

## EFL Instructors' Perceptions and Attitudes towards Using CALL in Language Classrooms

Hakan Demiröz<sup>1</sup>

Faruk Türker<sup>2</sup>

**Type/Tür:**

Research/Araştırma

**Received/Geliş Tarihi:**

November 19/ 19 Kasım 2019

**Accepted/Kabul Tarihi:**

December 25/ 25 Aralık 2019

**Page numbers/Sayfa No:** 291-307

**Corresponding**

**Author/İletişimden Sorumlu**

**Yazar:**

[hdemiroz@cumhuriyet.edu.tr](mailto:hdemiroz@cumhuriyet.edu.tr)



This paper was checked for plagiarism using iThenticate during the preview process and before publication. / Bu çalışma ön inceleme sürecinde ve yayımlanmadan önce iThenticate yazılımı ile taranmıştır.

**Copyright © 2020** by

Cumhuriyet University, Faculty of Education. All rights reserved.

**Abstract**

Using computers to teach a language paved the way for the emergence of Computer-Assisted Language Teaching (CALL) in Applied Linguistics. The perceptions and attitudes of the practitioners of a system or method are significant because it is evident that they have crucial effects on the efficiency, effectiveness and outcomes of the process. This study aimed to find out the perceptions and attitudes of EFL instructors using CALL in their teaching and the instructors who do not use CALL. The study adopted the survey method as a data collection tool. The results of the study indicated that there was a great willingness to use CALL among EFL educators working at higher education institutions in Turkey in English courses both in preparatory classes and compulsory general English courses and that male instructors found CALL more applicable and they stated that they found themselves more efficient in using the CALL programs. Another finding of the study is that male instructors have more positive attitudes towards CALL as more male instructors believe CALL facilitates students' studying at their own pace and CALL programs motivate instructors and students than the traditional techniques and methods in language learning.

**Keywords:** Computer assisted language teaching, English as a foreign language, instructors, perceptions and attitudes, tertiary education.

**Suggested APA Citation/Önerilen APA Atıf Biçimi:**

Demiröz, H., & Türker, F. (2020). EFL instructors' perceptions and attitudes towards using CALL in language classrooms. *Cumhuriyet International Journal of Education*, 9(1), 291-307.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.30703/cije.648438>

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Sivas Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi, Sivas/Türkiye  
Assist. Prof. Dr. Sivas Cumhuriyet University, Faculty of Education, Department of English Language Teaching  
Sivas/Turkey

**e-mail:** [hdemiroz@cumhuriyet.edu.tr](mailto:hdemiroz@cumhuriyet.edu.tr) **ORCID ID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2413-5383>

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Emekli Öğr. Üyesi, Sivas/Türkiye

Dr. Retired Faculty, Sivas/Turkey

**e-mail:** [farukturker@gmail.com](mailto:farukturker@gmail.com)

## Dil Sınıflarında Yabancı Dil olarak İngilizce Öğreten Öğretim Görevlilerinin BDDE Kullanımına yönelik Algı ve Tutumları

### Öz

Dil öğretmek için bilgisayarların kullanımı Uygulamalı Dilbilimde Bilgisayar Destekli Yabancı Dil Öğretiminin (BDDE) ortaya çıkmasına yol açmıştır. Bir sistem ya da yöntemin uygulayıcılarının algı ve tutumlarının sürecin verimliliği, etkililiği ve sonuçları üzerinde önemli etkilere sahip olduğu açık olduğu için önemlidir. Bu çalışma öğretimlerinde BDDE'yi kullanan ve kullanmayan öğretim görevlilerinin BDDE kullanımı ile ilgili algı ve tutumlarını araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Çalışmada veri toplama aracı olarak tarama yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Çalışmanın sonuçları Türkiye'de yükseköğretim kurumlarında çalışan Yabancı Dil olarak İngilizce (YDI) öğreten öğretim görevlileri arasında hem hazırlık sınıflarında hem de zorunlu genel İngilizce derslerinde BDDE kullanmaya büyük istek olduğunu ve erkek öğretim görevlilerinin BDDE'yi daha fazla uygulanabilir bulduklarını ve kendilerini BDDE programlarını kullanmada daha yeterli gördüklerini göstermiştir. Çalışmanın diğer bir sonucu ise daha fazla erkek öğretim görevlisi BDDE'nin geleneksel yöntem ve tekniklere göre öğrencilere kendi hızında çalışmaya imkân sağladığını ve BDDE programlarının öğretim görevlilerini ve öğrencilerini motive ettiğine inanmaktadırlar.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Bilgisayar destekli dil eğitimi, İngilizcenin yabancı dil olarak öğretimi, öğretim görevlileri, yüksek öğretim

### Introduction

It is apparent that technology is penetrating into every part of human life, which causes many changes in every field of life around us, one of which is foreign language teaching. Using computers to teach a language caused the emergence of Computer-Assisted Language Teaching (CALL) in the language teaching and learning domain. According to Mirescu (1997, p. 2) "CALL is a term used for different forms of second language instruction accomplished with the use of computers." Computers have been in the arena of teaching English since 1960s (Lee, 2000; Stone, 1991; Warschauer & Healey, 1998). CALL as a field of study, research and practice is exciting, frustrating, dynamic and quickly changing (Hubbard, 2009). Robinson (1985) expresses that computers provide benefits for students as computers are mechanisms that help students become interested in materials closely, thus facilitating them to become more motivated since it provides stimulation in the form of graphics, animation, colour, and sound. On the other hand, computers also provide a means for tutoring individual students at their own pace. Language teachers need to be concerned not only with the potential for linguistic interaction between them and their students, but also with the possible functions of computer which is a device for handling or processing information. Computers are a suitable medium for demonstration and practice in that they can provide graphics, colour, animation and sound to present language, to manipulate, analyse and synthesize it and to contextualize it with pictures and sounds. Computers have been used for supplementing exercises by foreign language teachers for many years. Likewise, in recent years, there has been a rapid move to reassess advances in computer technology and it is deemed as an indispensable part of foreign language teaching. The advances in computer technology, namely commercial software packages, authoring tools, and computer networks provide educators to integrate culture, grammar, and real language use in the classroom (Warschauer,

Shetzer, & Meloni, 2000). Computer programs and web-based materials can be utilized to teach basic language skills and components. They are also highly used to test the language performance of the test-takers (Carr, 2006; Chapelle & Douglas, 2006). Computers have been used to provide supplementary materials by foreign language teachers for many years. However, the rapid changing world of technology necessitated foreign language teachers to evaluate the computer and the activities with computers in foreign language teaching. Computers are best for practicing grammar through filling the blanks, transformation, multiple-choice and similar exercises. Likewise, they can be used for vocabulary building with similar activities. Another language component that computers are used is pronunciation. Computer-assisted pronunciation teaching (CAPT), a special branch of CALL, is taking attention in recent years (Pokrivčáková, 2015). Computers are also beneficial for both intensive listening and reading. Another use of computer is word-processing which provides highly fruitful outcomes for writing in a foreign language. Spell checkers can be beneficial to the learners. The benefits are very motivational for the learners. Authoring programs provide the teachers with great flexibility to produce simple or elaborate software programs which are suitable to their own lesson plans, teaching context, and group of learners. For Higgins (1993), there are simple templates and more complicated authoring programs.

However, integration of innovation either by means of an approach, a system, or a new method is not an easy task. It requires the stakeholders of that particular innovation to have positive attitudes towards it. The perceptions and attitudes of the practitioners of a system or method are significant (Kadel, 2005) because it is evident that they have crucial effects on the efficiency, effectiveness and outcomes of the process (Albirini, 2006; Capan, 2012). That is, teachers' attitudes and perceptions play a key role in any educational environment. Their perceptions and attitudes also have the potential to motivate or demotivate them to use CALL in their teaching.

Various research has been conducted about CALL practitioners' experience in language teaching. Christie (2001) claims that CALL materials have crucial impact on instructors' attitudes towards the teaching environment. Jamieson, Chapelle and Preiss (2005) investigated the perceptions of three stakeholders of CALL: developers of software, teachers and students. They included six criteria in their evaluation that are language learning potential, learner fit, meaning focus, positive impact, authenticity, and practicality. They concluded that teachers have generally positive perceptions of CALL software. Alshumaimeri (2008) explored the perceptions and attitudes of Saudi EFL teachers towards using CALL in English classrooms and found out that the participants had a positive attitude towards the integration of CALL approaches into teaching and there was a need for teacher training about the use of CALL. Wiebe and Kabata (2010) through both quantitative and qualitative data illustrated that instructors had positive perceptions about the use of CALL materials in teaching foreign languages. In a descriptive study, Aydin (2013) surveyed 157 EFL teachers in Turkey and found out that they had positive attitudes towards computer use in teaching EFL and positive perceptions about the integration of computers although the participants reported that they had little knowledge about software and how to use them in EFL. The results also showed that the participants needed technical and instructional guidance about software. Mustafina (2015) researched teachers'

attitudes towards Information and Communication Technology (ICT) integration in teaching and found out that teachers thought that ICT was a facilitator of the study process and affected students' academic motivation. In a quantitative study, İnce (2017) found out that the participants of her study, 32 EFL instructors, had positive perceptions despite indicating concerns about their competency stemming from the lack of training in the integration of CALL in language classes, technical support and equipment.

In spite of various research in the literature review, there is limited research focusing on the perceptions and attitudes of the teachers of English and specifically university instructors (Alshumaimeri, 2008; Hampel & Stickler, 2005; İnce, 2017) in language learning settings. To help fill this gap in the literature, this study aimed to find answers to the following questions:

RQ1: What are the perceptions and attitudes of EFL instructors towards the integration of CALL in higher education institutions in Turkey?

- a) What are the perceptions and attitudes of EFL instructors towards integration of CALL who are using CALL in higher education institutions in Turkey?
- b) What are the perceptions and attitudes of EFL instructors towards the integration of CALL who are not using CALL in higher education institutions in Turkey?

RQ2: Are there any differences in the perceptions and attitudes among the instructors with regard to gender, age, education level and professional experience?

## Methodology

### Research Design

This study aimed to explore the perceptions and attitudes of EFL instructors towards the integration of CALL in teaching and learning with a survey approach. According to Creswell (2012), survey research design which is one of the procedures in quantitative research aims to investigate and describe the attitudes, perceptions, opinions, behaviours, or characteristics of the research population. Thus, in line with its research questions, this study adopted the survey design as a data collection method.

### Participants

Dörnyei (2007) states that survey studies attempt to describe the characteristics of a population by investigating a sample of that population. The population of this study consists of EFL instructors working at universities in Turkey which are of two types: state universities and foundation universities. The universities were chosen by screening the websites of foreign language departments, schools of foreign languages or centres for English language programs of both state and foundation universities to find out whether they use CALL or not. At the time of research, universities which had computer-assisted language learning laboratories for the intensive preparatory English class were determined. The sample of the study included a total of 71 EFL instructors of 20 CALL implementing universities and 20 universities which did not have CALL applications.

According to the demographic details of CALL users, 49 English instructors (Female=27, Male=22) from various state and foundation universities participated in the study. Thirty-one instructors had a graduate degree and the rest 18 instructors had

a postgraduate degree. Eight instructors had experience of 1- 5 years. Twenty-eight of them had an experience of 6-10 years and the rest 13 instructors had professional experience of 11 or more than 11 years. Nineteen instructors stated that they had classes in the CALL laboratory between 1 and 5 hours a week and 30 stated that they had classes between 6 to 10 hours a week.

In addition to CALL users, 42 EFL instructors who did not use CALL (Female=23, Male=19) participated in the study. Twenty-six of them had a graduate degree and 16 instructors had a postgraduate degree. The year of professional experience of 16 instructors was between 1 and 5; 17 out of 42 had professional experience of 6 to 10 years and the rest 9 instructors had an experience of 11 years or more than 11 years. Twenty-nine instructors expressed that they believed that the students were more motivated in the laboratory. Thirty-one percent of the participants pointed out that the students were more motivated in the classroom. Thirty-eight instructors (90,5%) stated that they wanted to use CALL at their institutions which showed their positive attitudes towards CALL. Only 9,5% of the instructors were reluctant to use CALL. Likewise, 38 participants who were willing to use CALL stated that they wanted to take part in CALL applications and 4 instructors did not want to take part in CALL applications. 17 instructors claimed that they felt insufficient in using CALL programs. The number of instructors who felt sufficient themselves in using CALL was 17, too. The remaining eight instructors felt they were good at CALL implementation.

### **Instruments**

For the data collection instrument, CALL Perceptions and Attitudes Scale was developed by the researcher. The process of scale development was as follows: First, the literature in Turkish and English was reviewed. An item pool was formed. Then, the items to be added to the questionnaires were determined. The questionnaires were piloted with three volunteer EFL instructors. They were revised regarding their recommendations. The final form was given by considering the suggestions of three specialists in English Language Teaching and Educational Evaluation and Measurement. During these processes, the reliability of the data was constantly controlled. The final scale included 14 three-point scale items which are (1) "Disagree", (2) "Not decided", and (3) "Agree." It was applied to both CALL and non-CALL users. However, in order to explore the willingness of non-CALL users to use CALL in the future, their perceived efficiency in using CALL, two items were responded by the non-users of CALL.

### **Data Collection and Analysis**

While collecting the data, the researcher himself applied the questionnaires to the EFL instructors of the determined universities through e-mail, mail and telephone. It took approximately three months to collect the data. No problems were confronted during the application of the questionnaires except few questionnaires were returned unfilled. For the data analysis, descriptive statistics, t-tests and ANOVA analysis were used in order to answer the research questions.

## Results

### CALL Perceptions and Attitudes of EFL Instructors who use CALL

When the demographic details of the participants are considered, it is seen that CALL is in its infancy in the higher education institutions in Turkey at the time of research. However, it is developing day by day. The program does not require too much staff and a lot of computers at the beginning. Generally, younger instructors are more involved with implementing the program as the young instructors have better computer literacy than the more experienced instructors. It is also seen that CALL programs do not require much time. It can be implemented for a couple of hours a week after a needs analysis.

### T-Test Results with respect to Gender

When Table 1 is analysed, it can be seen that most of the means of the items did not differ with respect to gender in the CALL Perceptions and Attitudes Scale and only five items were statistically significant with respect to gender.

Table 1

*All T-Test Results for Gender*

	Gender	N	Mean	SD	df	t	p																																																																																																																																																								
1. I feel myself efficient in CALL when I started the program.	Male	27	1,54	,66	47	-,82	,52																																																																																																																																																								
	Female	22	1,75	,62				2. I think that the current applications of CALL are successful for students' motivation.	Male	27	1,23	,44	47	-,55	,29	Female	22	1,33	,49	3. I think that the current applications of CALL are successful for attendance to the courses.	Male	27	1,08	,28	47	-,67	,18	Female	22	1,17	,40	4. I think that the current applications of CALL are successful for students' grades.	Male	27	1,15	,38	47	1,68	,04*	Female	22	1,33	,49	5. I think that the current applications of CALL are successful for students' pace.	Male	27	1,33	,51	47	1,68	,02*	Female	22	1,17	,40	6. I confront technical problems while implementing CALL.	Male	27	1,38	,51	47	-,97	,76	Female	22	1,58	,51	7. I think that CALL can be a remedy for the problems of teaching English at higher education level.	Male	27	1,08	,28	47	-,67	,18	Female	22	1,17	,40	8. I think that CALL programs can motivate the students and instructors more than the traditional methods and techniques.	Male	27	2,77	,44	47	1,85	,043*	Female	22	2,42	,51	9. I think CALL applications changed my students' attitudes towards English courses.	Male	27	1,92	,28	47	,06	,91	Female	22	1,92	,29	10. I think CALL applications changed my students' English course grades.	Male	27	1,85	,38	47	,08	,87	Female	22	1,83	,40	11. I think that my students are communicative after the CALL programs were introduced.	Male	27	1,77	,44	47	-,39	,44	Female	22	1,83	,40	12. I think that there is an increase in my students' success at English.	Male	27	1,92	,28	47	,67	,18	Female	22	1,83	,39	13. I think CALL can solve problems like insufficient attendance of students to the classes and low motivation.	Male	27	1,31	,48	47	-1,39	,32	Female	22	1,58	,51	14. I recommend using CALL programs in English classes.	Male	27	1,54	,52	47	,59	,68
2. I think that the current applications of CALL are successful for students' motivation.	Male	27	1,23	,44	47	-,55	,29																																																																																																																																																								
	Female	22	1,33	,49				3. I think that the current applications of CALL are successful for attendance to the courses.	Male	27	1,08	,28	47	-,67	,18	Female	22	1,17	,40	4. I think that the current applications of CALL are successful for students' grades.	Male	27	1,15	,38	47	1,68	,04*	Female	22	1,33	,49	5. I think that the current applications of CALL are successful for students' pace.	Male	27	1,33	,51	47	1,68	,02*	Female	22	1,17	,40	6. I confront technical problems while implementing CALL.	Male	27	1,38	,51	47	-,97	,76	Female	22	1,58	,51	7. I think that CALL can be a remedy for the problems of teaching English at higher education level.	Male	27	1,08	,28	47	-,67	,18	Female	22	1,17	,40	8. I think that CALL programs can motivate the students and instructors more than the traditional methods and techniques.	Male	27	2,77	,44	47	1,85	,043*	Female	22	2,42	,51	9. I think CALL applications changed my students' attitudes towards English courses.	Male	27	1,92	,28	47	,06	,91	Female	22	1,92	,29	10. I think CALL applications changed my students' English course grades.	Male	27	1,85	,38	47	,08	,87	Female	22	1,83	,40	11. I think that my students are communicative after the CALL programs were introduced.	Male	27	1,77	,44	47	-,39	,44	Female	22	1,83	,40	12. I think that there is an increase in my students' success at English.	Male	27	1,92	,28	47	,67	,18	Female	22	1,83	,39	13. I think CALL can solve problems like insufficient attendance of students to the classes and low motivation.	Male	27	1,31	,48	47	-1,39	,32	Female	22	1,58	,51	14. I recommend using CALL programs in English classes.	Male	27	1,54	,52	47	,59	,68	Female	22	1,41	,51								
3. I think that the current applications of CALL are successful for attendance to the courses.	Male	27	1,08	,28	47	-,67	,18																																																																																																																																																								
	Female	22	1,17	,40				4. I think that the current applications of CALL are successful for students' grades.	Male	27	1,15	,38	47	1,68	,04*	Female	22	1,33	,49	5. I think that the current applications of CALL are successful for students' pace.	Male	27	1,33	,51	47	1,68	,02*	Female	22	1,17	,40	6. I confront technical problems while implementing CALL.	Male	27	1,38	,51	47	-,97	,76	Female	22	1,58	,51	7. I think that CALL can be a remedy for the problems of teaching English at higher education level.	Male	27	1,08	,28	47	-,67	,18	Female	22	1,17	,40	8. I think that CALL programs can motivate the students and instructors more than the traditional methods and techniques.	Male	27	2,77	,44	47	1,85	,043*	Female	22	2,42	,51	9. I think CALL applications changed my students' attitudes towards English courses.	Male	27	1,92	,28	47	,06	,91	Female	22	1,92	,29	10. I think CALL applications changed my students' English course grades.	Male	27	1,85	,38	47	,08	,87	Female	22	1,83	,40	11. I think that my students are communicative after the CALL programs were introduced.	Male	27	1,77	,44	47	-,39	,44	Female	22	1,83	,40	12. I think that there is an increase in my students' success at English.	Male	27	1,92	,28	47	,67	,18	Female	22	1,83	,39	13. I think CALL can solve problems like insufficient attendance of students to the classes and low motivation.	Male	27	1,31	,48	47	-1,39	,32	Female	22	1,58	,51	14. I recommend using CALL programs in English classes.	Male	27	1,54	,52	47	,59	,68	Female	22	1,41	,51																				
4. I think that the current applications of CALL are successful for students' grades.	Male	27	1,15	,38	47	1,68	,04*																																																																																																																																																								
	Female	22	1,33	,49				5. I think that the current applications of CALL are successful for students' pace.	Male	27	1,33	,51	47	1,68	,02*	Female	22	1,17	,40	6. I confront technical problems while implementing CALL.	Male	27	1,38	,51	47	-,97	,76	Female	22	1,58	,51	7. I think that CALL can be a remedy for the problems of teaching English at higher education level.	Male	27	1,08	,28	47	-,67	,18	Female	22	1,17	,40	8. I think that CALL programs can motivate the students and instructors more than the traditional methods and techniques.	Male	27	2,77	,44	47	1,85	,043*	Female	22	2,42	,51	9. I think CALL applications changed my students' attitudes towards English courses.	Male	27	1,92	,28	47	,06	,91	Female	22	1,92	,29	10. I think CALL applications changed my students' English course grades.	Male	27	1,85	,38	47	,08	,87	Female	22	1,83	,40	11. I think that my students are communicative after the CALL programs were introduced.	Male	27	1,77	,44	47	-,39	,44	Female	22	1,83	,40	12. I think that there is an increase in my students' success at English.	Male	27	1,92	,28	47	,67	,18	Female	22	1,83	,39	13. I think CALL can solve problems like insufficient attendance of students to the classes and low motivation.	Male	27	1,31	,48	47	-1,39	,32	Female	22	1,58	,51	14. I recommend using CALL programs in English classes.	Male	27	1,54	,52	47	,59	,68	Female	22	1,41	,51																																
5. I think that the current applications of CALL are successful for students' pace.	Male	27	1,33	,51	47	1,68	,02*																																																																																																																																																								
	Female	22	1,17	,40				6. I confront technical problems while implementing CALL.	Male	27	1,38	,51	47	-,97	,76	Female	22	1,58	,51	7. I think that CALL can be a remedy for the problems of teaching English at higher education level.	Male	27	1,08	,28	47	-,67	,18	Female	22	1,17	,40	8. I think that CALL programs can motivate the students and instructors more than the traditional methods and techniques.	Male	27	2,77	,44	47	1,85	,043*	Female	22	2,42	,51	9. I think CALL applications changed my students' attitudes towards English courses.	Male	27	1,92	,28	47	,06	,91	Female	22	1,92	,29	10. I think CALL applications changed my students' English course grades.	Male	27	1,85	,38	47	,08	,87	Female	22	1,83	,40	11. I think that my students are communicative after the CALL programs were introduced.	Male	27	1,77	,44	47	-,39	,44	Female	22	1,83	,40	12. I think that there is an increase in my students' success at English.	Male	27	1,92	,28	47	,67	,18	Female	22	1,83	,39	13. I think CALL can solve problems like insufficient attendance of students to the classes and low motivation.	Male	27	1,31	,48	47	-1,39	,32	Female	22	1,58	,51	14. I recommend using CALL programs in English classes.	Male	27	1,54	,52	47	,59	,68	Female	22	1,41	,51																																												
6. I confront technical problems while implementing CALL.	Male	27	1,38	,51	47	-,97	,76																																																																																																																																																								
	Female	22	1,58	,51				7. I think that CALL can be a remedy for the problems of teaching English at higher education level.	Male	27	1,08	,28	47	-,67	,18	Female	22	1,17	,40	8. I think that CALL programs can motivate the students and instructors more than the traditional methods and techniques.	Male	27	2,77	,44	47	1,85	,043*	Female	22	2,42	,51	9. I think CALL applications changed my students' attitudes towards English courses.	Male	27	1,92	,28	47	,06	,91	Female	22	1,92	,29	10. I think CALL applications changed my students' English course grades.	Male	27	1,85	,38	47	,08	,87	Female	22	1,83	,40	11. I think that my students are communicative after the CALL programs were introduced.	Male	27	1,77	,44	47	-,39	,44	Female	22	1,83	,40	12. I think that there is an increase in my students' success at English.	Male	27	1,92	,28	47	,67	,18	Female	22	1,83	,39	13. I think CALL can solve problems like insufficient attendance of students to the classes and low motivation.	Male	27	1,31	,48	47	-1,39	,32	Female	22	1,58	,51	14. I recommend using CALL programs in English classes.	Male	27	1,54	,52	47	,59	,68	Female	22	1,41	,51																																																								
7. I think that CALL can be a remedy for the problems of teaching English at higher education level.	Male	27	1,08	,28	47	-,67	,18																																																																																																																																																								
	Female	22	1,17	,40				8. I think that CALL programs can motivate the students and instructors more than the traditional methods and techniques.	Male	27	2,77	,44	47	1,85	,043*	Female	22	2,42	,51	9. I think CALL applications changed my students' attitudes towards English courses.	Male	27	1,92	,28	47	,06	,91	Female	22	1,92	,29	10. I think CALL applications changed my students' English course grades.	Male	27	1,85	,38	47	,08	,87	Female	22	1,83	,40	11. I think that my students are communicative after the CALL programs were introduced.	Male	27	1,77	,44	47	-,39	,44	Female	22	1,83	,40	12. I think that there is an increase in my students' success at English.	Male	27	1,92	,28	47	,67	,18	Female	22	1,83	,39	13. I think CALL can solve problems like insufficient attendance of students to the classes and low motivation.	Male	27	1,31	,48	47	-1,39	,32	Female	22	1,58	,51	14. I recommend using CALL programs in English classes.	Male	27	1,54	,52	47	,59	,68	Female	22	1,41	,51																																																																				
8. I think that CALL programs can motivate the students and instructors more than the traditional methods and techniques.	Male	27	2,77	,44	47	1,85	,043*																																																																																																																																																								
	Female	22	2,42	,51				9. I think CALL applications changed my students' attitudes towards English courses.	Male	27	1,92	,28	47	,06	,91	Female	22	1,92	,29	10. I think CALL applications changed my students' English course grades.	Male	27	1,85	,38	47	,08	,87	Female	22	1,83	,40	11. I think that my students are communicative after the CALL programs were introduced.	Male	27	1,77	,44	47	-,39	,44	Female	22	1,83	,40	12. I think that there is an increase in my students' success at English.	Male	27	1,92	,28	47	,67	,18	Female	22	1,83	,39	13. I think CALL can solve problems like insufficient attendance of students to the classes and low motivation.	Male	27	1,31	,48	47	-1,39	,32	Female	22	1,58	,51	14. I recommend using CALL programs in English classes.	Male	27	1,54	,52	47	,59	,68	Female	22	1,41	,51																																																																																
9. I think CALL applications changed my students' attitudes towards English courses.	Male	27	1,92	,28	47	,06	,91																																																																																																																																																								
	Female	22	1,92	,29				10. I think CALL applications changed my students' English course grades.	Male	27	1,85	,38	47	,08	,87	Female	22	1,83	,40	11. I think that my students are communicative after the CALL programs were introduced.	Male	27	1,77	,44	47	-,39	,44	Female	22	1,83	,40	12. I think that there is an increase in my students' success at English.	Male	27	1,92	,28	47	,67	,18	Female	22	1,83	,39	13. I think CALL can solve problems like insufficient attendance of students to the classes and low motivation.	Male	27	1,31	,48	47	-1,39	,32	Female	22	1,58	,51	14. I recommend using CALL programs in English classes.	Male	27	1,54	,52	47	,59	,68	Female	22	1,41	,51																																																																																												
10. I think CALL applications changed my students' English course grades.	Male	27	1,85	,38	47	,08	,87																																																																																																																																																								
	Female	22	1,83	,40				11. I think that my students are communicative after the CALL programs were introduced.	Male	27	1,77	,44	47	-,39	,44	Female	22	1,83	,40	12. I think that there is an increase in my students' success at English.	Male	27	1,92	,28	47	,67	,18	Female	22	1,83	,39	13. I think CALL can solve problems like insufficient attendance of students to the classes and low motivation.	Male	27	1,31	,48	47	-1,39	,32	Female	22	1,58	,51	14. I recommend using CALL programs in English classes.	Male	27	1,54	,52	47	,59	,68	Female	22	1,41	,51																																																																																																								
11. I think that my students are communicative after the CALL programs were introduced.	Male	27	1,77	,44	47	-,39	,44																																																																																																																																																								
	Female	22	1,83	,40				12. I think that there is an increase in my students' success at English.	Male	27	1,92	,28	47	,67	,18	Female	22	1,83	,39	13. I think CALL can solve problems like insufficient attendance of students to the classes and low motivation.	Male	27	1,31	,48	47	-1,39	,32	Female	22	1,58	,51	14. I recommend using CALL programs in English classes.	Male	27	1,54	,52	47	,59	,68	Female	22	1,41	,51																																																																																																																				
12. I think that there is an increase in my students' success at English.	Male	27	1,92	,28	47	,67	,18																																																																																																																																																								
	Female	22	1,83	,39				13. I think CALL can solve problems like insufficient attendance of students to the classes and low motivation.	Male	27	1,31	,48	47	-1,39	,32	Female	22	1,58	,51	14. I recommend using CALL programs in English classes.	Male	27	1,54	,52	47	,59	,68	Female	22	1,41	,51																																																																																																																																
13. I think CALL can solve problems like insufficient attendance of students to the classes and low motivation.	Male	27	1,31	,48	47	-1,39	,32																																																																																																																																																								
	Female	22	1,58	,51				14. I recommend using CALL programs in English classes.	Male	27	1,54	,52	47	,59	,68	Female	22	1,41	,51																																																																																																																																												
14. I recommend using CALL programs in English classes.	Male	27	1,54	,52	47	,59	,68																																																																																																																																																								
	Female	22	1,41	,51																																																																																																																																																											

\* The mean difference is significant at the ,05 level.

According to Table 1, the mean of the male participants is 1,23 and female participants' mean is 1,33 for item 2 "I think that the current applications of CALL are successful for motivation." which are very close to each other. In addition, the variance is statistically significant ( $p < ,05$ ).

As it is seen in Table 1 when the item 4 "I think that the current applications of CALL are successful for students' grades in English courses." asked to male instructors, the mean is 1,15 ( $SD=,38$ ) and the mean for females is 1,33 ( $SD=,49$ ). The result of the t-test is 1,68, and it is significant ( $p<,05$ ). It can be interpreted as the male instructors find CALL more successful with respect to the grades of the students.

The table also shows that there is a significant result for the item "I think that the current applications of CALL are successful for the students' pace." in that mean for the male instructors is 1,38 ( $SD=,51$ ) and the mean for females is 1,17 ( $SD=,45$ ). The result of the t-test is 1,68. This result is statistically significant ( $p<,05$ ). It can be interpreted as the males believe that CALL facilitates students working at their own pace.

Another significant result is to the item "I think that CALL programs can motivate the students and instructors more than the traditional methods and techniques." The mean for the males is 2,77 ( $SD=,44$ ) and the mean for the female instructors is 2,42 ( $SD=,51$ ). The result of the t-test is significant ( $p<,05$ ). More male instructors think that CALL programs motivate instructors and students better than traditional techniques and methods in language learning.

### **T-Test Results with respect to Education Level**

The results showed that the participants perceived that CALL's success for attendance and grades of the students is the same; that is to say, they are not significant statistically with respect to the education level of the participants. The mean of the graduate participants is 1,25 ( $SD=,45$ ) and postgraduate participants' mean is 1,33 ( $SD=,50$ ) for the item "I think that the current applications of CALL are successful for students' motivation" which are very close to each other. In addition, there is not significant difference ( $p>,05$ ). This result shows us that both the graduates and postgraduates think in the same way; that is to say, they believe that CALL facilitates the motivation of students.

When the participants answered the item "I think that the current applications of CALL are successful for students' attendance to the lessons.", the mean for the graduate participants is 1,00 ( $SD=,00$ ) and the mean for the postgraduate instructors is 1,33 ( $SD=,50$ ). The t-test result is -2,71. This result is statistically significant. It shows us that the postgraduate participants believe that CALL enhances the students' attendance more than the graduate participants. Another finding is that according to graduate participants CALL has a contribution to the students' grades which means that CALL has an effect on students' success.

Graduate instructors believe that CALL programs enhance the communicative faculties of the students more than postgraduate instructors. The mean for the graduates is 1,88 ( $SD=,34$ ) and the mean for the postgraduates is 1,67 ( $SD=,50$ ). The t-test result is 1,68 which is significant ( $p<,05$ ).

When the responses to the item "I think that there is an increase in my students' success at English?" is considered, mean for the graduates is 1,9 ( $SD=,25$ ) and the mean for the postgraduates is 1,78 ( $SD=,44$ ). The t-test result is 1,67 ( $p<,05$ ). It is significant which shows that graduates think that students' success in English is enhanced by CALL.

### T-Test Results of Weekly Hours in the CALL Laboratory

The results showed no statistically significance with respect to weekly hours in the CALL laboratory. The mean for the participants who have classes in the CALL laboratory between 1 and 5 hours a week is 1,44 ( $SD=,73$ ) and the mean for the participants who have classes in CALL laboratory 6 to 10 hours a week is 1,75 ( $SD=,58$ ) for the item "I feel myself efficient in CALL when I started the program." There is no statistical significance in the variance. This result shows us that both the instructors who have 1-5 or 6-10 hours a week in the CALL laboratory think in the same way; that is to say, they believe that they feel the same efficiency when they started implementing the program.

When the participants responded to "I think that the current applications of CALL are successful for students' motivation.", the mean for the participants who have classes between 1 and 5 hours a week is 1,11 ( $SD=,33$ ) and the mean for the instructors who have classes from 6 to 10 hours in a week is 1,38 ( $SD=,50$ ). The t-test result is -1,88. This result is significant ( $p<,05$ ). It shows us that the instructors who have classes in the CALL laboratory from 6 to 10 hours a week believe that CALL enhances the students' motivation more than the participants who have 1-5 hours a week in the laboratory. It can be suggested that the amount of hours in the laboratory has a positive effect on the motivation of the students. The same results are also valid for the attendance of the students to the courses. The instructors who have more classes think that CALL is successful at enhancing the attendance of the students.

The results of the item "I think that the current applications of CALL are successful to increase the grades of the students in English courses." show that mean for the instructors teaching 1-5 hours in a week in the CALL laboratory is 1,11 ( $SD=,33$ ) and the mean for the instructors who teach 6 to 10 hours is 1,31 ( $SD=,48$ ). The t-test result is -1,68 ( $p<,05$ ). This result is significant which shows us that the instructors who teach more in the CALL laboratory perceive that there is an increase in the grades of the students in English courses.

As for the changes in the students' grades after CALL programs, more instructors who have 6-10 hours a week denote that CALL contributes to the increase in the students' grades. The mean for the instructors having classes between 1 and 5 hours is 1,6667 ( $SD=,50$ ). The mean for the instructors having classes between 6 and 10 hours is 1,9375 ( $SD=,25$ ). T-test result is -1,81. This result is significant ( $p<,05$ ).

When the instructors responded to the item "I think that my students are communicative after the CALL programs were introduced.", the mean for participants who have 1-5 hours a week is 1,67 ( $SD=,50$ ) and the mean for the instructors is 1,88 ( $SD=,34$ ). The t-test result is -1,67 which is significant ( $p<,05$ ). It shows us that the more the instructors have lessons in the CALL laboratory, the more they believe that CALL facilitates the communicative faculties of the students.

### Variance Results for the Year of Professional Experience

When the responses to the item "I think CALL can solve insufficient attendance to the classes and low motivation of students." are analysed, the answers to all of the items in the questionnaire with respect to year of professional experience are the same. The results show that the means for the item "I think that CALL can be a remedy for the problems of teaching English at higher education level," are 1,00 for instructors who



have 1-5 year experience, for 6-10 year experience 1,13 and for 11 or more than 11-year experience 1,14. There is no significant difference between the perceptions of the instructors who have been working for different years. They all think that CALL can be a remedy for student problems like low motivation and attendance to the courses.

Year of experience in teaching English is not a significant variable in the answers to the questionnaire. It has only effects on the answers to the question "I think CALL can solve the problems like insufficient attendance of students to the classes and low motivation." The variance result is significant according to the LSD test. ( $F = ,04$ ). When the means to this item are analysed, the mean for 1-5 year professional experience is 2,00; the mean for 6-10 year experience is 1,40 and the mean for 11-or more than 11-year experience is 1,29. The variance result is 4,42. It is concluded from the means that more instructors who have 1-5 year experience think that CALL can solve the motivation and attendance problems of the students.

### **T-Test Results of the CALL Implemented Programs**

When Table 2 is analysed, most of the items did not differ in terms of implemented programs. Only four of the responses to the items were statistically significant.

The responses to item 2 show us that who implement CALL only in the preparatory classes think that it is successful for motivation ( $M=1,35$ ;  $SD=,49$ ). The mean for the instructors who use it both in preparatory and service English classes is 1,00 ( $SD=,00$ ) and t-test result is ,042 which is significant ( $p < ,05$ ). The same result is also valid for the question "I think that the current applications of CALL are successful for students' grades in English courses."

When the participants are asked "I confront technical problems while implementing CALL.", the instructors who use CALL programs in the preparatory classes confronted with technical problems ( $M=1,40$   $SD=,50$ ) more than the instructors who use CALL in both service English and preparatory classes ( $M=1,80$   $SD=,45$ ). It can be interpreted as who use programs only in preparatory classes have more technical problems. This may be related to the number of students in that when the CALL is implemented in both preparatory classes and service English, it appeals to more students and the instructors may demand more support from the administration of the university. There is a similar result and significance for the item "I think CALL applications changed my students' English course grades."

When the participants are asked "I recommend using CALL programs in English classes?", more instructors who use CALL in preparatory classes suggest using it in English courses ( $M=1,55$   $SD=,51$ ). The mean for the instructors using CALL in both preparatory and service English classes is 1,20 ( $SD=,45$ ). The t-test result is 4,42 ( $p < ,05$ ).

Table 2  
T-Test Results of the CALL Implemented Programs

	In which programs do you use CALL?	N	Mean	SD	df	t	p
1. I feel myself efficient in CALL when I started the program.	Prep. Classes	41	1,5	0,51	47	-1,40	0,14
	Prep and service English classes	8	2,2	0,84			
2. I think that the current applications of CALL are successful for students' motivation.	Prep. Classes	41	1,35	0,49	47	4,42	<b>0,04*</b>
	Prep and service English classes	8	1,00	0			
3. I think that the current applications of CALL are successful for attendance to the courses.	Prep. Classes	41	1,10	0,31	47	-0,60	0,28
	Prep and service English classes	8	1,20	0,45			
4. I think that the current applications of CALL are successful for students' grades.	Prep. Classes	41	1,30	0,47	47	4,42	<b>0,04*</b>
	Prep and service English classes	8	1,00	0			
5. I think that the current applications of CALL are successful for students' pace.	Prep. Classes	41	1,30	0,47	47	0,43	0,34
	Prep and service English classes	8	1,20	0,45			
	Prep. Classes	41	1,40	0,50	47	-4,42	0,05
6. I confront technical problems while implementing CALL.	Prep and service English classes	8	1,80	0,45			
	Prep and service English classes	8	1,20	0,45			
	Prep. Classes	41	1,10	0,31	47	-0,60	0,28
7. I think that CALL can be a remedy for the problems of teaching English at higher education level.	Prep. Classes	41	1,10	0,31	47	-0,60	0,28
	Prep and service English classes	8	1,20	0,45			
8. I think that CALL programs can motivate the students and instructors more than traditional methods and techniques.	Prep. Classes	41	2,60	0,50	47	0	1
	Prep and service English classes	8	2,60	0,55			
9. I think CALL applications changed my students' attitudes towards English courses.	Prep. Classes	41	1,95	0,22	47	4,42	0,05
	Prep and service English classes	8	1,80	0,45			
9. I think CALL applications changed my students' English course grades.	Prep. Classes	41	1,90	0,31	47	4,42	<b>0,02*</b>
	Prep and service English classes	8	1,60	0,55			
11. I think that my students are communicative after the CALL programs were introduced.	Prep. Classes	41	1,85	0,37	47	1,67	0,07
	Prep and service English classes	8	1,60	0,55			
12. I think that there is an increase in your students' success at English.	Prep. Classes	41	1,90	0,31	47	0,60	0,28
	Prep and service English classes	8	1,80	0,45			
13. I think that CALL can solve the problems like insufficient attendance of students to the classes and low motivation.	Prep. Classes	41	1,40	0,50	47	-0,78	1
	Prep and service English classes	8	1,60	0,58			
14. I recommend using CALL programs in English classes.	Prep. Classes	41	1,55	0,51	47	4,42	<b>0,04*</b>
	Prep and service English classes	8	1,20	0,45			

\* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

### CALL Perceptions and Attitudes of EFL Instructors' who do not use CALL

According to the perceptions of non-CALL users, CALL is not seen as an area of hesitation any more by the instructors of different genders, education level, and professional experience. The instructors have computer literacy. They are willing to implement CALL in their programs. They think that the applicability of CALL in their universities is high.

### T-Test Results of Willingness to Use CALL with respect to Genders

When the item "I want to use CALL." asked to instructors of both genders, the mean for the males is 1,11 ( $SD=, 32$ ) and mean for females is 1,09 ( $SD=, 29$ ). Both genders

have the same attitudes towards using CALL; that is, they are willing to use CALL. This result can be interpreted as advantage in implementing CALL in the future.

#### **T-Test Results of Willingness to Use CALL with respect to Level of Education**

When the item "I want to use CALL." asked to instructors who have a graduate or postgraduate degree, the mean for the graduates is 1,12 ( $SD=,33$ ) and mean for postgraduates is 1,06 ( $SD=, 25$ ). The difference between groups is insignificant. Both graduates and the postgraduates showed willingness to use CALL.

#### **Variance Results of Willingness to Use CALL with respect to Year of Professional Experience**

When the mean results of the year of professional experience of the participants are analysed, the mean for 1-5 year experience is 1,06; 6-10 year experience is 1,12; 11- more than 11 year experience is 1,11. There is no significant difference with regard to the year of professional experience and willingness to use CALL among the participants when the mean results are investigated.

#### **T-Test Results of the Motivation of the Students with respect to Genders**

When motivation of students with respect to gender was investigated, it was found that there is a significant difference between the male and the female instructors about the motivation of the students in the classroom or the laboratory lessons., The mean for the males is 1,21 ( $SD=, 42$ ) and the mean for females is 1,39 ( $SD=, 50$ ).

#### **T-Test Results for Motivation of the Students with respect to Education Level**

There is no significant difference when the item "I want to use CALL." asked to instructors who have a graduate or postgraduate degree. The mean for the graduates is 1,34 ( $SD=,49$ ) and mean for postgraduates is 1,25 ( $SD=, 45$ ). Both graduates and the postgraduates believe that students are more motivated during the laboratory classes. This can be interpreted that instructors of both education level need laboratories in their institutions.

#### **Variance Results of the Motivation of the Students with respect to Year of Professional Experience**

When the mean results of the motivation of the students according to year of professional experience of the participants are analysed, the mean for 1-5 year experience is 1,44; 6-10 year experience is 1,18; 11- more than 11 year experience is 1,33. There is no significant difference between perceptions about students' motivation according to year of experience among the participants.

#### **Willingness to Participate in CALL with respect to Genders**

Table 3 shows us that there is a significant difference between male and female instructors about the willingness to implement CALL.

Table 3  
Willingness to Participate in CALL with respect to Genders

	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-test	p
Would you like to take part in CALL applications?	Male	19	1,16	,37	1,25	,01*
	Female	23	1,04	,21		

\* The mean difference is significant at the ,05 level.

Male instructors are more willing than female instructors to take part in CALL applications.

As is seen in Table 3, the difference is significant ( $p < ,05$ ). The mean for the male instructors ( $M=1,16$ ;  $SD=,37$ ) is higher than that of the females ( $M=1,04$ ;  $SD=,21$ ). This result is similar to the result of willingness to use CALL because males are more willing to use CALL.

### Willingness to Take Part in CALL Applications with respect to Education Level

The t-test result of the willingness to participate in CALL according to education level is insignificant. The mean for the graduates is 1,07 ( $SD=,27$ ) and the mean for the postgraduates is 1,13 ( $SD=,34$ ). This result can be interpreted as the instructors having a postgraduate degree seem more aware of the benefits of CALL.

### Willingness to Participate in CALL with respect to Year of Professional Experience

When the mean results of the participants' year of professional experience are analysed, the mean for 1-5 year experience is 1,06; 6-10 year experience is 1,06; 11- more than 11-year experience is 1,22.

Table 4  
Willingness to Participate in CALL with respect to Year of Professional Experience

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between Groups	,185	2	9,241	1,05	,36
Within Groups	3,434	39	8,806		
Total	3,619	41			

\* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Table 4 shows us that there is no significant difference. This is an important result in that the instructors who have more experience than the other instructors are also willing to take part in CALL applications.

### T-Test Results of Efficiency in CALL with respect to Genders

As it is seen in Table 5 when the question "Can you use CALL efficiently?" asked, the mean for the males is 2,00 ( $SD=,75$ ) and mean for the females is 1,61 ( $SD=,72$ ).

Table 5  
T-Test Results of Efficiency in CALL with respect to Genders

	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-test	p
Can you use CALL efficiently?	Male	19	2,00	,75	1,72	,04*
	Female	23	1,61	,72		

\* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

The result of the t-test shows that there is a significant difference between the genders ( $p < .05$ ). It can be interpreted as the males feel more efficient in CALL than females.

### **Variance Results for Efficiency in CALL**

When the mean results of the efficiency in CALL applications of the participants are analysed, the mean for 1-5 year experience is 1,94; 6-10 year experience is 1,71; 11- more than 11-year experience is 1,67.

There is no significant difference according to the efficiency in using CALL and year of experience among the participants. The results show that there is no significant difference when the means are analysed; the younger instructors who have 1-5 year experience are more willing to implement CALL.

### **Discussion and Conclusion**

In this study, it was aimed to have an understanding of perceptions and attitudes of EFL instructors towards CALL which is defined as the use of computers in language learning. The overall results of the study showed that EFL instructors have positive perceptions and attitudes towards implementing CALL, and there is a great willingness to use CALL at higher education institutions in Turkey in English courses both in preparatory classes and service English courses. This finding is also similar to that of Ekşi (2012), Aydin (2013), Christie (2001), Wiebe and Kabata (2010), İnce (2017) who also suggested that EFL instructors have positive attitudes towards ICT use in foreign language teaching. The questionnaires show us that male instructors find CALL more applicable and they state that they find themselves more efficient in using the programs which is related to computer literacy. This finding is also similar to Mahdi and Al-Dera (2013) who found out that female teachers used ICT less than male teachers in language teaching. Both the graduate and postgraduate participants believe that CALL enhances the students' attendance. The motivation of the students at higher education level is highly an important problem which is very effective in students' success and proficiency in English. We found out that most of the participants stated that CALL can serve as a solution to this problem. This finding is in line with the results of Kim's (2008) study which suggested that computers may serve as a motivator.

Most of the instructors from various universities think that CALL is problematic when the institution does not support technically as the computers in the laboratory require technical support for upgrades, internet access problems and hardware. The instructors also state that instructors who have a good command of computer literacy should take part in CALL applications and they should be provided with constant in-service training about using computers in language teaching which was also concluded by Ekşi (2012).

When students start to use CALL laboratory, one of the most important things that should be done regularly is record-keeping. In order to keep a record of the students' success, there is a lot of software in the market and some of the CALL software provides built-in record-keeping facilities.

It has been found out that when computers are integrated into language learning, the first advantage is that students may work independently at their own pace. CALL systems allow the normal and even unusual errors and provide the

students with feedback. CALL systems provide considerable potential for language learning with abundant types of exercises. CALL programs are flexible which enables the learners to choose between various modes. CALL systems have a beneficial effect on learner motivation as the activities are furnished the learners with attractive colours, good quality sound, movement, simulation, and interaction. When there is access to the Internet, computers provide a valuable source for language practice and interaction through multimedia, World Wide Web, e-mail, mailing lists, and discussion forums. Another facility provided by the use of computers is the record keeping which crucially enhances learning (Oredein, 2008). Using CALL programs in language learning may help learners to become more disciplined (Pouranshirvani, 2015). There are lots of reasons for computerising the education in that computers improve both teaching and student achievement. Another advantage of using computers in education is that schools would become more student-centred and more individualised learning would take place than ever before.

When the use of computers in education and mainly EFL was analysed, it was found out that computers were first put into use in education in Turkey in 1980s and their use in foreign language teaching is getting more common day by day. However, after conducting a survey in the higher education institutions in Turkey, it was found out that the ELT (English Language Teaching) instructors who work in the state or foundation universities have a curiosity and willingness to implement CALL programs in their institutions. They are aware of the fact that CALL has a capacity to motivate the students towards language learning, to enable them to work at their own pace, to enhance their communicative skills, success and grades in English courses. It is believed that CALL can be a remedy to solve the problems of EFL at higher education institutions.

Since the world is in a process of rapid changes in technology, foreign language teaching and learning must be a beneficiary of this process by bringing new technologies into the classroom. Students of higher education can learn English in a better environment. Through the integration of CALL into curricula, EFL instructors can get more motivated students. The students have an opportunity to work at their own pace. CALL programs facilitate students' communicative and writing skills. Last but not least, it enhances students' success.

It should be noted that this study has some limitations. It is a survey study depending on the self-report of the limited number of participants from the selected universities. Further studies can be designed with a larger group of instructors and data might be collected through experimental, or quasi-experimental methods for a comprehensive understanding of EFL instructors' CALL applications.

### Acknowledgements

The authors note that this study is a part of the first author's Master of Arts thesis "Modification of Language Laboratories into Computer Assisted Language Learning Laboratories" under the supervision of the second author.

### References

- Albirini, A. (2006). Teachers' attitudes toward information and communication technologies: The case of Syrian EFL teachers. *Computers & Education*, 47(4), 373-398. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2004.10.013

- Alshumaimeri, Y. A. (2008). Perceptions and attitudes towards using CALL in English classrooms among Saudi secondary EFL teachers. *The JALT CALL Journal*, 4(2), 29-46.
- Aydin, S. (2013). Teachers' perceptions about the use of computers in EFL teaching and learning: The case of Turkey. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 26(3), 214-233. doi: 10.1080/09588221.2012.654495
- Capan, S. A. (2012). Teacher attitudes towards computer use in EFL classrooms. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching*, 3, 248-254.
- Carr, N. T. (2006). *Computer-based testing: Prospects for innovative assessment*. In L. Ducate & N. Arnold (Eds.), *Calling on CALL: From theory and research to new directions in foreign language teaching* (CALICO Monograph Series, Vol. 5, pp. 289-312). San Marcos, TX: CALICO.
- Chapelle, C., & Douglas, D. (2006). *Assessing language through computer technology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Christie, K. N. (2001). Web-based multimedia in business Italian: A longitudinal evaluation of learner experiences and attitudes. *Italica*, 78(4), 499-525.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ekşi, G. (2012). Foreign language instructors' computer and information literacy perceived self-efficacy: a school of foreign languages case. *ELT Research Journal*, 1(2), 91-108.
- Hampel, R., & Stickler, U. (2005). New skills for new classrooms: Training tutors to teach languages online. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 18(4), 311-32. doi:10.1080/09588220500335455
- Higgins, C. (1993). *Computer assisted language learning: Current programs and projects*. In: Eric Clearinghouse on languages and linguistics. Washington DC: Eric. ED355835
- Hubbard, P. (2009). *Computer assisted language learning: Vol 1 (Critical Concepts in Linguistics)*. London: Routledge.
- İnce, M. N. (2017). The analysis of EFL teachers' perceptions of CALL and variables influential on teachers' attitudes. *Journal of Narrative and Language Studies*, 5(8), 59-72.
- Jamieson, J., Chapelle, C., & Preiss, S. (2005). CALL evaluations by developers, a teacher, and students. *CALICO Journal*, 22(1), 93-138. doi: 10.1558/cj.v23i1.93-138
- Kadel, R. (2005). How teacher attitudes affect technology integration. *Learning and Leading with Technology*, 32(2), 26-31.
- Kim, H. K. (2008). Beyond motivation: ESL/EFL teachers' perceptions of the role of computers. *CALICO Journal*, 25(2), 241-259.
- Lee, K. (2000). English teachers' barriers to the use of computer-assisted language learning. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 6(12). Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Lee-CALLbarriers.html>

- Mahdi, H., & Al-Dera, A. (2013). The impact of teachers' age, gender and experience on the use of information and communication technology in EFL Teaching. *English Language Teaching*, 6(6), 57-67. doi:10.5539/elt.v6n6p57
- Mirescu, S. (1997). Computer assisted instruction in language teaching. *English Teaching Forum*, 35(1), 53-56.
- Mustafina, A. (2015). *The role of teachers' attitudes toward technology integration in school*. The Eurasia proceedings of educational & social sciences (EPESS), ICRES 2015: International conference on research in education and science. 3, 129-138.
- Oredein, A. (2008). New technology and record keeping in educational management: Levels of secondary school principals' computer literacy and phobia. *Academic Leadership: The Online Journal*, 6(4), Article 9. Retrieved from <https://scholars.fhsu.edu/alj/vol6/iss4/9>
- Pokrivčáková, S. (2015). *CALL and foreign language education: e-textbook for foreign language teachers*. Nitra: Constantine the Philosopher University. doi: 10.17846/CALL.2014.29-37
- Pouranshirvani, M. (2015). Computer-assisted language learning takes into account individual differences. *Cumhuriyet University Faculty of Science, Science Journal (CSJ)*, 36(3) Special Issue, 888-915.
- Robinson, B. (1985). *Microcomputers and the language arts*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Stone, L. A. (1991). *Task-based activities: Making the language laboratory interactive*. ERIC Digest, ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics. Washington DC.
- Warschauer, M., & Healey, D. (1998). Computers and language learning: An overview. *Language Teaching*, 31, 57-71.
- Warschauer, M., Shetzer, H., & Meloni, C. (2000). *Internet for English teaching*. Alexandria, Virginia: TESOL Inc.
- Wiebe, G., & Kabata, K. (2010). Students' and instructors' attitudes toward the use of CALL in foreign language teaching and learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 23(3), 221-234. doi: 10.1080/09588221.2010.486577

### Araştırmanın Etik Taahhüt Metni

Yapılan bu çalışmada bilimsel, etik ve alıntı kurallarına uyulduğu; toplanan veriler üzerinde herhangi bir tahrifatın yapılmadığı, karşılaşılabilecek tüm etik ihlallerde "Cumhuriyet Uluslararası Eğitim Dergisi ve Editörünün" hiçbir sorumluluğunun olmadığı, tüm sorumluluğun Sorumlu Yazara ait olduğu ve bu çalışmanın herhangi başka bir akademik yayın ortamına değerlendirme için gönderilmemiş olduğu sorumlu yazar tarafından taahhüt edilmiştir.

### Authors' Biodata/ Yazar Bilgileri

**Hakan Demiröz** works as an assistant professor in the Department of Foreign Language Education at the Faculty of Education, Sivas Cumhuriyet University, Turkey. His research interests include L2 motivation, L2 reading and writing, CALL, and literature and language teaching.

**Hakan DEMİRÖZ** Sivas Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümünde doktor öğretim üyesi olarak görev yapmaktadır. Çalışma alanları



arasında yabancı dil öğrenme motivasyonu, yabancı dilde okuma ve yazma, BDDE, ve edebiyat ve dil öğretimi bulunmaktadır.

**Faruk Türker** worked as an assistant professor in the Department of English Language and Literature at the Faculty of Letters, Sivas Cumhuriyet University, Turkey. He is retired.

**Faruk TÜRKER** Sivas Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümünde yardımcı doçent olarak çalışmıştır. Emeklidir.