T.C.

ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE STUDIES

EFL TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS COMPUTER ASSISTED LANGUAGE LEARNING

MASTER'S THESIS

Amal El MALLEH

Department of English Language and Literature

English Language and Literature Program

NOVEMBER, 2022

T.C.

ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE STUDIES

EFL TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS COMPUTER ASSISTED LANGUAGE LEARNING

MASTER'S THESIS

Amal El MALLEH

(Y1912.020010)

Department of English Language and Literature

English Language and Literature Program

Thesis Advisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Eyyüp Yasar KÜRÜM

NOVEMBER, 2022

APPROVAL FORM

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this MA thesis titled "EFL teachers' attitudes towards computer assisted language learning" is my own work and I have acted according to scientific ethics and academic rules while producing it. I have collected and used all information and data according to scientific ethics and guidelines on thesis writing of Istanbul Aydin University. I have fully referenced, both in the text and references, all direct and indirect quotations and all sources I have used in this work.

Amal EL MALLEH

FOREWORD

There is a number of people without whom this thesis might not have been written, and to whom I am thankful.

I would like to express deep gratitude to my supervisor, Professor EYYÜP YASAR KÜRÜM for his countless hours of reflection, reading and most of all patience throughout the entire process. Thank you for helping me meeting the research challenges and finalizing the present master's thesis. I would not have made it this far without your support and valuable advice.

To my mother, Hafidha, who has been a source of encouragement and inspiration throughout my life. A very special thank you for believing in me and being here during the whole process, for giving me strength when I thought of giving up and for continually providing me with moral, spiritual, emotional, and financial support.

To my father, Youssef, who believed me and was by my side during the master's program.

To my aunties, Amel and Radhia, as well as my grandmother, Zohra, for being supportive and helpful and for encouraging me to reach my goals.

To my brothers, Hedi and Mahdi, for always standing by my side and sharing their words of advice and encouragement.

I dedicate this work and give special thanks to my best cheerleader, my best friend and sister Doaa Arebi for being there for me throughout the entire master program.

November, 2022 Amal El MALLEH

EFL TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS COMPUTER ASSISTED LANGUAGE LEARNING

ABSTRACT

Information and Communication Technology (ICT) has brought major changes and developments which helped to improve and change the traditional classroom concepts. In fact, teachers' methods regarding the employment of ICT in their classroom play an important role in the EFL accomplishment. Following the recent trend of the implementation of CALL in EFL classrooms, this study aims to examine how EFL teachers perceive the use of Computer Assisted Language Learning at a foundation University. To answer the research questions, a descriptive research design will be used. 41 EFL teachers working at the Higher Institute of Languages of Tunis participated in this study. Two data collection instruments developed by Christensen and Knezek (1998) were used. The first instrument was a Survey of Faculty Attitudes Toward Information Technology. The aim of this survey was to gather general information concerning teacher's knowledge and attitudes toward information technology. The second instrument was The Faculty Attitudes Toward Information Technology (FAIT). The results of the study showed that most teachers have a positive attitude towards the implementation of computer assisted language learning in their teaching process. Teachers stated that working with computers is stimulating, and that they don't feel anxious when it comes to using computers in their classes. They believe that having training sessions helps them use computers in a proper way. Furthermore, teachers believe that computers help them organize their work and time and be well prepared as well as they help both teachers and students to communicate easily beyond the classroom and to create an interactive atmosphere.

Keywords: Attitudes, Information and Communication technology (ICT), Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL).

EFL ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN BİLGİSAYAR DESTEKLİ DİL ÖĞRENİMİNE KARŞI TUTUMLARI

ÖZET

Bilgi ve İletişim Teknolojisi (BİT) (ICT- Information and Communication Technology), geleneksel sınıf kavramlarının iyileştirilmesine ve değiştirilmesine yardımcı olan büyük değişiklikler ve gelişmeler getirmiştir. Aslında, öğretmenlerin sınıflarında ICT'in istihdamına ilişkin yöntemleri, EFL başarısında önemli bir rol oynamaktadır. Bu çalışma, EFL sınıflarında CALL uygulamasının son zamanlardaki eğilimini takiben, EFL öğretmenlerinin bir vakıf üniversitesinde Bilgisayar Destekli Dil Öğreniminin kullanımını nasıl algıladıklarını incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Araştırma sorularını cevaplamak için tanımlayıcı bir araştırma tasarımı kullanılacaktır. Bu çalışmaya Tunus Yüksek Diller Enstitüsü'nde çalışan 41 EFL öğretmeni katılmıştır. Christensen ve Knezek (1998) tarafından geliştirilen iki veri toplama aracı kullanılmıştır. İlk araç, Fakültenin Bilgi Teknolojisine Yönelik Tutumlarının bir Araştırmasıdır. Bu araştırmanın amacı, öğretmenin bilgi teknolojisi konusundaki bilgi ve tutumları hakkında genel bilgi toplamaktır. İkinci araç, Fakültenin Bilgi Teknolojisine Yönelik Tutumlarıdır (FAIT). Çalışmanın sonuçları, çoğu öğretmenin öğretim sürecinde bilgisayar destekli dil öğreniminin uygulanmasına yönelik olumlu bir tutuma sahip olduğunu göstermiştir. Öğretmenler, bilgisayarlarla çalışmanın teşvik edici olduğunu ve sınıflarında bilgisayar kullanmaya gelince kendilerini rahat hissettiklerini belirtmişlertir. Eğitim seanslarına sahip olmanın bilgisayarları doğru bir şekilde kullanmalarına yardımcı olduğunu düşünmektedirler. Ayrıca öğretmenler, bilgisayarların işlerini ve zamanlarını düzenlemelerine ve iyi hazırlanmalarına yardımcı olduklarına ve hem öğretmenlerin hem de öğrencilerin sınıf dışında kolayca iletişim kurmalarına ve etkileşimli bir atmosfer yaratmalarına yardımcı olduklarına inanmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Tutumlar, Bilgi ve İletişim teknolojisi (ICT), Bilgisayar Destekli Dil Öğrenimi (CALL).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION ..... **i**
FOREWORD ..... **ii**
ABSTRACT ..... **iii**
ÖZET ..... **iv**
TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... **v**
ABBREVIATIONS ..... **viii**
LIST OF TABLES ..... **ix**
I. INTRODUCTION **1**
A. Background of the Study 1
B. Research Problem 3
C. Research Aims, Objectives and Questions 4
D. Research Questions 4
E. Significance of the Study 5
F. Operational Definitions 6
II. LITERATURE REVIEW **8**
A. Introduction 8
B. An Introduction to Computer Assisted Language Learning 9
C. History and Development of Computer Assisted Language Learning 9
1. Behavioristic Computer Assisted Language Learning 10
2. Communicative Computer Assisted Language Learning 11
3. Integrative Computer Assisted Language Learning 12
D. The Advantages of Computer Assisted Language Learning 14
E. Changing the role of teachers in Computer Assisted Language Learning Classes. 16
F. Computer Competence of EFL Teachers 17
G. Teachers' Attitudes Towards Computer Assisted Language Learning 20
III. METHODOLOGY **23**
A. Introduction 23
B. Research Design 23
C. Setting and Participants 24

D. Data Collection Instrument 25
E. Data Collection Procedures 26
F. Data Analysis 27
IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION 28
A. Introduction 28
B. Findings from the Demographic Data 28
C. Findings from the Quantitative Data 29
1. Findings on Enthusiasm 29
2. Findings on Anxiety 32
3. Findings on Productivity Improvement 34
4. Findings on Avoidance 37
5. Findings on E-mail Use for Classroom Learning 40
D. Findings from the Qualitative Data Analysis 43
1. Findings Regarding the Reasons Why Teachers Like Using Computers 44
a. Computers as a source of saving teachers' time and Energy 46
b. Computers as a source for the organization of teaching materials and easy access 47
c. Computers as a source for student-teacher interaction, communication, motivation and participation 47
d. Computers as a source for multimedia materials 48
e. Computers as a sources for teachers creativity and productivity 49
2. Findings Regarding the Reasons Why Teachers Do Not Like Using Computers 50
a. Computers are discouraging elements due to technical problems 51
b. Computers are discouraging elements due to institutional barriers 52
c. Computers are discouraging elements due to Interaction 52
d. Computers are discouraging elements due to health issues 52
e. Computers are discouraging elements due to the lack of information 53
V. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS 54
A. Overview of the Study 54
B. Conclusion and Discussions 55
C. Limitations of the Study 59
D. Suggestions for Further Research 59
VI. REFERENCES 61

APPENDICES **72**
RESUME **80**

ABBREVIATIONS

ALLP : Athena Language Learning Project

CALL : Computer Assisted Language Learning

CAMILLE : Computer-Aided Multimedia Interactive Language Learning

CMC : Computer-Mediated Communication

ELT : English Language Teaching

ESL : English as a Second Language

FAIT : Faculty Attitudes towards Information Technology

ICT : Information Communication Technologies

IITTL : Institute for the Integration of Technology into Teaching and Learning

IT : Information Technologies

OLA : Oral Language Achievement

PLATO : Programmed Logic for Automated Teaching Operations

SPSS : Statistical Package for Social Science

TICCIT : Time-shared, Interactive, Computer-Controlled Information Television

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 The Old Computing Versus The New Computing 15
Table 2 Distribution of the Subscales Consisting the FAIT Survey 25
Table 3 Characteristics of the Negative Worded Items in FAIT Survey 26
Table 4 The Demographic Distribution of the Participants in the Study 28
Table 5 The Frequency of the Instructors' Responses to the Items Related to Enthusiasm 29
Table 6 The Frequency of the Instructors' Responses to Items Related to Anxiety ... 32
Table 7 The Frequency of the Instructors' Responses to The Items Related to Productivity Improvement 35
Table 8 The Frequency of the Instructors' Responses to The Items Related to Avoidance 38
Table 9 The Frequency of the Instructors' Responses to The Items Related to E-mail Use for Classroom Learning 41
Table 10 The Most Frequently Cited Reasons "Why The Teachers Like The Use of Computers 44
Table 11 The Below Table Shows The Participants' Answers to The First Open-Ended Question 44
Table 12 The Most Frequently Cited Reasons About Why The Teachers Do Not Like The Use of Computers 50
Table 13 The Below Table Shows The Participants' Answers to The Second Open-Ended Question 50

I. INTRODUCTION

Are teachers and institutions ready and well prepared for the upcoming technological changes? Technology keeps evolving at the fastest pace ever in human history, and with this evolution and changes come new challenges and adventures for both, teachers and students. This research aims to analyze teachers attitudes toward CALL in the Higher Institute of Language of Tunisia. This research shows how ready teachers are in order to tackle this new wave of technological changes since technological tools are becoming more essential within teaching processes.

A. Background of the Study

For decades, English has become a global means that facilitates international communication (Crystal, 2003). Both teaching and learning English have also been exposed to many changes and have been affected in many ways. According to Hubbard and Levy (2006), the changes in language teaching and language learning became more noticeable. Integrating technology, computers, the internet, multimedia, and so on became much more significant concepts used by language teachers. Despite this fact, the main factor will always be technology and its integration into language teaching and learning processes. Scinicariello (1997) argues that technology is a beneficial tool to use through the learning process. It is also considered to be a tool that attracts learners and heightens their learning experiences. Technology is considered to be a powerful mechanism to transform the perspectives of education and develop its process (Chalhoub-Deville, 2001). Due to all these changes and development in education, computers are broadly used in different areas as in both Language teaching and learning and there has been a remarkable improvement in information technology (Jiang, 2009).

Researchers such as Gorjian, Moosavinia, Ebrahimi Kavari, Asgari, and Hydarei (2011) argue that technology supports learning in various ways. In fact, due to the progress of technology, and because of the major roles that computers play in our lives, it became mandatory for language teachers to be conscious of their own

roles and be aware of the roles of computers in the teaching and learning processes. It is believed that computers are means for communication between teachers and learners. However, the most challenging aspect of using technology and creating an effective learning environment is when teachers do not try to understand how to use technology or computers in the classroom or to have enough knowledge about computers as an educator (Hubbard, 2013). Due to the evolution of technology and learning styles, a new challenging era of teaching and learning languages has started. As Heffernan and Wang (2008) pointed out in one of their studies, language instructors are required to decide what, when, and where to use their materials. Along with this, through the integration of computers into their teaching, they are also obliged to check their appropriateness. Since computers have the capacity to motivate learners, it also grants access to authentic language materials for the language teachers. Many researchers (e.g., Jones 1986; Zhao, 2003; Kern, 2006; Fatemi, Jahromi and Salimi, 2013) claim that the most important thing that we need to focus on is not whether the integration of technology in our teaching process is effective or not, but on how teachers use technology so that they create a better learning environment. In fact, the key to success is the use of technology for the purpose of granting our students a better learning environment. Yet, this will be only achievable when the teachers become aware of the importance of integrating computers in their teaching process, along with recognizing their convenient and efficient use in their teaching methods (Son, 2008).

Many researchers emphasized the benefits of implementing technology in teachers' education (Volk, et al., 2000; Gentile, et al., 2000; Chester, 2001; Schneckenburger, et al., 2001; & Berlin, & White, 2002). For a long time, many educational researchers have investigated the technological effectiveness in both spheres of learning and teaching to help both teachers and learners to develop their learning. This refers to the integration of technology especially multimedia wherever they are. According to Almekhlafi (2004), multimedia has been used by both learners and teachers to excel in their training and boost the quality of education. The use of technology is seen to influence the learners' linguistic skills and their performance in the classroom (Ahmadi, 2018). Many researchers such as Cononelos and Oliva (1993) and Warschauer (1996) have reported that through the use of computers, student writing skills improved. According to Beauvois (1994), when it comes to

writing, students display more fluidity of conversation, more use of complex sentences, and more acknowledgment of the topic. She considers the role of the students as they should dominate their classroom instead of teachers. This would be more suitable to give them a wider chance to be communicative and to rely on themselves. In a study conducted by Borras (1993), the results showed that in fifth-semester students of French as a foreign language, the use of subtitled videos leads the way to a more sufficient level of oral communicative performance rather than the ones without the subtitled ones.

On the other hand, Warschauer (1999) provided a proof in associating input with acquisition. He notifies some mutual Hawaiian expressions in conversations which he has never apprehended before and assigns them to be observed in computer-mediated writing for the first time. Salaberry (2000) confirms these results, and reports that there was a change that was identified before in the progression stages in the Spanish verbal skills in CMC in comparison with face to face interaction. Ayres (2002) has investigated student behavior regarding the use of computer-assisted language learning (CALL). He stated that students see CALL as a beneficial side of their studies. He also stated that CALL needs to be applied delicately and must be integrated into the learning curriculum in order for learners to gain greater benefit from it (P.249). The use of CALL shows signs of assisting students in different areas such as spelling, writing, and grammar use. In the implementation of CALL in the learning process and its success, there are many different fundamental aspects and attitude is one of them.

B. Research Problem

Due to the constant development in technology, computers have an important part in our lives. In fact, the number of learners enrolled in foreign language learning programs is enlarging globally, thus, the desire to enhance their excellence is crucial. This improvement in the students' level of proficiency will only be achieved by implementing technology and having access to it in universities, high-schools or even prep-schools. However, having the necessary components for a highly developed language-learning classroom does not always mean success. To find out the most efficient strategies to improve learning English, both teachers' and learners'

attitudes toward the inclusion of technology in learning and teaching process are bound to change.

Several studies acknowledge that to successfully implement technology in the learning process, both learners and teachers' attitudes towards technology and computers should be taken into consideration. In fact, a proper guidance such as a training or professional development should be provided to them to overcome the difficulties that they may face and the possible problems that can occur regarding the application of tools (Pickard, Chan, & Tibbets, 1994; Stevens, 1991; Thurston, & Candlin, 1998).

According to Lam (2000), there is a lack of research investigating language teachers' attitudes toward the use of technology in the teaching process, however the focus was always on students' perceptions and attitudes towards the use of technology and how it affects their level in learning a language.

C. Research Aims, Objectives and Questions

The main purpose of this study is to investigate the teachers' attitudes towards Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL). Teachers' attitudes toward the use of technology, how they perceive it, and their knowledge about how long it has been used in teaching-learning are not clear. One might wonder about teachers' attitudes toward using technology in the classroom, and whether or not their attitudes have been measured.

D. Research Questions

This study focuses on the attitudes of teachers towards Computer Assisted Language Learning, and on their perceptions towards Enthusiasm; Anxiety, Productivity Improvement; Avoidance and e-mail use for classroom learning.

In fact, in the first item related to enthusiasm, the researcher will investigate the teachers' perceptions toward Enthusiam and how do they feel about working with computers. This item will show if the teachers would like to learn about computers, and will use them in their classes.

Concerning the second item related to anxiety, the researcher will investigate the teachers' perceptions towards anxiety and if they feel anxious, stressed or worried when it comes to implement CALL in their classes.

Moving on to the third item which is related to productivity improvement, the researcher will investigate the teachers' perceptions towards the implementation of computers in their lives. In fact, this is item will show if the teachers think that computers help them organize their work, increase their productivity, and save their time.

Regarding the fourth item related to Avoidance, the researcher will investigate how the teachers perceive the use on computers and if they are knowledgeable enough to use them.

According to the last item related to e-mail use for classroom learning, the researcher will investigate teachers' perceptions toward using e-mails inside and outside the classroom and how this will help them create interaction in the classes.

Based on what has been said so far, this study will seek answers to the following one major question and five minor questions.

- What are teachers' attitudes toward Computer Assisted Language Learning?
- What are teachers' perceptions towards enthusiasm?
- What are teachers' perceptions towards anxiety?
- What are teachers' perceptions towards productivity improvement?
- What are teachers' perceptions towards avoidance?
- What are teachers' perceptions towards e-mail use for classroom learning regarding the use of CALL?

E. Significance of the Study

Recently, many universities in Tunisia provided the opportunity to improve language education. This advantage is generally not accessed by all language teachers. In fact, the improvement of language teaching will be accessed with the help of integrating technology and computers into their curriculums and making use of them as much as possible. As formerly graduated from the Higher Institute of Language of Tunisia, I witnessed the lack of technological implementation, but this

is not the case in departments. Computer technology is basically used only in Science and Engineering universities and it is not accessible in all English language departments. This improvement in the use of technology in Tunisia has resulted in a better educational system, and as long as it is used efficiently, it will improve learners' levels of language proficiency.

Computer technology, the Internet and web-based resources are now provided in most departments and are accessible by both teachers and learners. In fact, technology offers a vast source of resources and multiple opportunities for language learning and teaching methods. Yet, the more teachers implement technology in their classes, the more they benefit from the resources in developing materials for the language classroom.

It would be beneficial if language teachers in Tunisian universities use technology in a proper way. This would not only help teachers in their way of teaching but it will also motivate the students by providing them with the necessary tools and resources. Knowing the teachers' attitude would establish solid foundations for a new process of teaching and learning in the Higher institute of Language of Tunisia.

The findings of this study may provide some valuable information about the EFL teachers' attitudes the CALL. The results of the study might also suggest better ways of implementing technology, better ways of training teachers to be ready to use technology in their classes, as well as equipping them with better strategies, methods, techniques, and approaches. This will help them boost the level of their students and improve the quality of learning and teaching.

Such results might be achieved through implementing an effective training program on how to better use technology and computers inside and outside the classroom.

Finally, since many universities in Tunisia are not aware of the advantages of using technology and providing students with useful resources to improve their level, this study may offer an alternative to widen the administrative staff's vision on the benefits and advantages of using CALL in the teaching process.

F. Operational Definitions

Attitudes: Your behavior to react in a given way to something or a person and the way you perceive things towards them (Brown, 1965; cited in Lakshmi, 2004:8).

Information and Communications Technology (ICT): Information communication technology refers to technologies that provide access to information through communications. ICT is an umbrella term that includes any communication device, encompassing radio, television, cell phones, computer and network hardware, satellite systems, and more (Khan et al., 2005).

Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL): Computer-assisted language learning (CALL) has been defined as "the search for and study of applications on the computer in language teaching and learning" (Levy, 1997:1).

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Introduction

Over the last decades, there have been several changes and developments in language teaching methods. It shifted from teaching grammatical rules and structures to the implementation of concrete communicative activities (Zhan, 2008). Technology made education easy and accessible for everyone. Without the technological developments and improvements, we would have probably been teaching complex grammar using abstract rules to our learners who turn out to be inattentive and passive. The integration of technology and computers to language teaching and learning has started to have a whole new dimension and changed the learning atmosphere in language classrooms.

For a long time now, technology has been put into use for many different purposes. As argued by Zhan (2008), the technology's main purpose is to provide language content for educators and has been used in order to communicate with the learners. Technology has been used in the learning process of students as well as monitoring their improvement. Computers started to fit in our lives and play a major role in it that we can say that they have mesmerized us. The integration of computers in language classrooms has created much better communication and learning opportunities for both teachers and learners. The potential they provide as an important element in language teaching is globally acknowledged (Levy, 1997; Chapelle, 1997; Moras, 2001; Ayres, 2002; Davies, 2002; Gamper & Knapp, 2002; Egbert, 2005) and all the findings and results promoted the successful and beneficial implementations of CALL in language teaching.

This chapter starts with a brief introduction to Computer Assisted Language Learning along with its history and developments through years as well as its advantages in English Language Teaching. Moving on to presenting the changing role of teachers in computer assisted language learning classes. Afterwards, it continues with discussions on the importance of changing the role of computers and computer competence of EFL teachers. Finally, the chapter concludes with a

discussion on the importance of teachers' attitudes towards Computer Assisted language learning.

B. An Introduction to Computer Assisted Language Learning

With the evolution of computers and the spread of technology all over the world, their role and purpose evolved as well. This development and improvement have occurred in more than one area but the most important one is in education and language learning. the era of Computer Assisted Language Learning has started when the employment of computers in language learning and teaching process occurred. As it is defined by Gamper and Knapp (2002) CALL is a discipline of research which explores the approaches and techniques which are employed by computers in the field of language learning along with their benefits.

CALL is a method to implement computers in the classrooms for learning and teaching foreign languages. In fact, it promotes better and more varied learning and teaching process. Levy (6) views CALL as the search for and study applications of the computer in language teaching and learning.

As technology improved and progressed, CALL has promoted itself as one of the most attractive and inspiring alternatives to communicate more inside the classrooms.

C. History and Development of Computer Assisted Language Learning

The integration of technology in education is not a recent phenomenon. In fact, applying technology in language learning is a very new trend for both language teachers and learners. As it is mentioned by Warschauer and Healey (1998) it was only employed for language teaching purposes since the 1960s. Since that time, CALL has developed a symbiotic relationship between the development of technology and pedagogy (Gorjian, Hayati, & Pourkhoni, 2013:35; Stockwell, 2007:118).

Warschauer (1996) also mentioned the historical development of CALL illustrating that computers and technology can not only be used for language teaching. Moreover, he mentioned that computers can be used in more than one field and serve many other purposes. In fact, computers can help learners to practice the

languages as well as motivate them to interact. Additionally, computers can be used as a tool for academic purposes such as research. With the appearance of the internet, the role of computers changed and ended up being an important means for international communication.

Computer-assisted language learning and teaching provides both learners and teachers with lots of opportunities. The progressive development of the role of technology in language courses has known a few different phases. These phases are called: Behavioristic CALL, Communicative CALL, Integrative CALL. Each phase has its own advantages and disadvantages.

1. Behavioristic Computer Assisted Language Learning

The first phase in the history of CALL was introduced in the 1960s and executed in the 1970s and the 1980s was known earlier as 'Behavioristic CALL' and later as 'Structural CALL' by Warschauer (Warschauer, 1996:5; Warschauer & Healey, 1998:59; Lee, 2000; Fotos & Browne, 2004:5; Warschauer, 2004:20), Structural CALL viewed the computer as mechanical tutor (Warschauer, 1996:3; Warschauer & Healey, 1998:57; Ahmed, 2004:24; Gündüz, 2005:198) "ideal for carrying out repeated drills since the machine does not get bored or exhausted with presenting the same material and …can provide immediate non-judgemental feedback or criticize the learners, in fact, it helps them to learn by themselves and work at their own pace" (Warschauer, 1996:3; Pim, 2013:36).

Through the use of drills and audio-lingual methods, Learners were given the chance to experience the language (Moras, 2001). Some researchers such as Warschauer and Healey (1998) mentioned that computers were accepted by the learners as it helps them to learn and develop themselves, and they are considered to be tutors that never got criticized and exhausted the learners and let them work at their own pace.

One of the best-known tutorial systems was the PLATO (Programmed Logic for Automated Teaching Operations) which was introduced at the University of Illinois, USA (Butler-Pascoe, 2011:17; Egbert et al., 2011:17). Later on, another system appeared which was called TICCIT. These two systems represent projects which reflect the ideas and effects of this stage (Levy, 1997).

The main purpose of the PLATO system was the employment of computers in education. This system included vocabulary drills, grammar explanations, and drills, as well as direct translation tests.

The other system which was developed afterwards was TICCIT (time-shared, interactive, computer-controlled information television). It was a significant project first conducted at Brigham Young University, Utah, the US in 1971. It integrated the two most essential elements: television and computers (Levy, 1997).

2. Communicative Computer Assisted Language Learning

Communicative computer assisted language learning is the second stage or phase which is also called cognitive CALL. It started in the span of the 1970s and 1980s. At some point, the followers of this approach felt the desire and the necessity of using communication in real-life scenarios as compared to the drills activities that appeared and was used in the previous stage. It rejected the longstanding effects of the behavioristic approach and moved to the adaptation of the theories of the cognitive approach, paying more attention to the improvement, exploration as well as the course of learning (Warschauer & Healey, 1998).

Through time, researchers affirmed that the behavioristic approach did not serve its purpose accordingly. In fact, using drills and repetition programs and ways of teaching did not give the chance to learners to experience authentic communication enough and it restricted them from doing so (Warschauer, 1996). In the communicative CALL stage, the results of computer use were not restricted to the tasks students performed on the machine but also their interaction with each other while using the machine (Warschauer & Healey, 1998).

Underwood cited the basic features of communicative CALL as:

- Focuses more on using forms rather than on the forms themselves;
- Teaches grammar implicitly rather than explicitly;
- Allows and encourages students to generate original utterances rather than just manipulate prefabricated language;
- Does not judge and evaluate everything the students nor reward them with congratulatory messages, lights, or bells;

- Avoids telling students they are wrong and is flexible to a variety of students' responses;
- Uses the target language exclusively and creates an environment in which using the target language feels natural, both on and off the screen;
- Will never try to do anything that a book can do just as well (Underwood 1984; cited in Warschauer, 1996:4).

Both Communicative stage and behavioristic CALL viewed computers as a mechanical tutor. However, it gave the opportunity to control, choose and interact. Moreover, it is believed that computer alongside by being motivator is also providing tools for the learners to practice language materials beneficially (Moras, 2001).

A project called Athena Language Learning Project (ALLP) started first as a totally financed project in 1983. Its main purpose is to identify the main role of computers in education at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), Massachusetts, US (Beatty, 2003). J. Murray et al. (1991; cited Beatty, 2003) noted and cited that advantages of ALLP as:

- The encyclopedic information usually associated with print that can be recalled with the speed of the computer.
- The extensive models of the language provided by multiple speakers (including native speech in its appropriate cultural context) usually associated with television or film materials.
- The engagement of interactivity usually associated with more primitive drill-and-practice routines (Murray, et al., 1991; cited Beatty, 2003:29).

According to Murray's findings, communicative CALL tried to integrate the advantages of the behavioristic approach with the engagement, and the constructivist approach with interaction in order to disqualify the possibility of having shortcomings (Beatty, 2003).

3. Integrative Computer Assisted Language Learning

Integrative computer assisted language learning is the third stage or phase which is also called Socio-cognitive CALL and Socio-constructive CALL. This stage has been put together after the presence of two fundamental growth in the technology: the evolution of computers with multimedia along with the internet. Due

to the teachers' habit to engage in communicative teaching, content-based, task-based, and project-based approaches were required.

With the evolution of internet, this stage has introduced the most crucial element of our present-day: multimedia technology. According to Warschauer (1996), multimedia technology is defined as the availability of a broad dimension of media, which includes text, graphics, sound animation and video on one device which devote a lot to the learners. In this stage, learners get to know the technological tools because in this approach language learning is seen as a mature process. In fact, instead of practicing the language weekly, learners use computers as the technological tool and learn the language at their own pace through the use of many kind of media (Warschauer & Healet, 1998).

CAMILLE and OLA are two projects that represent this stage. CAMILLE (Computer-aided multimedia interactive language learning) was designed through the collaboration of four European countries (the Netherlands, United Kingdom, France, and Spain), in order to provide language courses either as general courses or English for academic purposes to each country in Dutch, English, French or Spanish (Levy, 1997). The second project is OLA (Oral Language Archive) which started at Carnegie Mellon University, Pennsylvania, the US in 1994. The main purpose of this project is to turn the sound recordings into computerized versions and collect them, later on, they will be available to whoever wants to use them via the Internet (Levy, 1997).

At full length of all these three stages of CALL, teachers have tried to always find out beneficial ways to teach the language in a more effective and practical way by dropping out certain sides and steps. Instead of that, teachers adopted new approaches in order to set a view on teaching languages in the best ways possible.

To sum up, it can be said that CALL is directly linked to technology and task-based pedagogy. It offers rich virtual platforms which are related to blogs, online feedback, and the use of many modern applications and tools. In fact, CALL is considered to be a new phenomenon of the 21st century, to replace the old methods, techniques and approaches of language learning. Therefore, CALL is a new norm which shows and explains the modes and processes of communication related to language learning and teaching. In other words, it reveals new horizons of communication and knowledge for ESL teachers and learners. CALL is known as the

century of technology and a central force to the learner which motivates them, enhance their learning autonomy, and provides them with feedbacks as well as to language teachers. It helps improving the teaching institutions and making them better for both learners and language teachers.

D. The Advantages of Computer Assisted Language Learning

With the development of technology and the integration of the internet in our lives, computers have become more accessible to everyone. In fact, the use of computers in teaching is not a new approach. Thanks to information communication technologies (ICT), remarkable advancements were initiated at the end of the twentieth century. Before the twenty-first century, teachers were provided with many tools such as language labs, multimedia devices as well as the internet. In addition to that, learners had access to foreign language documents. This helped them to learn more and to improve themselves. They had access as well to communicate with native speakers in order to practice and learn more about the language. Moreover, teachers who are still doubting these new phenomena, will find satisfying answers to their questions with the help of computers and technology (Goodwyn, 2000).

In the previous practices and implementations of computers, the focus was on what could computers provide for both teachers and learners. However, in the new practices and implementations of computers, the focus is on what both teachers and learners can do with computers. Thus, if technologies correspond with the needs of the users, will they successfully co-exist in both language learning and teaching. According to Shneiderman, 2003, computers will support communication and promote real-life experiences for both teachers and learners. For now, we have reached the highest stage proposed by Shneiderman.

The table (Table 1) below provides more detailed characteristics of the development of computers in language teaching and learning:

Table 1 The Old Computing Versus The New Computing

The old computing	The new computing
Focus on what computers can do. The moment of excitement when something new works. Teachers get excited when they learn something new or something works.	The focus is on what people can do with computers not the inverse.
Technician and technology driven. Focus on bits and bytes, connectivity. Teachers often told to adapt their classroom practices to fit the system.	Driven by the curriculum and learning goals of the forward-thinking educational leader in the school. User-centered not technology-centered.
Better ways of: • Marketing the school • Presentation • Vocational preparation • Research • Communication • Re-drafting • Organizing / storing	Better ways of: • Using multiple intelligences. • Analytical thinking • Visual analysis • Facilitating • Collaborating • Empowering • Discovering • Making and doing
Generally, teacher-controlled, didactic learning.	Potential for open-ended, pupil-centered, constructivist learning.

According to Gamper and Knapp 2002, The widespread and accessibility of computers have positively affected the interaction between both teachers and learners as well as the collaboration between both of them. In fact, Computer-mediated communication (CMC) is considered to be the most popular approach to technology being applied and introduced in the language classroom. In fact, Thomas and Reinders, 2010; Zhang, 2008 agreed that computers have numerous functions and can play various roles through the changing of teaching contexts, from drill to highly effective agents in intercultural communications.

Through years and with the help of technology, computers are becoming more empowering and favorable devices for both aspects, teaching and learning process. This is because they bring lead the way to flexibility and distance the learning experience by separating the boundaries of a classroom for both students and teachers. In addition to that, computers and CALL guide the learners to participate in the learning experience by reducing their level of anxiety and help them practice and excel in the language. The benefits of teachers are serving the aim of achieving the

voluminous data and keeping the detailed improvement of learners, therefore, reducing their burden (Zhang, 2008).

As mentioned by Howard Gardner in 1983, in a classroom not all students have the same intelligence. Thus, they cannot operate and use the same material sand resources provided to them as their peers. In fact, each student is unique and has his own ways to proceed things. There are various learning styles and numerous independent and dominant intelligence types among the student population. For these reasons, computers are integrated to close the gaps that exist due to the differences that emerged from different learning types. As pointed out by both Schneiderman (2003) and Jian (2009), computers join forces between texts, audios, as well as graphics, and through them deliver the message in a harmonious way in line with the language teaching and learning needs of the students.

Egbert (2005), illustrates that introducing computers in teaching specifically implementing CALL, provides a quick access to the lesson's materials as well as improving them and promoting language learning. One of the most valuable benefits of using and implementing CALL is interactivity. In fact, CALL grants the chance of creating a more student-centered teaching spirit and highlights the necessity of providing instant feedbacks (Davies, 2002).

Another considerable aspect of CALL is that all these opportunities are provided in a process called cost-effective ways (Woodard, 1998). As Cameron 1989 believed that if all the advantages of CALL are properly applied in the process of language teaching and are well applied, the ultimate goal of CALL is to enhance the quality of language teaching and the success of carrying it into action.

E. Changing the role of teachers in Computer Assisted Language Learning Classes

According to some researchers, teaching can occur only when the users of language such as teachers and native speakers can transfer their knowledge to the learners. Due to the development of technology, both roles of learners and users of the language has changed. In fact, the learner role has changed to a producer and the users from only receiver of the given structures. Moreover, the role of the teacher faced changes as well. For instance, teachers became facilitators. They play an

important role in given instructions and they can offer and deliver information to their students in a variety of ways to meet the needs of their learners (Warschauer and Healey, 1998). Since the role of teachers has changed and developed, their determination is integral to their achieving goals throughout this time of change. However, even though the role of the teacher has faced changes and development, the role of technology cannot be denied, because technology made teachers succeed to achieve their goals.

As stated by some researchers such as Fullan and Hargreaves (1991), even though how perfectly prepared a change can be, this does not mean anything if not adopted and implemented by teachers in their teaching practices. As mentioned by Garret 1991, he supported the idea that computer use does not form an approach, instead it is a way to utilize consisting practices, methods, and schemes. For instance, during the implementation of CALL, its effectiveness cannot be measured by the existence of computers (Warschauer, 1996), simply because neither technology nor language play an important role by their own. However, the most important thing here, is the language learning setting which is built by teachers and the environment created by them (Egbert, 2005).

F. Computer Competence of EFL Teachers

According to some researchers such as (Thomas and Reinders, 2010), teachers play an important role in the learning process, the adoption and use of technology as well as the learners' adjustment. In fact, how much students spend time using technology and computers and how much they implement them in their daily life has a great impact on how much they will benefit from them and will profit from CALL (Almekhlafi, 2006). The teachers are seen as role models for their students. They should reinforce the use of computers as well as technology and show great interest in using them to prepare their lessons or during their lessons. They should implement CALL, technology, and computers in their learning process to encourage their students to use it in their daily life. The more computers are used in the language learning, the more advantages will be provided for both learners and teachers (Arishi, 2012). Yet, the most passionate and successful teachers may experience some difficulties while implementing technology and these new tools and instruments of teaching even though they might be in favor of computers' integration into teaching

(Nettelbeck, 2005). Teachers might go through technical problems that cannot be solved without the help of technicians, and this makes it hard for them to have full control over computers (Nettelbeck, 2005).

As it is stated by Peters (2006), teachers should go through training that helps them to develop themselves and to be able to use technology and computers properly, this doesn't mean they should be experts in this field but at least they should have great information about what they have in hands and how to be competent in implementing technology in their classrooms. During their training, they are asked not only to broaden their knowledge of technology but also they should share experiences and knowledge about how to use technology and computers in a useful way which will help them create solutions for language teaching for the next decades (Kessler & Plakans, 2008).

According to some researchers such as (Hegelheimer, 2006, Levy & Stockwell, 2006), acquiring a specific knowledge related to technology which is relevant to the use of CALL in classes provides teachers with several benefits. However not every teacher has the competence to investigate any relationship happening between computers and language teaching (Lam, 2000). There are four different distinct levels of computer-competent teachers which were illustrated by Hertz (1987:183; as cited in Levy, 1997):

- Level 1: The computer using teacher;
- Level 2: The non-programming author of courseware content;
- Level 3: The user of authoring systems;
- Level 4: The teacher programmer (Herts, 1987; as cited in Levy, 1997:106).

First, level 1 is linked to teachers with basic computer skills. Those are the ones with the help of computers can carry out their duties in both their daily life and classrooms. Second, Level 2 is linked to those who use CALL materials but are still not the creators. Then, Level 4 is related to those who created CALL programs. They are the ones who can create their materials and what they need to implement in their classrooms and how they want to use them, they don't face any problem using their programs and they put them into use without much effort. Apart from those who are part of level 1, all the teachers in the other levels are able to create their own

materials with the help of software. One of the suitable examples for this would be the materials created for presentations such as PowerPoint, Keynote or online programs such as Prezi, SlideShare and PowToon.

Along with knowing some basics about computers, language teachers should also have some basic information about the use of web-based search engines and locating the materials they need, scanning them as well to decide the appropriateness level (Chappelle & Hegelheimer, 2004; Singhal, 1997). In fact, in our era, it is not easy to find appropriate lesson materials and useful ones that are adequate to the level of students and their needs, even if the search is related to languages such as English for example, you can find plenty of resources and materials and it would take time to figure out which ones are suitable for the learners (Hubbard, 2013).

One of the most important steps that Hubbard emphasized on is the discovery of every aspect of the settings that the language will be taught, this helps the teachers to decide on what kind of CALL materials they are supposed to use. According to Chalhoub-Deville, 2001, as L2 learning opportunities tend to change, technological advances tend to change as well. This is the reason why most teachers should have enough training and professional development regarding the use of technology and computers to catch up with the new changes. If the teachers are not able to cope with the use of computers and the internet, it might lead to a problematic situation for them (Moras, 2001).

To better implement technology in their teaching process, Warschauer and Whittaker (1997) proposed that teachers should step back and look for the parts they have missed and concentrate on essential educational needs.

Kessler (2007) mentioned that teacher training and professional developments are basically focused more on certain aspects of instructional technology or specific software programs. This results to the lack of desire from teachers to create something new for language learning purposes. They will not be able to step inside a classroom that requires the use of technology or other specific programs or the one that are already equipped with state-of-art technologies. For this fact, Chappelle and Hegelheimer (2004) described the attributes of the 21st century teachers as concerned with the latest technology related to the language field and are able to implement them productively.

According to some researchers, they strongly believe that to facilitate the learning process, language teachers are obliged to have enough competence to be ready with the necessary materials and implement them in their language classroom (Warschauer & Healey, 1998).

G. Teachers' Attitudes Towards Computer Assisted Language Learning

Although in many schools and universities, computer resources are available nowadays. This is believed that it will help to improve the quality of teaching and learning. Despite this fact, not all teachers are willing to adapt to such development as it is expected by most of the researchers (Marcinkiewics, 1994; Dusick, 1998). It is the say, that despite the fact of the development in computer technology, teachers' adaptation and integration of this new phenomenon has been slow (Swan & Mitrani, 1993). This made researchers question the benefits and true effectiveness of integrating computers in the learning process and how teachers will adapt themselves to enhance the learning process, make it more beneficial and encourage their students to integrate computers in their education.

According to Stepp-Greeany 2002, the students' attitude towards technology became positive when they became aware of the importance of implementing it in their learning process. This situation doesn't differ for teachers. In fact, the main goal in teaching is when both students and teachers share the same attitudes towards technology and computer implementation into the learning process. Min (1998). This is why the teachers' attitudes towards both computers and CALL are important in both integrating computers into their curriculums and integrating CALL in their classrooms. Moreover, the more they are experienced and familiarized with computers, the more favorable attitudes, and less anxiety they will demonstrate. That is to say, they acquire more experience and become much keener about computers (Hardy, 1998).

There have been several researches focusing on the teachers' attitudes towards CALL, especially when it comes to practicing CALL in language classrooms. The finding of these several researches done by Chen (2008), Hong and Koh (2002), Teo (2008), Tezci (2009), and Dashtestani (2012) showed that the majority of the teachers have a positive attitude towards technology, computers as well as CALL.

In fact, the study conducted by Albirini (2006) which analyzed the attitudes of 326 Syrian high school EFL teachers towards information communication technologies (ICT) resulted that they also have positive attitudes towards ICT. Another study that has been conducted by Bordbar (2010) resulted the same as in the findings of the research the teachers showed positive attitudes towards ICT. He analyzed the attitudes of 10 Iranian high school EFL teachers towards the implementation of ICT in their classrooms as what Albirini (2006) did, as well as they both focused on the reasons and factors behind them. The findings in both studies are similar.

Another study has been done in the Egyptian context by Bark (2011) on teacher attitudes towards computers. The survey was focusing on gender and the years of experiences for 118 secondary school teachers. The results revealed that their attitudes are positive towards computers and technology. One of the latest studies which has been conducted was by Safdar and Jumani (2013), which provide the same results as the positive attitudes of teachers towards ICT. It was conducted in Pakistan with 600 students and 100 teachers. The main focus of all these studies was on the attitudes towards computers and ICT.

Harrison and Rainer (1992) carried a study on ICT integration in the teaching and learning process of university teachers in the Southern United States found out that many of them were less skilled in computer use and therefore had a negative attitude about it. Another study carried by Albirini (2004) investigated the Science teachers' attitudes about ICT integration in teaching and learning in Syrian high schools. The results indicated that they had a positive attitude towards the integration of ICT in their teaching and learning process. Albirini (2004) also found out that most of the teachers were interested in developing their ICT skills. Though the studies done by these researchers are very important, because they were done in developed countries and in the context of science-based subjects.

Another study conducted by Arkin (2003) focusing on the teachers' attitudes in a vocabulary program at the tertiary level. In fact, 97 Turkish instructors' attitudes were investigated, and the results found out positive attitudes towards computers and technology resources. A similar study was conducted by Zereyalp (2009), who also conducted it at the tertiary level. The main purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes of 80 Turkish EFL educators from 27 state universities all over Turkey.

The results revealed the positive attitudes of the teachers towards computers in general as well as the use of computer technology in the classroom to improve language instruction, learning and CALL.

In the same field, another study was conducted by Özerol (2009), which investigated 60 Turkish EFL primary school teachers. It presented positive results of the attitudes and perceptions towards CALL. A study carried by Aydin (2013) in the same field, investigated 157 elementary and secondary school EFL teachers and the results showed positive attitudes as well as perceptions towards computers, CALL and ICT.

According to all these studies stated before and the findings, the attitudes of teachers towards computers, ICT, CALL and computer technology are crucial and contribute to the success of the methods, techniques and approaches that have been employed in language teaching.

For these reasons, teachers and educators should be aware of the educational effectiveness of computers, CALL, ICT and computer technologies and their importance in the development of the learning process and well as the teaching process. As it is believed by Goodwyn (2000), as a community, English teachers will be competent users of computers and will be aware of implementing them in language teaching.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Introduction

This study aimed to find out the attitudes of English language teachers towards using Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL). The participants of the study worked at the Higher Institute of Language of Tunis located in Tunisia.

B. Research Design

Since the main purpose of this study is to analyze the teachers' attitudes toward computer assisted language learning (CALL) at the Higher Institute of Language of Tunisia. In the present study descriptive research was used. Descriptive research attempts to examine situations in order to establish what is the norm (Wilman, 2011:10). In fact, a descriptive study describes what exists and tries to pave the ground for finding new facts. This type of research does not follow a structured research hypothesis (Travers, 1978), because the purpose of the study is to uncover the hidden elements of a real-world context.

The study contains aspects of both qualitative and quantitative research. Qualitative research is a type of scientific research that seeks answers to a question, systematically uses a predefined set of procedures to answer the question, collects evidence, produces findings that were not determined in advance, and produces findings that are applicable beyond the immediate boundaries of the study (Mack, et al., 2005:1). Quantitative research seeks to confirm hypotheses about phenomena. It uses more rigid style of eliciting and categorizing responses to questions, and uses highly structured methods such as questionnaires, surveys, and structured observation. (Mack, et al., 2005:3).

Studies that employ both quantitative and qualitative aspects are said to employ mixed-method research. Mixed methods research is the combination and integration of qualitative and quantitative methods in the same study (Molina-Azorin, 2016). In their "Advanced Mixed Methods Research Designs" John W. Creswell, Vicki L.

Plano Clark, Michelle L. Gutmann and William E. Hanson mentioned that "*A mixed methods study involves the collection or analysis of both quantitative and/or qualitative data in a single study in which the data are collected concurrently or sequentially, are given a priority, and involve the integration of the data at one or more stages in the process of research".*

This study also contains aspects of a survey research. Survey research is defined as "the collection of information from a sample of individuals through their responses to questions" (Check & Schutt, 2012:160). This type of research allows for a variety of methods to recruit participants, collect data, and utilize various methods of instru-mentation. Survey research can use quantitative research strategies (e.g., using questionnaires with numerically rated items), qualitative research strategies (e.g., using open-ended questions), or both strategies (i.e., mixed methods).

C. Setting and Participants

The study was conducted at the Higher Institute of Languages of Tunis. The English department has more than 55 teachers who supervise more than 800 students in the two licenses: fundamental and applied English as well as in 4 different masters. The Higher Institute of Languages of Tunis was founded in 1999 at Cité El-Khadhra. It was in fact founded first in 1964 under the name of the Bourguiba Institute of Modern Languages, which is situated in the north of Tunisia. It is a public university, which is part of the University of Carthage, which has provided university training in languages and translation since 1976 under the supervision of the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research. The English department comprises more than 55 teachers and all the courses are taught in English.

The university is not a technology based one. In fact, both students and teachers are not exposed to technology as much as they have to. The participants of this study are selected through a voluntary-based sampling method. This method explores the potential respondents who are willing and qualifying to participate in the survey (Murairwa, 2015). To fulfill the purpose of this study, 41 EFL instructors working at the Higher Institute of Language of Tunis, Tunisia participated in this study. 21 males and 20 females aged between 21 to 55+. All the participants were informed about the purpose of the study before proceeding to answer the questions, and they were assured about the confidentiality of their personal information.

D. Data Collection Instrument

The data collection instrument used in this study is a questionnaire developed by two researchers Christensen and Knezek in 1998. The Institute for the Integration of technology into Teaching and Learning (IITTL) of the University of North Texas (UNT) made this survey public for further studies. The survey is entitled Faculty Attitudes towards Information Technology (FAIT). It consists of 5 dimensions which focus on specific aspects of the attitudes of teachers. They are cited as: Enthusiasm, Anxiety, Productivity Improvement, Avoidance and E-mail use for classroom learning. The numbers of the items in each subscale are as follows in their respective orders: 15, 15, 15, 12, 11. A distribution of the subscales of the FAIT survey is shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2 Distribution of the Subscales Consisting the FAIT Survey

Subscales	Number of Items
Enthusiasm	15
Anxiety	15
Productivity Improvement	15
Avoidance	12
Email use for classroom learning	11
TOTAL	68

The questionnaire contains mainly three parts. The first part is the cover page and aims to inform the respondents about the aims and aspects of the questionnaire together with a guarantee of confidentiality. The second part of the questionnaire contains 15 items and mainly elicits demographic information and participants' use of computers in their daily lives. The third part of the questionnaire contains a five-point Likert scale containing 68 items. This type of scale was developed by Rensis Likert (1931), who described and then developed this technique for the assessment of attitudes. It requires an individual to respond to a series of items by indicating whether he/she agrees (SA), agrees (A), is undecided (U), disagrees (D), or strongly disagrees (SD) (Croasmun, & Ostrom, 2011).

The internal reliability coefficient was found between .90 and .96 by Christensen and Kneezek (1998). However, because the researcher adapted the survey to meet the needs of the setting and participants of the present study, the internal reliability was re-calculated and found to be .88.

With the purpose of getting consistent responses from all the participants, there are many negative words and questions in the survey. In fact, the number of negative worded questions is as follows: 2 items in Enthusiasm subscale, 11 items in Anxiety subscale, none in productivity improvement subscale, 9 items in avoidance subscale and none in E-mail use for the classroom learning subscale. The overall number of the negatively worded items is 22 in 68 items which are used to avoid bias in the responses.

Table 3 Number of the Negatively Worded Items in FAIT Survey

Subscale	Number of Negative Worded Items	Items with Negative Wordings
Enthusiasm	2	12,14
Anxiety	11	16,17,18,19,20,22,23,24,25,27,29
Productivity Improvement	0	0
Avoidance	9	46,47,48,49,50,51,54,55,57
E-mail use for the classroom Learning	0	0
TOTAL	22	22

E. Data Collection Procedures

First, the researcher received the approval from the developers of the questionnaire to use it in the study. Later on, the researcher received the acceptance from the Ethical committee of the Social Institute of Istanbul Aydin University to administer the questionnaire. The researcher used google form to prepare the survey with the participants.

The questionnaire was distributed via mailing list of the Higher Institute of Languages of Tunis as a Google Form link. The questionnaire was administered during the end of Year 2020. The reasons for choosing a web-surveys were to speed up the process of collecting the data, lower costs, and lower the usage of multimedia interfaces.

The study collected both the quantitative and qualitative data. Quantitative data were collected through FAIT survey. Qualitative data were collected through two open-ended questions at the end of the questionnaire. The two open-ended questions elicited from respondents why the liked or disliked using computers.

F. Data Analysis

The researcher used SPSS to analyze qualitative and quantitative data. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) is used to analyze scientific data related to the social sciences. This method was applied to the responses of 41 teachers who participated in this study. The total number of items per participants was 68 and 2 open-ended questions. IT was divided into frequencies and percentages in order to provide a clear overview of the teachers' attitudes toward computer assisted language learning.

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Introduction

This chapter displays the findings obtained from both qualitative and quantitative analysis which were gathered through the FAIT survey (See Appendix 2). The study aimed to find the EFL teachers' attitudes towards CALL. This chapter first introduces the demographic characteristics of the participants, then the findings from the quantitative and finally the findings from the qualitative data which are discussed respectively.

B. Findings from the Demographic Data

41 EFL instructors working at the Higher Institute of Language of Tunis, Tunisia participated in this study. In order to collect detailed information about the participants and their experiences, the demographic sheet (See Appendix 1) was used. Through this demographic part, the data part related to participants' age, gender, experiences and educational level were collected. The analysis of the demographic data in the forms of frequencies and percentages for each item can be found in Table 4 below.

Table 4 The Demographic Distribution of the Participants in the Study

		F	%
Gender	Male	21	51.2
	Female	20	48.8
Age	21 – 24	3	7.3
	25 – 29	10	24.4
	30 – 34	6	14.6
	35 – 39	5	12.2
	40 – 44	7	17.1
	45 – 49	4	9.8
	50 – 54 – 55+	6	14.6
Education	Bachelor's degree	4	9.8
	Master's degree	24	58.5
	PhD	12	29.3
	Professional degree	1	2.4

At it is revealed in Table 4 above, the participants in this study were 21 male and 20 females. 3 participants are aged between 21 and 24, 10 participants are aged between 25 and 29, 6 participants are aged between 30 and 34, 5 participants are aged between 35 and 39, 7 Participants are aged between 40 and 44, 4 participants are aged between 45 and 49 and 6 participants are aged between 50 – 54 and 55+. Regarding the participants' educational level, 4 participants had bachelor's degree, 24 participants held master's degree, 12 participants had PhD and only 1 participant had a professional degree.

C. Findings from the Quantitative Data

This section presents the findings gathered from the quantitative data. These findings are discussed under four categories. Firstly, the findings related to Enthusiasm, then the findings related to Anxiety and the findings on Productivity improvement as well as the findings on avoidance and finally the findings on E-mail use for classroom learning are discussed.

1. Findings on Enthusiasm

The purpose of the first research question was to find out how Enthusiastic the teachers at ISLT are towards the use of computers and CALL-in language teaching. This subcategory consisted of 15 items (the first 15 items in the FAIT survey). In Table 5, teachers' responses are presented in percentages and frequencies.

Table 5 The Frequency of the Instructors' Responses to the Items Related to Enthusiasm

		Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Strongly Agree	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1-	I think that working with computers would be enjoyable and stimulating.	3	7.3	5	12.2	1	2.4	22	53.7	10	24.4
2-	I want to learn a lot about computers.	3	7.3	4	9.8	2	4.9	21	51.2	11	26.8
3-	The challenge of learning about computers is exciting.	2	4.9	7	17.1	8	19.5	18	43.9	6	14.6
4-	Learning about computers is boring to me.	11	26.8	18	43.9	4	9.8	3	7.3	5	12.2

5-	I like learning on a computer.	3	7.3	4	9.8	4	9.8	18	43.9	12	29.3

Table 5 (cont.) The Frequency of the Instructors' Responses to the Items Related to Enthusiasm

		Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Strongly Agree	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
6-	I enjoy learning how computers are used in our daily lives.	3	7.3	4	9.8	6	14.6	16	39	12	29.3
7-	I would like to learn more about computers.	2	4.9	2	4.9	11	26.8	15	36.6	11	26.8
8-	I would like working with computers.	4	9.8	3	7.3	2	4.9	20	48.8	12	29.3
9-	A job using computers would be very interesting.	2	4.9	3	7.3	10	24.4	15	36.6	11	26.8
10-	I enjoy computer work.	4	9.8	5	12.2	7	17.1	15	36.6	10	24.4
11-	I will use a computer as soon as possible.	1	2.4	4	9.8	6	14.6	17	41.5	13	31.7
12-	Figuring out computer problems does not appeal to me.	2	4.9	9	22	19	46.3	6	14.6	5	12.2
13-	If given the opportunity, I would like to learn about and use computers.	1	2.4	3	7.3	5	12.2	24	58.5	8	19.5
14-	Computers are not exciting.	14	34.1	14	34.1	2	4.9	7	17.1	4	9.8
15-	Computer lessons are a favorite subject for me.	2	4.9	8	19.5	16	39	11	26.8	4	9.8

The responses to the first item related to Enthusiasm indicate that working with computers is enjoyable and stimulating for the teachers. Most teachers responded positively (f=32, 78.1%) by stating "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" to the first item in the survey. The teachers responded to the second item by showing their interest to learn a lot about computers. In fact, it can be concluded that most teachers are eager to learn more about how to use computers is quite noticeable (f=32, 78%) by stating "Agree" or "Strongly Agree". Moving on to the third item through which the researcher tried to investigate whether the challenge of learning about computers is exciting for the teachers or not. In fact, more than half of the teachers responded positively (f=24, 58,5%) by stating "Agree" or "Strongly Agree". For the fourth item, 8 teachers responded positively declaring that learning about computers is

boring for them (f=8, 19.5%) by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” while (f=29, 70.7%) stated that they don’t believe in this statement by stating “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree”. Item 5 determined whether the instructors like learning on computers or not. In fact, more than half of the participants responded positively (f=30, 73.2%) by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” while only 7 participants (f=7, 17.1%) responded by stating that they “Strongly Disagree” or “Disagree” with this statement.

The following item which is number 6 tried to clarify if the instructors enjoy learning how computers are used in their daily lives. More than half of the instructors responded positively (f=28, 68.3%) by stating that they “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” with the statement, while only 7 participants (f=7, 17.1%) responded by “Disagree”, or “Strongly Disagree” to this statement. In item 7 most of the instructors responded positively. They would like to learn more about computers (f=26, 63.4%) by stating “Agree”, or “Strongly Agree” to this item, while 11 participants were not sure and responded by “Undecided” (f=11, 26.8%). As stated in item 8, instructors would like to work with computers (f=32, 78.1%) by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to this item. Twenty-six of the instructors (63.4%) would be interested in a job in which they are required to use computers by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to item 9. In item 10, it is seen that more than half of the instructors (f=25, 61%) enjoy computer work by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to this item.

According to the results in item 11, by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to this item, thirty (73.3%) out of 41 instructors want to use computers straight away whenever they have a chance. Moving on to item 12 which was the first negative worded statement in the Enthusiasm subcategory and also the first in the FAIT survey. The results indicated that figuring out computer problems appealed to the instructors (f=11, 26.9%) by stating “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree”. The next item, item 13, aimed to elicit whether the instructors would like to use and learn more about computers, if they are given the opportunity. The results revealed that more than half of the answers were positive (f=32, 78%) by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to this statement. Item 14 is considered to be the second negatively worded item in the Enthusiasm subcategory. In this item, the instructors were asked whether they find computers exciting. Results revealed that (f=28, 68.2%) stating “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree” to this item. This means that instructors really

enjoy computers and find them exciting. For this item only (f=11) reported otherwise by stating that they "Agree" or "Strongly Agree". Item 15 is the last item of the subscale which inquired whether computer lessons are a favorite subject for the instructors. 16 instructors responded by "Undecided" (39%), while 15 of them stated that they "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" (36.6%) and 10 of them stated that they "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" (24.4%).

2. Findings on Anxiety

The purpose of the Second research question was to find out how Anxious the teachers at ISLT are when they use computers and implement CALL in language teaching. This subcategory consisted of 15 items (the second 15 items in the FAIT survey). In Table 6, teachers' responses are presented in percentages and frequencies.

Table 6 The Frequency of the Instructors' Responses to Items Related to Anxiety

		Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Strongly Agree	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
16-	I get a sinking feeling when I think of trying to use a computer.	6	14.6	16	39	10	24.4	5	12.2	4	9.8
17-	Working with a computer makes me feel tense and uncomfortable.	11	26.8	17	41.5	4	9.8	5	12.2	4	9.8
18-	Working with a computer would make me nervous.	12	29.3	15	36.6	4	9.8	4	9.8	6	14.6
19-	Computers intimidate and threaten me.	12	29.3	14	34.1	4	9.8	9	22	2	4.9
20-	Computers frustrate me.	11	26.8	15	36.6	5	12.2	6	14.6	4	9.8
21-	I have a lot of self-confidence when it comes to working with computers.	4	9.8	6	14.6	5	12.2	15	36.6	11	26.8
22-	I sometimes get nervous just thinking about computers.	11	26.8	18	43.9	3	7.3	7	17.1	2	4.9
23-	A computer test would scare me.	10	24.4	14	34.1	10	24.4	6	14.6	1	2.4
24-	I feel apprehensive about using a computer.	3	7.3	9	22	14	34.1	8	19.5	7	17.1
25-	Computers are a tool much like a hammer or lathe.	1	2.4	8	19.5	15	36.6	13	31.7	4	9.8
26-	Computer could enhance remedial instruction.	0	0	3	7.3	12	29.3	19	46.3	7	17.1
27-	Computers will relieve teachers of routine duties.	1	2.4	7	17.1	3	7.3	16	39	14	34.1
28-	Computers can be used successfully with courses which demand creative activities.	2	4.9	4	9.8	5	12.2	12	29.3	18	43.9
29-	I have become familiar with computers through my previous experience.	1	2.4	7	17.1	5	12.2	17	41.5	11	26.8
30-	University students should understand the role of computers play in society.	0	0	0	0	5	12.2	13	31.7	23	56.1

The answers related to the second item of the FAIT survey are concentrated on the negative rating scale for this subcategory because it consists of a high rate of negatively worded items (f=11) in the survey.

The responses to item 16 reflect that the instructors feel calm and relaxed when it comes to using computers (f=22, 53.6%) by stating “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree” to this item, while 9 participants (f=9, 22%) responded by agreeing on the fact that they get a sinking feeling when it comes to using computers by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to this item. Moving on to item 17 which reflects as well how the instructors feel when they use computers. In fact, they are pleased when it comes to implementing computers in their teaching process. More than half of the participants (f=28, 68.3%) responded by stating “Disagree” or Strongly Disagree” to this item. In item 18, more than half of the participants feel confident and they don’t feel terrified when working with computers (f=27, 65.9%) by stating “Disagree” or “Strongly disagree”, while (f=10, 24.4%) stated that they “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” with the fact that they feel nervous working on computers. It was revealed as well in item 19 through which we can notice that the instructors are not discouraged when it comes to implementing computers in their work by stating “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree” (f=26, 63.4%). In item 20, (f=26, 63.4%) showed that computers do not discourage them and make them feel frustrated by stating “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree” to this item.

For the next item, item 21, while 26 of the instructors feel confident when it comes to using computers (63.4%) by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”, 5 of them are undecided (12.2%) and the rest (f=10, 24.4%) answered negatively by stating “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree”. Item 22 tried to figure out whether the instructors get nervous when thinking about computers. 29 instructors (70.7%) assured that this is not the case for them and they don’t feel nervous when it comes to thinking about computers by stating “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree”, while 9 instructors (22%) claimed that they feel nervous by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to this item. In item 23, nearly more than half of the instructors (f=24, 58.5%) claimed that they wouldn’t be frustrated when they had a test on a computer by stating “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree”, while 10 participants (24.4%) were not decided. In item 24, (f=12, 29.3%) claimed that they don’t feel uptight about using

computers by stating “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree” to this item. Meanwhile, 14 instructors remain uncertain (34.1%) and the rest (f=15, 36.6%) feel concerned. Moving on to item 25, in which instructors are asked whether they think computers’ being like a hammer or not for them. 1 instructor claimed that they “Strongly Disagree” with this statement (2.4%), while 8 other instructors claimed that they “Disagree” with this statement (19.5%), 15 instructors revealed that they are “Undecided” with this statement (36.6%). Moreover, 13 instructors claimed that they “Agree” with his statement (31.7%) and the rest (f=4, 9.8%) revealed that they “Strongly Agree” with this statement.

63.4% of the instructors (f=26) agreed with the idea that computers could enhance remedial instruction by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”, while no participants oppose this idea, however 12 participants were uncertain (29.3%) in item 26. For the following item (27), more than half of the instructors (f=30, 73.1%) claimed by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” that computers will relieve teachers from daily routine and make them feel free from their daily responsibilities. The purpose of item 28 was to reveal whether computers would be successful when it comes to implementing them in courses that demand creative activities. More than half of the instructors (f=30, 73.2%) revealed that computers are a very important tool to establish creative activities by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to this item. Item 29 revealed that more than half of the instructors became familiar with using computers through their previous experience by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to this item (f=28, 68.3%). For item 30, 5 instructors (12.2%) claimed that they are undecided regarding whether university students should consider computers a key aspect in society. The remaining instructors (f=36, 87.8%) which represent the majority of the participants responded positively by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to this item.

3. Findings on Productivity Improvement

The purpose of the Third research question was to find out teachers’ thoughts on how productive they feel when they are around computers and when they employ them in language teaching. This subcategory consisted of 15 items (the Third 15 items in the FAIT survey). In Table 7, teachers’ responses are presented in percentages and frequencies.

Table 7 The Frequency of the Instructors' Responses to The Items Related to Productivity Improvement

		Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Strongly Agree	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
31-	University students should have some understanding about computers.	0	0	0	0	5	12.2	13	31.7	23	56.1
32-	I feel qualified to teach computer literacy.	4	9.8	10	24.4	14	34.1	9	22	4	9.8
33-	Computers can be a useful instructional aid in almost all subject areas.	1	2.4	1	2.4	8	19.5	19	46.3	12	29.3
34-	Use of computers in education always reduces the personal treatment of the students.	2	4.9	4	9.8	8	19.5	20	48.8	7	17.1
35-	I feel at ease when I am around computers.	3	7.3	6	14.6	6	14.6	18	43.9	8	19.5
36-	I feel comfortable when a conversation turns to computers.	3	7.3	7	17.1	9	22	15	36.6	7	17.1
37-	Teacher training should include instructional applications of computers.	0	0	1	2.4	7	17.1	16	39	17	41.5
38-	Computers would motivate students.	0	0	2	4.9	6	14.6	18	43.9	15	36.6
39-	Computers would significantly improve the overall quality of my students' education.	0	0	3	7.3	7	17.1	15	36.6	16	39
40-	Computers would help students improve their writing.	5	12.2	7	17.1	7	17.1	16	39	6	14.6
41-	Computers would stimulate creativity in students.	1	2.4	3	7.3	7	17.1	18	43.9	12	29.3
42-	Computers could help students work with one another.	2	4.9	7	17.1	7	17.1	16	39	9	22
43-	Computers would help me organize my work.	3	7.3	4	9.8	2	4.9	15	36.6	17	41.5

44-	Computers would help increase my productivity.	3	7.3	3	7.3	8	19.5	12	29.3	15	36.6
45-	Computers would save time.	3	7.3	2	4.9	3	7.3	13	31.7	20	48.8

As it is showing in Table 7 above, in item 31 nearly all the instructors (f=36, 87.8%) believe that university students should have some understanding about computers by stating "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" to this item while only 5 instructors (12.2%) were uncertain about the statement. Regarding item 32, (f=13, 31.8%) of the instructors feel proficient enough to give computer literacy by stating "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" to this item, while 14 instructors (34.1%) are uncertain of their capacities and the rest (f=14, 34.2%), claimed that they are not competent enough to give computer literacy by stating "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree". By stating "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" to item 33, more than half of the instructors (f=31, 75.6%) believe that computers are a useful instructional aid in almost all subject areas. In the next item, item 34, which tried to elicit whether the implementation of computers in education always reduces the personal treatment of the students. In fact, more than half of the instructors (f=27, 65.9%) are in favor of this statement by stating "Agree" or "Strongly Agree", while 8 instructors (19.5%) are uncertain and the rest (f=6, 14.7%) are not in favor of this statement by stating "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to this item. As for item 35, 9 instructors (21.9%) reported feeling tense when they are around computers by stating "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to this item, while 6 instructors (14.6%) were uncertain and the rest (f=26, 63.4%) responded positively about this statement stating that they feel pleasant and relaxed around computers by stating "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" to this item.

According to the answers given in item 36, more than half of the instructors (f=22, 53.7%) responded positively but claiming that they feel secure and comfortable when the conversation turns to computers by stating "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" to this item. Meanwhile, 9 instructors (22%) were uncertain and the rest (f=10, 24.4%) were not in favor of this statement by stating "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree". As for the responses in item 37, there are no instructors who opposed to the idea that teacher training should include instructional applications of computers. In fact, more than half of the participants (f=33, 80.5%) responded favorably by stating "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" to this item while 7 instructors

(17.1%) were uncertain about the statement. The majority of the instructors responded favorably and positively regarding item 38 which claimed that Computers would motivate students (f=33, 80.5%) by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to this item. A great number of participants (f=31, 75.6%) responded positively to item 39 by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”. In fact this item stated that Computers would significantly improve the overall quality of my students’ education, meanwhile, 7 instructors (17.1%) were unclear about this statement.

In the next item, item 40, more than half of the participants (f=22, 53.6%) stated that they “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” and believed that Computers would help students improve their writing, however, 12 participants (29.3) stated that they “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree” with the statement. The results of item 41 are positive with the affirmative responses of 30 instructors (73.2%) who stated “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to how computers would stimulate creativity in students. For item 42, more than half of the participants (f=25, 61%), agreed with the statement that says computers could help students work with one another and be collaborative by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to this item, while 7 instructors (17.1%) were uncertain about this statement and the rest (f=9, 22%) responded oppositely by stating “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree”. Nearly most of the instructors in item 43, (f=32, 78.1%) agreed on the fact that computers would help them organize their work by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” and only 7 instructors opposed to the idea (17.1%) by stating “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree” to this item. As more than half of the participants responded positively in item 44, (f=27, 65.9%) by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” and indicating that computers would help increase their productivity, 8 instructors were uncertain (19.5%) and the rest (f=6, 14.6%) were opposite to the statement by stating “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree”. For the last item (45), most of the instructors responded positively by agreeing on the fact that Computers would save time (f=33, 80.5%) by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to this item.

4. Findings on Avoidance

The purpose of the Forth research question was to find out whether teachers avoid using computers and implementing CALL in their teaching process. This subcategory consisted of 12 items in the FAIT survey. In Table 8, teachers’ responses are presented in percentages and frequencies.

Table 8 The Frequency of the Instructors' Responses to The Items Related to Avoidance

		Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Strongly Agree	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
46-	Computers would help me learn.	3	7.3	1	2.4	3	7.3	18	43.9	16	39
47-	Computers would help me organize my finances.	3	7.3	5	12.2	12	29.3	12	29.3	9	22
48-	Computers solve more problems than they cause.	4	9.8	4	9.8	10	24.4	13	31.7	10	24.4
49-	I will probably never learn to use a computer.	15	36.6	15	36.6	5	12.2	4	9.8	2	4.9
50-	I see the computer as something I will rarely use in my life as an adult.	16	39	12	29.3	1	2.4	7	17.1	5	12.2
51-	Not many people can use computers.	3	7.3	7	17.1	15	36.6	10	24.4	6	14.6
52-	Learning to operate computers is like learning a new skill – the more you practice, the better you become.	0	0	1	2.4	5	12.2	19	46.3	16	39
53-	Knowing how to use computers is a worth wile skill.	0	0	0	0	7	17.1	17	41.5	17	41.5
54-	I do not think I could handle a computer course.	8	19.5	17	41.5	7	17.1	5	12.2	4	9.8
55-	I would never take a job where I had to work with computers.	12	29.3	17	41.5	6	14.6	3	7.3	3	7.3
56-	If given the opportunity, I would like to learn about and use computers.	0	0	1	2.4	7	17.1	21	51.2	12	29.3
57-	You have to be a "brain" to work with computers.	3	7.3	15	36.6	14	34.1	6	14.6	3	7.3

The data provided in table 8 was collected through many items related to the subcategory “Avoidance”. In most of the items (f=9) are negatively worded just like in the items in the second subcategory “Anxiety”.

As it is showing in the table, most of the participants in item 46 (f=34, 82.9%) stated by choosing “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” that computers help them learn and they believe that they are beneficial in the process of learning. For the following item 47, the question was related to whether the participants think that Computers would help them organize their finances. In fact, (f=21, 51.3%) of the instructors responded positively by choosing “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to this item, while 12 instructors were uncertain (29.3%) and the rest (f=8, 19.5%) responded negatively by choosing “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree”. In item 48, nearly more than half of the participants responded positively (f=23, 56.1%) to the idea that Computers solve more problems than they cause by choosing “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”, while 10 instructors (24.4%) were uncertain about this statement, and the rest (f=8, 19.6%) responded negatively by choosing “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree”. When the participants were asked whether they would ever learn how to use a computer in item 49, (f=30, 73.2%) responded negatively by choosing “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree”, while (f=6, 14.7%) responded positively by choosing “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” and the rest (f=5, 12.2%) were uncertain.

For the next item 50, 68.3% of the instructors (f=28) claimed that they do not see computers as a tool they hardly ever make use of in their daily lives by stating “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree”, while (f=12, 29.3%) responded positively by choosing “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”, and only one participant was uncertain (f=1, 2.4). In item 51, some instructors (f=16, 39%) responded positively by choosing “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” and stating that they agree that not many people can use computers, while only 10 instructors (24.4%) responded negatively by stating “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree” and the rest (f=15, 36.6%) were uncertain about this statement. Nearly most of the participants in item 52 (f=35, 85.3%) revealed that learning how to operate computers is like learning a new skill – the more you practice, the better you become by choosing “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to this item, while only 5 participants (12.2%) were uncertain and only 1 participant (2.4%) responded negatively by stating “Strongly Disagree”. In fact, in item 53 most of the

participants responded positively to this item by choosing “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” (f=34, 83%) and they revealed that knowing how to use computers is a worth wile skill, while only 7 participants (17.1%) were uncertain about this statement.

In the next item 54, 25 instructors (61%) do not feel pessimistic about managing a computer course by stating “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree” to this item, while 7 participants (17.1%) were uncertain and the rest (f=9, 22%) responded negatively and feel pessimistic about managing a computer course by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”. For the next item 55, the majority of the participants (f=29, 70.8%) claimed that they would not have any problem with finding a job where they have to work with computers by stating “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree” to this statement, while 6 participants (14.6%) were uncertain and the rest (f=6, 14.6%) responded positively by choosing “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to this statement. More than half of the participants in item 56 (f=33, 80.5%) pointed out that if they were given the opportunity, they would definitely like to learn about computers and make use of them and there is no one opposing this idea by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to this item, while 7 participants (17.1%) were uncertain and only one participant responded negatively (2.4) by choosing “Strongly Disagree”. For the last item of this section, item 57, some instructors (f=18, 43.9%) responded negatively to the fact that you should be a brain to work with computers by stating “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree” to this item, while 14 instructors were uncertain (34.1%) and the rest (f=9, 21.9%) responded positively by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to this statement.

5. Findings on E-mail Use for Classroom Learning

The purpose of the Fifth research question was to find whether the instructors are comfortable with using e-mails as a part of their teaching or not. This subcategory consisted of 11 items (the last items in the FAIT survey). In Table 9, teachers’ responses are presented in percentages and frequencies.

Table 9 The Frequency of the Instructors' Responses to The Items Related to E-mail Use for Classroom Learning

		Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Strongly Agree	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
58-	The use of e-mail makes the students feel more involved.	0	0	6	14.6	11	26.8	11	26.8	13	31.7
59-	The use of e-mail helps provide a better learning experience.	1	2.4	7	17.1	6	14.6	15	36.6	12	29.3
60-	The use of e-mail makes the course more interesting.	2	4.9	6	14.6	9	22	15	36.6	9	22
61-	The use of e-mail helps the student to learn more.	1	2.4	6	14.6	7	17.1	17	41.5	10	24.4
62-	The use of e-mail increases motivation for the course.	2	4.9	4	9.8	9	22	18	43.9	8	19.5
63-	More courses should use e-mail to disseminate class information and assignment.	2	4.9	4	9.8	6	14.6	18	43.9	11	26.8
64-	The use of e-mail creates more interaction between students enrolled in the course.	1	2.4	8	19.5	5	12.2	17	41.5	10	24.4
65-	The use of e-mail creates more interaction between student and instructor.	2	4.9	2	4.9	7	17.1	20	48.8	10	24.4
66-	E-mail provides better access to the instructor.	0	0	7	17.1	7	17.1	18	43.9	9	22
67-	E-mail is an effective means of disseminating class information and assignments.	1	2.4	4	9.8	4	9.8	20	48.8	12	29.3
68-	I prefer e-mail to traditional class handouts as an information disseminator.	6	14.6	3	7.3	8	19.5	15	36.6	9	22

Responses to item 58 revealed that when the instructors (f=24, 58.5%) make use of e-mail in the classroom setting, students feel more involved in the learning process and this was revealed from the participant's answers when they choose "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" to this statement. However, some instructors were not certain about the statement (f=11, 26.8%) and only 6 participants (14.6%) responded negatively by stating "Strongly Disagree". 65.9% of the instructors (f=27) supported the idea that the use of e-mail provides a better learning experience by stating "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" to this item, while 6 instructors were not certain about it (14.6%) in item 59 and only 8 participants (19.5%) responded negatively by stating "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree". For the next item 60, 24 instructors (58.6%) claimed that they believe that the use of e-mail makes the course more interesting by stating "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" to this statement, while only 9 participants (22%) were uncertain and the rest (f=8, 19.5%) responded negatively by stating "Disagree" or Strongly Disagree" to this item. Item 61 claimed that the use of e-mail helps the student to learn more. In fact, more than half of the participants (f=27, 65.9%) responded positively by choosing "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" to this item, while only 7 participants (17.1%) were uncertain about this statement and the rest (f=7, 17%) responded negatively about this item by stating "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree". As for item 62, most of the instructors responded positively (f=26, 63.4%) for the fact that the use of e-mail increases motivation for the course by stating "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" to this item, while only 9 participants (22%) were uncertain and the rest (f=6, 14.6%) responded negatively by stating "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to this item.

In the next item 63, more than half of the instructors responded positively (f=29, 70.7%) claiming that more courses should use e-mail to disseminate class information and assignment by stating "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" to this item, while only 6 participants (14.6%) were uncertain about it and the rest (f=6, 14.7%) responded negatively by choosing "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" to this statement. For item 64, while 65.9% of the instructors (f=27) supported the idea that the use of e-mail creates more interaction between students enrolled in the course by choosing "Agree" or "Strongly Agree", 5 of them are doubtful (12.2%) and responded to this item by choosing "Uncertain" and the rest (f=9, 21.9%) responded negatively to this item by choosing "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree". According to

the responses in item 65, 30 instructors (73.2%) stated that they agree that the use of e-mail creates more interaction between student and instructor by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to this item, while only 7 participants (17.1%) were uncertain and the rest (f=4, 9.8%) responded negatively by choosing “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree” to this statement. In item 66, more than half of the instructors responded positively (f=27, 65.9%) to the fact that E-mail provides better access to the instructors by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to this item, while 7 participants (17.1%) were uncertain about it and the rest (f=7, 17.1%) responded negatively by choosing “Strongly Disagree” to this item. Furthermore, in item 67, 32 instructors (78.1%) stated that they agree with the statement claiming that E-mail is an effective means of disseminating class information and assignments by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”, while only 4 participants were uncertain (9.8%) and the rest (f=7, 17.1%) responded negatively to this item by choosing “Strongly Disagree”. The last item, 68 claimed that if the instructors prefer e-mail to traditional class handouts as an information disseminator. In fact, more than half of them (f=24, 58.6) responded positively to this statement by stating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”. However, 19.5% of the instructors (f=8) claimed that they are uncertain about using E-mail as a tool to make announcements for their classes and the rest (f=9, 21.9%) responded negatively to this item by stating “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree”.

D. Findings from the Qualitative Data Analysis

Analysis is a process in which data is divided and broken into bits and beaten together (Bohm, 2002). In fact, according to Dey (2003), analysis is a deconstructing process used to reveal the structures and the main components of any data. Meanwhile, after being able to deconstruct the process and the data, we should reconstruct it again to become more meaningful and useful (Jorgense, 1989).

The questionnaire comprised two open-ended questions at the end. In fact, in the first item 69, the researchers asked the participants whether they like teaching English using computers and in item 70 they were asked if they don’t like teaching English using computers. The findings of the analysis are presented in two main categories. First, the findings related to why teachers like using computers in language teaching. Second, the findings related to why teachers do not like using computers in language teaching.

1. Findings Regarding the Reasons Why Teachers Like Using Computers

The statement in item 69 was "I like teaching English using computers because … "and the participants had to fill in with their point of view or their thoughts about implementing computers in their teaching process. In fact, the participants had many different reasons as to why they like using computers in English teaching. In this section, the reasons are presented under themes. (1) Computers as a source of saving teachers' time and Energy; (2) Computers are a source for the organization of teaching materials and easy access; (3) Computers are sources for student-teacher interaction, communication, motivation and participation; (4) Computers as a source for multimedia materials; (5) Computers are sources for teachers creativity and productivity.

Table 10 The Most Frequently Cited Reasons "Why The Teachers Like The Use of Computers

I like the use of computers because ….		Number of teachers.
1-	Computers are a source of saving teachers' time and Energy	11
2-	Computers are a source for the organization of teaching materials and easy access	9
3-	Computers are sources for student teacher interaction, communication, motivation and participation	9
4-	Computers as a source for multimedia materials	1
5-	Computers are sources for teacher's creativity and productivity	4

Table 11 The Below Table Shows The Participants' Answers to The First Open-Ended Question

I like using computers because		Frequency	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulated percentage
Valid		8	19,5	19,5	19,5
	Because computers can make our jobs easier Nd helps me connect with my colleague's friends Nd relatives	1	2,4	2,4	22,0
	Because it is a source of interaction between students and teachers	1	2,4	2,4	24,4
	Because it makes life easier and it is efficient	1	2,4	2,4	26,8
	Because they are a source of motivation for teachers and students	1	2,4	2,4	29,3
	computers are a source of motivation	1	2,4	2,4	31,7
	computers are sources for the	1	2,4	2,4	34,1

	organizations of teaching materials and easy access				
	computers are spruces for teacher creativity and productivity	1	2,4	2,4	36,6
	Computers increase my productivity	1	2,4	2,4	39,0
	Computers keep my files more organized and have an easy access to all my work.	1	2,4	2,4	41,5

Table 11 (cont.) The Below Table Shows The Participants' Answers to The First Open-Ended Question

	I like using computers because				
		Frequency	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulated percentage
Valid	I do not have to carry the notebooks all my data is stored in computer	1	2,4	2,4	43,9
	It facilitates teaching.	1	2,4	2,4	46,3
	it gives access to teaching materials and motivates both students and teacher.	1	2,4	2,4	48,8
	It gives easy access to the teaching materials	1	2,4	2,4	51,2
	It helps students stay motivated as it attracts their attention therefore facilitates the learning process	1	2,4	2,4	53,7
	it is efficient	1	2,4	2,4	56,1
	It organize my work	1	2,4	2,4	58,5
	It relieves me as a teacher of routine duties.	1	2,4	2,4	61,0
	It saves my data.	1	2,4	2,4	63,4
	it saves our time and I can reach all students instantly.	1	2,4	2,4	65,9
	it's more efficient	1	2,4	2,4	68,3
	practical	1	2,4	2,4	70,7
	they are a source for student-teacher interaction and communication.	1	2,4	2,4	73,2
	they are effective and efficient	1	2,4	2,4	75,6
	they are sources for multimedia materials.	1	2,4	2,4	78,0
	they are sources of motivation and help to save teachers' time and energy	1	2,4	2,4	80,5
	they bring creativity to and productivity to my class	1	2,4	2,4	82,9
	They facilitate things	1	2,4	2,4	85,4
	they get the attention of the students	1	2,4	2,4	87,8
	they help improve interaction between students and teachers	1	2,4	2,4	90,2
	they help prepare materials and teach English effectively	1	2,4	2,4	92,7
	they help the teachers to make their lessons more clear and more functional	1	2,4	2,4	95,1
	They make courses more interactive	1	2,4	2,4	97,6
	they make things easier and save our time	1	2,4	2,4	100,0
	Total	41	100,0	100,0	

In the following subsections, each theme will be discussed with more details about the responses of the participants.

a. Computers as a source of saving teachers' time and Energy

This section explains in details why teachers believe the use of computers save their time and energy. In fact, some participants wrote their own thoughts and beliefs about how the use of computers save their time and energy. Below are the answers to the open-ended questions.

Participant 36: They make things easier and save our time.

Participant 18: They facilitate things.

Participant 39: They are sources of motivation and help to save teachers' time and energy.

Participant 12: Computers are Practical.

Participant 37: It saves our time and I can reach all students instantly.

Participant 9: It saves my data.

Participant 15: It organize my work.

Participant 16: I do not have to carry the notebooks all my data is stored in computer.

Participant 7: Because it makes life easier and it is efficient.

Participant 14: It relieves me as a teacher of routine duties.

Participants 11: It facilitates teaching.

According to the responses of the participants, the use of computers helps them save their time and energy and have less workload. In fact, they will spend less time preparing for their lessons and look for materials. They will get rid of their teacher routine duties and make things happen in a shorter time.

b. Computers as a source for the organization of teaching materials and easy access

This section explains in detail why teachers believe the use of computers would help them organize their teaching materials and give them easy access to any resource they need. In fact, some participants wrote their own thoughts and beliefs about how the use of computers represents a source for organizing their teaching materials and how it gives them an easy access to a wide teaching materials. Below are the answers to the open-ended questions.

Participant 34: Computers keep my files more organized and have an easy access to all my work.

Participant 25: Computers are sources for the organizations of teaching materials and easy access.

Participant 16: I do not have to carry the notebooks all my data is stored in computer.

Participant 4: It gives easy access to the teaching materials.

Participant 15: It organize my work.

Participant 31: They help prepare materials and teach English effectively.

Participant 30: They help the teachers to make their lessons more clear and more functional.

Participant 22: It gives access to teaching materials and motivates both students and teacher.

According to the responses of the participants, the use of computers provides them with the opportunity to access the materials they need easily and quickly. This helps them manage the materials smoothly, because with the help of the computers, all their data and materials will be saved. In fact, computers help teachers look for their materials and collect them in a standardized way rather than collecting them piece by piece and trying to put them all together.

c. Computers as a source for student-teacher interaction, communication, motivation and participation

This section explains in detail why teachers believe the use of computers would foster motivation, participation, communication and interaction with their students. In fact, some participants wrote their own thoughts and beliefs about how the use of computers helps the students-teachers interaction, communication, motivation and participation in the teaching process. Below are the answers to the open-ended questions.

Participant 3: Because it is a source of interaction between students and teachers.

Participant 2: Because they are a source of motivation for teachers and students.

Participant 26: Computers are a source of motivation.

Participant 17: It helps students stay motivated as it attracts their attention therefore facilitates the learning process.

Participant 38: They are a source for student-teacher interaction and communication.

Participant 32: They help improve interaction between students and teachers.

Participant 13: They make courses more interactive.

Participant 8: Because computers can make our jobs easier and helps me connect with my colleagues friends and relatives.

Participant 33: They get the attention of the students.

By taking all these responses into consideration, it is believed that with the integration of multimedia and computers into lessons, it became easier for teachers and students to interact and communicate together as well as it became easier for teachers to generate motivation among students.

d. Computers as a source for multimedia materials

This section explains in detail why some teachers believe the employment of multimedia materials in the lessons would help both teachers and students to benefit from them. In fact, some participants wrote their own thoughts and beliefs about how

the use of computers represent a source for multimedia materials and give access to multimedia materials. Below are the answers to the open-ended questions.

Participant 40: They are sources for multimedia materials, it allows us to have access to audio, videos and project presentations.

Some teachers agree on the importance of using multimedia in their classrooms and implement computers in their lessons. In fact, this helps both of them teachers and students to enjoy the lessons and be motivated to follow up. Multimedia is a way to make the lessons more fun and interesting.

e. Computers as a sources for teachers creativity and productivity

This section explains in detail the instructors responses which indicates that computers are the sources of teachers' creativity and productivity inside the classroom. In fact, some participants wrote their own thoughts and beliefs about how the use of computers is considered to be a source for creativity and productivity for teachers. Below are the answers to the open-ended questions.

Participant 24: Computers are sources for teacher creativity and productivity.

Participant 10: Computers increase my productivity.

Participant 28: They are effective and efficient.

Participant 29: They bring creativity to and productivity to my class.

Participants 6 and 5: It's more efficient.

The responses of the participants affirm that computers help teachers to be creative and give them the opportunity to get rid of the traditional way of teaching by being productive and by thinking outside the box.

According to all the responses collected in this section, it can be said that computers give opportunities for both students and teachers to be creative, productive, and it facilitates their learning and teaching process by providing multiple ways to produce the language differently. Furthermore, this section revealed that computers are the reason to have a positive teaching environment, to have motivated students and teachers and to have better access to materials and resources needed.

2. Findings Regarding the Reasons Why Teachers Do Not Like Using Computers

The statement in item 70 was "I don't like teaching English using computers because … " and the participants had to fill in with their point of view or their thoughts about not implementing computers in their teaching process. In fact, the participants had many different reasons as to why they don't like using computers in English teaching. In this section, the reasons are presented under themes. (1) Computers are discouraging elements due to technical problems; (2) Computers are discouraging elements due to institutional barriers; (3) Computers are discouraging elements due to distraction; (4) Computers are discouraging elements due to health issues, (5) Computers are discouraging elements due to the lack of information.

Table 12 The Most Frequently Cited Reasons About Why The Teachers Do Not Like The Use of Computers

I Don't like the use of computers because ….		Number of teachers.
1-	Computers are discouraging elements due to technical problems	4
2-	Computers are discouraging elements due to institutional barriers	2
3-	Computers are discouraging elements due to Interaction	1
4-	Computers are discouraging elements due to health issues.	2
5-	Computers are discouraging elements due to the lack of information	2

Table 13 The Below Table Shows The Participants' Answers to The Second Open-Ended Question

I don't like using computers because					
		Frequency	Valid percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulated percentage
Valid		28	68,3	68,3	68,3
	/	1	2,4	2,4	70,7
	Because of the institutional restrictions and the lack of resources	1	2,4	2,4	73,2
	Computers are discouraging element due to technical problems	1	2,4	2,4	75,6
	I don't like it	1	2,4	2,4	78,0
	It hurts my neck.	1	2,4	2,4	80,5
	It makes my eyes sick	1	2,4	2,4	82,9
	Of the lack of resources at university	1	2,4	2,4	85,4
	The lack of knowledge	1	2,4	2,4	87,8
	There are a few things that i don't understand	1	2,4	2,4	90,2
	There may be some	1	2,4	2,4	92,7

problems that I can't handle such as internet connection or when the computer breaks down.				
There might be some problems such as internet connection that I can not handle	1	2,4	2,4	95,1
They might break or crash which will cause technical problems that I can't handle	1	2,4	2,4	97,6
They never substitute human emotions and human's interactions	1	2,4	2,4	100,0
Total	41	100,0	100,0	

In the following subsections, each theme will be discussed with more details about the responses of the participants. As it is showing in the table above, the number of the participants who answered "I don't like the use of computers because…" is less than the number of the participants who answered "I like the use of computers because…" this is because some participants answered both open-ended questions.

a. Computers are discouraging elements due to technical problems

This section explains in details the instructors responses which indicates that computers are a discouraging elements due to technical problems. In fact, some participants wrote their own thoughts and beliefs about why computers are a discouraging element and what are the reasons for these beliefs. Below are the answers to the open-ended questions.

Participant 23: Computers are discouraging element due to technical problems

Participant 27: There might be some problems such as internet connection that I cannot handle

Participant 35: There may be some problems that I can't handle such as internet connection or when the computer breaks down.

Participant 41: They might break or crash which will cause technical problems that I can't handle

Participants pointed out that due to technical problems computers are sometimes considered to be disadvantageous in Language Teaching process.

b. Computers are discouraging elements due to institutional barriers

This section explains in details the instructors' responses which indicates that computers are a discouraging element due to institutional barriers. In fact, some participants wrote their own thoughts and beliefs about why computers are a discouraging element when it comes to facing institutional barriers. Below are the answers to the open-ended questions.

Participant 20: Due to the lack of resources at university.

Participant 1: Because of the institutional restrictions and the lack of resources.

Participants pointed out that due to the institutional barriers and the lack of resources, teachers are not able to apply and implement computers in their teaching process and this can affect the teaching process, since some universities are not able to offer the adequate resources for both students and instructors to benefit from different resources and a variety of materials.

c. Computers are discouraging elements due to Interaction

This section explains in details the instructors' responses which indicates that computers are a discouraging element due to distraction. In fact, some participants wrote their own thoughts and beliefs this statement and what are the reasons behind this belief. Below are the answers to the open-ended questions.

Participant 18: They never substitute human emotions and human's interactions

One of the participants responded to this subsection by believing that computers will never substitute human emotions nor interaction between individuals.

d. Computers are discouraging elements due to health issues

This section explains in detail the instructors' responses which indicates that computers are discouraging elements due to some health issues. In fact, some participants wrote their own thoughts and beliefs about why computers are a discouraging element when it comes to facing some health issues. Below are the answers to the open-ended questions.

Participant 9: It hurts my neck.

Participant 15: It makes my eyes sick.

Some participants responded to this subsection by believing that computers are sources of health problems especially the eyes and neck. This could be true as for the case for students as well. Computers are a very beneficial element for both teachers and students but it can harm their life as well.

e. Computers are discouraging elements due to the lack of information

This section explains in detail the instructors' responses which indicates that computers are a discouraging element due to the lack of information and knowledge. In fact, some participants wrote their own thoughts and beliefs about why computers are a discouraging element when it comes to not being knowledgeable enough about how to use computers and implement them in their teaching process. Below are the answers to the open-ended questions.

Participant 21: The lack of knowledge.

Participant 11: There are a few things that I don't understand.

Some participants responded to this subsection by believing that they don't have enough knowledge and information about computers and how to use them. In this case, they don't want to implement computers in their classes because they are not sure enough of their understanding of how this technology works.

V. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Overview of the Study

The purpose of this study was to find out the teacher's attitudes towards Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL). Even though the Higher Institute of Language of Tunis is a very old University of Languages, there has not been any research done on this topic in this institution. In fact, this study is very important in this manner because the findings provided will help understand the instructors' attitudes towards CALL under 5 dimensions namely Enthusiasm, Anxiety, Productivity Improvement, Avoidance and Email use for classroom learning. The findings from each of the subscales are represented in their respective order to answer the research questions.

This study was carried out with 41 EFL instructors from the Higher Institute of Language of Tunis. They participated in this study through a Google Form link to the Survey FAIT which was designed by the Institute for the Integration of Technology into Teaching and Learning

(IILT) of the University of North Texas and provided the researcher with their responses. The researcher got a permission to use this questionnaire in the study from the developer of the survey. The survey is divided into two parts; the first part consisted of 68 multiple-choice items with 5 Likert-type Scales and the second part consisted of 2 open-ended questions about CALL to investigate the instructors' attitudes in using computers for instructional purposes.

This study employed both qualitative and quantitative research methods. The data gathered from the first questionnaire responded to the five research questions was analyzed through SPSS. The findings gathered from the second part of the questionnaire were discussed under the most frequently given answers and were divided into themes and categories in order to have a better understanding of the attitudes of teachers.

The following research questions were addressed in this study:

- What are the teachers' perceptions towards enthusiasm?
- What are the teachers' perceptions toward anxiety?
- What are the teachers' perceptions towards productivity improvement?
- What are the teachers' perceptions towards avoidance?
- What are the teachers' perceptions towards E-mail use for classroom learning regarding the use of CALL?

B. Conclusion and Discussions

The findings of this study showed that most teachers have positive attitudes towards the implementation of computers in their teaching process and the findings are in consistent with the ones of Hardy (1998), Hong and Koh (2002), Arkin (2003), Albirini (2006), Chen (2008), Teo (2008), Özerol (2009), Tezci (2009) and Zereyalp (2009), Bordbar (2010), Dashtestani (2012), Aydin (2013), Safdar and Jumani (2013).

The conclusions acquired from the findings of the responses of the five research questions mentioned above and the open-ended questions are discussed below in their respective orders.

Research Question 1: What are the teachers' perceptions towards enthusiasm?

According to the responses to the item related to Enthusiasm indicates that working with computers are enjoyable and stimulating for the teachers. The participants enjoy working with computers as much as they want to learn about them and make use of them in their teaching process. These findings are in line with the ones of Albirini (2006), Arkin (2003), Bordbar (2010).

Research Question 2: What are the teachers' perceptions toward anxiety?

According to the responses to the second research question it can be said that most of the participants do not feel anxious or stressed when they work with computers. They feel more confident when it comes to employ computers in their working and teaching. Computers do not discourage teachers or stress them; on the contrary, it makes them more confident and relaxed towards the implementation of CALL in their teaching. Therefore, it can be concluded that from the instructors'

responses that teachers have low anxiety levels when it comes to using computers in their life. They do not feel stressed, uncomfortable or scared just like the findings presented by Hong and Koh (2002), Arkin (2003), Zereyalp (2009) and Aydin (2013),

Research Question 3: What are the teachers' perceptions towards productivity improvement?

According to the responses to the third research question, the findings indicate that teachers believe that having training sessions on how to use computers is beneficial and it can help them in the integration of computers in their teaching process. They agree that computers play an important role in educational setting. When computers are implemented and integrated in the teaching process, the students will get a chance to improve themselves and be more productive with the help of computers. Regarding the findings mentioned above, we can conclude that teachers believe that computers provide a much better productivity improvement level for teachers by saving their time. The findings of Albirini (2006), Arkin (2006), Özerol (2009), Bordbar (2010), Aydin (2013) and Safdar and Jumani (2013) revealed the same results.

Research Question 4: What are the teachers' perceptions towards avoidance?

According to the responses to the fourth research question, teachers do not show negative feelings towards the use of computers. In fact, they believe that computers play an important role in our life and are means and tools to learn new things and most importantly help them to organize their work and save their time. Furthermore, the instructors believe that computers are not a discouraging element in the teaching process in the contrary they give more opportunities to teachers to be organized and well prepared. As a consequence, teachers don't see computers as a threatening element. The findings of this study are similar to those of Arkin (2003), Albirini (2006), however the present research findings are not similar to the ones of the ones in Zereyalp (2009) but similar to the findings of Bordbar (2010).

Research Question 5: What are the teachers' perceptions towards E-mail use for classroom learning regarding the use of CALL?

According to the responses to the fifth research question, it can be concluded that teachers believe that computers are important and beneficial agents in the

teaching process since they help both teachers and students communicate easily beyond the classroom by creating more interaction and motivation. In fact, computers turn the lesson into a more interactive one and integrate students in the process of learning. They also provide better access to materials and resources as well as better communication with the instructors via E-mails and are considered to be more efficient comparing to the traditional way of teaching. The studies carried out by

Chen (2008), Tezci (2009), Safdar and Jumani (2013), and Aydin (2013) revealed similar results.

Open-Ended Items

Based on the results from the findings related to the Open-Ended items (I like teaching English with computers because …), (I don't like teaching English with computers because …), it can be concluded that instructors have positive attitudes toward computers or CALL. The responses given to the Open-Ended questions are in line with the findings of the study. However, some instructors reported some unfavorable results regarding implementing CALL in their teaching methods by citing some discouraging factors such as lack of resources, technical problems, or health issue.

Due to the implementation of computers, teachers have more chances to present their lessons with more technological aspects with the help of more visual and audio materials (Özerol, 2009), and with the Implementation of Power Point presentations prepared by teacher, the learners become more engaged in the lesson (Aydin, 2013).

In fact, computers are used by most of the teachers to find different materials to teach and have access to wider resources. It helps teachers to find reading and listening materials to be used inside the classroom by the teachers to make the lesson more interesting, make student to be involved and engaged in the lesson (Bordbar, 2010). As Kulekçi (2009) pointed out, computers raised the quality of teaching in many different ways. According to Özerol, (2009), & Safdar and Jumani, (2013) computers and CALL have provided more opportunities to establish communication and interaction between teachers and learners. Through the help of computers and CALL, the interaction of students is highly increased whether inside or outside the

classroom (Dashtestani, 2012). Computers help teachers save their time, energy and have them to more access to a greater number of resources. In fact, class preparation, assignment preparation, keeping records of students' notes and grades will be much easier and available in the future when computers are used (Safdar and Jumani, 2013). Lastly, computers give learners the chance to be self-learners and make them rely on themselves by being autonomous and increase their motivation to do their own researchers and be active in their learning process (Arkin, 2003).

Due to some technical problems and difficulties in understanding how to use computers or implementing them in the teaching process, teachers feel discouraged and do not like using computers or implementing CALL in their teaching process (Özerol, 2009; Zereyalp, 2009, Bordbar, 2010 and Aydin, 2013). Therefore, their reactions and thoughts about computers will decrease in the future and they will think about computers as something difficult to use and to understand. In fact, in this study 2 teachers reported another issue related to the implementation of computers in their teaching process or classrooms and this is related to the institutional barriers such as the lack of hardware and software and CALL materials as well as the resources needed to implement computers in their teaching. In fact, they didn't have enough access to computers and internet when it comes to teaching their lessons. In addition, the lack of technical infrastructure and institutional support made it hard for teachers to be knowledgeable enough and familiar with the technical problems that can be occurred (Hardy, 1998; Özerol, 2009 and Zereyalp, 2009; Dashtestani, 2012 and Aydin, 2013).

According to what some researchers said (Chen, 2008; Dashtestani, 2012) some teachers believe that creating lesson materials is time consuming, that's why they prefer less use of computers. Nevertheless, computers provide unlimited access to unlimited resources at anytime and anywhere through the help of internet as well as classroom setting. Despite of this, computers are considered to be a disturbing element in the learning process, it become increasingly difficult to make sure that students are focusing on the lesson and engaging in the activities inside the classroom. (Kulekçi, 2009; Bordbar, 2010;) That is to say, computers can possibly create problems when it comes to classroom management. (Özerol, 2009).

Some teachers believe that computers are sources of health problems especially for the eyes and neck. In fact, two participants claimed that computers "hurt their

neck; and make their eyes sick". This could be true as for the case for students as well. The last reported reason was the lack of information and knowledge to use computers. In fact, some teachers responded to this by believing that they don't have enough knowledge and they don't receive enough training or information about computers and how to implement them in their classes.

C. Limitations of the Study

In this study, the participants were limited to 41 EFL teachers working at the Higher Institute of Language of Tunis located in Tunisia. In fact, this study only focused on the Teachers working in the Higher Institute of Language of Tunis, not all the other Institutes or Universities which makes it limited to only one university. The number of the participant is nearly half of the instructors working in the Higher Institute of Language of Tunis. In fact, the researcher couldn't reach all the instructors due to the current situation related to the pandemic. In addition, even though the findings are generalized, unfortunately they don't reflect the ideas of all the instructors.

Another factor is because of the late approval from the research ethics committee which took some time to be issued and approve the questionnaire, the study took place during the Academic year 2020-2021. Due to the current situation and the pandemic, the researcher could not be able to be in Tunisia to meet with the instructors and distribute the survey in person.

Another limitation is due to the participants' ages. As it is shown in chapter 4, most of the participants were aged between 21 and 44, thus the study mostly covered and represents the ideas of young teachers.

The FAIT survey is not only designed for English Language Teachers, Preparatory Schools or Schools of Foreign Languages. In fact, it is designed as well to measure the attitudes of faculties in any college, institute or university. Thus, it could be used in different departments to get a general idea about the attitudes of the faculty towards the implementation of computers in the learning process as well as computer technology and CALL.

D. Suggestions for Further Research

The FAIT survey is one of the surveys that is designed to not only for English Language Teachers, Preparatory Schools or Schools of Foreign Languages. In fact, it can be used in different departments to get a general idea about both the student's and teacher's attitudes towards computer assisted language learning. The benefits of this survey are to figure out how learners and teachers in any department and institution perceive the use of computers in their classes.

This study was conducted with the participation of 41 EFL teachers working at the Higher Institute of Language of Tunis located in the north of Tunisia. In fact, it was conducted to find out the attitudes of EFL teachers towards Computer Assisted Language Learning from 5 different dimensions and subcategories through the distribution of the FAIT survey which was developed by two researchers Christensen and Knezek in 1998. For further research, it would be better to reach all the teachers working at the Higher Institute of Language of Tunis as well as other EFL teachers working in different universities or Institutes to check their attitudes towards computer assisted language learning.

This study didn't focus on the different variables such as age, gender, experience in teaching, education level nor computer competence. In fact, if another research could be done, it can focus on one variable such as experience in teaching. This would help the researcher to focus and work on one variable only which will help to provide a great data and different from the old one focusing on different aspects.

In addition, other studies could include the attitude of students as well as teachers. In fact, they can provide with more details and data about the conditions in the EFL departments and how they see the implementation of CALL in their learning process. Thus, when conducting such research, the researcher could compare the answers of EFL teaching and the students and provide different data.

For more beneficial and greater results of the future of CALL, further studies could also redesign the data instrument and do not emphasize more on the institutional barriers nor the technical problems.

VI. REFERENCES

BOOKS

BAYRAKTAR, S. (2002). A meta-analysis of the effectiveness computer assisted instruction in science education. **Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 34, 173-188.**

BEATTY, K. (2003). **Teaching and Researching Computer Assisted Language Learning.** New York: Longman.

BEATTY, K. (2003). **Teaching and Researching Computer-Assisted Language Learning.** London: Pearson Education Limited.

CHECK, J., & SCHUTT, R. K. (2012). Survey research. In J. Check & R. K. Schutt (Eds.). **Research methods in education.** (pp. 159–185). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

CRESWELL, J. W., PLANO CLARK, V. L., GUTMANN, M. L., & HANSON, W. E. (2003). **Advanced mixed methods research designs.** In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research (pp. 209 – 240). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

CRYSTAL, D. (2003). **English as a global language.** Ernst Klett Sprachen.

FRAENKEL, J. R., WALLEN, N. E., & HYUN, H. H. (2012). **How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education** (8th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

FULLAN, M. G., HARGREAVES, A. (1991). **What's worth fighting for? Working together for your school.** New York: Teachers College Press.

GARDNER, H. (1983). **Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences.** NYC: Basic Books; 440 pp.

GOODWYN, A. (2000). **English in the digital age.** London: Cassel Education.

HUBBARD, P. (2013). **An Introduction to CALL.** Retrieved from http://www.stanford.edu/efs/callcourse2/

HUBBARD, P., & LEVY, M. (EDS.). (2006). **Teacher education in CALL.** Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

LAKSHMI, G. B. (2004). **Attitude Towards Science.** Discovery Publishing House.

LEVY, M. (1997). **Computer-assisted language learning: Context and conceptualization.** Oxford University Press.

MACK, N., WOODSONG, C., MACQUEEN, K., GUEST, G., NAMEY, E. (2005), **Qualitative research methods.**

MOLINA-AZORIN. J. (2016). **Mixed methods research: An opportunity to improve our studies and our research skills.**

MORAS, S. (2001). **Computer-assisted language learning (CALL) and the Internet.** Retrieved from http://www3.telus.net/linguisticsissues/CALL.html

MURAIRWA. S. (2015). **Voluntary Sampling Design**. Faculty of Management and Administration, Africa University, Mutare, Zimbabwe.

NETTELBECK, D. (2005). **Computers, thinking and learning.** Camberwell, Victoria: ACER Press.

SAFDAR, M., & JUMANI, (2013). **Information Era: Tutors' and learners' attitude and skills towards the use of information and communication technologies.** Retrieved from http://www.ed.aaou2013.com/pdf/139.pdf

SHNEIDERMAN, B. (2003). **Leonardo's laptop: human needs and the new computing technologies.** The MIT Press.

THOMAS, M., & REINDERS, H. (EDS.). (2010). **Task-based language learning and teaching with technology.** Continuum International Publishing Group.

TRAVERS, R. (1978), **Introduction to Educational Research**, (4th Ed.), McMillan, London.

WARSCHAUER, M. (1999). **Electronic literacies: language, culture, and power in online education.** Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

WOODARD, C. (1998). **Developing vocabulary skills.** ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED426400.

ZHANG, F. (2008). **Handbook of research on computer-enhanced language acquisition and learning.** Hershey, New York: Information Science Reference.

ARTICLES

AHMADI, M. R. (2017). The impact of motivation on reading comprehension. **International Journal of Research in English Education**. http://www.ijreeonline.com

AHMED, ZOHUR. (2004). "The Role of Computers in Facilitating the Academic Writing of Undergraduate Students." **Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages.**

ALBIRINI, A. (2006). Teachers' attitudes toward information and communication technologies: The case of Syrian EFL teachers. **Computers & Education,** 47(4), 373-398.

ALMEKHLAFI, A. G. (2004, APRIL). The effect of interactive multimedia on learning English as a second language. **Proceedings of the Fifth Annual UAE University Research Conference** (Vol. 2). Al-Ain, United Arab Emirates.

ALMEKHLAFI, A. G. (2006). The effect of computer assisted language learning (CALL) on United Arab Emirates English as a foreign language (EFL) school students' achievement and attitude. **Journal of Interactive learning research,** 17(2), 121-142.

ARISHI, S. A. (2012). Attitudes of students at Saudi Arabia's industrial colleges toward Computer-Assisted Language Learning. **Teaching English with Technology,** (1), 38-52.

AYDIN, S. (2013). Teachers' perceptions about the use of computers in EFL teaching and learning the case of Turkey. **Computer Assisted Language Learning**, 26(3), 214-233.

AYRES, R. (2002). Learner attitudes towards the use of CALL. **Computer Assisted Language Learning,** 15(3), 241-249

BARK, S. M. (2011). Attitudes of Egyptian teachers towards computers. **Contemporary Education Technology**, 2(4), 308-318.

BEAUVOIS, M. (1994). E-talk: Attitudes and motivation in computer-assisted classroom discussion. **Computers and the Humanities,** *28(1)*, 177-190.

BERLIN, D. F., & WHITE, A. L. (2002). Attitudes toward integration as perceived by preservice teachers enrolled in an integrated mathematics, science, and technology teacher education program. **Science Educator,** *11*(1), 32-40.

BORDBAR, F. (2010). English teachers' attitudes toward computer-assisted language learning. **International Journal of Language Studies (IJLS),** 4(3), 27-54.

BORRAS (1993). Developing and assessing practicing spoken French: A multimedia program for improving skills. **Educational Technology Research and Development,** *41(4)*, 91-103.

BUTLER-PASCOE, MARY ELLEN. (2011). "The History of CALL: The Intertwining Paths of Technology and Second/Foreign Language Teaching." **2International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching** 1 (1): 16–32.

CHALHOOB-DEVILLE, M. (2001). Language testing and technology: Past and future. **Language Learning & Technology,** 5(2), 95-98.

CHAPELLE, C. (1997). CALL in the year 2000: Still in search of research paradigms? **Language Learning and Technology,** 1(1), 19-43. Retrieved from http://llt.msu.edu/vollnum1/chapelle/default.html

CHAPELLE, C. A., & HEGELHEIMER, V. (2004). The language teacher in the 21st century. **New perspectives on CALL for second language classrooms,** 299-316.

CHARISCHAK, I. (2000). A look at technology's role in professional development of mathematics teachers at the middle school level. **School Science and Mathematics,** *100*(7), 349-354.

CHEN, Y. L. (2008). A mixed-method study of EFL teachers' Internet use in language instruction. **Teaching and Teacher Education,** 24(4), 1015-1028.

CHESTER, I. (2001). Technology teacher education at Griffith University, Queensland, Australia. **Technology Teacher,** *60*(5), 32-37.

CHIKAMATSU, N. (2003). The effects of computer use on L2 Japanese writing. **Foreign Language Annals,** *36*(1), 114-127.

CHRISTENSEN, R., & KNEZEK, G. (1998). Parallel forms for measuring teachers' attitudes toward computers. **Technology and teacher education annual,** 2, 820-821.

COLPAERT, J. (2012). The "Publish and Perish" syndrome. **Computer Assisted Language Learning,** 25(5), 383-391.

CONONELOS, T., & OLIVIA, M. (1993). Using computer networks to enhance foreign language/culture education. **Foreign Language Annals,** *26*, 527-534.

CROASMUN. J., & OSTROM. L. (2011). "Using Likert-Type Scales in the Social Sciences", **Journal of Adult Education**, Volume 40, Number 1.

CUSHION, S., & DOMINIQUE, H. (2002). Applying new technological developments to CALL for Arabic. **Computer Assisted Language Learning,** *15*(5), 501-508.

DASHTESTANI, R. (2012). Barriers to the implementation of CALL in EFL courses: Iranian EFL teachers' attitudes and perspectives. **The Jalt CALL Journal,** 8(2), 55-70.

DAVIES, G. (2002). Article on CALL in the Good Practice Guide at the website of the Subject Centre for Languages, **Linguistics and Area Studies (LLAS),** University of Southampton Retrieved from http://www.llas.ac.uk/ resources/gpg/61

DUSICK, D. M. (1998). What social cognitive factors influence faculty members' use of computers for teaching? A literature review. **Journal of Research on Computing in Education,** 31 (2). Retrieved November 2, 2002 from EBSCO Host.

EGBERT, J. (2005). CALL essentials: **Principles and practice in CALL classrooms.** Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

EGBERT, J., PAULUS, T.M., & NAKAMICHI, Y. (2002). The impact of CALL instruction on classroom computer use: A foundation for rethinking technology in teacher education. **Language Learning and Technology,** *6*(3), 108-126.

EGBERT, JOY, OMRAN AKASHA, LESLIE HUFF, AND HYUNGYUNG LEE. (2011). "Moving Forward: Anecdotes and Evidence Guiding the Next Generation of CALL." **International Journal of Compter-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching** 1 (1): 1–15.

FATEMI JAHROMI, S, A., & SALIMI, F. (2013). Exploring the human element of computer-assisted language learning: an Iranian context. **Computer Assisted Language Learning,** 26(2), 158-176.

FENFANG, H. (2003). Learners' behaviors in computer-based input activities elicited through tracking technologies. **Computer Assisted Language Learning,** *16*(1), 5-29.

FOTOS, S., & BROWNE, C. (2004). The development of CALL and current options. In S. Fotos & C. Brown (Eds.), **New Perspectives on CALL for Second and Foreign Language Classrooms** (pp. 3-14). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

GAMPER, J., & KNAPP, J. (2002). A review of intelligent CALL systems. **Computer Assisted Language Learning,** 15(4), 329-342.

GENTILE, J., LONBERGER, R., PARANA, J., & WEST, A. (2000). Preparing preservice teachers for the technological classroom: A school-college partnership. **Journal of Technology and Teacher Education,** *8*(2), 97-109.

GORJIAN, B., MOOSAVINIA, S. R., EBRAHIMI KAVARI, K., ASGARI, P., & HYDAREI, A. (2011). The impact of asynchronous computer-assisted language learning approaches on English as a foreign language high and low achievers' vocabulary retention and recall. **Computer Assisted Language Learning,** 24(5), 383-391.

GORJIAN, BAHMAN, ABDOLMAJID HAYATI, AND PARISA POURKHONI. (2013). “Using Praat Software in Teaching Prosodic Features to EFL Learners.” **Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences** 84 (2005) (July): 34–40. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.06.505.

GÜNDÜZ, N (2005). 'Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL)', **Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies,** 1(2), 193-215. Retrieved online from http://www.jlls.org/index.php/article/view/16/18.

HARDY, J. V. (1998). Teacher attitudes towards and knowledge of computer technology. **Computers in the Schools,** 14(3-4),119-136.

HARRISON, A. W., & RAINER, R. K. (1992). The influence of individual differences on skill in end-user computing. **Journal of Management Information Systems,** 9(1), 93–111.

HEFFERNAN, N., & WANG, S. (2008). Copyright and multimedia classroom material: a study from Japan. **Computer Assisted Language Learning,** 21(2), 167-180.

HEGELHEIMER, V. (2006). When the technology course is required. In P. Hubbard and M. Levy (Eds.), **Teacher education in CALL** (pp. 117-133). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

HONG, K. S., & KOH, C. K. (2002). Computer Anxiety and Attitudes towards Computers among Rural Secondary School Teachers: A Malaysian Perspective. **Journal of Research on Technology in Education,** 35(1), 27-48.

JIANG, Z, (2009). Developing CALL to Meet the Needs of Language Teaching and Learning. **English Language Teaching,** 1(2), 108-113.

JONES, C. (1986). It’s not so much the program, more what you do with it: The importance of methodology in CALL. **System**, 14(2), 171-178.

JUNG, U.O. (2002). An international bibliography of computer-assisted language learning: Fifth installment. **System**, *30(*3), 349-398.

KERN, R. (2006). Perspectives on technology in learning and teaching languages. **TESOL Quarterly,** 40(1), 183-210.

KESSLER, G. (2007). Formal and informal CALL preparation and teacher attitude towards technology. **Computer Assisted Language Learning,** 20(2), 173-188.

KESSLER, G., & PLAKANS, L. (2008). Does teachers' confidence with CALL equal innovative and integrated use? **Computer Assisted Language Learning,** 21(3), 269-282.

KHAN M S, KHAN I, DIN S, ISMAIL H M, RAFID K, et al. (2015). The Impacts of ICT on the Students' Performance: A Review of Access to Information. **Res Human Soc Sci** 1: 2224- 5766.

LAM, Y. (2000). Technophilia vs technophobia: A preliminary look at why second-language teachers do or do not use technology in their classrooms. **Canadian Modern Language Review/La revue Canadienne des langues vivante,** 56(3), 389-420.

LEE, K. W. (2000). English teachers' barriers to the use of computer-assisted language learning. **The Internet Journal of Research on Technology in Education**, *34*(2), 173-188.

LEVY, M., & STOCKWELL, G. (2006). CALL dimensions. *London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Long, M. (1998)* **Task-group and task-group interactions. University of Hawaii Working papers in ESL,** 8, 1-26.

MARCINKIEWICZ, H. R. (1994). Computers and teachers: Factors affecting computer use in the classroom. **Journal of Research on Computing in Education**, 26, 220+. Retrieved January 28, 2003 from EBSCO Host.

MIN, B. C. (1998). A study of the attitudes of Korean adults toward technology-assisted instruction in English-Language programs. **Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning,** 1(1), 63-78.

NESSELHAUF, N., & TSCHICHOLD, C. (2002). Collocations in CALL: An investigation of vocabulary- building software for EFL. **Computer Assisted Language Learning** *15*(3) 251-279.

PETERS, M. (2006). Developing computer competencies for pre-service language teachers: Is one course enough? In P. Hubbard & M. Levy (Eds.),

Teacher education in CALL (pp.153-165). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

PICKARD, V., CHAN, K., & TIBBETS, J. (1994). Concordancing for schools: Problems and potential. **Paper presented at the Annual International Language in Education Conference,** Hong Kong, 1993. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 386 056).

PIM, CHRIS. (2013). "Emerging Technologies, Emerging Minds: Digital Innovations within the Primary Sector." In **Innovations in Learning Technologies for English Language Teaching,** edited by Gary Motteram, 15–42. London: British Council.

ROBERT, A. (2002). Learner attitudes towards the use of CALL. **Computer Assisted Language Learning,** *15*(3), 241-249.

SALABERRY, R. (2000). L2 morphosyntactic development in text-based computer-mediated communication. **Computer Assisted Language Learning,** *13(1)*, 5-27.

SCHNACKENBERG, H L., LUIK, K., NISAN, Y. C., & SERVANT, C. (2001). A case study of needs assessment in teacher in-service development. **Educational Research and Evaluation,** *7*(2- 3), 137-160.

SCHWIENHORST, K. (2002). Why virtual, why environments? Implementing virtual reality concepts in computer assisted language learning. **Simulation & Gaming,** *33*(2), 196-209.

SCINICARIELLO, S. G. (1997). Uniting teachers, learners, and machines: Language laboratories and other choices. In M.D. Bush and R. M. Terry (Eds.), **Technology-enhanced language learning** (pp.185-213). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

SINGHAL, M. (1997). The Internet and foreign language education: Benefits and challenges. **The Internet TESL Journal,** 3(6). Retrieved from http://itslj.org/Articles/Singhal-Internet.html

SON, J. B. (2008). Using web-based language learning activities in the ESL classroom. **International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning,** 4(4), 34-43.

STEPP-GREANY, J. (2002). Student perceptions on language learning in a technological environment: Implications for the new millennium. **Language Learning & Technology,** 6(1), 165-180.

STEVENS, V. (1991). Classroom concordancing: Vocabulary materials derived from relevant, authentic text. **English for Specific Purposes,** 10, 35 – 46.

STOCKWELL, GLENN. (2007). "A Review of Technology Choice for Teaching Language Skills and Areas in the CALL Literature." **ReCALL 19** (02) (May 4): 105–120. doi:10.1017/S0958344007000225. http:// www.journals.cambridge.org/ abstract_S0958344007000225.

SWAN, K., & MITRANI, M. (1993). The changing nature of teaching and learning in computer-based classrooms. **Journal of Research on Computing in Education,** 26 (1), 40+ Retrieved April 10, 2002 from EBSCO Host.

TEO, T. (2008). Pre-service teachers' attitudes towards computer use: A Singapore survey. **Australian Journal of Education Technology,** 24(4), 413-424.

TEZCI, E. (2009). Teachers' effect on ICT use in education: The Turkey sample. **Procedia-Social and Behavioral Science,** 1(1), 1285-1294.

THURSTON, J., & CANDLIN, C. N. (1998). Concordancing and the teaching of vocabulary of academic English. **English for Specific Purposes,** 17, 267 – 280.

VOLK, K. S. (2000). Trends in U.S. technology teacher education programs: Home thoughts from abroad. **Journal of Industrial Teacher Education,** *37*(3), 115-126.

WARSCHAUER, M. (1996). Computer-assisted language learning: An introduction. In S. Fotos (Ed.), **Multimedia Language Teaching** (pp. 3-20) Tokyo: Logos International.

WARSCHAUER, M. (2004). The rhetoric and reality of aid: Promoting educational technology in Egypt. **Globalization, Societies and Education**, 2(3), 377-90.

WARSCHAUER, M., & HEALEY, D. (1998). Computers and language learning: An overview. **Language teaching,** 31(02), 57-71.

WARSCHAUER, M., & WHITTAKER, P. F. (1997). The Internet for English Teaching: Guidelines for teachers. **TESL Reporter,** 30(1), 27-33.

WARSCHAUER, M., (1996). "Computer Assisted Language Learning: an introduction", In Fotos S. (ed.) **Multimedia language teaching,** Tokyo: Logos International: 3-20.

ZHAO, Y. (2003). Recent developments in technology and language learning: A literature review and meta-analysis. **CALICO journal,** 21(1), 7-27.

DISSERTATIONS

ALBIRINI, A. (2004). An exploration of the factors associated with the attitudes of high school EFL teachers in Syria toward information and communication technology. (Doctoral Dissertation, the Ohio State University). ProQuest Digital Dissertations (UMI No.3141718).

ARKIN, E. (2003). Teachers' attitudes towards computer technology use in vocabulary instruction. (Unpublished MA dissertation). The Institute of Economics and Social Science, Bilkent University, Ankara, turkey.

ÖZEROL, G. (2009). Perceptions of EFL primary school teachers towards CALL. (Unpublished MA Thesis), Cukurova University, Adana, Turkey.

ZEREYALP, S. A. (2009). EFL Teacher Educators' Attitudes Towards CALL: Case of Turkish State Universities. (Unpublished MA Thesis). Cukurova University Institute of Social Sciences, Adana, Turkey.

APPENDICES

Appendix A : Fait Questionnaire

Dear colleague,

My name is Amal El MALLEH and am doing my master's study at Istanbul Aydin University, Istanbul, Turkey. I have been doing my MA in the Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL). My thesis title is "EFL teachers' attitudes towards computer assisted language learning", in Tunisia, and as part of my study, I have prepared this questionnaire. The aim of this questionnaire is to elicit data about teachers' attitudes toward using technology in language classes. Your answers are of the highest value to me and they will constitute the backbone of this MA study. Please answer all the questions in the questionnaire. ALL RESPONSES WILL BE KEPT STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL AND ALL RESPONDENTS ANONYMOUS. NO ONE OF THE RESPONDENTS WILL BE REVEALED IN ANY WAY IN THE STUDY. Please remember that your responses are very important for me. Thank you in advance for your co-operation.

PART I. The aim of this part is to gather general information on participants, their knowledge of and attitudes toward information technology.

1. Age: ___21-24___ 25-29___ 30-34___ 35-39___ 40-44___ 45-49___ 50-54 55+

2. Education: __Bachelor's degree__Master's degree__Doctorate or professional degree

3. Gender: ____Male____ Female

4. Do you own a computer at home: ____Yes____No

5. How often do you use a computer?

____Daily____ Once a week____ Once a month____ Never

6. How often do you use a word processor (Microsoft Word, Word Perfect, etc)?

____Daily____ Once a week____ Once a month____ Never

7. How often do you use a spreadsheet program (Microsoft Excel, Lotus 123, etc)?

____Daily____ Once a week____ Once a month____ Never

8. How often do you use a presentation program (Microsoft Power Point, Freelance Graphics, etc.)?

____Daily____ Once a week____ Once a month____ Never

9. How often do you use electronic mail (e-mail)?

____Daily____ Once a week____ Once a month____ Never

10. How often do you use the Internet?

____Daily____ Once a week____ Once a month____ Never

11. Have you ever received any type of computer training? ____Yes____ No

12. Where did you receive your training (check all that apply)?

____Self-taught____ Computer store____College or University____ other (specify:)_____

13. Are you____ part-time or____ full-time faculty?

14. How long have you been teaching at the University level?

_____

15. Department: _____

Name: _____ Date: _____

(Please Print)

PART II. The aim of this part is to elicit information about Faculty Attitudes toward Information Technology (FAIT). Please read each statement and then circle the number which best represents how you feel.

SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, U = Undecided, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree

	SD	D	U	A	SA
1. I think that working with computers would be enjoyable and stimulating.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
2. I want to learn a lot about computers.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
3. The challenge of learning about computers is exciting.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
4. Learning about computers is boring to me.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
5. I like learning on a computer	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
6. I enjoy learning how computers are used in our daily lives.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
7. I would like to learn more about computers.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
8. I would like working with computers.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
9. A job using computers would be very interesting.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
10. I enjoy computer work.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
11. I will use a computer as soon as possible.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
12. Figuring out computer problems does not appeal to me.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
13. If given the opportunity, I would like to learn about and use computers.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
14. Computers are not exciting.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
15. Computer lessons are a favorite subject for me.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	SD	**D**	**U**	**A**	**SA**
16. I get a sinking feeling when I think of trying to use a computer.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

17. Working with a computer makes me feel tense and uncomfortable.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
18. Working with a computer would make me very nervous.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
19. Computers intimidate and threaten me.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
20. Computers frustrate me.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
21. I have a lot of self-confidence when it comes to working with computers.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
22. I sometimes get nervous just thinking about computers.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
23. A computer test would scare me.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
24. I feel apprehensive about using a computer.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
25. Computers are a tool much like hammer or lathe.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
26. Computer could enhance remedial instruction.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
27. Computers will relieve teachers of routine duties.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
28. Computers can be used successfully with courses which demand creative activities.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
29. I have become familiar with computers through my previous experience.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
30. University students should understand the role of computers play in society.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

	SD	D	U	A	SA
31. University students should have some understanding about computers.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
32. I feel qualified to teach computer literacy.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
33. Computer can be a useful instructional aid in almost all subject areas.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
34. Use of computers in education always reduces the personal treatment of the students.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
35. I feel at ease when I am around computers.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
36. I feel comfortable when a conversation turns to computers.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
37. Teacher training should include instructional applications of computers.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
38. Computers would motivate students.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
39. Computers would significantly improve the overall quality of my students' education.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
40. Computers would help students improve their writing.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
41. Computers would stimulate creativity in students.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
42. Computers could help students work with one another.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
43. Computers would help me organize my work.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
44. Computers would increase my productivity.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
45. Computers would save time.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
46. Computers would help me learn.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
47. Computers would help me organize my finances.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
48. Computers solve more problems than they cause.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
49. I will probably never learn to use a computer.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

50. I see the computer as something I will rarely use in my daily life as an adult.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
51. Not many people can use computers.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
52. Learning to operate computers is like learning a new skill – the more you practice, the better you become.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
53. Knowing how to use computers is a worthwhile skill.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
54. I do not think I could handle a computer course.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
55. I would never take a job where I had to work with computers.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
56. If given the opportunity, I would like to learn about how to use computers.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
57. You have to be a “brain” to work with computers.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
58. The use of e-mail makes the student feel more involved.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
59. The use of e-mail helps provide a better learning experience.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
60. The use of e-mail makes the course more interesting.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
61. The use of e-mail helps the student to learn more.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
62. The use of e-mail increases motivation for the course.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
63. More courses should use e-mail to disseminate class information and assignments.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
64. The use of e-mail creates more interaction between students enrolled in the course.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
65. The use of e-mail creates more interaction between student and instructor.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
66. E-mail provides better access to the instructor.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
67. E-mail is an effective means of disseminating class information and assignments.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

68. I prefer e-mail to traditional class handouts as an information disseminator.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

69. I like teaching English with computers because …

……

……

……

……

……

……

……

70. I don't like teaching English with computers because …

……

……

……

……

……

……

……

Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 17.09.2020-3073

T.C.
İSTANBUL AYDIN ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ
Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü

Sayı : 88083623-020
Konu : Etik Onayı Hk.

Sayın Amal MALLAH

Tez çalışmanızda kullanmak üzere yapmayı talep ettiğiniz anketiniz İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi Etik Komisyonu'nun 31.08.2020 tarihli ve 2020/07 sayılı kararıyla uygun bulunmuştur. Bilgilerinize rica ederim.

e-imzalıdır
Dr.Öğr.Üyesi Alper FİDAN
Müdür Yardımcısı

17/09/2020 Enstitü Sekreteri Tuğba SÜNNETCİ

Evrakı Doğrulamak İçin : https://evrakdogrula.aydin.edu.tr/enVision.Dogrula/BelgeDogrulama.aspx?V=8E5U3EY0U

Adres:Beşyol Mah. İnönü Cad. No:38 Sefaköy , 34295 Küçükçekmece / ISTANBUL
Telefon:444 1 428
Elektronik Ağ:http://www.aydin.edu.tr/

Bilgi için: Tuğba SÜNNETCİ
Unvanı: Enstitü Sekreteri

RESUME

Personal Information

Name Surname: Amal El MALLEH

Education

Master of English Language and Literature, Istanbul Aydin University, Turkey.

Bachelor of English Language, Literature and Civilisation High Institute of Languages of Tunisia, Tunisia.

Certificate of Teaching Pathways: How to teach speaking from British Council.

Certificate of Developing Speaking skills for B1 Preliminary for Schools and B2 First for Schools: A focus on interactive communication from Cambridge.

Diploma in Business English – Graphic Design – Web Development: BE'TECH AISEC CARTHAGE, Tunisia

Diploma in English Grammar Review Language from AMIDEAST: AMERICA-MIDEAST EDUCATION & TRAINING SERVICES, Tunisia.

Diploma in English Communication Course from AMIDEAST: AMERICA-MIDEAST EDUCATION & TRAINING SERVICES, Tunisia.

Nationality: Tunisian

Work Experience: Three years of Teaching English at Turkish International School, Istanbul, Turkey.

A year of Teaching English at International Arab School, Istanbul, Turkey.

A year of Teaching English at Al-Fayez International School, Istanbul, Turkey.

2 years of Teaching English at a language school, ABC Horizon, Istanbul, Turkey.

Language Skills: Arabic, French and English