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Abstract: Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL) has been an attention-grabbing topic to many researchers in information, communication and technologies in language education. This paper investigates teachers’ perspectives towards CALL and teaching. teachers’ perspective towards CALL is analyzed by 4 sections in our research questionnaire which includes teachers’ general attitudes towards CALL, teachers’ conception to the content of CALL, teachers’ viewpoint towards the application of CALL and finally teachers’ perspective towards the the use of CALL program in language education. The questionnaire is designed to elicit teachers’ perspective towards CALL. Participants of this study include 47 teachers from schools (primary, middle, high) and university English instructors. Results revel that teachers have positive attitudes towards the content, application and use of computers in language education. In terms of the content and application of CALL, it is also found that CALL program is beneficial to improve students’ listening, speaking skills and vocabulary knowledge rather than improving their reading and writing skills. Taking the content, application and use of computers into consideration, gender shows no difference in attitude towards the CALL in lanugage education. Implication and further research suggestions are provided.
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Introduction

With the advancement of information, communication and technologies, not only teachers are exposed to adapt their teaching methodology to the changes of application of ICTs in language education, but also learners are affected by the ICT tools and expected to become active participants in the learning process than participating in ICT-based language learning passively.

The CALL has been attracting considerable attention since early 1950s and implementation of CALL started 1960s and 1970s. CALL was defined as searching for, studying of application of computer in language learning, and teaching (Levy, 1997). Barson and Debski conclusively categorized computer Assisted Learning in 1996. Barson et al demonstrates the distinct categorization of CALL, which includes behaviorist CALL, communicative CALL, and integrative CALL (Barson & Debski, 1996). The first major fieldwork project that was undertaken in CALL was Levy’s period which includes PLATO, TICCIT, Standford and Dartmouth projects (1960, Levy).

With appearance of internet, teachers are the direct exposure to the changes, especially in language learning with the help of internet. Following with internet, as can be seen modern or immersion language classroom, computer has become necessary in language learning and teaching field. In the process of implementing modern technology such as computers and internet in EFL classroom, teachers are also the direct exposure to these changes and are supposed to stand the pace of challenges and development. Since the emerging usage of computers and availability of accessing internet has made the computer-assisted language, learning ubiquitous in ELT field of many countries (Golenka et al, 2012).

As for standing the pace with the changes and development, several studies has been focusing on the CALL in order to provide teachers with new insight into collaborating computers or ICT tools in language learning and teching procedures.
In a comprehensive literature review of Atkins et al., they identified two significant elements, knowledge and ability, in teachers’ attitudes towards computer usage in language classroom. Even though traditional techniques and techniques with computers, which are implemented in language classroom, are considerably different from each other, the primary aim of both of which is to improve students’ abilities and as much as possible by the help of teachers’ endeavour supported by computers and ICT tools (Atkins & Vasu, 2000).

Since CALL and teaching has gained attraction by many researchers, the comprehensive literature review manifests that teachers have considerable positive attitudes towards the usage of computers and ICT tools in ELT field (Hsieh & Tsai, 2010; Yüksel & Yüksel, 2015; Başöz & Çubuklui, 2014). Computer assisted learning is widely researched since it is ubiquitous gained-attraction topic since the early studies in 1970s.

As can be seen from the literature, dozens of researchers has been focusing on the study ex parte. Some researches focus on only students’ attitudes towards computer assisted language learning, or some researches have been done done only to analyze teachers’ perspectives towards CALL. Little research was found as to focusing on mixed participants from primary schools, high schools or universities (public and private universities). Furthermore, some researches have been done only in public universities or in private universities.

The purpose of this investigation has been to explore the relationship between teachers’ perspective and the content, application, and factors of CALL, which affect the perspective of teachers. The study sought to answer following specific research questions:

1. What are the teachers’ general perspectives towards CALL?
2. What are the teachers’ perspective about the content of the CALL in ELT classroom?
3. What are the teachers’ perspectives about the application of the CALL in ELT classroom?

4. What are the factors that affect teachers’ use of the CALL in EFL classroom?

5. Do teachers’ perspectives towards CALL (general, content, application and the use of CALL) differ between genders?

**Literature Review**

More recently, researchers have become increasingly interested in the research field, which has an extensive relationship with the CALL. There is growing number of publication focusing on either teachers’ perspectives or students’ attitudes towards computer assisted learning.

In 2017, Hsieh and Tsai conducted a research on teachers’ conception of mobile learning with 15 participants from five schools in Northern Taiwan. The study demonstrates that using technology boosts efficiency and productivity. It also proposed that, as a result, mobile devices’ utilization in learning exerts transformative strength on learning. They also concluded that it is essential to cultivate advanced conceptions of mobile learning among teachers. (Hsieh & Tsai, 2017).

Yüksel & Yüksel carried out a study investigating the influence of computer assisted instruction on academic performances of students’ from vocational foreign language. This study suggests that instructional methodologies with the help of computer applied in vocational foreign language classrooms is much more effective than these, which apply traditional instructional methods in connection with students’ academic performance. (Yüksel & Yüksel, 2015)

To examin teachers’ attitude towards computer assisted language learning, Rafiee et al carried out a research on high school techers’ viewpoint on CALL in different high schools in Azarbayjan Province. It reveals that using computers in language classroom make the subject matter interesting; also, it notes that computer use in ELT
classes contributes to improve education of English language. It is also pointed not only do computers motive students in language learning milestones, but also the study reported that computer use suits students’ learning preferences and their level of computer use (Rafiee & Purfallah, 2014).

Başöz et al did a similiar study in 2014 to elicit teachers’ attitudes towards the CALL. Participants are pre-service teachers from English Language Teaching Department of Dokuz Eylül University in Turkey. It was found that pre-service teachers have positive attitudes towards CALL and they hold the view that CALL creates a stress-free classroom atmosphere and pre-service teachers regard CALL as beneficial as traditional language learning. It is also found that there is a positive correlation between CALL and students’ vocabulary knowledge and listening skills. It also demonstrated that language learning with the assistance of computer could improve their intelligence (Başöz & Çubuklui, 2014).

To investigate the teachers’ attitude towards CALL, Bilbatua & Herrero de Haro also documented that there is a strong association between teachers’ IT literate and their use of CALL in their teaching, separately in Spain and Australia. This study proved that the more the IT literate teachers are, they more they are attempt to apply CALL in language learning and teaching. This study noted that Australian participants (teachers) demonstrated much more positive attitude to CALL than the participants in Spain did. This study also conclude that it is essential to give CALL–based exercises certain weighting in the final mark if the students take CALL on board or use these materials. (Bilbatua & Herrero, 2014).

Another study examines Technology Enhanced Language Learning (TELL) tools and teachers’ attitudes towards it. It reveal that although there are lots of chanllenges and difficulties, teachers demonstrates positive attitudes towards applying technology in the classroom. In this study, Golshan and Tafazoli noted that it is important for language teaching to introduce TELL tools and programs in language classrooms. Not only deos this study report that TELL is a medium for students’ motivation. It is
also suggested that most English teachers in Iran keep up with advancement in technology, feel comfortable with technology and it is believed that teachers time and effort could be saved by these TELL tools. (Golshan & Tafazoli, 2014)

Selami Aydin also examined teachers’ perceptions about the computer use in EFL teaching and learning. According to this study, Turkish EFL teachers have insufficient or little understanding about some software. In addition, they have difficulty applying the software program so that they are affected by a lack of technical and instructional support. This study also noted that teachers hold positive perspective towards the integration of computer use in language learning and teaching. (Aydin, 2013)

Jafarian et al also carried out a further research to determine whether CALL affects on EFL students’ writing achievement; it is reported that there is a significant difference between two groups, which are, separately, CALL users and nonusers. It is found that students who use CALL in language learning are much more successful than those who do not use CALL in language learning. The result of this study supports that applying CALL tools in language learning can enhance students’ not only writing achievement, but also it could improve students’ other skills as well (Jafaran & Soori, & Kafipur, 2012).

Yüksel et al also examined the Pre-Service teachers’ attitudes towards technology in 2010. Yüksel et al. demonstrated that there is a significant positive correlation between their attitudes and technology in language classroom. They also found that, unlike other studies, there is a significant difference in attitudes of pre-service teachers towards technology. As for gender differences in attitudes, female participants are more likely to have negative attitudes towards technology. Moreover, unlike previous researches, university type and subject domain show no difference in gender (Yüksel & Kavanoz, 2011).
Similar studies have been done by researchers on analyzing attitudes of teachers or candidate teachers towards computers or ICT tools in EFL classroom. Several researches conducted by a dozen of researchers as to ICT usage in language classroom, these researches reveal that not only do teachers have very positive attitudes towards CALL programs, but also students do maintain a positive viewpoint as to using CALL in language classroom (Zhou & Hu et al; Hismanoğlu, Saracoğlu & Serin et al, 2010).

Timothy Teo also performed a similar series of experiment in Singapore in which 139 Pre-Service teachers were assessed as to their attitudes towards computer usage in language classroom. Results of this study shows that subject areas determine teachers’ attitudes towards CALL, the same study also reveals that there is considerable correlation between years of computer usage and confidence level and their attitudes towards computers (Timothy Teo, 2008).

Khine also performed the identical study in 2001 that considerable relationship was found between teachers’ attitudes towards CALL program and use of CALL in institutions (Khine, 2001). From the literature review, it can be concluded that there is a positive relationship between teachers perception and computer usage in EFL classrooms.

**Method**

**Subjects**

The subjects participated in this research are EFL teachers from public and private universities, high schools, secondary and primary schools. In this research, 33 females (70.20%) and 14 males (29.80%) answered the questionnaires designed to elicit teachers’ perspective towards general, content, application of computer assisted learning. Most of the teachers are non-native English teachers, international non-native speaker English teachers are also found from this investigation.
Instrument

The questionnaire consists of five sections. The first section of questionnaire includes participants’ background information, such as: gender (1=female, 2=male), year of teaching experience (1=less than a year, 2=1-4 years, 3= 5-8 years, 4= 9-12 years, 5=13+ years), currently teaching at level (1=Beginner, 2=elementary, 3=pre-intermediate, 4=intermediate, 5=upper-intermediate, 6=advanced), the information of currently teaching in a computer laboratory (1=yes, 2=no). The second section comprises the general attitudes of teachers on frequency of computer use (1=less than once a week, 2=1-2 times a week, 3=3-4 times a week, 4= 5 or more times a week ), what teachers use computers for (electronic mail, games, online shopping, material design, trying and maintaining lesson plans, Office work, student records, administrative reports, surfing internet, assigning and checking assignment via email, chat rooms, entertainment, web page design and other.) and 13 general attitude questions which measures teachers’ general viewpoint of computer assisted language learning. The third section of the questionnaire covers 8 questions that evaluate teachers’ opinion towards the content of computer assisted learning program in ELT classrooms. Part 4 includes the opinion of teachers towards the application of the computer assisted learning. The last section incorporates 8 questions which elicit the factors of using computers in English language education.

Participants responded to the questionnaire using five-point scale of Likert; strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), netural (3), agree (4) and strongly agree (5). The Realibility coefficient Cronbach Alpha was 0.904, which indicated a high reliability.

Data Analysis

Questionnaire was used to collect Data. Frequencies, percentage and means were calculated to test each item. To interpret and analyze the data, SPSS 22 version was used. Man-whitney U-test was applied to interpret the result and differences among gender and differences towards CALL, it is for the reason that sample is not homogeous. Transcript data was put into categories according to the factors of questionnaire.
Results

Background information of the participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45+</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatal</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows the frequency of age groups participated in this research. As can be seen from the table, 23.40% of participants are in the age group between 20-25, 25.50% of participants belong to the age group ranged from 26-30, 31-35 age group takes 19.10%, 36-40 age group are with 10.60%, 41-45+ age group takes 21.30% of all percentage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>70.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatal</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 indicates that 70.20% of participants are female, 29.80% are of the male participants in this research. Compared to male participants, it is found that more female participants replied to the questionnaires.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of teaching experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than a year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 year(s)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13+ years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatal</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table 3, it can be clearly seen that participants with 13 or more years replied questionnaires the most with 29.80%, teachers with 1-4 years’ teaching experience hold 23.40% of total percentage. Teachers with 5-8 years’ teaching experience (17%) are qual with percentage of participants with 9-12 years of teaching experience (17%). In addition, teachers with less than a year teaching experience remain the least participated group with 12.80%.

Table 4 shows the percentage of participants’ currently teaching at level, most of the teachers participated in this research are teaching elementary groups (26.60%), respectively, beginner level (10.10%), pre-intermediate (19.00%), intermediate (17.70%), upper-intermediate (12.70%) and advanced level with 13.30%. In terms of frequency, total number of replies exceeds the total questionnaires because of the multireponses of currently teaching level, in this occasion, participants check more than one items in this part of the questionnaire.

Table 4. Currently Teaching Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currently teaching level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginner</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-intermediate</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-intermediate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Frequencies of teaching in a computer laboratory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching in a computer laboratory</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>78.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From table 5, it can be reached a conclusion that 78.80% of participants do not use computer laboratory for teaching foreign languages. Only 21.20% of teachers answered as “yes”, and 78.80% participants replied as “no” in terms of using laboratory in language classroom.

**Table 6.** Frequency of using computers in daily tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Using computers in daily tasks</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a week</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times a week</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 times a week</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more times a week</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 illustrates that 78.7% of all participants use computers 5 times or more a week, and only 2.10% participants use computers less than once a week. Participants with 10.60% use computers 1-2 times a week, 8.5% teachers use computer 3-4 times a week. From this we can draw the conclusion that teachers generally use computers in daily task.

**Table 7.** Frequency and purpose of computer use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of computer use</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electronic mail</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online shopping</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material design</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying and maintaining lesson plans…etc.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfing Internet</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigning and checking assignments via email</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chat rooms</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web page design</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. shows that electronic email is the main purpose of teachers using computers (17%), participants use computers for surfing the net (16.60%), online shopping comes 3rd purpose of participants with 13%, assigning and maintaining lesson plans, material design, chat rooms have the same frequencies out of 100%. The least one is shown as entertainment by 2%. Total number of frequency is found more than questionnaire because participants can choose more than one option since this part of the questionnaire is multiple choice with multiple responses.

Research question 1: what are the teachers’ perpective towards computer assisted language learning?

To answer this question, frequencies of all 13 items were analyzed seperately;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GAQ1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAQ2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAQ3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAQ4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAQ5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAQ6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAQ7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAQ8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAQ9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAQ10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAQ11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAQ12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAQ13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SD: Strongly disagree, F=Frequency, D=disagree, N= Natural, A=Agree, SA= Strongly Agree.

From the table, it can be seen that 59.6% of participants generally like using computers in language classroom. Most of the teachers hold the positive attitude towards computers with 72.30% of frequency. 55.3% teachers believe that computers make completing jobs easier. 70.3% of participants use computers for general interest
because 33 participants checked “strongly agree”. 48.9% of participants perceive computers as pedagogical tool in language education. 66% of participants think that they generally have positive attitude towards using computers in language instruction whereas 4.3% of participants strongly disagree the given statement. Considerable number of participants use computers to search teaching resources online by the support of 80.9% frequency in the research. 68% participants hold the view that computers can be a good supplement to support learning. 42.6% teachers are of the opinion that training is required to teach with computers. 31.9% of participants remain neutral when it comes to needing training with computers while 12.8% of participants do not need any training on teaching with computers in language classroom. It can be concluded that most teachers have the positive attitude towards computer use in language classroom or language education.

Research question 2: What are the teachers’ perspectives about the content of the CALL in ELT classroom?

Table 9. Teacher’s perspective towards the content of the CALL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CQ1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQ2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQ3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQ4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>0.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQ5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQ6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQ7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQ8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SD: Strongly disagree, F=Frequency, D=disagree, N=Neutral, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Agree

As Table 8 illustrates, most teachers strongly agree that the CALL program is beneficial in improving listening skills (80.90%). 53.2% participants also hold the opinion that the CALL program is crucial for improving speaking skills (53.2%). By 61.7%, teachers have positive attitudes that vocabulary knowledge can be improved
by CALL program. 38.3% of participants hold considerable positive attitude to CALL program. Improving reading skills and writing skills by CALL program do not take the considerable percentage compared to improving listening and speaking skills (53.2%). It can be seen from the table that teachers have slight positive attitude towards reading passages by which reading passages is easy to understand.

**Research question 3: What are the teachers’ perspectives about the application of the CALL in ELT classroom?**

Table 9 shows that CALL program can be used to teach vocabulary to support students’ learning (59.6%), it can also be used by students in practicing vocabulary to support their learning (59.6%) as well. Participants also expresses positive to using computers in teaching foreign languages by 61.7%. 51.1% of participants also believe that students in practicing grammar to support their learning can use the CALL program. In terms of monitoring students’ progress in computer laboratory, teachers have less positive attitude towards it (8.5%), the data shows that they can monitor students’ progress better in class with the percentage of (23.4%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AQ1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GAQ: General attitude questions SD: Strongly disagree, F=Frequency, D=disagree, N= Netural, A=Agree, SA= Strongly Agree

**Research Question 4 : Teachers’ perspective to the use of the CALL in EFL classroom?**

http://jflet.com/jflet/
Table 11. Teachers’ use of the CALL program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FQ1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FQ2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FQ3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FQ4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FQ5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FQ6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FQ7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SD: Strongly disagree, F=Frequency, D=disagree, N=Netural, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Agree

Table 10 findings show that participants checked 40.4% as “agree” which indicates that teachers need training in guiding students in the use of software for learning languages. By the same percentage, participants also agree that a training is necessary in planning lessons in computer laboratory (40.4%). In terms of guiding students in the use of software for practicing language, training is needed to teachers (34%). As to teachers’ perspective towards curriculum used for CALL instruction, curriculum design is less satisfactory for CALL program (31.9%). If students’ attitude towards CALL instruction affects teaching in a computer laboratory, most of teachers remain netural (40.4%), only 21.3% participants strongly agree to this item. Overall teachers hold positive attitudes towards CALL program in language education.

Research Question 5. Do teachers’ perspective towards CALL (general, content, application and use of CALL) differ between genders?

In order to answer research question 5, we used Mann-whitney U test since our data is non-parametric.

The Table 11 shows us teachers attitudes towards CALL and 4 sub-factors affect teachers’ perspective towards CALL program. The first item is teachers’ general attitudes towards call. From the chart, it can be seen clearly that there is no significant differences between gender of participants towards general attitude of
CALL (0.852, p>0.05). In terms of the opinion towards the content of CALL, there is no differences towards it in terms of gender (0.825, p>0.05). The application of CALL and other factors that affect CALL also show no differences in terms of gender (0.224, p>0.05; 0.154, p>0.05). Overall, in terms of gender, no significant differences were found among participants towards the general attitude; content, application and factors that affect teachers perspective towards CALL.

Table 12. Gender Differences between GAQ, CQ, AQ, FQ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GAQ</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24.24</td>
<td>0.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23.71</td>
<td>0.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQ</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22.42</td>
<td>0.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22.15</td>
<td>0.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FQ</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GAQ: general attitude questions, CQ: content of CALL program, AQ: Application of CALL program, FQ: Factors of CALL use. P<0.05. Sig. Significance.

Discussion and Conclusion

The results of this investigation will be presented in quantitative form. We first examine the tables for the four main parts in questionnaire, which includes teachers’ general attitudes towards CALL, teachers’ opinion towards the content of CALL program, and teachers’ viewpoint towards the application of CALL and the factors that affects teachers’ use of CALL in language instruction. In the first section of the research, it was found that teachers generally have positive attitudes towards CALL program in language education, which indicates the close relationship with previous researches (Heish & Tsai, 2010; Yüksel & Yüksel, 2015; Başöz & Çubuklu, 2014). Following research question asks the teachers’ perspective towards the content of CALL in language classroom. From the outcomes of research and data, it can be concluded that teachers strongly agree that CALL program is beneficial in improving
listening skills, 53.2% participants also agree that CALL program is crucial to improve speaking skills of learners. Teachers also believe that CALL program can help improve students’ vocabulary knowledge. From the data, it can be said that participants have positive attitude towards the content of CALL program.

Third research questions asked if teachers hold positive attitude towards the application of CALL program. From the research result, a conclusion could be drawn that most participants have positive attitude towards the application of CALL program, which is supported by the result: 59.6% participants agree that CALL program can be used to teach vocabulary to support students’ learning. Participants also express that CALL program can be applied by students in practicing grammar to support their learning. The date also shows that participants can monitor students’ progress better in class (23.4%). The results found from this research are in accordance with the result, which has found by Başöz and Çubuklu (Başöz & Çubuklu, 2014). Başöz et al found that CALL is beneficial in language education and there is a positive correlation between students’ knowledge of vocabulary, and CALL is essential in improving students’ listening skills.

The next research question investigates the teachers’ perspective towards the use of CALL program. It is found that training is necessary to guide students in the use of software for learning languages. From the result, we can conclude that participants hold positive attitude towards the use of CALL program in language education. From the careful literature review, this result from this research is supported by the research done by Bilbatua et al (Bilbatua & Herrero, 2014). The result is also in positive correlation with the research investigated on technology-enhanced language learning in which it is concluded that teachers demonstrate positive attitudes towards applying technology in the classroom (Golshan & Tafazoli, 2014).

Another research also supports our research that teachers hold positive attitude to the integration of computer use in language learning and teaching (Aydin, 2013). As to the application of CALL program in language education, our date is also
supported by the research, which was carried out if application of CALL program, affect students writing achievement. It was reported that students who use CALL program in language learning are more successful than those who do not use CALL in language education (Jafaran & Soori & Kafipur, 2012). Another similar study also provides supports to our findings. In this research, not only do teachers hold positive attitudes towards the use of computers in language classroom, but also students show positive attitude towards the CALL program in language learning (Zhou et al., Hismanoğlu, Saracaoğlu, Serin et al, 2010).

Last research question analyzes the teachers’ perspective towards CALL in terms of gender; it is found that teachers’ attitudes towards the general, content, application and use of computer show no differences in terms of participants’ gender. Our result from the last research question is supported by the research in which pre-service teachers’ attitudes towards technology in language education, it is reported that teachers’ perspective towards CALL has no differences in terms of gender, university type, subject domain (Yüksel & Kavanoz, 2011).

Considering the purpose of this study, our aim was to investigate the teachers’ general perspective towards CALL, content, application and use of CALL program. The conclusion is drawn after this research that teachers overall have positive attitudes towards CALL in language learning and language teaching. Considering the methodology, Google form and questionnaire were created to collect data, which has been applied in many researches in the process of researching teachers’ prospective towards CALL. The findings suggest that teachers can make language-teaching process more efficient when CALL programs are applied in language teaching. The research also give advice not only to teachers in language education, but also to students improving their listening, speaking and vocabulary knowledge by applying CALL program in language classroom or outside of language classroom. The result from this research is also supported by many researches carried out by dozens of researches in the field of CALL and teaching.
From the interpreted data, it can be clearly seen that gender show no differences in the use of computer programs, the content of computer programs, application of computer programs in the field. This might be the reason that 70% participants are female and less than 30% of participants are male. In the further research, it could be done by balancing the participants by which results that are more reliable could be achieved. However, of course, our results are rather speculative and based on small group which only consisted of 47 participants, increasing participant numbers or large corpus is needed to yield more reliable results and establish how far it could be generalized on teachers’ positive attitudes towards computer assisted language learning. In this study, it is only focused on teachers’ perspective towards computer-assisted language learning, it could be suggested to carry out further research comparing students’ and teachers’ perspective towards CALL in language learning and language teaching. In this research, samples are chosen randomly and voluntarily, a more systematic sampling is suggested for the further research.
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Appendices

https://goo.gl/forms/jhAnsOPzjZEqn3zn2
Teachers' perspective towards Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL).

Dear participant,

First of all, my special thanks go to you for spending your precious time to join this academic research on the teachers' perspective towards Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL). This academic research is the part of my graduate program in English Language Education. This research is designed to elicit your opinion of the Content, Application, and Factors that affect teachers' perspective towards CALL. I would be grateful if you spend your precious time to become the part of my academic research.

Yours sincerely,

Alan

* Required

Section One: Background Information.

Please tick (check) the appropriate choices and provide the necessary information below.

1. Age *
   Mark only one oval.
   - 20-25
   - 26-30
   - 31-35
   - 36-40
   - 41-45+

2. Gender *
   Mark only one oval.
   - Female
   - Male

3. Years of teaching experience: *
   Mark only one oval.
   - Less than 1 year
   - 1-4 (years)
   - 5-8 (years)
   - 9-12 (years)
   - 13+ (years)
4. Currently teaching at level: *
   Check all that apply.
   [ ] Beginner
   [ ] Elementary
   [ ] Pre-Intermediate
   [ ] Intermediate
   [ ] Upper-Intermediate
   [ ] Advanced +

5. Are you currently teaching in a computer laboratory? *
   Mark only one oval.
   [ ] Yes
   [ ] No

Section 2: General Attitudes

This section is designed to elicit your general attitudes towards computers and towards using computer technology in language instruction. Please tick the appropriate option.

6. 1. How often do you use computers? *
   Mark only one oval.
   [ ] Less than once a week
   [ ] 1-2 times a week
   [ ] 3-4 times a week
   [ ] 5 or more times a week

7. 2. What do you use computers for? *
   Check all that apply.
   [ ] Electronic mail
   [ ] Games
   [ ] Online shopping
   [ ] Material design
   [ ] Trying and maintaining lesson plans, office work, student records, administrative reports.
   [ ] Surfing Internet
   [ ] Assigning and checking assignments via e-mail
   [ ] Chat rooms
   [ ] Entertainment
   [ ] Web page design
   [ ] Other (Please specify).

3. For the following items, please tick the answers that best show your opinion.
1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

8. I like using computers *
   Mark only one oval.
   
   1  2  3  4  5
   

9. I generally have positive attitudes towards computers. *
   Mark only one oval.
   
   1  2  3  4  5
   

10. Using computers makes me more efficient in my life. *
    Mark only one oval.
    
    1  2  3  4  5
    

11. Using computers generally makes completing tasks easier. *
    Mark only one oval.
    
    1  2  3  4  5
    

12. I like searching the Internet for general interest. *
    Mark only one oval.
    
    1  2  3  4  5
    

13. I perceive computers as pedagogical tools. *
    Mark only one oval.
    
    1  2  3  4  5
    

14. I generally have positive attitudes towards using computers in language instruction. *
    Mark only one oval.
    
    1  2  3  4  5
15. 8. I like using computers for teaching purposes. *
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

16. 9. I like searching the internet for teaching resources. *
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

17. 10. Computers can be a good supplement to support teaching. *
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

18. 11. Computers can be a good supplement to support learning. *
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

19. 12. I believe that training is required to teach with computers. *
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

20. 13. I think that I need training to teach with computers. *
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Section 3: Opinions about the Content of the CALL program in ELT classroom.
21. 1. The CALL program is beneficial in improving reading skills. *
   Mark only one oval.

   1 2 3 4 5
   

22. 2. The CALL program is beneficial in improving writing skills. *
   Mark only one oval.

   1 2 3 4 5
   

23. 3. The CALL program is beneficial in improving speaking skills. *
   Mark only one oval.

   1 2 3 4 5
   

24. 4. The CALL program is beneficial in improving listening skills. *
   Mark only one oval.

   1 2 3 4 5
   

25. 6. The CALL program is beneficial in improving grammar. *
   Mark only one oval.

   1 2 3 4 5
   

26. 8. The CALL program is beneficial in improving vocabulary knowledge. *
   Mark only one oval.

   1 2 3 4 5
   

27. 7. Reading passages on the computer program are easy to understand. *
   Mark only one oval.

   1 2 3 4 5
28. The CALL program offers students choices while studying. *
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Section 4: Opinions about the Application of the CALL program in ELT classroom.

This section is designed to elicit your opinion about the application of the CALL program in ELT classrooms.
1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

29. 1. The CALL program can be used to teach grammar to support students’ learning. *
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

30. 2. The CALL program can be used to teach vocabulary to support students’ learning. *
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

31. 3. The CALL program can be used by students in practicing grammar to support their learning. *
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

32. 4. The CALL program can be used by students in practicing vocabulary to support their learning. *
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

33. 6. Student interest in learning language will increase by using computer programs. *
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5
34. 6. I like teaching with computers. *
   Mark only one oval.
   
   1 2 3 4 5

35. 7. I can monitor my students’ progress in a computer laboratory better than in class. *
   Mark only one oval.
   
   1 2 3 4 5

36. 8. I believe students can learn more from computers than from books. *
   Mark only one oval.
   
   1 2 3 4 5

Section 5: Factors affecting teachers’ use of the CALL program.

This section is designed to elicit factors which affect teachers’ use of the CALL program in ELT classroom.
1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

37. 1. I believe I need training in guiding students in the use of software for learning language. *
   Mark only one oval.
   
   1 2 3 4 5

38. 2. I believe I need training in guiding students in the use of software for practising language. *
   Mark only one oval.
   
   1 2 3 4 5

39. 3. I believe I need training in planning lessons in a computer laboratory. *
   Mark only one oval.
   
   1 2 3 4 5
40. I believe the curriculum that we use for CALL instruction is satisfactory. *
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

41. The time that we spend in a computer laboratory is not enough to cover all the topics on the curriculum. *
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

42. The design of the laboratory positively affects my teaching with computers. *
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

43. Students' attitudes towards CALL instruction affect my teaching in a computer laboratory. *
Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

44. Other factors (please specify)

__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________