

ESL Teachers' Perception of CALL Integration in ELT

Dr. L. Baskaran

PG and Research Department of English, Rajah Serfoji Government College, Thanjavur, India
lbaskaran2@gmail.com

C.P. Shafeeq

Research Scholar, Bharathidasan University, Trichy, India, cp.shafeeq@rediffmail.com

Abstract

Considering the importance of technological and pedagogical dimensions of Computer-assisted Language Learning (CALL) integration in institutional settings, the present study investigated English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers' pedagogical and technological perceptions of CALL integration in English Language Teaching (ELT). Teachers play an important role in effective and successful integration of CALL. To obtain and delineate the perceptions, a questionnaire of 5-point Likert scales was administered to 105 ESL teachers. In addition, qualitative data was collected in interviews. According to the survey findings, ESL teachers perceived CALL integration as easier, interesting, encouraging, and motivational. Even though ESL teachers possessed positive perceptions of CALL integration, they had concerns about ICT facilities at their workplace. As for the interviews findings, the teachers frequently mentioned that innovative methods of CALL applications help to make teaching of English lively. Most interview participants perceived CALL as supporter of student-centred teaching-learning process. Though ESL teachers were using CALL for learning and classroom preparation, most participants were not regular users of technology in their classroom teaching.

Keywords: CALL, ELT, ESL, Perception, ICTs in education

INTRODUCTION

As technology becomes the normal and expected means of communication and education, important changes occur in expectations about the abilities students have to acquire to be successful language users (Bruce & Hogan, 1998). The abilities required by English language users should directly be relevant to English language teachers. Moreover, the bond between technology and language use in the modern world should prompt all language professionals to reflect on the ways in which technology is changing the profession of English Language Teaching (ELT) (Chapelle, 2003). As rapid advances in technology suggest pervasive access to and use of technology in a very different high-tech life style, teachers and researchers should be educated about possibilities that could improve or change their work (Chapelle, 2003). The search for such possibilities of technology in language teaching and learning enlivened discussions on Computer-assisted Language Learning (CALL), which is defined as "the search for and study of applications on the computer in language teaching and learning" (Levi, 1997, p.1).

Nowadays, the advantages of computer-assisted learning may be universally accepted (Levy, 1997; Warschauer, & Kern, 2000; Chapelle, 2001), but how effective it can be in the actual teaching-learning process is yet to be explained, it is thus crucial that we consider our position, prepare ourselves for the impact of the computer and absorb its implications for curriculum renewal and methodological change. CALL may not be a new phenomenon for the advanced countries, but the possibilities of CALL in the Indian context, especially in the rural areas, where technological infrastructure is comparatively limited in nature, has to be analyzed further. The problem can be further justified when we consider the rapid technological advancement that revolutionized the information and communication systems. Likewise, CALL is "constantly undergoing change because of technological innovation that creates opportunities to revisit old findings, to conduct new research and to challenge established beliefs about the ways in which teaching and learning can be carried out both with and without a human teacher" (Beatty, 2003, p.1). As language teachers, the researchers are bound to accept the challenges posed by computer and to make teaching of English more lively and integrated. As teachers' application

of computers depends on their perceptions of technology, they are more likely to translate their beliefs and perceptions into instructional practices (Ihmeideh, 2010; Kim, 2008). Considering the increased power and potential of new technologies, further research on teachers' perceptions and attitudes toward the integration of CALL in English as a Second Language (ESL) classroom instruction is necessary in the best interest of ELT in India. The above realities necessitate a study about the pedagogical and technological perceptions of teachers who teach English at secondary schools in Kerala.

Even in the international CALL scenario, only a few researchers (Kim, 2008; Wiebe&Kabata, 2010) have directly asked about teachers' perceptions and attitudes during implementation for ESL students. The studies on teachers' and students' perceptions toward CALL (Wiebe&Kabata, 2010) found that students have positive attitudes and feel comfortable interacting with CALL in language learning environments, whereas teachers' perceptions and subsequent behavior in using CALL vary. This shows that teachers' technology integration does not meet students' expectations in English language learning contexts (Feng, 2013). Considering the lack of a consolidated theoretical framework based on teachers' voices, experiences, and reflections on CALL, this study attempts to explore ESL teachers' pedagogical and technological perceptions toward the integration of CALL. The problem is further validated as we find that few studies have focused on ESL teachers' perceptions of CALL integration in Indian ELT context.

TEACHERS' TECHNOLOGICAL AND PEDAGOGICAL PERCEPTIONS

Considering the importance of technological and pedagogical dimensions of CALL integration in institutional settings (Levy & Stockwell, 2006), the present study attempts to investigate ESL teachers' pedagogical and technological perceptions of CALL integration in ELT. Even though CALL applications have potentials to energize the students, the CALL environment might not be effective without teachers (Beatty, 2003; Kessler & Plakans, 2008). Researchers view that, along with technology, teachers play an important role in effective and successful integration of CALL in second/foreign language education (Burston, 2003; Chambers & Bax, 2006; Coryell & Chlup, 2007; Jones, 2001; Jung, 2005). As Kadel (2005) states, "having technology does not guarantee its effective use. You have to have the right attitude toward technology" (p.34). Many studies have served to suggest that teachers' attitudes and perceptions contribute to the success of CALL practices (Jung, 2005; Kern, 2006; Kessler & Plakans, 2008; Teo, 2008).

The present study provides an analysis of pedagogical and technological perceptions of ESL teachers on integrating CALL into ELT. It has been established that computer software can be used a medium for communication and negotiation of meaning in the target language. Currently, computers and the Internet together have been described to be the tools with the most potential for the field of language learning (Warschauer & Healey, 1998). Computers represent a great potential for the facilitation of language input because of their ability to integrate multimedia material such as videos, images, and text simultaneously into one single screen. However, language teachers still have not determined which technologies are chosen for their use and technology integration remains an issue. Therefore, the need for teacher education in the area is increasingly becoming essential as positive perceptions play a vital role in adopting a new technology (Mohsen & Shafeeq, 2014). The future of CALL is closely tied to the future of language teacher education because language teachers are the pivotal players. Teachers need to select the tools to support their teaching and determine what CALL applications language learners should be exposed to and how learners can use them. However, many language teachers are leaving their certification and degree programs with little or nothing in the way of formal training in the use of technology in language teaching (Hubbard, 2008). To change pedagogical practice through technology, a teacher has to arrive at the highest level of digital competence with tools, and be able to think creatively with them. It necessitates the teachers to have a holistic view of the principles and philosophies behind the designs of a computer-assisted system in order for them to better apply appropriate pedagogies and learning theories to their teaching.

METHODOLOGY

The main purpose of this study is to (1) investigate ESL teachers' pedagogical and technological perceptions of CALL integration. The researcher used a mixed methods research design to collect data from ESL teachers and analyse responses. The study seeks to answer the following research question:

1. What are ESL teachers' pedagogical and technological perceptions of CALL integration??

The study is intended to investigate the way in which CALL integration is perceived and used by ESL teachers within secondary education. Thus, the purpose of this study is exploratory. That is, the researchers delineate the perceptions and describe the thinking of ESL teachers as a group, with respect to the integration of CALL in ELT. To obtain and delineate the perceptions, a set of 5-point Likert scales was designed to measure teachers' perceptions of CALL integration in ELT. In addition, qualitative data was collected in interviews.

The settings selected for the present study are the secondary schools in the state of Kerala. For the present study, the researchers selected 20 schools from five districts of Kerala. The target population is the entire group to which a researcher wishes to generalize the study findings. The sample population under study consists of teachers who teach English in the secondary schools in the state of Kerala. The main function of these teachers is to teach ESL. They teach English to students of class 8-10. The researcher adopted purposive sampling technique, and 105 ESL teachers participated in the first phase of the research. In addition, 15 teachers were interviewed to get additional information.

Since there is no appropriate quantitative instrument to measure ESL teachers' perceptions of CALL integration of the study context, the researchers developed a survey questionnaire. The researchers obtained validity evidence directly from experts' judgments and opinions. Two professors in Applied Linguistics first reviewed the survey instrument. One of the reviewers was a CALL expert, so that he could provide specific feedbacks in terms of the research questions posed by the researcher. Final survey questionnaire was developed through the long processes of literature review, expert reviews, and pilot test. The questionnaire contained an introductory statement that included information about the general purpose, a request for cooperation, and information about anonymity or confidentiality procedures. The questionnaire contained two sections. Section A titled *Background Information* contained 15 items, section B focusing on teachers' pedagogical and technological perceptions of CALL integration contained 13 items. Section B included 13 questions on perceived experiences with CALL. Item 1-7 were positively worded while items 8-13 were negatively worded as quantitative researchers recommend the use of mixed-item formats (positive items and negative items) in Likert scale. The researcher established internal consistency for the 13 items included in Section A and B of the questionnaire using Cronbach's Alpha reliability, and the overall value for alpha of the items was 0.81. The interview questions served as complementary tool to questionnaire, that is, it provided additional information for the researcher to find answers to the research questions.

RESULTS

After collecting the data from the teachers, the researcher inputted the data to an electronic template of Microsoft Excel and descriptive statistics (frequency distributions, mean and SD) was used to analyze teachers' perceptions of CALL integration. The quantitative data analysis will be discussed in three sections: (1) background information, (2) teachers' pedagogical and technological perceptions of CALL integration.

Background information of survey participants

The researcher used frequency distribution to analyze participants' background information such as e-mail, gender, age group, and years of teaching English. The same method was used to analyze the next ten checklists (yes/no) related to the participants' ICT/CALL awareness and experiences.

Among the 105 ESL teachers who participated in the study, 50 (47.62%) were males and fifty-five (52.38%) were females. In terms of age, 16 participants (15.24%) were between 20 and 30 years old, 56 (53.33%) were between 30 and 40 years old, 29 (27.62%) were between 40 and 50 years old, and only four (3.81%) were above fifty. Out of 105 participants, 17 (16.19%) were teaching English for a period of less than five years. 42 (40%) participants had a teaching experience of 5 to 10 years, 34 (32.38%) were teaching for 10 to 15 years, eight (7.62%) were teaching for 15 to 20 years, and only four (3.81) had a teaching experience of more than twenty years.

The details of the ICT facilities of the participants are provided in Table 1. Regarding the ICT facilities of the participants, 77 (73.33%) of them owned a personal computer while 28 (26.67%) did not have a computer. 88 (83.81%) of the participants had the Internet access in their offices while 17 (16.19%) were not accessing the Internet at workplace. 72 (68.57%) teachers accessed the Internet at home while 33 (31.43%) did not have the Internet access at home. Out of 105 participants, 73 (69.52%) used technology when they were preparing teaching materials while 32 (30.48%) did not rely on technology for preparing lessons. Most participants (N=101, 96.19%) reported that there were computer facilities for students in their schools while only a few (N= 4, 3.81%) reported against it. 70 (66.67%) of the participants had some kind of ICT skills training at their school while 35(33.33%) did not receive training at their school.

Table 1: ICT Facilities

Question	Yes	No
Do you have your own personal computer?	77 (73.33%)	28(26.67%)
Do you access the Internet in your office?	88 (83.81%)	17 (16.19%)
Do you access the Internet at home?	72 (68.57%)	33 (31.43%)
Do you use technology when you prepare teaching materials?	73 (69.52%)	32 (30.48%)
Are there any computer facilities in your school for students?	101 (96.19%)	4 (3.81%)
Have you ever had any ICT skills training at your school?	70 (66.67%)	35 (33.33%)

The details of the participants’ CALL experience are provided in Table 2. Only 35 (33.33%) participants had CALL integration in their classrooms while 70 (66.67%) of them did not have CALL integrated classrooms. 43 (40.95%) of the participants attended a training course on CALL, and 62 (59.05%) did not have any specific training in CALL. 63 (60%) had the experience of teaching English using CALL applications while 42 (40%) did not teach using CALL applications. 65 (61.9%) reported that the syllabus they were teaching contained some CALL materials while 40(38.1%) reported that their syllabus did not contain CALL activities.

Table 2: CALL Experience

Question	Yes	No
Do you have CALL integration in your classroom?	70 (33.33%)	35 (66.67%)
Have you ever attended a training course on CALL?	62 (40.95%)	43 (59.05%)
Have you ever taught English using CALL applications?	63 (60%)	42 (40%)
Does the syllabus you teach contain any CALL materials?	65 (61.9%)	40 (38.1%)

Quantitative results

Items in Section B were intended to answer the first research question “What are ESL teachers’ pedagogical and technological perceptions of CALL integration?” Items 1-7 were positively worded while items 8-13 were negatively worded. Participants responded on a five-point Likert scale (5=strongly agree, 4= agree, 3= neutral, 2= disagree, 1= strongly disagree). Frequency distributions, means, and standard deviation were the methods to report the descriptive data

that indicated the overall perceptions of ESL teachers regarding the integration of CALL in ELT. Table 4 reports the descriptive statistics for the positive points indicated in Section B of the survey. The results from the descriptive statistics reveal that ESL teachers showed positive attitude towards the CALL integration in ELT ($M=3.91$, $SD=.76$). In the survey, items 1-7 of Section B were positively worded, and the mean scores ranged from 3.42 to 4.17 on a 5-point Likert scale. Almost all the items obtained *high* scale. The total mean of the 7 statements is 3.91, indicating that the overall mean of the positive statements is *high*. Most participants agreed or strongly agreed on item 1 (90.48%, $M=4.17$, $SD=.75$), item 2 (91.44%, $M=4.07$, $SD=.64$), item 3 (82.86%, $M=3.94$, $SD=.78$), and item 4 (87.62%, $M=4.10$, $SD=.84$). Combining strongly agree and agree options, item 5 (75.24%, $M=3.82$, $SD=.76$) and item 6 (73.33%, $M=3.85$, $SD=.70$) also received fair responses while item 7 (51.44%, $M=3.42$, $SD=.89$) received the lowest response and mean.

Table 4: Perception of CALL Integration: Descriptive Statistics of the Positive Statements

Statement	Percent						
	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	M	SD
Use of CALL makes learning easier and interesting.	31.43	59.05	6.67	0.95	1.90	4.17	0.75
CALL offers opportunities for better language practice.	19.06	72.38	5.71	1.90	0.95	4.07	0.64
The rate of students' interaction with CALL materials is encouraging.	16.19	66.67	11.43	4.76	0.96	3.94	0.78
Teaching English via CALL increases students' motivation to learn.	30.48	57.14	7.62	1.90	2.86	4.10	0.84
CALL applications focus on students-centered learning.	13.33	61.91	19.05	4.76	0.95	3.82	0.76
CALL promotes students' use of English to communicate with peers and instructors.	13.33	60.00	23.81	2.86	0.0	3.85	0.70
Learning English via CALL would make student feel autonomous	8.58	42.86	33.33	13.33	1.90	3.42	0.89

Note. N=105; SA=Strongly Agree; A=Agree; N=Neutral; DA=Disagree; SDA= Strongly Disagree; M= Mean; SD= Standard Deviation.

Items 8-13 in Section B were negatively worded and Table 5 reports the descriptive statistics for these statements. The mean scores ranged from 2.24 to 3.73. Most items obtained the response *moderate* scale (2.61 - 3.40) except item 8 and 12. The total mean of the 6 statements is 2.99, indicating that the overall mean of the positive statements is *moderate*. Most participants disagreed to item number 8, making the total of disagree and strongly disagree 72.38% ($M=2.24$, $SD=.93$). Similarly, almost half of the participants disagreed or strongly disagreed to item 13 (50.47%, $M=2.70$, $SD=.95$) and item 10 (49.52%, $M=2.74$, $SD=1.02$). The only item that got a *high* scale was item 12, in which 71.43% ($M=3.73$, $SD=1.0$) of the participants agreed or strongly agreed to the statement. Overall, the participants did not agree to the negative statements except item 12, which was exclusively related to insufficient facilities at their workplace, not CALL in general. Thus, the analysis of Section B shows that participants agreed with all the positive statements while they disagreed with all the negative statements except item 12.

Qualitative Results

The interview data were analyzed based on the constant comparative method (Strauss & Corbin, 1990), and the coding process followed the analysis of the grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990) that combined two data analysis processes. Any words or sentences relating to the teachers' perceptions and expectations of CALL integration were coded, conceptualized, and categorized using the constant comparative approach until the

Table 5: Perception of CALL Integration: Descriptive Statistics of the Negative Statements

Statement	Percent						
	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	M	SD
CALL makes the lessons more difficult for teachers.	1.90	10.48	15.24	54.29	18.09	2.24	0.93
Commercial CALL packages are not suitable for our students.	3.81	37.14	42.86	16.19	0.0	3.28	0.78
Using CALL will not improve overall student performance in English	2.86	25.72	21.90	41.90	7.62	2.74	1.02
Planning CALL lessons is time-consuming.	8.57	43.81	16.19	30.48	0.95	3.28	1.02
The current facilities in my school are not sufficient to integrate CALL in teaching.	19.05	52.38	15.24	9.52	3.81	3.73	1.00
Using CALL is not recommended because it has several technical problems.	0.0	27.62	21.91	44.76	5.71	2.70	0.95

Note. N=105; SA=Strongly Agree; A=Agree; N=Neutral; DA=Disagree; SDA= Strongly Disagree; M= Mean; SD= Standard Deviation.

Categories were saturated. Based on analysis of participants' interview, two major themes, six subthemes and twenty-three issues emerged.

Interview Question 1. What are the benefits of CALL from the perspective of pedagogy of teaching English?

Three sub-themes emerged from the theme regarding the benefits of CALL from the perspective of pedagogy of teaching English.

Improve the quality of teaching. With respect to pedagogical benefits of CALL, almost all participants asserted that CALL improves English teaching quality.

Student-centred learning. Another subtheme emerged from the pedagogical benefits of CALL is that technology makes the teaching-learning process student-centred.

Multimedia aid. Among the benefits of CALL, many participants asserted the use of multimedia.

Interview Question 2. What kind of technologies do you currently use for teaching / learning / preparation etc.?

Three sub-themes emerged from the theme regarding the current use of technology. The teachers were found using technology for learning, for classroom preparation, and for teaching.

For learning. Most participants were using laptop for learning. They used their personal computer to improve their knowledge. The participants varied in their use of technology for academic purposes. Some of them were using the Internet to browse materials for their professional improvement.

Lesson preparation. Another subtheme emerged out of the question is the use of technology for classroom preparation.

For teaching. Though many of the participants were not regular users of technology in their classroom teaching, most of them used technology at times.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

As reflected from the background information of the survey, most of the participants were familiar with ICT tools. Familiarity with technology helps to possess right perceptions. As Chapelle and Hegelheimer (2004) point out, teachers need to be familiar with a variety of information regarding basic computer, hardware, software and lab operation in order to make informed decisions regarding CALL use. However, the teachers' familiarity with the technology did not reflect in their actual classroom practice. This is in the line of Egbert et al. (2002) and Mohsen & Shafeeq (2014), who found that despite being confident and capable with the technologies, teachers were not likely to implement these newly learned practices. Some previous studies (Chambers & Bax, 2006; Meskill, Mossop, DiAngelo, & Pasquale, 2002) have pointed similar issues, that is, though some teachers' beliefs regarding technology integration are quite positive, each step they take to the actual implementation of technology is slow and narrow. As Ertmer (2005) stated, real technology integration happens when it is effectively applied to a curriculum and to the students' learning. When it comes to the actual practice, the link between knowledge of technology and actual practice is missing. Two negative points derived from the background information checklist have been identified as: (1) Only a few participants (33.33%) had CALL integration in their classrooms and (2) only some (40.95%) teachers attended a training course specifically on CALL. Regarding the first point, though the teachers possessed *perceived usefulness*, it is assumed that they lacked *perceived ease of use* (Davis, Bagozzi, & Warshaw, 1989). Secondly, lack of adequate teacher training poses a challenge to technology-enhanced instruction (Egbert & Thomas 2001).

ESL teachers' perceptions of CALL integration

As reflected by the descriptive statistics, their perceptions and attitudes toward the integration of CALL in ELT were very positive. This finding is in line with some previous studies (Kim, 2008; Lim & Khine, 2006; Park & Son, 2009; Tezci, 2010).

CALL and advantageous teaching-learning opportunities

According to the survey, the ESL teachers perceived CALL integration as easier, interesting, encouraging, and motivational. The study endorses the findings of the previous studies that CALL can change the proportion of learning from teacher-led to learner-controlled activity, increasing participation and motivation among learners (Raby, 2007; Warschauer, 2000). Another teachers' perception is CALL can offer better opportunities for language learning. Some previous studies (Park & Son, 2009) also pointed to the idea that CALL offers development of innovative and authentic language learning materials and activities (Meagher, 1995; Meskill & Anthony, 2005; Wang, 2006). As CALL applications are student-centred, they can promote communicative competence of the students. This is supported by previous studies (Chen, 2011; Park & Son, 2009; Son, 2007). As suggested by Wu, Yen, and Marek (2011), such successful and enjoyable interaction through CALL applications help building student motivation and eventually leads to improvements in ability and confidence.

Concerns about facilities, packages and time

Even though the ESL teachers possessed positive perceptions of CALL integration, they had concerns about ICT facilities at their workplace. Most of them strongly agreed or agreed (71.43%, $M=3.73$, $SD=1.0$) to the negatively worded item that states the current facilities at schools are not sufficient to integrate CALL in ELT. Previous studies (Mahdi, 2013; Hani, 2014) have found similar issues in CALL integration. This suggests the necessity of well-equipped classrooms, and the administrators need to address such issues. The two negative statements that got moderate agreement were "Commercial CALL packages are not suitable for our students" ($M=3.28$, $SD=0.78$) and "Planning CALL lessons is time-consuming" ($M=3.28$, $SD=1.02$). These two items are related to the facilities. Teachers feel CALL lessons time-consuming in the absence of adequate facilities. Another issue is related to the suitability of the commercial CALL packages to the

students' level. As Kessler (2007) concluded, even trained teachers do not feel confident that they could create CALL-based materials. The only solution is to rely on available materials or CALL packages. However, the teachers become less confident of making appropriate decisions regarding CALL implementation (Kessler, 2007), which will naturally lead to a non-CALL situation.

Interview Findings

CALL and quality of teaching

With respect to pedagogical benefits of CALL, researchers have already established that ESL programs find the use and knowledge of CALL to be essential to effective instruction (Warschauer & Healey 1998). As suggested by previous studies (Jones, 2001; Meagher, 1995; Shin & Son, 2007; Wang, 2006), CALL is a diversion from the traditional methods, and language teachers need to be aware of technology integration and the possibilities it holds for ESL classes. As found in interviews, the teachers frequently mentioned that innovative methods of CALL applications help to make teaching of English lively. Previous researchers have established the benefits of CALL in almost all areas of language teaching-learning by providing innovative and authentic language learning materials and activities (Meagher, 1995; Meskill & Anthony, 2005; Wang, 2006). This shows that ESL teachers need to widen their horizons of understanding regarding CALL applications. As researchers (Chun, 2007; Lafford & Lafford, 2005) have also emphasized the pedagogical benefits of CALL technology for ESL teaching and learning, teachers need to be familiar with the changing structure of present classroom, and being the facilitator of learning, they should help students to explore the expansive world of English (Mangayarkarasi & Preethi, 2011).

Student-centredness

Most interview participants perceived CALL as supporter of student-centred teaching-learning process. Overall, CALL can easily generate learner-centered, autonomous language learning (Lee, 2005; Raby, 2007; Wang, 2006). In addition, the interview findings demonstrated a significant relationship between the use of CALL and motivation. The interviewees believed that if students are motivated to learn, then CALL could increase their motivation to learn English. This is in support of some previous positions that regarded CALL as a motivator in language classrooms (Chen, 2011; Kim, 2008; Wu, Yen, & Marek, 2011).

Multimedia aid

The benefits of multimedia in language learning have been established by the experts in CALL (Chapelle, 1998). The participants have pointed out certain advantage of multimedia, that is, the use in pronunciation, listening and speaking skills, and writing. However, multimedia environments have been widely used for many years as a delivery tool in second/foreign language learning, by providing different media modalities (Mohsen & Balakumar, 2011). For example, the participants in the interview found multimedia the best way to learn listening and speaking skills. Previous studies have established the benefits of multimedia use with pictorial or/and written glosses for text and listening comprehension as well as vocabulary recall and recognition (Aldera & Mohsen, 2013; Jones, 2006). In addition, multimedia facilities enhance communication (Chapelle, 1998) and interaction with international language learning communities (Ferney & Waller, 2001). The participants are aware of the use of drills and quizzes to check the progress of linguistic acquisition.

Current use of technology

Though ESL teachers were using CALL for learning, for classroom preparation, and for teaching, their uses seem to be limited in nature. The uses for learning and classroom preparation are moderately acceptable, however, CALL in actual classroom practice is very limited in nature. Some of them were using the Internet to browse materials for their professional improvement. The use for lesson preparation varied from dictionary checks to browsing for information.

However, most participants were not regular users of technology in their classroom teaching. This is an area that needs more attention. Since ESL teachers have perceived the benefits of CALL in ELT, they need to be responsible to adapt to the changing situations. As Bayhan et al. (2002) stated, the use of computers in young children's classroom settings demands proficient teachers who are skilled in using computers in such settings.

CONCLUSION

As learned from the survey and interview, ESL teachers possess positive perceptions of CALL integration in ELT. However, the current use of CALL applications in ELT is not promising. There are some practical barriers that need to be solved for successful CALL integration. It is high time for ESL teachers and administrators to know that CALL is no longer optional, but rather essential for ESL teachers in the technology-enhanced classroom to "understand the empowering and limiting features of any technology, and what technology can achieve in relation to the language skills and areas in order to make informed choices about how to implement a CALL component" (Levy & Stockwell, 2006, p. 190). Endorsing the call for change in the previous studies, the present study also suggests the necessity for the teachers to be familiar with CALL options within the classroom, at the institutional level, and at the broader level of inter-institutional collaboration (Fotos & Browne, 2004).

REFERENCES

- [1]. Aldera, A. S., & Mohsen, M. A. (2013). Annotations in captioned animation: Effects on vocabulary learning and listening skills. *Computers & Education*, 68, 60-75.
- [2]. Bayhan, P., Olgun, P., & Yelland, N. (2002). A study of pre-school teachers' thoughts about computer-assisted instruction. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 3(2), 298-303.
- [3]. Beatty, K (2003), *Teaching and Researching Computer-assisted Language Learning*, London: Longman.
- [4]. Bruce, B. C. & Hogan, M. P. (1998). The disappearance of technology: Toward an ecological model of literacy. In D. Reinking, M. C. McKenna, L. D., Labbo, & R. D. Kieffer (Eds.), *Handbook of literacy and technology: Transformations in a post-typographic world* (pp. 269-281). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- [5]. Burston, J. (2003). Proving IT works. *CALICO Journal*, 20(2), 219-226.
- [6]. Chambers, A., & Bax, S. (2006). Making CALL work: Towards normalization. *System*, 34, 465-479. doi:10.1016/j.system.2006.08.001
- [7]. Chapelle, C. (1998). Multimedia CALL: Lessons to be learned from research on instructed SLA. *Language Learning and Technology*, 2(1), 22-34.
- [8]. Chapelle, C. (2001). *Computer Applications in Second Language Acquisition*, Cambridge University Press.
- [9]. Chapelle, C. (2003), *English Language Learning and Technology*, Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Co.
- [10]. Chapelle, C. & Hegelheimer, V. (2004). The language teacher in the 21st century. In S. Fotos & C. Browne (Eds.), *New Perspectives on CALL for Second Language Classrooms* (pp. 297-313). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- [11]. Chen, H. (2011). Developing and evaluating SynctoLearn, a fully automatic video and transcript synchronization tool for EFL learners. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 24(2), 117-130.
- [12]. Chun, D. M. (2007). Come ride the wave: But where is it taking us? *CALICO Journal*, 24(2), 239-252.
- [13]. Coryell, J. E., & Chlup, D. T. (2007). Implementing E-learning components with adult English language learners: Vital factors and lessons learned. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 20(3), 263-278.
- [14]. Davis, F. D., Bagozzi, R. P., & Warshaw, P. R. (1989). User acceptance of computer technology: A comparison of two theoretical models. *Management Science*, 35, 982-1003.
- [15]. Egbert, J., Paulus, T., & Nakamichi, Y. (2002). The impact of CALL instruction on language classroom technology use: A foundation for rethinking CALL teacher education? *Language Learning and Technology*, 6 (3), 108-126.
- [16]. Egbert, J. & Thomas, M. (2001). The new frontier: A case study in applying instructional design for distance teacher education. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 9 (3), 391-405.
- [17]. Ertmer, P. A. (2005). Teacher pedagogical beliefs: The final frontier in our quest for technology integration?. *Educational technology research and development*, 53(4), 25-39.
- [18]. Evans, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Foreign Language Learning with Digital Technology*, London: Continuum.

- [19]. Feng, Y. (2013). English language teachers' perceptions of computer-assisted language learning. Doctoral dissertation, Texas A & M University, 2012, ProQuest LLC, UMI Number: 3549718.
- [20]. Ferney, D., & Waller, S. (2001). Reflections on multimedia design criteria for the international language learning community. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 14(2), 45-168.
- [21]. Fotos, S and Brown, C. (2004) ed. *New Perspective on CALL for Teachers*, New York: Prentice Hall.
- [22]. Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *Discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- [23]. Hani, N. A. B. (2014). Benefits and barriers of computer assisted language learning and teaching in the Arab world: Jordan as a model. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(8), 1609-1615. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1552152473?accountid=142908>.
- [24]. [24]. Hubbard, P. (2008). CALL and the future of language teacher education. *CALICO journal*, 25(2), 175-188.
- [25]. Ihmeideh, F. (2010). The role of computer technology in teaching reading and writing: Preschool teachers' beliefs and practices. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 24, 60-79.
- [26]. Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2012). *Educational Research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- [27]. Jonassen, D. H., Peck, K., & Wilson, B. G. (1999). Learning with technology: A constructivist approach. *Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill*.
- [28]. Jones, J. F. (2001). CALL and the responsibilities of teachers and administrators, *ELT Journal volume 55/4*: Oxford University Press.
- [29]. Jones, L. C. (2006). Effects of Collaboration and Multimedia Annotations on Vocabulary Learning and Listening Comprehension, vol 24, no 1, *Calico Journal*.
- [30]. Jung, U. (2005). CALL: Past, present, and future – A bibliometric approach. *ReCALL Journal*, 17(1), 4-17.
- [31]. Kadel, R. (2005). How teacher attitudes affect technology integration. *Learning & Leading with technology*, 32(5), 34-47.
- [32]. Kagan, D. M. (1992). Implications of research on teacher belief. *Educational Psychologist*, 27(1), 65-90.
- [33]. Kern, R. (2006). Perspectives on technology in learning and teaching languages. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 183-210.
- [34]. Kessler, G. (2006). Assessing CALL teacher training: What are we doing and what could we do better? *Teacher education in CALL*, 23-44. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- [35]. Kessler, G. (2007). Formal and informal CALL preparation and teacher attitude toward technology. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*. 20(2), 173-188.
- [36]. Kessler, G., & Plakans, L. (2008). Does teachers' confidence with CALL equal innovative and integrated use? *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 21(3), 269-282.
- [37]. Kim, H. K. (2008). Beyond motivation: ESL/EFL teachers' perceptions of the role of computers. *CALICO Journal*, 25(2), 241-259.
- [38]. Lafford, P. A., & Lafford, B. A. (2005). CMC technologies for teaching foreign languages: What's on the horizon? *CALICO Journal*, 22(3), 679-709.
- [39]. Lee, L. (2005). Using web-based instruction to promote active learning: Learners' perspectives. *CALICO Journal*, 23(1), 139-156.
- [40]. Levy, M (1997), *Computer-assisted Language learning: Context and Conceptualization*, Oxford: OUP.
- [41]. Levy, M. & Stockwell, G. (2006). *CALL Dimensions: Options and issues in computer assisted language learning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- [42]. Lim, C. P., & Khine, M. S. (2006). Managing teachers' barriers to ICT integration in Singapore schools. *Jl. of Technology and Teacher Education*, 14(1), 97-125.
- [43]. Mahdi, H. S. (2013). Issues of computer assisted language learning normalization in EFL contexts. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 5(1), 191-203. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1548423694?accountid=142908>.
- [44]. Mangayarkarasi, J. and Preethi, R. (2011). Teaching of English in the digital age. *Language in India*, 11(11), 417-420.
- [45]. Meagher, M. (1995). Learning English on the Internet. *Educational Leadership*, 53(2), 88.
- [46]. Meskill, C., & Anthony, N. (2005). Foreign language learning with CMC: Forms of online instructional discourse in a hybrid Russian class. *System*, 33(1), 89-105.
- [47]. Meskill, C., Mossop, J., DiAngelo, S., & Pasquale, R. K. (2002). Expert and novice teachers talking technology: Precepts, concepts, and misconcepts. *Language Learning & Technology*, 6(3), 46-57.

- [48]. Mohsen, M. A., & Balakumar, M. (2011). A review of multimedia glosses and their effects on L2 vocabulary acquisition in CALL literature. *ReCALL*, 23(02), 135-159.
- [49]. Mohsen, M. A. & Shafeeq, C.P. (2014). EFL Teachers' Perceptions on Blackboard Applications. *English Language Teaching*, 7(11), p108.
- [50]. Park, C. N., & Son, J.B. (2009). Implementing computer-assisted language learning in the EFL classroom: teachers' perceptions and perspectives. *International Journal of Pedagogies & Learning*, 5(2), 80+. Retrieved from <http://go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA251278042&v=2.1&u=sdl&it=r&p=AONE&sw=w&sid=1a1b96c4da97634291b3baec2df69524>.
- [51]. Fotos, S., & Browne, C. (2004). The development of CALL and current options. *New perspectives on CALL for second language classrooms*, 3-14.
- [52]. Raby, F. (2007). A triangular approach to motivation in computer assisted autonomous language learning (CAALL). *ReCALL*, 19(2), 181-201.
- [53]. Shin, H. J., & Son, J. B. (2007). EFL teachers' perceptions and perspectives on Internet-assisted language teaching. *CALL-EJ Online*, 8(2), 1-13.
- [54]. Son, J. B. (2007). Learner experiences in web-based language learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 20(1), 21-36.
- [55]. Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. M. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- [56]. Teo, T. (2008). Pre-service teachers' attitudes towards computer: A Singapore survey. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 24(4), 413-424.
- [57]. Tezci, E. (2010). Attitudes and knowledge level of teachers in ICT use: The case of Turkish teachers. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 7(2), 19-44.
- [58]. Wang, L. (2005). The advantages of using technology in second language education. *T.H.E. Journal*, 32(10), 1-6.
- [59]. Wang, Y. (2006). Negotiation of meaning in desktop videoconferencing supported distance language learning. *ReCALL*, 18(1), 122-145.
- [60]. Warschauer, M. (1997). Computer mediated collaborative learning: theory and practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(4), 470-481.
- [61]. Warschauer, M. (2000). On-line learning in second language classrooms: An ethnographic study. In M. Warschauer & R. Kern (Eds.), *Network-based language teaching: Concepts and practice* (pp.41-58). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [62]. Warschauer, M., & Kern, R. G. (Eds.). (2000). *Network-based language teaching: Concepts and practice*. Cambridge university press.
- [63]. Warschauer, M. (2004). Technological Change and the Future of CALL, *New perspectives on CALL for Second Language Classrooms*, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- [64]. Warschauer, M., & Healey, D. (1998). Computers and language learning: An overview. *Language teaching*, 31(02), 57-71.
- [65]. Wiebe, G., & Kabata, K. (2010). Students' and instructors' attitudes toward the use of CALL
- [66]. in foreign language teaching and learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 23(3), 221-234.
- [67]. Wu, W. V., Yen, L. L., & Marek, M. (2011). Using online EFL interaction to increase confidence, motivation, and ability. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 14(3), 118-129.

AUTHORS' BIOGRAPHY



Dr. L. Baskaran, M.A English, M.A Linguistics, B.Ed., M.Phil., Ph.D., PGDHRM, is an Assistant Professor of English at Rajah Serfoji Government College, Thanjavur. He has been teaching English at college level for the past 16 years. He received his academic credentials from Tamil University, Thanjavur, Bharathidasan University, Trichy, Madurai Kamaraj University, and Annamalai University, Chidambaram. He is a research supervisor at Bharathidasan University. He has presented papers in international conferences. His research interests include Applied Linguistics and Literature.



C.P. Shafeeq, M.A., M.Ed., Lecturer of English, is researching in ELT at Bharathidasan University, Trichy. He has been teaching English for the past ten years at different level. He received his academic credentials from University of Calicut, Mysore University, and Aligarh Muslim University. His research interests include ELT and literary studies.

Citation: Dr. L. Baskaran and C.P. Shafeeq (2015)ESL Teachers' Perception of CALL Integration in ELT. IJSELL 3(5), pp: 63-74.