CHAPTER I:
INTRODUCTION

The decision of using and integrating computer assisted language learning (CALL) into language teaching and learning is more than just purchasing equipment and software and making them available for instructors and their students at language institutions. It goes much beyond that to consider the surrounding context that helps shape the impact of these technologies on teaching and learning. Because language programs are not isolated from the context where they operate, it is important to examine issues surrounding technology use, including institutional support, teachers’ beliefs, and social factors as well as other issues that may stand in the way of integrating technology into these programs.

Some language institutions, however, are not sure of how computer technology could help them with teaching and learning, the institutions often find themselves trying to join the technology movement by purchasing a staggering amount of hardware and software they had not been trained to use (Frase, 1996).

This is despite the fact that there are still many language institutions and professionals who oppose the use and integration of technology for various reasons. Some of these reasons are:
1. The fear on the part of some language professionals that technology will someday replace them. It is true that any learners with Internet access can now choose from a number of online language courses, however, human instructors, I believe, will always be needed.

2. The risk of exposing students to potentially harmful information on the Internet.

3. The time spent on learning computer skills for novice users is usually more than time spent on academic subjects. Bush, 1997 cited a study commissioned by the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy and the Office of Technology of the U.S. Department of Education (1996), who found that 45.5% of the time high school students spent using computers was spent on computer education verses 31.2% spent on academic subjects. Only 2.7% of the time spent on academic subjects was on using computer for language learning. The rest of their computer use was spent on vocational subjects as well as on recreational and other matters.

4. The high cost of technology equipment (Hardware and Software) and the rapid pace of
changes in technology. Language institutions do not want to spend their budgets on equipment that would be out of date a few months later. These advancements put demand on language institutions to spend more money on purchased hardware and software and to keep them current and up-to-date. Amiri (2000) states:

It is well known that the computer you buy today could be out of date 4 months later. Six years ago few people had heard of the world wide web (WWW). Today it is hard to imagine the world without it. Even the humble word processor of yesterday has now turned into a powerful mixture of a desktop publishing and multimedia/web authoring package with its own programming language. (p.78)

The above two different positions raise the question of how CALL should be integrated successfully in EFL programs.

For a successful CALL integration, language institutions need to know issues affecting technology use and provide their faculty members with the support they need to integrate technology into their teaching. Based on needs analysis, each institution may decide the number of computing facilities needed by teachers and their
students with reference to particular educational goals. They are also supposed to help their teachers make sense of the role technology can play in teaching and learning. Blanco (1996) suggests, “all faculty should be in the possession of a computer for use in instruction” (p.118) and that their offices should be wired with telecommunications capabilities. He further suggests that institutions should provide easy access to the electronic mail and the Internet and make them available for faculty and their students. He recommends that institutions should consider the use of technology as one of the components in the promotion and tenure process. He also recommends that teachers should be encouraged to attend conferences on technology-related issues to learn from other teachers’ experiences, or as Pagnucci (1997) puts it in The Tic Toc Story “to understand what technology education might mean for one English department at one institution at one intersection of circumstances” (p.60).

In addition to providing language teachers with adequate CALL resources, it can be equally important that they receive recognition or even financial compensation on their CALL integration effort (Levy, 1997). If language institutions fail to understand the context surrounding CALL use or have no mechanism for encouraging creativity, teachers may not develop positive attitudes
towards technology since it is far easier to teach out of ordinary textbooks.

In view of circumstances mentioned above, this study investigates how computer assisted language learning (CALL) is currently being used by faculty members in EFL instruction at the following Saudi Arabian government-funded universities:

1. King Saud University (KSU),
2. Imam Mohammed Bin Saud Islamic University (IMIU),
3. King Khalid University (KKU), and

In order to determine how CALL is being used and whether a problem existed, the study examined:

1) The computer resources and the types of support provided for EFL faculty members;
2) The most frequently utilized resources, and the manner in which they are used in EFL instruction by EFL faculty members as well as their views about advantages/disadvantages resulting from CALL use and integration;
3) The issues impacting CALL use such as teacher’s beliefs about teaching/learning philosophies and CALL, social factors, and other issues limiting the use of CALL in EFL instruction.
Prior Research

A number of studies have been conducted over the past two decades mainly in the United States and Canada with the aim of surveying the current status of CALL in foreign language programs.

Olsen (1980) undertook a survey to explore the use of CALL in foreign language departments at four-year colleges in the United States. The survey collected information on the current hardware and software available in foreign language departments at that time and investigated the use or planned use of what Olsen termed “computer aided instruction (CAI).” Olson made a list of departments using CAI and names of faculty members in charge of each department. Out of 1810 foreign language departments, 602 responses were received. Only sixty-two (10%) of the total responses reported use of CAI, while 14 were planning to use CAI within two years. 527 indicated that they did not have any intention of using CAI in the near future.

In another study, Graven & Sinyor (1987) carried out a survey to find out how computers were used in Canadian universities for L2 teaching, what kinds of hardware and software were being used, and whether teachers and students were using computers for language learning and teaching. In the second part of the questionnaire, they
also asked CALL faculty if they were interested in networking with other CALL users. In this study, they surveyed 173 university language departments and language labs across Canada. Out of 139 responding departments, only 46% were using computers in their teaching. Another 45% were interested in using computers in the future, 9% were “possible” users, 10% had no intention of using computers, and 3% did not indicate any responses regarding this matter. The non-user respondents attributed why they did not use computers to factors such as lack of funds to buy hardware and software, lack of support from their departments, and lack of recognition or reward such as tenure consideration for people using CALL in their teaching.

12 years after conducting their first study, Graven & Sinyor (1998) followed up the 1987 survey with another survey in the winter of 1998. The objectives of the follow-up survey were the same as those in 1987 except for more focus on changes brought about by computers such as courses taught with and without computers. During this period of time, computer use increased from 33% in 1987 to 84% in 1998. One of the significant applications that was not reported in the 1987 but was the second most used application in 1998 is the use of CALL for cultural enhancement. Graven & Sinyor attributed this to the advent of multimedia and the Internet.
To see how CALL has been conceptualized, Levy (1997) mailed a survey to 213 CALL practitioners at universities, colleges, and private language schools. 104 (48.8%) responses were returned. The questionnaire was distributed to 23 countries. CALL practitioners from 18 countries returned the questionnaire. Among these 18 countries was Saudi Arabia; the location of my intended study. It is unfortunate that no details were given in the survey about what CALL practitioners from Saudi Arabia had to say about their experience with CALL. This does, however, give added need for my own planned study. Information the questionnaire sought to collect included the background of CALL practitioners from different countries, their experience with CALL, the philosophies they used in teaching languages, and obstacles that prevented them from CALL integration. Among the sixteen methods and approaches provided in the questionnaire, communicative language teaching, task-based learning, and grammar instruction were the major three philosophies used in language teaching. Lack of time, funding, and training were found to be the most significant barriers limiting CALL use.

These studies are good starting points for more extensive research in the field of CALL and are indicative of how CALL has been implemented in those surveyed institutions. It is unfortunate that we know
almost nothing about how CALL is being employed in Saudi Arabia from published studies. However, this clearly points to a need for increased CALL-based research in Saudi Arabia. My study examined how computer assisted language learning was being used by faculty members in EFL instruction at four Saudi universities. In addition, the study attempted to identify some deep issues relating to CALL use and its effect on language teaching and learning at the targeted universities.

Study Beneficiaries

This study investigated the extent of CALL use and integration in EFL instruction at four Saudi government-funded universities. Thus, it provides:

1. Baseline data for administrators and decision makers within the English as a foreign language programs at the four universities who need to know about the current state of CALL in EFL instruction. This examination of CALL integration efforts can serve as a vehicle for strategic planning when administrators decide to revise or integrate CALL into their institutions.

2. A description of successful practices of CALL or what Enerson (1997) called “best practices” useful for people involved in Language Teacher
Preparation Programs. Furthermore, the data obtained from the study may help in designing a future in-service CALL training program for faculty members in English language departments at Saudi universities.

3. A necessary knowledge for prospective language faculty members, including myself, who will be hired to teach at these four Saudi universities. After conducting this research and completing my degree, I will join the faculty members at KSU, the original sponsor of my graduate studies including this research. Among other faculty members, I am expected to help in introducing pre-service language teachers to computer technologies and their applications in EFL teaching and learning. Given the fact that this study was conducted in the same context, it is hoped that the study will provide me with some of the necessary knowledge and expertise required for such work.

4. Important information for CALL researchers regarding the current state of CALL in Saudi Arabia. This study is one of few in the field of CALL at Saudi Arabian universities and is thus contributing to the research on computer assisted language learning.
Topic Selection

My interest in this topic dates back to 1994 when I used to work as a teaching assistance at King Saud University. During this period of time, CALL had never been part of any of the language courses syllabi taught at the university except for some minimal practices in older language laboratories, which had traditional and often outdated visual aids. Even when our Language Institution at KSU decided at some point to include an Audio-Visual Course for the Arabic as a second language teacher preparation program, we had to assign teaching the course to a non-language specialist faculty member from the educational technology department at the college of education at KSU.

In 1995 I was granted a full scholarship from KSU to pursue my graduate studies in the United States in the field of applied linguistics with a concentration on Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL). Because the field was relatively new, there were no graduate programs in CALL at most American universities. As an alternative, I took most of my elective courses at the Masters and Ph.D. levels in educational technology and communication media departments. I also took two seminar courses on technology and language teaching and learning and have published several papers (i.e. AlKahtani, 1999a, 1999b,
2000), and reviews (i.e. AlKahtani, 1999c, 1999d, 1999e) in the field of Computer Assisted Language Learning, as well as several presentations at professional conferences (e.g. AlKahtani, 2000a, 2000b, and 2000c). The idea for my present research was developed in one of the seminar courses I took with my dissertation director who helped me narrow the topic to the present study. Since then, I have collected a good number of books, articles, dissertations, and other related materials on the topic. Exploring how Computer Assisted Language Learning is being used by faculty members in EFL instruction at Saudi Arabian universities would help me understand better the context of my prospective work and would result in some suggestions and recommendations regarding the use of CALL in EFL instruction at those universities. It is my hope that this study will help push the wheel of development in my country in general and shed light on CALL use and integration in EFL instruction at Saudi universities in particular.

Statement of the Problem

Although some technologies are used for instructional purposes in various departments at Saudi universities, there is no solid evidence that CALL is fully integrated in any of the Foreign Language Programs at any of the Saudi Arabian universities. Technology
hardware and software may be available in some language
departments, but when it comes to utilization, it appears
that these tools are not fully exploited. According to
the International Handbook of Educational Systems (1983),
the Saudi Arabia educational system has plenty of modern
computer equipment and media. Again, the problem is that
most of the educational technology hardware and software
are not fully utilized. The Handbook gives three main
barriers to the effective use of these educational
technologies in Saudi Arabia:

(i) the lack of courses for which use of audio-
visual or other aids would form an integral part
(ii) the paucity of courses to train teachers in the
efficient use of such equipment and the preparation
of materials
(iii) the shortages of trained technicians to repair
and maintain equipment.(p.787)

While CALL may have some benefits for language
teaching and learning, it may also have negative side
effects such as devoting too much classroom time to
teaching computer skills to novice users and the risk of
exposing students to potentially harmful/offensive
content on the Internet. Despite these possible
drawbacks, I still believe that CALL is a useful tool by
which teachers can enhance their teaching. Scott (1998)
argues that technology has an important influence in
faculty and curriculum and predicts that Internet
technology will continue to expand language faculty
resources to the extent they will be obliged to redefine
their goals and course contents accordingly. She asserts,
however, that faculty should learn how to examine
theories underlying CALL materials rather than focusing
on the ordinary use of CALL applications. Similarly
Pagnucci, 1998 argues that we should move beyond the
ordinary use of CALL and focus not only “on the physical
hardware [but also] the new ways of thinking embodied in
that hardware” (p.48). Teachers should be able to examine
the underlying pedagogical theories of CALL software and
hardware and how they view language teaching and learning
(Scot, 1998; Strickland, 1993). With all these demands
and increased expectations on foreign language faculty,
they appear to have no option but to embrace technology

Knowing what hardware, software, and Internet
connectivity are available for faculty and how they are
using them in EFL instruction at Saudi universities is
thus of critical importance. Another concern is the
context surrounding the use of these technologies and the
impact it has on CALL implementation. Since no single
study deals thoroughly with CALL use in EFL instruction
at Saudi universities, the present study is intended to
answer important questions regarding the current status
of CALL in EFL programs in Saudi Arabia. This study can also help broaden our limited knowledge about CALL integration and its impediments in this area.
Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this study are four-fold:

1. to document the current availability of CALL resources (hardware, software, and Internet connectivity) and the types of institutional support (technical, financial, and training) provided for EFL faculty members and their students in EFL programs at the four selected Saudi universities.

2. to investigate the extent and manner to which technology resources (general purpose software, CALL software, and Internet resources) are utilized in EFL instruction.

3. to identify faculty teaching philosophies and beliefs about CALL as well as their views about the pros and cons of CALL use in EFL instruction.

4. to determine how faculty beliefs about teaching and technology, social factors, and other limitations have impacted the current state of CALL implementation in EFL programs at the four chosen Saudi universities.

Significance of the Study

The importance of proper integration of CALL and its effect on teaching and learning languages has been noted
by CALL researchers including Smith, 1989; Pennington, 1996; Levy, 1997; Warschauer, 1995; Kern & Warschauer, 2000; and Salaberry, 2001.

After reviewing a great deal of literature, I could only find a few studies that relate to computer use by Saudi Higher Education faculty members (e.g. Al-Weshail, 1997; Al-Amri, 1993; and Bin-Bakr, 1996). However, none of these studies was concerned with faculty use of CALL in EFL instruction. Al-Weshail (1997) evaluates the current state of use and integration of computer and computer-related technology applications by faculty at the Institute of Public Administration (IPA). Al-Amri, (1993) investigates and assesses the adoption of microcomputers by King Saud University faculty members and the factors influencing the adoption or non-adoption of microcomputers. Bin-Bakr (1996) investigates the current status of microcomputer technology utilization among Saudi Higher Education Administrators (SHEA) at four Saudi universities: King Saud University (KSU), King Fahad University of Petroleum and Minerals (KFUPM), King Faisal University (KFU), and King Abdulaziz University (KAU). No single study appears to have been conducted on the use of CALL by faculty members in EFL instruction at any of the selected universities. My study is designed to help fill this gap. It is meant to help EFL faculty members at these universities to understand
better the use of CALL in their teaching and to provide administrators with baseline data about CALL to aid in their future planning for integrating CALL into their departments. The current study also provides suggestions and recommendations regarding the use and integration of CALL in EFL instruction at the chosen universities.

Research Questions

The study intends to address the following main question: **What is the current state of Computer Assisted Language Learning in EFL instruction at four Saudi government-funded universities?**

This broad question will be answered by providing responses to the following more specific questions:

1) **Access**

1. What computer resources are provided for EFL faculty members and their students at each of the four universities (e.g. access to instructional equipments, computers, software, Internet connectivity, and student computing services)?

2. What types of institutional support (technical, financial, and training) are currently provided for EFL faculty members?
II) CALL practice

3. Within the categories of (a) general purpose software, (b) CALL software, and (c) Internet resources, which resources are utilized most frequently in EFL instruction?

4. How do faculty members use computer assisted language learning in EFL instruction?

5. What advantages/disadvantages did faculty members perceive as a result of using CALL for EFL instruction?

III) Teaching methods and beliefs about CALL:

6. What teaching philosophies, methods, and approaches did faculty have for EFL instruction?

7. What are EFL faculty members’ beliefs about:
   
   (a) CALL use and integration in EFL instruction?
   
   (b) Limitations that might stand in the way of CALL use in EFL instruction?

III) Beliefs/social factors impacting CALL use and integration
8. How did faculty beliefs about teaching and technology affect their use of CALL for EFL instruction?

9. What social factors have impacted CALL use and integration for EFL instruction?

Definition of Terms

EFL Instruction: For the purpose of this study, EFL instruction refers to the teaching of English as a foreign language. This includes the teaching of English linguistics, literature, and translations.

Quantitative:

Qualitative:

Positivist:

Constructivists:

Multimedia, hypertext, and hypermedia: Ashworth (1996) cited Schwerin as saying:

If you can figure out what they mean by multimedia, please send us a note because it’s not clear that there is a universal definition (p.80).

Ashworth, however, distinguishes between the three terms. He refers to ‘multimedia’ as combinations of sound, video, and other resources, ‘hypertext’ as the linking of text to text, and ‘hypermedia’ as the linking of all media.
**CALL**: In his introduction, Levy (1997), defines Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) as “the search for and study of applications of the computer in language teaching and learning” (p.1).

Kern & Warschauer, (2000) consider network-based language teaching (NBLT) to be one form of CALL since it involves the use of computers connected to each other in either local area network (Intranet), or global networks (the Internet). Chapelle (2000) also suggests that the distinction between pre-network CALL (CALL that does not require computer networking) and network learning does not exist, at least for the time being. She examines themes and activities that emerged throughout the evolution of CALL and decides, “it is useful to consider network-based learning within the scope of CALL” (p.222). Thus, throughout my present study, the term ‘CALL’ will be used to include various computer technologies (hardware, software, and the Internet and its related technologies) as long as they are used for language learning and teaching.

**Bulletin board**: An online area where language learners can post written messages to be read and responded to by peers or teachers. USENET newsgroups focusing on specific topics like study skills or political views are considered to be bulletin boards (Klopfenstein, 1996). Like electronic mail, bulletin board communication is
asynchronous (non-real time communication). However, while electronic mail is sent directly to other recipients using email addresses, the users of bulletin boards post their messages alongside other people’s messages in a public forum.

**LAN:** An abbreviation for Local Area Network; computers connected one to another within the same school or language laboratory to share expensive equipment and resources. Teachers also use LAN to engage their students in email exchanges or chat sessions. Computers connected to a local area network are not often connected to the outside/Internet.

**WAN:** An abbreviation for Wide Area Network. Communication through WAN covers a longer geographical distance than a single school or building. Computers connected to a wide area network are often connected through modems and telephone line or leased line systems. The Internet is an example of a larger WAN.

**Synchronous communication:** Computer-mediated communication that enables individuals to exchange instant written or spoken messages. Communication can be done over LAN using specific software programs such as Daedalus or through the Internet using Internet Relay Chat (IRC), AOL or MSN Instant Messenger, or similar software. Synchronous communication is similar to live speech/phone conversations.
**Asynchronous communication:** Computer-mediated communication with a delayed message system such as electronic mail, bulletin boards, and Usenet newsgroups (Warschauer & Healy, 1998). The aspect here is Delay. Similar to letter writing, messages first written, and then sent for reading at a later time.

**NBLT:** Network-based language teaching where networking is needed. Language learners can communicate one to one, one to many, or many to many using either LAN or WAN. NBLT is considered as an expansion of the term CALL (Chapelle, 2000).

**Context of the study**

The present study was conducted in foreign language learning settings at King Saud University (KSU), Imam Mohammed bin Saud Islamic University (IMIU), King Khalid University (KKU), and King Fahad University of Petroleum and Minerals (KFUPM) (A map is in appendix #). KSU and IMIU are located in Riyadh, the capital city of Saudi Arabia, which represents a typical urban setting with enormous government buildings, paved highways, wide streets, and tunnels. KKU is located in Abha, about 1000 K.M. south-west of Riyadh. Abha is a beautiful rural town with mild weather, high mountains, and green landscapes. The beauty of this town and its mild weather attract tourists from all over the country and from the
Arabian Gulf states. King Fahad University of Petroleum & Minerals (KFUPM) is located in Dahran, 20 kilometers away from Dammam, a coastal town along the Arabian Gulf and is the capital city of the Eastern Province of Saudi Arabia. The State of Bahrain, a small country in the Arabian Gulf, is about 35 Kilometers away from the campus.

Selection of the Participating Universities

Four of the country’s eight government-funded universities were selected to participate in this study. Students enrolled at government-funded universities enjoy free tuition, and nearly free dormitories and board as well as monthly financial support. Faculty members at these schools are generally well paid and their positions as faculty members are respected in Saudi Arabian society.

The participating universities were selected based on the following criteria:

1- Type: Traditional vs. cutting edge universities
2- Location: Rural, coastal, and urban universities
3- Age: Oldest vs. newly founded universities

Saudi Arabia has eight universities, four of which participated in this study. The four selected
universities (50% of the country universities) are good representatives for the four remaining universities in Saudi Arabia. While KSU represents the oldest and most prestigious university in the country, IMIU is a good model for the most traditional universities in the Kingdom. KKU, on the other hand, is a merger of the two universities and would represent rural and newly founded institutions in the country. KFUPM was chosen because of its coastal location and its apparent integration of technology.

Investigating CALL use at these four universities would provide us with the big picture of the current status of CALL in other Saudi universities. Additionally, I believe that exploring the current status of CALL-based teaching in English as foreign language departments could add to my own and others’ understanding of how CALL-based teaching is practiced in English language departments at Saudi universities and would help form the baseline for other English departments to integrate CALL into their academic and training programs.

Due to cost and time limitation, four universities were not examined in this study. These universities were: King Abdulaziz University located in Jeddah, Im Al-Qura University located in Mekkah, The Islamic University located in Al-Madeenah, and King Faisal University located in Al-Ihsa. While the present study gives
indication of the current state of CALL in Saudi Arabia, a study of the remaining four universities would also be useful and is recommended.

Participating Universities

**King Saud University (KSU)** is the oldest university in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. It was founded in 1957 and is comprised of 15 colleges and specialized institutes. KSU has two campuses. The main campus in Riyadh has the colleges of:

- Medicine
- Dentistry
- Medical Science
- Pharmacy
- Science
- Engineering
- Computer Science
- Construction and planning
- Agriculture
- Arts
- Education
- Administrative science
- Graduate studies
• Language and translation
• Arabic language institute

The second campus in Al-Qaseem has colleges of:
• Economics and Administration
• Agriculture
• Veterinary medicine (Al-Amri, 1993).

In response to the increasing need for translators in the major languages of the world, the main campus in Riyadh has a college of Language and Translation that consists of three major departments:
1. The Department of European Languages and Translation: offering instruction in English, French, German, Russian, Italian and Spanish. From these departments, the Department of English participated in this study.
2. The Department of Asian Languages and Translation: offering instruction in Urdu, Turkish, Japanese, Chinese, Persian and Hebrew, and
3. The Department of African Languages and Translation: Offering instruction in Swahili and Hausa.

The college of Arts also houses a department of English language, which also participated in the present study. The department enables Saudi students to major in English language by offering bachelors and masters degrees in English.
Imam Mohammed Ibn Saud Islamic University (IMIU) was founded in 1974 and has colleges of:

- Islamic Law (share'a)
- Arabic Language
- Fundamental Studies in Islam
- Islamic Propagation and Media
- Higher Institute for Islamic Jurisdiction
- Social Studies
- Institute for Teaching Arabic Language (for non-native speakers of Arabic)
- Propagation (in Madenah)
- Studies of Fundamental Principles in Islam, and Social and Arabic Sciences (in Al-Qaseem)
- Jurisdiction and Islamic Studies (in Al-Ihsa area)

IMIU also has several institutes inside the country and abroad, including in the United Arab Emirates, Japan, and the United States (Ministry of higher education in Saudi Arabia, 1998). IMIU is devoted to Arabic and Islamic education and awards bachelor of arts, postgraduate diploma, masters, and doctorate degrees in these fields. The College of Arabic language houses the Languages and Translation Department (English as a foreign language program), which participated in the current study. The Languages and Translation Department
was in the process of becoming a college of Languages and Translation during the time of my study.

King Khalid University (KKU) is a newly founded university in the southern region of Saudi Arabia. The university is a merger of previously two campuses of KSU and IMIU in the southern region of Saudi Arabia.

KSU campus consists of two colleges:

- College of Medicine, and
- College of Education.

College of Medicine has eleven departments:

1. Physiology
2. Anatomy
3. Clinical Biochemistry
4. Pathology
5. Clinical Microbiology & Parasitology
6. Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics
7. Family and Community Medicine
8. Internal Medicine
9. Surgery
10. Gynecology and Obstetrics

College of Education has ten departments:

1. Education
2. Psychology
3. Curriculum and Instruction
4. Biology
5. Physics
6. Chemistry
7. Mathematics
8. History
9. Geography
10. English.

IMIU campus has two colleges:

- College of Share'a, and Studies of Fundamental principles of Islam, and
- College of Arabic Language and Social Sciences.

On May 1998, the two campuses merged in what is now known as King Khalid university; the eighth university in the country. KKU houses the English Language and Translation Institute (ELTI), which participated in this study. ELTI was merged from the former English department at KSU and the former English Language and Translation department at IMIU. As of the year 2000, ELTI has more than 912 students. The focus of ELTI is currently on English language teaching; however, other departments such as linguistics and translation are under consideration. The goal of ELTI is to enable its graduates to work in various fields as related to English such as teaching, propagating, and working abroad at the Saudi embassies.
King Fahad University of Petroleum and Minerals (KFUPM), in the Eastern Province of the country, was established by a Royal Decree in 1963 under the name of College of Petroleum and Minerals (CPM). In 1975, CPM became the University of Petroleum and Minerals. In 1986, the University was renamed: The King Fahad University of Petroleum and Minerals (KFUPM). The University has eight academic units:

- The College of Graduate Studies
- The College of Applied Engineering
- The College of Engineering Sciences
- The College of Sciences
- The College of Industrial Management
- The College of Environmental Design
- The College of Computer Science & Engineering
- The Preparatory Year Program.

Because English is the medium of instruction at KFUPM, the university has two English programs: 1) the Orientation English Program (OEP) that is responsible for preparing students to develop an English proficiency necessary for entering the undergraduate studies at the university, and 2) the University English Program (UEP) which teaches composition and technical writing courses for freshmen students.
Limitations and assumptions of the Study

The following limitations and assumptions may affect the results of this study:

1. While it is important to learn about students’ use of CALL, this study is limited to investigating the use of CALL by EFL faculty members. It is assumed that faculty use of CALL is a critical factor for improving language teaching and learning.

2. This study is limited in its generalizability as it focuses only on four of eight total Saudi government-funded universities. However, it is assumed that CALL use and integration at these four universities is a good indication of how CALL is being used and implemented in the country at the other similar remaining institutions.

3. The issue of gender is another limitation of this study. Due to religious and cultural reasons, it was not possible to have access to female faculty participants. As a result, the findings of this study might not represent the use and integration of CALL by all EFL faculty members.

4. The study employs self-report research (questionnaire and interviews), which relied on
EFL faculty’s self-identified use and integration of CALL. Regardless of data obtained through observation and document analysis, accuracy of data depended on the truthfulness of faculty’s responses and their willingness and ability to provide accurate information about their use of CALL in their teaching.

5. In spite of some negative aspects of CALL such as the high cost of integration, ineffective use, and rapid changes of technology, this study generally support the use and integration of CALL based on the researcher’s belief that we live in a world which is dependent on computer technology for most aspects of our lives. Potential bias may occur as a result of this belief.