

TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS COMPUTER-ASSISTED LANGUAGE
LEARNING IN AUSTRALIA AND SPAIN

Lidia Bilbatua and Alfredo Herrero de Haro

University of Wollongong

[lidia at uow edu au](mailto:lidia@uow.edu.au), [alfredo at uow edu au](mailto:alfredo@uow.edu.au)

Abstract

A review of the existing literature shows that when it comes to studying attitudes towards CALL (Computer-Assisted Language Learning), researchers have traditionally focused on students' perspectives and ignored teachers' views. This study focuses on teachers' attitudes towards CALL in order to gain a better understanding of what issues, advantages, and disadvantages teachers come across when incorporating CALL into their teaching. Furthermore, a group of teachers from Australia and Spain has been interviewed to compare how views on CALL vary across professionals in these two countries. As some authors have previously proved, the more IT literate teachers are, the more likely they are to use CALL in their teaching.

Key words: Computer-Assisted Language Learning CALL, teachers' attitudes, advantages and disadvantages of CALL, face-to-face learning.

Bilbatua, Lidia, and Alfredo Herrero de Haro. 2014.

Teachers' attitudes towards Computer-Assisted Language Learning in Australia and Spain.

Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación 57, 3-44.

<http://www.ucm.es/info/circulo/no57/bilbatua.pdf>

<http://revistas.ucm.es/index.php/CLAC>

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5209/rev_CLAC.2014.v57.44513

©2014 Lidia Bilbatua and Alfredo Herrero de Haro

Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación (clac)

Universidad Complutense de Madrid. ISSN 1576-4737. <http://www.ucm.es/info/circulo>

Contents

Abstract 3

1. Introduction 5

2. Research methodology 6

2.1. Structure of the study 6

2.2. Methodology followed 7

3. Review of literature 8

4. Interviews 10

4.1. Information about the participants 10

4.2. Teachers' perspectives on CALL 13

4.2.1. The use of CALL 13

4.2.1.1. The use of CALL: Australia 13

4.2.1.2. The use of CALL: Spain 16

4.2.2. Teachers' positive attitudes towards CALL 19

4.2.2.1. Teachers' positive attitudes towards CALL: Australia 19

4.2.2.2. Teachers' positive attitudes towards CALL: Spain 21

4.2.3. Teachers' negative attitudes towards CALL 22

4.2.3.1. Teachers' negative attitudes towards CALL: Australia 22

4.2.3.2. Teachers' negative attitudes towards CALL: Spain 24

4.2.4. Will CALL or MOOCs change the role of language teachers? 31

4.2.4.1. How CALL or MOOCs will change the role of language teachers:
Australia 31

4.2.4.2. How CALL or MOOCs will change the role of language teachers: Spain
33

5. Conclusion 34

References 38

1. Introduction

There are several studies about the use of computer technology in the classroom. However, as we will see in this paper, the tendency has been to focus on the effect of CALL on students rather than on teachers. Hong (2010) and Beatty (2003: 14) explained how the focus was first on whether to use CALL in language learning, and then it shifted to how CALL should be used. Other common topic of interest for researchers has been students' attitudes to using computers in the language classroom, with studies analysing students' motivation and satisfaction using CALL. Some of these studies are, for example, Conole (2008), Sagarra and Zapata (2008), Ushida (2005), Bolaños-Medina and Isern González (2012), Grünewald (2009), Wang (2009), and Aydin and Genç (2011).

The predominance of these topics becomes obvious if we examine works such as Liu et al. (2002), where the authors present a review of the research on CALL from 1990 to 2000. Out of the 70 articles studied by Liu and her colleagues, 44 dealt with the effectiveness of CALL in language teaching vs. traditional teaching, 15 dealt with how to use CALL more efficiently, and the other 11 dealt with students' attitude to using CALL. Even when we review more recent studies, we find that these three key areas continue being the main focus for researchers, as we can see in Aydin and Genç (2011), and in Heift and Schulze (2012: 171). There is, however, one key element which has been ignored to a great degree in most studies despite its importance in the classroom; the teacher.

Teachers and lecturers are the ones in charge of incorporating CALL into their classroom, and as Sagarra and Zapata (2008) explained, the success of CALL is linked to the abilities of the teacher who manages the course. More advanced language learning software can definitely have a big impact on language learning, however, unless the teacher knows how to use that technology well the impact will not necessarily be a positive one. It is clear that language learning software is becoming more advanced in terms of error detection and intelligent feedback, but a different matter is whether or not teachers are excited about those developments. Studies such as Liu (2002), and Sagarra and Zapata (2008) show that attainment and motivation in students who use

CALL are not always higher than those using traditional teaching methods. In some cases the latter outperformed the former, so it looks like teachers have reasons to be wary about this technology. Bearing all this in mind, it seems reasonable to wonder how many teachers use CALL, why they use it, and what they think of it, so that, at least once, we can shift the focus from students' voice to teachers' voice and see what educators think of the issue.

It was with these questions in mind that we designed and now present this study on teachers' perspectives on the use of CALL in Spain and Australia. On the one hand, we wanted to give teachers the opportunity to voice their opinions on the use of CALL, and on the other, we wanted to compare the views of various teachers in these two countries. We chose Spain and Australia because they are two countries with a different background and approach to language learning, and, additionally, as Johnson et al. (2013) said, they are part of the group of countries studied by The New Media Consortium.

2. Research methodology

2.1. Structure of the study

In terms of structure, we have decided to divide the article in five sections.

First of all, we have an introduction to help readers understand the rationale behind the study, and the reasons which made us study CALL from our particular point of view. After that, we have devoted a section to research methodology, so that readers have the opportunity to gain a better understanding of the process we followed to complete our study.

In the third section of the article, we provide the reader with a brief review of the literature on CALL, as we believe that it is important to familiarise oneself with previous studies on the topic to understand where this present study fits. We expect this section to be useful to understand how little emphasis has been given to teachers' voices in the study of CALL and why a study like this was necessary.

We will then give a short introduction about the teachers and lecturers interviewed for our study, although due to personal data issues, we will not be able to identify either the participants or their institutions. However, we believe that a short introduction of the subjects interviewed will be useful in terms of contextualising the environment where different participants work. In this section we will also discuss the information provided by our informants, and we will put this in relation to previous studies when relevant.

In the fifth section we will analyse the information given by our participants, compare teachers' and lecturers' views on CALL, and then present the conclusions of our study. Finally, we will present a list of the reference material we have used to complete our study, where readers might find related articles of interest.

2.2. Methodology followed

To gather the necessary information for this study, one of the researchers interviewed a sample of five teachers in Spain and five in Australia.

The interviews were recorded, and later on transcribed. The length of the interviews varied between 20 and 50 minutes. The involvement in the study was voluntary and confidentiality was assured to all participants.

The interviews were conducted in a friendly and informal manner. The researcher and the participants first engaged in a general conversation covering topics such as teaching loads, levels of the groups taught, etc. to make the participants feel more relaxed, and later on the topic of CALL was brought into the conversation with questions relevant to the study. The participants were all either coordinators or lecturers in languages, and

they all had language teaching experience ranging from 3 to 25 years. Only two of them were working as casual teachers.

All the interviews in Spain were conducted at each participant's office, however, in Australia interviews had to be conducted via Skype.

3. Review of literature

The use of CALL is frequently seen as an effective tool to improve students' involvement. Additionally, it is usually seen as a way of improving students' performance, although as Liu et al. (2002) and Sagarra and Zapata (2008) showed, this is a more controversial matter, as different studies argue about the effectiveness of the use of technology in language learning.

Many institutions try to promote the use of CALL in their courses, up to the point that efficient technology is abandoned for a new one as the new one is seen as more innovative. Johnson et al. (2013) suggest that "any discussion of technology adoption must also consider important constraints and challenges". However, many institutions try to envision the possible advantages of different software for their students and very rarely do they pay attention to the repercussion that this might have on teacher's teaching, as highlighted by Hong (2010).

This lack of consideration of the pressures put on teaching staff can be seen when we review the existing studies on the use of CALL. These investigations mainly deal with the effectiveness of CALL vs. traditional face-to-face teaching, and the attitudes of students towards technology in the language classroom. Some studies carried out in the 1960s and 1970s, such as Barrutia (1964, 1969 and 1970), or Gilman (1969), already showed a tendency to study the effectiveness of a certain CALL application in language teaching. This was also one of the main foci in the 1990s and in more recent years, as we can see in Blake (2000), Cahill and Catanzaro (1997), Chun (1994), Chun and Plass (1996), Davis and Lyman-Hager (1997), Derwing, Munro, and Carbonaro (2000),

González-Edfelt (1990), González-Bueno (2000), Grace (2000), Kasper (2000), Lam (2000), Nagata (1996, 1997, 1998, 1999), Osuna (2000), and Van Handle and Corl (1999), and more recently, in Aydin and Genç (2011), in Heift and Schulze (2012: 28), and Wang and Vásquez (2012).

Another very popular line of enquiry has been studying students' attitudes towards the use of CALL or whether they prefer computer or teacher-led instruction. There are several studies that focus on this, such as Blyth (1999), Bradley and Lomicka (2000), Donaldson and Kotter (1999), Kubola (1999), Lee (1997), Osuna and Meskill (1998), Ulitsky (2000), Ushida (2005), and Wong et al. (2013). Very few recent studies pay attention to teachers' perception on the issue, one of them being Russell et al. (2003) and more recently Kalaja and Ferreira Barcelos (2012). Our study focuses on teachers' use of CALL, however, in our paper we will also consider teachers' attitudes towards technology in language learning.

A review of the literature shows many examples of student voice reports, but not enough studies focusing on teachers' attitudes towards CALL. We believe that our study will help illustrate what teachers have to say about the use of technology in language teaching, as at the end of the day, they are the ones that need to implement this in their classrooms. Sagarra and Zapata (2008) presented some interesting facts in their study, and they concluded that the success of CALL depends on the abilities of the teacher using it, however, many studies, such as Aydin and Genç (2011), and Heift and Schulze (2012: 28) amongst many others, focused on studying the performance of students using CALL, without paying attention to how the relevant teachers implemented this in the classroom.

Sagarra and Zapata (2008) also studied student perception regarding CALL in L2 learning, and the difference in attainment between students using face-to-face instruction only, and those who had had an element of face-to-face learning substituted by a CALL element. They concluded that the results were mixed. Likewise, Nagata (1996) said that the results from different studies do not follow a consistent pattern; they contradict each other. In other words, according to some authors, students prefer face-

to-face instruction to CALL, although other researchers say the opposite. Additionally, in some studies students who used a CALL element outperformed their peers who only used face-to-face instruction, although in others there was no difference in either attainment or preference of instruction. If the level of attainment or motivation is no higher amongst students who use CALL, why was it, and why is it still introduced in so many language classrooms? Is it the choice of their teachers or managers?

In their study regarding preference of instruction and attainment between CALL or traditional face-to-face method, Conole (2008), and Sagarra and Zapata (2008), said that this depends on the teacher's ability to use CALL. This is because many students complained that they failed to see the link between the content in the face-to-face tutorial and the online material. If there is so much pressure to incorporate technology into language teaching, we thought it worthwhile taking a look at the teachers' opinions and level of comfort in using these technologies. If teachers do not want to use them, and they are forced to, are organisations forcing their staff to fail?

It is difficult to predict what the new lines of focus of researchers who study technology in language learning will be, however, Johnson et al. (2013) present some good guesses. They believe that Massively Open Online Courses and the use of tablets in learning will be amongst the main developments in the use of computer-assisted learning in education, so we can foresee an interest in studying how these new technologies are used in language learning.

4. Interviews

4.1. Information about the participants

We interviewed five teachers in Australia and five in Spain as a way of comparing opinions on CALL between these two countries. We have provided below a brief description of each participant in order to gain a better understanding of their

teaching experience, however, due to data protection issues, neither the participants nor their universities will be identified.

First participant [A1]

We will refer to the first participant as A1. She works at an Australian university as a lecturer in Spanish and she also coordinates various subjects, some of which are 100% online. Regarding research interests, A1 is interested in the interrelationship between cultural values and individual emotions, in the sounds of Spanish, and in practical and theoretical translation.

Second participant [A2]

A2 works as a senior lecturer in Spanish and Latin American Studies at a very prestigious university in the south of Australia, and she is also the Spanish convenor. She has extensive teaching experience overseas, and her research focuses on Spanish literature and on gender studies. A2 is also interested in minority languages and cultures of Spain.

Third participant [A3]

A3 has been working as a casual teacher in tertiary education in Australia for almost 10 years. Her research focuses on issues of cultural identity, and she likes using videos and other media resources to provide students with a better understanding of Hispanic culture.

Fourth participant [A4]

A4 has extensive experience working at international schools and universities. Apart from working at a university in Australia, A4 also deals with assessment and marking of official language tests such as DELE (Certificate of Spanish as a Foreign

Language). Furthermore, she also works with private companies, such as airlines, where she provides language training to staff.

Fifth participant [A5]

A5 lectures and coordinates beginners and advanced Spanish courses at a well-known Australian university. She has been working at her current university for three years.

Sixth participant [S1]

S1 is the head of the language Centre at a prestigious private university in Northern Spain. He has more than 20 years of experience in education and has taught in various countries.

Seventh participant [S2]

S2 works as director of a language centre at a very well-known university in Spain, and a high percentage of her students is made of international students on exchange. She has a PhD in Linguistics, and she has teaching and research responsibilities. Her research area focuses on two main topics; new technologies, and the teaching of Spanish as a foreign language.

Eighth participant [S3]

S3 works as a lecturer in the English department of one of the most prestigious universities in Spain. Her research interests are in the teaching of the English language using literature as an educational tool, and in vocabulary acquisition. Her university started offering courses of Spanish as a foreign language in the 1920s, and today it offers one of the broadest ranges of courses in Spanish language and culture, including training for teachers of Spanish as a foreign language.

Ninth participant [S4]

S4 is the director of the language centre of a famous university in the North coast of Spain. She worked for several years at that university as a coordinator for language students, and she has recently been promoted to the post of director.

Tenth participant [S5]

S5 works as head of the department of Spanish as a foreign language at a *Escuela Oficial de Idiomas*, which is a government-owned language school that offers courses to people over the age of 16. S5 is a leading figure in projects related to language teacher training.

4.2. Teachers' perspectives on CALL

We will now present the information gathered during the interviews. The participants' opinions fall, broadly speaking, within three categories, so we have decided to reflect this on the presentation of the article to make the information more accessible to the reader. Furthermore, each of the following sections will be divided into opinions of Australian and of Spanish lecturers, so that we can see more clearly the differences in opinions and approaches between these two countries.

4.2.1. The use of CALL

4.2.1.1. The use of CALL: Australia

Out of the five Australian lecturers interviewed, only one teaches language courses exclusively through the medium of CALL, while the rest of them use CALL to complement face-to-face instruction.

These five participants use electronic resources in their teaching, but they use them differently. A1, A2, and A3 use a textbook in class which has an online component to complement it. Those online resources are used as supportive materials to reinforce what has been covered in tutorials, although A2 and A3's textbooks have a bigger online component. A2 and A3 use them as compulsory online assessments, and they contain quizzes, grammar, and cultural information, as well as extra explanations. Both teachers have given this section a 10% weighting, which is the same percentage as Sagarra and Zapata (2010) used for their online workbook.

A5 also uses online materials in addition to the content of the textbook. She uses a very strong eLearning component in her courses, and this practice is compulsory for lecturers at her institution. A5's students need to do exercises on Blackboard every week and these have a 5% weighting in the final marks for students in levels 1 and 2 (first and second year). For advanced students (third year), A5 only uses online materials to provide information and links to interesting resources, but these students do not have to complete any online assessments.

A4 also uses an eLearning platform to upload all the readings and exercises for the lessons. She has given these a small weighting, although she did not specify what this weighting was. A4's department has created a bank of grammar and listening exercises that are available on their eLearning platform and that they use in their lessons, and they have uploaded all the textbook's multimedia resources to this online platform.

A5's department has also created a bank of resources on an eLearning platform, and students have access to various types of resources, such as exam samples. A5 admitted that they only have a few online listening exercises on their platform, but she said that this is because it is difficult to integrate them into Blackboard.

Additionally, A1 uses eLearning to provide students with information about the course and A2 uses CALL to provide students with feedback on compositions.

All these uses of CALL to complement what has been done in class are in line with the findings presented in Sagarra and Zapata (2010), who said that this is the most popular use of technology in language learning.

A1 teaches two types of students; internal students, who attend face-to-face language lessons, and external students, who only have online lessons. A1's, A2's, A3's, and A4's students can obtain more information on the set work on their eLearning platforms, and A1's external students submit their assignments online. A1 and A3 also use technology to facilitate communication and submission of work to students. A1 uses technology very differently with internal and external students, as with the former ones she mainly uses IT as an administrative tool. A3 also uses the internet for homework, and all set homework is available on the eLearning platform. Likewise, A3 uses the internet to provide students with links to other websites to reinforce what has been covered in class.

A1 made some very interesting comments about her experience teaching external students. Regarding online lessons, these are taught using a video chat programme, where everyone can see each other in a small screen, and students choose whether or not they want others to see them. Everyone talks, and interrupts each other, and the teacher appears on the top right and can use the screen to show documents, such as PowerPoint presentations or PDFs. This programme also offers a chat option, so the teacher talks and types to communicate with the class. There is another screen that works as a whiteboard, where teachers can type and even draw. A1 is unsure about whether the university pays a subscription or has bought the licence to use it, but it is integrated to their website. She thinks that it a great tool, and she describes it as an improved version of Skype. A1 also uses Moodle, so the university has incorporated the video chat programme into their eLearning site.

A1 also explained how everything will change the following year, as they will stop using the textbook and all the materials will be on their website. Students will have to print their own material, so the website will work as a digital book. She sees this as a positive move as she believes that students only use the parts of the book which are

important for assessment, (about 30% of the book). In this way, students can save money and lecturers can add sections from old books to their eLearning platform.

A1 also pointed out some very interesting differences between internal and external students. She said that internal students do not read the cultural notes or anything that does not reflect directly on their final marks, and even though they have access to forums and to the same online resources as external students, they never use them. A1 believes that this is due to lack of motivation, and she thinks that internal students are less responsible, and that they need to be guided at all times, whilst external students find the information by themselves and are more proactive.

A1's university has started to give more importance to the role of technology in learning, and as a result lecturers have to include online assessments in their courses, which is why the online component is now compulsory, and its weighting has gone up from 5% to 10%.

A2's and A4's students have access to computers in language labs and they can study and do online exercises from home. Students can also watch DVDs and Youtube clips outside of lessons to complement the work they do in the class. A3 uses films as an important part of the course, and these are available for students on their eLearning site. A4 uses the projector and interactive whiteboard in lessons, and they have some resources available for teachers. Finally, A5 also uses interactive whiteboards, although in her department the interactive boards are being changed for new ones, as the latter ones are considered more innovative and technologically superior.

4.2.1.2. The use of CALL: Spain

S1 teaches courses of 4 hours per week and of 5 hours per week spread over two days, and his students have access to some lectures online. As opposed to the Australian

teachers, he has not made any other contents available to his students online as he says that nobody asks for it. He says that he is not totally against blended learning, and explained how the person who was in charge of the Language Centre for 15 years did not introduced any blended learning. Now S1 is taking over the department, and he does not know if he will be interested in it as he has seen examples of how blended learning does not work very well. Sagarra and Zapata (2008), and other works studied in Liu (2002), support his opinion, as they give examples where CALL does not always improve student performance. Stracke (2007) also explained how some students had dropped out of courses because CALL was not being used well.

S2 teaches a variety of courses, such as conversational or business courses. The length of the courses varies, and the ones focused on conversation are the shortest, lasting around 20 hours. As opposed to S1, S2 uses an eLearning platform; Moodle. At S2's university, teachers have freedom regarding how much CALL they use in their courses. Some teachers use this platform to upload extra activities to complement what is done in lessons, such as exercises and videos, which is similar to what the Australian lecturers do. The use of CALL is not compulsory at S2's university, and if teachers decide to use online assessments they can choose the weighting.

In S2's department teachers are responsible for their own subject, and they have to produce their own guides to their courses. Teachers who teach the same levels can agree on how to teach a subject, but they do not have to. They have freedom to teach their lessons as they want although they all have to use the same exam at the end of the course. In the subject guide lecturers know what contents they have to include but they can teach it as they want, and because of all this freedom eLearning does not have a specific weighting in the department. S2's department uses online exams devised by Oxford University Press, but these are only used as placement tests.

Unlike S1, S4 does not upload lectures to an online platform, but she has used some books of Spanish as a foreign language which came with a subscription to a website where students could find extra materials. S4 thinks that most publishers do this these days and that is why she thinks that eLearning will become more important in language teaching. She explained how Instituto Cervantes now offers several online courses for

teachers, and how their catalogue of courses is increasing every year, and now they even have an online course for teachers who want to teach over the internet. S4 told us how this is something that Spanish universities are starting to do as well, as many courses which were previously delivered face-to-face are now being taught online in partnership with Instituto Cervantes, such as Masters degrees. Apart from courses, Instituto Cervantes has a section on its website which is free, where they have online activities such as listening and samples of past exams.

S5 has taught at two universities, and courses are always taught face-to-face. She taught some intensive courses in one of the universities she worked at in Northern Spain and these courses were around 4 or 5 hours per day for two weeks. In terms of course content, S5 uses the European Framework for Languages, where it is explained what content students should be familiar with, and she accesses information on this framework on the Instituto Cervantes website. At S5's current university the online work does not have to carry a certain weighting, although at her previous university, only a few kilometres away from her current one, teachers had to use eLearning and these activities had some weighting in the final mark. At her current university, teachers are the ones who decide the weighting, and it is totally up to the teacher to use eLearning as an assessment method. At her previous university, all teachers had to follow instructions on how to work out the final mark, although she thinks that there is much more freedom at other universities.

S5 uses interactive whiteboards and videos in class. There is a library where students can use computers and S5 recommends websites to her students to practise what they have learnt in class. They do not have enough computers for all students, but they have a multimedia room which can be booked for the whole class, although students prefer to go outside of lesson times when it is convenient for them. For Spanish, they use the online programme of Instituto Cervantes, as the regional government has an agreement with this organisation. Furthermore, S3 says that there are times when she has used Skype, but she found herself doing all the talking instead of the students.

Once again, we see how CALL is used to complement what has been done in class, which Sagarra and Zapata (2010) identified as the most popular use of technology in language learning.

4.2.2. Teachers' positive attitudes towards CALL

4.2.2.1. Teachers' positive attitudes towards CALL: Australia

A1 says that her external students perform better than the ones that attend face-to-face lessons, however, she believes that this is due to the characteristics of both students. She says that internal students are “*younger, lazier, much more dependent [on the teacher], less motivated and less organised*”. She believes that to succeed in language learning you need to be motivated and have a good self-discipline, so that is why external students perform better, because they are more mature and more motivated than internal ones. A2 also considers motivation an important factor for the success of CALL. She says that her students find eLearning useful, but she thinks that this is because they need very good grades to go to her university, so students are usually very organised and hard-working, and they want to do well. A1 thinks that CALL works well for motivated and independent students, but not very well for other type of students, which is an opinion also presented in Dörnyei and Skehan (2003: 589).

A3 says that her students like using eLearning because it is an environment they feel comfortable with and they find its content very valuable for their learning. It is interesting to see that this observation is in line with the findings of Kern (1995), who, as Sagarra and Zapata (2008) explained, showed that “chat discussions increased self-confidence when using the target language, because online environments allow students to make mistakes without being embarrassed”. However, A3, A4, and A5 say that they do not know how many of their students would still use their eLearning platform if it did not have any weighting in the final mark. A3 thinks that students will generally do what they have to do, as some students are self-motivated, and find that eLearning is useful for learning at home, but she thinks that students will do more if the work is given some weighting. A5 explained that her students do exercises on Blackboard, but

only because these have a 5% weighting in the final mark. She also thinks that they would not do it if it did not count for their final mark, as some students do not complete it in spite of its current weighting.

A4's students enjoy doing online exercises, and they usually complete them, although this might be because she always reminds her students of the importance of submitting this work. A4 thinks that the exercises are interactive, that they promote participation among students, and that they make things more entertaining for them. Teachers can monitor if students are completing the exercises and when, and she thinks that they are a good tool. These opinions on motivation are in line with the conclusions reached by Adair-Hauck et al. (1999), Cahill and Catanzaro (1997), Lee (1998), and Soo and Ngeow (1998), and more recently by O'Dowd (2010). However, according to the experience of our informants, the success depends more on the type of student than on the method they use to learn the language. This is what A2 had in mind when she said that CALL only works at her institution because of the type of students they have.

A2 and A5 say that students like the online component, and that these make them study more regularly. A5 also thinks that these materials make her students work harder and more independently, although students have a forum where they can ask questions if they need further help. A2's and A5's students also like the fact that they get automated feedback on their exercise, which is also an advantage highlighted in Heift and Schulze (2012: 155). This is also a positive aspect that Sagarra and Zapata (2008) identified in their study, and, as they said, "immediate feedback, multiple opportunities for improvement and the extensive and overt practice that online environments provide, convert procedural into declarative knowledge faster, and promote L2 learning". A2 and A5 think that online exercises work particularly well for precision with grammar and vocabulary exercises, and A5 thinks this is because they are quite repetitive, and they do not want to do them in class, as they prefer more communicative exercises in lessons. A5 also admits that there are some types of exercises, such as dialogues, that she prefers to do face-to-face in class. These opinions are in line with what Nagata (1996) found out, as due to limitations on current CALL systems, automated feedback is limited to certain types of exercises, e.g. gap fillings, translations, listening exercises. A2 thinks

that CALL really makes students study more regularly, and she thinks that 70% of her students would still use it even if it was not part of the assessment. As Heift and Schulze (2012:11) said “these types of programs do not necessarily provide any language material, but rather empower the learner to use or understand language.”

A1 also pointed out another advantage of incorporating CALL into her teaching. Her students usually complain about the price of the language course and of the book on top of it, so A1 will upload the necessary materials on Moodle. This means that CALL has made resources cheaper and, indirectly, has increased students’ satisfaction. In terms of making things cheaper, A1 says that 10 years ago they had to post cassettes to students doing their distance learning courses, so CALL has made it cheaper and more hassle free for everyone.

A2 says that teachers in her department do not face many challenges with new technologies; tutors in her department know how to deal with technology problems, and they also have IT support. This supports the idea presented by Hong (2010), according to which, the success or failure of CALL depends on the IT skills of the teachers who use it. Likewise, this problem is also identified in O’Dowd (2010), and Johnson et al. (2013) explained it saying that:

“Several important challenges are explained below, but it was clear that behind them all was a pervasive sense that individual organizational constraints are likely the most important factors in any decision to adopt—or not to adopt—a given technology”.

Finally, A2, A4, and A5 also think that CALL provides students with greater flexibility about when to complete their assignments, and even though there are set deadlines, all of them can complete the work when it best suits them. This is why, despite the difficulties that CALL might cause, A4 thinks that the advantages outweigh the disadvantages.

4.2.2.2. Teachers’ positive attitudes towards CALL: Spain

As some of the teachers in Australia, S1 also commented on the relationship between CALL and motivation. S1 said that students who are really motivated are going to use

online materials anyway. There are enough materials available online, so CALL is seen in his department as an opportunity to expand on what has been covered in lessons. This is a similar approach to that of the five Australian teachers in the previous section, who also like using CALL to expand on book activities.

S2, on the other hand, works at a university where using eLearning is compulsory and this can be useful for students with very specific needs or to complete work that they would not have time to complete in class. S2 also thinks that a positive element is that eLearning offers students independence, an opinion also expressed in Jones (2001), and in Sagarra and Zapata (2008). S2 also says that in Spain there are various online courses for teachers, and she likes doing them online as that way she does not have to travel anywhere, thus saving time and money. This view of CALL as a tool that makes learning cheaper and more accessible is also something that A1 mentioned. S2 also thinks that you have more flexibility doing a course online than doing it face-to-face, as you do not have to stick to a timetable, and you can organise your own time. This is an opinion that S2 has in common with A2, A4, and A5.

Finally, S2 thinks that CALL can be useful to give students something different to what they get in face-to-face lessons, and S5 believes that an advantage of using eLearning is that students can work with and without the supervision of teachers. However, as Nagata (1996) explained, there is a limit in terms of what type of work students can use CALL for.

4.2.3. Teachers' negative attitudes towards CALL

4.2.3.1. Teachers' negative attitudes towards CALL: Australia

Regarding negative points about the use of CALL in language learning, A1 says that she has learnt very much about it, but that it has been exhausting. Apart from her students in face-to-face lessons, she also has several students spread around the world, and

sometimes she has had problems receiving and opening documents. She thinks that as a teacher, one needs much more self-discipline to work online. She knows that students doing distance-learning courses at other universities have had pre-recorded videos of the lessons taught face-to-face to other students, so they are going to do the same next year for their distance-learning students. A1 says that she uses jokes, non-verbal language, and laughter in face-to-face communication with her students, but she is concerned that it will be a challenge to incorporate these in online teaching. She also admits that in order to teach online she has had to be more meticulous to communicate with students and to reply to emails, always trying to give students, as she puts it, “*constant little bits of digital presence*”.

In the distance-learning courses that A1 teaches tutorials are not compulsory, but students have to follow them as these are their only chance to hear some Spanish, so accessibility to *real* Spanish can be another problem of these distance-learning courses. This is why A1 organises impromptu tutorials apart from the compulsory ones, because it works out better for her. Additionally, A1 finds it hard not being able to answer student questions immediately, and she thinks that she has to be much more disciplined as a teacher to reply to students on time.

A4 thinks that CALL has made many more materials available to students, and as a teacher she needs to be much more prepared to know what is available to students online and make resources available on the eLearning platform. A4 also thinks that even though students have several online materials, they still like having face-to-face interactions and asking questions to teachers in person. Other studies, such as Ayres (2002), Stepp-Greany (2002), and Sagarra and Zapata (2008) also support the value of face-to-face interaction.

A5 started her interview by saying that at her university they are changing their current whiteboards for those of another company, so this technological update will make things more difficult for teachers. A5 does not think that CALL motivates students more, and she gives a couple of examples to support this. She thinks that students would stop completing online exercises if these did not carry a weighting, as currently some students do not do them even though they are 5% of their final mark. She is also

concerned because sometimes students complain saying that they do not have access to the internet, so students can find excuses not to do their work. She also explained how she put questions on the eLearning platform for students to record their answers and then A5 recorded her feedback and passed it on to students. She said that this was being used to push their marks up, but out of 200 students only a few did it.

A5 said that in her department they do not have many online listening exercises because she finds it is difficult to incorporate them into the eLearning platform. A5 also thinks that eLearning requires much more work from the teacher, as you need to plan how this fits into the lessons. Stracke (2007) also talked about this, showing how students can decide to drop out of courses when CALL has not been effectively incorporated with face-to-face lessons.

A5 has put up some work on their online platform to make things look more *modern*, but it has not always worked when she has tried to put it in practice. She believes that sometimes online materials need more work to be developed, managed, and marked. A5's perception of CALL is clearly linked to Mumtaz (2000), Penuel (2006), and Hong (2010), who set a strong connection between teacher's confidence using IT and their attitude towards the use of CALL in the classroom.

4.2.3.2. Teachers' negative attitudes towards CALL: Spain

The Basque government has invested great amounts of money over the last few years in teaching Euskerathrough CALL, but S1 thinks that this has been "*a waste*", as students are not motivated by CALL. S1 doesn't think they have achieved what they were supposed to, and he calls it "*a big failure*". S2 also talks about lack of motivation from students when it comes to IT, and she believes that the only way of getting students to complete online work is making it compulsory.

S5 has a similar opinion, as she says that students are not enthusiastic about eLearning. There is going to be a trial of an electronic portfolio in her department, which is a EU

initiative. S5 explained how this used to be done on paper, and even though it is electronic now students think it is nonsense, “*Students do not show any interest in it and they do not like it*”. She thinks that students will only do it if it has some weighting.

S1 also believes that CALL is only fashionable at the time because it is new technology. He thinks that everyone gets enthusiastic about CALL and then disappointed, and that everybody loses interest in it after a couple of years. His opinion is that blended language teaching goes well for three years or so, but it then goes down. He believes that the main reason why it fails is because of lack of motivation of the students. This belief in motivation as a key element for the success or failure of CALL is also shared with A1 and A2, and it is also supported by the findings of studies such as Hong (2010), and Ushida (2005). Additionally, S1 also thinks that eLearning is a very passive way of learning, and that the only way to learn a language is through active learning.

Instead of relying on CALL, S1 suggests teaching more dynamic classes and to be selective with the activities that are done in lessons. In S1’s opinion, eLearning is only a more complicated and extensive way of doing things. He added that if students come to class the learning is dynamic and there is interaction, but that if they go online to do their work that is no better than using a computer or a book by themselves, making learning non-interactive. S2 presents a similar opinion, as she says that students are interested in face-to-face learning and in having human interaction, which is what S1 referred to earlier. S2 also thinks that students are more motivated in lessons, as they have their classmates there.

S4 has a similar opinion. She believes that students are more reluctant to using technology in language learning than teachers, and S3 thinks that students do not welcome these types of changes. Even though they have been born in a generation which is extremely familiar with technology, they still prefer grammar lessons, gap fillings, and communicative activity, which is what teachers are used to. They can use CALL, but they still need rely on their teacher for many aspects of the course, such as for explanations. Students also think that teacher’s language is alive and more authentic. This is the reasoning behind S4’s department’s policy, which asks for 90% attendance from their students. S4 added that she knows people in other institutions who have spent

time creating online activities, such as blogs, and students do not participate much in them. S5 also thinks that students prefer face-to-face learning, and she gave an example to prove the lack of effectiveness of CALL; she made some online work available to students but students were not too interested, although she thinks that this may be due to the fact that maybe CALL was not being used properly. These views of CALL as an ineffective tool due to the lack of teachers' competence are analysed in detail by Hong (2010). Conole (2008) expressed a similar concern, as she explained how:

“Only one person on the survey mentioned VLE as one of the four technologies they like to use most, and ten listed a VLE as a dislike. Critical factors appear to be whether the VLE is well designed and structured, how relevant the information on the VLE is to the students' needs and the degree to which it is really embedded into the culture of the course”.

The effects of ineffective embedding of CALL into a course were studied in Stracke (2007), who showed how some students had decided to drop out of their courses because of this.

Sagarra and Zapata (2010) presented similar opinions to those above:

“Green and Youngs (2001) reported that attending a face-to-face class three hours per week and completing online activities resulted in the same levels of student satisfaction as attending class four hours per week”.

Additionally, Chenoweth and Murday (2003) reported higher levels of satisfaction in students who had had four in-class contact hours per week instead of having one 20-minute face-to-face lesson with a native speaker plus CALL activities.

S5 also prefers face-to-face teaching, however, attending lessons is not compulsory at her university. She complained that many students do not do their homework, although she thinks that this is because they are foreign students studying in Spain, and they learn Spanish through immersion within the country. S5 still thinks that it is difficult for students to pass if they do not attend lessons, which shows her preference for face-to-face lessons.

Regarding various technologies, S1 explained how CDs were used at the beginning, and how they were supposed to be interactive but they are now obsolete. He believes that

the best way to learn a language is from feedback from the trainer on how to read, write, listen and speak, and he is dubious that these skills will be developed better if they were done online. S1 complains that in his 25 years of teaching he has seen many different names for materials, and tendencies have come and gone. He explained that the only way in which he has seen people learn languages is through face-to-face lessons, being motivated by a good teacher. Furthermore, he does not believe that doing work online is the way to be productive.

S1 explains how now language laboratories and eLearning are fashionable, but that it was videos before that. However, he thinks that the key element in language learning is the teacher's skills, which Hong (2010) also defends. He thinks that teachers can motivate students, but he is unsure that CALL can do that. In his opinion, one of the problems is that nowadays eLearning is so fashionable that you do not look like a good teacher if you do not use technology in language teaching.

S1 is also concerned about the fact that teachers already have too much work to do, and eLearning only increases their workloads. S2 also has a concern regarding workload, as she thinks that to work with CALL you must offer interesting activities and different ones to what you offer in your face-to-face lessons. S3 also mentions the problem of workload, and she says that university teachers already have to produce more research, teach more lessons, and do much more paperwork than before, and that all that is coming with reductions in salary. S3 and S5 firmly believe that eLearning increases teachers' workload. Additionally, S3 and S5 think that students abuse the email system, and they complain saying that replying to all the emails they receive is too time-consuming. At the same time, S3 says that students are getting more demanding and less independent, to the point that they ask about information that is somewhere else instead of looking for it. Similarly to A1, S1 thinks that eLearning turns teachers into administrators, and teachers' real skills are wasted when they have to spend time using eLearning. Furthermore, people that teach, for example, 25 hours a week, will not have any time left to dedicate to real teaching if they spend time managing eLearning, as they also have to do other duties like planning and marking work. Different researchers have studied these issues, such as Weikart and Marrapodi (1999), who studied lack of

teachers support from schools, Becker (1994), and Wozney et al. (2006), who looked into school workload issues.

Sagarra and Zapata (2008) also mention the issue of workload, but in their study students are the ones that complain about it, as they say that it takes too long to complete online exercises because of having to insert symbols, accents, etc. Students also say that it would be easier to have all the resources on one site, instead of on various platforms.

S1 and S5 think that teachers lack IT skills and that they are not enthusiastic about CALL. S5 thinks that there is lack of training, which is exactly the conclusion presented in Hong (2010) and one of the issues highlighted in O'Dowd (2010). Johnson et al. (2013) had this in mind when they said that: "Faculty training still does not acknowledge the fact that digital media literacy continues its rise in importance as a key skill in every discipline and profession".

S1 thinks that the system creates a problem if a teacher does not have a good set of IT skills. He thinks that if a teacher has very good skills as a face-to-face teacher this kind of teaching will work better than online teaching. Once again, this opinion matches the ones presented in Hong (2010).

Sagarra and Zapata (2008) made an interesting comment about this:

"Stracke (2007) reported on the fact that some L2 students choose to drop L2 courses with a technology component, and she investigated the reasons why this might happen. She interviewed three students who had decided to stop attending two computer-enhanced L2 Spanish and French classes, and she discovered that the main reasons behind their decision had been lack of instructor support and print material and failure to see a connection between face-to-face instruction and CALL components. As with the participants in the studies by Ayres (2002) and Stepp-Greany (2002), the three students interviewed by Stracke expressed their preference for a face-to-face class with no CALL component."

Sagarra and Zapata (2008) also talked about teachers' IT skills and about the needs to create a clear relationship between face-to-face lessons and online content:

"These suggestions are also supported by other researchers such as Barr (2004), MacDonald (2006), and Neumeier (2005) who believe that poorly planned face-to-face and CALL L2 classes can result in low student satisfaction and can influence the fate of this type of course when it comes to incorporating CALL into language teaching."

As Hong says, for language teachers to integrate CALL into their teaching, L2 teachers need “to experience and become familiar with the use of available CALL technologies during their teacher education (Hubbard and Levy 2006b; Hughes 2005, Kassen et al. 2007)”.

All these comments seem to indicate that teachers need more training to incorporate CALL successfully into their teaching. Lam (2000), also comments on this, saying that “teachers’ lack of knowledge about using computers and lack of training for integrating computer technology into the classroom were related to their reluctance to use computer technology in the classroom”.

Furthermore, as Hong (2010) explains :

“The increasing attention to L2 teachers’ technology education and the national guidelines concerning technology integration notwithstanding, several researchers note that there is still an insufficient number and quality of courses and workshops that integrate technology education into L2 teacher education programs (Hubbard, 2008; Kessler, 2006, Oxford and Jung 2007).”

The views of our Spanish participants on the use of CALL may look rather negative to start with, however, it is worth noticing that the issues they complain about are also presented by various researchers. Mumtaz (2000) and Penuel (2006) reported factors that influence teacher’s use of computer technology in the classroom, such as their formal technology training experience, their attitude toward computer technology, and the availability of technology resources and technical support in the school. Likewise, Johnson et al. (2013) said that “Too often it is education’s own processes and practices that limit broader uptake of new technologies”.

It is interesting to notice how S1 also talks about the pressure to incorporate CALL into teaching. He complains that eLearning is used as a magical word that sounds very modern, that institutions promote it because it makes them sound good and up-to-date, and that it would look unprofessional if teachers were not using CALL in their lessons.

Regarding different types of CALL, S1 claims that Virtual Learning Environments are not more than traditional resources, and that language learning is real communication,

not online communication. He also believes that everything will have changed in 10 years' time, and that he really believes that the only way in which people will still be learning a language well will be with a real teacher.

S1 expressed a concern about the fact that teachers are spending too much time learning about a technology that will be forgotten in a couple of years, and he is convinced that using an audiocassette is as efficient as CALL. He thinks that teachers might experiment with CDs, email learning, and Skype learning, but that people will always go back to face-to-face teaching as it is the only way forward.

S2 presents a slightly more positive view on the use of technology in language learning, however, she thinks that CALL can be a complement, but not a replacement to face-to-face teaching. S2 thinks that it is important to link the activities done in lessons with the online work. Interestingly enough, this is what staff failed to do in Stracke (2007), and the reason why some students did not like the use of technology in language teaching, and ended up dropping out of language courses. S2 thinks that students can watch a video online and then discuss it in class, as students can compare their notes, but that CALL has some limitations and the only way of using CALL at home working with a video would be with closed questions, which is a concern that Nagata (1996) explained. In S2's opinion, these activities could have some weighting in the final mark. Again, we have the idea that it is important to give marks for online work, as otherwise students will not do it.

S3 raises an interesting concern, and that is the inability to know whether the work submitted through CALL has been produced by the actual student or if it has been done by a friend or another classmate. She also thinks that the mechanisms available to detect plagiarism are not enough to prevent it. On a similar note, S5 is also concerned about the inability for teachers to check whether or not their students complete certain types of online activities.

S4 thinks that one of the main issues are technological problems. This is linked to the findings of Mumtaz (2000) and Penuel (2006), who identified these type of problems as one of the key issues that affected the appropriate implementation of CALL in teaching.

Nagata (1996) concluded that “as suggested by Pederson and Dunkel, the present study also confirms that the use of a medium (i.e., computer) alone does not bring better effects; rather the quality of the messages produced by the medium affects the result”. This supports the beliefs of S1, S2, Sagarra and Zapata (2008), Hong (2010), and Johnson et al. (2013), who identify the need of more training on CALL for teachers, which could change teachers’ negative perspectives on CALL in a very radical way.

4.2.4. Will CALL or MOOCs¹ change the role of language teachers?

The final question that our participants were asked was if they thought that technology had changed or would change the role of teachers and, once again, there were some interesting opinions.

4.2.4.1. How CALL or MOOCs will change the role of language teachers: Australia

A1 is against “inflexible teaching” now. She likes teaching to be interactive, with human interaction, and with improvisation and flexibility depending on the students’ needs, which is why she prefers face-to-face teaching. A1 complained about the corporatisation of universities, as she believes that these were developed to give a service, not as a business, which is how they seem to operate nowadays. A1 is expecting a big change with the new head of languages, and consistency is going to improve amongst staff in the programme. A1 explained how when they discarded the oral component in their courses students’ needs increased in terms of getting more oral practice. Now that they are offering courses entirely through the medium of CALL this has become an issue, as they find it hard to offer students the opportunity of practising their speaking skills.

On the other hand, A2 says that what they do at her university in terms of IT is not very sophisticated. A2 said that students saw teachers as a very important point of contact

¹Massive Open Online Courses.

and she does not think that online components will replace teachers in the classroom. In her opinion, the role of teachers has not changed as CALL is only a small component of the course. A2's students still want grammar taught face-to-face in class, so she does not think that CALL will replace teachers.

A3 thinks that CALL has put some pressure on teachers, as it requires them to be better informed and up-to-date on computer-assisted learning developments and practices. According to A3, the role of the teacher is changing, but face-to-face teaching is still extremely important in language learning, and this has not diminished the role of teachers. A3 also believes that technology changes very quickly, and as a result it is a challenge to teach effectively face-to-face. These days teachers focus on those aspects which would be very difficult for students to work on by themselves, such as speaking practice, but other components are taught through CALL. It is interesting to see how this is the approach also suggested by Nagata (1996).

CALL has changed A4's teaching as she needs to find different materials to offer variety, such as songs or films. She also believes that teachers need to play with technology to attract students, and make contents more appealing to them. She also acknowledges that this is the case especially when students are young, and as a result teachers need to be more creative, innovative, and enthusiastic. Despite all this, A4 still uses board games and big posters because students need to be entertained while they learn. They already have technology at home, so she feels like she needs to offer them something different, such as monopoly or other classic games. According to A4, if students play using computers they are just playing on their own, and they do not use the language to socialise, on the other hand, they do use language in lessons. This view is similar to S1's.

A5 recognises that CALL is an interesting topic, but she also thinks that universities are obsessed with it. However, she does not think that the role of teachers will change much. In A5's opinion, the most important aspect in face-to-face lessons is to give students the chance to practice what they have learnt. For this, she suggests using communicative activities where the teacher gives some input and students take over the lesson, using the vocabulary and grammar they have learnt to communicate in a range

of everyday situations. A5 says that she uses very interactive exercises in lessons so that students can talk and realise their mistakes, which is very important, and up to this day, CALL cannot offer that kind of support to students.

4.2.4.2. How CALL or MOOCs will change the role of language teachers: Spain

S1 is convinced that the only way people will really learn a language is if they have a real teacher. He also believes that spending a great amount of time trying to learn about a type of technology that will be forgotten in a few years is a “*waste of time*”. In his opinion, new teachers only want eLearning, but he gives more importance to other skills. He wonders what the difference is to have an audiocassette as opposed to using an online platform, and he wonders whether we are too dependent on CALL. Finally, S1 justifies his opinions by saying that in the language classroom we have had audiocassettes, videos, CD-ROMs, eLearning, and Skype, and although these have been helpful, everybody has gone back to face-to-face teaching as it is the only way to learn a language.

S2 has a similar attitude to CALL as A3. She thinks that it is better to plan online activities in relation to what has been done in class, and then use face-to-face lesson to solve doubts. As A3 suggested, an effective way to use CALL is using it for the easier parts of the language learning process and then use face-to-face lessons for the most difficult components. This is similar to what Nagata (1996) said, that CALL can help with easier or specific part of language learning, but not with all. It is interesting to see how S2 thinks that giving students too many materials and online work does not help students, as students will then think that face to face lessons are not important and are redundant, as all the work will be online. This belief suggests that teachers can potentially be made redundant once CALL is totally widespread.

S2 believes that it is very difficult to substitute face-to-face lessons by technology, as students want face-to-face lessons, and they want to be in touch with people who speak the foreign language. People like talking and face-to-face lessons, and they try to travel to attend those lessons. She thinks that online lessons will not have that much impact as

people prefer to have face-to-face contact. As Sagarra and Zapata (2008) explain, “it is important to note that 89% of the participants deemed the presence of the instructor important for the success of CALL activities and learning”, meaning that students will always need teachers, which is a similar idea to that supported by S2 and A3.

According to S4, the European Framework of Reference for Languages promotes independence amongst students. She explained that she has many friends teaching Spanish outside of Spain and that she thinks that CALL is used much more abroad. However, she thinks that the Bologna protocol is increasing uniformity amongst universities, and that this will put pressure on staff to increase the level of use of CALL. Students can work with CALL, but they need great amount of support from a teacher, such as explanations. Finally, S4 says that she has always taught face-to-face lessons, never online, but she thinks that this will change in the future.

5. Conclusion

The information gathered during our interviews shows some interesting differences and similarities between teachers’ perspectives on CALL in Australia and Spain.

Regarding how teachers use technology in language learning, the most common use is as a complement to what is done in lessons, providing students with extra materials or information. Our participants use face-to-face teaching for those areas students find most difficult, and they leave CALL for other areas that students find easier. This approach matches the one suggested by Nagata (1996). Some participants also use CALL as an assessment tool, and only A1 teaches courses entirely through it.

The main advantages identified about the use of CALL are that it promotes independence in students and that it offers them flexibility. A4, A5, and S1 see CALL as creative and innovative, but S1 expresses an interesting opinion, saying that CALL puts pressure on teachers to incorporate it into their teaching.

The main disadvantage found by our participants is that the use of technology in language learning increases the workload of teachers, not only when it comes to managing CALL in a course, but also when it comes to learning how to use it. A4 and A5 do not consider CALL to be very important, and apart from that, all the participants from Spain also said that students are not too interested in using technologies in their studies. S1 also believes that CALL is expensive, and that the results which can be obtained are not worth the investment. Another issue that came up in the responses was the lack of support and training by their institutions, which is a problem also reported in Weikart and Marrapodi (1999), Hong (2010), and in Johnson et al. (2013).

When the participants were asked about the future of language teachers, they thought that even though technology can be helpful if incorporated into teaching, teachers will always be needed, at least in languages, because of the nature of the subject. They thought that CALL can only be used for certain types of exercises and course components, but not for those that students usually find more difficult, such as speaking. These beliefs were also the conclusions reached by Nagata (1996). Finally, it is also curious to see how only those participants who are more familiar with the use of CALL think that technology will change the role of teachers in the future.

One common perception of CALL is that it forces teachers and students to be more responsible and better organised. All our participants commented on the need for students to be motivated in order to use CALL effectively, so this method of instruction might not suit all types of learners. Likewise, CALL does not suit all types of teachers.

It is important to notice how our Australian participants show a much more positive attitude towards CALL than the Spanish ones. A1 and A3 show a very positive attitude towards the use of technology in language teaching, and, even though A2, A4, and A5 are also positive about it, they also recognise that the use of CALL comes with some challenges. Regarding the Spanish teachers, S1, S3, and S4 show a negative attitude towards CALL, and S2 and S5 are somewhat in the middle, with a balanced view of advantages and disadvantages. Mumtaz (2000), Penuel (2006), and Hong (2010) talk

about the relationship between previous IT skills and school support with attitude towards CALL, so this could be the reason why Australian teachers feel more positive about CALL, because they also use it more than their Spanish counterparts. S4 believes that CALL is used much more outside of Spain, so this seems to back her opinion.

One of the reasons that teachers give not to use CALL is that it is not important, and that it does not have much of a positive impact on students' learning. This has been studied extensively by several researchers, and authors like Liu et al. (2002), and Sagarra and Zapata (2008) explain how studies show opposing evidence regarding the effectiveness of CALL compared to traditional teaching. However, it would be interesting to add Hattie's findings to the equation. After analysing 50,000 studies, involving over 240 million students in total, Hattie (2012) produced a table with the effect size of various interventions and techniques on student learning. He concluded that educators should try to use those interventions with an effect size over 0.4, and according to his study, computer-assisted instruction has an impact size of 0.31. If we considered Hattie's findings, the old debate on whether computer-assisted instruction is more effective than face-to-face instruction would be redundant, as even if computer-assisted instruction was proved to be more effective, the effect of this on students would not make it a strong enough factor in learning.

While other participants defended the importance of the language teacher against the use of CALL, S1 and S2 talked specifically about the need to offer *un toque humano* (human interaction –literally *a human touch*–). It could be that the use of CALL in Spain is being halted by Spanish cultural values, which give great importance to human interaction and personal relationships.

All of our teachers, except A1, are unhappy about having to incorporate more CALL elements in their language teaching. They believe that they would do a much better job if they continued using their skills as face-to-face teachers. However, their organisations are asking them for a change. If an organisation forces its staff to embrace CALL against their will, are they setting themselves up to fail just, as S1 would put it, to follow institutional peer-pressure to look more up-to-date? Are institutions preventing

teachers from using their good face-to-face skills, and instead asking them to just try to do what they can using CALL? If that is the case, one wonders whether it would not be wiser for institutions to recognise teachers as professionals and give them more freedom about how much they use CALL in their teaching. As Johnson et al. (2013) explain, “any discussion of technology adoption must also consider important constraints and challenges”. Taking all this into account, it would be beneficial to urge institutions to consult with teachers rather than to impose the use of technology in language learning, giving each individual staff a choice depending on his or her strengths as a teacher. We are not advocating leaving teachers who have no knowledge of CALL out of the loop, but giving them the option on whether to take CALL on board or not, and if they decide to do so, then offer them the support and training that Hong (2010), and Johnson et al. (2013) identified as necessary and missing in many institutional plans.

We can conclude that three facts have become clear in this study. Firstly, the more IT-skilled teachers are, the more they use CALL and the happier they are with the use of computer-assisted instruction in their teaching; likewise, their students enjoy CALL more. Secondly, if we want to make sure that our students take CALL on board and use these resources, we have to give these exercises certain weighting in the final mark. Finally, all of our participants think that CALL does not work as well in languages because of the nature of the subject, resorting to the long-existing stereotype that *languages are different*.

Our participants are currently in a situation where they will have to use computer-assisted instruction more in their teaching, and we believe that this could be used as an opportunity for a real-time study. As Hong (2010) said, the more previous IT experience teachers have, the more likely they are to use CALL and to be happier with it. We plan to interview our participants again in two years' time in order to see if their views on CALL have changed, and if so, what has caused this.

References

- Adair-Hauck, B., Willingham-Mclain, L., and Youngs, B.E. (1999). "Evaluating the integration of technology and second language learning". *CALICO Journal*, 17 (2), 269-306.
- Aydin, S. and Genç, G. (2011). "Students' motivation toward computer-based language learning". *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 20 (2), 171-189.
- Ayres, R. (2002). "Learner attitudes towards the use of CALL". *Computer assisted Language Learning*, 15, 241-249.
- Barr, D. (2004). "Students and ICT: An analysis of student reaction to the use of computer technology in language learning. *IALL Journal of Language Learning Technologies*, 36 (2), 19-38.
- Barrutia, R. (1964) "A suggested Automated Branch Program for Foreign Languages". *Hispania*, 7 (2), 343-350.
- Barrutia, R. (1969). *Linguistic Theory of Language Learning as Related to Machine Teaching*. Heidelberg: Julius GroosVerlag.
- Barrutia, R. (1970). "Two approaches to self-instructional Language study: Computerized foreign Language Instruction". *Hispania* 53, 361-371.
- Beatty, K. (2003). *Teaching and researching Computer-assisted Language Learning*. London: Pearson Education.
- Blake, R. (2000). "Computer mediated communication: A window on L2 Spanish interlanguage". *Language Learning and Technology*, 4 (1), 120-136.
- Blyth, C. (1999). "Implementing technology in the foreign language curriculum: Redefining the boundaries between language and culture". *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 20 (1), 39-58.
- Bolaños-Medina, A. and Isern González, J. (2012) "Análisis de las actitudes de los estudiantes hacia las herramientas informáticas de traducción asistida". *Sendebarr23*, 275 - 300.

- Bradley, T., and Lomicka, L. (2000). "A case study of learner interaction in technology-enhanced language learning environment". *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 22 (3), 447-368.
- Cahill, D., and Catanzaro, D. (1997). "Teaching first-year Spanish online". *CALICO Journal*, 13 (2-4), 97-114.
- Cantos Gómez, P. (2012). "Actividades mediante ordenador para la clase de ingles: ¿Favorecen la motivación del alumno?". *AEDEAN: select papers in language, literature and culture : proceedings of the 17th International Conference, 2000*, 199-204.
- Chenoweth, N.A. and Murday, K. (2003). "Measuring student learning in an online French Course". *CALICO Journal* 20, 284-314.
- Chun, D. (1994). "Using computer networking to facilitate the acquisition of interactive competence". *System*, 22 (1), 17-31.
- Chun, D., and Plass, J. (1996). "Effects of multimedia annotations on vocabulary acquisition". *Modern Language Journal* 80 (2), 183-198.
- Conole, G. (2008). "Listening to the learner voice: The ever changing landscape of technology use of language students". *ReCALL* 20 (2), 124-140.
- Davis, J. N., and Lyman-Hager, M.A. (1997). "Computers and L2 reading: Student performance, student attitude". *Foreign Language Annals* 30 (1), 58-72.
- Derwing, T., Munro, M., and Carbonaro, M. (2000). "Does popular speech recognition software work with ESL Speech?" *TESOL quarterly* 34 (3), 592-602.
- Donaldson, R., and Kotter, M. (1999). "Language learning in cyberspace: Teleporting the classroom into the target culture". *CALICO Journal*, 16 (4), 41-60.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Skehan, P. (2003). "Individual differences in second language learning" in C. J. Doughty and M. H. Long (Eds.) *The handbook of second language acquisition*, 589-630. Malden, MA and Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Gilman, D.A. (1969). "The Effect of Feedback on Learners' Certainty of Response and Attitude Toward Instruction in a computer- Assisted Instruction Program for Teaching Science Concepts". *Journal of Research in Science teaching* 6, 171-184.

- Goodyear, P. and Retalis, S. (2010). *Technology-Enhanced Learning. Designs Patterns and Pattern Languages*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- González-Bueno, M., and Perez, L.C. (2000). "Electronic mail in foreign language writing: A study of gramatical and lexical accuracy, and quantity of language". *Foreign Language Annals*, 33 (2), 189-198.
- González-Edfelt, N. (1990). "Oral interaction and collaboration at the computer: Learning English as a second language with the help of your peers". *Computers in the Schools*, 7 (1/2), 53-90.
- Grace, C.A. (2000). "Gender diffeernces: Vocabulary retention and access to translations for beginning language learners in CALL". *Modern Language Journal* 84 (2), 214-224.
- Green, A. and Youngs, B. E. (2001). "Using the web in elementary French and Germancourses: Quantitative and qualitative study results". *CALICO Journal* 19, 89-123.
- Grunewald, A. (2009). "La motivación de los alumnos en la clase de lengua extranjera: resultados de una investigación empírica en el contexto del uso de las tecnologías de comunicación e información". *Pulso: revista de educación* 32, 75-94.
- Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: maximising impact on learning*. London: Routledge.
- Heift, T. and Schulze, M. (2012). *Errors and Intelligence in Computer-Assisted Language Learning. Parsers and Pedagogues*. New York: Routledge.
- Hughes, J. (2005). "The role of teacher knowledge and learning experiences in forming technology-integrated pedagogy". *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education* 13 (2), 277-302.
- Hubbard, P. (2008). "CALL and the future of language teacher education". *CALICO Journal*, 25 (2), 175-188.
- Hubbard, P. and Levy, M. (2006a). "The scope of CALL education" in Hubbard, P. and levy, M. (eds.) *Teacher education in CALL*, 2-20. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Hubbard, P. and Levy, M. (2006b). *Teacher education in CALL*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Johnson, L., Adams Becker, S., Cummins, M., Estrada, V. Freeman, A. and Ludgate, H. (2013). *NMC Horizon Report: 2013 Higher Education Edition*. Austin, Texas: The New Media Consortium.
- Jones, J. (2001). CALL and the Teacher's Role in Promoting Learner Autonomy. *CALL-EJ Online* 3 (1).
- Kalaja, P., and Ferreira Barcelos, A. M. (2013). "Beliefs in Second Language Acquisition: Learner". *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*.
- Kasper, L. (2000). "New technologies, new literacies: Focus discipline research and ESL learning communities". *Language Learning and Technology*, 4 (2), 105-128.
- Kassen, M.A., Lavine, R.Z., Murphy-Judy, K. and Peters, M. (eds.) (2007). "Preparing and developing technology-proficient L2 teachers". *CALICO Monograph Series* 6. San Marcos, TX: Computer Assisted Language Institution Consortium (CALICO).
- Kern, R. (1995). "Restructuring classroom interaction with networked computers: Effects on quantity and characteristics of language production". *Modern Language Journal* 79 (4), 457-476.
- Kessler, G. (2006). "Assessing CALL teacher training: What are we doing and what could we do better" in Hubbard, P. and Levy, M. (eds.) *Teacher education in CALL* 23-42. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kubota, R. (1999). "Word processing and WWW projects in a college Japanese language class". *Foreign Language Annals* 32 (2), 205-218.
- Hong, K. H. (2010). "CALL teacher education as an impetus for L2 teachers in integrating technology". *ReCALL* 22 (1), 53-69.
- Lam, W.S.E. (2000). "L2 literacy and the design of the self. A case study of a teenager writing on the Internet". *TESOL quarterly* 34 (3), 457-482.
- Lee, L. (1997). "Using Internet tools as an enhancement of C2 teaching and learning". *Foreign Language Annals* 30 (3), 410-427.

- Lee, L. (1998). "Going beyond classroom learning: Acquiring cultural knowledge via online newspapers and intercultural exchanges via on-line chat rooms". *CALICO Journal* 16 (2), 101-120.
- Liu, M., Moore, Z., Graham, L. and Lee S. (2003). "A look at the research on computer-based technology use in second language learning: A review from the literature from 1990-2000". *Journal of Research on Technology in Education* 34 (3), 250-273.
- MacDonald, J. (2006). *Blended learning and online tutoring: A good practice guide*. Aldershot, England: Gower Publishing.
- Mumtaz, S. (2000). "Factors affecting teachers' use of information and communications technology: a review of the literature". *Journal of Information Technology for Teacher Education* 9 (3), 319-341.
- Nagata, N. (1996). "Computer vs. workbook instruction in second language acquisition". *CALICO Journal* 1, 53-75.
- Nagata, N. (1997). "The effectiveness of computer-assisted metalinguistic instruction A case study in Japanese". *Foreign Language Annals* 30 (2), 187-200.
- Nagata, N. (1998). "Input vs. output practice in educational software for second language acquisition". *Language Learning and Technology* 1 (2), 23-40.
- Nagata, N. (1999). "The effectiveness of computer-assisted interactive glosses". *Foreign Language Annals* 32 (4), 469-479.
- Neumeier, P. (2005). "A closer look at blended learning: Parameters for designing a blended language environment for language teaching and learning". *ReCALL* 17, 163-178
- O'Dowd, R. (2010). "Online foreign language interaction: Moving from the periphery to the core of foreign language education?" *Language Teaching* 44 (3), 368-380.
- Osuna, M., and Meskill, C. (1998), "Using the World Wide Web to integrate Spanish language and culture: A pilot study". *Language Learning and technology* 1 (2), 71-92.

- Osuna, M. (2000). "Promoting foreign culture acquisition via the Internet in a sociocultural context". *Journal of educational computing Research* 22 (3), 323-346.
- Oxford, R. L. and Jung, S. (2007). "National guidelines for technology integrating in TESOL programs: Factors affecting (non)implementation" in Kassen, M.A., Lavine, R. Z., Murphy-Judy, K. and Peters, M. (eds.), *Preparing and developing technology-proficient L2 teachers*, 23/48. San Marcos, TX: CALICO.
- Penuel, W.R. (2006). "Implementation and effects of one-t-one computing initiatives: A research synthesis". *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 38 (3), 329-348.
- Russell, M., Bebell, D., O'Dwyer, L. M. and O'Connor, K. (2003). "Examining teacher technology use: Implications for preservice and inservice teacher preparation". *Journal of teacher Education*, 54 (4), 297-310.
- Sagarra, N. and Zapata, G.C. (2008). "Blending classroom instruction with online homework: A study of student perceptions of computer-assisted L2 learning". *ReCALL* 20, 208-224.
- Soo, K.-S., & Ngeow, Y.-H. (1998). "Effective English as a second language instruction with interactive multimedia: the MCALL project". *Journal of Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia* 7 (1), 71-89.
- Stracke, E. (2007). "A road to understanding: A qualitative study into why learners drop out of a blended language learning (BLL) environment". *ReCALL* 19, 57-78.
- Strepp-Greany, J. (2002). "Student perceptions on language learning in a technological environment: implications for the new millennium". *Language Learning and Technology* 6, 165-180.
- Ulitsky, H. (2000). "Language learner strategies with technology". *Journal of educational computing Research* 22 (3), 285-322.
- Ushida, E. (2005). "The Role of Students' Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning in Online Language Courses". *CALICO Journal* 23 (1), 49-78.

- Van Handle, D., and Corl, K.(1998). “Extending the dialogue: Using electronic mail and the Internet to promote conversation and writing in intermediate level German language courses”. *CALICO Journal*, 15 (1-3), 129-143.
- Wang, L. and Coleman, J.A. (2009). “A survey of Internet-mediated intercultural foreign language education in China”.*ReCALL* 21 (1), 113-129
- Wang, S., and Vásquez, C. (2012).“Web 2.0 and second language learning: What does the research tell us”. *CALICO Journal*29 (3), 412-430.
- Weikart, L.A. and Marrapodi, M. (1999). “The missing link: The technology infrastructure”. *Computers in the Schools* 15 (2), 49-60.
- Wong, L. H., Chai, C. S., Chen, W., & Chin, C. K. (2013).“Measuring Singaporean Students’ Motivation and Strategies of Bilingual Learning”. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 1-10.

Received: April 5, 2013

Accepted: February 8, 2014

Revised: February 11, 2014

Published: February 24, 2014

Updated: March 3, 2014