The Analysis of EFL Teachers' Perceptions of CALL and Variables Influential on Teachers' Attitudes

Melike Nazlı İnce[1]

Erzincan University
melikenazli86@gmail.com

Abstract

The current study aims to shed light on EFL teachers' perceptions and attitudes of CALL which have a significant effect on the effectiveness of teaching process. Besides language skills taught via CALL, teachers' preferences with respect to the programmes and their aims in using CALL in their classes have also been scrutinized within this study. In line with this purpose quantitative data were gathered with a questionnaire through which participants' attitudes as regards CALL were tried to be clarified. SPSS 15 was used in the analysis of the data taken from participants' responses. Overall findings indicated that participants had positive perceptions of CALL although they had some concerns as to their competency in carrying out CALL-based language classes which mostly derived from the lack of necessary trainings concerning with the integration of technology into the language lesssons, pedagogical necessities to be fulfilled as well as their personal charachteristics and willingness in relation to CALL

Key Words: computer-assisted language learning, ESL teachers, perception, technology

Introduction

Known as an indispensable part of the globalizing world; computers play a crucial role in language learning as well. A recent and popular trend in language learning, that is, experimental or reflective learning style makes people seek for communicative and audial methods instead of traditional ones such as grammar-translation. As for what experimental learning means; it stands for learning language through experience provided with the use of cognitive and affective abilities. In other words, learners need to learn a foreign language by listening, seeing, speaking and practicing, which makes possible for them to use the knowledge practically in an appropriate context and case. To that end, computer-assisted language learning has received much attention particularly in recent years with the increasing use of technology in almost every aspect of human life.

However; in spite of its popularity CALL is not a term defined exactly and efficiently. As stated by Beatty (2003), CALL refers to "language learning in which a learner uses a

---

[1] Erzincan Üniversitesi, Yalnızbağ Yerleşkesi 24000

computer and, as a result, improves his or her language". (p.7) Even if the above definition does not mention, the use of computer and the related variables actually attach greater importance. To put it more precisely, teachers must be knowledgable about how to use computer in language learning, which programmes and learning materials are to be selected, how pedagogical learning theories could be integrated into computer-asssisted language learning and so forth. Deriving from the popularity of computer or technology-integrated learning style, it is an obvious fact that learners prefer to be taught by means of visual and audial methods which involve in the concept of computer-assisted language learning. Therefore, "traditional school education can no longer equip one with the knowledge and skills required for a continued progress of the globe" (Lu, 2010, p. 343)

The concept of "digital natives" set forth by Phensky (2001) is a term which refers to the nativeness of current students with technological tools such as digital computers, video games and the Internet (p .1) It is a well-known fact that today's students are quite good at using computer technology vis-à-vis their teachers. At this point; a question in relation to the discrepancy of teachers' and students' efficiency in the use of technological tools comes to the fore. Another question in relation to the matter above is to what extend teachers are ready to teach these digital natives. Although a number of studies have been carried out on the effectiveness of educational technology on teaching-learning process, CALL–classroom comparisons, and students' perceptions towards the use of CALL (Chang, 2002; Meskill & Anthony, 2005; Neri, Mich, Gerosa & Giuliani, 2008; Kessler & Bikowski, 2010; Chenoweth & Murday, 2003; Chenoweth, Ushida &Murday, 2007; Fitze, 2006; Neri; Lee, 2005; Lin, Winaitham & Saitakham, 2008; Winke, Goertler & Amuzie, 2010; Miyazoe & Anderson, 2010); studies conducted on the perceptions and experiences of teachers concerning CALL are comparatively insufficient. (Bloch, 2004; Byrne, 2007; Chang, 2007; Chinnery, 2008; Hampel & Stickler, 2005; Marriott & Torres, 2009)

From a number of studies conducted on the potential uses of CALL for EFL students (Ayres, 2002; Barr & Gillespie, 2003; Kessler & Bikowski, 2010; Raby, 2007; Stockwell, 2003), it is obviously seen that CALL creates an enjoyable, reflective, interactive, and flexible language learning environment. What's more, it gives the learners an opportunity of autonomous learning. To put in another way, through multimedia technology, Internet and computerized devices students could learn everything they need without depending on others. It goes without saying that independent learning style accompanied with the use of technological devices increases students participation, which is to say learners become much more motivated when they are aware of their capacity and potential to do something by themselves.

With the aid of Internet technology and computers, students could take advantage of employing innovative electronic learning materials and activities (Meagher, 1995; Meskill & Anthony, 2005; O'Byran & Hegelheimer, 2007; Wang, 2006). Additionally, CALL differs from other methods in that it encourages individuals to make cross-cultural connections which is an indispensable part of language learning process. With the help of programmes such as Skype, Chat, listening podcasts, electronic grammar, reading and writing materials involved in CALL, students could improve their language skills even though they are not exposed to native speakers. In a similar vein, Meagher (1995) states that through cultural exchange activities EFL learners learn grammatical structures and vocabulary as well as developing their thinking skills. A quick review of the related literature has clearly revealed that EFL students benefit a great deal from being taught with such an innovative way.

It is doubtless to say that there is a linear relationship between the efficiency of CALL-related applications and teachers' competency of CALL. Previous studies carried out in the area of technology integration indicate that teachers play a crucial role on the effective and

successful integration of technology into the language education (Beatty, 2003; Burston, 2003; Chambers & Bax, 2006; Coryell & Chlup, 2007; Jimoyiannis, 2008; Jones, 2001; Jung, 2005; Kessler & Plakans, 2008; Schwienhorst, 2003; Teo, 2008) In this sense; teachers' lack of training, perceptions and attitudes may set the tone of the process in different ways. As noted by Chambers & Bax (2006), teachers' lack of training is one of the important factors which have a negative impact on students' motivation. Furthermore, teachers' insufficiency in CALL may lead them not to use the method as they do not feel themselves ready and comfortable enough to use CALL appropriately.

Another problem concerning CALL is the lack of technological equipments, computers and Internet. Markinkiewicz (1993) stated that there is no relation between the availability of the technological equipments and teachers' use of computers. In other words, when they are deprived of the necessary equipments students could not use technology as they are asked for doing research or their homework with the aid of computer and Internet. Moreover, some authorities in schools may ask for the teachers to fulfill some procedures to use the computer laboratory which is a demotivating factor on the parts of teachers. They, in most cases, perceive these things as an extra work load and prefer not to employ these labs.

An additional factor in relation to the implementation of CALL and other technological tools is teachers' perceptions and attitudes. The findings of studies conducted by Akbaba & Kurubacak (1999) suggested that a good number of teachers do not have favourable attitudes towards the use of technology altough they view CALL as an effective teaching method. What's more, some teachers are not competent in creating CALL-based materials in spite of their positive approaches toward the use of CALL. Drawing from these contradictions, it is clear that positive opinions about technology and its availability do not necessarily assure the effective use of CALL therefore as stated by Kadel, it is important to have the right attitude toward technology.

Teaching experience is one of the variables which affect teachers' perceptions and attitudes of CALL. In this sense; the investigation conducted by Meskill, Mossop, Di Angelo & Pasquele (2002) has verified the divergence between experienced and inexperienced teachers as to the integration of CALL into language teaching process. Novice teachers are mostly concerned about the potential damage to be given to the technological equipments which, to a great extend, restrict their preferences as to students' use of computers. On the other hand, expert teachers do not interfere with students' use of computers in any way as they focus on outputs to be acquired during CALL-based teaching process. Teachers' perceptions concerning their roles in teaching process is another controversial issue to be dealt with in frame of CALL. Wang (2002) discussed teachers' role in computer-based teaching under sub-titles such as teacher-centeredness and student-centeredness. A number of studies show that inexperienced teachers, mostly, may not be aware of the roles that students and teachers play in classrooms with respect to computers. Findings of another study carried out by Olphen (2007) revealed that there is a linear correlation between the positive perceptions of teachers and their teaching experience. After the examination of pre-service teachers' perspectives on Web-based instruction in their language classes; he found out that their perceptions changed as they progressed. Their perspectives converted "a state of concern, hesitation, and denial into a state of easiness, certainty and acceptance that was close to keenness" (Olphen, 2007, p.103). The increasing experience in technology-based teaching besides students' support make teachers more confident as to the use of CALL.

Put simply, all of the whole of the aforementioned studies clearly reveal that teaching experience is an imperative factor on the approaches adopted towards the use of technology in language teaching process. Ertmer (1999) categorized the barriers which might negatively influence the decisions and behaviours of teachers concerning the use of technology. In

accordance with the abovementioned categorization, first-order barriers include lack of access to computers and software, insufficiency of time to plan the process of teaching and inadequacy of technical and administrative support. On the other hand, second-order barriers are related to beliefs, perceptions and willingness of teachers as regards the integration of CALL into the language classes. The critical point with these types of barriers is that the first group may be eliminated to some extend through some interferences whilst the second group is difficult to overcome in that it is directly related to the charachteristics of teachers.

Therefore it is possible to say that pedagogical and practical problems do not make teachers perceive CALL as a promising tool of language education (Arnold, 2007). Teachers' perceptions should be taken seriously in that they could influence the perceptions and attitudes of learners in a negative and positive way (Sheingold & Hadley, 1990). Considering the increasing affect of globalization around the world, it becomes easy to perceive the potential and power of technology as well as the necessity of doing research in the area of CALL which derives from the need to integrate technology into the language learning process in an efficient way. In this sense, the study seeks to answer the following research questions:

Research Questions

1) How do EFL teachers perceive the integration of CALL into English classes?
2) What are EFL teachers' perceptions of the impact of CALL on foreign language teaching?

Methodology

Participants

Aimed to gain an indepth understanding into EFL teachers' attitudes and opinions of CALL, this study was conducted with 32 participants working at various universities in Turkey. Most of the respondents were Turkish altough there were a few coming from other countries with Fullbright sponsorship. The female participants constituted for 53.1% of the whole sample while the percentage of the males was 46.9%.

Instruments

In frame of the study, survey strategy was chosen in that it is an appropriate method of collecting quantitative data to explore respondents' beliefs, perceptions and attitudes. Therefore a questionnaire consisting of two stages was employed as a data collection instrument in order to assess descriptive and inferential data concerning CALL.

In the first part, besides questions as to the use of CALL, teachers' demographic information including age, gender, teaching experience were gathered. In the second part, five scale likert scale designed by Papanastasiou and Angeli (2008) was used in order to measure teachers' perceptions in relation to the items as regards CALL. Through the questions ranging from 1 to 10, teachers' general perceptions towards the use of CALL was tried to be clarified while through the statements between 11 and 20, data on teachers' perspectives as regards the impact of CALL were obtained. The items were evaluated on a likert scale ranging from 1 to 5 (Strongly Agree=5; Agree=4; Neutral=3; Disagree=2; Strongly Disagree=1). The first five statements placed on the questionnaire addressed the effectiveness of CALL in teaching, as well as its importance in that it is an innovative, collaborative, and independent method which may be effective on meeting students' needs in learning English. As for the rest of the statements, they were prepared in a way to make the readers understand the personal reasons and preferences which encourage teachers to employ computer and internet technology and

computerized devices. The higher scores concerning these statements revealed positive attitudes towards CALL, while lower scores indicated less positive or negative attitudes.

Data Analysis Procedure

The obtained data were analyzed with SPSS 15 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). Descriptive statistics including frequency, mean, standart deviation and percentage were employed to describe and assess the answers to the questionnaire. Prior to the evaluation of the data, reliability and validity of the statements and questions were calculated. The reliability values were computed in Cronbach's Alpha and the values indicated a high level of reliability as shown in the following tables.

Results

As shown in table 1 below; the number of female and male participants are close to each other, that is, 53.1% (17) of the subjects were female while 46.9% (15) were male. Not surprisingly, the female participants outnumber the males as is in most of the studies conducted in the field of ELT (Büyükduman, 2005; Topkaya, Küçük; 2010; Kayaoğlu, 2011; İnceçay, 2012)

Table 1 Gender profile of the respondents

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Male	15	46.9	46.9	46.9
Female	17	53.1	53.1	100.0
Total	32	100.0	100.0	

The age range of participants, as shown in table 2, vary on between 22 and 47. (M=27.22). 81.3% of the whole respondents were aged 22-29 years followed by 30-39 age group (15.7%; N=5) contrary to the declining participant profile aged 40 years over (3.1%; N=1). The high percentage of teachers aged 22-29 years is an indicator of the fact that a majority of participants are quite young revealing that they may be open to the innovations conducted in the field, thereby having favourable opinions and attitudes towards the use of CALL as one of the significant innovations recorded in the area of foreign language teaching and learning.

Table 2 Participants' Age Profile

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
20-29	26	81.3	81.3	100.0
30-39	5	15.7	15.7	100.0
40 Over	1	3.1	3.1	100.0
Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Aiming to answer the third demographic question, Table 3 shows participants' teaching experience which is one of the variables being influential on teachers' perceptions of CALL.

As seen from table below, 12 teachers corresponding to 37.5% of the whole participants have been teaching English for one to three years, while teachers with four to six years teaching experience come in second with 31.3% (N=10). As for the third group who have seven to nine years of teaching experience, they consist of 9.4% (N=3) of the subjects; while 5 teachers teaching English for ten to thirteen years account for 15.6%. Lastly, the fifth group who have more than 13 years of teaching experience are represented with 2 teachers accounting for 6.3%.

Table 3 Frequency distribution of teaching experience

Valid (Years)	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1-3	12	37.5	37.5	37.5
4-6	10	31.3	31.3	68.8
7-9	3	9.4	9.4	78.1
10-13	5	15.6	15.6	93.8
13 Over	2	6.3	6.3	100.0
Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Being responsive to the question of how often teachers intregate CALL into their English teaching, the values shown in table 4 verified the assumption that CALL is, to a great extend, integrated into their teaching process. According to the data taken from descriptive analysis, 40.6% (N=13) of the participants integrated CALL into 75% (M=3.19) of their teaching while there is an equity between teachers (28.1%; N=9) who integrate CALL into one fourth (25%) and half of (50%) their classes. Of the whole subjects, only 3.1% (N=1) completely teach their lessons by incorporating CALL. Based on the values above, it would be not wrong to say that a great majority of the respondents spent 25% - 50% of their teaching as integrated to CALL.

Table 4 How often do you integrate CALL into your English teaching?

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
25% of my teaching	9	28.1	28.1	28.1
50% of my teaching	9	28.1	28.1	56.3
75% of my teaching	13	40.6	40.6	96.9
100% of my teaching	1	3.1	3.1	100.0
Total	32	100.0	100.0	

With the purpose of finding out students' English proficiency level taught by each participant in their CALL-related classrooms, the following table was prepared. As seen in table 5, a very high percentage (40.6%; N=13) were teaching English to the beginner students, while 7 of them (21.9%) to the intermediate students. 10 teachers represented with 31.9% were teaching both intermediate and beginning students while participants teaching mixed groups such as beginning, intermediate and advanced constituted for the 28.2% (N=9) of the whole sample.

Table 5 What are your students' level of English proficiency in your CALL-integrated classrooms?

Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Beginning	13	40.6	40.6	40.6
Intermediate	7	21.9	21.9	62.5
Beginning-Intermediate	10	31.3	31.3	93.8
Beginning-Intermediate-Advanced	2	6.3	6.3	100.0
Total	32	100.0	100.0	

To give teachers' preferences as regards the skills they teach through CALL, listening takes the highest frequency with 24 people who integrate CALL into the 75% of their listening classes. Following listening comes the integration of grammar lessons for the teaching of which 59.4% (N=19) of the participating teachers preferred to use CALL. The obtained values suggested that four lessons for which teachers prefered to integrate CALL were respectively listening, grammar, reading and speaking. Worthy of note is that CALL was not integrated into the lessons of writing and others as much as it was integrated into the listening and grammar.

For the next item in which participants were asked to choose technology and applications that they integrated into their English teaching, table 6 was designed. As inferred from the data shown in table below, there was a diversity with respect to the participants' use of technology and applications. In this sense, technologies and applications used by the participants were as follows: computers 96.9% (31), projector with a computer system 93.8% (30), language learning software for drill and practice or tutorials 59.4% (19), DVD 53.1% (17), electronic whiteboard 12.5% (4), Text (e.g.Word processing & PPT), 59.4% (19), graphics 21.9% (7), sound 78.1% (25), videos 93.8% (30), images 71.9% (23), animations 37.5% (12), web search (e.g. glossary dictionary) 62.5% (20), web-based multimedia (e.g.You Tube, Audacity) 50,0% (16), web-based assessment creator (e.g. hot potatoes, Quia) 9.4% (3), web conferencing 6.3% (2), CMS (e.g. Moodle , Blackboard) 3.1% (1), social media (e.g. Twitter, Facebook) 31.3% (10), web publisher 6.3% (N=2), Chat 9.4% (3).

Table 6 Which of the following technology and applications have you integrated into your English teaching?

Valid	F	P
Computer	31	96.9
Projector with a computer system	30	93.8
Language learning software for drill and practice or tutorials (download &CD's)	19	59.4
DVD	17	53.1
Electronic whiteboard	4	12.5
Text (e.g. Word processing & Powerpoint)	19	59.4
Graphics	7	21.9

Sound	25	78.1
Videos	30	93.8
Images	23	71.9
Animations	12	37.5
Web search (e.g. glossary dictionary)	20	62.5

Table 6 (Continued)

Valid	F	P
Web-based multimedia (e.g. YouTube, Audacity)	16	50
Web-based assessment creator (e.g. hot potatoes, Quia)	3	9.4
Web conferencing	2	6.3
CMS (e.g. Moodle, BlackBoard)	1	3.1
Social media (e.g. Twitter, Facebook)	10	31.3
Web publisher (e.g. Blogger)	2	6.3
Chat (e.g. Skype, MSN)	3	9.4

As regards the competence with technology and applications; participants were asked for defining their own level of confidence and proficiency with technology and applications in such domains as personal use, instructional use and students' use. Participants' answers were evaluated based on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from (1: Very Poor to 5: Excellent). As obviously seen in table 7, most of the participants defined their confidence in relation to the personal use of technology and applications as average 37.5% (12) while nobody described their personal competency concerning the technology as poor. As for the values related to the instructional use of technology, the results taken from the table below indicated that 46.9% (15) of participants rated their competency level in technology for instructional use as very good whereas 3.1% (1) rated their level as very poor. For students' use, there is an equity between the ones rated their level as average and the ones as very good 40.6% (13). While 3.1% (1) rated h/her level as excellent, 12.5% (4) evaluated themselves as poor. The findings interestingly revealed that teachers' competency in relation to the personal and instructional use of technology is higher than their proficiency and self-confidence in technology for students' use

Table 7 How would you rate your level of competence with technology and applications?

	Very Poor	Poor	Average	Very Good	Excellent
For personal use	-	-	12 (37.5%)	-	-
For my instructional use	1 (3.1%)	-	-	15 (46.9%)	-
For making students use	-	4 (12.5%)	13 (40.6%)	13 (40.6%)	1 (3.1%)

As for the items which aimed to clarify EFL teachers' perceptions of the impact of CALL on foreign language teaching, they mostly took positive responses from the participating

teachers. To name but a few, most of the participants (96.9%; M= 4.38) agreed or strongly agreed with the first item, that is, 'CALL increases my teaching effectiveness' (item 1). In a similar vein, when asked if CALL promotes innovative teaching practices (item 2), the majority of the respondents (93.7%; M=4.31) indicated a preference for strongly agree or agree. However, the third item, that is, 'CALL reduces my teaching load' (item 3) did not take positive answers as understood from the percentage of the subjects who disagreed or expressed reservation (56.3%; M=3.03). One explanation for this finding is likely to be related to first-order barriers including lack of access to computers and software, not having enough time to plan the process of teaching and inadequacy of technical and administrative support.

In consistent with the studies in the literature, many participants (71.9%; M=3.90) agreed or strongly agreed with the next item, that is, 'CALL meets my students' needs in learning English' (item 4). One reason for the high number of affirmative answers may be the fact that CALL presents students a good number of activities and practices including four language skills thereby making possible for them to identify, compensate and complete their deficiencies. Similarly, most of the participants (87.5%; M=4.06) answered positively to the item that 'CALL improves my technology skills' (item 5). In the same vein, a very high percentage of participants (84.4%; M=4.06) agreed or strongly agreed with the notion that 'CALL is influential on the improvement of instructional approaches' (item 6). Likewise responses given to the next item 'CALL supports individualized language learning' (item 7) showed a positive stance (81.3%; M=3.97). As mentioned earlier, this finding may be attributed to the variety of activities and things that learners can do via CALL without being depended on others. Regarding whether CALL supports collaborative language learning for students, (item 8); more than half of the participants (53.2%; M=3.72) gave positive responses whereas approximately half of them 46.9% stated that they were neutral. When asked if CALL increases access to authentic language learning materials (item 9), virtually all of the participants (93.8%; M=4.41) answered in a positive way. Considering the variety of English materials (newspapers, magazines, breaking news etc.) to be reached through CALL, this finding is no surprise. As for the item asking for whether or not CALL increases students' attendance (item 10), 62.5% (M=3.84) remained neutral or gave a positive response.

Table 8 Teachers' reasons for using CALL in their teaching

Items	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
CALL increases the effectiveness of my English teaching.	13 (40.6%)	18 (56.3%)	1 (3.1%)	-	-
CALL promotes innovative teaching practices.	13 (40.6%)	17 (53.1%)	1 (3.1%)	1 (3.1%)	-
CALL reduces my English teaching load.	4 (12.5%)	9 (28.1%)	5 (15.6%)	10 (31.3%)	3 (9.4%)
CALL meets my students' needs in learning English.	6 (18.8%)	17 (53.1%)	7 (21.9%)	1 (3.1%)	-

CALL supports individualized language learning for my students.	7 (21.9%)	19 (59.4%)	4 (12.5%)	2 (6.3%)	-
CALL increases access to authentic language learning materials.	15 (46.9%)	15 (46.9%)	2 (6.3%)	-	-
I use CALL because I am aware of how CALL impacts my teaching.	9 (28.1%)	18 (56.3%)	5 (15.6%)	-	-
I use CALL because I have pedagogical knowledge of how to integrate CALL for language learning.	4 (12.5%)	14 (43.8%)	12 (37.5%)	1 (3.1%)	-
I use CALL because my English classrooms have user friendly technology.	5 (15.6%)	11 (34.4%)	6 (18.8%)	10 (31.3%)	-
I use CALL because I have students with the ability to use technology.	7 (21.9%)	18 (56.3%)	7 (21.9%)	-	-
I use CALL because my students understand the purpose of the use of technology.	8 (25.0%)	11 (34.4%)	8 (25.0%)	5 (15.6%)	-

Discussion & Conclusion

In consistent with a number of studies in the related literature (Alshumaimeri, 2008; Kim, 2008; Yuksel and Kavanoz, 2011; Baskaran & Shafeeq, 2015; Chung, 2014; Çelik & Aytın, 2014; Hismanoğlu, 2010; Külekçi, 2009; Sağlam & Sert, 2012; Park & Son, 2009), this study indicated that EFL teachers have positive perceptions and attitudes towards the use of CALL in their English classes. Secondly, the findings obtained from quantitative data showed that technology was perceived as a supplementary tool and was used in teacher-centered or teacher-student negotiated settings in a traditional way. Overall speaking, the participants mostly recognized CALL-based classrooms as more facilitating; however, teachers particularly inexperienced ones had some concerns in relation to their roles and sufficiency in technology-based or CALL-based language teaching. In this sense, this study does not differ from others (Chambers &Bax, 2006; Mohsen &Shafeeq, 2014; Egbert, Paulus and Nakamichi, 2002) in terms of finding out a discrepancy between teachers' positive perceptions of CALL and the anxiety in using it.

Regarding the impact of CALL on language learning; teachers believe that students' various language skills could be improved to a high degree in CALL-related classrooms.

Particularly for interactive skills such as listening and speaking, CALL is perceived as an effective way of teaching. In parallel to some other studies (Kyeung Kim, 2008), this study shows once more that CALL is not used equally in teaching of four language skills. That is to say, while some skills e.g. listening are commonly taught via CALL, some others such as writing are not. In contrast to many studies, speaking skill in this study was stated to be one of the two skills taught via CALL the least, the reasons of which need to be closely analysed.

As to factors which are influential on teachers' integration of CALL into their classrooms, they were limited by first-order barriers which involve the lack of training, technical support and equipment. Second order barriers involving personal factors e.g. anxiety, lack of knowledge could also be called as reasons which caused teachers to feel reserved in using CALL although they have positive perceptions and attitudes concerning CALL-based language learning. Having a closer look at the review of literature, it is also possible to see the abovementioned barriers as the common reasons lying behind many EFL teachers' reluctance in using CALL. (Fabry and Higgs, 1997; Pelgrum, 2001; Kirkpatrick and Peck, 2001).

Another finding in line with other studies is students' positive perception of CALL (Akbulut, 2008; Kılıçkaya and Seferoğlu, 2013; Mohktari, 2013; Zaini and Mazdayasna, 2014) which is also influential on teachers' willingness to employ and adopt CALL in their language education. Cognizant of the fact that CALL is an important way of increasing students' motivation to learn, EFL teachers should take an in-service technology and CALL-based training in order to integrate the technology into the lesson efficiently thereby addressing to the pedagogical requirements and needs of students. Given EFL teachers reported disagreement as to the fact that CALL reduces their teaching load, Turkish MONE should analyze the reasons leading teachers to think so and make an effort to facilitate the conditions and requirements of using CALL. In this respect, inservice trainings related to CALL should be provided for teachers in a way to make them use the technology efficiently without depending on others. As a final remark, it is imperative for teachers to access to the necessary CALL equipments in order to benefit from the whole opportunities presented by technology. In this sense, a further study aiming to explore for the impact of uneasy access to the CALL technology on teachers' motivation to teach their lessons via CALL can be suggested.

Limitations

This study is limited to the number of participating teachers which makes it difficult to generalize the results.

REFERENCES

Akbaba, S., & Kurubacak, G. (1999). Teachers' attitudes towards technology. *Computers in the Social Studies, 7*(2), 833

Arnold, N. (2007). Technology-mediated learning 10 years later: Emphasizing pedagogical or utilitarian application? *Foreign Language Annals, 40*(1), 161-181.

Ayres, R. (2002). Learner attitudes towards the use of CALL. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *15*(3), 241-249. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.

Barr, J. D., & Gillespie, J. H. (2003). Creating a computer-based language learning environment. *ReCALL, 15*(1), 68-78. doi:10.1017/S0958344003000612

Beatty, K. (2003). *Teaching and researching computer-assisted language learning*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education Limited

Bloch, J. (2004). Second language cyber rhetoric: A study of Chinese L2 writers in an online USENET group. *Language Learning & Technology, 8*(3), 66-82.

Byrne, T. (2007). Marrying two existing software packages into an efficient online tutoring tool. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 20*(5), 459-469.

Burston, J. (2003). Proving IT works. *CALICO Journal, 20*(2), 219-226.

Chambers, A., & Bax, S. (2006). Making CALL work: Towards normalization. *System, 34*, 465-479. doi:10.1016/j.system.2006.08.001

Chang, C. C. (2002). Assessing and analyzing the effects of WBLP on learning processes and achievements: Using the electronic portfolio for authentic assessment on university students' learning. Retrieved October 11, 2010, from ERIC Web Site: http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED476984.pdf

Chenoweth, N. A., & Murday, K. (2003). Measuring student learning in an online French course. *CALICO Journal, 20*(2), 285-314.

Chenoweth, N. A., Ushida, E., & Murday, K. (2007). Student learning in hybrid French and Spanish courses: An overview of language online. *CALICO Journal, 24*(1), 115-145.

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.

Ertmer, P. (1999). Addressing first- and second-order barriers to change: Strategies for technology integration. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 47*(4), 47-61.

Fitze, M. (2006) Discourse and participation in ESL face-to-face and written electronic conferences. *Language Learning & Technology, 10*(1), 67-86.

Hampel, R., & Stickler, U. (2005). New skills for new classrooms: Training tutors to teach languages online. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 18*(4), 311-32. doi:10.1080/09588220500335455

Jimoyiannis, A. (2008). Factors determining teachers' beliefs and perceptions of ICT in education. In C. Antonio & P. Marco (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Information Communication Technology* (pp. 321-334). Hershey, PA: IGI Global

Jones, J. F. (2001). CALL and the responsibilities of teachers and administrators. *ELT Journal: English Language Teachers Journal*, *55*(4), 360. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Jung, U. (2005). CALL: Past, present, and future – A bibliometric approach. *ReCALL Journal, 17*(1), 4-17.

Kessler, G., & Plakans, L. (2008). Does teachers' confidence with CALL equal innovative and integrated use? *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 21*(3), 269-282.

Kessler, G., & Bikowski, D. (2010). Developing collaborative autonomous learning abilities in computer mediated language learning: Attention to meaning among students in wiki space. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 23*(1), 41-58. doi:10.1080/09588220903467335

Lee, L. (2005). Using web-based instruction to promote active learning: Learners' perspectives. *CALICO Journal, 23*(1), 139-156

Levy, M. (2008). *Computer-Assisted language learning: Context and conceptualization*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lin, S., Winaitham, W., & Saitakham, K. (2008). The use of websites for practicing listening skills of undergraduate students. Retrieved October 12, 2010, from ERIC Web Site: http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED500929.pdf

Lu, D. (2010). A salutary lesson from a computer-based self-access language learning project. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 23*(4), 343-35

Marcinkiewicz, H. (1993). Computers and teachers: Factors influencing computer use in the classroom. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education, 26*(2), 220. Retrieved October 10, 2010, from Academic Search Complete database

Marriott, R. C. V., & Torres, P. L. (Eds.). (2009). *Research on e-learning methodologies for language acquisition*. New York: Information Science Reference.

Meagher, M. (1995). Learning English on the Internet. *Educational Leadership*, *53*(2), 88. Retrieved October 15, 2010, from Academic Search Complete database

Meskill, C., Mossop, J., DiAngelo, S., & Pasquale, R. (2002). Expert and novice teachers talking technology: Precepts, concepts, and misconcepts. *Language Learning & Technology, 6*(3), 46-57.

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.

Miyazoe, T., & Anderson, T. (2010). Learning outcomes and students' perceptions of online writing: Simultaneous implementation of a forum, blog, and Wiki in an EFL blended learning setting. *System, 38*, 185-199.

Neri, A., Mich, O., Gerosa, M., & Giuliani, D. (2008). The effectiveness of computer assisted pronunciation training for foreign language learning by children. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *21*(5), 393-408. doi:10.1080/09588220802447651

O'Bryan, A., & Hegelheimer, V. (2007). *Integrating CALL into the classroom: The role of podcasting in an ESL listening strategies course, 19*(2), 162-180. doi:10.1017/S0958344007000523

Raby, F. (2007). A triangular approach to motivation in computer assisted autonomous language learning (CAALL). *RECALL, 19*(2), 181-201.

Schwienhorst, K. (2003). Learner autonomy and tandem learning: Putting principles into practice in synchronous and asynchronous telecommunications environments. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *16*(5), 427-443. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Sheingold, K., & Hadley, M. (1990). *Accomplished teachers: Integrating computers into classroom practice*. New York: Center for Technology in Education, Bank Street College.

Stockwell, G. (2003). Effects of topic threads on sustainability of email interactions between 318 native speakers and nonnative speakers. *ReCALL, 15*(1), 37-50. doi:10.1017/S0958344003000417

Teo, T. (2008). Pre-service teachers' attitudes towards computer: A Singapore survey. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 24*(4), 413-424.

Wang, Y. (2006). Negotiation of meaning in desktop videoconferencing supported distancE language learning. *ReCALL, 18*(1), 122-145.

Wang, Y. M. (2002). When technology meets beliefs: Preservice teachers' perception of the teacher's role in the classroom with computers. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 35*(1), 150-162.

Winke, P. M., Goertler, S., & Amuzie, G. L. (2010). Commonly taught and less commonly taught language learners: Are they equally prepared for CALL and online language learning? *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 23*(3), 199-219.