CHAPTER VI:
QUALITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS

Chapter IV of this study used quantitative methods to examine EFL faculty members’ access to technology and support provided by their institutions and to explore the extent of their use and beliefs about computer technology in EFL instruction. This Chapter uses qualitative methods to examine these five research questions:

1. How do faculty members use computer assisted language learning for EFL instruction?
2. What advantages/disadvantages did faculty members perceive as a result of using CALL for EFL instruction?
3. How did faculty beliefs about teaching and technology affect their use of CALL for EFL instruction?
4. What social factors have impacted CALL implementation in EFL instruction?
5. What other limitations might stand in the way of CALL use for EFL instruction?

Data from the case studies in Chapter five were used in exploring Questions 1 and 2. Question 3 was addressed with both quantitative and qualitative data. To gain a deeper understanding about issues limiting CALL use and integration, Questions 4 and 5 were addressed using data gathered from interviews with EFL faculty members,
chairpersons, and CALL lab coordinators and campus computing directors.

**CALL Practices at the Four Universities**

The research question, “how do faculty members use computer assisted language learning for EFL instruction?” dealt with computer practices for EFL instruction at the four universities. In order to address this question, data were obtained from the cases studied at IMSIU, KSU/CLT, and KFUPM. While the three cases studied provide some picture of how CALL is being specifically employed in EFL instruction, it should be mentioned that data were also obtained from the questionnaire data form and from interviews with other EFL faculty members. Following is an analysis of how CALL was practiced in EFL instruction at the participating universities and whether their goals of using CALL were met.

**CALL Practice at KSU/COA**

In the English department at KSU/COA and the English Language and Translation Institute at KKU, CALL was not practiced at all except for some EFL faculty members at these two institutions who assigned certain tasks with the help of the computer. This could be attributed to the lack of adequate hardware and software infrastructure as we can sense from the following quote of one of the faculty members at KKU:
If we have labs equipped with computers and CALL software enough for everybody, I would be motivated to use them. If we have access to the Internet, I would not hesitate for a second to use it, I would not hesitate to display my courses on it, and have my students connected and email them, and keep in touch with them, but we don't have the Internet, we don't have the computer lab, we don't have even sometimes overhead projectors, not to mention computers in our classrooms.

CALL Practice at IMSIU

At IMSIU, though Professor Mohammed did not have specific software for teaching writing, he used MS Word processor in teaching EFL college writing. He had three main goals: 1) to break the technophobic attitudes his students had about technology, 2) to introduce students to some basic computing skills such as opening, typing, and saving a document, and 3) to help with peer response. Of course, Professor Mohammed found that he was wrong about the first goal, as we have seen in Chapter V. Though the first two goals were not directly related to language teaching, they were necessarily for the third objective to be accomplished. This may support the fear on the part of some CALL opponents that technology may shift class time to learning computer skills rather than learning language skills (Bush, 1997).
CALL Practice at KSU/CLT

Like Professor Mohammed, MS Word processor was the only teaching software used by Salem from KSU/CLT. The European Languages & Translation Department (English) offered two courses in computer applications in translation. The first one was an introductory course where students learned basic skills such as how to open a file, type a text, and save it. The second course was an advanced one where students learned the application of machine translation. There were two goals for using computers in the classroom as stated in course’s description: 1) to introduce students to basic computer literacy, and 2) to show students the importance of the computer and its application in the field of translation. Based on my observation, it seemed that these two objectives were not very well met. Translating and typing passages from Arabic to English and vise versa using a word processor were the only activities used in the classroom. Students did not seem to be interested in these basic activities and did not have the chance to be introduced to machine translation programs and their applications in the field of translation.

CALL Practice at KFUPM

KFUPM objectives for using CALL as stated in their Lab documents were:
1- To provide basic computer literacy to OEP students.

This objective was accomplished through the introduction and assessment of word-processing, which has been integrated into both 001 and 002 Writing courses. Two Mandatory word-processing lessons are scheduled each semester for each section’s writing class. Typing instruction and practice is available through a self-access program (Mavis Beacon) in the CALL Lab.

2- To reinforce and practice OEP classroom activities.

This objective was only partially met due to outdated CALL materials. Materials for listening and reading skills were not implemented during the time of the study. Even grammar materials for 001 grammar class were designed seven years ago using a Wida authorware program. There were also materials from an old grammar book that had been changed and updated. In order to reinforce and practice OEP activities, the CALL materials must reflect those activities. There was little relationship between the new textbooks and the old CALL materials (the exception being 001 vocabulary components authored in Seminar). In addition, available CALL materials do not reflect KFUPM’s specific focus on
Available Self-access CALL programs at KFUPM were basic drill-and-practice programs that focused on specific language skills such as vocabulary and grammar points. These types of CALL programs as pointed out by Warschauer & Healy (1998) are consistent with Behaviorist CALL, which is designed to repeat teaching the same materials and check learners’ responses on grammatical, vocabulary, and testing exercises and provide them with wrong or right responses on their answers. Neither Communicative CALL Programs that facilitate communication, nor Integrative CALL programs represented in multimedia computers and the Internet were developed in the OEP during the time of the study.

Based on the findings of this study, it can be synthesized that the majority of EFL faculty at Saudi universities were using available computer resources for purposes other than language teaching. Apart from the drill and practice and tutorial programs available as self-access for EFL students at KFUPM, very few faculty members used computer technology for instructional purposes. This usage, however, was limited to motivating students when they got bored with regular classroom activities, producing instructional materials (e.g.
lesson plans, worksheets, etc.) for EFL students, or providing students with basic computing literacy skills. Computer was also used to retype assignments like it was just a typewriter. The most obvious candidate for such use was the Word processor. Multimedia and Internet-based activities had not been utilized in EFL instruction at any of the four universities.

**Advantage/Disadvantages of CALL**

The research question “what advantages/disadvantages did faculty perceive as a result of using CALL for EFL instruction?” dealt with EFL faculty members’ perceptions about the positive and negative aspects of using CALL for EFL instruction.

In order to answer this question, responses to an open-ended question on the questionnaire as well as cases and interview responses from EFL faculty members were analyzed.

The analysis revealed that EFL faculty members had various views about the advantages and disadvantages CALL can bring to EFL instruction. Some EFL faculty members saw only the positive aspects of CALL, others saw some drawbacks besides the positive aspects, and there were those who saw some of the advantages as disadvantages. For example, it was argued that computer mediated communication (CMC) encourages shy students to “speak up” and “speak out” (Warschauer & Healy, 1998). Although this
was a positive aspect, there were some EFL faculty members who thought that this was at the expense of the quality of discourse. These faculty members saw the Internet-based communication as an encouraging factor for students to write in a speech-like format. The result had been “new English” like that used in chatting.

The categories of advantages and disadvantages as seen by EFL faculty members are listed below. The responses per advantage/disadvantage ranged from 5-9 responses for each category.

**Advantages of CALL:**

Following are the top five most frequently cited advantages of CALL in EFL instruction:

**Motivation:** Motivation was found to be the most frequently cited advantage (9 responses). EFL faculty reported that their students got motivated and liked the ordinary book exercises when made interactive. This could be attributed to the tutorial, interactive, and illustration capabilities multimedia has as compared to what some deemed boring book exercises. Additionally, some EFL faculty members reported that their students were eager to learn about computers because of the benefits computers could bring to their English learning. Most of their students believed that computers would help them to practice their English and communicate with people around the globe. Unfortunately, the net was not
actually being used. Consequently, students were supposedly motivated every time computers were used in EFL instruction. However, in my observation some students were only motivated to play games. Salem reported that some of his students decided to buy their own computers and learn about them as a result of using CALL in his classes. This supports the study carried out by Warschauer (1996) on student motivation from using computers for writing and communication in the language classroom. Warschauer found three factors of student motivation: 1) communication, 2) empowerment, and 3) learning). He states:

Factors, which influence student’s positive attitude toward computers, include the benefits of computer-mediated communication, the feeling of personal empowerment, and the enhancement of learning opportunities. Another possible factor is the achievement (and sense of achievement) which learning to use computers can help bring about (p.11).

To increase student motivation, Warschauer concludes: Teachers can enhance student motivation by helping students gain knowledge and skill about using computers, giving them ample opportunity to use electronic communication, and carefully integrating
computer activities into the regular structure and goals of the course (p.11).

A goal of motivation clearly falls within the behaviorist framework.

**Individualization:** The individualization that computers offer for language learners was the second most frequently cited advantage (8 responses). Using CALL was important for slow students to catch up and not to be left behind as in a regular class. During CALL sessions, slow students set their own work pace as reported by some EFL faculty members. This is consistent with Kenning & Kenning’s (1983) argument that computer “allows learners to work on their own, in their own time and, most importantly, at their own pace” (p.3).

Kenning & Kenning add:

> This is valuable [individualization] not only for those who, because they have been ill or because they are slow learners, have fallen behind and need to catch up with the rest of the class, but also for the better pupils who always finish early and need extra materials to stretch them (p.3).

Unfortunately in some of the classes I observed students who finished early started playing games instead of stretching themselves.

**Teaching Support:** Using CALL to support language teaching was the third most cited advantage (7
EFL faculty members, mostly from KFUPM, believed that CALL was a wonderful support as self-access for EFL learners. They reported that their students benefited a lot from the Self-access CALL lab available for students in the English orientation program at KFUPM. Using Mavis Beacon and other CALL programs, students were able to enhance their typing skills in English and to practice some of the grammar and vocabulary exercises in their own free time. More complex language practice did not appear to take place independently.

**Immediate Feedback:** Immediate feedback was found to be the fourth most cited benefit of CALL use for EFL instruction (6 responses). EFL faculty members liked the idea that most CALL software programs tend to have immediate feedback as compared to traditional teaching methods. They reported that their students liked the immediate feedback that some CALL programs provided. They also reported that EFL students liked the idea of having their mistakes corrected by computer immediately and seemed to retain most of the corrected information.

**Ease of Presentation:** The least cited advantage was the ease of presentation that computers provided when used in EFL instruction (5 responses). A teacher’s message can be presented in a more effective way on computer than via a chalkboard illustration. Some EFL faculty members found it to be easier and more
interesting to present their lessons using PowerPoint and LCD projectors. Of course, this type of presentation style fits more a teacher-centered than the preferred student-centered approach.

The following advantage categories received less than five responses. The responses to these advantages of CALL ranged from 2-4 with some EFL faculty members citing more than one category:

- Helps overcome bad handwriting and spelling mistakes.
- Helps teachers monitor their students’ strength, weakness, and development in language learning.
- Helps students accept their mistakes more easily because of the privacy computers provide as opposed to regular classrooms.
- A computer never gets tired repeating the same lesson again and again.
- A bi-learning opportunity where English and computer skills meet.
- Makes L2 learning less stressful and more enjoyable (game-like approach).
- Requires learners to be active participants in the language activities.
- Encourages EFL faculty’s self-development.
• Allows EFL students to practice and reinforce what is introduced in the classroom.

**Disadvantages of CALL:**

Following are the top four most frequently cited disadvantages of CALL for EFL instruction as mentioned by EFL faculty members:

**High Cost of Implementation:** This disadvantage of CALL was found to be the most frequently cited (8 responses). It is very expensive for someone who is dedicated to using CALL as a language learning resource to keep up with technology rapid changes. Technology changes and develops rapidly to the extent that it is extremely difficult to keep them current and updated. EFL faculty members found updating their CALL materials to be costly for them personally, for their moderate-income students at home, and for the language institutions at large. Such costs were clearly reflected in the outdated equipment at all four universities.

**Lack of Reliability:** The second most cited disadvantage was the lack of reliability of computers when used in EFL instruction (7 responses). EFL faculty members expressed concerns about the technical breakdown
that always occurred when using computers in their classrooms. This problem was true in my observations.

**Over-reliance on the Computer:** Over-reliance on the computer was found to be the third most frequently cited disadvantage (6 responses). Some EFL faculty members reported that their students were relying on spelling and grammar checkers to do the corrections for them. While the grammar feature was not EFL student friendly, over-reliance on the spelling checkers caused students not to think about their spellings mistakes. In addition, some students’ handwriting declined as a result of being Word processor dependents. This point, in particular, contradicts with what Professor Mohammed from IMSIU mentioned about the great help Word processors provided to do away with his and some of his students’ bad handwriting and spelling mistakes. Some other faculty members disagreed strongly with what Professor Mohammed saw as the advantage of using the word processor in EFL writing. Yet, I tend to agree with Professor Mohammed that students would be more willing to share their writing with their peers when it is typed.

**Using Technology for the Sake of It:** This disadvantage was found to be the fourth most frequently cited disadvantage of using CALL in EFL instruction with only 5 responses. Some language instructors at KFUPM reported that their departments bought a good number of
computers and required instructors to use them because they were there rather than to ask what language teaching goals these technologies could accomplish. It is what Hawisher & Selfe (1998) called “prefigurative culture”. They borrowed this term from Margaret Mead (1970), which means: parents or teachers teaching their kids or students concepts (e.g. technology), which teachers themselves never had because of the rapid changes in society. What this causes is teachers spending great deal of their class time trying to introduce their students to new experiences such as technologies, but less time on the traditional core subject matter. Instructor Aftab suggested that before wasting money and resources, “language professionals and their administrators should first get together and decide the CALL software programs to be used and the expected outcome of using them”.

The following disadvantage categories received responses ranging from 2-4 with some EFL faculty members citing more than one category:

- Losing work before saving it or printing it out.
- Reluctance on the part of some teachers and students who prefer teaching and learning in traditional settings.
• The reckless use of lab facilities on the part of some EFL students.

• Some teachers may judge students on how good they are at using computers rather than on their language performance.

• Students may spend more time on computers and achieve less in terms of language development.

• Might have some side effects such as vision or spinal problems. In addition, radiation from computer monitors may cause some health problems.

• Preparation time is much longer than traditional classes.

• It is difficult to detect errors and generate ideas on the screen as apposed to printed copy. Of course some would disagree with this and prefer writing at the screen.

**Internet Advantages:**

The Internet had been used as a teaching resource for teachers, but had not been implemented as a language-learning tool at any of the EFL language programs in Saudi Arabia. Technical support for the net and infrastructure are still neither capable nor reliable to carry out class activities online in any of the four studied universities. However, some EFL faculty members
were able to foresee the positive and negative aspects of the Internet in EFL instruction. Their views were based on prior experiences with using the Internet for EFL/ESL instruction before they were hired to teach EFL in the four Saudi Arabian universities. An obvious problem, however, is that in this case faculty members are generalizing their views about the use of the net in other context to the EFL context of Saudi Arabia. In spite of this fact, I still see some values to their views about the advantages/disadvantages of the net for EFL instruction. Below are the top four most frequently cited advantages of the Internet in EFL instruction as perceived by some EFL faculty members:

**The Amount of Information on the Internet:** This Internet advantage was found to be the most frequently cited advantage (9 responses). Some EFL faculty members saw the Internet as a huge library of information that could help solve the shortage of resources and materials in their English departments. The World Wide Web is a treasure for finding authentic materials for foreign language classrooms. If teachers and their students learn how to access the Internet and use it properly, it can benefit their English language teaching and learning. Some EFL faculty members believed that the Internet would enhance their students’ English proficiency since most information on the Internet is in English. This, alone,
would encourage students to learn English so that they could make use of the Internet.

**A Tool for Reading and Writing:** This was the second most frequently cited Internet advantage (7 responses). In some societies like Saudi Arabia, people prefer to talk with each other and tell stories rather than reading books. You rarely see people with books in public places in Saudi Arabia (AlKahtani, 1998). Only people from story reading and writing environment homes tend to read and write on a regular basis. EFL learners in Saudi Arabia are no exception. By integrating the Internet into foreign language programs, students can surf, read, and write simultaneously. Some faculty believed that reading extensive material on the Internet would improve their students’ reading, writing, and vocabulary skills.

**International Communication Among Students:** This was found to be the third most frequently cited Internet advantage (6 responses). Through the Internet, students can have access to real audience with original needs for information. The traditional classroom lacks this quality (Al-Mozaini, 1998). Some faculty members believed that the Internet could be a useful tool for “synchronous communication” where EFL students can participate via the Internet with their peers or with other students in real time communication. They also saw some benefits in using “asynchronous communication” such as electronic mail,
discussion lists, and bulletin boards. They believed that using asynchronous communication would help their students to read and write with communicative purposes for real audience.

Some EFL faculty members believed in the importance of learning culture along with the target language in an integrative way. In the same line, Canal & Swain (1980) argue that cultural understanding is important for learners in order to attain communicative competence. Given the importance of learning culture, the culture of the target language would be best learned in its context and with its people. It might be possible for some language learners to learn a language along with its culture this way, such as learning German in Germany or French in France. But when it comes to learning English, which is often considered to be the lingua franca of the world, learners need to learn more than one culture. They need to learn about the cultures of the English speaking countries as well as the cultures of countries using English as a medium of communication. To learn these different cultures in their contexts is difficult. Only the Internet can help carry these different cultures to the steps of every student’s door. In theory all of this sounds good, yet again and again faculty members spoke of administrative fear and misunderstanding of Internet content.
A Useful Tool for Research: This Internet benefit was found to be the fourth most frequently cited advantage. In Saudi Arabia, many EFL faculty members spend many years before they meet promotion requirements. They attributed this holdup to a lack of resources and the process by which manuscripts were sent to outlets and reviewers. Some EFL faculty members believed that this era is over as they can now access online resources and correspond with journal editors all over the world via the Internet. In addition, some EFL faculty members mentioned that the Internet would be a great tool for students to search for information as related to their EFL assignments and projects.

Internet Disadvantages

Despite the excitement about the Internet on the part of some EFL faculty members, there were those who remained skeptical about the Internet role in language teaching and learning in Saudi Arabia. Following are the top three most frequently cited Internet drawbacks as pointed out by some EFL faculty members:

Inappropriateness of Content: The unsuitability of some of the Internet content was found to be the most frequently cited disadvantage (9 responses). Some EFL faculty members had shown linguistic and cultural concerns regarding the content of the Internet. They feared that their students might come into contact with
resources that contained vulgar as well as grammar and spelling mistakes. In addition, students may stumble upon materials contradicting their religious and cultural beliefs. This disadvantage poses an obvious conflict with some of the advantages listed earlier.

Take Students Away from Task: Deviating from assigned tasks was found to be the second most cited disadvantages of using the Internet in EFL instruction (7 responses). Some faculty members had concerns that the Internet would make it difficult to keep students on task when used in the classroom. Because of the nature of the Internet, some EFL faculty members believed that the Internet would be a “distraction tool” as opposed to “educational tool” as their students would deviate from the subject matter to access other information on the Internet. Professor Mohammed, for instance, found it difficult to keep his students on task as they sometimes logged on to the Internet or checked their mail accounts when they were supposed to be responding to their peers’ writing. Clearly this is a very real concern.

Social Loss: One of the main dangerous situations that can happen in education and is happening in life in general as a result of using the Internet is the loss of social interaction. This was found to be the third most frequently cited disadvantage of using the Internet in EFL instruction (6 responses). Nowadays, many people are
no longer socializing in traditional, face-to-face ways. They spend their time in front of their computers chatting or exchanging email messages. Some EFL faculty members expressed their concerns that this might happen in language teaching if they or their students over indulged in using the Internet to the extent that they did not interact with each other. This claim seems rather overstated however.

The impact of faculty beliefs about teaching and technology on CALL use

The research question “How did faculty beliefs about teaching and technology affect their use of CALL for EFL instruction” dealt with the influence of EFL faculty members’ beliefs about teaching and technology on their CALL use in EFL instruction. Interestingly, it was found that faculty’s instructional use of computers paralleled their beliefs about teaching and technology. To elaborate on this connection, faculty’s beliefs about teaching and technology were analyzed and discussed in terms of what Warschauer, 1996 refers to as behaviorist CALL, communicative CALL, and integrative CALL. Each of these three main phases of CALL “corresponds to a certain level of technology as well as a certain pedagogical approach” (Warschauer & Healey, 1998:1).

**Behavioristic CALL:**
This phase of CALL was based on B.F. Skinner’s behaviorist notion of learning where learners imitate and repeat an accurate form of language until it becomes a habit. CALL programs of this phase featured repeated language work known as “drill and practice”. EFL faculty members believing in this approach, particularly at KFUPM, encouraged their students to use the self-access grammar and vocabulary programs to reinforce and practice activities taught in 001 grammar and 002 vocabulary classes. Students were also encouraged to use the Mavis Beacon typing tutorial program to practice typing activities as part of the 001 and 002 writing courses. For the 001 grammar practice, for instance, words were dashed out to test students’ use of verbs. Students had to fill in the missing words with verbs. For 002-vocabulary practice, a word from a sentence was removed. Students had to choose from a list of words to fill in the missing word. If the answer was wrong, a message relevant to the sentence displayed in a red color. Students were compelled to repeat answers until they were correct or until all options were exhausted. If the answer was right, a message in a green color flashed and a bell rang. These types of programs were simple in design and limited in terms of interactivity. However, EFL faculty members believed that these CALL programs were beneficial to language learning since they enforced
what was introduced in the classroom. They believed that CALL should serve as a back up and consolidate materials taught in class. This study revealed that a good number of these faculty members had a tendency to teach in a behavioristic manner and use less sophisticated CALL programs.

Communicative CALL:

This phase of CALL was based on the communicative approach, which emerged in the 1970s and 1980s as a reaction to the behaviorist approach (Warschauer & Healey, 1998). In Richard & Rodger’s second edition book: Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching, they grouped five approaches and methods (i.e. communicative language learning, the natural approach, cooperative language learning, content-based instruction, task-based language teaching, and the post methods era) and called them “current communicative approaches”. The goal of these approaches was to develop the learner’s communicative competence in the target language. Contrary to the tutorial and drill programs of the previous phase, communicative CALL applied more sophisticated technologies such as reading courseware, multimedia videodiscs, games, and non-drill text reconstruction programs.
As we have seen in chapter IV, more than half of the EFL faculty members (54.2 %) believed that they were using teaching methods similar to the communicative approach. Faculty members from this group believed that technology should be used to promote language communication. Although EFL practices in Saudi Arabia are moving toward communicative language teaching, most of the textbooks and computer based exercises are still very structurally based in a way that emphasizes grammar rules and accuracy rather than communicative competence. However, every time communicative CALL programs such as multimedia were used, the stress was put on communication. This would also apply to using web-based CALL such as electronic mail, electronic pen pals, bulletin boards, and chat rooms. Unfortunately, no one was using any of these technologies. Some EFL faculty members mentioned that they found themselves teaching English for communicative purposes as a result of using these types of CALL programs. For faculty whose beliefs mediated between structural and communicative approaches, emphasis on communication was balanced by using certain software that concentrated on accuracy side-by-side with communication. Using cloze testing or gapping programs, they gathered their students in groups to work on a computer rather than working individually.
Integrative CALL

At the end of 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s, communicative CALL started to lose its glamour as many language instructors were moving from communicative teaching to more authentic social context teaching. Using task-based, project based, and content-based instruction, teachers tried to integrate their students into authentic environments similar to those encountered in real life situations. They tried also to integrate learning and the use of different language skills (Warschauer & Healey, 1998). This led to what Warschauer (1996) called “integrative CALL”, a perspective where technology is used in teaching a language activity that combines all language skills (i.e. reading, writing, listening, and speaking). By doing so, teachers were creating a more authentic learning environment where listening is combined with seeing and reading with writing, just like in real life situations (Warschauer, 1996). This phase of CALL, as argued by Warschauer, was based on two technological advancements: the multimedia represented in the CD-ROM and electronic communication via the Internet. While the CD-ROM partially contributed to the Integrative CALL, the Internet became “the single computer application to date with the greatest impact on language teaching” (Warschauer, 1996:7).
In this direction, there were some EFL faculty members who believed that language skills should be taught in an integrative way. Consequently, they held a belief that multimedia entailing hypermedia would offer their students a variety of ways to learn English integratively. For example, instruction or learning could be carried out through a variety of media such as text, graphics, audio, video or other forms that would give learners different perspectives about what they learn.

In the same line, they believed that the Internet would be a good tool for collaborative English language learning. Learners could collaborate with other language students at a distance on non-language related projects (e.g. building a web site), but the interaction would be in English. In this way, students would be learning English in a content-based approach where English is used to learn about non-language subjects. Warschauer (1997) discusses such bi-learning opportunities. He asserted that it is not only the use of the Internet to learn English that matters but also learning English to be able to use the Internet. The sad truth was that I could find no evidence of anyone using an integrative CALL at any of the four universities.

Analyzing EFL faculty beliefs about teaching and technology within the three phases of CALL revealed that there was a mutual impact between faculty beliefs about
teaching and technology, and the type of technology they used in EFL instruction. EFL faculty members who believed language is acquired in a behavioristic manner tended to use less sophisticated CALL tools for stimulation or reinforcement. Moreover, faculty who believed that the goal of language is communication tended to use more sophisticated CALL programs to promote their students’ communicative competence. Those who believed in integrated skill approaches claimed to be willing to imagine their students using high-tech mediums such as the multimedia and the Internet to practice a variety of language skills simultaneously in an environment similar to that of the real world. Their claims were not in evidence however.

By the same token, technology had some effects on the way faculty taught English as a foreign language. Multimedia, for instance, forced them to modify their teaching beliefs and move toward communicative language teaching. Furthermore, Hypermedia and the Internet encouraged faculty to teach language skills in conjunction with each other.

Beyond the aforementioned three phases of CALL, EFL faculty beliefs about teaching and technology varied from one teacher to another. Surprisingly, some EFL faculty members still believed in teaching techniques as old as the Grammar-Translation Method. This method was the focus
of language learning from the 1840s to 1940s. Yet, my surprise diminished once I knew that these faculty members were trained in literature and structural linguistics rather than applied linguistics. Having been trained in the Grammar-Translation Method, they were inclined to use programs such as machine translation (e.g. Ajeeb web-based translation software & Al-Kafi translation software), electronic dictionaries, and word-processing systems with thesauruses. Using these programs, students were usually given sentences or texts to translate into and out of the target language. One of these faculty members was quoted as saying:

I believe in the old grammar translation method. I believe it mustn’t be used to the exclusion of everything else, but grammar translation has been the standard mechanism in which great minds, great philosophers, great politicians, great leaders throughout history had learned another language. Do not tell me that they learned the wrong way. These famous people like Ibn Rushd [an Arab historian] did not learn through the communicative approach, but via grammar translation and look what they were able to produce. Grammar translation is a discipline that you need in philosophy and I believe still much work is going to come. I think Machine translation programs are wonderful to use with learners
especially for advanced students. Wonderful stuff is still going to come.

Such a view ignores the fact that Grammar Translation Method paid little or no attention to speaking and listening. The result was inability on the part of many students to communicate in the target language.

Some other EFL faculty members were also found to believe in the traditional role where teachers are the “dispensers of knowledge” whom students consult in every aspect of language learning. This belief led to a more teacher-centered classroom rather than a student-centered one and more passive learning rather than active learning. One faculty member, for instance, felt that the computer, when he had to use it, threatened his central authority. He said:

I need to communicate with my students. In the CALL Lab, to get the students to look at me and not the screens was extremely difficult. They were glued to that magnetic thing called “screen”. The only way was to send them a message through the system. I want my students to direct their attention to me and not to the computer. I want them to listen to me, watch how my lips move, and understand my pronunciation without the intervention of computers........ to be honest, I was not interested in
CALL but I had to do it because it was part of the writing course.

Some EFL faculty members, however, used CALL to escape the typical teacher’s authority as we have seen in Professor Mohammed’s case. He used word processing for he believed in peer response and in teaching writing as a student-centered process.

Whenever the computer was involved, the role of teacher had moved from one of central authority to one of facilitating and helping with activities. Some EFL faculty members were already aware of this reality:

The teacher used to be the sole source of information for his students; now with the new technology, we expect our students to get their information from different resources and use them in an active manner.

Among the participants were also those who did not believe in using CALL in EFL instruction for other reasons. Here is a quote from one of the faculty members who did not see any advantage of computers over the traditional way of teaching:

The computer is wasteful in terms of time. It takes much longer time to learn through computers than through other methods of language teaching. The computer is a machine; it is not as flexible as the teacher.
This participant was one of a few faculty members (33.3%) who believed that CALL was no better than any other traditional method. This group of teachers can be divided into two subgroups: 1) those who used CALL for EFL instruction but were not impressed by the results, and 2) those who resist CALL due to beliefs in traditional teacher-centered classrooms. Both were not as enthusiastic as other EFL faculty members to use CALL in their EFL teaching.

Some faculty members, however, believed in using CALL not because of its importance but because it was inevitably moving to curriculum as the word “creep” suggests in the following quote from one of the faculty members:

Sooner or later, CALL will creep into our curriculum. Therefore, the earlier we accept it, the better. But I am not sure if it will replace the teacher.

This belief may lead teachers to embrace technology because of its existence in their schools rather than its effectiveness for EFL instruction.

There were also those who saw computers as another tool just like an overhead projector where you can teach very well without one. Others saw them as distracting tools that would take away their students’ attention to be spent on something other than language learning. In a
middle position were those who believed that computers would serve as a good support for teachers to prepare class materials, but not to be integrated into EFL curriculum.

Sociocultural Factors

The research question “what social factors have impacted CALL implementation for EFL instruction” dealt with the cultural dimensions affecting CALL use and implementation from the perspective of faculty members and my observation of faculty using computers in EFL instruction. Some cultural problems were aroused when technology was used in Saudi classrooms and, in particular, when imported CALL materials were introduced for EFL instruction. These problems were linked with cultural, social, and religious attitudes. In Saudi Arabia, these three dimensions are intertwined.

Cultural Attitudes

During my field trip to Saudi Arabia to collect data for this study, I had the opportunity to talk about and discuss various language issues with EFL faculty members at Saudi Arabian universities. Amongst these issues was whether the culture of a language should be taught along with the language in Saudi EFL programs. Depending on their cultural backgrounds, EFL faculty members varied in their standpoints regarding this issue. There were the
leftists who believed that all cultural elements in the English language should be taught, and the rightists who rejected any type of cultural awareness other than the Arab and Muslim culture. Faculty members from the first group made cross-cultural generalizations and forgot that Saudi EFL learners belong to a different culture and that Islam is the “strongest denominator” in Saudi schools as was noted by Kniffka (1992) who studied the cultural aspects in teaching German to adults in Saudi Arabia. A faculty member from a Western cultural background, for instance, assumed that students would feel motivated to learn English if linked with female students from different cultures over the Internet. He said:

... I don’t use the Internet that much, but I can’t see why we shouldn’t use it to link students from different cultural background.

He, smilingly, added:

...you know what young people like to use the Internet for; they’d probably feel motivated to discuss culture over the Internet, especially with female students!

Quite the opposite, faculty members from the second group considered L2 culture as a threat to their students’ identity. A Saudi faculty member from this group said:
... Given the satellite dishes and the Internet, I don’t think we need to teach Western culture in our classrooms... helping students to hang on to their own culture is what we really need.

There were, however, a few moderate voices who believed that some L2 cultural elements might not work in another culture, but admitted the importance of teaching the target language culture within the moral code of Saudi Arabia. Khuwaileh (2000) argues that while “imported EFL theories written for a certain culture may not be workable in another culture ...... the separation of culture from language will certainly lead to learning failure” (p.282). Contrary to this view is that of Zaid (1999) who analyzed the culture-oriented classroom from the pedagogical vantage of approach, design, and procedure. He concludes that teaching culture in EFL classrooms should not be the sole concern as it may result in cultural confrontation, undermining students’ perspective of their own language and culture, or creating a third culture, not based on either the students’ own culture or the target language culture.

To relate the above discussion to the impact of cultural issues on CALL implementation for EFL instruction, I should say that most ready-designed CALL programs comprise social aspects of Western culture, which could be “morally offensive” to Saudi EFL learners.
One of the faculty members, for instance, used a CALL program for teaching speaking skills called “ESL-2000” by HRB systems. He mentioned that he could not get the maximum potential out of the program because of episodes on Blind Date, Thanksgiving, and Country Music as well as some of the interactive video and audio-textual materials that were written for ESL/EFL students from cultures other than that of Saudi Arabia.

In a restrained view different from that of Zaid and more like that of Khuwaileh, I feel that familiarizing EFL learners with the target language culture is of great importance. Yet, CALL programs written for cultures other than that of Saudi Arabia may not suit Saudi EFL learners. The content of CALL software programs may have to be modified to meet Saudi learners’ needs and the specific socio-cultural context of Saudi Arabia.

**Religious attitudes:**

Saudi Arabia is a conservative Islamic country that allows only what conforms to Islamic religion and culture. Practices should not include any representations of alcohol, pork products, gambling, immodest dress, especially for women, and non-Islamic religious symbols. As we have seen in the “ESL-2000” CALL program, some other imported CALL software may have content considered objectionable by administrators, faculty, and students. These predetermined CALL programs may contain religiously
tabooed content such as drinking alcohol, boyfriend/girlfriend relationships, dating, or showing women wearing religiously inappropriate dresses (e.g. short sleeves, beach/bikini wear, etc.) which are prohibited in Islam. There were, however, some products that considered the Middle East culture, but unfortunately were not related to the various subjects taught in EFL departments. This may imply that EFL programs should design their own CALL content.

Even in some cases where CALL content was culturally appropriate, unawareness of technology led students to question its appropriateness. A faculty member mentioned that some of his students refused to watch videotapes on language teaching methodology fearing that they might contain activities that contradict with their beliefs. This fear on the part of some students made them believe that it had something inappropriate and caused them to leave the classroom before they even knew what it contained. This, I believe, could be attributed to the fact that students saw videotapes and VCRs, tools associated with Hollywood movies, as foreign values emerging through these technologies. This applies to other instructional technologies, which had not been part of EFL classrooms. Perhaps this fear can be overcome by educating our students and enlightening them as to the benefits of having technology in our homes, businesses,
institutions, and our schools, not because of their neutrality, but because of their importance. Once this happens, students’ suspicions about technology will hopefully start to fade away. Radio and TVs used to be like this when first introduced in Saudi Arabia.

Social Attitudes

EFL Faculty members at the four participating universities were made up of native speakers of English (mainly from the UK and the USA) who were hired to teach English in Saudi Arabia and nonnative speakers of English (mainly Saudis and from other Arab and Muslim countries) who were educated in the West (mainly in the UK and the USA). From my interviews with these faculty members, I learned that they came from different socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds and had different previous familiarity with using computers in EFL instruction. The faculty members’ different backgrounds had a noticeable impact on CALL use and implementation for EFL instruction. Administrators, for instance, saw faculty members from Western countries as experts in the field of Computer Assisted Language Learning. Given the fact that they came from high-tech societies, they were always consulted in most computer-related aspects, sometimes at the cost of their actual classroom time. For example, a young British instructor explained to me how he benefited from being labeled as a computer expert, though at the
cost of much time. He told me that EFL administrators and colleagues consulted him every time they had problems with their school, office, or home computers.

I just came last year and I’m now the number one expert in the department.... I learned about computer here, and I don’t feel ashamed to say that...

He added:

They always call me with questions about computers...

Sometimes I want to say no but I don’t know how to say it. I’m afraid I’ll say no some day.

As for nonnative speaking of English faculty members, most of them, with the exception of some Saudis, were from low economic countries and similarly had little familiarity with Computer Assisted Language Learning. Because of their economic status, they had to accept jobs below their qualifications as we have seen in the case of Salem who accepted the title of “lecturer” though he had a doctorate in Education. Even those who had a good grasp of technology were not considered to be as expert as their Western colleagues from the perspective of their administrators. Some of these faculty members complained to me during interviews about what they saw as “unequal treatment” from decision makers at their departments. Because they were not viewed as professionals in the way their Western colleagues were and were paid less, they were inclined to just relax and not really care about
creativity including the implementation of CALL in their EFL instruction.

Saudi EFL faculty members who graduated from the USA or United Kingdom became quite excited about using new technologies in their classes as we have seen in the case of Professor Mohammed who was trying hard to implement CALL despite the sever shortage of materials. Most of these faculty members admitted the positive impact on their knowledge and attitudes toward using computers in EFL instruction as a result of studying at British and American universities. Faculty members from this group also tended to use computers extensively for personal and administrative uses. A group of these faculty members, however, told me in their interviews, that they found little relevance in what they learned in the West about CALL because of the rapid changes in technology. Needless to say, they need to be trained again on using new technologies and their applications for EFL instruction. This Saudi faculty member says it all:

I have been “off-line” from CALL for a few years now. Things have changed dramatically- and we have no supplier here with either the stock or the expertise to help me select the right course material or to help me catch up technologically.

Another interesting observation was the cultural clashes between two groups of the same profession who had
common backgrounds. At KFUPM where EFL instructors were mainly from England and the United States, there were clashes between these two groups on how to integrate technology into EFL instruction. Coming from technologically advanced countries, each group was trying to dominate the other. It is what Dennis Tito (the first space tourist) called “professional jealousy” when asked by CNN about NASA’s objection to his space tour. Tito states:

There is a concept called professional jealousy. This exists in many, many fields: doctors, actuaries, or -- even like myself -- investment professionals. We all like to think we're experts, and if somebody comes in that doesn't have exactly the same training that we do, we don't think they're qualified (www.cnn.com, 24 April, 2001).

This rivalry seemed to have had a negative impact on CALL use and integration in that institution. For example, the CALL coordinator at KFUPM had to resign as a result of such cultural and societal clashes. Obviously, he kept most of the information about the CALL lab away from his competitors, which required them to start from scratch.

Similarly, this type of professional competition was seen among Saudi faculty members and also between faculty members from Arab and Muslim countries. In this EFL
context, faculty members tended to compete with people from similar cultural and societal backgrounds. This could be attributed to the reason that faculty from the same backgrounds were seen as bigger competitors than those from different cultures. It is customary, though not official, to compare EFL faculty members in Saudi Arabia with their social groups when renewing their contracts. That is, Western faculty members are compared with Westerns, Egyptians with Egyptians, and so forth. As for Saudi EFL faculty members, they are compared with their fellow Saudis when promoted for positions. This setting can create bitterness amongst faculty and negatively impact CALL use and integration. Having a balanced mixture of EFL faculty members would help reduce such tension amongst teachers and create a healthy learning environment.
CALL Limitations

Interviewed faculty gave a number of limitations that might stand in the way of CALL use in EFL instruction. Most of the limitations mentioned by EFL faculty members were explicit limitations that are often found in the literature. In an attempt to extract meaningful conclusions from the raw data provided by the interviews, I tackled only the most frequently mentioned limitations, which I thought would help us understand the obstacles that might stand in the way of integrating CALL in EFL instruction.

The large number of students was found to be the issue most frequently mentioned by faculty as limiting CALL use in EFL instruction. This finding makes sense when we remember that Salem had to abandon using the first CALL lab as a result of the blow up in the number of students. In the second CALL lab, he had to divide his class into six sessions in order to overcome this limitation.

Traditional ways of teaching were the next most frequently cited limitation that might stand in the way of integrating CALL into EFL instruction. Computers have made the student-centered classroom possible as well as the process approach to writing. Not all teachers are willing to adopt these approaches or to have computers in their classrooms. Some of them were trained in a
traditional way and found it difficult to change their methods of teaching. In addition, they would not feel comfortable if computers took their authority away. A computer can provide more information than teachers. In this way, the teacher was no longer the source of knowledge.

Internet bandwidth was another problem faced by EFL faculty members. The Internet in Saudi Arabia when compared with other Arab countries (with the exception of UAE, being the best amongst all) is less of a problem, but it is still lagging behind the West in terms of bandwidth. This bandwidth problem caused some universities not to be able to provide Internet access to all their faculty members, let alone their students. For example, KSU provides only Ph.D. holder faculty members with Internet access. EFL faculty members considered this as a serious limitation that would limit Internet use in EFL instruction. The following comment from one of the faculty members illustrates this problem:

The Internet is too slow to the point you hate it and you don’t want to check your email. Not to mention that if you want to do some search or look for some articles.

This faculty member was one of those who were provided with Internet access at their schools but were not satisfied with the speed of the Internet when more than
one user access at the same time. This would definitely
discourage teachers from using the Internet for
instructional purposes.

Heavy load, lack of training, lack of typing skills,
lack of suitable CALL materials, and bureaucracy were
found to be obstacles that inhibited CALL use and
integration in EFL instruction.