even though I may have a good reason.	90,33 %	28	9,67 %	3
6. I prefer learning from my teacher to learning independently.	83,87 %	26	16,13 %	5
7. I would rather learn English by struggling to communicate with my own efforts.	41,93 %	13	58,07 %	18
8. I prefer my teacher to explain the content of a particular topic explicitly giving me examples.	70,97 %	22	29,03 %	9
9. I want my teacher to correct my errors immediately.	83,87 %	26	16,13 %	5

The second part of the questionnaire investigated student views about the key assumptions of CLT (statements 10-17) in relation to teaching. The results reveal that the teacher is seen as the sole input provider, and thus should generate English as much as he can, but apart from that, the majority of the students wanted the teacher to explicitly supply them with the required information about the subject content and while doing so, the teacher is expected to use a good and fluent English as the ideal model to imitate (see S10, S11, S12). However, there was a lack of agreement among students on the choice of which type of tasks (i.e. functional or grammatical) should be given much precedence by the teacher. Except for hesitant students, half of the rest favoured functional tasks, whereas the other half took side with grammatical tasks (see S13). More than one-third of the students were of the opinion that speaking capabilities should have much weight over the other major skills and, and hence the teacher should attend to this fact in earnest (S14). In terms of the material choice, nearly all students (n=27,87,09 %) supported the view that the teacher should make use of authentic materials in the delivery of the lessons (S15). However, with regards to the medium of learning and teaching, slightly more than half of the students (n=17, 54,80 %) opted for English-only, while less than one-thirds (n=6, 19,39 %) were opposed to the delivery of lessons in solely English.

Table 5
Students’ views about teacher’s role and teaching

Statements (n=31)	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
10. Students should produce a lot of English in class.	25,80 %	61,29 %	6,45 %	3,23 %	3,23 %
11. The English teacher’s role is to provide clear information.	25,80 %	45,16 %	9,67 %	6,45 %	12,90 %
12. The English teachers should model a good example of using English.	29,03 %	54,84 %	6,45 %	6,45 %	3,23 %
13. The teacher should spend a lot of time on functional language tasks rather than grammatical tasks.	19,35 %	19,35 %	16,13 %	41,94 %	3,23 %
14. The teacher should focus on speaking skill. Listening, reading, writing, grammar and vocabulary are secondary.	22,58 %	48,39 %	29,03 %	0 %	0 %
15. The teacher should use authentic material all the times.	32,26 %	54,83 %	9,68 %	3,23 %	0 %
16. The teacher should only use English in the classes.	19,35 %	35,49 %	25,80 %	16,13 %	3,23 %
17. The teacher should engage you to practice meaningful and purposeful language tasks.	54,84 %	45,16 %	0 %	0 %	0 %

In response to question 18, which asked whether their present English classes described the way their teachers taught them, 90,32 % of students

reported that their current English classes did not exactly match with the above statements (S10-S17). To the question whether their current English class differed from their previous classes in secondary or high school, the overwhelming majority of students (n=27, 87,09 %) responded saying that that they were not alike. The things students liked in their present classes were different from those in secondary/high schools for many students (n=18, 64,52 %). What they disliked at their previous learning contexts appeared to be the same for the majority of the students (67,74 %), and the problems they encountered in secondary schools and their present English classes were recognized to be tremendously different (83,87 %). What they liked and disliked regarding English language teaching are outlined as follows: many students complained that classes were too crowded; they disliked teacher-centred classes, but they were not willing to communicate through language. Some students complained about too much memorization put on them as a strain. A few students even confessed that they just studied to pass their exams and get a diploma, namely, they had no concern for improving their language skills at that time.

The joint results obtained from teachers and students overlapped with each other and also with some key tenets of CLT in some points, and diverged at other points. So, if a general picture is drawn based on the results, it is clear that both teachers and students found themselves trapped in a dilemma: they welcomed the main tenets of CLT in principle, with a desire to employ them, but it was hard to put CLT into practice. These findings echoed what Sarıçoban and Tılfarlıoğlu (1999) found with language teachers, and Jarvis and Atsilarat (2004) with both students and their teachers who acknowledged the positive aspects of CLT but remained in doubt concerning its practical applications in actual classroom contexts due to some barriers such as overcrowded classes, and inexperienced teachers. Related to the students' concerns were the delivery of teaching and learning via explicit or implicit ways and through English-only or mingled with the mother language, immediate error correction or let-it-pass only if communication is not subject to impediment, strong attachment to traditional teacher roles (e.g. the authority, transmitter of knowledge, near-native like for imitation, etc.). This was in line with the findings of Anderson (1993) whose student participants were also reluctant to shift to CLT-driven English teaching. However, in congruent with CLT tenets, it was their wish to produce language, particularly speaking, and the combination of fluency and accuracy in the delivery of language teaching, which are the points considerably emphasized in the strong version of CLT. Unlike students in Tan's (2005) research who considered CLT culturally unsuitable for the Singaporean context, participants in this study did not level criticisms against CLT from a cultural perspective at all.

Despite the fact that almost all teachers expressed that they comprehended and applied CLT in their teaching, they faced a variety of problems during the implementation process. Moreover, a great number of students favoured a deductive teacher-fronted learning, which totally contradicts with CLT tenets. Previous research mirrors that such problems have been encountered

in other contexts in implementing CLT as well (see Anderson 1993; Li 1998; Tan, 2004, 2005; Hiep 2005). The common proposal of researchers is to adapt CLT to suit the local needs and conditions without a wholesale acceptance or a blanket rejection. However, there are still oppositions to such proposals, with a claim that the value of CLT is still under question (see Bax 2003). For Bax (2003), failure to question the CLT paradigm may originate in the idea that “a country without CLT is somehow backward” (p. 279). Therefore, questioning CLT along with its effectiveness and context-sensitive modifications to CLT may prove to be fruitful in taking language teaching forward in EFL contexts. Thereupon, Jarvis and Atsilarat (2004) proposed a context-based approach as an alternative to CLT, which, however, did fail to revive any interest from researchers.

4. Conclusions

The main objective of this paper was to examine Turkish teachers’ and students’ views on CLT. Furthermore, CLT was also questioned to be able to determine whether it was a cure-all approach in language teaching in Turkey. As for the first research question, it was found that both teachers and students had indecisive views on CLT, and they shared common concerns at some levels, especially the difficulties perceived in the application of CLT. Teachers seemed more willing to move into CLT in essence than students who showed a strong attachment to the principles of previous teaching methods such as GTM and audio-lingual approach. This is an obvious indication of students’ lack of autonomy, and reluctance to take responsibility for their own learning. As the underlying reason, previous learning experiences, having centred on GTM and audio-lingual method, might be pointed out, as students were made teacher-dependent in language learning. However, it would be rather short-sighted to discount other factors that paved the way to the current situation such as contextual factors (e.g. culture, local needs), institutional constrictions (e.g. large class sizes, limited class hours per week), insufficient training of language teachers for CLT, poor proficiency of students and misperceptions of CLT by educators (see Li, 1998). Based on these reasons, the second research question, which asked whether CLT might be an absolute solution to the problem of deficient language learning/teaching in Turkey, was answered with negation on account of the grounds cited above. CLT itself, as also maintained by other researchers (e.g. Anderson, 1993; Li, 1998; Tan, 2004, 2005), is not a sole answer or the best approach to effective language teaching. Overall, the current situation indicates that both teachers and students referred to the weak version of CLT in their expressions of views, as they could not manage to draw a sharp line between the principles of structural and communicative approaches, and remained in the blurry area (see Richards & Rodgers, p. 155).

It is worth mentioning that this research suffers from some limitations. First and foremost, it is clear that the size of the group and the results prevent any generalizations across the country. Thus, the findings are limited to the setting and subjects of the study. In a different context with other participants, other researchers may reach findings which may highlight

different issues and problems. The study also failed to take various variables into account that might affect the views of students and teachers, such as their previous learning experiences, age and gender factor, among many others. However, it contributes to literature in the Turkish context by serving as scientific evidence to the debates over CLT, which has so far remained incomplete in terms of scientific basis. Besides, the inclusion of university students and teachers as subjects was a distinguishing factor that differentiated this study from previous studies. All in all, this study has just ignited a spark as a preliminary and descriptive research. Hence, there is a burning need for large scale research that will provide us a more concrete picture, including other stakeholders, such as administrators and curriculum developers.

Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to thank Dr. Julia Huettner for her valuable comments and constructive feedback on an earlier draft of this paper. My thanks also go to the anonymous reviewers for their comments on the review version of this paper and the journal editor Dr. Mehmet Özcan for his rigorous effort in the editorial process. I would like to wholeheartedly extend my gratitude to the participants for their participation in this study. Last but not least, I owe a big thanks to my fiancée, Münevver Mehtap Çeliksoy, for her help during the process of data analysis.

References

- Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence. *ELT Journal*, 56 (1), 57-64.
- Anderson, J. (1993). Is a communicative approach practical for teaching English in China? Pros and Cons. *System*, 4 (21), 471-482.
- Bachman, L. F. (1991) *What Does Language Testing Have to Offer?* TESOL quarterly, 25(4), 671-704.
- Bax, S. (2003). The end of CLT: a context approach to language teaching. *ELT Journal*, 57 (3), 278-87.
- Breen, M. & Candlin, C. (1980). The essentials of the commutative curriculum in language teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(2), 89-112.
- Breen, M. P., & Candlin, C. (2001). The essentials of a communicative curriculum in language teaching. In D. Hall & A. Hewings (Eds.), *Innovation in English language teaching: A reader* (pp. 9-26). London: Routledge.
- Brumfit, C. J. (1979). 'Communicative' Language Teaching: an Educational Perspective, in Brumfit, C. J., & Johnson, K. (Ed.), *The communicative approach to language teaching*, (1st ed). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bygate, M. (2001). Speaking. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds), *The Cambridge guide toteaching English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-47.

- Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. C. Richards and R. W. Schmidt, (Eds.), *Language and communication*. New York: Longman.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.
- Collins, S. (1999). Communicative methodology: a health warning? *Explorations in Teacher Education*, 7 (online).
- Cook, G. (2003). *Applied linguistics*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, G. (1996). How culturally appropriate is the communicative approach? *ELT Journal*, 50, 213-218.
- Hiep, P. H. (2005). "Imported" Communicative Language Teaching: Implications for Local Teachers. *English Teaching Forum*, 43 (4), 2-9.
- Howatt, A. P. R. (1984). *A history of English language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hymes, D.H. (1971). *On communicative competence*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hymes, D.H. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. Pride, & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Jarvis, H., & Atsilarat, S. (2004). Shifting paradigms: from a communicative to a context based approach. *Asian EFL Journal*, 6(24), 1-23. Retrieved from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/Dec_04_HJ&SA.pdf
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2005). English language teaching in Turkey: Challenges towards the 21st century, In G. Braine (Ed.), *Teaching English to the world history, curriculum and practice*. (pp. 159-169). London: Lawrence Erlbaum,
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2007). English language teaching in Turkey: Policy changes and their implementations, *Regional Language Centre Journal*, 38(2), 216-228.
- Li, D. (1998). "It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine": Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32 (4), 677-703.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd, ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press
- Sarıçoban, A. & Tilfarlıoğlu, F.Y. (1999). Attitudes of foreign language teachers to the communicative learner-centered approach. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* 15, 61-65.
- Stern, H. H. (1992). *Issues and options in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swan, M. (1985a). A critical look at the communicative approach (1). *English Language Teaching Journal*, 39 (1), 1-12.
- Swan, M. (1985b). A critical look at the communicative approach (2). *English Language Teaching Journal*, 39 (2), 76-87.

Tan, C. (2005). How culturally appropriate is the communicative approaches for primary school children in Singapore? *The Reading Matrix*. 5, (1), 21-35. Retrieved from <http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/tan/article.pdf>

Thompson, G. (1996). Some misconceptions about communicative language teaching. *ELT Journal*, 50(1), 9-15.

Trim, J. L. M. (2001). The work of the council of Europe in the field of modern languages, 1957-2001. European Centre for Modern Languages. Retrieved from <http://www.ecml.at/efsz/files/Trim.pdf>

Warschauer, M., & Kern, R.(Eds.) (2000). *Network-based language teaching: Concepts and practice*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Wilkins, D. (1976). *Notional syllabuses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Widdowson, H.G. (1978). *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Appendices

Appendix 1 Teacher Questionnaire

Part 1: Conception of Communicative Language Teaching

1. Briefly define what for you is most important about Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) (one or two sentences)

2. Do you use CLT in your teaching? Please put _ .

_ YES _ NO

3. Please put _ in a column that matches your opinion most.

Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. Teaching should focus on fluency .					
2. Teaching should focus on accuracy .					
3. Teaching should focus both on fluency and accuracy.					
4. The students should be the centre of learning.					
5. The teacher should be a facilitator for students.					
6. The teachers should primarily encourage students to communicate.					
7. The teacher should spend a lot of time on role play/ games/ group and pair work.					
8. The teacher should devote time to teaching structures explicitly.					

9. The lesson should focus mostly on communicative skills.					
6. The teacher should not correct the students' mistakes unless they may cause communication breakdown.					
7. The students should be exposed to authentic language and material all the time.					
8. Language task should be meaningful and purposeful.					
9. CLT is an effective approach for your students.					

Part 2 CLT Implementation

4. Have you experienced any problems when implementing CLT in your classroom?
 _ YES (please go to 4.1 and then to 5) _ NO (please go to 5)

4.1 If yes, please tick _ any problems that you find relevant to your situation.

- The students are not comfortable with CLT.
- The students need accuracy rather than fluency.
- The students' English proficiency level is too low.
- Both students and I want the teacher to be central and give clear guidance.
- Students do not take responsibility for their own learning.
- Class size is too big.
- Time is limited.
- Material does not facilitate CLT implementation.
- The examination format is not totally CLT-based.
- I am not clear what CLT expects you to do.

From 4.1 You find other approaches work better in your context (state which ones.

Please use the space below to identify any other limitations that prevent you from successfully implementing CLT.

5. Please answer by putting a _ in the boxes.

	Yes	No
5.1 When you were a student, your English teacher(s) used CLT.		
5.1 You have received CLT training.		

6. I am _____ I have _ less than 2 years teaching experience.

- | | |
|-------------------|----------------------|
| _ Turkish | _ 2-5 years |
| _ American | _ 6-10 years |
| _ Other (specify) | _ more than 10 years |

Appendix 2

Student Questionnaire

Dear student,

I am an IPhD student at the University of Southampton in Applied Linguistics. I am conducting a study on Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) as part of the course entitled “Critical Appraisal of Language Teaching Methodologies.” You are kindly invited to take part in the study. Your participation is voluntary and you have the right to withdraw any time. All the data collected will be stored by the researcher in his personal computer, and destroyed at the end of the study. To protect confidentiality, you are not asked to provide your name or your student ID.

The data will be collected via the questionnaire below, prepared to examine your attitudes towards CLT. The answers to the survey will be used only in accordance with research objectives and will be kept confidential. Thank you for participation.

Part 1: Attitudes toward CLT (✓)

	True	False
1. I want my English to be as accurate as possible even if I am a little less fluent.		
2. I want my English to be as fluent as possible even if I am a little less accurate.		
3. I will lose face and feel very embarrassed if I make a mistake or ask a question in the classroom.		
4. I do not like speaking in front of the class.		
5. It is impolite for me to disagree with the teacher even though I may have a good reason.		
6. I prefer learning from my teacher to learning independently.		
7. I would rather learn English by struggling to communicate with my own efforts.		
8. I prefer my teacher to explain the content of a particular topic explicitly giving me examples.		
9. I want my teacher to correct my errors immediately.		

Part 2: Teacher and Teaching

3. Please put ✓ in a column that matches your opinion most.

Statements	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
10. Students should produce a lot of English in class.					
11. The English teacher’s role is to provide clear information.					
12. The English teachers should model a good example of using English.					
13. The teacher should spend a lot of time on functional language tasks rather than grammatical tasks.					
14. The teacher should focus on speaking skill. Listening, reading, writing, grammar and vocabulary are secondary.					
15. The teacher should use authentic material all the times.					
16. The teacher should only use English in the classes.					
17. The teacher should engage you to practice meaningful and purposeful language tasks.					

18. In part 2, from question number 10-17, can any statement describe the ways your teacher teaches you?

_ Yes (please go to 16 and continue to the end) _ NO (please go to 17 and continue to the end)

19. Please tick the box or boxes which matches the ways your teacher teaches.

Statement No	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	

20. Is your present English class similar or different from your previous English class in secondary school? ___ *Similar* ___ *Different*

Source: Jarvis & Atsilarat (2004)

The impact of CALL instruction on English language teachers' use of technology in language teaching

Ferit KILIÇKAYA¹

Gölge SEFEROĞLU²

Abstract

This study investigates the impact of CALL training on in-service language teachers' use of CALL-based activities in their classrooms. The participants included 35 pre-service English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers who took an undergraduate-level elective CALL course (FLE318) offered during the 2008-2009 academic year in the Department of Foreign Language Education at Middle East Technical University and 25 of these participants who started teaching English during the Fall semester in the academic year 2009-2010 at several private and state institutions. The journals kept by the participants during and after the training, the lesson plans of micro and macro teaching, the questionnaires given to the participants to determine their perceived computer knowledge, the interview sessions held with the participants' on their practices showed that the training provided to the participants helped them infuse a variety of CALL-based materials and tools into their classroom practices.

Keywords English language teachers, CALL, computer assisted language learning, technology integration

1. Introduction

In recent years, technology has been used in all parts of our lives from communication among friends to shopping, from education to media tools. By means of computers and inevitably the Internet, it is getting easier for people to communicate throughout the world. Furthermore, the development of technology has not stopped and no doubt it will go on developing and this makes "the world flattened". As Friedman (2005) claimed "The world is being leveled"; and this leveling process is continuing on every minute. No matter where someone is, in Turkey, in India, in Australia, or elsewhere, s/he has the opportunity to contact with people around the world without time constraints; and this communication occurs through the computers and the Internet. As for the field of education, it is becoming more important to study the integration of technology. However, the other question is whether teachers are ready for integrating technology into their classrooms. In other words, it is questioned whether teachers who are "digital immigrants" are ready to teach the generation in the 21st century who are "digital natives". These two terms – digital immigrants and digital natives – were coined by Prensky (2001, p. 1). He stated that "Our students have changed radically. Today's students are no longer the pupils our educational system was designed to teach", considering how technology is used by students and

¹ Bio: Assist. Prof. Dr., Department of Foreign Language Education, Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Burdur, Turkey ferit.kilickaya@gmail.com, corresponding author

² Bio: Prof. Dr., Department of Foreign Language Education, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey golge@metu.edu.tr

teachers. Technology also may affect the way we teach, the way we learn and affect teachers' choice of teaching and learning styles as put forward by Watson (2010, p. 15):

Teachers may face a conflict of teaching and learning styles. Older teachers generally teach face to face and proceed in a logical or step-by-step basis. In contrast, younger students tend to jump around from one idea or thought to another and expect sensory-laden environments as a matter of course. They also want instant results and frequent rewards, whereas many teachers regard learning as slower and serious and consider that students should just keep quiet and listen.

Considering the technological developments which happen at a breathtaking rate and the tools available which are frequently used by students, though not often for educational purposes, it has become necessary that teachers change and be trained in terms of technology integration. Moreover, they should be equipped with the required tools to meet the current needs of our schools and students who are looking forward to coping with various educational contexts. Yet, teacher training programs often ignore training in the use of information and communications technology and teachers are often far less knowledgeable and skilled than their own students when it comes to using current technology in life. As happened in the previous years, teachers will have to update their skills, teaching styles and learn to integrate new tools into what they teach to improve learning and teaching. As Pilus (1995) puts forwards,

Teachers have to realize that computers are not used in the classes just because they are sophisticated or state of the art. Computers cannot perform magical tasks and they are not substituting for the teachers. Computers have to be treated like other teaching aids thus; appropriate training in this aspect is crucial (p. 10).

an appropriate Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) training should be provided to pre-service and in-service teachers

1.1. Literature review

As Hubbard (2009) says,

As computers have come more a part of our everyday lives- and permeated other areas of education- the question is no longer whether to use computers but how. CALL researchers, developers and practitioners have a critical role in helping the overall field of second language learning come to grips with this domain (p. 1).

each day we are getting involved with technology and it is getting more present in the daily life. Technology have imbued a great many students' lives especially in developing and developed countries with technology such as mobile phones, interactive videos and games (Moyle, Wijngaards, & Owen, 2012). Although there are differences in the access and the intensity of technology use (Sanchez, Salinas, Contreras, & Meyer, 2011) and their use is generally is not linked to educational purposes, new generations of

students are more comfortable with technology though using it in their life for a variety of purposes such as communicating with friends, gaming and listening to music. Given that students access to the Internet easily and use it for several purposes, teachers also must be open to join their students to benefit from their being comfortable with technology to infuse into daily activities in classrooms (Barsotti, & Martins, 2011; Gray, Andrews, & Schroeder, 2012) and to individualize learning processes more than that in a traditional classroom (Volman, 2005; Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011).

The existing literature show that teachers are eager to integrate technology into their classrooms and benefit from CALL-based activities; however, what they did in their computer courses may not facilitate using CALL-based activities (Wentworth, 1996; Keirns, 1992; Hargrave & Huse, 2000). When the research on technology and the training of teachers are reviewed, it is seen that there are two approaches: One-course approach which focuses on the teaching of technology is found to be limited and too technical (Peters, 2006; Wong & Benson, 2006; Desjardins & Peters, 2007; Lambert, Gong, & Cuper, 2008) and the technology infusion throughout teacher education which focuses on exposing teachers to continuous technology. Desjardins and Peters (2007) examined whether a single-course approach would be sufficient to train pre-service teachers for teaching with technology, focusing on how well prepared these teachers felt they were able to integrate technology in the language classroom. The study was done in a university in Montreal and the participants followed a 45-hour-long course during the last semester of their program. The findings showed that although the training helped them develop their technological competencies, it was not enough for them to feel confident to infuse technology in their future classes. In several studies (Peters, 2006; Wong & Benson, 2006; Lambert, Gong, & Cuper, 2008) found similar results, showing that a single course approach or short in-service CALL training are not sufficient, though it affects participants' attitudes towards technology positively. In contrast with these studies, Thiemann's (2008) findings of the study conducted with the 223 pre-service teachers in this longitudinal 5-year study showed that 85% of the pre-service teachers infused several technology tools into instructional practice with their K-12 students. Kressler's (2007) web-based survey of 108 graduates of TESOL master's degree programs show that although the teachers were confident about CALL overall, they did not feel the same way in creating and integrating CALL materials.

The study conducted by (Fisher, 2009) on the perceptions of 5 trainee teachers over the nine months of their postgraduate training course in England showed that the teachers were reluctant at the very beginning due to a lack of confidence; however, when they are provided with good classroom practice, they adopted methodological approaches to their own teaching.

The need for technology education in the teacher education, professional development has been stressed out by several studies (Daniel, 2010). However, when the students are required to learn about technology throughout the program (Hegelheimer, 2006), it is not impossible to have technology-savvy graduates in English language teaching. Recognition of the importance of ICT curriculum integration has already occurred, and most

teacher education programs have introduced courses in ICT for future teachers. Teaching about computer or teaching with computers to enhance teaching and learning through integration ICTS within the curriculum. In the study conducted by Kessler (2006), 240 participants in the TESOL master's program reported a perceived lack of formal CALL training. The findings revealed that the participants were not satisfied with the CALL training and they tried to look for other sources of information to prepare them. They also participated in formal training outside their classroom and university.

Chapelle (2006) adds that “second-language teachers today need to be able to choose, use, and in some cases, refuse technology for their students” (p. ix). Teachers also need to know how technology can constrain as well as enhance their students' language use and know when it is better not to use computers (Kern, 2011). As Egbert (2010) points out, teachers should also find out the ways to work with technologically rich and poor environments, focusing on how to assess students' needs, interests and abilities. Whether and how the skills and knowledge that teachers “learn” during their education programs or professional development in CALL actually transfer to their teaching practice in real learning contexts requires utmost importance (Hong, 2010; Egbert, Huff & Lee, 2011). The important question is, then, how learning opportunities for teacher candidates and teachers can be made so that they learn how to infuse technology into their teaching. In other words, planning each and every detail of the training, as in each stage of life, is important (Sergeant, 2000; Mayo & Kajs, 2005; Toledo, 2005; Hockly, 2012).

As stated by Lee (2000) and Warschauer and Healey (1998), CALL technologies can support learning in a variety of ways, provide feedback, enable pair and group work, promote exploratory and global learning, enhance student achievement, provide access to authentic materials, facilitate greater interaction, individualize instruction, create opportunities to benefit from a variety of sources rather than limiting oneself to a single source, and motivate learners. Furthermore, technology can provide us with the necessary tools which enable us to benefit from the opportunities to make language learning more enjoyable, productive and effective. However, in order to achieve this, we need to have competent teachers in using technology as the anecdote provided by an Egyptian university lecturer and cited by Warschauer (2002, p. 472) “we have the hardware, we have the software, but we lack the humanware” indicates, it is imperative that pre- and in-service language teachers learn about computer tools which will support them in their teaching practices. Therefore, pre- and in-service language teachers should be equipped with skills and strategies in integrating CALL technologies into their classrooms.

Seferoğlu (2007), Seferoğlu, Akbıyık, and Bulut (2008), and Karakaya (2010) state that teacher candidates did not feel competent in using computers for teaching, in other words, how to infuse technology to their teaching. Moreover, Gökteş, Yıldırım and Yıldırım (2008) suggest that ICT courses can help to improve teachers' ICT competency; however, they add that in addition to the ICT courses offered to the students in the faculties of education, another ICT related course should be included in the curriculum

which will integrate their subject matter such as a foreign language. To the best knowledge of the author, there is no currently conducted on introducing an ICT related course that integrates teacher candidates' subject matter, which is English language teaching in the current study. Therefore, the current study concerned with the relationship of the integration of ICT into English language teaching and their use of computer technology in the classroom will fill this gap in the literature. Moreover, it will also help us find out the effect of contextual characteristics on the use of CALL-based materials, especially the school climate.

2. Methodology

2.1. Participants

The participants in the study were 35 pre-service English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers who took an undergraduate-level elective CALL course (FLE318) offered during the 2008-2009 academic year in the Department of Foreign Language Education at Middle East Technical University and 25 teachers who started teaching English during the Fall semester in the academic year 2009-2010 at several private and state institutions. The training lasted 14 for weeks, 5 hours each week. Considering the amount of the information that needs to be covered in the course, a two-hour lab class allowing structured practice was held for students, especially who were not comfortable with technology. The profile of the participants is provided in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1. The profile of the participants before the training

<i>First language</i>	Turkish	33
	Mongolian	1
	Azerbaijani	1
<i>Years of learning English</i>	5-10	30
	more than 10	5
<i>Age</i>	18-20	29
	20-22	6
<i>Gender</i>	Male	7
	Female	28
<i>Reason for taking the FLE course</i>	Interested	20
	No other elective course	7
	Other	8

Table 2. The profile of the participants after the training

<i>First language</i>	Turkish	25
<i>Current teaching level</i>	K6-8	10
	K9-12	10
	College	5
<i>Age</i>	23-24	25
<i>Gender</i>	Male	4
	Female	21
<i>School/College</i>	Public School	19
	Private School/College	6

Research question

How does in-service EFL teachers' gained knowledge in their pre-service CALL training impact their teaching?

2.2 Data collection instruments and procedures

The content of the course, interview and the survey questions were based on the literature review and the content of the FLE 318 course. The questions were pilot-tested with several students who had completed the course offered during the academic year 2006-2007. The content of the training was also revised based on the suggestions made by the participants and the findings of the pilot test (Kılıçkaya, 2009). The participants who had taken the undergraduate-level CALL course (FLE 318) were interviewed on how they transferred their knowledge of technology gained in the course into their own classroom, what factors influence their use of computers in their classroom and how they continued to learn new technologies and how to apply them. The topics and the content of FLE 318 syllabus were changed according to the responses gained from the interviews.

Upon agreeing to participate in the study and signing the Informed consent based on the sample provided by Mackey and Gass (2005, p. 33), the participants enrolled in the training. After the participants started teaching, they were asked to keep a journal on their own blogs regarding what they learned and to chart their progress, thoughts and feelings about the training, how it affected their choice of CALL-based materials, when they used these materials and when did not and the reasons for their decisions on the use of technology.

When the participants graduated and started to teach, they were asked to keep a journal in English on their blogs. They were asked to note down what worked and what did not when they used CALL-based materials and the reasons for their decisions on the use of technology. Moreover, the researcher also interviewed 25 participants, as ten of them did not opt for any teaching position, on their use of integrating technology into their teaching using Skype. The interviews were semi structured, conducted in

English and the role of the questions was just to initiate the discussion. The main questions were as follows:

- (1) Have you benefited from any technological tools in your classroom? Can you please give examples? If your answer is no, can you provide reasons for that?
- (2) Did your school support you when you wanted to infuse technology into your teaching?
- (3) What are the difficulties that you have faced while using CALL tools? What are the main reasons for not using CALL tools?
- (4) Did you have the chance to observe your colleagues at your school practicing the use of technology in their classrooms?

2.3 Data analysis

2.3.1 Lesson plans, journals and the interviews

The data collected through lesson plans, journals and interviews were subjected to content analysis and code analysis through *MAXQDA version 10*. Content and code analyses were conducted on the steps suggested by Stake (1995, as cited in Schreiber & Asner-Self, 2011). The first stage included organizing the data about case chronologically and hierarchically. Then, the researcher began to categorize the data and developed categories in order to cluster data into meaningful units. As a final stage the researcher examined the data in relation to the case overall, leading to patterns and codes. During this process, the researcher collaborated with another field expert, compared the codes and patterns, discussed and made necessary changes. While providing the participants' quotations throughout the data analysis, and results and discussion sections, the following abbreviations have been applied:

Participant ID : PI
Participant group : Pre-service (Pre)/ In-service (Ins)
Gender : Male (M)/ Female (F)

Data source

Interviews : Int
Journals : Jrl
School type : Private (Pri) /Public (Pub)

In order to ensure consistency between the coders and the reliability of the content analysis, Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance Law was calculated. For critical reviews, coefficient of concordance was .863; for lesson plans prepared by the participants, it was .943; for interviews, it was .853; and for the journals kept by the participants, it was .883. All coefficients of concordance were higher than .85, leading a statistically significant reliability.

2.3.2. CALL course

FLE318: *Audio-visual aids in ELT* is an elective course offered by the researcher at the Middle East Technical University in Turkey. The most unique feature of this course was its focus on classroom applications of technology (i.e., conceptual development) rather than on technical skill development. Moreover, the focus was on preparing teachers to use technology for instruction taking SLA theories into consideration to evaluate and create CALL-based materials rather than merely focusing on the digital literacy or software specific orientation (Kessler, 2006; Kessler & Bikowski, 2011). The topics included in this course were revised taking the suggestions and comments provided the students of the course offered in the academic year of 2006-2007. As can be seen, there are three parts in this syllabus – software based applications, web based applications and theoretical information about the use of CALL; and the syllabus is mostly based upon web based applications (Table 3).

Table 3. Topics covered in the CALL course in 2009-2010

Theoretical Information	Software Based Applications	Web Based Applications
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction to the History of CALL • SLA theories, Language Teaching Methodology and CALL: How do they come together? • Conditions for optimal language learning environments and CALL • Social, Ethical and Human Issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating Online Quizzes using Hot Potato Software and online quiz generation tools • Advanced use of PowerPoint: Adding Interaction • Course Management Systems: Moodle and Dokeos 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computer Mediated Communication (CMC) (Synchronous and Asynchronous tools) • Creating and Using Blogs and Wikis in education

3. Data analysis and results

Table 4 shows the emerging tools and applications that the participants used in their language teaching practices, taking language skills into consideration. Some of the tools or websites used by the participants in their activities with their students can be used in more than one skill. The journals kept by the participants clearly showed that the participants mainly focused on the tools that helped them have the students improve their listening and writing skills, together with grammar and that PowerPoint was the commonly used software for introducing grammatical structures as well as brain-storming activities to the classrooms. In relation to the language skills, the journals and the interviews indicated that their integration of CALL-based materials particularly helped their students improve their listening and the use of grammatical structures, leading to better writing abilities. One of the participants put forward how these materials helped the students expressing that:

My students were not interested in writing a sentence, let alone a paragraph. However, when I introduced blogs and wikis to them and told them that we were going to use them throughout the semester, they got excited. In a way, it increased their motivation. Even students unwilling to write anything in Turkish

tried to post something on my blog or theirs. I think seeing other students write something in English led the others to write. [PI:08, Ins, M, Int, Pri]

Table 4. Sample description of how in-service teacher candidates applied CALL-based tools into their English language activities

CALL-based tool	Skill/Content	Pedagogy
Listening websites (Ello and esl-lab) Videos (YouTube) Digital Story-telling Dokeos	<i>Listening/Speaking</i> (Audio files as well as the videos; course management)	The teacher, using <i>Dokeos</i> , published listening materials based on the audio files available on <i>Ello.org</i> and video materials on <i>YouTube</i> and asked the students in groups to create listening questions. Then, the other students tried to answer these questions. Another teacher assigned homework in which students had to prepare a story using their own photos through <i>Photo Story 3</i> , freely available Microsoft tools for educators.
Blogs and Wikis (Blogger and PBworks)	<i>Writing/Grammar</i> (review of grammatical mistakes)	The teacher prepared a list of his/her students' grammatical mistakes and published them on their blogs and wikis. Then, s/he asked them to find any mistakes and correct them. The students worked in pairs and groups.
WiziQ	<i>Listening/Speaking</i> (Recorded online classroom session)	The teacher created an online classroom, where s/he and his/her students had a synchronous communication using the webcams, microphone and the speakers available. The topic included a story discussed last week. The session was recorded and downloaded to be sent to the students. Then the students checked their pronunciation as well as their use of grammar and choice of vocabulary.
Concordance (COCA and Jukuu) Online Dictionaries (Cambridge, Macmillan and Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English)	<i>Reading and Writing/Grammar</i> (Word choice, sample sentences and worksheets)	The teacher prepared a worksheet including the highlighted vocabulary items for class for the following week, focusing on definitions and sample sentences, using online dictionaries such as <i>Cambridge and Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English</i> and concordance website such as <i>Jukuu</i> . Then, the students reviewed the materials for the coming lesson and as a homework activity; they were required to find the synonyms and antonyms of these words using these websites.
Authoring tools (Hot Potatoes, QuizFaber and QuizStar)	<i>Listening/Reading</i> (Recording a voice and creating an activity based on the recorded voice)	The teacher recorded his/her voice using a free audio editor, <i>AUDACITY</i> and created a multiple choice activity based on this recorded voice using <i>Hot Potatoes</i> . The students, then, answered the corresponding questions and got feedback, depending on the answers that they provided.
PowerPoint as a presentation and authoring tool	<i>Reading and Speaking, Writing/Grammar</i>	The teacher provided a summary of the grammatical items using the <i>PowerPoint</i> as a presentation tool. Another teacher used pictures and ideas as a brain storming activity for the speaking topic that day, how to overcome air pollution.

In line with what the previous participant expressed, another participant explained how he infused Wikis into his writing class saying that:

While I was thinking about how to integrate Wikis into my grammar classroom, I got a simple but useful idea. Without writing the students' names, I published mistakes frequently made by Turkish students as well as the ones made by my own students on a wiki page which I created in less than 5 minutes. I was surprised at how they were willing to correct the mistakes. [PI:24, Ins, F, Int, Pri]

The journals and the interviews also revealed that compared to the past, the participants had the opportunity to make the best of the freely available materials such as audio and video files on the Internet. One participant clearly illustrated this saying:

When I look back to the years at the secondary school, I can say that it was difficult if not impossible to find audio materials, let alone the video materials. I remember myself trying to find graded readings to improve my English. Through graded readings, learners are exposed to and encouraged to produce varied and creative language. I know very well that my students should be exposed to input as much as possible and thanks to the Internet and the authors publishing materials. I benefited from a lot using websites providing audio materials such as Ello and Esl-lab and many others to have my learners be exposed to varied language. [PI: 05, Ins, F, Jrl, Pub]

Some of the participants also benefited from technology to prepare their students for the nation-wide exams held and help them enter the departments of the faculties of education where their students would be a teacher of a foreign language. One of the participants explained this in this way:

This semester I am teaching a language class where the students are willing to enter the teacher training departments of the universities. As you know, since the exam mainly focuses on the grammar, reading and vocabulary knowledge, I greatly benefited from concordance websites to create vocabulary worksheets for my students. I used concordance software to analyze the frequency of the words used in the previous exams and also encouraged my students to use these websites. [PI:23, Ins, F, Int, Pub]

The majority of the participants also expressed that they mostly used the software given together with their course books as CDs and DVDs, providing audio and video materials. Using these materials, they tried to increase their students' motivation as well as providing input. Some of the participants used websites such as VoiceThread and WiziQ to help their students improve speaking in English. Regarding how the participants improved their students' speaking skill, one of the participants expressed that:

To me, the most difficult part of teaching speaking is to encourage my students to speak. Most of the time, they do not want to speak as they think their friends will laugh at them and considering the time allocated to the English lessons, it is not always possible to have each and every student speak in English. Then I decided to use VoiceThread website, similar to the way I once recorded my voice on a tape recorder and listened to it. At first, I asked my students to briefly introduce themselves recording their voice on the website. At the beginning, it was difficult to achieve it as most of them did not have their own computer at home. However, I managed to use the lab for that, scheduling it for my students. Now, my students frequently use it and they talk on the subject they choose. They love it. [PI:17, Ins, F, Int, Pri]

Only 5 participants had the opportunity to deliver course materials through course management software such as Dokeos and Moodle as their school environment had been already using course management systems. One of these participants expressed that

While I was thinking that I would not be able to infuse technology although we had learnt a lot in the course, I was surprised to see that my school was already implementing tools for instructional purposes. My school had a Moodle system where teachers of English as well as other teachers were actively using it. [PI:01, Ins, F, Jrl, Pri]

However, the rest of the participants stated that they could not benefit from course management systems as the school environment and the students' access to the computer and to the Internet were very limited. They added that most of the students did not have a computer at home and the lab at their school was not available outside the classroom hours. Supporting this view, one of the participants voiced his disappointment:

I knew that most of the public schools were not equipped with the up-to-date technology. However, it was good to have a computer and a projector in my class and I felt happy because I thought I could implement what I have learnt. I was planning to use WiziQ, blogs and other tools. I later discovered that most of my students did not have a computer at home, not to mention the Internet. Instead of leading them to spend time in the Internet cafes, I tried to benefit from the computer and the projector in class providing listening and grammar activities, though in a limited way. [PI:04, Ins, F, Int, Pub]

Especially during the interviews, another important aspect of technology integration into classroom emerged: How the participants continued learning about new technologies. In other words, could the participants move further apart from the CALL-based materials that they have covered during their training? As all we know and expect, technology changes every day and what we know today may be outdated or updated with new tools and information. Most of the participants stated that they tried to follow the journals on the integration of technology into classrooms and attended online sessions held by the famous online community of practice, Evo sessions. Some of the participants added that they got in touch with the instructor of the course on the possible uses of new technology and got suggestions through the website of the course. One of the participants clearly expressed that:

This semester, our classrooms have been equipped with boards called smart boards or interactive whiteboards. During the lab hours of the course I had taken before I graduated, I had the opportunity to learn about these boards although not in detail. I knew the basic things about these boards. The technicians setting up these boards just showed how it worked but nothing else. Then, I just read the tutorial in English and asked for help from the people on the Internet working with these boards and got an idea on how I could use them. I think we, English teachers, are in a good position as we all know English and can figure out how things work. That is the good part. [PI:24, Ins, M, Int, Pub]

To summarize, in light of the journals and the responses given in the interviews, the participants tried to infuse technology into their classrooms

to help their students practice language skills, especially listening and writing skills, together with grammar in the classroom as well as outside the classroom. The materials supported by the integration of technology into the classroom aimed at making classroom activities more engaging and motivation for the students. Moreover, the participants in the study also found their own way to keep their knowledge up-to-date through various journals and the websites.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

Considering the findings provided in the data analysis chapter, together with what participants' responses on their journals and the interviews, it is clear that the training provided to the participants helped them infuse a variety of CALL-based materials and tools into their classroom practices. The training aimed at both providing a link between SLA theories as well as optimal conditions for language learning and building upon what the participants have learned in their previous computer courses and knowledge. A knowledge of how-to-use a computer does not necessarily imply ability in knowing how to infuse CALL-based materials into language classes appropriately and effectively. In other words, technology training which merely engage language teachers in gaining ICT skills in purely technical issues do not help develop their ability in applying technology in language teaching effectively and appropriately. There is a need for training with a certain degree of content knowledge such as the optimal conditions for language learning and SLA theories that parallel as closely to the appropriate choice of technology as possible. Therefore, the training provided in this way helped them combine language teaching activities with computer technologies, focusing on what works and what does not for their language classrooms.

Data collected at the very beginning of the study on the participants' perceived computer and technology integration knowledge indicated that the participants do not consider themselves competent especially in planning and designing learning environments and experiences. However, after the training was conducted, there were statistically significant differences in their perceived computer knowledge and technology integration. As the data were related to their perceptions, it was not clear whether this change in their perceptions would lead to better integration of technology into their classroom. The analyses of the journals and the interviews, however, showed that the participants tried to include a variety of tools covered during the training and the ones available on the Internet, based on their own evaluation. This finding is in alignment with the one suggested by Kessler and Plakans (2008), showing that teachers' positive sense of competence can lead to the use of technology in the classroom more than those who have lower competence level.

The training especially allowed the participants to infuse technology into their classrooms that helped improve their students' language skills, especially listening, and writing skills, together with English grammar. This can be attributed to the fact that teachers of English as well as EFL students can easily access the rich environment of the Internet and the websites allowing easy publishing of materials especially audio and video files. The

participants also helped their students improve their writing skill, which is generally found to be the most difficult ability after listening by the students through, blogs and wikis. Most of the participants benefited from blogs and wikis as they thought these tools would encourage their students to practice writing as well as to share their opinions and reflect on what they had learnt. These tools also functioned as an information sharing place that led to collaborative writing. As for speaking, some of the participants benefited from web-based tools such as WiziQ and VoiceThread and they were content with the results as using these tools found a way to have some unwilling students speak in class due to several reasons. However, factors such as the lack of sufficient technology and students' not being able to access to the Internet prevented the other participants to use these tools, which will be discussed in the next section.

With everything considered, it can be put forward that despite several problems and factors, the majority of the teachers integrated CALL-based materials into their classroom activities. Possible explanations for this, as also stated by Thieman (2008), include the training provided to the participants, focusing on the link between optimal language learning conditions and the use of technology for instructional purposes, as well as building on the participants' previous knowledge that greatly benefited from the previous computer courses.

Considering the technology environment in the schools where the participants started teaching upon graduation, the analyses of the surveys and the interviews indicated that all the classrooms were equipped with at least a computer and a projector, which is connected to the Internet although private schools had more access to various technologies. The majority of the participants working at public schools had limited access to the lab and the Internet compared to the ones working at the private schools, which implies that the public schools are at a disadvantage (Top, 2007). In relation to the language skills, the study showed that the in-service language teachers used a variety of tools such as WiziQ and Wikis to help their students to improve their listening and writing skills, together with grammar. The in-service language teachers especially valued CALL-based materials as they observed that these tools helped their students improve their listening and the writing abilities through online and in-class activities based on the materials available through the Internet such as audio and video files. As perceived by the in-service language teachers, the study also showed that the materials supported by the integration of technology into the classroom helped make classroom activities more engaging and motivation for the students. Regarding the discussion on the factors that affect EFL teachers' use of CALL tools in their teaching contexts, the findings showed that school policy, the available hardware and software, the use of the computer labs, time constraints and the discrepancy between the curriculum and national exams were the main factors that play an important role in technology integration. As a final note, having language teachers implement technology successfully resides in the importance given to pre-service teaching given by the faculties of education, as well as to the implementation of the desired changes in the undergraduate curriculum and in-service training to be given by the Ministry of Education and the Higher

Education Council. However, they also need to be aware of that, as stated by Hocklyon on a debate with Alan Waters (Waters & Hockly, 2012):

Technology is not a magic bullet. ... Depending on context and how it's used, technology can be effective or not, just like any other teaching tool.

Providing the necessary tools and access to technology, combined with constant support and training, language teachers will be more willing to integrate technology into their teaching contexts. As the journals and the interviews analyzed in this study show, if pre-service teacher candidates are provided with the opportunity to practice infusing technology into their subject matter and the environment where they work support them, they can manage in spite of the problems or difficulties they face or may do. The important point is that they should be given the opportunity to do as Mercer (2012, p. 28) states:

“..... The overwhelming trend is to also accept the capacity of every learner to ‘grow’ and develop their abilities, possibly beyond their expectations, given the right context, environmental support, and a personal willingness to invest time and effort and engage in repeated practice”

In light of the data analysis and the discussion above, the following implications for teaching can be presented:

A course that covers integration of ICT in language teaching and learning in subject matter should be included in the pre-service English teacher education curriculum in Turkey. This course should be offered in the 6th semester of the candidates' undergraduate curriculum as most of the methodology and approaches courses on English language teaching will have been covered by that time. However, before introducing teacher candidates to the integration of technology into classrooms, they learners should be provided with the necessary skills required to use the computers properly and comfortably, which will ensure that learners will be freed from computer anxiety and negative attitudes towards computers. This can be achieved through the computer courses focusing on the basic skills of Information and communication and the Instructional Technologies and Material Development.

This course should build on the previous courses and *emphasize subject specific technology*, as stated by (Lei, 2009). In other words, the course should expose teacher candidates to a variety of technologies (Lei, 2009), taking into consideration English language teaching, methodology, SLA theories and optimal conditions for language learning. Use of instructional technology should be ongoing, rather than being treated as a part of the curriculum. This can be achieved by the active involvement of the all the staff that are in the department (Berger & Thomas, 2011). The instructors of the course offering methodology courses on English language teaching and learning should encourage the use of technology in their classrooms and be a model for exemplary practice (Larose, 2009; Meagher, Özgün-Koca, & Edwards, 2011).

Teacher candidates should be aware of the fact that technology should be used provided that it will facilitate meaningful classroom activities, rather

than an alternative to classroom teaching. They need to understand how learning technologies work and can help us to improve learning and teaching (Collins & Halversont, 2010). The key point is not the use of technology or a specific technological tool, but how it can be used to improve language learning and teaching. As Watson (2010, p.162) states, “computers are supposed to be tools to help us to think, not prevent us from thinking”. Teacher candidates and in-service teachers of English who did not participate in any training on CALL and/or do not feel competent in infusing technology into the classroom should be exposed to face to face or online training. Through online trainings, if conducted properly and effectively, many more teachers of English can be trained, which could be more practical and cost-effective. This can be done through a dedicated website for all teachers, not just English teachers, providing tutorial videos and forums for common problems and questions.

3.1 Suggestions for Further research

The participants in the study were not selected randomly and a convenience sample was used. Therefore, the study can be repeated with a larger number of participants to decrease the likelihood that the results obtained were a one-time occurrence. Moreover, the training did not include some of the tools like *Second Life* and mobile learning, which the further studies can also deal with. Moreover, there were some differences in the responses provided especially to the school environment as some of the participants worked at private schools. Therefore, future research can also focus on how the private and public schools are different in terms of technology infusion into the language classrooms. Moreover, the researcher could not have the opportunity to observe and record the sessions where the participants infused technology in their language teaching and learning activities, how the students reacted towards these materials. Therefore, the data analysis relied on the participants’ self-report through journals and lesson plans. Future research can also compare what the participants reported in their journals with the recordings of the classroom practices, which will lead to a more accurate portrayal of technology integration into the classroom.

Acknowledgement

This article is based on the dissertation entitled *The impact of CALL instruction on English language teachers’ use of technology in language teaching*, which was submitted by Ferit Kılıçkaya to the Graduate School of Social Sciences of Middle East Technical University in 2012.

References

- Barsotti, C., & Martins, C. (2011). The use of ICTs in Foreign language teaching: The challenges of a teachers’ education program. In M. Levy, F. Blin, C. B. Siskin, & O. Takeuchi, (Eds.), *WORLDCALL: International perspectives on computer-assisted language learning*, (pp. 241-256). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Berger, T., & Thomas, M. (2011). Integrating digital technologies in education: A model for negotiating change and resistance to change. In M. Thomas,

- (Ed.), *Digital education opportunities for social collaboration*, (pp. 101-119). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chapelle, C. A., & Jamieson, J. (2008). *Tips for teaching with CALL: Practical approaches to computer-assisted language learning*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Collins, A., & Halversont, R. (2010). The second educational revolution: Rethinking education in the age of technology. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 26, 18-27.
- Daniel, J. S. (2010). *Mega-schools, technology and teachers: Achieving education for all*. New York: Routledge.
- Desjardins, F., & Peters, M. (2007). Single-course approach versus a program approach to develop technological competencies in preservice language teachers. In M. A. Kassen, R. Z. Lavine, K. Murphy-Judy, & M. Peters, (Eds.), *Preparing and developing technology-proficient L2 teachers*, (pp. 3-21). Texas: CALICO.
- Egbert, J. (Ed.). (2010). *CALL in limited technology contexts*. San Marcos, TX: Calico.
- Egbert, J., Akasha, O., Huff, L., & Lee, H. (2011). Moving forward: Anecdotes and evidence guiding the next generation of CALL. *International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching*, 1(1), 1-15.
- Fisher, L. (2009). Trainee teachers' perceptions of the use of digital technology in the language classroom. In M. Evans (Ed.), *Foreign-language learning with digital technology*, (pp. 60-79). New York, NY: Continuum.
- Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first Century*. New York: Farrar, Straus, & Giroux.
- Göktaş, Y., Yıldırım, Z., & Yıldırım, S. (2008). A review of ICT related courses in pre-service teacher education programs. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 9(2), 168-179. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/EJ811128.pdf>
- Gray, B., Andrews, K., Schroeder, S. (2012). What are Alberta's K-12 students saying about learning with technologies? K. Moyle & G. Wijngaards (Eds.), *Student reactions to learning to learning with technologies: Perceptions and outcomes*, (pp.42-67). Hershey, PA: Information Science Reference.
- Hargrave, C., & Hsu, Y. (2000). Survey of instructional technology courses for preservice teachers. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 8(4), 303-314.
- Hegelheimer, V. (2006). When the technology course is required. In P. Hubbard & M. Levy, (Eds.), *Teacher education in CALL*, (pp. 117-133). Philadelphia: Johns Benjamins.
- Hockly, N. (2012). Digital literacies. *ELT Journal*, 66(1), 108-112.
- Hong, K. H. (2010). CALL teacher education as an impetus for L2 teachers in integrating technology. *ReCALL*, 22(1), 53-69.
- Hubbard, P. (2009). General introduction. In P. Hubbard (ed.), *Computer assisted language learning: Foundations of CALL. Critical concepts in linguistics* (vol. 1). (pp. 1-20). New York: Routledge.
- Karakaya, K. (2010). *An investigation of English language teachers' attitudes toward computer technology and their use of technology in language teaching* (Unpublished master's thesis). Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

- Keirns, J. (1992). Does computer coursework transfer into teaching practice? A follow up study of teachers in a computer course. *Journal of Computing in Teacher Education*, 8(4), 29-34.
- Kern, R. (2011). Technology and language learning. In J. Simpson (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of applied linguistics*, (pp. 200-214). New York: Routledge.
- Kessler, G. (2006). Assessing CALL teacher training: What are we doing and what could we do better? In P. Hubbard, & M. Levy (Eds.), *Teacher education in CALL* (pp. 23-44). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Kessler, G., & Bikowski, D. (2011). The influence of SLA training in curricular design among teachers in preparation. *CALICO Journal*, 28(2), 522-545.
- Kessler, G., & Plakans, L. (2008). Does teachers' confidence with CALL equal innovative and integrated use? *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 21(3), 269-282.
- Kılıçkaya, F. (2009). The effect of a computer-assisted language learning course on pre-service English teachers' practice teaching. *Educational Studies*, 35(4), 437-448.
- Kressler, G. (2007). Formal and informal CALL preparation and teacher attitude toward technology. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 20(2), 173-188.
- Lambert, J., Gong, Y, & Cuper, P. (2008). Technology, transfer, and teaching: The impact of a single technology course on preservice teachers' computer attitudes and ability. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 16(4), 385-410.
- Larose, F. (2009). The impact of pre-service field training sessions on the probability of future teachers using ICT in school. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 32(3), 289-303.
- Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques & principles in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lee, K-W. (2000). English teachers' barriers to the use of computer-assisted language learning. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 6(12). Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Lee-CALLbarriers.html>
- Lei, J. (2009). Digital natives as preservice teachers: What technology preparation is needed? *Journal of Computing in Teacher Education*, 25(3), 87-97.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.
- Mercer, S. (2012). Dispelling the myth of the natural-born linguist. *ELT Journal*, 66(1), 22-28.
- Mayo, N. B., & Kajs, L. T. (2005). Longitudinal study of technology training to prepare future teachers. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 29(1), 3-15.
- Meagher, M., Özgün-Koca, S. A., & Edwards, M. T. (2011). Preservice teachers' experiences with advanced digital technologies: The interplay between technology in a preservice classroom and in field placements. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 11(3), 243-270.

- Moyle, K., Wijngaards, & Owen, S. (2012). K. Moyle & G. Wijngaards (Eds.), *Student reactions to learning to learning with technologies: Perceptions and outcomes*, (pp.1-21). Hershey, PA: Information Science Reference
- Peters, M. (2006). Developing computer competencies for pre-service language teachers: Is one course enough?. In P. Hubbard & M. Levy, (Eds.), *Teacher education in CALL*, (pp. 153-165). Philadelphia: Johns Benjamins.
- Pilus, Z. (1995). Teachers' interest in CALL and their levels of computer literacy: some implications. *ON-CALL*, 9(3), 8-11.
- Prensky, M. (2001, September/October). Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the Horizon*, 9(5), 1-6. Retrieved from <http://www.marcprensky.com/writing/Prensky%20-%20Digital%20Natives,%20Digital%20Immigrants%20-%20Part1.pdf>
- Sanchez, J., Salinas, A., Contreras, D., & Meyer, E. (2011). Does the new digital generation of learners exist? A qualitative study. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 42(4), 543-556.
- Schreiber, J. B., & Asner-Self, K. (2011). *Educational research: The Interrelationship of questions, sampling, design, and analysis*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Seferoğlu, S. S. (2007). Pre-service teachers' perceptions of their computer self-efficacy. *International Journal of the Computer, the Internet and Management*, 15(SP3), 35.1-35.4.
- Seferoğlu, S. S., Akbıyık, C., & Bulut, M. (2008). İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin ve öğretmen adaylarının bilgisayarların öğrenme-öğretme sürecinde kullanımını ile ilgili görüşleri [The in-service and pre-service primary school teachers' opinions of the use of computers in learning-teaching process. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* [Hacettepe University Journal of Education], 35, 273-283. <http://www.efdergi.hacettepe.edu.tr/200835S%C3%9CCLEYMAN%20SAD%C4%B0%20SEFERO%C4%9ELU.pdf>
- Sergeant, S. (2000). CALL innovation in the ELT curriculum. In D. Hall (Ed.), *Innovation in English language teaching: A reader* (pp. 240-249). Florence, KY: Routledge.
- Thieman, G. Y. (2008). Using technology as a tool for learning and developing 21st century citizenship skills: An examination of the NETS and technology use by preservice teachers with their K-12 students. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education* [Online serial], 8(4). Retrieved from <http://www.citejournal.org/vol8/iss4/socialstudies/article1.cfm>
- Toledo, C. (2005). A five-stage model of computer technology integration into teacher education curriculum. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 5(2), 177-191.
- Top, E. (2007). *Secondary school English teachers' technology perceptions and issues related with their technology integration processes: A qualitative study* (Doctoral dissertation). Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Volman, M. (2005). A variety of roles for a new type of teacher educational technology and the teaching profession. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 15-31.
- Warchauer, M. (2002). A developmental perspective on technology in language education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(3), 453-475.

- Warschauer, M. & Healey, D. (1998). Computers and language learning: An overview. *Language Teaching*, 31, 57-71.
- Waters, A., Hockly, A. (2012). ELT Journal/IATEFL debate: Tweeting is for the birds- not for language learning. In T. Pattison (Ed.), *IATEFL 2011- Brighton Conference Selections*, (pp. 110-112). Canterbury: IATEFL.
- Watson, R. (2010). *Future minds: How the digital age is changing our minds, why this matters, and what we can do about it*. Boston: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.
- Wentworth, N. (1996). Educational technology: From curriculum course to the classroom. *Technology and Teacher Education Annual*, 1996, 335-358.
- Wong, L, & Benson, P. (2006). In-service CALL education: What happens after the course is over? In P. Hubbard & M. Levy (Eds.), *Teacher education in CALL*, (pp. 251-264). Philadelphia: Johns Benjamins.